

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 11 April 1989

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 3.30 pm, and read prayers.

MOTION - STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Advance Coal Purchase - Evidence Tabling

HON A.A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [3.34 pm]: I move -

That the Clerk of the Legislative Council be, and is hereby, ordered to lay on the Table at the next sitting all evidence, including transcripts, taken or received by the Select Committee appointed in the previous session to inquire into an advance coal purchase by SECWA from Western Collieries Ltd with the exception of any evidence which, in the Clerk's opinion, is commercially-sensitive.

As Chairman of the Select Committee involved I was under the impression that all the Select Committees in which I have been involved in this place have, when tabling their reports, tabled the evidence relative to the reports. Prior to last Christmas there certainly was a misunderstanding on my part and the evidence tendered to this Select Committee was not tabled. On discussing the matter with the Clerk he brought to my notice the fact that certain confidential financial evidence was involved. I therefore move this motion to allow the Clerk to remove that part of the evidence from the transcripts, and I urge the House to support it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Fred McKenzie.

VISITORS - PRESIDENT'S GALLERY

Senator Sy - Taiwanese Delegation

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths): I take the opportunity of advising honourable members that we are honoured today with the presence in the President's Gallery of Senator Sy from Taiwan with a delegation to Western Australia from Taiwan.

[Applause.]

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - FIFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 6 April.

HON P.H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [3.36 pm]: I take this opportunity to congratulate Government Ministers on their re-appointment, particularly the Leader of the House, Hon Joe Berinson, and his two colleagues on their continued presence on the frontbench. I am sure they will carry out their duties to the best of their ability. Also, I congratulate Hon Doug Wenn for being elevated to the position of Deputy Whip. I note the demise from that position of my colleague Hon Tom Stephens who now sits in this House without a phone, which will put a strain on him. I regret that parliamentary business precludes him from being in the House at the moment but I am hopeful that my message will be passed to him.

I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a sensitive matter which has been affecting me for some weeks, in the hope that the person or persons responsible might raise their hands. Prior to the last State election and during the election campaign I was called to the office of the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr MacKinnon, to be told that he had been approached by a certain member of the community and told that I had a substantial loan from Rothwells Bank and that the receivers apparently had discovered my name was on some bank documents. My leader did not quote a figure but said that he had been told that the loan had been made good; that, is written off. I assured him at the time that I had never borrowed money from Rothwells, Laurie Connell or anyone else and as far as I was concerned someone was being mischievous. From time to time and particularly around nomination time I, like people from all political parties, have had mischievous things said about me and at the time I did not take this allegation seriously because I thought it was just another one of these things.

However, last weekend I was in the company of a senior Liberal, Senator Fred Chaney, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, who said that he had been asked by someone to investigate a \$150 000 loan I was supposed to have obtained from Rothwells, which subsequently had been made good. I told Senator Chaney what I told my Leader. They were both within their rights to come to me and I am pleased that they did.

I have never received one cent from Laurie Connell or Rothwells. I advise the sniveller who has asked senior members of my party to speak to me about this matter that if I want \$150 000 the quickest way for me to obtain it is to sue the person who is spreading stories. Better still, if the person concerned thinks he has evidence to this effect he should come to me and tell me personally. I hope he does it in public and soon because I have just about reached the end of my tether and sooner or later I will find out who is responsible.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I advise the strangers and the policeman in the Public Gallery that there is one door leading into the gallery of the Legislative Council. That is the way to get in and out.

[From the gallery]: It has been locked.

The PRESIDENT: I will arrange to have it unlocked. I apologise to Hon P.H. Lockyer for interrupting him.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: That is quite all right, Mr President. I understand that it is the President's job from time to time to deal with things like attendants' duties.

As I was saying, sooner or later I will find out who this person is. For some weeks now I have been very concerned about this type of rumour and I hope to lay it to rest. It is no secret that I have always been good friends with Laurie Connell, and I am sorry about the demise of the Rothwells Bank, as many people are. Nobody in this world needs to be persecuted as Mr Connell has been in the last few months. If he has done something wrong, hopefully the receiver or the National Companies and Securities Commission will find out what it is. In my view, if ever Mr Connell is charged he will have absolutely no hope of getting a fair trial. As for the persecution by the media of his wife, if it was their intention to give her a hard time, they have succeeded. They have nearly sent her to the nuthouse. If the media wanted to give the Connells' kids a hard time, they have succeeded there too. Unfortunately they are only little kids, and little kids get a hard time at school.

By far the most appalling thing that happened was the hauling of Laurie Connell out of the VIP lounge at the airport - he was not hauled off the aeroplane, as was reported in the media - by the use of a court order to stop him from going to London because it was thought he would do a midnight flit. In my view that has only turned public opinion his way.

Hon Mark Nevill: It sells a few papers though.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: It might sell newspapers, but it does no-one any credit. I understand from him personally that had someone rung him up and said there was a problem he would not even have gone to the airport, let alone go through the nonsense that went on. I am not defending the collapse of his bank at all. That is something that needs to be looked into properly by the receiver and the people concerned. The lawyers and judges will decide that in due course. However, I thought Australia gave people a fair go. I think he is fair game and that he should be pursued in the right way. But it is disgraceful journalism when the newspapers start printing pictures of his wife with no shoes on when she is obviously distressed. The people responsible - members of the Press in the gallery can go and tell them this from me - are engaging in gutter journalism at its very worst.

That does not make me any less angry about the person who is going around trying to lump me in just because I have an odd beer or two with Laurie Connell and because I happen still to be one of his friends. That makes me very angry. If that person is in my party I would like him to bob up pretty quickly. I do not think even members opposite would do that sort of thing. I honestly do not believe it. The fact that I have to defend myself or give answers to senior leaders in my party leaves a bad taste in my mouth. I do not like it. Where I come from, if one has something to say to somebody one goes to him and says it. If this person has some evidence let him or her produce it in public and I will defend myself properly. My conscience is crystal clear; I have not had one cent.

Mr President, you have drawn attention to the presence in your gallery of Senator Sy from

Taiwan, who is in Western Australia with a delegation. I also recognise a former Premier of Western Australia, Hon Ray O'Connor, as the person who encouraged these people to come to Australia. That is the next subject I wanted to deal with after getting over what I believe has been a terrible malapportionment of blame to a certain person.

I want to refer to the importation of seafood into Western Australia from South East Asia. For a number of months now certain importers quite rightly have taken the opportunity, using new technology, of bringing a large amount of seafood into this State from South East Asia. I applaud that because it is particularly important that our major trading partners are given the opportunity to export products of any kind to Australia, as we do to them. However, it is quite obvious from evidence that has been presented to me that once that fish in particular reaches Australia some retailers are selling it in shops under false names. For instance, in one particular case which I was able to authenticate, the fish was being retailed as Australian barramundi at \$4.15 a kilo.

Hon Mark Nevill: South Vietnamese perch!

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: That is right. One cannot buy barramundi from a fisherman for that price so it is quite obviously falsely named. Fishermen in Western Australia are obviously upset for very good reason. They do not mind the fish being imported provided the strict health regulations which are applied to fishermen in Western Australia are applied also to fishermen in South East Asia. However, they want the product to be correctly labelled in Australia, and the same rules and regulations which are so strictly applied to our primary producers, such as fishermen, to be applied to this particular product. There is no doubt whatever that we will not stop these products from coming in, although some fishermen would like to stop them. The more sensible approach is that if the product is export quality and the necessary health regulations have been applied right from the time the fish was caught, just as applies to our fishermen, it is fine for the fish to be brought in. I understand that last year well over 150 tonnes of fish was condemned on the wharves here for various reasons. That by itself is something we need to consider.

The fact that retailers are selling the fish under false names in shops must be jumped on quickly. It is like people getting bananas from Camarvon and calling them as Queensland bananas. It is wrong, and it needs to be attended to quickly.

I do not know how a union like the Miscellaneous Workers Union can hold sick people to ransom as it is doing at present in this ridiculous hospital strike. I cannot find any sympathy for a union which sets up picket lines to restrict the amount of food going into hospitals. In my most charitable mood I cannot find one point in favour of Mr McGinty and his union for holding to ransom the sick and elderly and frail aged people in hospitals in order to get a wage rise. I say to Mr Butler, who is a good friend of mine and is the State President of the Labor Party, that he should use whatever authority and influence he has to try to persuade those people to lift the restrictions on the hospitals and let some of the striking workers go back and help the aged people, because sooner or later someone is going to die.

I do not believe that the general public will have an ounce of sympathy for the strikers. The doctors and senior nursing sisters in the hospitals are having to go out and serve meals to the patients, and clean the toilets, after they have performed their operations or handed out their medical expertise. It is a pretty sad indictment of our society that these union members are refusing to return to work. I do not know what is their beef about their wage increase, but there must be a better way of resolving their problem than by holding the patients to ransom. The possibility that this strike may continue until Friday, or until after the weekend, makes the situation even worse.

I hope that my colleagues over the road, or Mr Berinson, as a Minister of the Crown, will be able to use whatever influence they have to resolve this situation. I felt very sympathetic towards the Minister for Health when I saw him being interviewed on television last night. He looked most exasperated. He could not believe that the union members would not go back to work. I heard the Premier speaking on the radio this morning, and he castigated Mr McGinty in the strongest possible words, and said that the strikers were being unfair. It was the Premier's view that Mr McGinty had misled the strikers yesterday at Subiaco Oval by not telling them the full story. If that is the case, Mr McGinty has a tremendous amount to answer for. I hope he will have some spare time in which to tour through places such as the Homes of Peace, where people simply cannot be sent home. It is terrible when a

judgment has to be made about whether people in hospital are well enough to be sent back home, as happened today.

I move on now to deal with tourism. It is no secret that many towns in the north of this State are starting to suffer tremendous setbacks. The towns of Carnarvon and Exmouth are at their lowest ebb in terms of business undertakings for the 20 years that I have been involved with them. Carnarvon has seen shopkeepers and the operators of businesses going broke, and during the past few months, two businesses have had to close their doors. That situation is unprecedented in the town, and there is an urgent need for an injection of capital of some kind. Prior to the State election both major parties said they would look at the possibility of establishing a dredging project in the town. I take this opportunity to ask the Government to bring forward that commitment in order to give the town a shot in the arm.

I urge the Minister for Tourism to look at the possibility of encouraging major tourism into the north. The Tourism Commission needs to do this by means of a blanket operation with a view to giving a much needed boost to tourist facilities. I have been told by two hoteliers in Exmouth that business during the first three months of this year has been down a third on the 1988 figure, and that were it not for the fairly hefty resources behind some of the businesses in the town, they would not be able to continue in operation. The Government must approach this issue on an apolitical basis. I would be happy to give whatever assistance is required, because there will be serious repercussions if something is not done urgently to enhance the businesses in these small and not so small towns in the north.

I regret that my good mate, Hon Tom Helm, has business out of the Chamber. I listened carefully to his response to the Speech of his Excellency the Governor, and while I disagree vehemently with the member's comment about the monarchy, I respect his right to say it because I wonder whether he would have had the same opportunity had he decided to go to Russia instead of Australia. I am pleased he decided to come to Australia because he is obviously a useful member of the community.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I think in Russia he would still be able to exercise the right to make comments about the Queen.

Hon P.G. Pandal: They are now getting a bit lovey-dovey about the monarchy; they want the Queen to visit.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I have spoken privately to the member. I happen to think that the monarchy is a great institution. The British monarchy has served the test of time, and it is one of the few monarchies in the world which has.

In closing I want to say what a wonderful job Professor Gordon Reid and his lovely wife are doing in their vice regal capacity. When Professor Reid was appointed Governor by the Burke Government, no-one knew much about him. I can assure members that he has, in my view, served this State with enormous eminence, and has become an extremely popular figure. I was pleased recently to send him an invitation to visit the Gascoyne for a special event in August, which will take place over three days. He and his wife have graciously accepted my invitation, and the people of the Gascoyne, along with myself, are looking forward to them renewing their many friendships with the people of the area. The Governor and Mrs Reid carry out their duties in this State exceptionally well, and that is why they are so widely accepted right across the political spectrum. I support the motion.

HON A.A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [3.56 pm]: I would like to be associated with this motion. I reiterate the comments made by Hon Phil Lockyer about the Governor and Mrs Reid. I have known many Governors in this and other States, and Professor and Mrs Reid are a fine example of how the duties of the position of Governor should be carried out. I will not enter into the debate about the abdication of the Queen, nor about republicanism. We belong to a monarchy, and I am proud about that. If I was like one of my colleagues in another place I would probably end my speech by saying, "God save the Queen." I believe that taken as a whole, the monarchy, and our system of States and the various State Governors, has served this country extremely well; although there have been a few hiccups, and the Leader of the House knows of one - and I am not going to retrace ground - of 11 November.

That leads me to what has happened in this State and in other places in respect of the treatment by the Government of members of Parliament. I guess that at my advanced stage

in life I can say that, because I have only another five weeks to go in the parliamentary scene. There has been a total lack of respect shown by Government Ministers to members of Parliament in their electorates. I do not think I am breaching a confidence by saying that the former member for Collie, Tom Jones, used to be extremely embarrassed when Ministers did not let him nor I know that they were going into Collie. They would just arrive, and did not think it was incumbent upon them to inform the local member of their arrival. The local member has been elected by the people of that area, and may not be of a political colour that the Minister likes, but that member should be shown the courtesy of being told when Ministers are coming into the electorate. I would have thought the dignity of the Ministers failed because of this.

I want to quote from the Public Affairs Media Probe which is a leaflet some of us receive. I will quote at some length from an article by the Premier of New South Wales, Nick Greiner, which was originally printed in the IPA Review of December-February 1988-89, as follows -

... The Wran administration, over the period 1976 to 1986, undermined the role of the Opposition both inside and outside Parliament. Question time became the forum for "good news" announcements with Ministers taking up to 20 minutes to answer Dorothy Dix questions - questions which should have been handled through a Ministerial statement.

Many Ministers chose not to answer a question but rather used the time to launch an attack against the Opposition or announce some good news about a Government activity totally unrelated to the question. Legislation was forced through the Parliament with little or no notice, and debate was gagged at the earliest opportunity. In one case, the Government attempted to introduce a Bill even though copies had not been distributed to Members.

I will interrupt the quote there to say that even this mob have not got that bad yet. The article continues -

The Government attempted to debate a Bill when it had not been seen by the rest of the Parliament.

The effectiveness of the Opposition was also restricted outside the Parliament. The Wran administration would not allow the Opposition access to the public service for briefings on matters of Government policy, or for briefings of any nature. The Opposition was never recognised at official functions. In fact, the only time Wran and I met at an official function, I was met by a barrage of unpleasant expletives, most of which are unprintable.

I interrupt the quote again to say that, as members know, I have had a great interest in certain conservation matters in this State over a number of years. Last year I suggested a senior officer in one of the departments with which I was concerned have lunch with me but that before doing so he should inform his Minister he was going to do so because that was the time when we both decided we could get together for two hours to discuss the problem. To my horror, the Minister refused to allow the officer to have lunch with me. Mr Greiner's comments continue -

One of the areas where the Wran style of government left its mark is government advertising - the use of departmental funds to advertise government policy. Wran honed the use of government advertising of political achievements down to a fine art, especially around election time.

Does that ring a bell with regard to anything that happened before the last election? The article continues -

He used it so skillfully that it almost became accepted practice. Politically-oriented government advertising puts the Opposition at a great disadvantage as they cannot match the resources of the Government's advertising budget. ...

The total annihilation of the rights of an Opposition may serve the government's political agenda, but the end result must be worse for the general public in terms of good government.

The Opposition provides a check and balance, and with a government which is

prepared to allow the Opposition to exercise its rights under the Westminster system, constant pressure can be applied to the government in order that it performs. . . .

I will miss a few paragraphs of the article - and if members think I am just missing out things that might not be unpleasant, I advise that they are even more unpleasant to this Government and to Wran than the ones I am reading out. Mr Greiner goes on -

Legislation is no longer forced through the Parliament, but rather Members are given notice of the legislation a considerable time prior to its introduction. More important pieces of legislation are left on the Table to allow maximum debate outside the Parliament prior to its movement through the Houses. . . .

The Leader of the Opposition is invited to all State functions, and is seated at the guest table, not in the body of guests as was the case whenever I was invited. Also, the Leader of the Opposition is invited to speak at these functions, -

He is referring to New South Wales; the article continues -

- a privilege the current Leader of the Opposition has enthusiastically embraced.

In terms of managing his own office, the Leader of the Opposition now has complete control through the introduction of global budgeting. Previously the leader of the Opposition's budget was determined by line item giving almost no flexibility in determining where funds can be spent.

If I could just comment on that latter point, the previous Premier was approached to take into consideration this sort of accountable action by the Leader of the Opposition's office, and the request was refused. I make a plea to the Minister for Budget Management that the Leader of the Opposition's office be given a budget in the same way as is any department - not in the same figures, of course, because nobody could spend money like some of the Ministers do, not even the Leader of the Opposition. However, the Leader of the Opposition should be able, through his department, to have his budget tabled to show what he is spending on his office. If he wants two level 2s and not one level 5 officer, that should be his choice.

This is not a new thing for me. When the present Government was in Opposition I fought like blazes to get certain help and accommodation for the then Leader of the Opposition - I think it was first Ron Davies and then Brian Burke - because I believe an Opposition should have the wherewithal to do something without having to go through the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet to get the money. It should be accountable in just the same way as is the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet.

Hon T.G. Butler: Are you doing a bit of forward thinking?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: No. Since I have been in this place, despite some comments that have been made lately, I have been one of those people who believe that members of Parliament, and certainly Oppositions, should be treated reasonably and fairly in this regard. If members want to add up the sorts of innovations I have brought to this Parliament for the benefit of Parliament and of members in the 17 or 18 years I have been here, they will not find very many people who have done as much - certainly there are few who have done more - for members of both sides. I do not suppose I should repeat corridor talk but Hon Tom Butler and I had a discussion only recently -

Hon T.G. Butler: We certainly did, and it was a very big help too, I might add.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: - about who will take on this sort of task when I go. Of course, for a small fee I might come back.

Hon T.G. Butler: Okay, you could set up a training school.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I might set up a training school but I would have to charge a consultant's rates, Mr Deputy President (Hon John Williams), and they would be fairly heavy.

I do believe it is ludicrous to expect the Leader of the Opposition to work in an office in the corner of this place at the same time as an overseas visitor such as a consul or an ambassador can visit the Premier's office and be whisked up in a lift from an underground car park into a very nice office. I see from tonight's *Daily News* that the Premier does not have enough space. That may well be the case; I will not argue it in the Address-in-Reply although I might have a few words to say about it in debate on the Supply Bill. Then that person has to

walk through Parliament House, with no reception area, into the office of the Leader of the Opposition. This is an insult to Parliament and an insult to the Leader of the Opposition. Something should be done about the situation. I am pleased to see that the Leader of the House has taken note of what I have said because I am sure that as Minister for Budget Management he can see some savings in doing things this way. If the Leader of the National Party and other persons, for instance, are given a budget and told to report on that budget and sign for the over-runs, this would give a sense of accountability and responsibility to such people - which should be encouraged in this place.

Returning to PAM Probe, the author then goes on to say how full of facts is Mr Greiner's article and how poor is the reporting of the *Sydney Morning Herald*. We in this State know all about that with our morning paper. The article reads -

The question must arise why it is that the SMH in particular (serving the residents of New South Wales on public affairs) had virtually nothing to say during the tenure of the Wran government about the abuse of the basic principles of parliamentary government. The Greiner government could have continued in the same vein and further helped to undermine Parliament. It would have been easy for it to have done so, especially because there was little (if any) criticism of the Wran government. It is very much to the credit of the Greiner government that it has turned its back on the practices of the Wran government.

I have read that article to give the House some comparisons. Anyone who has witnessed Parliament in action over the last six years will realise the change that has come over this place. Someone is always trying to muck around with Standing Orders and to not carry on in the prescribed form of the past with which we get through business quickly and more sensibly. The shenanigans in the other place during question time involve Dorothy Dixers and Ministers taking tens of minutes to answer them and, in many cases, giving smart arse replies which really do not answer the question. People in that place try to make political points just like in the days of the Wran Government. Anyone who has been into the bear pit and watched events in New South Wales would know that that is not an example which anyone would want to follow.

Returning to the topic of discourtesy, not one member of the Opposition was invited to the State reception for the Sheffield Shield cricket team last night. That is typical, even when State Government and taxpayers' money is being used in this way. The Kings Cup regatta at Collie is another example. Some of us had a little to do with that event, either by design or by being forced into it by Tom Jones, but none of us received the courtesy of an invitation.

Hon Graham Edwards: The Government was not running that event.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: It seems that those people the Government wanted to be invited were invited.

Hon Graham Edwards: That is not true.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: It appeared so to the people of Collie.

Hon Graham Edwards: That is nonsense. Mrs Turnbull was there.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: She may have been there, but upper House members were not invited.

Hon Graham Edwards: I saw Hon Bill Stretch there.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: He attended because he was a rower.

Hon Graham Edwards: The Government did not issue the invitations.

Hon T.G. Butler: I was there.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: The member was lucky, as was Hon Mark Nevill. I do not take free tickets. I pay my own way. I do not expect free tickets.

The number of ministerial visits which have occurred without the knowledge of the local member are now legend. In the last 12 months, there would have been 60 or 70 such visits to my electorate. All the Ministers say, "Sorry, when we go North we will tell you; and we will go north when we want to." That is all very well but it is discourteous. The Government should make a statement about this matter. Will the Government be accountable to the people or to members of Parliament who were elected by those people, or will the

Government continue with this snide form of electioneering? Hon Graham Edwards has told me what he will do. He said, "I will not be telling you ever again when I am going to your electorate." He has stuck to that and I admire him for it.

Hon T.G. Butler: Now you know why you did not receive an invitation to the regatta.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Mr Edwards is the first bloke who has had the guts to stand up and say, "I am not going to tell you." Another bloke, who is no longer here, was Arthur Tonkin. He said that as long as I was a member he would not tell me when he was going to my electorate. That was fair enough; I accepted that. But I used to catch him every time he came to my electorate because I would organise an invitation to any function and then ask embarrassing questions. I was often told that I should ask those questions in Parliament. I answered that if I were not shown the courtesy of notification of the visit I would continue to ask embarrassing questions. That is the way to embarrass Ministers in the public forum.

Hon B.L. Jones: Perhaps that is why you are not told of the visit.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: The member's contribution is not too good at the best of times. She should keep quiet.

Hon Bill Stretch will remember the previous Premier trying to be smart at the opening of the Manjimup office of the Department of Conservation and Land Management. The Premier recognised David Evans but refused to recognise Hon Bill Stretch and me. I wandered up quietly to the Premier, who was seated beside the Director of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, and said, "Unless you recognise Bill Stretch and me at the next two openings I will get up and say that we are here too." He said that I would not do that, and I asked him whether he would like to try me out. However, he mentioned Mr Stretch and me on the next two occasions. I received an apology in writing from the previous Premier in this regard and I admire him for that. He heard that I was annoyed, and on that occasion I was representing the Leader of the Opposition. Like Mr Greiner, I was right down at the end of the table with the foreign delegation and without an interpreter. I felt like one of those well known buildings.

Hon T.G. Butler: You lead an interesting life.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I do and I will continue to lead an interesting life for many years to come.

Hon T.G. Butler: You certainly will.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I refer now to jobs for the boys. I was horrified when I heard that the Premier was thinking of removing Mr Malcolm Bryce from the board of the R & I Bank. I do not know what my party thinks about it, but a person who has reached the position of Deputy Premier, regardless of whether that person is a member of the Labor Party, Liberal Party, National Party or any other party, has done something for this State and he could be of great benefit to boards such as this. As a result of some friction concerning accountability - a subject which I will refer to at a later stage - the Government is going overboard. We should not risk technology used in commercial operations and by boards. To give Malcolm Bryce his due, Technology Park would not have got off the ground if it had not been for his efforts. He really put a first class effort into it and he gave it status and a push when it was needed. He was very keen. Today many members have word processors in their offices because of Malcolm Bryce's interest in technology. The Leader of the House will remember the discussions which took place at the time of the pilot scheme. I have not changed my view since then that word processors would be of benefit to members. I hesitate to say that we have yet to reach a stage where we know how to use the word processors properly. I tend to think that the majority of members spend a large amount of money on postage because their machines churn out numerous letters, and members feel they should be posted. I am a little worried about that and I am also a little worried that the public are becoming jack of electronic mail. As members of Parliament we may have to do something more in an effort to refine the process. All members are aware of the use of technology in this place and the savings in the cost of printing Notice Papers, etc.

While on the subject of accountability and telling the truth, I wonder how many members read an article in *The West Australian* on 3 April, headed "Premier recalls good old days". The article referred to the Premier attending the opening of the Gwalia museum and it stated -

He worked at Gwalia during his 1962 summer holidays as a bogger and trucker - and made coffins part-time.

"At the time it was well known that if you went into a certain Perth office and said you were an experienced bogger and trucker you would get a job," he said.

"So I went into the office and said I was an experienced bogger and driver and they gave me a ticket straight away.

In 1962 he said that he was an experienced bogger and driver when he really was not. Is he doing the same thing now? Is he telling this State fibs? Quite frankly, with the numerous things that are happening it is my opinion he is carrying on in the same way he did in 1962. He is drawing a long bow - I would never say that he was telling fibs because you, Mr Deputy President (Hon John Williams), would not allow me to do that - and obviously his accountability was not so hot even then.

Hon Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: The member may be right. Many people have challenged me physically, but I am still here. I would not be frightened of the Premier. I recall seeing him run one night. He could only just outstrip me with two members from this place hanging on to his arms. I will not report what they said to me at the time.

If the Premier did behave like that in 1962, I wonder whether it is something he should have been proud of.

Getting back to jobs for the boys, I was a little offended when I read in *The West Australian* the other day that I had received a job for the boys. I was lined up with Mr Burke, Mr Bryce and Don Taylor in that article wherein it stated that I was appointed by the Government to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. I make it clear that this Parliament appointed me - I still am an appointee until November this year - as the representative of this Parliament, not of this Government, on that tribunal. Of course, from 21 May I will be open to offers.

Hon T.G. Butler: Confession is good for the soul.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Yes, it is.

Hon J.M. Berinson: It is 22 May.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: If it is offered to me on 21 May I will make my decision on 22 May.

There is far too much confusion about what is Government and what is Parliament. I do not blame this Government totally for it because previous Premiers and leaders in this place were just as keen as the present Government to rush legislation through this Parliament and put this place under the thumb of the Executive. It is a shocking thing for this Parliament to take that sort of pressure from the Government. Members from all parties should stand up and say, "Enough." I am proud of Hon Robert Hetherington for his comments about the Parliamentary Precincts Committee. I will not deal with his frosted phallic symbol, but I will deal with parliamentary precincts.

Several members interjected.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: The precincts of this place have, to many members, been extremely important. I was horrified when I heard about the Government's actions concerning this committee and I noticed an article in the "The Press Gallery Report" - which is now back with us at a huge cost; that is, if members pay their subscriptions - headed "Parliamentary Precincts Committee Abolished". Some members in this House will recall the fights which the now President and Hon Colin Jamieson put up to preserve the precincts of this place. I think Hon Jim Brown is the only member in this place who will remember when the tjurunga board was buried. At the time there were many problems about the reserve of Parliament and there was great difficulty in convincing people that the precinct should be looked after.

There should be a precincts committee which should override any other committee. If one stands on the front steps of Parliament House one looks out over the city. You will remember, Mr Deputy President (Hon John Williams), the fuss about the lift well that stuck out on one building. There was a debate at that time in this place as to whether the gentleman who built that building and put the lift well over the prescribed line should be made to pull down that lift well. That is how seriously we considered that matter. The idea

of the precinct was to make this Parliament House a feature viewable from all over the city. I think that the Parliamentary Precincts Committee has done an extremely good job. It has not been easy; there have been times when Perth City Council has been here in force asking the Joint House Committee to change its instructions to the Parliamentary Precincts Committee, and we have given long and serious thought to that matter. I believe to allow the abolition of that committee now would be a mistake. I have questions on notice the answers to which I will be extremely interested to see. If we allow the abolition of the precincts committee, what will happen to those people who have in the past been refused permission to build? Is it just, "Bad luck, Jack, you were in first, but because of a change of Government we have decided to give this one or that one permission to build. Although you were first, you miss out"? It seems to be a rather rash way of dealing with the parliamentary precinct.

I believe that we should leave the business coming to and emanating from this place in the form it is now. It is most unfortunate that the plan suggested by BMA - which was so thoroughly damned by the Press, which at times worries me and makes me wonder whether there is an investigative journalist left - to have two octagonal, five-storey buildings in front of Parliament House which would not have obscured the view was not adopted. The suggestion was to build over the freeway, which in my opinion will have to happen shortly, anyway, for other reasons. We would probably get the land cheaper by building over the freeway than by buying land around the city. Government departments could be put into those two buildings and Ministers would have access to the Parliament and the Parliament access to the Ministers.

The Government would be able to stop using \$15 million to \$18 million in leased space in the city. The total cost, from memory, would have been \$114 million. No-one looked at what could be saved in leasing fees if one compared the cost of outside accommodation with the capital cost of the new buildings. I do not believe there is a member here who has not cursed quietly under his breath when he has had a delegation meet him here and then has had to take it to the Capita building, Elders building or May Holman House, or somewhere in that vicinity. If they were close by and there were parking available for constituents coming to this place so that they could be taken quietly to a Minister's office without any fuss, I am sure we would be better off. However, the Press jazzed up reference to the huge cost of those buildings, yet that cost was offset by rental savings.

I believe that Hon Robert Hetherington was right, and that, if we ever get answers to my questions to the Premier and the Minister for Planning in relation to this matter, we should have a full scale debate on whether this Parliament wants a parliamentary precinct. If it does we should tell the State Planning Commission to run off and play ball somewhere else; that this is a people's Parliament House, we are the Parliament, and the commission will do as it is told. That might sound like a Labor bully boy speech. However, I believe that this House, and the other place, should debate whether we need this precinct. There was absolutely no argument in the past between parties as to whether we needed a parliamentary precinct; the matter was agreed unanimously. The only argument was about where the boundaries should be and how it should be set out. I imagine that would happen again and there would be 91 different views held on this matter. I am sure that we must fight to retain this precinct that we have had, I believe, since 1897. We should stick to it and to the rules that have applied in the past.

I turn now to Ministers' answers to questions. It seems to me that matters are getting worse. When one pays a Minister the courtesy of putting a question on notice and a fortnight later it is still not answered, a member has the right to complain, which is what I am doing. I believe that this House may find that our forebears were not silly when they read out their questions on one day and they were answered on the next. It may be that Governments will not like it, but the time will come when in order to get answers we will have to return to that situation. I do not think that anybody wants to do that. There are a couple of questions asked by Hon Phillip Pandal and me that have been on the Notice Paper since the first day of the session. If we were to return to the previous system we would put those questions on notice and then put them to the Minister in the way that we used to. The Minister would then have to say day after day, "We have no answer to that; I wish that deferred." When that happens I am sure that after a few days of Ministers saying, "I wish the question to be deferred", the Ministers will get as sick of it as do backbenchers.

Mr President, you may have heard me querying the Attorney General about product liability

and the Law Reform Commission report No 34 of 1988. I would like to quote from a paper on that report. It states -

It is a serious attempt to look at two problem areas -

1. The sale of goods that are unsafe and how the public can be protected against these, and
2. the sale of acceptable goods, and I quote - "a basic principle that the quality of the goods should be such as would be fully acceptable to a reasonable person, having regard to all the circumstances".

The question of what is a reasonable person would probably tax this House because the word "reasonable" has been bandied around ever since I have been in this Chamber. To continue quoting from the report -

It would seem that very few people would, in this day and age, have any complaints with the contention that all the goods we sell are as safe as it is humanly possible to make them remembering the specific jobs the goods have to perform. Mowers, for instance, are going to have a cutting device and these can be dangerous if care is not taken.

There is also the situation of farmers, and Hon Jim Brown and Hon Bill Stretch will remember how when they cleared country a lot of little sticks about the size of one's little finger or a pencil remained, and farmers could find no way of clearing them. I held the record for Australia with the model 57 rake which was a three point linkage hay rake which New Holland used to produce. It used to rake up these sticks beautifully as long as one stuck about one-tenth of an inch of the rake into the ground. The problem from New Holland's point of view was that these rakes were on a lifetime warranty.

Hon T.G. Butler: Was this recognised as a sport?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: It was recognised as a sport, all right. It did a wonderful job of cleaning up the paddocks, but it did not do much good for the hay rake which should have been operating half an inch above the ground rather than one-tenth of an inch below the ground. So machines are used for things that they are not expected to be used for. The report continues as follows, and I am talking about dealers -

The area that appears to have major problems is the 'acceptable goods' one, and I quote from the summary of provisional proposals and then comment on the problems I foresee.

Presumption as to time. There should be a rebuttable presumption that the relevant characteristic was in existence at the time the goods left the enterprise if it was in existence at the time it caused the loss or damage.

Again referring to the farmers amongst us -

This is something that would be pretty hard to argue either way with farm machinery when one considers the change in soil type, climate conditions, type of crop etc, and could cause a great deal of litigation that probably come not come to any final conclusion.

The report continues -

Limited liability of retailers. The proposed statutory scheme should allow action against the retailer, as well as other primary defendants, for a remedy limited to the repair or replacement of the goods, or the refund of the price.

One does not have to be a genius to see the problems involved in refunding the price, and that applies not just to farm machinery. Is the refund the full purchase price? Is it a case involving a self-propelled header where the purchaser got a trip to America for buying it? Does that person refund the price of the trip to America? What do we do about trade-ins? Can one get another machine which is in the same state as that which the dealer traded in? What happens to the drum of oil, or the Subaru four wheel drive that was given away? Members have seen the bonuses that go with some of these high priced machines, and I wonder whether this can ever be put into law. To continue -

Surrogate defendant. Where the manufacturer cannot be identified or located, is

insolvent, or is unable to satisfy the claim for compensation, a supplier of the goods should be the primary defendant.

That means that all those small dealers out in country towns become the primary target if the manufacturer goes bung or he is unable to satisfy the claim for compensation. I could go on about the economic losses to the farmer whose header or mower or baler does not work. How does one adjudge the amount involved? How does one decide whether a baler that is set up properly for use in New South Wales has been properly set up for use in Western Australia? The difference in the dust and grit in the span of 100 kilometres can be phenomenal. Machines for east of Kojonup and west of Boyup Brook - less than 100 kilometres apart - would have to be set up in a different way. But these people are suggesting the small businessman should be responsible for the loss of profit and a refund of the price if the manufacturer cannot be found or if he goes broke. What does a businessman do? He looks at his situation and says, "All right, in a normal situation I insure."

This paper has been circulated for two months and nobody around Australia to whom it has been circulated can find an insurance company which will insure a small business. Nobody can find an insurance company which will insure for a reasonable premium. I guess they would charge a 100 per cent premium for one's turnover every year. The areas one could get into in this situation are multitudinous. I have pointed out some for members to think about. As I said when I addressed a question to the Attorney General and quoted from the McGuinness column in *The Australian* on 30 March, "... away with self aggrandising meddlers", because these people are playing with the law. We in this place - and I will not be here to see it - should be concerned about the practical application of the law. We have had numerous arguments about it over time, and I have won some and lost some.

The Minister at the Table will remember the discussions on chattel securities and areas that have involved businesses that, if it were not for goodwill, could have got right out of hand. I believe that it should comprise mainly practical people who examine the Bills which come before it and the situations that may arise, rather than its being set up as a legal forum and debating house to set up more practices for lawyers. Law is a wonderful thing if it is tempered with a little commonsense, but all too often we do not get that commonsense.

This will not be my final speech in this House.

Hon T.G. Butler: Oh!

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I am glad I have upset Hon Tom Butler. I look forward to talking on the Supply Bill, the Stamp Amendment Bill (No 2), the Acts Amendment (Accountability) Bill, Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd and a few other things, but only, I assure the Leader of the House, within my hour's limit in each case. We will have a very enjoyable week together.

I want to say a few things that I did not say at the end of last year. As I have this opportunity and that afforded by the Supply Bill in which to say them, I will say them.

Hon T.G. Butler: Do you remember that before Christmas I said I would miss you? I am not sure now.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I am glad Hon Tom Butler will not miss me - many other people will. I did not fairly pay tribute to two friends of mine in this House last year. One, of course, is my very good friend Hon Fred McKenzie, who has been deputy chairman of many committees with me. Like Hon Robert Hetherington, who is the other friend I must mention, he is honest and straightforward, and it has been a pleasure to be in Parliament with them both, despite the fact that occasionally we disagree on something - especially Hon Robert Hetherington and I. However, we have agreed today on the subject of the parliamentary precinct. Hon Robert Hetherington made some very nice comments about me in November and at that stage, because we were running short of time, I forgot to thank him properly for that; I do so now.

To conclude, I implore the Leader of the House that, whatever the cost in manpower and time to this House and the other place, all political parties thoroughly examine whether we are doing the right thing in abolishing the parliamentary precinct, because we will not have another chance. If those buildings go up and wipe out the views to and from Parliament House, that will be the end of it; we have had our chips. I implore the Leader of the House to consider this, to confer with his Cabinet colleagues and, if necessary, to have a discussion in this House about the precincts of Parliament House. Our forebears - and I do not know

whether the Leader of the House was here but I mentioned him, Mr President, Hon Colin Jamieson, Sir Desmond O'Neil -

Hon T.G. Butler: He was here as well.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Was he? That is good. Before the State Planning Commission and the Perth City Council take this place over and probably turn it into a second class slum - because they have no love of this institution and do not appreciate the thought that has gone into the precinct - I implore the Leader of the House to take it to the Premier and to whomever else he wishes, but let us have an inter-party committee and discussion before we make a final decision to abolish the parliamentary precinct. I believe it is totally necessary for all parties to agree. If they agree to abolish it I will go along with the decision, but I do not believe a body outside the Parliament should write to the President of this place and say, "You are sacked and your parliamentary precinct goes with you." It is a disgrace and that officer really should be called before the Bar of this place and grilled thoroughly. We have had our instance of someone coming to the Bar, but the officer concerned should know that his cavalier attitude towards the parliamentary precinct is not appreciated by most of the members of this place.

I support the motion.

HON NEIL OLIVER (West) [4.56 pm]: I am very pleased to be associated with the Address-in-Reply to the Opening Speech by His Excellency the Governor, Professor Gordon Reid, for this Thirty-third Parliament. Certainly I want to be associated with the remarks made by other members in conveying to His Excellency our pleasure at his acceptance of an extension of his term of office. I wish His Excellency and Mrs Reid good health and every enjoyment of that office.

The Address-in-Reply is one of the few opportunities afforded to members in this House to bring forward subjects of a general nature or matters of extreme public importance. However, I wish to bring to the attention of Parliament today the exposure of alarming new evidence of serious electoral irregularities in the recent State election, on a scale which raises some very disturbing questions about both the conduct of that election and its results.

I and many other candidates wrote to many electors personally and individually addressed letters which were returned by Australia Post showing on the outer envelope "Address unknown" or "Left address". The number of letters sent out by my office and returned in this way exceeded 10 per cent of the electors listed by the Electoral Commission as eligible voters. A simple inquiry at many of these addresses indicated either that they did not exist at all or that the addresses were parks, condemned houses, or rental properties from which people had departed.

A comparison of these letters with rolls used on the day of the election clearly suggests that many people voted absentee, or possibly other people illegally voted on their behalf. Obviously this state of affairs puts into question the manner by which the Australian Electoral Commission is ensuring that the rolls are accurate in order to effect a fair and true result. An examination of the rolls used on the day of the poll indicates widespread duplication of votes; that is, that one person voted twice, or another person also voted on the elector's behalf, or either one or two people voted on the elector's behalf. The opportunity to record a personal vote is to ensure that sick or disabled electors or electors who are absent either interstate or overseas or voters in remote areas have an opportunity to vote.

[Leave granted for speech to be continued.]

Debate thus adjourned.

[Continued on p 562.]

The PRESIDENT: Order! Before I call for questions without notice, I wish to indicate that immediately after the taking of questions without notice and prior to Hon Neil Oliver recommencing his comments on the Address-in-Reply debate, it is my intention to make an announcement to the House in respect of the future of this Chamber. I will take the opportunity at that time simply because at question time there seem to be more members in the Chamber and I do not want to make the same comments half a dozen times. Therefore I will simply make this comment now: I have an announcement of some importance, which I believe all members ought to hear.

[Questions without notice taken.]

PARLIAMENT HOUSE - COUNCIL CHAMBER

Seating and Desk Arrangements - Alteration Plan

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths): Over some time, I, as President and the custodian of the facilities for members of this House, have been approached by members about the standard of members' seating and desks. Members have come to me with all sorts of complaints about their backs and the need to obtain special cushions designed to make their seats reasonably comfortable for them.

Over the years, I have had the opportunity to visit Parliament Houses in many places, not the least of which being the new Parliament House in Canberra. As a result of the approaches I have received from members and the more recent suggestion by Hon Tom Stephens concerning the use of keyboards and screens, I called a meeting of the Legislative Council House Committee which agreed in principle to a proposal to have the seating and desk arrangements in this Chamber redesigned to eliminate the necessity for members to cross over each other when getting in and out of their seats. Each seat and desk would be separate.

With that in mind, I asked the consulting architect for Parliament House, Mr Chris Keen, to sketch a plan not to scale of what the place would look like if the alterations were to proceed. He was good enough to provide that drawing. If we are to proceed with the alterations, planning will be done in detail and the work completed at the beginning of 1990 - before the next session. I will leave those drawings in the Chamber for the next couple of weeks to allow members to look at them with a view to making suggestions so that I can, in consultation with the architect, produce a set of plans that will enable the alterations to be done. There is nothing definite about the issue at this time. The House Committee has agreed in principle to adopting a plan such as the one provided. I nearly fainted when I first saw it; I am now very excited about the project. Other members may have different ideas. The purpose of the exercise is to look at it. Members can either come to me personally or write me a letter about any suggestions or recommendations they may wish to make.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - FIFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON NEIL OLIVER (West) [5.21 pm]: Prior to questions without notice I was outlining the fact that the opportunity to record a postal vote is provided to ensure that sick, disabled or absent people - either interstate or overseas - or people in remote areas, have an opportunity to vote. However, votes have been recorded, not only as postal votes but also as absent votes, duplicating an elector's entitlement to vote. How can these events occur in a system claimed by the Labor Government to be fair to all electors? How can we have false enrolments where people no longer reside in accordance with the Electoral Act and their entitlement to vote? Is their vote duplicated in other electoral districts where they may have resided in the past five or 10 years? Does anyone know? If not, why not? Why has no action been taken where there is evidence of multiple voting on behalf of a single individual? How can such a state of affairs be recorded as being consistent with a fair and free election?

Rolls for elections are now maintained in a single page unbound format in ringlock binders. Does this not present an invitation to substitute alternative pages with different results? This Government has available to it a new Homeswest rental roll of residents, and their arrival and departure details, yet the most elementary errors have been made. From my investigations of many residences I have found some families registered at the same address more than once. Surely the Australian Electoral Commission should be able to perform equally well as my humble volunteers, particularly in view of this Government's solemn guarantee that we would have a fair election.

Naturally, in the course of preparing for the recent election, I returned to the State Electoral Commission the envelopes sent to constituents but returned by Australia Post. Surely it would be normal to expect that action would be taken to distil this information gathered at no cost to taxpayers in order to ensure an accurate roll. I understand that Premier Dowding

wrote many letters emanating from the office of Premier and Cabinet prior to and during the State election. I ask whether he received any letters returned marked, "Not at this address" or "Address unknown". I ask what action he took. Did he present them to the State Electoral Commission to assist in the compilation of an accurate roll? Why has this Government not acted on the anomalies and irregularities of which it is already aware?

Many questions remain unanswered and the people of Western Australia have the right to know those answers. These irregularities constitute in excess of 10 per cent of the enrolment in the electorate of Swan Hills. This then is a matter of most serious gravity which should be addressed urgently. Given the imminence of a Federal election, surely we cannot rely on electoral rolls which are in such a questionable state. I will tomorrow, as no doubt other candidates may wish to do, petition the Court of Disputed Returns in order that the accusations I have put to members here today in relation to these irregularities, which this Government has singularly failed to inquire into, may be inquired into by the judiciary. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Fred McKenzie.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES AUTHORITY BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Leader of the House), and read a first time.

Second Reading

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [5.28 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is an important part of the Government's initiatives to improve the accountability and public scrutiny of its statutory authorities following the report of the Commission on Accountability which was chaired by the former Chief Justice, Sir Francis Burt.

This Bill, together with the Acts Amendment (Accountability) Bill, fulfils the undertaking given by the Premier during the election campaign to implement the recommendations of the Burt Commission on Accountability.

Specifically, this Bill gives effect to the Burt Commission's recommendation that the Northern Mining Corporation (Acquisition) Act be repealed and that Western Australian Government Holdings Limited be reconstituted as a statutory authority and made subject to the Burt Commission's accountability requirements. The new authority, Western Australian Petrochemical Industries Authority, will be required to satisfy all of the accountability requirements recommended by the Burt Commission. In particular, the new authority will be -

subject to direction from the Minister in regard to the performance of its functions and powers, and the authority must give effect to all such directions. All ministerial directions must be in writing and included in the annual report of the authority - clause 8;

required to furnish to the Minister, reports relating to the activities and business of the authority as specified in clause 9 of the Bill;

subject to the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act - clause 19. Consequently, the new authority will amongst other requirements be subject to scrutiny by the Auditor General and must provide audited annual reports to the Parliament through the Minister.

In addition to these requirements, the Bill also provides for ministerial control over the financial powers of the authority. For instance, the amounts, terms and conditions of the authority's borrowings will be subject to the Treasurer's approval - clauses 24 and 26.

The manner in which the authority invests surplus funds available to it will be subject to the Treasurer's approval - clause 23. And the terms and conditions of any guarantee or other commitment given by the authority will be subject to the Treasurer's prior approval -

clause 25. In addition, clause 27 provides that the Treasurer may guarantee the performance of any obligation entered into by the authority on his direction or approval.

The new authority will be established as a body corporate with the normal powers and controls that that entails. The Government has, however, accepted the Burt commission's recommendations that no Government agency be constituted as a partnership or limited liability company, and the new authority will not be constituted under the Companies (Western Australia) Code. This will avoid potential conflicts in respect of accountability that can arise when corporations are subject to the requirements of the Companies Code and are also accountable to the Parliament through their Minister.

Finally, the authority will be unable to enter into contractual arrangements with third parties which include secrecy or confidentiality requirements without the explicit prior approval of the Minister. In short, the new authority will be as accountable as it is possible to make a Government agency under the Westminster system of Government.

The Western Australian Petrochemical Industries Authority will assume the areas of activity currently being undertaken by Western Australian Government Holdings Ltd. Its major activity will involve managing the State's equity interest in the petrochemical project. The new authority will be required to assist and facilitate the implementation of this project which will bring substantial benefits to the State's economy. It will be the largest single industrial development in the State since the North West Shelf gas project was commenced. It is anticipated that opportunities will arise to develop the project into the production of related products, and provision is made in clause 5(b) of the Bill for the authority, subject to the approval of the Minister, to become involved in those activities.

Other areas of involvement of WAGH, which in the current absence of any more suitable vehicle will be absorbed by the new authority, are -

- the provision of financial accommodation involving a \$US24 million loan facility to the Western Australian Diamond Trust to fund the trust's five per cent participation in the Argyle diamond joint venture. WAGH is being, and the new authority will continue to be, reimbursed in full by WADT for all charges, service costs and foreign exchange fluctuations on this facility. The Treasurer has guaranteed WAGH's performance of the terms and conditions of the \$US24 million loan facility and WAGH has, in turn, executed a mortgage in favour of the Treasurer;

- ownership of all the shares in Aboriginal Enterprises Company Limited. This company funds loans to Aboriginal business ventures. WAGH does not participate in the management of this company but elects individuals nominated by the Government as directors of the company. It is proposed that the new authority will continue to observe this practice. In the longer term it is proposed to separately constitute this body but for the present it will remain here for convenience, and the separate amendments to the Financial Administration and Audit Act relating to subsidiaries will ensure that it is fully accountable; and

- ownership of all of the shares in Business Services (Belgium) N.V., a company incorporated under Belgian legislation. This company provides financial and commercial services to the WADT. WAGH does not participate in the management of this company and there are no common directors between WAGH and this company. It is proposed that the new authority will also continue to observe this practice. Ultimately this company will be divested.

The Bill provides, in clauses 6 and 7 and schedule 1, for the transfer of the assets and liabilities of Western Australian Government Holdings to the Western Australian Petrochemical Industries Authority by way of a transfer scheme to be devised by the board and approved by the Minister.

The new authority will be managed by a board of directors comprising a chairman, who will also be the chief executive, and from two to eight other directors. The board will have the power to delegate authority and appoint committees - clause 15. The powers of the authority are set out in clause 10 and are considered to be those necessary for the proper discharge of its functions. These powers are consistent with normal commercial powers for the carrying out of the functions required of the authority.

The authority will be subject to all local government rates and charges and all taxes, fees and

charges imposed by the Government - clause 11. Furthermore, the authority will be expected to pay income tax to the State Government as if the authority were a public company. Tax is to be assessed using normal income tax provisions and the amount payable will be certified by the Auditor General. In addition, the board will be required to pay, annually, a dividend to the Government from any profits it might make - clause 22 - to an amount determined by the Treasurer.

In introducing this Bill and the range of amending legislation relating to the Burt commission recommendations, the Government is giving legislative effect to its total acceptance of the commission's accountability requirements. The concept of accountability - that legislative authority should exist authorising the investment of public moneys or the creation of contingent liabilities by the executive of Government agencies; and that every Government agency should be subject to the control of a Minister of the Crown and through that Minister be able to account to the Parliament for all that it has done in the exercise of its statutory authority - is a concept that is fully endorsed by the Government as fundamental to its operations.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon G.E. Masters (Acting Leader of the Opposition).

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 6 April.

HON MAX EVANS (Metropolitan) [5.36 pm]: In this Supply Bill for 1989 the Government seeks the grant of Supply of \$2.5 billion, of which \$2.3 billion will come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$200 million from moneys to the credit of the General Loan and Capital Works Fund. These are funds the Government requires to carry on from 1 July 1989 until subsequent approval of the Budget appropriations for next year.

In the second reading speech the Minister stated that in 1988-89 the Commonwealth's hospital funding grant was paid into the Hospitals Fund and netted against expenditure, but in 1989-90 it is intended to bring the funds into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, requiring a higher level of appropriation by Parliament for hospital funding, but improving public accountability. I agree with that concept and I am surprised that it has taken so long for it to come into effect. It is very important to see these two things in perspective - to see grants on the revenue side against total expenditure on the other side. It is desirable that a net figure be presented, because an increase of \$100 million in revenue could immediately be consumed by a similar increase in expenditure, which may or may not be in order. We should be able to get a better understanding of the figures. Do any other departments have similar funding; that is, where funding is netted to a department rather than to Consolidated Revenue? If there are any other departments operating in this way, why is a similar method not adopted for them? It would be in the interests of the public to adopt that course.

It was also stated in the Minister's second reading speech that, due to buoyant economic activity, revenue collections in total were expected to be above estimate. We read elsewhere that the \$85 million required to cover the collapse of the Teachers Credit Society will be met from Consolidated Revenue rather than from underspent money in the General Loan and Capital Works Fund. This has been possible as a result of the buoyant and better than anticipated economic activity. That situation worries me. It will be interesting to see the figures when they are available because the Government has indicated that it anticipates a small surplus. I believe revenue for last year is \$200 million higher than anticipated and it is matched by increased expenditure. It is a dangerous practice to keep matching increased revenue with increased expenditure because it is not possible to guarantee that the rate of increase in revenue will continue, and it is difficult to curtail the increase in expenditure. It was reported this morning that the banks have told the Federal Government that the only way to control interest rates is to control expenditure. The State Government has been fortunate - and I give it some credit - in being able to increase its revenue as a result of the buoyant economic activity. Also the financial institutions duty has been increased and the Government has raised \$30 million a year over the last five years, providing \$150 million additional revenue that was not available to the previous Government. An additional levy

was made on cigarettes which raised more than \$30 million, only \$2 million of which was spent on the Quit smoking campaign.

I was interested that the Government did not reply to the doctor about that. The Government could raise more money from cigarettes and put it into research into smoking. It could say, "We are doing very well; we are getting an extra \$30 million or \$35 million per year." Only \$2 million goes to the Quit campaign, so Consolidated Revenue has increased by \$160 million from smoking and \$150 million from FID, making something like \$210 million over the year, which has been of considerable benefit.

I hope the Minister can explain to us how the Government can keep expenditure going up to match this revenue. It should have put more money away into hollow logs for a rainy day. Perhaps it has; perhaps it is now coming out. The Government has been well aware each year that stamp duty revenue will be far higher than budgeted. Each year it has been the variable in the Budget. The Government works out the expenditure. We know what the stamp duty should be from the projections, and it is scaled back. This is done in business; one must know how much one has. The Government will leave itself wide open, as in this last year. I hope the Minister can sleep well at night after looking at these figures. We brought forward a reserve last year of \$199 million on short term investments which has not been required as the result of buoyant conditions. We expended most of that in one year on capital works, leaving \$10 million.

Can the Minister advise us if the \$85 million has been used on the Teachers Credit Society? He mentioned the \$85 million would be paid out of revenue, and he would not have to call on capital works money, but did he call on the \$10 million left over from the reserves on short term investments?

Hon J.M. Berinson: We really will not know that until the end of the year.

Hon MAX EVANS: The Minister was going to advise me when he would use interest earned on short term investments. This year he was going to use expenditure in the current year. Does he anticipate doing that still, or will he lock it all in?

Hon J.M. Berinson: It should not be necessary to use the current year's interest earnings this year. In other words, we are expecting it to be possible to adopt the same procedures as we did previously and to treat that income as available for the next Budget.

Hon MAX EVANS: The Minister might be able to advise us what that amount is with the present high interest rate. That will be a reserve carried through to next year, and I believe it will be needed.

Turning to Supply, that concerns how the Government is to raise revenue next year and how it is to expend it. I ask the Minister to give very serious consideration to this matter. In 1987 I suggested to him that he should consider looking at four year Budgets. The Government is in power for four years. Instead of giving the House a single line telling us the salaries of the top 10 departmental heads, and \$500 million on the next line, that is probably a net figure because the revenue has been set off against it. The Commonwealth grant has been offset against expenditure in hospitals so we know both sides of the equation. It will now be credited to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. By how much does that affect the figures?

At some time I would like to go back through *Hansard* and see if I can take credit for the Government's talking about accountability. When I first came here I talked about accountability. My first speech was about it. The Government should become more accountable. The Government, with its Budget, should be far more accountable to the Parliament and to the public. The Budget figures are far from adequate to show what the Government will do with the money it receives each year. The figures should be broken down into far greater detail so that we can analyse them, and the detail should be projected for four years. The Government has been elected to office for four years. It should honestly tell us how it sees the impact of these large promises given by the Minister for Budget Management and the Government. Allowance could be made for expenditure in future years. There may be an increase of 1 000 policemen over three to four years, which would have a huge impact on the Budget each year. Somewhere in Treasury the number crunching must have been done. If the Government is to be truly accountable to the public of Western Australia it should be giving us four year Budgets. The Press should demand that we get Budgets next August or September showing four years. The figures could be rounded off to

the nearest \$10 million, but it would not be a very difficult task because the work must have been done. Let us get the figures in the right order. I could not care what the head of the Health Department gets; some of the other expenditure is far more important, and a lot of it is given in one lump sum.

The Minister for Budget Management does a very good job in relation to capital works. Health is broken down over three or four pages; there may be \$10 000, \$20 000 or \$30 000. The Ministry of Education is the same. Ballidu Cemetery gets a mention for \$10 000. The first part will cost \$150 000, and \$10 000 will be paid the first year. That detail is included in the Capital Works Budget, which is about \$1 billion, but we are led astray with the CRF, and that, after all, is what needs to be controlled.

Not only do we have the police budget; we have the increased cost of extra policemen, extra cars for them to drive, extra typewriters, tape recorders, uniforms and all the rest of it. Often the policeman is the cheapest part of the cost, before we add all the extras like long service leave, holiday pay and so on.

Coming to the Ministry of Education, the Minister did a marvellous job of appeasing school teachers recently. I think Bob Pearce did a good job. The Minister offered everything people wanted. How much will that cost us in the future? The Press should demand a projection of these figures for teachers for year 1, year 2, year 3 and year 4. Not only must the increase in the number of teachers be reflected; we also want reflected the increases in salaries each year. Then we must have somewhere to put the teachers, which means more capital expenditure.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Actually the biggest single impact is the full year cost of staff like teachers who initially come on for only six months.

Hon MAX EVANS: That is right. Those figures appear in the first year's Budget. There might be a lot of teachers the next year. From July to January there may be very little increase. There may be an increase to June. From June the Budget can be set up. The equation should be projected.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I am not saying it cannot be done; I am pointing out where the biggest increase in future costs comes from.

Hon MAX EVANS: I was chairman of finance on Scotch College council many years ago when we put a sixth stream in year 1 in high school, which meant another two or three teachers. As that stream goes through the school we have extra costs. If we cut out the sixth stream we will never get rid of the cost. We are stuck with it, as I predicted years ago. We have the same sort of problem when watching these numbers.

The Health Department made huge savings this week on salaries and food. It has saved money with the patients all going out. The Government has probably saved \$10 million. As my wife said, the Government could keep the strike going for days for financial considerations. The Government has no interest in stopping this strike; it is saving a lot of money.

Hon J.M. Berinson: The time you save money on the health vote will be the first.

Hon MAX EVANS: That is just a thought. Airline companies will always have problems with strikes, and the cost of strikes will not be picked up because people take their holidays only once a year. The hospitals affected by the current strikes will not catch up again because the food not provided last week will not be provided again next week. Patients have been eating sandwiches and drinking cups of tea for the last four days.

I return to police officers and teachers, as these are important areas. We should also see a Budget figure in relation to these officers - not an all round total figure such as for miscellaneous works and so on. The Minister promised us a figure and perhaps we should have used some sort of gimmick when the promise was made in relation to \$100 for senior school students and \$50 for junior primary school students. I am not sure why those amounts were provided.

Hon N.F. Moore: They are not getting it.

Hon MAX EVANS: It will be just like the food in the hospitals - the cost will be put off for a few weeks so money will be saved.

The Budget in August should project future costs. We are entitled to this information. I have a note here in relation to nurses who received a large increase in salaries, and this came through in stages. The increase in salary involved a lift in the base salary, together with CPI increases. If we have a \$300 million increase in salaries one year and they are lifted by 25 per cent, that is \$75 million; so that is 10 per cent on \$75 million, not \$300 million.

We should work towards four-year Budgets so that we will know where we are going. This is the ideal time to plan four-year Budgets; they will not be perfect but if we do not start now then we will never have four-year Budgets. Last year was not the time to plan for a four-year Budget because the election was coming. As I have said, now is the time to start a precedent for which the Minister for Budget Management can take credit.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I insist that you do, Mr Evans.

Hon MAX EVANS: Let us share it.

Requirements exist under the Financial Administration and Audit Act in respect of accounts. The Minister for Budget Management's second reading speech gave an overview of the economy and how money will be spent, but should we not have a different type of Budget? We should start off with four-year projections and, as the Government is new to the game, we will not ask for the figures for the last five years because that would be almost impossible. To compare the last five years with the next five years would limit the comparisons. However, we should have written statements to include such things as proposals for putting up 300 policemen the first year, and 300 policemen for each of the following two years. That should be shown, just as this information is shown in annual reports. I do not care what has happened in the past; that is history. I want to know what will happen in future. We are entitled to this information. The Minister for Budget Management should also want to know. The taxpayers, and members of Parliament, should be better informed on what will happen with taxpayers' money. We should see the same sorts of descriptions and headings, say two to three pages per department - as in the annual reports - telling us the basis of any movements.

Information in relation to general works and capital loans is very good. We do not need an explanation here because these matters are laid out so well. We know what sums were spent last year and what will be spent this year. The amounts to be expended can be worked out - roughly \$1.5 billion. As a result of requests I made a couple of years ago figures have been provided and this results in a more meaningful statement. "Future capital commitments" is the jargon used in private companies.

The Financial Administration and Audit Act refers to statutory authorities preparing a budget for the Minister. Let us consider the area of main roads, which receives a budget of some \$200 million. I do not know why this one is kept separate, but some of the major statutory authorities should be looked at when considering the Budget. Changes to the Financial Administration and Audit Act provide that these bodies at the correct time should create a proper budget, similar to the present accounting system and estimates regarding the following year. Until a few years ago, statutory authorities did not have accrual accounting. A member for the South West Province commented on the South West Development Authority's accounting methods and we should receive comments from the Auditor General on that matter.

I would like the Minister to comment on the proposition of a four-year budget so that we can be informed. I do not believe that the costs will be any higher; as time goes by the preparation of the financial accounts would become far easier because we have had proper documentation in the past. Capital works and loans is easy because 90 per cent of the information is available and projections can be made.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Of course, they do not go beyond about a three-year spread including the current year. Only on the biggest projects would we have a spread over more than one year plus two to come.

Hon MAX EVANS: I would be happy if the Minister could tell us how much has been spent up to last year, how much will be spent this year and next year, and then how much is still to be expended. That is all clear and I am happy about that in relation to capital works. But in relation to all the departments' expenditure from CRF - wages, cleaning, maintenance - we need to know. I was surprised last year when I started looking at rentals to find that the

Public Works Department used to pay rent on all Government buildings. I thought this was the most amazing accounting procedure. Now the Office of Government Accommodation pays all these rents but it does not pass this on to the offices. Another matter I picked up by chance related to "Silver City" - the Education Department - which pays rent and is funded by the Superannuation Board to which interest is paid. I understand that is the only Government building which pays rent to the Government, or has a rental factor financed by the Government.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Does the Education Department pay this itself?

Hon MAX EVANS: It is paid to the Superannuation Board; there is a notional figure somewhere in the costs but I am not too certain about that. We should look at all departments including the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet, which has some 270 staff. Hon Sandy Lewis has told us that if that department needs more staff it will need another building. The rental for that department is probably about \$7 million and I think this should be shown as a cost to the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet, not as a loss to OGA.

Hon J.M. Berinson: How does that help you? I am not arguing against this; in fact, it is a regular proposition which has been put up, but in the end how does it help you? If we have 270 staff, we need space to accommodate them.

Hon MAX EVANS: I do not know what the staff numbers were before the present Government came to office, but the staff numbers have been increasing. Staff is one factor, but we then need to consider housing and so on; more office space, toilets and so on, need to be provided, and the ongoings are terrific. That should be reflected as a cost to the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet. If it is another \$5 million or \$10 million we should know the true costs of renting the premises for that department because they are real costs. I said years ago that in school accounting one had to give notice of the rental factor in all of one's buildings and accommodation for the boarders, so that one showed the costs. It is possible to get something back on the depreciation of the building. One must look into this. I remember discussing this with a sister of the Catholic Church when I gave a paper in Melbourne, because the Catholic Church had been remiss for years on the notion of salaries for the teachers and the nuns in the hospitals.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

Hon MAX EVANS: The accounting for Government expenditure should be more meaningful for the public. The provision of annual accounts has been a big improvement. The Minister asked why we would want to break down rentals between the departments, and I put it this way: If someone owned a number of properties in the city, and the repair bills for those properties were charged against one property or against one account, and not split up, one would not know if one was making a profit on a particular property. One would not know which costs may or may not be covered by the tenants' payments if all of the costs were charged to kitty - to the main operating account - and not against the respective companies. One would not know how one was getting on with respect to the cost of each building. Rates and taxes are already covered by the tenants, but one has electricity charges which one recovers from the tenants, and electricity charges which one may not recover for the common ways. Those charges are paid by the landlord. If they are not split up between the respective properties, one would not know whether a profit or a loss was being made, and one could deceive oneself.

The same thing applies with the Government. The Office of Government Accommodation used to pay the lawnmowing contractors \$3 million for all Government properties, and it did not know what was charged to parks and gardens, or to schools. Therefore, the office was unable to know the true accounting of the costs to run the schools. In the same way, the Government pays insurance on all the city properties, and the Office of Government Accommodation paid insurance of more than \$6 million for all properties. There was no allocation of insurance costs against the departments having the benefit of those assets. If the Government wants to know how much it costs departments so it can control the costs and the expenditure of the departments, to make them more accountable - after all, that is what we are talking about - it must break down the expenditure for each department. The Government should know how much it costs to run the hospitals, so it has a true picture of the hospitals. This would apply to many more Government departments, and many other costs.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I raise this as a serious question because, as I told you before, it is being considered. Say we know that the nominal rental cost of the Central Law Courts is \$4 million a year, and we add that to the Crown Law Department vote. How does that help us? We must occupy the courts, and it does not matter who it is charged against.

Hon MAX EVANS: I started referring to notional factors, and that would be a notional one. Take the Capita Centre, where the Government is paying an external landlord. That is one instance where the cash is going out. The notional ones are another ball game.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Then why should there be a difference between the Crown Law Department in rented office space in the Westpac Building and the Department for Community Services in a Government-owned building in East Perth?

Hon MAX EVANS: Because one eventually comes back to the fact that it is better to own buildings rather than pay rental on them. One has a low interest rate rather than renting them. The private sector likes to rent a certain amount of accommodation to the Government; that keeps the private sector going. When a Government is short of money, it goes into its own buildings to save the public revenue.

If the Minister wants to talk about notional factors, he should compare one with another. As I was saying about the schools, one could have a notional factor in respect of boarding costs. The Catholic Church did not allow for the notional salaries of the nuns and the priests in the schools and hospitals. When they were charging school fees, those salaries were not accounted for, so they kept the fees low. When the number of staff dropped from 30 priests or nuns to about 10 and they had to employ teachers, they found their fees going up. I did a job for St Anne's hospital many years ago, and I asked the Mother Superior, "How are you charging?" She said, "I am charging nothing." Those were the days of the Whitlam era when the Government was giving lots of money away. Had the hospital charged, say, \$500 000 to salaries - and they were nursing nuns - the hospital would have received that money back. Over 10 years, it would have received \$5 million, but it was not charging for that cost of labour. The same applied to the Catholic schools. They should have been able to recover those salary costs, had they accounted for it properly.

With better accounting over four years, a breakdown is required. I will leave that to the Minister for Budget Management. The annual reports of the departments give details of the capital expenditure, but more information could be put in by the departments. The Government should include more descriptions of what it is trying to achieve so that the accounts are more meaningful. The accounts under the Financial Administration and Audit Act were of great benefit to certain Ministers and the public; one was able to see what the departments were on about.

Some interesting questions come up when thinking of Supply, which includes revenue and expenditure. I hope the Minister can give us more information about the indemnity to the National Australia Bank Ltd in respect of Rothwells. I presume there was a fee in respect of that. Was a fee ever paid, or was it unsecured? Who paid the fee?

I come back to another interesting problem which I cannot solve at the moment. I hope the Minister might be able to help me, because it relates to the income and expenditure situation at the end of the year. The State Government Insurance Commission lent \$175 million to WA Government Holdings. The interest was about \$16 million, to be paid by WA Government Holdings to the SGIC. How will WA Government Holdings obtain the income to pay the interest to the SGIC, because it has no assets? That \$175 million loan is in respect of the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd project. We know that the Government will not receive that money for years down the line. How will WA Government Holdings get the money to pay the interest to the SGIC, otherwise the SGIC will be able to earn nothing? We know the SGIC is covered by the guarantee given by the Treasurer, but how will it be paid the interest?

Similarly, we were told last year that the Government was making an advance of \$20 million to the PICL project by way of some working capital. Was that an advance or guarantee of a bank account? If it were an advance, did it come out of Treasury advances to date; or how was it financed? It was not clear at the time. If it was part of the guarantee, is it part of the \$100 million guaranteed to PICL? We understand that a line of credit for \$100 million has been arranged. This all comes back to a Government which has a 43.75 per cent interest in

the project. How will PICL pay the interest on that \$100 million? After all, it will be paying about \$20 million interest; the rate is 20 per cent at the moment, although PICL might get it for a bit less. It is really paying interest on the Bond Corporation proportion as well as on its own proportion as it has only a 43.75 per cent equity but has guaranteed the whole lot of the \$100 million. I believe that is wrong. It should have a several and not a joint guarantee.

Will the Government further fund this interest of \$20 million per annum, or will it merely increase the overdraft, which will then compound the interest; in other words, capitalise the interest? I cannot believe that a bank would let the interest capitalise for long. I believe the Government might have to start finding some money there. Is the amount under that guarantee now \$100 million or \$120 million?

The Government must look back on this whole Rothwells scenario, which is getting messier and messier every day. I am glad that we do not have the National Companies and Securities Commission report, otherwise we would miss out on a lot of the good things happening at the moment and would just run off into the report. There are plenty of inaccuracies occurring at the present time. As has been said before, and repeated tonight, long before the crash of 1987 Rothwells was a tragedy waiting to happen. It is reported that the NCSC report states that the Rothwells crash would have happened and that that was nothing to do with the share market crash; it was only a matter of time before it went down. I hope the report tells us whether Connell went to Premier Burke or Alan Bond, or whether Bond went to Brian Burke to get help. What was the scenario? It was thought until recent times - and the Minister might know this but might not tell us - that Mr Connell went to Mr Burke to get some help and explained to him the involvement of the Catholic church and local government money, and the Government had to come in right behind it.

I refer this back the Minister, because it concerns his portfolio, but it is also part of the debt problem that exists today in relation to Rothwells. A guarantee was given, and I have said that I accept that when one makes a decision, that is it. However, after the first Rothwells decision it got worse and worse. We knew that the security licence was taken away from Rothwells and that it was told that one of the conditions was that it seek no further funds from the public. We were told that generally, and I understand it is in the report as well. How was it that, with the security licence being given up, the Government did not act against Rothwells, having the Corporate Affairs Department or the NCSC say, "You cannot advertise for more money"? We know that two Ministers admitted they went to local government trying to get it to put more money into Rothwells. I believe the Government, knowing what it did, should have stopped any more money going in and the bank should have lived on what it got. As I said at the time, there was no way in which Rothwells could get out of its problems except by making profits, and with losses of that size it could not.

Then, in January and February, Tony Lloyd tried to get money. In April a beautiful brochure went to the business houses of Perth. It showed Tony Lloyd's photograph and was written up by Darcy Farrell. That gave a degree of credibility to the document because there were two Government persons highly regarded by the Premier who we believed were there to look after the interests of the Government, because Tony Lloyd took the job after the Government got involved. The brochure told us how wealthy Rothwells was and that it had the strongest financial backing of any finance company in Australia. After all, it had \$150 million in new capital; \$70 million from Laurie Connell; and \$150 million in bank guarantees which it added in but which was not real capital; plus \$60 million of its own, less \$20 million in losses. That was a total of \$350 million.

The Government did nothing about that. It did not say, "You should not have money." The Government should have stopped that happening. This goes for the whole scenario. We have problems. The Government is losing money because it did not act on these matters. The Corporate Affairs Department should have looked at the report on Rothwells which came out in March, the 31 January audited accounts. We did not see the auditor's report but are told they were audited accounts. The Stock Exchange said, "You have to believe in fairytales and Alice in Wonderland to believe it." It said that from 31 January Rothwells made a profit of \$94 million before a provision for bad and doubtful debts of \$114 million. It made a profit of \$94 million on \$60 million capital, a 150 per cent return over 12 months. People said that just could not be done after a crash, that no-one could make that sort of money. The fee was there somewhere.

Then one goes to the Stock Exchange to see what the \$114 million was made up of. It said, "Provision for diminution in investments \$19 million." For investments of the size that company had it could only show a loss on investments of -

Hon J.M. Berinson: Is this the auditor's report?

Hon MAX EVANS: The report to the Stock Exchange.

Hon J.M. Berinson: The audited one?

Hon MAX EVANS: I do not know. We presume that it was. The audited accounts were never available publicly. All we can go back to is a statement made to the Stock Exchange, and I presume to Corporate Affairs, when it said bad and doubtful debts were only \$69 million on \$700 million. They tell us somewhere it was nearly \$1 billion at one stage; that is a 6.9 per cent write off for bad and doubtful debts. There was only \$19 million for diminution of value of investments, but someone was not looking at it. The Government, with \$150 million there, had its two favourite sons looking after it and nobody querying, "Is this company going well?". I believe they should have. It goes back to Teachers Credit Society - the signs were there for three or four years, yet a body had to look into them. Here there were two Government persons in there and it was obvious to the Minister's department after the crash that nobody could believe there was a \$94 million profit before a \$114 million bad and doubtful debts diminution of assets, etc - it was just not possible.

I believe that the Minister for Budget Management and the Government must take much responsibility for what happened with Rothwells and for the eventual loss to all the investors. I do not believe it is the full responsibility of the Minister that people believed the Government guaranteed all the debts. They could read that into the situation because the Government guaranteed the bank. A lot of people were reported as saying in the media that because the Government guaranteed the bank it guaranteed everybody. That was a false illusion and did not stand up, but I believe the Minister for Budget Management had a responsibility. The Minister for Budget Management was looking at Government funds that could be affected there.

The Premier said that he spoke to Tony Lloyd only twice during the year about what was going on. I would have thought that he went back many times, but it appears Tony Lloyd was not a tool of the Government, he just broke his ties, went over there and forgot the Government. I believe that the Minister must be accountable to the public. The Government convinced Bell Resources to put \$50 million into Rothwells in the week of the crash. Two weeks later Mr Holmes a Court had sold his BHP shares and his properties for \$494 million. It was a coincidence that the SGIC had borrowed \$500 million to do the deal. It appears, due to the direct influence of the Government, that private sector company was requested to put \$50 million into Rothwells to keep up with what the Government was doing.

Then we have Tipperary, \$50 million, and Warren Anderson. That is now in Rothwells. It is alleged that sum was paid to Rothwells in June, once again at the request of the Government. I cannot see why Warren Anderson or Kerry Packer would have put \$50 million of Tipperary money into Rothwells for the love of Laurie Connell before any new balance sheets came out. There was a little coercion. The buyers of the Perth Technical College site received a \$180 million interest free loan from the Government over two and a half years. They had a good deal from the Government to buy those properties, and a quid pro quo was to put the money into Rothwells. At the same time, Warren Anderson bought half of the David Jones site from Alan Bond for \$45 million. The R & I Bank lent him \$45.5 million, which seems rather unusual for the R & I Bank - to lend over 100 per cent of the borrowings on one property.

The Government has been directly responsible for \$50 million resources, for \$50 million for Packer and Anderson money. The SGIC put in \$89 million, and the R & I Bank has \$11 million at the end. All they had was headaches. The SEC had a major headache on \$15 million.

The Government was responsible for putting \$175 million into PICL, and Bond Corporation put in \$225 million. But \$350 million went to Rothwells. Did the Government check on those non performing debts? A very precise list was reported by Price Waterhouse at the annual general meeting of the company. These were to be taken over. I had a very interesting phone call one day. A gentleman said, "If you recognise my voice, don't say my

name, but have you thought, if Laurie Connell gets five per cent out of \$350 million, he has \$17.5 million in his pocket." I am told it is generally thought around town he received \$30 million out of that. Nobody checked these non performing debts. Did the Government check them? Did the Government say they were not worth anything? The Government allowed Connell to take out this amount of money and those small creditors will be lamenting. The Government had a big responsibility; it should have been overseeing it because Government men were at the helm and taxpayers' money was at risk.

I feel sorry for the Minister opposite. I do not doubt his integrity. He does not always come back with the answers, but the National Australia Bank is offside. Mr Parker is saying that what the bank is saying is not the truth. I shall not go right through it, but people are saying they are not happy with the comments being made.

We also know that the Minister has made some false statements on several occasions regarding Wardley Australia Ltd. The fact that the Government said it completely accepted Wardley's proposal for the deal has been alluded to. I am advised this is what the Government said. After advice on Rothwells' position, which was provided by Wardleys, the organisation underwriting the rescue package and examination by the merchant banks on the audited account, the Government adviser was prepared to consider the proposal. Wardleys retaliated with a statement that the rescue package had already been designed when Wardley's representative was summoned on 23 October to an emergency meeting of the rescue participants. The Minister queried this situation, and so did 200 other people who could prove that that was wrong - that Wardleys did know all about it when the package was set up.

I talked to the managing director of Wardleys this morning - he is an old friend of mine - to let him know what is being said about the company. It is a bit like what is being said about the National Australia Bank. He was horrified. His answer to me was that they came over here and went to a meeting in Connell's office. Spedleys was involved. Brian Yuill of Spedleys was there, and so was Connell and others. They told Wardleys of the proposed package to put it together. Wardleys said, "We do not think it will work; you should do some other sort of deal." He suggested something like the arrangements for Tricontinental, which was taken over by the State Bank of Victoria. Thank goodness Rothwells was not taken over by the R & I Bank. They did not believe that bank guarantees was the way to go and they left the meeting. They tried to get early tickets back to Sydney; they could see no point in staying around. There was a guarantee with subunderwriters and the National Australia Bank to cover the money for the deal, because a lot of people were very slow in bringing in the \$150 million in shares. In February and March I searched the share register and a lot of the \$150 million was not in then.

That is the only role that Wardleys had. There was no undertaking, no underwriting or guarantee to the Government or the creditors. I feel sorry for the Minister opposite having a Minister like this making untrue statements about companies which are highly regarded in the commercial world.

The Minister is supporting the Supply Bill; he must have Supply to go on. The media and the public of Western Australia expect better accounting reporting and accountability in the future and a closer supervision. There was not nearly enough supervision of the Teachers Credit Society and the prudential standards for keeping the balance sheet looking reasonable. It got into an uncontrolled mess and eventually the Government had to pick up \$125 million. I do not hold the Government responsible at all for the Swan Building Society collapse. I do not know whether that could have been supervised better. In the last couple of years we have put \$125 million into the Teachers Credit Society; \$15 million into the Swan Building Society; and the Western Australian Development Corporation has had \$40 million in capital. I do not believe the return on funds has been that good or that the Government could not have earned this. There has been \$20 million with Exim, which has made only losses. We do not believe the Treasurer when he tells us that the assets of Exim are worth \$23.5 million, when the capital there was \$14 million for the State Government, \$6 million for the Federal Government, and \$1.5 million for Western Australian Overseas Projects Authority, so the \$21.5 million was put in by the Government. We have had no return on \$20 million of our money. We will get it back soon. GoldCorp had \$25 million. I would be very surprised and pleased if GoldCorp makes a profit this year, because it made a loss last year when it was part of the Western Australian Development Corporation.

The Government must keep a better control of its money going out and not just put out good Press releases about what it is doing. The Minister has 10 times or a hundred times the problem on his hands now with the petrochemical project. He has a guarantee of \$100 million of \$175 million, and Alan Bond's 53.25 per cent of that \$100 million. Alan Bond should be guaranteeing that; he should not be using his security of the shares in PICL. The Government should guarantee one part and he should be guaranteeing the other part. The first \$100 million of a \$600 million project is not worth anything, nor is the second, the third, the fourth or the fifth - only the last \$100 million which might turn the key on a producer profit. There is always a risk, with the sort of money put in there. If it does not take off we will never get back the \$175 million, which must be repaid in nine years' time by WA Government Holdings Ltd to the SGIC. We are looking at hundreds of millions of dollars. The Minister cannot tell us what he expects to come out of the Treasurer's Advance Account.

Finally, could the Minister answer a question on the money in the Treasurer's Advance? I would have thought that the Treasurer's Advance ought to be used by the Government to pay wages, salaries and so on - even the Teachers Credit Society, by way of a special comment to the House. How can the Government put nearly \$30 million of that into Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd? After all at the moment the Government has given a line of credit of \$100 million - or maybe \$120 million, I am not too certain - but now we are talking about the Treasurer's Advance, and the Government may have to put some money up front which will be paid back if and when there is non-recourse finance. Legally, can the Government draw from Treasurer's Advance to put money into WA Government Holdings Ltd, which is an arm's length statutory authority, or into the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd, which is where it is eventually going? What security does the Government have on its money to put it there? I believe these things should be known before we go on to debate the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill. Exactly how will the Government get security for the \$30 million, \$40 million or \$50 million out of the Treasurer's Advance to go into the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd?

Hon J.M. Berinson: Security to whom?

Hon MAX EVANS: Security to the Government. The Minister for Budget Management said the Government would put in the Treasurer's Advance money. I know the Minister in the other place did not worry about security when the State Energy Commission paid \$15 million to Western Collieries Ltd. When the manager said, "I have no security; I cannot pay \$15 million for the prepayment of coal; it could all be lost and the company could roll over. I have no security; I would be unsecured, and I do not want to put my neck on the line", the Minister said, "You just draw the cheque and do not worry about it, my lad. It will be fixed up later." Three weeks later the Government had not received the cheque back. We need to know where this money is going to go. Will the Government be lending it to WA Government Holdings Ltd, or will it go to Petrochemical Holdings Ltd, which it owns shares in, or will it go to Petrochemical Investments Ltd, which it also owns shares in, or will it go to Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd, which is actually doing the thing? Who will get the money? What security will there be? Can the Government legally lend money to an outside body from Treasury funds?

HON BARRY HOUSE (South West) [8.02 pm]: In this Supply debate, I want to concentrate on a series of schools in my electorate. I have an interest in schools, being an ex-teacher. I also have a healthy concern because I fear that capital works and maintenance have not kept pace with the demand of the schools throughout the State and I along with other members in this Chamber could rise to speak about a whole series of schools that need a lot of attention.

I will start right at the bottom of my electorate, at Augusta. The Augusta Primary School is a fairly old school; it has a serious lack of administration space and a lack of privacy for the principal, the staff, and everybody else. One example which clearly illustrates that is that last year the principal was talking to a parent at the school and the parent informed the principal, within earshot of quite a few other people, that his spouse had cancer. That sort of thing should not occur. There should be provision within a school where somebody can at least divulge private information to the principal of the school. The Augusta Primary School is badly in need of some extensions to its administration block. The P & C association is willing to help to the tune of up to \$20 000 but there still seems to be no action. In my

opinion some priority should be given to schools where the P & C associations are prepared to pitch in and provide some of the finance and assistance needed to construct things like covered assembly areas. It seems no priority is given to people who are prepared to help themselves. Augusta does not have a covered area, and that is a vital omission because as members may know it rains for six months of the year at Augusta and water drips off the trees for the other six months.

The Margaret River Primary School is another matter for concern. It was represented very well today in this Parliament by a delegation to the Minister for Education. Along with Hon Doug Wenn, the member for Vasse, Mr Barry Blaikie, the member for Warren, Mr Paul Omodei, I attended a delegation to a couple of the Education Ministry's officers on the Margaret River Primary School's needs and requirements. Unfortunately the Minister for Education could not attend that delegation this afternoon. She was ill, so I hope she is on the mend very soon because she has a lot of work to do. I would firstly like to congratulate the delegation from the Margaret River Primary School, which was headed by Ray Stocker. It prepared a detailed submission which clearly outlined the need for the facilities required at the primary school. The delegation documented the lack of action over recent years and it stated its case very clearly. It is worth quoting something from the submission put to the Minister. Just to establish the background, the submission begins -

Over the period from 1985 to 1989, the P & C has been seeking improvements in conditions for both teachers and students through both the Minister and Governmental avenues with little result other than promises as yet unfulfilled and in our opinion long overdue.

In Margaret River the requests for the primary school are starting to be considered along the same lines as improvements for the hospital, which were sought over many years and finally came to fruition about 12 months ago. The Augusta-Margaret River Shire, as members know, is one of the fastest growing regions in the State. The past decade has seen substantial change to the population characteristics of the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River. There has been rapid growth in resident numbers and during the census period 1981-86, there was a substantial growth in the shire's population from 3 680 to 4 825, an increase of 31.1 per cent. That is an increase far above most of the other areas of Western Australia. Projected into the future the Leeuwin-Naturaliste stage 2 report predicted that the likely outcome is a doubling of the shire's residential population over the next three census periods. In fact the submission adds the proviso that the shire's population could in fact reach 10 600 by the year 2001.

The figures and the projections at the moment are conservative, if anything. Other growth indicators in the area also support the data the delegation provided in its submission. Private dwellings are very much on the increase in the shire. The number of new home constructions has increased markedly since the 1976-81 period and represents a twofold increase on the 1981 figures. Based on current predictions of continued strong growth in the local housing sector, this trend could continue for at least the next five years. On the score of proposed subdivisions, there is a series of proposed subdivisions for the town of Margaret River and neighbouring areas. These include approximately 1 000 residential lots south and east of the town's centre; approximately 120 residential lots west of the town centre, proposed to be released before the end of 1989; and approximately 115 special rural lots west of the town centre, which are to be released over the next six to 12 months. These subdivisions will occur and even with a conservative 25 per cent building rate, they represent another 300 houses and families entering the community.

The submission also makes a case in respect of new industries and the growth of existing industries. Mineral sands mining, coal mining and the proposed annexe of the Notre Dame University are mooted for Margaret River and will bring with them employment, new families and increased demand on community facilities, including schools. I will not read all of the figures provided in the submission, but the school population itself has grown from 387 in 1985 to the present figure of 489 this year, so there is obviously an upward trend in the school population, in keeping with the population growth of the area. The delegation's main concern with the school facilities centre around the library for a start. Student numbers at the school make up 13 classes; however, only 12 rooms are available, so the library doubles as a classroom. This means that the library resource centre is not being used to its full potential and is unavailable to the majority of school children. The school has an old art and craft house on the school site.

This is an aged building and should be condemned, but the school cannot afford to let it go. It is essential to the school because it is used, firstly, as an art-craft room, and secondly as a part time classroom for small reading groups. It also contains the school canteen. Like it or not, they have to use it and cannot do without it. The school also contains demountable classrooms which are the bane of schools throughout the State. Administration and teachers' facilities are also grossly inadequate. Most rooms are used for dual purposes; for example, the deputy principal's office doubles as a sick room for children, and the reading room-book storeroom doubles as a preparation area for teaching aide staff, etc.

Four questions were asked of the Minister and her representatives this afternoon. Firstly, when will the proposed transportable classroom arrive in Margaret River? The school has 13 classes and only 12 classrooms in which to teach the students. This was satisfactorily answered by the officers in attendance this afternoon, who stated that a demountable would arrive from Woodvale Primary School at the beginning of the second term. The P & C association now has only to wait a week or two, providing the demountable is in a satisfactory condition. The second question asked was: When will funds be made available for permanent buildings and improvements at the Margaret River Primary School? The standard reply was given by the ministry that that would depend on the Budget and priorities for this coming year.

The third question was: What does the Minister feel is the optimum size for that primary school? The school feels that the optimum size is about 500 students. The ministry did not disagree. It believes that the optimum size for a primary school is between 500 and 600 students. However, its response was that the population of that school would have to increase from 500 before a second primary school in the town would be considered. The fourth question was: What does the ministry plan to do about the old art-craft house? The ministry plans to do nothing about it except demolish it. However, it said it could be retained at the expense of the P & C association. An amount of \$12 000 will need to be provided by the P & C association just to maintain it in a serviceable condition. If it were not a Government building it would be condemned and demolished straightaway.

Across the road from the Margaret River Primary School is the Margaret River High School. It is overdue for an upgrading of its buildings and their status. It is a junior high school at the moment, but has obtained a commitment that it will be upgraded to a senior high school in 1991.

Hon Garry Kelly: Is it a district high school?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: Yes. There does not seem to be much happening on that score, either locally or in the ministry. The school cannot be upgraded under the present conditions without a complementary upgrading of the buildings and the facilities. The school cannot cope with the extra commitments required of a senior high school. However, that status must come for the town and for the area, which includes Augusta, Cowaramup, Gracetown and Prevelly Park which are growing all the time. It must also come to relieve pressure on the Busselton High School which takes the year 11 and year 12 students from Margaret River and Augusta.

A little further up the Bussell Highway is the Cowaramup Primary School. A letter landed on my desk a couple of days ago stating that the Cowaramup Primary School also has had a running battle over many years to upgrade its facilities. It is urgently in need of new administration facilities, library, resource area and a classroom. That letter states in part -

...the Cowaramup Primary School...consists of 4 classrooms of brick construction, administration-library buildings of bristol construction, and a transportable Pre-primary, 4 year old centre.

The bristol administration-library building was erected in 1954 as a temporary measure. Thirty five years on, it is still here and has become a permanent eyesore, and an impairment on the scholastic qualities in this school.

The administration half of this building is totally inadequate for the many functions that have to be performed in it. There is very little privacy for the Principal in his office. The staff room is cramped. There is very little storage space, no sick room, no office for the school secretary, no general staff work area.

The Library side of this building has many functions, but, because of its size, it cannot cope effectively.

We have 119 children at this school and if another 2-3 children are enrolled, we are eligible for another teacher. The only place that this teacher would be able to take a class of students, would be in the library. This would then deny the rest of the school any major use of the library.

The school supports its case with statistics on the growth rate of the Augusta-Margaret River Shire and points out that a 30 to 60 block subdivision will be developed in Cowaramup and Gracetown, the neighbouring town, is also growing rapidly. School programs such as music and art are suffering and a new administration, library, resource centre and classroom are needed.

A bit further down the track in the area to which Mr Masters will devote his retirement is Dunsborough. It is also growing rapidly. There is no covered assembly area at Dunsborough Primary School and there is a lack of wet weather areas. Assemblies are held in a classroom into which the school sometimes tries to squeeze 150 kids and 20 or 30 parents. That is a difficult if not impossible task. That school requires two new classrooms and additions to its administrative block and resource centre. Once again, the Dunsborough community is prepared to help by contributing \$10 000 towards a covered area. It is also prepared to donate labour and materials, but it does not seem to be getting much cooperation from the ministry. Once again, I believe that consideration should be given to areas that are prepared to help themselves. The school put in a minor works request for a covered assembly area and the reply from the Ministry of Education is interesting. It states in part -

The above request has been accepted for consideration by the Minor Works Committee at a meeting held on 18 May 1988.

The committee although accepting your request has not been able to refund it at this stage.

Your request will be held in abeyance pending further allocations of funding during 1988.

The letter is dated 20 May 1988. The last paragraph makes the most interesting reading. It states -

Should you be able to fund this project from some other fund source or you make other arrangements can you please advise and your request will be withdrawn.

The Ministry of Education is not assisting people but encouraging them to seek funds elsewhere. There is nothing wrong with that, I suppose, but the Ministry of Education is wiping its hands of the problem in a way and hoping that it will go away.

The next school on my list is the Busselton High School. I have spoken about this before. I have had strong personal involvement in that school having been a student, a youth education officer for five years, a teacher, and now a parent there. This school was not allocated funds in the last Budget for stage 2 of its building program, despite the assurance of the then new Minister for Education, Dr Lawrence, who visited the school and assured the P and C and the school council - the two bodies operate there - that there would be no interruption to its budgetary requirements and stage 2 of the building program would go ahead. The result of the funding not being provided is that overcrowding is a problem at the Busselton High School. Once again, the library is used as a classroom, not by one class or even two classes, but sometimes there are up to four classes at once. That creates a pretty impossible teaching situation. Last year the photography room at the school was condemned by the local shire's health officer. That problem was partially corrected by scraping up pennies from somewhere. I will be a member of another delegation tomorrow, and so will Hon Doug Wenn. That delegation will come from the Busselton P and C to the Minister for Education. It is interesting to note that the concerns are not just at a political level; they have bipartisan support. The problems are real problems.

The Newton Moore High School in Bunbury is in need of an upgrade as well. It is in need of an additional three or four classrooms. Here the library is being used by up to five classes at a time. If members do not think that is a real problem, it is simply because the classes physically fit into the area. However, I can assure them that it is difficult for a physical education teacher to teach a sex education class, for instance, without affecting other classes that are trying to do something of a more passive nature elsewhere. The alternative at Newton Moore has been to program some of the classes into the gymnasium and some under

trees. At the beginning of this year, they needed an additional three demountable classrooms, just to start the teaching program. Initially they were given only two, and I do not believe they have received another one, so they have had to adjust the teaching program now. They have just had to cope. This has led to restrictions on timetabling, and that really makes a mockery of the Unit Curriculum which was introduced into schools last year. In theory, the Unit Curriculum permits a wider choice of subjects. Nobody has anything against that in principle, but in practice it is not able to be implemented. It is impossible.

Just a bit further up the road is the Bunbury High School, and it has recently had a new section built. There are excellent facilities in that part of the school, and it has the best view of any high school in the State. However, I believe there are problems in the science block. There is an urgent need for some improvements there.

The Adam Road Primary School - another school in Bunbury - will have a covered assembly area built this year, as will the Cooina Primary School. That covered area is welcome, but there is a serious need for an upgrading of the administration block there. Adam Road was built as a school for about 100 students. However, there are more than 500 in the school now, but it has storage and administration facilities applicable to a school of about 100 students. It is worth quoting some of the needs listed in a letter to the Minister for Education in 1988. In addition to the covered assembly area, on which they have already seen some action, they require a first aid room. Sick children are accommodated on one couch in a book store. There is a need for an office for the deputy principal, a duplicating room - equipment is spread through the school in store rooms - a parent interview or guidance officer-school nurse's room - they all operate out of the staff room. There is a need for an adequate sized staff room and sufficient storage space. The letter continues -

The removal of our demountable, coupled with an unexpected increase in numbers, means that we no longer possess a music room -

Yet they have a music specialist plus an instrumental music program. There is also a need for a maths learning centre. That is part of the problem associated with the Adam Road Primary School.

The Boyanup Primary School has a problem with the very old demountable classroom in the school grounds. That school has listed its needs as a modern resource centre, a covered assembly area, one permanent classroom, and a preprimary centre. In the *South Western Times* of 10 March 1988 the following letter appeared. I will quote from it because it is as relevant today as it was then. There was a headline "Kids swelter, candles melt in classroom heat", and the article read as follows -

Boyanup parents are wondering just how uncomfortable a classroom has to get before the Education Department will do something about it.

Parents and teachers have long been complaining at temperatures in the year 1 transportable but came across tangible proof recently when birthday cake candles melted in the classroom's heat.

That is a pretty intolerable situation in a country like Australia.

At Bridgetown High School, the saga has already been mentioned before. It is starting to sound like "Blue Hills". It has been going on for a few years now, and I am sure it has been mentioned in this House by Hon Bill Stretch and Hon Sandy Lewis many times. I have been in contact with the Bridgetown Parents and Citizens' Association, the Bridgetown staff, and the Bridgetown community. Despite all their efforts, they are still receiving absolutely no attention, it seems, from the hierarchy. Their need for an upgrading has been bypassed for years. They have very poor library resource facilities, and an administration area which is archaic, to say the least. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition, Barry MacKinnon, was a student at the school in the 1950s, and the facilities at that time were just the same as they are now, except that they were probably up to date in the 1950s, and they have deteriorated since then. Before the State election, the Liberal Party, through our shadow Minister for Education and the then candidate for Warren, Mr Paul Omodei - now the member for Warren - was prepared to make a commitment to the Bridgetown High School that the next coalition Government would upgrade the school within the first Budget year. However, the Government was not prepared to come to the party with that sort of commitment, it seems, and the P and C in Bridgetown is still receiving wishy washy letters which talk about its

being on the priority list and still being under consideration. The people of Bridgetown are sick and tired of waiting, and they are getting absolutely fed up with being fobbed off. Along with them, I certainly hope that this year we will see some improvements in the education facilities in Bridgetown budgeted for.

At Nannup, some students are housed in a single men's quarters with barbed windows, and they suffer extremely high temperatures in summer and freezing cold in winter. That is not really conducive to good education.

Another school which comes within my expanded electorate is Walpole, and the Walpole Primary School has also clearly enunciated its problems in a letter to the Minister. I think that letter explains the situation. It reads as follows -

Enrolments at the school have increased from 89 in 1984 to the current figure of 116. The school has not had a capital building programme since temporary demountable classrooms were erected some 15 years ago. The problems outlined below are a result:-

There is no area for remedial education programmes, despite having four E.S.U. core children identified.

The extra teacher provided for increased enrolments has to run a support programme in the library and lunch shed.

There are no withdrawal areas or wet areas provided to allow a variety of educational activities.

The staff room is a small enclosed verandah and is totally inadequate. There is no room for preparation, display or professional reading.

There is no sick bay or any area for children who feel unwell and as 72% live on farms, they cannot simply 'go home'.

That is an important consideration for rural communities. In city communities it is not such a major problem because if students become ill their parents can often be reached by a telephone call and are only five minutes drive from the school. The letter continues -

The office area is also a storeroom, the photocopy room and secretarial area. There is no possibility of confidential discussions or telephone calls.

There is totally inadequate storage space, especially for computer security.

Some of the schools have access to computer terminals and software. However, they do not have adequate facilities in which to store or operate them. The letter continues to explain more of Walpole's problems. This community is prepared to help itself, but the people are getting precious little assistance from elsewhere.

There are problems associated with the education system in Northcliffe and Pemberton. The people in those areas are entitled to be a little cynical about election promises because prior to the State election they were promised funding. In fact, funding was provided in last year's Budget for Northcliffe and Pemberton schools, but the amount was grossly inadequate. After a lengthy debate the people of Pemberton decided where they wanted the school to be built. The Government provided money for planning the school but no indication has been given of further funding. The contracts have been let for the school at Northcliffe but the cost far exceeds the amount allocated and the project is now in a state of limbo. The people want to know where they are going, and they are entitled to have that information.

On the first day of the new school year, a couple of days before the State election on 4 February, I accompanied Roger Nicholls the then candidate for the seat of Mandurah - who I am pleased to say is now the member - on a brief tour of the schools in that area, with which I am not as familiar as he is. We visited the Mandurah High School and spoke to people who were quite optimistic because the number of demountable classrooms at that school had been reduced from 21 to 18. It is disgraceful that any school should have 18 demountable classrooms.

Hon W.N. Stretch: It must be a record.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: One school in Perth has more, I believe.

Hon Graham Edwards: Why does not the member for Mandurah fix it?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: That is probably why the person who was the member for Mandurah for the last six years is no longer a member.

Hon Graham Edwards: You said that you went on a tour of the schools in Mandurah with the member for Mandurah.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I went on a tour with the current member.

Hon Graham Edwards: Why does he not fix it up?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: He is working on it now.

Hon Graham Edwards: He claimed to have got two new schools in his electorate; if he has claimed that on the one hand why not take responsibility for the other situation on the other hand?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: One of those new schools is the Coodanup High School. On the first day of school it consisted of a half completed building.

Hon Graham Edwards: He is taking credit for that.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: No.

Hon Graham Edwards: If you look at his maiden speech, you will find that he is. It is just a point for you to consider.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I would rather think that it was the fault of the previous member for Mandurah. The Coodanup school was not completed in time for the beginning of the school year, and completion was approximately a month overdue. When we visited the site there was no sign of staff or students and it was necessary to hurriedly organise a camp to take 80 year 8 students starting high school. Coodanup High School will be a very fine school which is urgently required. However, it will cater only for the increase in demand and it will not soak up the excess students at the Mandurah High School, which is overcrowded. The planning is not matching the expansion in that area.

A couple of primary schools are located in the area. One of them recently received an old demountable classroom from Newman which was in a disgraceful condition when it arrived. A great deal of work was necessary to make it habitable. It was unbearably hot and had just been painted, so the smell inside made it impossible for the room to be used. The students were outside the classroom, sitting under trees. That is not uncommon and I am sure most people would have seen that happening during the first few days of term. This is only a sample of the problems of schools in my area and my neighbouring area. I could go on and cite examples from all over the electorate, from Mandurah to Albany. I do not know how members are expected to cover an electorate as large as mine; Hon Beryl Jones will have similar problems and she must become familiar with all the schools I mentioned.

Hon B.L. Jones: Do you know how much has been spent on schools in the last few years?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I know how much has been spent, but I am also aware of the needs created in the expanding south west area. I am not saying the problems apply only to the south west; they apply to the whole State, particularly the rapidly growing areas. It was interesting to read in one of the newspapers a few weeks ago that some of the inner city high schools have excess capacity. There seems to be a problem with our planning. We should make greater strides in planning ahead and coping with areas that are rapidly developing, such as Mandurah, Bunbury, Busselton, and Margaret River. They require more assistance than do some other areas in this State. The problem lies with insufficient allocations in the Capital Works Program.

All members should be presenting this Parliament with a long list of the problems associated with schools in their area. The situation puts in doubt the basic right of future generations to a fair and good education. A very inequitable situation exists in that some schools have excellent facilities and are side by side with others which are struggling to get adequate facilities. The Australind and Clifton Park areas in Bunbury are very well catered for, but nearby the Picton Primary School was in a ridiculous situation this year as a result of lack of coordination. A transportable classroom was a week late arriving, and the contract had already been let to build a fence around that classroom. The fence was built around a vacant piece of lawn, and it probably had to be pulled down to allow the transportable classroom to be erected at a later stage. That is a crazy situation and it should not happen.

In addition, the electors of Western Australia were insulted by the election promise of \$100 for secondary school students and \$50 for primary school students. There is no doubt in my mind - nor in the minds of those to whom I have spoken on this subject - that the Government clearly created the perception that the money would be available for this school year, rather than for the school year starting 1990.

Hon B.L. Jones: Surely some people will know that you cannot manufacture money which has not been provided for in the Budget. Whatever promises are made have to be met out of the Budget. That surely is just good housekeeping.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: We had some Government bodies in this State which seemed to be able to manufacture money and run around like Father Christmas prior to the election. There is no reason why the money cannot come from some funding which has been promised, but it was obviously just another Clayton's promise. I know of some people who, on the strength of the pending \$50 or \$100 that they thought they would receive from the Ministry of Education, went out and charged up to the schools certain books and other materials which their children needed for the school year. However, that money, to their surprise, shock and horror, will not come forward, which means they cannot pay off their debts to the schools, and the schools will have to carry those debts throughout this year.

Hon B.L. Jones: If they needed to have the books, they would have ordered them anyway, whether the promise was there or not. The children would have had to have the books, whichever way they were going to pay for them.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The end result of the problems that have been highlighted tonight is that the education of our future generations will suffer. The education system is under a lot of pressure. I want the Government to address this situation because education is a vital area and must be a high priority in our society. If the Government is not prepared to address this situation with capital works and maintenance in schools around the State, then not only our children but ultimately the Government will pay the consequences.

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [8.42 pm]: I support the second reading of the Supply Bill which is currently before the House, and in the course of that I will touch on three separate topics, each of which in its own way relates to the finances of the State. The Bill now before the House seeks to grant Supply for an amount in the order of \$2.5 billion for the works and services of the State for the year ending 30 June 1990. In looking at those figures and at the magnitude of the amount that is before us, one is entitled to wonder aloud what it is that we are actually doing. If members examine what we have done with previous Supply Bills, it appears that we have already authorised Supply through to 30 September 1989. Today's Bill covers a further \$2.5 billion, which, as most members would be aware, is about half of the Consolidated Revenue Fund amount which the Government needs for any 12 month period.

If we pass this Supply Bill today, it will in effect mean that we are providing another six months' of Supply to the Government, and when that is added to the Supply which has already been authorised, we will be giving parliamentary compliance to providing the Government with money until March 1990. That begs the question: Why does Parliament grant Supply so far ahead? In the normal course of events that is probably not a major problem because Governments make that provision four, five or six months ahead because the Christmas holiday period will intervene, and Parliament will not be sitting and will not be able to grant the Government money for its works and services. The conclusion that one is entitled to draw out of this is that, by passing this Bill tonight, the Government can now function without the Parliament until March 1990.

Under normal circumstances one would not countenance a situation where the Parliament would not meet for 12 months, but given the fact that this place is a rumour factory as much as it is anything else, and given also that we know the Government is sitting on a National Companies and Securities Commission report of an explosive nature, I put it to the House: Are we running the risk of having the Parliament close down for another 12 month period from now so that once Supply is granted tonight and is added to the Supply which was granted last year until 30 September 1989, the Government can prepare itself for some sort of long winter during which the Parliament will be closed down and the public of Western Australia will have no opportunity to put the Government under the griller in relation to the contents of the NCSC report? It seems to me that we are passing a Bill of great significance

tonight, not only because of the amount of money attached to it but also because of the consequences of passing the Bill, whereby the Parliament may well be walking into a web not of its own making, which will see a potential to close the Parliament and to not reopen it inside of a year.

Hon Tom Stephens: When you were a young boy, did you often see a bogymen poking around the bushes?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I remind the member who has just interjected that it was only a year or so ago when in this Chamber we were being given assurances about the Teachers Credit Society, and were being told we were seeing boggy men in the dreams of our youth, and that there was nothing to worry about. The member now knows, as did his Government before it told us, that all those fears that were expressed by the Opposition have come true. The chickens have come home to roost, not only with the TCS but also with Rothwells, because at the time that members opposite went into the Rothwells rescue, they said to us and to the public that we were grasping at straws. We were told not to worry about the Rothwells bail out because it would never happen. That is the next string to the bow; we saw that collapse. We can see the pretty unseemly fight which is going on this very minute between the National Australia Bank and our own Deputy Premier about what the contractual arrangements were in that situation. The member should know, as we do, that the State is up for a huge level of indebtedness because of the Rothwells bail out, just as it was over the TCS bail out. So when members like Hon Tom Stephens say to me that we are whistling into the wind or grasping at straws, or making things up, I can only point to his Government's record and say we did not have to make up anything; members opposite created it all by themselves. That is why I genuinely fear that we will not see Parliament back here inside of a year if the going gets tough enough. The member may not be privy to that decision, but I wonder how many of his seniors are.

Hon Tom Stephens: We are members of a Caucus, who are elected to Parliament because we are members of a reforming party. We have legislation that we as a Caucus want to see introduced into this Parliament. I can assure you that we will be back.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is interesting to hear the member talk of himself as being a member of a reformist Caucus, because there certainly is a great need to reform some of the strategies that members opposite have put in place.

It is significant that just before Hon Tom Stephens interrupted my line of thought, and I do not know whether he is aware of this, I was about to refer to the fact that the Bill with which we are dealing makes a specific contribution to the Teachers Credit Society bail out. I refer Hon Tom Stephens to page three of the second reading speech made a couple of days ago where the Minister for Budget Management said the following -

... every effort is being made to contain overall outlays to the amounts appropriated by Parliament.

The Minister continued later -

... it has been necessary to fund some -

And listen to this -

- inescapable or unavoidable additional commitments which have emerged since the Budget was introduced into Parliament. The largest of these relates to the Government's action to protect the savings of many thousands of Western Australians who invested in the failed Teachers Credit Society.

It is passing strange that at the very moment in my speech I was expressing concern about the Government's long term intentions in the Parliament, and after responding to the member in the way in which I did, the next point I was to go to related to the fact that one of the items contained in the present Supply Bill is a consequence of the Government's intervention in another failed finance house in this State. I could spend my remaining time debating the Government's use of the words "inescapable and unavoidable" because it is a debatable question as to whether they were inescapable or unavoidable commitments on the part of the Government. Since that bail out commitment was made people have argued, both in this place and in the public arena - and not only in this State but across Australia - whether the Government had the right to go in with taxpayers' funds, which we were assured at that time

were not at risk. However, we find today, on 11 April 1988, two years or so after the event, that we are being told by the Government that we are dealing with a Bill to fund some inescapable additional commitments in the form of the Teachers Credit Society bail out. If Government members are proud of that, I would be very surprised - even someone like Hon Tom Stephens.

The second matter I will touch on is in its own way a matter of the finances of the State; that is, what is to become of the Percy Markham collection of vintage cars now that the Government's hastily arranged auction has bombed out? I do not know whether members are aware of this, but that is what has happened. For those who are not aware of the background of this matter it has been well documented. I can say without fear of contradiction that the whole issue of the Percy Markham collection of cars, which was virtually donated to this State 20-odd years ago, is one where we are dealing with a set of heirlooms that are not the Government's to give away, and certainly not the Government's to sell, but were all but donated to the Government of this State 20-odd years ago by a vintage car enthusiast.

Hon Mark Nevill: What were they purchased for by the Government?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Does Hon Mark Nevill mean the amount of money involved?

Hon Mark Nevill: I think it was substantial.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It was something like \$180 000, but it was a steal, I can tell Hon Mark Nevill that. That is why I said that it was a virtual donation. Not even Mr Markham suggests that he gave the cars to the Government. Can members imagine what Mr Markham and his family must be feeling today, having given this collection to the Government for about \$180 000 20 years ago, to know what they are worth today even in their unrepaired state? It must be passing through Mr Markham's mind that he would have been better off keeping them and making the profit himself rather than the Government making that profit. At least the Opposition has to its credit the fact that it stopped the sale of those cars overseas. In fact, the vehicles were headed for the auction rooms at either Sotheby's or Christies, I forget which.

This leads me to a second question to the Minister for Budget Management, who I presume will be answering questions before he closes this second reading debate. We were told that once the pressure went on the Government by the Opposition last year, and by the vintage car movement and the public generally, that a decision was made to not proceed with the auction. By then the vehicles were on the wharf at Fremantle and ready to go into containers. The Government had entered into a contractual arrangement with either Christies or Sotheby's. The Government is now obliged to sort that out. I would like to know by way of answer from Hon Joe Berinson the extent to which those contractual arrangements have been finalised and whether the auction house in London has been paid out what it believed it would get by way of commission had the sale gone ahead.

One of the things that this whole debate on the matter of the vintage cars has thrown up is the real and overdue need on the part of the Museum of Western Australia not only to have a decent acquisition fund but also to be given funds for restorative work of heirlooms entrusted to it. It is no secret that prior to the election the Opposition made a deliberate commitment through the Leader of the Opposition, after consulting people like Hon Max Evans, that should we gain Government a proper restoration fund would be set up within the Museum of Western Australia. I use this occasion to implore members of the Government, whether Ministers or backbenchers, to use their influence with the Government to make provision in the Budget this year not only for a decent fund for acquisitions but also for some form of fund for restoration work.

I was surprised to learn from a number of people that the museum trustees do not have access to that sort of funding. When one thinks of some of the frivolous things that have caught the Government's eye and have cost taxpayers an arm and a leg for no return in the past six years, it is relatively easy to argue that a proper acquisition and restoration fund should be set up and that a substantial amount should be paid into that fund by the Government for the work of the Museum so that it is never again placed in a position where it has to flog off part of the heritage of this State in order to restore other parts of that heritage. That just does not make sense. There is no other museum or art gallery in the world that does that. I am not

saying that a museum or art gallery should be stuck forever with inferior works of art or objects, as there clearly always has to be opportunity for museums and art galleries to sell material of which it has an excess.

For the benefit of members I point out that these vehicles were never sold because the museum decided to sell them; that is the tragedy. No conscious decision was ever made by the director or the trustees of the museum that the cars were not of any value. The Government's money men moved in - the razor gang people. They made the decision. I do not dispute the right of the Government to send in people to find ways of cutting costs, but it is a tragedy when this leads to a situation where the museum and its trustees and its senior staff are left in no better position than to say, "We have to accept what the Government says. We have to sell part of the national estate in order to get some money to do up other parts of the national estate."

Hon Tom Stephens: I think it was a case of the trustees having established their priorities as to what they saw as the role of the museum. They found themselves in a budgetary position having to put their cash behind their priorities rather than being forced to establish priorities.

Hon Max Evans: No. It was the Functional Review Committee.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Thank you. I was struggling a few minutes ago and I called it the razor gang. Hon Max Evans is right, the Functional Review Committee set up by this Government made that decision, and that is the point I am making. Had this been a decision of the trustees of the museum, and had it been made by people like Mr Bannister, and had they said, "We really do not need these cars, we think we should sell them and use the money to restore other objects that we have," that would have been a decision based on the merits of that collection. But, of course, that did not occur, as I have said many times, and as Hon Max Evans points out tonight, the decision was made by the Functional Review Committee whose job it was to go in and slash expenditure at all costs and damn the consequences. If the consequences were that we sold off part of the national estate, so be it. That was the Government's decision, it was not ours, and it was one we disagree with.

There was a better way out. The Combined Car Clubs of Western Australia sponsored the idea, which was subsequently endorsed by the Parliamentary Liberal Party, that it be given a land grant at Whiteman Park. That would have cost the Government nothing. Secondly, the Combined Car Clubs of Western Australia would have had access to an interest free loan. They would have repaid it, but at least it would have given them a holiday on the interest. The Combined Car Clubs themselves were prepared to do a public duty and restore those cars at no cost to the State, provided they had control over that museum and provided they could have had exhibition rights, and provided they could have been given some on-road rights in the course of every year. In other words, every demand they made was a realistic and reasonable one. All that was required of the Government was to give away a little land, and access to an interest free loan; and there may have been some money to be made on the restorative side as well.

The Opposition accepted that as well and made a public commitment in writing. More is the pity that the Government did not, and I think Hon Max Evans would agree with me, because the demand was not just for a handout. The Combined Car Clubs were not saying, "Give us money which you can ill afford to hand out." The club members were prepared to restore those cars at virtually no cost to the people of Western Australia.

It is still not too late. We have saved those cars from going overseas. The Government decided to put the market here to the test and tenders were called. The tenders closed on the sixth or eighth of this month. From the information I have the whole thing has been a shambles. The bids put in are vastly under what the cars are worth, and who can blame the people responsible for the tenders? They know they have the Government in a cleft stick. The Government made a silly decision when it said, "We are not going to sell them overseas but we will sell them within Western Australia. We will sell them as one group and under circumstances where a person cannot sell them anywhere outside Western Australia." Constitutionally that is a nonsense; it cannot be sustained. So the Government is left with these cars which are sitting at, I think, Fremantle, and with no prospect of getting rid of them or restoring them. It is still not too late, and if the Government is prepared to eat humble pie over the matter it may still be possible to keep those cars in the ownership of the people of Western Australia.

My third and final point concerns a very serious matter; in fact \$6 million. This is an action which I brought to the public light last year and which I took to the Leader of the Opposition, and it caused us on 22 November last year to hold a Press conference in this building and raise some very serious doubts over the security and the privacy of major account holders at the R & I Bank. Members might be aware that on that occasion we witnessed a commercial transaction in this State the illegality of which is breathtaking. This illegality is without any parallel in any banking circles anywhere in Australia. That was the occasion when we revealed that on the night of 20 October someone made a request of the R & I Bank at Collie to debit the Western Collieries bank account to the tune of \$6 million and overnight take it somewhere - where we do not know; where it went has never been answered. The next morning that \$6 million was put back. I challenge anyone in this Chamber to tell me of an incident in Australian banking history more deplorable and bordering on the criminal than that.

On that night apparently the R & I Bank branch manager at Collie was telephoned and told, "You will take out of Western Collieries' account \$6 million" - and that is where the trail ends. The next day the \$6 million went back into the account. But the oddity I have never answered in my own mind is that both of these transactions appear, if I remember correctly, on the one day. The sum is shown to be taken out the next day when the reality is that those funds did not clear the bank then, and they came back that following day. I suppose it is possible for someone to argue that the money was not missing for all that long, but the withdrawal was made after hours on that day and without the authorisation of the people from Western Collieries. What an extraordinary situation! We are not talking about a Government body; we are talking about a private company which was not consulted when \$6 million was pilfered from its account.

I know, as do most members, that there are people in Fremantle Gaol tonight with long prison terms for less reason than this - for pinching money out of someone's account at a bank, far less an amount than the \$6 million involved here. One of the things we made public at the time was the fact that the R & I Bank at Collie initially refused to make the debit entry when the person asked the officer involved to do so. Here is the scenario: The call went through to the R & I Bank manager at Collie, who was instructed to take out of the Western Collieries account \$6 million. The initial response was met the way it should have been, and that was that the manager told the person to take a big jump. However, Mr President, we also alleged in November last year that instructions later came that day - probably within the hour - from a higher source, ordering the bank to go ahead and complete that withdrawal. I do not know of a parallel occurrence; I know of no other occasion in Australian banking or corporate history where something like that would go for so long unattended and unexplained. Where was the Corporate Affairs Department in all of this? Where was the fraud squad? Was the fraud squad ever brought in, and, if it was not, why not? Was the Corporate Affairs Department ever brought in? I suspect that the National Companies and Securities Commission was brought in and I would not mind betting that that is the subject of at least some reference in the current report which the Government refuses to release, and which was authorised by the NCSC.

Members will remember that a Select Committee of this House was set up to look into a parallel transaction touching on Western Collieries, and that is the now famous \$15 million prepayment by SECWA to Western Collieries for an awful lot of coal. That Select Committee was set up to investigate that \$15 million transaction and, regrettably in my absence, the terms of reference for that Select Committee were worked out. Bearing in mind it had been my information touching on the \$15 million and the \$16 million, I regret the fact that the Select Committee was set up to inquire only into the \$15 million prepayment for coal. The terms of reference for the Select Committee were never wide enough to cover the pilfering of that \$6 million from the Western Collieries' account. That was a separate transaction but probably related to all of the Rothwells bail out. I cannot be sure that it was related but it seems to have been; from this distance it is certain that it was. We are in the position five and a half months after the event where we have had some explanation of the \$15 million prepayment and we have had a move, even today, on the part of one of our members to table the evidence of the Select Committee of inquiry into the \$15 million prepayment, minus, I might add, any matters that are commercially sensitive.

In the ultimate I suppose the Parliament will get to the bottom of the \$15 million payment,

but we have not even an assurance that the other matter is being investigated. Where else in the Western world would someone be able to take \$6 million out of a company's account without its knowledge and not at least be assured that somewhere along the path an investigation would be put in train? Even five and a half months after those disclosures by me and Mr MacKinnon, even if we were told at this stage, "We do not know the outcome, but we can assure you it is being investigated," our minds would be somewhat set at rest. I repeat that, for as much as I know, the \$6 million disappeared. The fraud squad was not brought in and I want to know why. Did the Corporate Affairs Department investigate? If it did, why have we not been told about it? Why was it left up to the NCSC to investigate that \$6 million act of criminal behaviour? I repeat: There are people in Fremantle Gaol who are languishing for stealing money as servants or taking money out of people's accounts in the banking system when they did not have the authority to do so. That is half the scandal: Not only did someone pilfer that account but five and a half months later we still have no assurance whatsoever that there has been an investigation into that overnight withdrawal.

Hon Tom Stephens: Regardless of whether there will be an investigation you have decided that the individuals are guilty of criminal behaviour.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have a simple answer to that. I have no other option but to assume what I have assumed in the absence of a proper investigation into the disappearance of the \$6 million. If Hon Tom Stephens is able, through the Attorney General or his Premier, to say to the House, "Ah, yes, rest easy. The \$6 million disappearance was investigated and we are on the job; we are going to lay some charges," my mind would be at rest. We went to that Press conference on 22 November last year with good information. I knew that what we were talking about on that occasion was accurate, and on one or two parts where we were questioned about the two transactions and we were not sure about those transactions, we said so.

Hon Tom Stephens: Did you go to the Corporate Affairs Department or the NCSC with your information and lay a complaint or did you go grandstanding before a Press conference?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is not my role as a member of Parliament to do as the member has just said. My role, and anyone else's as a member of Parliament, was to uncover the skulduggery and dishonesty that was going on in this State last year, and for all we know is still going on.

Hon Graham Edwards: You have had some good Press lately.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I do not know what that has actually to do with what we are talking about now.

Hon Graham Edwards: What is your opinion in relation to the disgusting situation with the Young Liberals in the northern suburbs?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I guess that is what members opposite have depended on for the past six years - the tactic of diversion. When they get into hot water, they actually -

Hon Graham Edwards: Obviously you are having trouble dealing with it.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Members opposite are capable of raising that matter in a debate if they want to. These are my 24 minutes remaining, and if the activities of the Young Liberals in the northern suburbs are worrying members opposite, I can understand that because we cleaned the Government up there in a couple of seats.

Hon Graham Edwards: Cleaned us up or blew us up?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Both I would say. It was very nicely done too. The Minister for Sport and Recreation will not divert me; I am asking the Government the question: What went on to investigate that \$6 million? An important element in all of this is that the Collie officer of the R & I Bank initially refused to comply with that illegal request, and good on him. He knew that it was illegal, and he knew that it was unprecedented in banking practice to interfere with a customer's account like that. I come now to the second point relating to the officer of the R & I Bank who did the right thing and acted like a custodian of people's moneys, but later the instructions came from a higher source - we are told, presumably in Perth - that he was to go ahead and complete that transaction. My questions are far more pertinent than the ones Hon Graham Edwards has just interrupted with, and I would like to know, for the record, who was the person higher up? Who was it in the R & I Bank in Perth

who telephoned that individual in Collie and said, "You've been asked to do that. Now you are being told", or words to that effect. That person was instructed from on high. Who was the person in the R & I Bank, who gave that instruction; and if came not from within the bank the matter is equally a difficulty? We want to know who it was.

Hon Tom Stephens: We want to know who gave you the information.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The member can well ask, just like the people at the Press conference did. They will not get any information from us on that.

Hon Tom Stephens: Is it true you will not still have a job after the change in the Liberal Party leadership?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Hon Tom Stephens was talking earlier tonight about fantasies. I am quite serene. I might not have gone forward in the last month, but at least I have remained static. He has gone from one end of the Chamber to the other, so I would suggest he has more to worry about in his future than I have.

If it was a bank officer at the R & I Bank who, from on high, issued that instruction to the Collie manager, I want to know what action, if any, has been taken against that officer for instructing a branch manager to do what he originally believed was an illegal act. We are entitled to know whether the person who gave the instruction from Perth, or from higher up in the scheme of things, has actually had any action taken against him, and whether he has been investigated by the fraud squad, the Corporate Affairs Department, or the National Companies and Securities Commission. Surely someone in a custodial position, like this person was in November, cannot be told to do something that is improper, illegal, immoral, or against banking practices only to find that the person who is giving the instruction is allowed to escape scot-free.

I have combed through the debates in the Parliament last year. I will not say that I have been able to read, study, and analyse every single word; but I do get the impression from those debates that the worst Mr Dowding can say that had taken place was that there may have been some act of impropriety. As the Premier wondered aloud on 22 November in the Legislative Assembly, the best he could input to the whole deal was to be able to say, "Well, where is the evidence of the impropriety?" I would say that the evidence is in the statement of the Western Collieries bank account. The evidence is there, and it shows on this side \$6 million out, and on the other side \$6 million in. I would have thought that would have been enough for the Premier to have made something better than a mere painful cry across the Chamber, "Well, where is your evidence for impropriety?" I repeat that the evidence is in the Western Collieries' bank account, and it is not just a question of impropriety; it is a straight-out question, in my opinion, based on what we know at the moment, of an act of criminality on the part of someone.

Hon Fred McKenzie: How did you get access to the Western Collieries' bank account?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is a matter asked of us on that day, too. I will give the same answer today that I would have given then. As a member of Parliament, Mr McKenzie knows that one does not reveal one's source. If people have asked one not to reveal the source, one does not do so. One cannot expect people to trust one unless that is done. That is a stand-by used by members of Parliament legitimately; it is a stand-by used by the media, also quite legitimately.

On that day, 22 November, in the other place Mr Grill, as a senior member of the Government, and as someone who seemed to know and seemed to be involved in many transactions around that time, evaded the issue, as did the Premier. A startling allegation was being made, and the Premier was the Minister in charge of the R & I Bank. A few people seem to forget that, in this age of new-found accountability.

It was only today, on a related matter, that I received some answers to questions I asked about the R & I Bank and how much it paid out in advertising expenditure in a certain period last year. The answer is available for members to see today, that the R & I Bank does not make a practice of revealing such amounts. Ironically, now I come to think about it, the two incidents were actually linked, because the withdrawal of \$6 million caused the bank so much pain that it embarked on, if I remember correctly, a very expensive advertising campaign designed to shore up public support for and confidence in the R & I Bank. I must say that I was pleased to see that campaign because, like many people in this place, I have a

lot of affection for the R & I Bank. A few years ago people were talking about privatising, but the R & I Bank was one of the things that was not on my list because it has a special place in this State's financial system. It ensures - and it is the only body that does so - that investment remains in Western Australia; therefore, despite being a State bank, my objections to it were set aside; and the R & I Bank, with whatever faults it had last year in relation to this matter, remains a very proud organisation that is entitled to ask for the confidence of the people of this State.

On that occasion, it did seem that the bank had allowed the most incredible actions to take place. It is not good enough to say, "Well, in order to protect people's confidence in the R & I Bank, we had better not talk about it." It is a bit like a similar question in relation to corruption in the Police Force. One does not protect the good name of the Police Force by saying, "We don't want to talk about one or two rotten apples in the setup." The way to do that is to root out those who are corrupt and get rid of them; and the same applies to the R & I Bank. The way to protect its long term reputation amongst depositors in Western Australia is to make sure that its procedures are so tight that it can never go down that path again, and no-one's account can be pilfered in the way this one has been. Therefore, it is not unreasonable that members of Parliament should ask questions, not only like the ones I have asked in the last couple of days about the advertising campaign and the expenditures that they brought about, but also, through the medium of these debates, members are entitled to ask of the R & I Bank why it was that \$6 million disappeared in the way that it did.

Who was responsible? Who, from high up, gave the order? Have those people been investigated? If they have not, why have they not been investigated. Five and a half months down the track I may not have needed to raise this matter in this debate if we had been given assurances from the Government or from the Minister for Budget Management that the matters raised in November last year were being investigated by the appropriate investigating authorities. The questions will not go away simply by the Government hoping that they will disappear. I repeat that I will be very surprised if the National Companies and Securities Commission, at least, has not been one of the regulatory bodies which got on to this and which has sought the truth of the matter. Without the truth of the matter there will be more lingering doubts in the minds of some people about the practices of the R & I Bank.

It was also significant at that time that Western Collieries Ltd publicly announced, in the light of what had occurred, that it might have to review who was its bankers. I do not know what it would have meant to Collie had Western Collieries withdrawn its accounts from the R & I Bank and gone to Westpac or the National Australia Bank. I imagine that the bank would have had to transfer its officers from Collie and relocate them in the State such is the business Western Collieries brought to the R & I Bank in Collie. I genuinely hope, for the future of the R & I Bank, including those people at the higher levels like Mr David Fischer, for whom I have a great deal of respect, we do get to the bottom of this.

I hope also we have seen the day that the R & I Bank became so close to being a political play thing. We saw the spectacle of Mr Malcolm Bryce, on his retirement from Parliament, being appointed to the board of the R & I Bank. I am not one of those people to suggest that Mr Bryce, after serving in such a high office, was not entitled to a position in which he could use his talents. Not everyone would agree with that.

Hon Tom Stephens: Some of your colleagues do.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: They are free. I am sure he could have been accommodated in some other way. The minute he was appointed to the board it paved the way for the sort of shonky business that later became the subject of the \$6 million withdrawal.

Hon Tom Stephens: You say anything you like. You are not a very nice person.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: There was a situation which is even worse than that of Mr Bryce's and it concerns Dr Ross Garnaut, who was appointed as Chairman of the R & I Bank. Many people questioned his appointment.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I am surprised to hear you say that. My observations have been that his appointment has been well received.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: If it has been, I am delighted to hear it. I certainly remember him from a little episode which touched on a visit to China by a couple of Liberal members of Parliament. I understand that, at the time, he was the Australian Ambassador to Beijing.

Certain information was released and the suggestion was that it could be traced back to him. When he resigned from that position he was appointed as Chairman of the R & I Bank, which is a large Australian bank. His appointment certainly surprised me.

Hon Tom Stephens: You confuse yourself.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I do not. If he has been an appointee without blemish, then I am pleased to hear it because the R & I Bank is certainly in need of some reassurances as has been indicated by the information I have given to the Parliament. With those points aside, I support the Bill.

HON E.J. CHARLTON (Central) [9.35 pm]: I refer members to the first line of the Minister's second reading speech in which he states -

This measure seeks the grant of Supply to Her Majesty of \$2 500 million for the works and services . . .

Members should consider what is likely to happen to the wheat industry following the release of what is referred to as the Kerin plan by the Federal Minister for Agriculture, Mr Kerin. It is an absolute disaster for the industry, which is looked upon as a most efficient industry in this nation. The wheat industry in Australia is often referred to in other parts of the world as the pinnacle of all grain industries in the western world. It is well known that the Australian wheat industry is most efficient in spite of the fact that it has the lowest rainfall of any other such industry in the world. Not only has the industry in this country demonstrated its efficiency, but also it has contributed to the export income of this country.

The Kerin plan will destroy the efficiency of the industry from the point of view of its marketing operation. Not only have we seen, against the will of 95 percent of the growers of the industry, the first stage of the dismantling of the industry's marketing operations, but also at the end of last year we saw three different meetings involving over 2 000 growers in Western Australia. However, the meetings were poorly reported. Can members imagine 2 000 growers out of 10 000 who travelled hundreds of miles to put their point of view to meetings attended by the Minister's representatives and who totally rejected the proposal put forward by the Federal Minister? Can members imagine what would happen if 2 000 people demonstrated at Fremantle against a proposal to allow an influx of nuclear powered ships to enter that port? On many occasions television cameras have covered demonstrations in which only six people have been involved. It appears to me that demonstrations become a worthy news item only if they involve a minority group. However, the wheat industry is the back bone of Australia's economy. It involves a group of people which is reducing in numbers, but it continues to increase production and the value of the industry to this nation.

The Federal Government has indicated that it will introduce legislation to take away the industry's marketing operation, against the will of the industry. With that in mind, and if that is not bad enough, we have now seen the Federal National and Liberal Parties doing a sweetheart deal because they are trying to imply to the people of Australia, for the want of some other reason or arrangement, some great unity, in the hope of winning the next Federal election. However, they have gone out on a limb, and they will be chopped to pieces by Kerin and the Federal Labor Government because they have backed themselves into a corner from which, in my opinion, they will not get out. For the sake of this so called unity which they want to demonstrate to the voting public of Western Australia, they have sold out the Australian wheat industry. This industry brings into Western Australia alone \$800 million to \$1 000 million for all the people within the State to share, and on top of that it provides employment for the people who are directly and indirectly involved through the associated service industries.

The transport industry of this State, which transports the majority of the State's grain crops to the various ports around the State, will have to rearrange its operations. I oppose that, because we have been talking repeatedly about the cutbacks in road funds by the Federal Government. It is now being proposed that the grain crops will be transported by road, and I do not have to go any further to detail to those people who go into the country now how this will have a further detrimental effect on the standards of our roads, which this State can ill afford.

What is this State Government going to do about the complications that will be forced upon it and everybody who lives in this State, either directly or indirectly, as a consequence of

what the Government and the Federal Coalition in Opposition have decided to do to the wheat industry? I will be looking forward to hearing a statement from the Minister for Agriculture, Mr Bridge, and his Government colleagues, similar to what has already been said by the Governments in Victoria and Queensland. Those Governments have said that they oppose - Queensland is prepared to take a case to the High Court - what is being signalled by the Federal Government in terms of the so-called deregulation of the wheat industry.

This makes an hypocrisy of the word "deregulation". There is no such thing as deregulation for a lot of things in this nation which carry that terminology. If we take the fuel industry, for example, there are three or four fuel companies which are supposed to be the greatest examples of private enterprise that we have ever seen. However, they have done a deal between themselves regarding the price they will charge consumers for their product. There are things occurring on the waterfront which are blatantly wrong, and the Federal Government is going to say, "We have introduced some deregulation. We have freed up the waterfront in this nation; and because the Federal Opposition has agreed, provided this and that happens, we will agree to the principle of deregulating the wheat industry in Australia." However, all that will happen is that there will be some minor adjustments on the waterfront and in the transport industry, and the Federal Labor Government will then say to the Federal Opposition that it has no ground on which to oppose deregulation of the wheat industry because the Government has made the required changes, and it must support the Kerin Bill as it will be presented to the Parliament on Thursday of this week.

I say on behalf of the National Party in this State - if it has not already been said, or if people do not know it - that we condemn what the Federal Coalition has done in the last few days. We further condemn the Federal Labor Government for its perception of what will happen to the wheat industry in this nation. Cooperative Bulk Handling has a contract to the year 2000 to be the sole operator in handling the grains which make up the grain industry in this State.

Hon Garry Kelly: Have you any comment to make about Wilson Tuckey's comments? He is treating farmers like fools.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I can make those comments, but they are well known, and I have made them before. The fact is that CBH is an organisation owned by grain growers, yet because of the system in New South Wales, which everyone agrees is in a mess, the Federal Government is trying to force upon us in Western Australia a new system which the taxpayers in New South Wales are trying to put together. We in Western Australia have built and paid for the operations of CBH at not one dollar's expense to the taxpayers of the State. It is fully financed and owned by the people who participate in its operations on a year to year basis.

The Federal Government's package deal to deregulate the handling, storage and transport of grain, along with the marketing powers of the Australian Wheat Board, is an absolute disaster for this State and nation. This State Government will be forced into a position where it may think that something will be its responsibility in the short term, but this decision of the Federal Government will have a bearing in the long term on this State's Budget. We do not know whether the Federal Government will come in and pick up the tab or the deficit that will be presented to people in the grain industry, for the sake of a few high flying entrepreneurs who want to get their greedy little hands into their hip pockets with a few dollars out of the industry, without contributing anything towards it.

We find what the Federal Government is doing in this nation totally abhorrent, with the camouflaged, half baked support of an out of touch Federal Opposition, in order to force upon the grain growers of this nation some perceived saving which will benefit only a few people in this industry, at great cost to the rest. It amazes me that we can allow this to happen, when we have a grain industry which is looked upon as being the most efficient in the world. Changes are being forced upon the industry which it does not want, and which will not benefit the nation. The changes that will take place are some that a few people believe will benefit a few people in the middle, and they will be of no benefit to the consumers, I might add, despite what Mr Kerin keeps saying. Mr Kerin keeps making the point that we will have a cheaper product for the consumer. With my collateral I am prepared to make up the difference which may come out of the pipeline as far as the grain industry is concerned.

In answer to Hon Garry Kelly about the member for O'Connor, it is widely known that he said he would push as hard as he could to deregulate this industry, and he has given a host of reasons. I have commented on many of them in the rural Press. This Johnny-come-lately in the wheat industry talks about his farm. He has been a grower of wheat for only the last one or two years. He knows nothing about the industry and how it came to arrive at its present position.

Hon P.G. Pandal: He does represent a lot of them.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: He should represent them because he was asked to. He gave them an undertaking 12 months ago, but while he disagreed with them he should at least acknowledge and respect their interests and support what they want to do. He never attended any of the meetings of those 2 000 farmers, but he has gone on a crusade telling the farmers they are dumb and stupid, and have been led by the nose by the National Party of Australia, the Grain Council and so on. These statements are totally rejected by the industry.

The comments I am making here are the result of my disgust about what is taking place. I have attended meetings of people from all political persuasions opposed to what is proposed by Mr Kerin. There may have been an odd individual at some of these meetings, but he has not stood up and spoken, perhaps because he was afraid to make too much noise. The last meeting took place in February at Merredin, where over 200 farmers voted against the Kerin plan, and only eight supported it. Those are the sorts of numbers opposed to it.

I want to draw the attention of members of this House to the debacle taking place. Members of this industry have voiced their opinion in the most orderly and democratic way. They have been sold a sweetheart deal by a group of most unlikely bed mates - the Federal Government and the Federal National and Liberal Parties. These are bodies the industry has looked to over the last few weeks and months to hang in for them. The National Party of Western Australia does not want to be associated with these people, and I hope both the Liberal Party and the Government here will demonstrate their opposition to what has taken place. I heard what the Labor Government has signified in a report on ABC radio tonight.

To have a Federal Government dictating not only what will go on from an export point of view but determining how a product will be shifted within a State is unacceptable. Transport is the State's prerogative to determine because that is a State operation under State control, yet we have a Federal Government which has made known its intention to ride roughshod across the rights of a State as regards how it will handle, transport and market this commodity.

We are not talking about peanuts, or some small, insignificant industry or by-product; we are talking about something worth close on a billion dollars a year to this State alone. Any fair minded individual with any conscience at all would not want to see this activity take place in a State which has lead the nation in growing grain in a low rainfall area. The industry has demonstrated its ability to handle and store this grain. It has paid through the nose on the waterfront, and it has overcome some other activities, and yet the Federal Government, and now the Opposition in Canberra, have decided that we can all go to hell because they have this philosophy and principle. It has been decided to regulate things in this way and the industry can go to hell.

I shall be asking the Government in this State, and the Minister in particular, to come out in support of this State's wheat growers forthwith. As soon as I can lay my eyes on the Minister, Mr Ernie Bridge, I shall ask him and the Leader of the House, Hon Joe Berinson, to take the matter up and say that the Western Australian Government will stand by our industry on two counts: First, to protect the rights of the State to control those facets of its operations which it should, and secondly, to denounce what the Federal Government and the Federal Opposition are doing to the detriment of the wheat industry in this State.

HON W.N. STRETCH (Lower Central) [9.58 pm]: My colleague, Hon Barry House, handled the question of school funding in our electorate very well. I emphasise again the difficulties we have had in the provision of school shelters and covered areas in the heavier rainfall areas, particularly around the south coast. We should be looking at the isobars on the map of Western Australia and judging where building programs should take place. Walpole was mentioned as being a particularly neglected school. The seat of Warren seems to have suffered severely in its Budget allocations for school improvements, and I urge the Minister to have a very close look at those schools.

I see from an answer to a question of mine on 6 April that the Minister, Hon Carmen Lawrence, is going south on 5 May, or thereabouts, to visit Walpole. I hope she takes the opportunity to at least look at the Bridgetown Primary School, which Hon Barry House also mentioned. That school has been greatly neglected; and, as the Minister said in reply to my question, there has been no major R and R on the Walpole Primary School since 1979 - it did get a small preprimary transportable a couple of years ago. Generally speaking the schools in that area are in need of a major upgrade. Pemberton, Northcliffe and Bridgetown in particular must be included in the Minister's visit.

I was very pleased also to hear my colleague, Hon Max Evans, drawing attention to the question of on-costing in Australian industry. The other night when I was speaking on another subject we heard an interjection asking why we did not support downstream processing. Of course, Mr President, we do support it. We are strongly in favour of downstream processing of wool, and indeed all our primary products and our mineral production wherever possible. However, Hon Max Evans pointed out exactly what the additional costs on industry were, and that is one of the major things holding back the further development of downstream processing. We have seen a lot of encouragement given to craft industries, but one must again look at the question of Government priorities in spending. One would wonder whether a \$20 000-odd computer is more valuable to the fine craft industry than perhaps some more tangible and practical assistance.

The next point I wanted to touch on was that of the parliamentary precinct. Mr President, you mentioned it at some stage and Hon Bob Hetherington made some very succinct remarks about it. I liked his comment about mounting a white charger and taking the argument to the Government.

Hon A.A. Lewis interjected.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Well, I think Hon Robert Hetherington could. I think he would be a very fine figure of a man on a white charger, and I am sorry that this House will be deprived of his abilities in that way.

On a serious note, I believe that this Parliament and its precincts belong to the people of Western Australia. It would be an act of vandalism if this building were built out. I know there are attractive financial reasons for accepting some of the deals floating around now, but as has often been said, one does not measure all these things in money. The environment and our heritage are things which cannot be measured in that way. The gardens and grounds surrounding this building being, as they are, an adjunct to Kings Park and the old Observatory and Hale School, are very important. They do not belong to parliamentarians; they belong to the people of Western Australia. I believe strongly that, whatever happens to these buildings, we are only the custodians or trustees of them during our occupancy of this Chamber or the other Chamber of the Parliament. If it is built in, that will be an irrevocable step. The title will probably pass forever out of the hands of the people. We are the representatives of the people. If there are to be changes of that magnitude, at some stage the people ought to be consulted. That might be a risky thing to put to a referendum in particular climates, and I do not necessarily recommend that as a course of action, but some action has to be taken to preserve this place and its environs. I believe it has to be regarded as a sacred site, if one likes, of the people of Western Australia. It is very much a part of our heritage and I would be very sad to see this place just become part of another office tower complex.

If one looks down from the top of another high building further up the hill, which is probably a bit of an abomination anyway, one has to admit that the tiled roof of Parliament House is not the most attractive sight in the world. However when viewed from its grounds and from pretty well any other angle, this is an attractive building and could be made more so if handled with tact and taste. Some of the plans I have seen so far have some attractive aspects, but as yet I have not seen anything that would add to the precinct in the way I believe the people would like to see. I do not think this can be treated like any other piece of real estate along the Terrace; it is different and I believe the people will want to keep it that way. I hope our colleagues in the Assembly and on the other side of this Chamber can take a reasonable and united approach to the development of this area. It is unquestionable that things have to be done, but I believe we have to be very careful in the steps we do take because they could be irrevocable.

Another matter that concerns me greatly is the Government's priorities in respect of family support and care. I believe that prior to the last election the Liberal Party launched a very sound and compassionate family policy. It was not patronising; it was positive and offered a lot of genuine assistance to the preservation of the traditional family unit. While it has been said, and very truly, that the Government has no role to play in the bedrooms of the nation, at the same time it does have a responsibility to support families to enable them to continue to look after their own units. It has been well said many times that the family is the building block of the entire society; any Government that ignores that and tries to wean children from their family atmosphere into a premature climate of socialist welfare ultimately destroys itself. World history virtually from time immemorial has proved that, and I think it is important we take note of it.

We can look back through history to see just what has happened. There is ample evidence to support my contention, and I believe that we ignore the advice and lessons of history at our peril. I believe there is a tendency now to use patch-up welfare assistance to aid children who have left home. There is so-called easy divorce; there is easy legal divorce but unfortunately the new family law legislation does very little to heal the heartache of the children and adults of marriages which have ended in divorce. It is not enough to offer more and more welfare assistance to children and single parents. I believe it would be a far better investment in Australia's future if money could be allocated to the preservation of the family, the patch up of marriages and in effect saying that prevention is better than cure. Money spent on things such as marriage guidance and counselling will be money well spent.

It will really be a far better investment that way than trying to patch up the sadness and the trouble that comes from broken homes. I am not saying that divisions will cease to exist - of course, divorce will continue - but I believe that the so-called easy divorce has really caused as many problems as it has solved. It is time for the Family Law Act to be considered seriously by our Federal colleagues, and possibly by a working party of State parliamentarians as well as Federal parliamentarians, to see how far we have gone. Rather than varying that Act, we should see whether we can do something to put the balance back in favour of counselling before break-up rather than counselling afterwards.

Today, several members received a visit from a farmer near Torbay in the Albany area, who is suffering badly under the provisions for country drainage districts. We have been through a similar debate in relation to the Busselton and Bunbury areas, and it is a vexed question. This gentleman, Mr John Somers, has been on his farm for many years, and his drainage rates have gone up four times in about the last six years. He has spoken to the Water Authority consistently about his problem, but the authority does not seem to be able to come to any agreement on it. The unfairness of the matter is that he is paying this rapidly increasing drainage rate, and yet he is not getting any drainage assistance. In fact, his farm is degrading because of the drain running through his farm. He feels that he has a genuine grievance that has not been addressed sufficiently by the department or the Minister.

He has seen virtually everyone he can think of. He has been to the Minister, and at the Water Authority he received a brush-off. They said, "Well, the drains are there, and therefore you've got to pay for them." That is all right from a departmental point of view, but in actual fact the drains have degraded the land and caused water erosion and some sheet erosion on the land, and it seems totally unfair when one realises that the actual drainage system has made 22 acres of his land unusable because of the drainage and the spoil banks. The man has a genuine grievance, and I hope that by my taking the step of raising it at this stage, the Minister for Budget Management will be able to talk to the Minister for Water Resources and see if Mr Somers can have his very real problems addressed. I will speak to the Minister myself as soon as I can; but, as I say, I take this opportunity to raise the matter.

Although the Government is bringing forward a very large amount of money at this time of the year, I am assured it is quite normal; but I do urge the Government to pay close attention to its priorities. I am sure it will do so in certain ways. We are a long way from the next election, we hope. There is no need for pork barrelling at this stage of the game; and I urge the Government to look at areas of real need and to assess its priorities for spending its money accordingly. I support the Bill.

HON J.N. CALDWELL (South) [10.14 pm]: I wish to make a few brief comments in support of this Bill. I was very interested to hear Hon Max Evans talking about a budget. Of

course, in anything to do with the spending of large sums of money, it is a fact that many farmers requiring money to carry on, or perhaps to improve the facilities on their farms, have to go to a money lender of some sort; and they have to prepare a budget. When they do prepare the budget, they must go to great lengths to explain to the bank manager before they get the loan why they want it and what they will spend the money on. I believe the Government should be in exactly the same position. As Hon Max Evans said, the Government has not been forthcoming with information on some of its proposals; and as members of Parliament representing the public, we need to know exactly what the Government wants to spend the money on.

The farmer says to the bank manager that he is going to put down two expenses as far as his sheep are concerned. He is going to drench them, and he has a certain amount of money allocated for that purpose. He also wishes to shear his sheep, and there are many aspects of farm costs that have to come into his budget to prepare it for the bank manager. Quite often, when one goes to the bank manager, he says, "Well, where is your second budget? Where is the next year's budget? Where is the one after that? We want a long term forecast of how you are going to use the money you want to borrow; and also, have you taken into account the interest you will have to pay?" That question is quite relevant to the Government's budgeting and supply of money. It should make a long term forecast; and I wholeheartedly support the remarks of Hon Max Evans in relation to this.

I now raise the question of housing in small country towns. Farming is on a slight upward plane at the moment, and some farmers are expecting higher yields through better farming practices, and wheat farmers are perhaps expecting better returns. It all depends on many factors overseas, and, as Hon Eric Charlton said, it depends on factors affecting the marketing of our wheat.

It is a well known fact that America is experiencing quite a substantial drought. I was in Narrogin the other day at the Wheat Board's presentation of trophies for the best wheat from the west, and it was stated there that the drought in America is continuing. It appears that Western Australia is in for substantially better prices in the next year or two. I am sure the Government and all members hope that the wheat industry does flourish. Of course, we hope that sense will prevail in Canberra and the Government will give us the right to market our grain. As we see it, we should have the right to conduct the show ourselves.

The economy in country areas is improving to the point of being almost buoyant. Farmers are now able to employ extra farm hands, which is good for the economies of those communities. However, the limiting factor on this rising economy is housing. There is no accommodation for these people in small country towns. I have made some inquiries, but it appears that Homeswest will do nothing about the problem unless there are at least 10 applications for housing. It will then supply two houses. I think Homeswest is being hard because many of these small towns do not have 10 houses in them. Towns that have come to my notice include Hyden, Nyabing and Newdegate. Newdegate has been under particular stress because seven or eight applications for accommodation have been lodged, with the applicants having nowhere to live in the meantime. Families are important to these areas. In many cases they mean that a school will remain open a little longer, or that amenities of the town will be improved because families put more money into the economy. The housing that is supplied should be transportable. The economy in country towns fluctuates as agricultural commodities rise and fall. Transportable homes could be moved to towns that have buoyant economies as the need arises. It is very important that the Government considers this matter because it is important to the small country towns of this State.

I live in Katanning, a small country town with three pubs. Many years ago the town had a flour mill which was recently converted to a museum by some hard working people in the community. Hon David Wordsworth and I attended its opening. I commend the people who worked to open that museum, especially one lady, Ainslie Evans, who put many hours of work into its restoration. The Governor opened the museum a month ago and it is attracting already a great deal of interest and will be an immense tourist attraction for the town. Limited Government support was provided, but not a lot. We hope that future Government support will contribute to the types of developments that will attract people to country areas.

Debate adjourned to a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Hon Robert Hetherington.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

After 11.00 pm

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [10.25 pm]: I move -

That the House continue to sit and transact business beyond 11.00 pm.

HON A.A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [10.26 pm]: This House has Standing Orders to control the way it operates. The Leader of the House continually attempts to alter the Standing Orders to suit himself. I do not mind if the House decides to agree with his motion, but eight days ago he said that we would obey the Standing Orders. He now wants to have the House sit beyond 11.00 pm. We have already decided to sit next week. We all know how the Leader of the House has fouled up every sitting of this Parliament.

Hon B.L. Jones: What a load of rubbish!

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Hon Beryl Jones says, "What a load of rubbish." Let us talk about rubbish. The Leader of the House has fouled up every sitting of the House by monkeying around with the Standing Orders. He is a disgrace to this Parliament by moving motions to change the Standing Orders and then, within a week or 10 days, attempting to change them again. His performance in running this House has been a disgrace. I oppose the motion because he has had a fair go since he has been the Leader of the House. He is not dinkum and has not treated us as individuals. He has tried to manipulate this House ever since he has been its leader. I believe the motion should be opposed.

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [10.28 pm]: I agree with Hon Sandy Lewis saying that I have had a fair go from this House. However, I believe the traffic has been two way and that I have done my best to see that the House has run -

Hon A.A. Lewis: In the way that you want to run it.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: - in a way that meets the requirements of the membership as best I can do that within the scope of my responsibility.

Hon A.A. Lewis: You double cross us all of the time.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: There is no question of my attempting to manipulate -

Hon A.A. Lewis: Always.

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (Hon John Williams): Order!

Hon J.M. BERINSON: - the Standing Orders. The fact is that the motion is contemplated by the Standing Orders. Members know that I have done my best to keep the sitting hours of the House within reasonable limits.

Hon A.A. Lewis: To suit yourself and not the House. You have never been concerned with the House.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I have attempted to keep the sitting hours of the House within reasonable limits, and I believe that we can achieve that tonight and for the rest of what will be by common understanding a very short session. I do not contemplate going very long tonight; there do not appear to be many speakers left on the Supply Bill and I seek to complete that legislation. Hon Sandy Lewis has said that, contrary to our usual practice, he intends to speak at the Committee stage of the Supply Bill. We should be able to accommodate that and still complete our business by a reasonable hour. Certainly it is my intention to attempt to do so.

Question put and passed.

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON A.A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [10.31 pm]: I had not intended to speak on this Bill, but will do so because of the attitude of the Minister for Budget Management. The Opposition wants to ask many questions about Supply and the use of Government money. It

has never been given answers to those questions. You, Mr Deputy President (Hon John Williams), know that this Leader of the House, this Budget Management person, will not answer any of the questions about Budget management that he is asked in this House. He replies by saying that the question relates to the Treasurer's or some other Minister's portfolio. We have put up with a shonky Government in this State for six years, with a man who says he will get us the answers but does not do so. He has never had the guts to stand and give the answers. He wants to sit on the front bench and smile, stroke his chin, and do everything but give answers to the public of this State. Western Australia has reached the stage at which Queensland and New Zealand look like babies in corruption. The Minister for Budget Management is the only person left of the Burke-Bryce-Berinson trio which created WADC. I debated the creation of WADC with the Minister for Budget Management, and he said that the following day he would supply the answers to questions asked by Hon Graham MacKinnon and me, and if he was wrong he would come back and tell us. He has been proved wrong but to this day this truthful man - who has been proved otherwise - this man who sat under the Burke and Bryce mantle and was part of that little triumvirate and made decisions about WADC, has not told the people of this State the true position. He is the only one left of that trio; he must be a masochist. The Minister for Budget Management promised at the Table of the House that he would provide answers the following day, but he has not done so. He is a man dishonoured because he has never answered a question about what is happening within the State. They are fairly telling words, which I would not normally use because I do not believe many parliamentarians would sink to the level to which this man who leads the House has sunk. He has blithely sat saying that he does not know, does not want to know or that he dissociates himself from certain matters. He was No 3 Minister in the Cabinet under the former Premier, the Ambassador to Ireland, and my friend Malcolm Bryce, who is a director of the R & I Bank. In that position the Minister for Budget Management cannot say that he does not know or does not want to know about certain matters. Everybody says that he is truthful and honest, but when shall we receive answers from him? He will not answer questions, nor will his party. It is interesting to note the silence that greets my comments, because the members of the ALP know that my comments are true. They know that this man has led them down the valley of destruction. The fact is that by 162 votes one way or the other the Labor Party is still in Government. This man who leads this House is one of the destroyers of the ALP; he is a capitalist and he has joined with all the sinister schemes in which the ALP has become involved. He made promises at midnight and two o'clock on the night of the debate on WADC - not to me or Hon Graham MacKinnon but to the House. He has dishonoured every one of the promises he made.

We are now asked to go along with a Supply Bill by this man, who has not been honest with the House and who has never been prepared to answer a question on the Budget of Western Australia. After all, he is the Minister for Budget Management, but he is not prepared to answer a question. It is obvious by their silence that all members of the ALP agree with my argument, apart from Hon Sam Piantadosi, who has indigestion. The whole of the ALP agrees with my argument.

Hon S.M. Piantadosi: At least I am not bellowing like Hon A.A. Lewis.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: That is an interesting comment because Hon Sam Piantadosi, who is a great friend of mine, is not allowed to speak; he is caucused and not allowed to get to his feet. He is not allowed to speak on this matter; nor is the whole of the ALP. It is fascinating to listen quietly to what the ALP is doing. There are five of its members in the House at present, which is great, as they are defending their leader. They are going to the fortress. They are saying, "Yes, Hon Joe Berinson is an honourable man." We know that the Leader of this House has not been prepared to answer questions. He has tried to change the whole of the procedures in this House. I do not dislike the poor fellow, I just wonder how the ALP continues to elect a supreme capitalist to be its leader in this place - a man who really does not represent Labor people in perhaps the same way as I do, the people who work with their hands or their heads and do not pick up odd thousands or millions of dollars by marriage, or anything else.

The situation exists of a Government not prepared to front up. The Leader in this House is not prepared to front up for his actions on WADC and the losses it has made. Hon John Caldwell and I are simple country fellows, but we could have made three times the profit for WADC.

Hon S.M. Piantadosi: Hon A.A. Lewis has insulted Hon John Caldwell.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I have not insulted him; he is a very clever business man. We could have made three times the profit that WADC made without paying Mr Horgan the huge amounts of money he was paid and without setting up an empire with all the ALP's cronies hanging off it. If we were given the buildings, land and what-have-you to sell we would have made three times the profit. The Leader in this place has told us how wonderful WADC was and what marvellous profits it has made. In private enterprise it would have been broke the year after it started if it had to pay commercial rates for anything it bought and if it did not have the \$5 million or \$10 million that the Leader of the House poured into its pockets as Minister for Budget Management. The man would not know what a budget is. He has never answered a question. He has never faced up to things. He has Bjelked out of every question asked in this place about anything to do with finance.

The money that Treasury used to make money on the overnight market has been given to WADC. I would like the Leader of the House to say that he would give it to some private enterprise organisation, or to somebody else to have a go at producing better figures because the figures when this so called leader - this member of the triumvirate of Burke, Bryce and Berinson - this disgraced gentleman -

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon John Williams): Order! I consider the use of the term "disgraceful gentleman" not in keeping with the standards of this House. I ask the member to continue with the debate but to refrain from using such phrases.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I accept your ruling, Sir, but I did not say "disgraceful", I said "disgraced" and I believe, Sir, with due deference to you, that he has been disgraced by the performance of the organisations that he has supported as Minister for Budget Management. I will not go further into that area because I do not wish to get into an argument with the Chair. We have here a Government that has had huge amounts of money provided through Treasury placed on the short-term money market. The bulk of that money is now put through WADC. I see a few smiling faces, such as those of Hon Gordon Masters and Hon Phillip Lockyer, who would like to have the same chance of having that money pass through a company that they or Hon David Wordsworth own.

Hon S.M. Piantadosi: Hon Phillip Lockyer would gamble it away at two-up.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Hon Sam Piantadosi has now put another point on this matter. He accuses an honourable member whom I will not name of gambling it away. What has this Government done with the petrochemical works and the various things such as the Teachers Credit Society and Rothwells? What has it done with the money? It has not gambled it away; it has thrown it down the God damned drain - thrown it down to look after its mates. There is only one remaining of the triumvirate that squandered that \$500 million or \$600 million away. He has constantly said in answers to questions that there will be no increases in taxation. However, there could have been a decrease in taxation. Unfortunately, the Press never picked that up. The fellow responsible for that is the Minister for Budget Management. He is the last of the triumvirate which conned this State out of wheat. He cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars per head.

The Minister for Budget Management cost each family in this State \$1 000 a year by his decisions; yet he still sits there, happy in the knowledge that he is the Leader of the upper House. The Minister is a disgrace to accountancy - Hon Max Evans has proved that time and time again; he is a disgrace to budget management because he does not know what it means. He looks after himself and his mates but he casts aside the people of Western Australia all the time; he is not interested in those people. The Minister for Budget Management, who is also the Attorney General and the Leader of the House, will not ever get down to their level; he is so superior. As a Federal Minister and then a Minister in this place, he could not give a damn about the average person I represent at Collie or Manjimup. No wonder the Labor Party lost the seats of Collie and Manjimup at the last election. The Minister for Budget Management has a flippant attitude towards budget management. He is not prepared to stand up and be counted, nor to debate the matter. He is not prepared to tell the public what he is spending the money on.

That is the problem with this Government. No other Government in this State has been so shy; so fey, so worried about what is going on that it will not tell the public what it is doing

with the public's money. Mr President, it is your money; it is the Clerk's money; it is the money of every person in the Chamber and of all those people outside. It is not the Minister for Budget Management's money, nor the Press' money; it is money contributed by every person in this State through their taxation, and every person in this State should have a say in how it is spent. I know that is drawing a very long bow and that a million and a half people cannot say, "I want \$2 to go towards a footpath; I want \$3 to go towards a school", but this Government has hidden everything. I listened at question time tonight when the Leader of the Opposition asked a question, and everything was put on notice, or the Minister ducked and dived. He is never prepared to say what he or his Government stands for. I will not talk about being gutless or anything like that, Mr President, because you would rule me out of order -

The PRESIDENT: Exactly.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: - but that is the sort of feeling I get when I hear the so-called answers from the Ministers of this Government. Questions remain on notice for a fortnight. Sir, you have been here for 24 or 25 years. How long have you seen a Government prevaricate in answering questions? Hon Phillip Pandal and I have had questions on the Notice Paper for a fortnight with no answers. Good Lord, Sir, when you were a member of the Government side, if a Minister did not give you an answer within 48 hours you would have torn him apart with your teeth!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the honourable member that it is out of order for him to refer to the President in the comments that he makes.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I will change it to the Leader of the Opposition; he would have torn them apart with his teeth. Really, it is a disgrace. The Government is a complete and utter shambles. I believe from talking to a Minister in the corridor that finally, after five days, the Government has solved the hospital dispute. Five days! You, Sir - and I do not know whether I am even allowed to say this - would remember the bread dispute during the period of the Court Government. Within three days the Court Government did something about it. This mob, with people dying and in hospital, could not give two hoots. The Government has sat back; and probably within a couple of weeks we will have another strike. We know the reason for that. McGinty is on the far left; Hon Fred McKenzie has been dropped as convenor for the far left, and Hon John Halder, a newcomer, has been put in as convenor. The broad left hates the guts of the Government - it hates Burke and Dowding, and Berinson does not bear mentioning. So, Sir, they are prepared to let strikes go on so that the little faction fights can go on forever so they may win them. This gutless Government is not prepared to make a stand.

We have seen this Government operating for six years now. I believe some Ministers have done a very good job but they have not been supported by the majority of the members of the Labor Party. This Government is a bully boy exercise and if any backbencher steps out of line he gets thumped under the ear or threatened with no re-endorsement. May I tell those who are threatened with no re-endorsement that it is not a bad bloody feeling.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I am sorry; it is not a bad feeling. I am feeling fairly good, looking at 21 May, and far be it from me to fight my party political line down to 21 May. However, if the Leader of the House wants to sit until 21 May I am prepared to sit right along with him.

This Government is a disgrace. Its monetary policy has confused the whole of Australia. No financial expert has endorsed any of the things this Government has done, and it has all been done with secrecy and behind a curtain. It has been done without the taxpayers' knowing what has happened. Earlier I mentioned that I thought the debit to the State was \$500 million or \$600 million. However, I will make one of my funny little predictions which everyone usually laughs at but most of which have been correct. That is, that this Government, through incompetent leadership, will cost the average taxpayer in Western Australia between \$2 000 and \$3 000 because it thought it was entrepreneurial. The Government was so keen to make a profit where private enterprise could not. We have talked about the Mint; we have talked about Western Australian Development Corporation. I estimate the losses of WADC to be in the region of \$1 billion - in real business terms, not creative accounting, the basic terms that the average person understands.

The Minister for Budget Management cannot step aside and say that he has not been told because he has been told time and time again. He has been told about flowers, the production of tractors, and all the sorts of things which are practical. The pharmacists and lawyers - even if they get a parliamentary QC - the people that wish to confront the public, will pay the price. On election day, the Government almost paid the price; it is here by the grace of God, and a bit of shonky work as well. The Government is here for four years and I congratulate it. I congratulate it for being smart and, I would say, shitty shrewd.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the member wishes to make smart remarks, I suggest he go somewhere else and make them. The member can continue with his speech on the understanding that he moderates his language and retains some decorum in this place.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: My apologies, Mr President, but you understand my frustration at leaving this place to people who have pulled smart tricks, people who will not answer questions, people who are not worthy of the people of Western Australia. I will not debate your ruling, Sir, because I seldom do. However, when I do debate your ruling, you know it and you tell me off. I wish that you always did so with the grin that you have on your face now.

The problem in this State is that we have a sleazy, underhand Government. We have people who are not prepared to tell the truth. I said in my speech earlier today that the Premier was not prepared to tell the truth in getting a job in 1962.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member will not use that language. I direct the member's attention to Standing Order No 87 which clearly indicates that no member shall use unbecoming or offensive words against any member of either House of this Parliament. I have ruled in the past, as have other Presiding Officers, that comments which can be permitted when referring to a general body of people - that is, in parliamentary terms to refer to the Government, as a broad group - is one thing, but to refer to a specific individual is a different matter altogether. I have never allowed, and I do not think this House would wish me to allow, any member to breach Standing Order No 87 when referring specifically to a member, albeit a member of another place. I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: In deference to you, Sir, I withdraw. Mr President, you were not in the Chair earlier when I happened to prove that the Premier in this State had obtained a job by lying about his qualifications. I will leave it at that, Sir, because you have so ruled.

I feel no happier about the situation of the State and the situation of the people ruining the State. Mr President, you were sitting in the Chair during debate about the Western Australian Development Corporation, when I was given an assurance that if a certain person was wrong and a certain statement was wrong, I would be told the next day. Hon Graham MacKinnon was sitting beside me when that assurance was given, but it has never been followed through. The man who did not follow that matter through is the Minister for Budget Management. He gave an assurance and never carried it out. I hope I am not blackening that gentleman's name; I have been here long enough to know that we can have prevarication or all the promises in the world, but people do not perform. Members should remember that we are at the end of the era of the three Bs: Burke, Bryce and Berinson. The bloke who created these monsters thought they were marvellous and fought for them has been ill advised. They have been proved to have been ill-advised. They have been proved to have stopped producing for the State. There is no doubt that WADC has lost millions of dollars for this State. John Cain in Victoria had the guts to say that the problems there had been a disaster and attempted to cut himself off from them. Burkie is in Ireland, Bryce is at the R & I Bank and Berinson is the only one left to attack. I do not like attacking him because I like him.

The PRESIDENT: Order! He should be referred to as Hon Mr Berinson.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I hope, Sir, that you, the Chairman, and Deputy President continue to refer to him as Hon Mr Berinson and to Hon Gordon Masters because I have noticed that, in the last few years, some Government members have stopped doing that.

Hon Joe Berinson is the last of the Mohicans. He has made promises in this place. He has had to; he is the Leader of the House. However, he has not provided answers. I think he should be made to provide answers in this debate about where the money is going.

When we reach the Committee stage, I want Hon Joe Berinson to answer some questions. He has been let off the hook. I know I should not say this, Mr President, but you were a most

feared advocate in asking questions and requiring answers. Nobody has forced Joe Berinson to answer anything in the time he has been in this House. I have only 41 days left in this place, but I am prepared to ask Hon Joe Berinson questions for all of those 41 days about his financial dealings on behalf of the Government. He will try to tell us that it has all been the Treasurer's fault or somebody else's fault. However, this Bill will not be passed until we hear where the money has been spent. Too often we have been gentle and nice, but have been treated like geriatric patients with Hon Joe Berinson being the senior sister making incisions and cuts and doing things the way he wants to do them. He will take what he gets in the next few days. He will have to be frank and answer the questions asked of him. He will have to act like a Minister of the Crown instead of like a surrogate to the Premier and Treasurer. He will have to explain his part in the WADC before this House will allow the Government to have any more money. That may sound fairly ruthless. He knows that this House will not oppose Supply because he has done a deal with my friends on the right. I do not mind what they do.

Hon E.J. Charlton: How many of us?

Hon A.A. LEWIS: My son, how many are there?

It is time the Leader of the House answered the questions that members have asked of him. He has had a magnificent run over the last six years. We have been gentlemen and ladies by not forcing him to stand up and be counted. The tide has turned.

Hon Joe Berinson has sold himself as a friend of the people. He will have to start telling us everything or his Government will not stay in office. That may not happen before 21 May, but there will be more intelligent people than me in this place asking questions of him after 21 May. They will make him account for everything he has done in the last six years.

It is time that this was said in this place. I shrink from having to do it. The House knows that I hate making speeches like this.

Hon E.J. Charlton interjected.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: That is the sort of thing I expect from people who go to Calingiri and come back half dressed.

Hon E.J. Charlton: I should have taken you with me; it would have done us all good.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: It probably would have done the people of Calingiri good, too.

The time has come for this Government to face up to the problems confronting it.

Hon E.J. Charlton interjected.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I am not a Roman Catholic, although I am married to one.

Hon E.J. Charlton interjected.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Roman Catholics, just like Jews, Anglicans, and many other people have beliefs which help them, but Hon Eric Charlton's comments do not help this debate. There is some soul searching and money finding to be done by this Government. It has been the most wasteful Government in the history of Western Australia. I do not think anybody will deny that. It has regurgitated the processes of the early Labor Party in the period between 1910 and 1912, and they were failures then. It has not proved that it can make a bob out of business. The Minister for Budget Management has been a failure because he has not answered questions. He has never faced up to the responsibilities of his portfolio of Budget Management. He has passed every question on this subject to another Minister. I admire him for his astute political ability and for the way he is allowed to pass on these questions. Somebody at some time has to answer for his mistakes. Will he allow the next four years of Labor rule to pass without answering a question on Budget Management, on what should be done or on what leadership should be given to this State? If I may say it gently, he is a disgrace in Budget management. He has lost this State and the taxpayers millions of dollars. He has cost every taxpayer in this State \$1 000 plus by his fiddling in matters which he did not understand. He is aware of that and I think he is nodding his head. Would the Minister compare himself with the Laurie Connells, Alan Bonds and other people who have gone out and taken the bloody risk?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon A.A. LEWIS: I am sorry, I mean the risk. Those people have taken the abuse, whereas these others in the Government want to take the credit but none of the abuse. The private entrepreneurs know that if they lose money they can be damned in the Press, yet these people who are meant to be the guardians of the public purse just shrug their shoulders and walk away from the situation. It is a disgrace. The Minister knows that and so do I. If Hon Jim Brown had somebody to do deals with him on his farm, his hair would stand on end. Members will recall Mr Cooley, who was a very honoured member of this place. His hair, what was left of it, would be standing on end. I see that the hair of the Minister for Budget Management is still flat on his head. He is not worried about what he has done with the money of the taxpayers of Western Australia. He does not give two hoots. He will not answer questions on the financial dealings of the State. He was one of the trio involved in those deals that lost \$500 million for this State. Do members think he cares? Of course he does not. He sits there smug in his position as Minister for Budget Management, and the Opposition allows him to sit there and does not go through any details at all. No questions are asked about what is happening to the money. From now until 21 May things will be different and the Committee stage may go on for quite some time. The Minister for Budget Management may or may not answer questions on what has been done with the money. He has allocated the money, but he claims he does not have a clue where the money went.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member's time is nearly up, but before it is I wish to advise him that he is getting close to the time when Standing Order No 90 could well and truly be invoked.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Would you read Standing Order No 90?

The PRESIDENT: It refers to tedious repetition and if, in the view of the President, a member is guilty of tedious repetition, the President has within his power the right to tell the member to sit down.

Hon A.A. LEWIS: Far be it from me to deny you that right, Mr President. I did not think I was being tedious. The gallery in this place has increased threefold since I started speaking. Perhaps I was repetitious. If you wish to invoke that Standing Order, I will not argue with you although I have three minutes left in which to speak. I am trying to reinforce in the minds of members of this House that one man in this Chamber has been involved in every conniving deal in the Western Australia Government since 1983. No-one would be game to put a deal through without that man's permission. Yet, he still sits here blithely saying that he knows nothing about the deals of WADC or the Government's performance in any way whatsoever. I refer to the Minister for Budget Management. As I said earlier, I hate talking about personalities because I happen to like the fellow. However, he is a bloke who has been involved, but has never told the House one thing that this Government, corrupt or otherwise - and far be it from me to say it is corrupt, although I think it is - has been involved with. This Government is one which in my time in this Parliament has never given one iota of financial detail to me in answer to a question regarding Supply Bills, Budgets or anything else. Tonight will differ because we may have recommendations going back to the other place.

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Minister for Budget Management) [11.31 pm]: I am naturally sorry that Hon Sandy Lewis should have chosen his line of personal abuse. I do not intend to dignify that approach by responding either in the same way or in any other way to that part of his comments. I will comment on one aspect which he repeated on many occasions and which was an accusation that I do not answer questions. The questions that I do not answer are those on matters which are not within my area of responsibility. It is no good the member saying that I am hiding behind some shield. I am not hiding behind anything. I am simply relying on the fact that I am responsible for a certain part of the administration of the Government of this State and am not responsible for others. Other Ministers have their own area of authority, and while as a member of Cabinet I have never moved from a position of sharing, in a collective sense, the responsibility that all Cabinets have, that does not impose on me the individual responsibility of other portfolios. It is true, also, that on some occasions I do not answer questions related to my own area of responsibility and that is simply when I do not have the information. The honourable member attacked me for my reply earlier this afternoon on a couple of questions about the Meredith/Tan case. I said then that I did not know but that I would find out and let Hon Gordon Masters have the information as soon as I could get it together. Had Hon Sandy

Lewis been in a rather fairer frame of mind he might have been prepared to recall that Mr Masters' questions today to which I was unable to respond immediately were prefaced by a statement from Mr Masters that a question he had put to me last week in similar terms which I said I would have to get him an answer for had been replied to. It was replied to, I think, the following day, certainly not longer than two days after it was asked. That is the reality of the situation; even in one's own areas of responsibility one cannot carry all the facts. Frankly, in the time during which I have been in this Parliament I have never heard a criticism to suggest that one ought to be able to carry all the facts in one's head related to one's own portfolio.

As to other matters, I think it is important to restate the general impossibility of any Minister applying himself to answers to questions covering the whole gamut of Government. We have special rules for that, as you are aware Mr President, in respect of questions without notice. On those we simply accept as a fact of life that a Minister cannot be expected to know the details of all other Ministers' portfolios.

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: That did not stop Messrs Olney and Dowding and you attacking me when I was a Minister.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I am sure Hon D.J. Wordsworth would be prepared to concede that even in the days when Messrs Olney and Dowding and I were in full flight we never engaged in the sort of flight in which Hon Sandy Lewis has just engaged. I refer to the question of the acknowledged limitations of Ministers' ability to answer questions on any subjects on questions without notice, because precisely the same situation arises when we come to deal with debates like the Address-in-Reply and this Supply Bill.

We are well aware of the traditions of this House that in such debates anyone can raise questions or develop arguments on any subject. It has been the practice for some time for Ministers responding in those circumstances to do so briefly. There is a very practical reason for that; that even if one brought in somebody from every department in order to prepare oneself for the possibility of having to reply, one simply could not do it - it cannot be done. Detailed questions must be handled by procedures that are available. They are, on the one hand, the questioning process or, on the other hand, specific Bills. It is quite impossible and impractical to believe that the sorts of generalised debates permitted by the various Budget debates and the Address-in-Reply debate can be responded to point by point. That is precisely the position that we are in today.

I have noted questions on particular aspects that have been asked by various speakers and to the extent that they are specific I will attempt to get answers to the members involved if the questions do not arise in a more specific context. My latter comment relates in particular to some of the questions Hon Max Evans asked about the nature of funding arrangements on Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd. As it happens there will be a debate on PICL starting on Thursday and I will either attempt to have those questions answered earlier, or we can deal with them at that time. That is all in the ordinary course of events.

It is the nature of the current debate on which we are engaged that there is no point - and I say this in advance to anyone who shares Mr Lewis' view - when one comes to a Bill involving \$2.3 billion in asking those questions. The nature of the Supply Bill is to apply the funds estimated to be necessary for the ordinary services of the Government. An amount of \$2.3 billion is estimated to be roughly the amount required for those services of the Government from July until roughly December, that being roughly the time by which it is expected the Budget will be passed and will allow more specific allocations to be made. As to the specific direction of each of those services, that has to await either the Budget process or the particular legislation which directs that certain moneys be spent in certain ways. Having made those comments, I thank most of the members who have contributed for their contributions to this debate and commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon John Williams) in the Chair; Hon J.M. Berinson (Minister for Budget Management) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short Title -

Hon MAX EVANS: Towards the end of the Minister's speech he talked about answering some questions but not answering every question. Could he please comment on the possibility of this Government having four year Budgets.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: This year Treasury has put some quite fundamental propositions to the Government in terms of the way in which Budgets should be presented in future. Among those proposals is the suggestion that we adopt the format of the Commonwealth Budget. There is a certain phrase that is used to describe it which escapes my memory at the moment, but it is suggested that because that format has been adopted by the Commonwealth and a number of States it would make national and interstate comparisons much more meaningful if we were to move in that way. Questions have also been raised about the desirability of forward budgeting.

I would say there is no prospect of either of those suggestions being implemented in the forthcoming Budget, but Hon Max Evans is quite right - with a four year term a Government does have the ability to approach questions of this nature without always looking over its shoulder at the immediate and urgent requirements. In principle I have no trouble in accepting that it is desirable to have that forward budgeting, and I will ensure that it is actively pursued as a possibility, together with the other suggestions which have come from Treasury itself and to which I have referred.

Hon MAX EVANS: An important question which should be answered in respect of Supply, relating to where the money is coming from, concerns the interest paid by WA Government Holdings Ltd to the State Government Insurance Commission. Is the Government going to give an amount of money to WA Government Holdings Ltd to pay the money across? If so, where would it come from and will it need an appropriation?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I have to include this in the list of matters on which I would like to get further advice, but tentatively I can refer to statements which were made last year by the Deputy Premier wherein he indicated that the funding costs of that loan are anticipated to be met out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and that, because of the great advantage of the State Energy Commission's participation in the supply part of the petrochemical project, it was anticipated that that allocation would be balanced by the withdrawal of the special allowances which the SEC now has because of the North West Shelf commitment in respect of being spared the 3 per cent levy, and I think the other component was the royalty. That is the general nature of the proposal - that it should be paid from CRF but balanced by the SEC's being called on to forgo the concessions that it has had on account of its North West Shelf difficulty.

Hon MAX EVANS: Does that mean the financial position of the State Energy Commission will be worse in the next few years until the gas and electricity come on stream to the petrochemical project?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I cannot give an indication of how long that would be. My impression from the statements that the Deputy Premier made last year supports the view that the SEC can manage over what is quite a short period. I think we are talking about only two or three years before it starts to get the benefit of the larger flow of gas sales; but I am really providing hearsay evidence, because I am depending on the recorded statements of the Deputy Premier last year rather than on any particular briefing that I have had directly.

Hon MAX EVANS: Last year I think the Government put some further funds into the R & I Bank. Has any further money gone to the R & I Bank this year, either out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund or by way of loans?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Not that I am aware of, but I would ask the member, if he would like to pursue that question, to put it on notice in the questioning process.

Hon MAX EVANS: In relation to the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill the Minister talked about funds available to go to the petrochemical project. The funds referred to were Government funds - that is the reason we have the extra \$50 million. Has the Minister had time to consider whether this should go to an outside company and not just to the ongoing costs of the Government?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I note that the honourable member raised that question before dinner,

but I would ask him to hold it over to the Western Australian Petrochemical Industries Authority Bill debate and I will make sure that I have the answer provided by Thursday.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Minister for Budget Management), and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [11.47 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

South West Development Authority - Auditor General's Report

HON BARRY HOUSE (South West) [11.48 pm]: I am concerned by a report from the Auditor General which was tabled earlier today in this House. It was an interim report relating to the South West Development Authority and it stated in part that the Auditor General had been unable to complete an audit of the financial statements of the South West Development Authority for the period 1 July 1987 to 30 June 1988 within three months of receipt of the statements on 19 December 1988.

We have heard much about accountability in recent weeks in this House and also in the community. It seems as if the South West Development Authority is following a fairly unreliable and very shoddy procedure with its accounts. For instance, the 1987 accounts were not tabled until August 1988, which was 10 months late, and they were then qualified by the Auditor General at the time. He said it did not have a proper double entry set of books.

In August 1988, the South West Development Authority appointed private accountants to put its books in order, and the Auditor General is not happy with what happened under the previous Minister. Obviously, financial irregularities have occurred somewhere and it is incumbent on the Government to demand an immediate report on the situation. We are nine months into this financial year and we have not heard anything from the South West Development Authority for 21 months. We are entitled to ask what is going on. The current Minister for South-West has already admitted publicly that the 1987-88 annual report will not be available until at least August this year; he has stated there is the possibility of large cost overruns by the authority. The Government's responsibility is to clear up the situation as quickly as possible.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.51 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**SWAN BREWERY SITE - LOUIS ALLEN COLLECTION OF
ABORIGINAL ART
*Housing Intentions***

24. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Does the Government still intend to use the refurbished Swan Brewery buildings as the home for the Louis Allen collection of Aboriginal art?
- (2) If so, have any discussions between the Government, the university and the WA Art Gallery been held as to consolidating the various collections of Aboriginal art held at those two places?
- (3) If not, what does the Government intend for the site?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

(1)-(3)

The Minister for Planning announced recently that the internal uses of the old Swan Brewery building are under review. The possibility of housing the Louis Allen collection will be one of the options considered.

POLICE - BUILDING COMPLEX

Site Consideration - Beaufort, James, Stirling, Roe Streets Boundary

26. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Is it correct that the site bounded by Beaufort, James, Stirling and Roe Streets is being considered for a new multi-million dollar police complex?
- (2) If so, have final decisions been made to use the site in this way?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) A task force chaired by LandCorp is investigating the feasibility of this site as a future police headquarters.
- (2) No.

TRANSPORT - BUSES

Port Hedland - RPT System, Student Fares

35. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it correct that an RPT system is to be introduced into Port Hedland?
- (2) If so, does this mean that all children who travel by bus to school in Port Hedland - and South Hedland - will be required to pay 90¢ per day?
- (3) Is it correct that the Government promised, prior to the recent election, to provide free bus transport for students who attend non Government schools?
- (4) If so, will this promise apply to the students who travel by bus to attend the St Cecilia's School in Port Hedland?
- (5) If not, why not?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes. It is proposed to request the introduction of further RPT services.
- (2) Students travelling on RPT services pay a student concession fare equivalent to the student concession fare charged by Transperth. Such services already operate in Karratha, Geraldton, Narrogin, Bunbury, Collie, Esperance, Kalgoorlie, Manjimup and Busselton.
- (3) No. The Government promised, commencing in 1989, that country children wishing to attend non government schools would be provided with school bus

services on the same basis as Government school students.

(4)-(5)

Not applicable.

HEALTH PROMOTION SERVICES - CENTRE FOR ADDICTION STUDIES
Alcohol Advisory Council of WA - Roles

36. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What are the individual roles of -
 - (a) the WA Health Promotion Unit;
 - (b) the Centre for Addictive Studies; and
 - (c) the Alcohol Advisory Council?
- (2) Given the role of the Health Promotion Unit and the ability of the Health Promotion Unit to undertake the work currently performed by the Alcohol Advisory Council, will he explain the reason for the Government making a financial contribution to the Alcohol Advisory Council?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1)
 - (a) The Health Promotion Services Branch of the Health Department is concerned with a wide range of preventive health issues including smoking, alcohol abuse, nutrition, Aboriginal health and immunisation;
 - (b) the National Centre for Research into the Prevention of Drug Abuse and the Addition Studies Unit at Curtin University are primarily concerned with professional education and research related to the prevention and treatment of drug abuse; and
 - (c) the Alcohol Advisory Council is an independent organisation concerned with alcohol policies and other related issues.
- (2) The work of the three organisations listed is considered to be complementary but the primary focus of the Health Promotion Services Branch is community-wide primary prevention.

HEALTH PROMOTION SERVICES - ALCOHOL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF WA
Work - Differences

37. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Health:

What specific work does the Alcohol Advisory Council perform that the Government's Health Promotion Unit either cannot do or is not doing?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Alcohol Advisory Council is independent. Its work is not controlled by the Government but may be seen as complementing the work of the Health Department and the Alcohol and Drug Authority.

HEALTH PROMOTION SERVICES - CENTRE OF ADDICTION STUDIES
Alcohol Advisory Council of WA - Work Duplication

38. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Health:

Given that the Government makes a financial contribution to the running of the Alcohol Advisory Council, the Health Promotion Unit and the Centre for Addictive Studies, can she advise if there is a conflict or duplication of the work undertaken by the Alcohol Advisory Council and the Health Promotion Unit or the Centre of Addictive Studies?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

See answer to question 36.

ALCOHOL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF WA - DRINKSAFE CAMPAIGN
Involvement

39. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Alcohol Advisory Council involved in the Government's Drinksafe campaign?
- (2) If so, will he provide details of the involvement?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) The Alcohol Advisory Council's education and research officer is a member of the Drinksafe advisory committee.
- (2) The committee has met on three occasions.

ALCOHOL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF WA - STATUS
Government Representatives - Government Funding

40. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the status of the Alcohol Advisory Council?
- (2) Who are the Government representatives on the council?
- (3) What Government funding was provided to the council for each of the past three financial years and what is the anticipated funding provision for the 1988-89 year?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) The Alcohol Advisory Council is an independent organisation concerned with alcohol policies and other related issues. Additionally, the council's management committee is elected from the financial membership and consists of experts from the alcohol research, education and treatment fields.
- (2) There are no Government representatives on the Alcohol Advisory Council.
- (3)

1985-86	-	\$22 891
1986-87	-	\$28 003
1987-88	-	\$32 978
1988-89	-	\$37 798

SEWERAGE - PUBLIC SEWERS
Liquid Discharge - Flow Meters

41. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Are flow meters used to record volumes of liquids being discharged into public sewers?
- (2) What is the criteria for the installation of these meters?
- (3) What is the maximum volume of liquid discharge allowed before a flow meter is installed?
- (4) What specific charges are imposed on users who have a concession to discharge liquids into public sewers?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Assessment of total volume to be discharged, rate of discharge, and time of discharge in relation to available sewer capacity.
- (3) No maximum specified as every individual discharge is under different conditions.

- (4) As provided in by-laws an annual permit fee, and for large volumes and/or high strength wastes a quality/quantity charge.

POLICE - MOTORCYCLES

Tenders

42. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Was a tender recently advertised for the supply of 122 motor cycles for the WA Police Force?
- (2) Did the specification require the motor cycles to have been approved by the Australian Design Council and comply with the vehicle standard regulations in force in this State?
- (3) Which companies or motor cycle distributors submitted tenders?
- (4) Who was the successful tenderer and which brand of motor cycle was provided?
- (5) What was the unit cost of each motor cycle?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(2)

Yes.

- (3) Dultad Holdings Pty Ltd
Bikeworld Pty Ltd
Honda Australia Pty Ltd
BMW Australia Pty Ltd
Hartley Kawasaki Pty Ltd
- (4) Bikeworld Pty Ltd. The Harley Davidson FXRP Pursuit.
- (5) \$8 395.

SEWERAGE - BEENYUP SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Effluent Outfall Point - Location

43. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Where is the treated effluent from the Beenyup sewage treatment plant discharged and what distance is the outfall point from the coast?
- (2) What research is being carried out into the effect of the treated effluent on the eco-system of the immediate and adjacent areas to the outfall point?
- (3) Does the continued operation and discharge from the Beenyup sewage treatment plant present any adverse impact to either the environment or to the community?
- (4) If so, will he provide details?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) (a) Into the Indian Ocean off Ocean Reef; and
(b) 1 600 metres.
- (2) Monitoring of the ocean is a continuous operation. Additional studies are to be commenced concentrating on the effects, if any, of nutrient loading.
- (3) A recent public environmental review by a consultant concluded that the Beenyup ocean outlet discharge presents no adverse impact to either the environment or to the community.
- (4) Not applicable.

SEWERAGE - BEENYUP SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Effluent Treatment - Alternative Methods

44. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Water Resources:

Will the Minister provide brief details of the alternative methods of treatment of effluent which have less environmental impact than the method currently used at the Beenyup treatment plant?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The current methods of treatment and disposal are considered to be those having the least environmental impact at a cost which the community can afford. Higher degrees of treatment, although available, would substantially increase costs, with minimal benefit.

SEWERAGE - BEENYUP SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Effluent Outfall Point - Gazetted Marine Park Location

45. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Water Resources:

Is the current outfall point from the Beenyup sewage treatment plant located in a gazetted marine park?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Yes.

SEWERAGE - BEENYUP SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Catchment Area

46. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What is the catchment area of the Beenyup sewage treatment plant?
- (2) What method of treatment is used at the Beenyup sewage treatment plant?
- (3) What volume is treated each month and what has been the annual percentage increase of the volume treated in each of the past five years?
- (4) What is the anticipated annual increase for the next five years?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) The Beenyup catchment is located essentially north of the Swan River. Its northern boundary is near Burns Beach, its southern limit is Yokine and its eastern edge is Midland.
- (2) At Beenyup wastewater treatment plant treatment processes are -
Preliminary - screening and degritting;
primary treatment;
secondary treatment; and
incineration of solids.
- (3) (a) 1 600 megalitres.
- (b)

1983-84	9.3 per cent
1984-85	5.4 per cent
1985-86	18.3 per cent
1986-87	3.3 per cent
1987-88	15.2 per cent
- (4)

1988-89	10 per cent
1989-90	9 per cent
1990-91	8 per cent
1991-92	7.5 per cent
1992-93	7 per cent

STATE PLANNING COMMISSION - BROWN STREET 151-153, EAST PERTH

Rent Increase

49. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the State Planning Commission intends, from 1 July

1989, to increase the rent on the property 151-153 Brown Street, East Perth, from \$1 380 per month to \$3 000 per month?

- (2) In view of the Government's election promise not to increase its charges in excess of the inflation rate, how does the Government justify the proposed increase?
- (3) Will she ensure that negotiations are initiated between the occupier and the State Planning Commission to ensure that this matter is settled to the satisfaction of both parties?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The property at 151-153 Brown Street, East Perth is a commercial property. The Government's commitment to keep charges at inflation level relates to domestic charges only.
- (3) The Minister is agreeable to having the rental determined by a private arbitrator.

MOTORCYCLES - HELMETS

Exemption Provisions - Amendment Proposals

50. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Does the Government propose to remove or amend the existing exemption provisions for the wearing of helmets by motorcycle riders and passengers?
- (2) If yes, will he provide details of the proposed changes and the timetable for implementation?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

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

MOTOR VEHICLES - DRIVERS

Training Facility - Metropolitan Area, Support

51. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

Will the Minister support the provision of a suitable area of land in the near metropolitan area both north and south of Perth for the use of a driver/rider training facility?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Yes.

MOTORCYCLES - TRAILERS

Licensing - Approval

53. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Has the Minister or his department considered approving motorcycle trailers for licensing purposes?
- (2) If so, when is it anticipated that the necessary amendments to the relevant Acts will be introduced into Parliament?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Road Traffic Code 1975 and the vehicle standards regulations 1977 will require amending. No amendments to the Road Traffic Act 1974-82 are necessary. The matter is currently under review by the Police Department's engineering and technical services section and it is not expected that these amendments will be in place before the end of the year.

WEST PERTH WORK RELEASE CENTRE - FUTURE

60. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Corrective Services:

- (1) Is it intended that the West Perth work release Centre continue to accept persons subject to work release orders?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) Is it intended that the West Perth work release Centre be used for other than work release programs and, if so, will he advise if the work release centre is to be relocated?
- (4) If the West Perth work release Centre is to be used for other than its current purpose, will the building be subject to renovation?
- (5) If so, what is the estimated cost of this renovation and for what purpose will the building be used?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(3)

The previously named West Perth work release hostel was deproclaimed as a prison on 3 March 1989 and proclaimed from the same date under the Community Corrections Centre Act as a community corrections centre. Persons approved to participate in the community based work release system will still attend the centre as required under the Act. It is intended that prison based work release programs as provided for in the Prisons Act will be discontinued. In the interim the program will operate from other prisons.

- (4) Internal renovations have recently been carried out on the building.
- (5) \$100 000, and see (1)-(3) above.

STATE TAXATION DEPARTMENT - LAND TAX ASSESSMENTS
Paper - Extra Sheets

61. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Leader of the House representing the Treasurer:

- (1) When did the State Taxation Department begin sending four separate sheets of paper to taxpayers as part of its land tax assessment?
- (2) Why are four pieces, three of which are retained by the taxpayer, necessary?
- (3) Has the cost of producing and processing this extra paper been costed?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The notice usually comprises three parts except where a taxpayer's land holdings are so extensive that additional parts are required.
- (2) The three part assessment notice is an integral part of procedures which have been introduced following an upgrading of the entire land tax system. The new system has, among other things, done away with the annual land tax return which previously placed serious obligations on owners and required labour intensive processing by the department.
- (3) The cost of printing an assessment in three parts would obviously be greater than printing it as a single part. However, the additional cost has been more than offset by the removal of the need to print about 200 000 land tax return forms each year as well as the saving of associated advertising and distribution costs.

FILMS AND VIDEOS - NEW GUIDELINES
Attorney General's Support - National Viewers' and Listeners' Association's Concern

62. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Attorney General aware of concern from the National Viewers' and Listeners' Association (WA) over his actions in voting for the adoption of the new guidelines for films and videos?

- (2) Why did he, as distinct from the Minister in charge of the Censorship Office - the Minister for the Arts - attend the conference in Darwin last June?
- (3) Was he accompanied by an adviser?
- (4) If so, what position does that adviser hold?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Censorship Ministers' meetings are often held in conjunction with meetings of the Standing Committee of Attorney General. It is common practice for the Western Australian Attorney General to represent the Minister for The Arts at such times.

(3)-(4)

I was not accompanied by censorship staff but was briefed prior to the meeting.

AMERICA'S CUP - ROTTNEST ISLAND

Future Base - Discussions

63. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Have any discussions been held or any suggestions been made to the Government for Rottnest Island to be used as a base for a future running of the America's Cup?
- (2) If so, will he give details?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(2)

No.

ROTTNEST ISLAND RESORT - TENDERS

Bond, Mr Alan - Lease

65. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Planning:

I refer to the advertising and calling of tenders for the Rottnest Island resort and ask -

- (1) Why, when tenders were not due to close until 24 February 1989, was a lease given to Mr Bond in late December?
- (2) Why was the lease extended to the year 2018 - giving a 29 year lease to Mr Bond - when the new Rottnest Island Authority Act - section 13(3)(a) - prohibits a lease of more than 20 years without the Minister's written approval?
- (3) Did the previous Minister use her powers under section 13(3)(a) to extend the lease beyond 20 years and, if so, did she give written approval?
- (4) If so, will he release her letter giving approval?
- (5) Why did the previous Minister say on 29 December 1988 that the Rottnest Island Authority "would consider the Bond purchase at its next meeting" when it was not the authority's approval needed but the Minister's?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) It should be understood by the member that the Rottnest Island Authority has not called tenders for the lease of the Rottnest Island Lodge. In December 1988 the present leaseholder advertised for expressions of interest in the remaining portion of the lease. The lease for the Rottnest Lodge was not transferred to Mr Bond in December.

(2)-(4)

Approval for extension of the Lodge lease to the year 2018 was granted on 5 November 1985. As the Rottnest Island Authority Act was not proclaimed until 30 May 1988 there was no requirement for the Minister's approval in writing.

(5) It is the responsibility of the Rottnest Island Authority to approve the transfer of leases. The transfer of the Rottnest Lodge lease was considered by the Rottnest Island Authority at the meeting of 21 February 1989.

FERTILISERS, ORGANIC - DUPING ALLEGATIONS

Composition Registration - Legislation Amendments

67. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the Department of Agriculture's warning that farmers are being duped by so-called organic fertilisers, will the Government be introducing amendments to legislation requiring that their composition should be registered in the manner of other fertilisers?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Organic fertilisers are required to be registered if they are other than unprocessed waste of either natural or manufacturing origin. Their composition then has to be registered in the same manner as other fertilisers. However, the current legislation allows the makers of fertilisers to recommend applications of their products which supply negligible proportions of the quantities of nutrients needed by plants and crops. This and other aspects of the Fertiliser Act are now being reviewed by an Australia-wide working party.

MOTOR VEHICLES - IMPORTED USED CARS

Registration Delays - Plastic Drivers' Licence Delays

69. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) To what extent is the registration of imported used cars affecting the normal day to day registration of new cars and the reregistration of those cars which have been off the road for fault repairs or when registration has expired voluntarily?
- (2) Have staff been transferred from vehicle inspections to handle the introduction of the new plastic driving licences?
- (3) What delays are being experienced in the issuing of plastic driving licences?
- (4) How many extra staff are considered necessary to handle their introduction?
- (5) Will these extra costs be covered by the extra charges?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) The examination of vehicles other than imported vehicles is not being delayed by the examination of imported vehicles.
- (2) No.
- (3) The production of plasticised drivers' licences was initially delayed for a period of up to two months from the time of payment. However, it is anticipated that these delays will be reduced to the forecast turnaround period of two weeks by the middle of April. Regardless of any delay, at the time of renewal each driver is given an interim paper licence which is valid for three months pending receipt of the plasticised licence card.
- (4) It has been necessary to increase the staffing levels at various police licensing centres in order to cope with an increasing workload in a range of activities, including the issue of plasticised drivers' licences. Eighteen additional staff have been employed on a temporary basis until 30 June 1989 at which time the position will be reviewed.

- (5) The fees for plasticised drivers' licences have been structured to provide an increased fee for a one year driver's licence whereas a five year licence is significantly discounted when compared with the fees which previously applied. It is therefore not possible to forecast the level of revenues for plasticised drivers' licences at this stage as it is dependent on the number of people who will opt for a one year licence rather than the discounted five year licence.

MOTOR VEHICLES - IMPORTED USED CARS

Registration Delays - Overtime Funds

71. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) In view of the delays currently being experienced in the inspection and licensing of used motor vehicles being imported into Western Australia, will the Minister authorise appropriate overtime funds and take such other action as may be appropriate to reduce the inspection delay?
- (2) Will he advise on the action he proposes to take?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(2)

I have approved the appointment of three additional examiners on a temporary basis to assist in clearing the backlog of imported vehicles.

POLICE OFFICERS - RECRUITMENT PROGRAM

Election Promise

72. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Does the Government intend to stand by its election promise to recruit an additional 1 000 police officers in the three year period commencing mid 1988, when the promise was first made by the Government and accepted by the Commissioner for Police?
- (2) If not, will he clearly outline the intended recruitment program and the reasons for such change?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) A request by the commissioner to extend the period is being considered.
- (2) Answered by (1).

POLICE - MAYLANDS POLICE ACADEMY

Employees and Trainees - Statistics

73. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) How many persons are attached to or located at the Police Academy in Maylands?
- (2) Will he distinguish the number of police officers from civil servants and others?
- (3) How many of those police officers located or attached to the Maylands Police Academy are involved in the training of police recruits?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|---|------|-----|
| (1) | As at 5 April 1989 | - | 539. | |
| (2) | Trainees | - | 421; | |
| | Police staff | - | 93; | |
| | Civilian staff | - | 22; | and |
| | Cadet staff | - | 3. | |
| (3) | Fifty five. | | | |

PLANNING - AMENDMENT 255
Forrest Road, South Area - Rezoning Proposal

77. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Planning:

I refer to amendment 255, City of Cockburn, district zoning scheme 1 and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that the proposed amendment 255 involves rezoning the area south of Forrest Road and east of the proposed extension to the Kwinana Freeway?
- (2) If so, why is this area being rezoned and what type of development, if any, is envisaged in the rezoned area?
- (3) Is it correct that the Perth metropolitan plan for this area was intended to be a green belt?
- (4) If so, why has this plan been changed?
- (5) Is the Minister aware that local residents are concerned that the amendment may result in adverse effects on wildlife?
- (6) Is she also aware of the residents' concern that any development on the low-lying land in the area is likely to result in serious drainage problems?
- (7) If she is familiar with the concerns of local residents, will she seriously consider their suggestion that any development in the area be restricted to the high ground?
- (8) If she is unfamiliar with these expressed concerns, will she undertake to consider them in detail?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The land is proposed to be rezoned for urban and residential purposes.
- (3) No.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5)-(6) Yes.
- (7) All submissions on the amendment will be seriously considered.
- (8) See (5), (6) and (7) above.

SARAH, MR PETER - MUSIC THEATRE IN WA REVIEW
Funds Allocation

78. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for The Arts:

- (1) What funds have been allocated to Mr Peter Sarah and for other expenses associated with the review of Music Theatre in WA?
- (2) Does the review imply the Department for the Arts is unhappy with the performance of the WA Opera Company in its present form?
- (3) Is there a link between the review and the reported heavy losses by the WA Opera Company over its production of the "Eureka Stockade"?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) \$24 800.
- (2) The review of Music Theatre is concerned with the provision of music theatre/opera for the community of Western Australia, and its potential range and standards given current available resources.

(3) No.

RURAL ADJUSTMENT AND FINANCE CORPORATION - ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

Transfer

79. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Budget Management:

I refer to an article in the *Farmers Weekly* of Wednesday, 19 March 1989 which outlines the transfer of the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation from the responsibility of the Minister for Agriculture to the Department of Treasury and ask -

- (1) Will this change of administrative responsibility cause difficulties in respect of State/Federal funding, bearing in mind that RAFCOR is mainly financed federally by the Department of Primary Industry?
- (2) Will the Minister for Budget Management give this House an undertaking to study the fiscal ramifications of this change of responsibility to ensure that WA's share of such funding of rural relief is not reduced?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not necessary. Responsibility for RAFCOR has been transferred to the Treasurer and not to the Department of Treasury.

AIDS - CASES

Contraction Methods - Statistics Tabling

81. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Health:

Will the Minister table the figures for total AIDS cases in Western Australia from 1985 onwards, on a yearly basis, showing the method of contraction of the disease in the following categories -

- (a) blood transfusion;
- (b) needle sharing;
- (c) homosexual activity; and
- (d) heterosexual activity?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

AIDS cases in Western Australia by method of contraction: 1985-1989

	Total	Blood Transf.	Needle Share	Homo- sexual	Hetero- sexual
1985	7			6	1
1986	12			12	
1987	11			11	
1988	21	1	1	18	1
1989 (to Feb)	3			3	

It is important to note that statistics relating to AIDS cases refer only to those with the full AIDS syndrome. On average these patients will have been infected five to eight years before they develop full-blown AIDS. For example, the one case of transfusion-related AIDS in WA was infected before April 1985, when screening and other precautions were introduced.

STATE PLANNING COMMISSION - LAND LEASE

Grandstand Road, Belmont - Waste Disposal Company

83. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Does a company involved in the waste disposal industry occupy portion of the land acquired by the State Planning Commission and formerly owned by the Bristle Tile Company at Grandstand Road, Dalby Street and Resolution Drive, Belmont?
- (2) If yes to (1), on what terms and conditions does the firm occupy the site and has a binding lease or agreement been entered into by the State Planning Commission and the tenant?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) Has the company referred to in part (1) above recently been asked to vacate the site and premises and, if so, will she advise of the reasons?
- (5) Did any Government officer indicate to the waste disposal company that it could extend its period of occupancy of the premises and, if so, will she advise of the reasons and details for such an offer?
- (6) Has the company indicated its intention to vacate the premises and, if so, when will this occur?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1)-(6) The answer required is very detailed and I will respond to the member in writing.

STATE PLANNING COMMISSION - LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS
Grandstand Road, Belmont - Ownership

84. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Is the State Planning Commission the owner of the land and improvements formerly occupied by the Bristle Tile Company at Grandstand Road, Dalby Street and Resolution Drive, Belmont?
- (2) When and on what terms and conditions was the land purchased and do the terms and conditions include a leaseback on portion of the land and, if so, will she advise of the rental and period of the leaseback?
- (3) Who currently occupies the land and improvements which are the subject of the leaseback agreement and on what terms?
- (4) Which other tenants occupy part of the land and improvements?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1)-(4) The answer required is very detailed and I will respond to the member in writing.

SMALL CRAFT PROFICIENCY CERTIFICATE - PRACTICAL SEGMENT
Facilities

87. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What facilities exist for persons to be instructed and examined in the practical segment for their small craft safety - or proficiency - certificate, after having passed the theory segment through such as TAFE courses?
- (2) How many such courses were organised in the years -
 - (a) 1986;
 - (b) 1987; and
 - (c) 1988?
- (3) To whom may people apply for instruction and examination?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) The Yachting Association of Western Australia, through its affiliated clubs such as the volunteer sea rescue groups, provides for practical examinations towards the certificate of proficiency in small pleasure vessel safety as part of the national power boat training scheme. Persons wishing to seek training or examination for the practical segment should contact the Yachting Association of Western Australia on 386 2438. A training program to improve the numbers of instructors and examiners available in Yachting Association affiliated organisations is being implemented.
- (2)
 - (a) In 1986 the practical segment was an integral part of the theory course and was done by approximately 149 students;
 - (b) in 1987 approximately 589 completed the practical component. By end of 1987 it was found that this was not a practical way to conduct the course as it was expensive in resources and financially. It could not cater for non metropolitan students and in general it lacked flexibility; and
 - (c) in 1988 approximately 100 completed the practical segment. However, this year training availability has increased and so far approximately 100 candidates have qualified.

Certificates issued:	1987	525;	
	1988	103;	and
	1989	32	to date.

WATER POLICE - MARINE RESCUE OPERATIONS

88. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) How many marine rescue operations were carried out by the Water Police during each of the following -
 - (a) 1986;
 - (b) 1987; and
 - (c) 1988?
- (2) Can he advise on the number of people involved in such rescues who were in charge of the vessel and who were qualified by examination to act as master of such a vessel?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1)
 - (a) 70;
 - (b) 145; and
 - (c) 242.
- (2) Water police vessels are always manned by personnel who have passed the Marine and Harbours examination under the Western Australian Marine Act and regulations. Documentation/statistics are not kept indicating whether the person in charge of the rescued vessel is qualified. The only way to determine this is to check each incident report against the Department of Marine and Harbours' computer reading. This would take considerable time and would require cooperation from the Department of Marine and Harbours. The experience of the water police section indicates that about 80 per cent of marine rescues involve pleasure craft which are manned by unqualified persons.

ROTHWELLS LTD - MEETING 20 OCTOBER 1988

Premier - Legal Adviser Request

89. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Did the Premier request a lawyer from the Crown Law Department or some other Government instrumentality to act as his legal adviser at the meeting he attended at the offices of Rothwells on Thursday, 20 October 1988?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The reasons for, and circumstances surrounding, the meeting have been the subject of extraordinary parliamentary and media discussions.

MOTOR VEHICLES - TRUCKS
A Class Licence - Test Requirements

90. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

What written/practical test/s are required by the holder of an A class licence in order to obtain a licence to drive a truck over 4 350 kilograms?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The following requirements apply -

- (a) A standard written test on the road rules;
- (b) an oral theory test which focuses on provisions relative to heavy vehicles; and
- (c) a practical driving test to assess the applicant's driving skills in a vehicle with an aggregate weight exceeding 4 350 kilograms.

MOTOR VEHICLES - DRIVERS' LICENCES
Tests - Points Requirement

91. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) For a person to obtain a motor vehicle driver's licence, how many points are required?
- (2) Has the number of points been varied in the past 12 months?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) The question asked by the member is ambiguous. However, if the points to which he refers relate to the number of questions on the road rules required to be answered correctly to obtain a driver's licence, the following applies -

Class A driver's licence: Motor car -

A minimum of 26 from 30 questions must be answered correctly from a standard written test.

Class B and C driver's licence: Motor wagon -

A minimum of 28 from 30 questions must be answered correctly from a standard written test. Further, a minimum of eight from 10 oral questions specifically related to heavy vehicles must be answered correctly.

Class F driver's licence: Omnibus -

A minimum of 28 from 30 questions must be answered correctly from a standard written test. Further, a minimum of eight from 10 oral questions specifically related to passenger vehicles must be answered correctly.

Classes L, M, N and K driver's licence: Motorcycles -

A minimum of 26 from 30 questions must be answered correctly from a standard written test. Further, a minimum of 13 from 15 written questions specifically related to motorcycles must be answered correctly.

- (2) The police licensing division is currently reviewing the pass rates for the theory tests relative to the issue of drivers' licences.

MOTOR VEHICLES - DRIVERS' LICENCES

Interstate Driver Requirements

92. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

Is a licensed interstate driver required to undertake a written/practical driving test in order to obtain a Western Australian driver's licence?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Persons holding a driver's licence within another State may obtain a Western Australian driver's licence of the equivalent class when they reside in this State subject to passing the appropriate theory test on the road rules. A practical driving test is not required.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING - MARKETFORCE PTY LTD

Air Time and Print Media - Cost

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

I refer to his answer to my question without notice of 4 April 1989 and ask what was the amount spent on air time and print media via Marketforce Pty Ltd during the second part of 1988 and early 1989 on -

- (a) the care and respect program aimed at seniors;
- (b) the family strategy;
- (c) the Dowding Government's law and order package; and
- (d) the Rural and Industries Bank program of reassurance featuring Mr David Fischer and Mr Des Guilfoyle?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| (a) | Television: | \$155 904 |
| | Press: | \$ 13 040 |
| (b) | Television: | Nil |
| | Press: | \$ 28 078 |
| (c) | Television: | \$405 806 |
| | Press: | \$ 33 513 |
| (d) | The Rural and Industries Bank does not allow advertising expenditure to be revealed. | |

ELECTORATES - WHITFORDS

Balcatta - New Enrolments

94. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) In each of the electorates of -

- (a) Whitfords; and
- (b) Balcatta

how many new enrolments were accepted in each of the months of -

- (i) October 1988;
 - (ii) November 1988;
 - (iii) December 1988; and
 - (iv) January 1989?
- (2) Were each of these new enrolments sent notice of acceptance of his/her application?
- (3) If so, how many of these notices were returned by Australia Post as not being known or resident at that address?

- (4) What action was taken to check that these new enrolments did in fact live at such addresses?
- (5) On how many of each of these new enrolments was action taken -
 - (a) by that person; or
 - (b) by house to house visits by persons authorised by the Electoral Commission?
- (6) When was a door to door check last made for portion or each of these electorates to check electors resident at each address?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

As the member's question is relevant to the joint Commonwealth-State electoral enrolment agreement, some of the information to answer the question will have to be obtained from the Australian Electoral Commission. The Electoral Commissioner for Western Australia, Les Smith, is coordinating the compilation of the information; and I will give the member an answer in writing in due course.

RESTRAINING ORDERS - APPLICATION PROCEDURES

96. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Attorney General:

- (1) What is the usual procedure that has to be followed by an individual who wishes to obtain a restraining order against another person?
- (2) Can such a restraining order be obtained on a public holiday?
- (3) If so, what procedure has to be followed?
- (4) If (2) is no, will the Attorney undertake consideration of a service whereby a restraining order can be obtained on a public holiday, given the difficulty that can be caused for a person who feels threatened by another, but who is unable to take out a restraining order because the usual service is closed?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Procedures for restraining orders may be initiated by a police officer or an individual completing a standard complaint form. Assistance to the public is provided by court officers and urgent matters can generally be listed at short notice for consideration by a court.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) No. A restraining order is designed to prohibit certain conduct. It cannot prevent it. A person who genuinely feels threatened should seek the assistance of police officers.

ARTS, DEPARTMENT FOR - "ANGRY UNDIES" EXHIBITION *Sponsorship*

97. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for The Arts:

- (1) Is it correct that the Department for The Arts has sponsored or supported the "angry undies" exhibition held over the weekend of 1 and 2 April 1989?
- (2) What was the nature of the support or sponsorship?
- (3) How many applications for support or sponsorship have been rejected in the past three months?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Not specifically. The organising group, Artemis Women's Art Forum, receives assistance towards administration, program support and the Arts Resource Officer's salary.

- (2) Grant of \$13 000 to Artemis Women's Art Forum was made for 1989 as outlined above.
- (3) Eighty-two.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS - MULAN ABORIGINAL CORPORATION
Accounts - Payment Delays

98. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the undue delay in payment of accounts being experienced by creditors of the Mulan Aboriginal Corporation of Lake Gregory via Halls Creek?
- (2) Will she advise on the reasons for these delays?
- (3) What action has been taken to alleviate the delays and have the creditors been paid?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(3)

The member should refer questions concerning the operations of privately incorporated organisations to the organisations concerned.

ROTHWELLS LTD - FERRIER, MR IAN
Minister for Budget Management - Insolvency Discussions

99. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) Did the Minister meet with or discuss with Mr Ian Ferrier matters relating to or touching on the insolvency of Rothwells prior to the appointment of Mr Ferrier as the provisional liquidator of the Rothwells group of companies?
- (2) If yes, on how many occasions and what was the nature of the discussions or meetings?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No. To the best of my recollection I have never met Mr Ferrier.
- (2) Not applicable.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MEREDITH, NICHOLAS - PAROLE
Eligibility

61. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Corrective Services:

I refer to a question without notice directed to the Minister for Corrective Services some days ago to which he promised to reply in writing. I thank him for his reply. My question dealt with Nicholas Meredith, the person held responsible for the death of the taxi driver, Mr Tan. The Minister for Corrective Services advised me that Nicholas Meredith would be eligible for parole on 14 June 1989.

Does this mean that Nicholas Meredith, if he has behaved himself, will automatically be released?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I cannot from memory confidently answer that question. I think I could bypass it by saying that it actually calls for a legal opinion because the Offenders Probation and Parole Act provides some circumstances in which parole is automatic at a particular time and other circumstances where the Parole Board has to give consideration to the case before parole is available. Certainly one of the categories of offence requiring the Parole Board to consider the issue involves serious assault convictions, but that does not necessarily conclude the question, as from memory there is a linked

requirement in respect of the length of the original sentence. I think in all the circumstances that it would be better that I do not rely on my memory but undertake, as I did last time, to obtain a specific response for the honourable member. I will do that as soon as I can.

MEREDITH, NICHOLAS - PAROLE

Government Appeal

62. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Corrective Services:

Bearing in mind that we are discussing the possible parole of Nicholas Meredith on 14 June, could the Minister for Corrective Services advise me whether the Government is able to make an appeal or representation against parole being granted in view of the public outrage?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

That question is actually linked to the previous one and I will take both matters into consideration together.

WHEAT - RAILWAY TRANSPORT

State Laws - Federal Export Powers, Overriding Proposal

63. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Attorney General aware of last night's announcement that the Hawke Government would use claimed constitutional powers to override States' regulations touching on the transportation, handling and storage of wheat?
- (2) Without canvassing the merits or demerits of the proposal on wheat deregulation, will the Attorney General tell the House whether he was consulted or forewarned by the Commonwealth on the constitutional issues involved?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

I did not get all those questions down. To the extent that I grasped them, I think the answer to both of them is no. I am trying to convey by that answer that I was not consulted on the question and was not aware of the position. However, I would not expect to be because - although Hon Phillip Pendal is good enough to add responsibility for intergovernmental affairs to the ones I actually am responsible for - I think he is in error in that.

Hon P.G. Pendal: It is just that we never receive any answers to the ones you are responsible for.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: But at least Hon Phillip Pendal gets a good try.

MINISTER FOR BUDGET MANAGEMENT - RESPONSIBILITIES

Office of Government Accommodation - Members' Offices

64. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Budget Management:

I thank the Minister for Budget Management for circulating the list of Acts for which he is responsible.

In respect of his responsibility for the Office of Government Accommodation, does that apply to the accommodation of Government departments as well as such things as members' offices and other buildings purchased by the Government?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

Yes.

MINISTER FOR BUDGET MANAGEMENT - RESPONSIBILITIES

Office of Government Accommodation - Curtin House Purchase

65. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Budget Management:

Is the Minister's department responsible for the purchase of Curtin House?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Office of Government Accommodation is not a department. Perhaps I should make that clear in the first place. It is an office currently combined with the Building Management Authority, although arrangements in that respect are likely to be reviewed. The office is responsible to the Government Accommodation Board, which is a subcommittee of Cabinet. My recollection is that the decision to purchase Curtin House was made by the Government Accommodation Board, although it would have had to go through other budgetary processes to get approval for the funds involved.

CURTIN HOUSE - GOVERNMENT PURCHASE

Details Tabling

66. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Budget Management:

Would the Minister table the details of the purchase of Curtin House by the Government?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

If the honourable member would care to provide some detail as to what he has in mind in terms of details such as price, vendor and so on, I would be happy to accommodate him.

CURTIN HOUSE - GOVERNMENT PURCHASE

Vendor and Purchaser - Price

67. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Minister for Budget Management:

Who was the vendor and who was the purchaser, and what was the price?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I will provide that information to the honourable member.

BEATTY PARK - FUTURE

Perth City Council Meeting - Invitation

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

Has the Minister been invited to a meeting of the Perth City Council, which is to be held tomorrow evening, regarding the future of Beatty Park?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

No, I am not aware of an invitation at this stage.

BEATTY PARK - FUTURE

Perth City Council Meeting - Proposal

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

Does the Minister know what proposal regarding the future of Beatty Park will be put to the meeting?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Further to a question of this nature asked last week by another member, I remind the House that I am not responsible for Beatty Park. It is a matter of responsibility for the Perth City Council.

SWIMMING - WORLD SWIMMING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Superdrome and Organisers - Stalemate

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

Will the Minister explain the statement in the Press this evening regarding the stalemate between the Superdrome and the organisers of the world swimming championships?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

That article is grossly inaccurate. I understand that Mr Craig McLatchy who is the executive officer working for Australian Swimming has refuted it. I am not in a position to say anything except that, in my negotiations with

Australian Swimming, we have relied heavily on Australian Swimming's technical officer for the technical data related to the provision of pools. The proposed pools at the Superdome will be constructed to his standard and, consequently, to FINA's standard.

As far as I am aware, FINA International and Australian Swimming are more than happy with the proposed pools.

ROTHWELLS LTD - CORPORATE AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Inquiry - Pre Collapse

71. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Attorney General:

I have been reliably informed that the interim report of the National Companies and Securities Commission reveals that it has been investigating the affairs of Rothwells almost constantly since July 1987. It appears that the WA Corporate Affairs Department has been investigating Rothwells only since its collapse in November 1988. I ask -

Did the Corporate Affairs Department conduct an investigation prior to the Rothwells collapse; that is, prior to November 1988?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

As I have made clear in recent days, the interim report of the NCSC has been regarded as not suitable for publication by seven of the eight Australian Attorneys General. The Chairman of the Ministerial Council on Companies and Securities has also indicated that he has asked the NCSC and the special investigator to consider an appropriate redraft of the report which would be suitable for tabling. Pending some finality on that latter question, the report has to remain confidential. When we have passed that point, the question the member has asked will become clear and I will be happy to address it further.

ROTHWELLS LTD - CORPORATE AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Inquiry - Pre Collapse

72. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Attorney General:

I accept the comment that the Government considers the interim report of the NCSC as confidential at this time. However, the Attorney General did not answer the last part of the question which was -

Did the Corporate Affairs Department conduct investigations prior to the Rothwells collapse in November 1988?

I do not consider that that touches on the confidentiality of the NCSC's report but rather deals with matters under the Attorney General's portfolio.

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I do not know. In the normal course of events, I am not kept in touch with the regular activities of the Corporate Affairs Department, especially in relation to matters involving investigations where the department acts as the delegate of the NCSC.

Hon G.E. Masters: So you did not direct any investigation?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I do not believe I have ever directed an investigation. It is not my role to do so.

I was making the point that, on the question of investigations, our department acts as the delegate of the NCSC and it could well be the case, for example, that, if and when the NCSC says it was investigating a matter at a certain date, it could have done that either through our department or in conjunction with our department.

Hon G.E. Masters: It would request your department to do certain things?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Either request or direct. The NCSC is in a position to direct the department to act in certain ways where the department operates as a delegate of the NCSC.

Returning to the initial question, I do not know the answer. However, I have to repeat myself and suggest that it would be preferable not to go too far with these questions pending the finalisation of a decision on the report.
