



WESTERN AUSTRALIA

**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

**(HANSARD)**

THIRTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT  
FOURTH SESSION  
1996

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 26 September 1996

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 26 September 1996

---

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

## **PETITION - SENIORS' MOBILITY PROGRAMS, FUNDING WITHDRAWAL**

**DR WATSON** (Kenwick) [10.02 am]: I present the following petition -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned residents of Western Australia are dismayed that the Government is withdrawing funding from the seniors' mobility programs. The men and women who are referred by their doctor to participate are able to keep fit and well, saving costs in the health care system. We urge the Government not to defund this sensible and practical initiative.

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

The petition bears 63 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 152.]

## **PETITION - RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS, COOLBINIA AND MENORA**

**DR HAMES** (Dianella) [10.03 am]: I present the following petition -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, strongly support the continued operation of the restrictive covenants in Coolbinia and Menora which prevents unit development and protects the pleasant environment we currently enjoy. We call on the State Government to strongly support any measures to protect or enhance these covenants.

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

The petition bears 25 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 153.]

## **PETITION - WESTRAIL, PENSIONERS' FREE TRIP, RESTRICTIONS**

**DR WATSON** (Kenwick) [10.04 am]: I present the following petition -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled.

We, the undermentioned people of Western Australia object to the Court Government's decision to restrict pensioners from taking their one free Westrail trip over Christmas and New Year when family reunions are so important. We also object to the restrictions on free travel at Easter and during school holidays.

We call on the government to immediately cancel the restrictions on this one free travel pass per year and to restore the choice to pensioners to travel at a time that suits them and their families.

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

The petition bears 90 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 154.]

## **PETITION - BREAST CANCER RESEARCH, FUNDING**

**MRS van de KLASHORST** (Swan Hills) [10.05 am]: I present the following petition -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned note:

#### BREAST CANCER: AN AUSTRALIAN EPIDEMIC

Breast cancer is the most serious malignancy affecting women. It is one of the most commonly diagnosed cancers in Australian women today.

Breast cancer is one of the leading causes of death in women ages 35 to 60.

There is an average of 683 new cases of breast cancer annually in Western Australia. One in four women with breast cancer dies within the first five years; 40% die within 10 years of contracting the disease.

The incidence of breast cancer among Australian women is rising each year at the rate of 3/3%. In 1960, 1 woman in 20 could expect to be diagnosed with breast cancer in a lifetime; today 1 in 13 faces that threat.

We do not know what causes breast cancer, how to cure it or what to do to prevent it. For two decades under funded research has focused on detection and treatment, rather than cause and prevention; and current methods of detection, physical examination and mammography, are imperfect at best. Funds for research are of an urgent need.

Depending on the quality, mammography fails to detect as much as 20% of all breast cancers, and recent studies show that it may fail to detect as much as 40% of breast cancers in women under the age of fifty.

#### ALL WOMEN IN AUSTRALIA ARE AT RISK OF CONTRACTING BREAST CANCER

We therefore call upon the Legislative Assembly to ensure that the Western Australian State Government to increase its contribution to Breast Cancer Research from \$0 to \$2 million per year for ten years to fight against this disease. There are so many families already suffering from the effects of breast cancer, it is imperative that the issue of research into the causes, prevention and cure be addressed with urgency.

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

The petition bears five signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 155.]

#### PETITION - RULED INADMISSIBLE

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Clarko): The petition that was just presented by the member for Dianella includes several pages which are photocopies and therefore are inadmissible.

#### WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION - METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME DOCUMENT, PAGES INSERTION

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Clarko): I have received a request from the Western Australian Planning Commission to add pages 55 to 73 to volume 3 "Transcripts of Public Hearings Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment No 977/33 North West Corridor Omnibus (No 2)". These pages were omitted from the volume tabled in the House on 17 September 1996. Accordingly, under the provisions of Standing Order No 233 I advise the House that I have authorised the pages be inserted.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - DEPUTY PREMIER

##### *Technology Precinct Task Force, Report Tabling*

**MR COWAN** (Merredin - Minister for Commerce and Trade) [10.09 am]: Members will be familiar with the Bentley Technology Park, now the most successful of all Australian technology parks. The park's surrounding areas contain a diverse range of facilities and organisations covering residential housing, research and development, manufacturing industry, government, education, recreation, social and community organisations.

The potential to develop synergies between these facilities, organisations and the local community has led to the investigation of the concept of a technology precinct based around Technology Park. A first stage evaluation of the concept was completed in 1993 by Murdoch University's Institute of Science and Technology Policy for the State Government's Technology and Industry Advisory Council.

In February 1995 Cabinet supported the establishment of a Technology Precinct Taskforce to investigate further the feasibility of the precinct concept. The task force examined the promotion of economic development through growth in new technology, facilitating technology transfer mechanisms and capitalising on the extensive public assets of the precinct. The task force was chaired by Emeritus Professor John de Laeter and membership was drawn from all sectors represented in the area. Representation was further expanded through the establishment of a number of subcommittees. During the report preparation phase, the task force endeavoured to keep all stakeholders informed by holding two public forums and conducting briefings with local councils and community groups.

I will be releasing the report to the public at a function at Technology Park this evening for a six week period of public comment. After the public comment is received, the report, incorporating those comments, will be presented to Cabinet for a decision. The Government has set aside \$4m in 1996-97 through to 1998-99, should the decision be made to proceed with the development of the precinct.

Finally, I would like to thank Emeritus Professor de Laeter and all the task force and subcommittee members for their commitment and time given to developing this report. I table the report of the findings of the technology precinct task force.

[See paper No 553.]

### **SKELETON WEED AND RESISTANT GRAIN INSECTS (ERADICATION FUNDS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR COWAN** (Merredin - Deputy Premier) [10.10 am]: On behalf of the Minister for Primary Industry, I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to establish a fund to assist with the eradication, prevention and spread of plant diseases. It will also enable assistance to be provided to growers of grain or seed crops that are destroyed in the course of action taken to eradicate or prevent the spread of specified plant diseases. The main necessity for the proposed amendments stems from the recent outbreak of the fungal disease anthracnose which has been found in lupin crops in the northern grain belt of Western Australia.

Although albus lupins are the most susceptible to the disease, and have been the most affected, adjoining narrow leaf lupin crops have also become slightly infected. The narrow leaf lupin forms the basis of the Western Australian lupin industry and it is over this species that the greatest overall threat looms for the future.

The lupin industry is worth \$200m a year and rapid action has been taken to protect this important rural industry, which I might add has been developed in Western Australia by Western Australians. The response to control the spread of the disease has been to inspect thoroughly and destroy by ploughing severely infected crops under the direction of Agriculture Western Australia. This has been achieved by using the provisions of the Plant Diseases Act 1914.

I have been greatly encouraged by strong grower and industry support for a voluntary levy to provide some assistance to growers of lupins affected by this disease. The Grain Pool of Western Australia has agreed to collect this voluntary levy from harvest payments on lupins delivered to the 1996-97 season pool as well on lupins sold under permit. Eligibility for, and levels of, assistance to be paid under this voluntary scheme to affected growers will be determined by an industry committee specifically established for the task.

In addition, there is a need for a fund to be established legislatively to ensure Grain Pool advances are repaid, and to cater for future situations that may require a similar response to ensure the control of plant diseases in the grain industries. The most appropriate mechanism to ensure the advance of the Grain Pool is repaid is the present Skeleton Weed and Resistant Grain Insects (Eradication Funds) Act 1974. Under this Act contributions may be collected from growers for the control and eradication of skeleton weed and resistant grain insects.

The amendments I now bring before the Parliament will establish a separate plant diseases eradication fund to be administered by the Agriculture Protection Board. To achieve this, the Skeleton Weed and Resistant Grain Insects (Eradication Funds) Act 1974 will be amended and retitled the Plant Pests and Diseases (Eradication Funds) Act. These amendments widen the provisions of the Act to allow similar collection and use of funds for the control, eradication and payment of assistance relating to specified disease and particular crop type.

The new fund will provide for the collection of fees from all growers of a crop type affected by a disease that requires destruction of the crop to facilitate the control of the disease. The declaration of this disease will be approved by the Minister in consultation with the industry. Additionally the amendments ensure collected funds cannot be used for

different purposes; that is, funds collected for skeleton weed and resistant grain insect control may be used only for that purpose. Funds collected under these amendments may be used for only specified grain disease control purposes.

The Bill is consistent with the objective of encouraging industry self-reliance as all funding will be provided by the affected grain growing industry. There is urgency attached to getting these amendments in place to provide certainty to producers for assistance and to the Grain Pool for repayment of its reserves under the temporary arrangement. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Ms Warnock.

### **RESERVE (No. 18039) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR KIERATH** (Riverton - Minister for Lands) [10.14 am]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is similar in intent to many others that have been brought before the House to obtain Parliament's approval to vary A class reserves. This Bill deals with A class reserve 18039, which has a purpose of recreation and is vested in the City of Subiaco. The area is known locally as Market Square. The reserve is located within the Subiaco redevelopment area which is administered by the Subiaco Redevelopment Authority.

Scheduling for part of the redevelopment program requires the authority to let a tender for the construction of an underground railway and station towards the end of 1996. The reserve is part of an area south of the railway line which is required to provide, firstly, sufficient area to undertake construction of a temporary track south of the existing alignment; and, secondly, an area for stockpiling and storage of rail materials, sleepers, ballast and equipment associated with temporary track work.

For the authority to let a tender it needs to have control of the reserve. Although the City of Subiaco has agreed to relinquish control of the reserve to the Subiaco Redevelopment Authority, the reserve purpose needs to be changed to accommodate the requirements of the authority. Having regard to the time constraints involved, the agreement reached with the City of Subiaco and the need not to delay unduly the redevelopment program, action is necessary to cancel the class A classification of reserve 18039 and change the purpose to "use and requirements of the Subiaco Redevelopment Authority". Subject to the approval of both Houses of Parliament, the authority may then proceed to use the land contained in the reserve. Following the relocation of the railway line, the authority is to investigate further the future disposition of the land contained in the reserve in consultation with the City of Subiaco. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Ms Warnock.

### **FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading - Deferral*

**MR C.J. BARNETT** (Cottesloe - Leader of the House) [10.18 am]: I move -

That Order of the Day No 3 be postponed until a later stage of this day's sitting.

Dr Gallop: What a disgrace!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No. I wish to explain the situation. The amendment Bill is ready and has been printed. The Minister for Police is concluding some comments in the second reading speech. Significantly - I understand this is unprecedented - when the legislation is presented, hopefully early this afternoon, the Minister will present not only the amendment Bill but also a consolidated firearms Bill, including all the amendments so that it can be easily understood, as well as all the regulations. The entire package will be presented. The printing of the consolidated Bill and the regulations is being undertaken this morning and they will be brought into this Parliament as soon as they are printed.

**MR RIPPER** (Belmont) [10.19 am]: For months the community has been awaiting this Government's response to the national consensus on uniform gun control. The Premier promised to introduce this Bill before 1 October - the deadline has been known for a very long time. This is the last day by which that deadline can be met. Despite all those months in which we and the rest of the community have been waiting, the Government has not been able to get the legislation here at the usual time.

The Leader of the House has given us an explanation about a consolidated Bill being presented. Of course, modern computer technology makes that very easy. I do not think that is a satisfactory explanation for the delay. Yesterday

in question time we asked the Minister for Police whether there had been a cave-in to National Party diehards on aspects of this legislation. He denied that, but this event leads me to suspect there is division within the coalition on this question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member that this is a motion about postponing the Bill. I ask him to relate his remarks to that matter.

Mr RIPPER: I am arguing that the reason the Leader of the House has moved this motion is not the one he has given to the House; it is that there has been division inside the coalition on this question. The division has delayed the drafting. Last minute changes have been made to the legislation, and it is not ready in time to meet the Premier's deadline.

We are way behind the other States, as legislation has been introduced in all other States. When will that second reading speech be made to the House? When will the House see the legislation? Will it be before question time?

Mr C.J. Barnett: It will be presented when it is ready.

Mr RIPPER: The speech and the Bill will not be ready before question time. Therefore, the Opposition will not have an opportunity to ask questions of the Minister for Police during the last question time before a significant parliamentary break. Had the Bill been introduced at the expected time, we would have had an opportunity to study it and at least ask a question or two of the Minister for Police before a significant parliamentary recess. It betrays division in the Government ranks or, at best, incompetence.

Question put and passed.

## **EAST PERTH REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Resumed from 25 September.

**MRS ROBERTS** (Glendalough) [10.22 am]: I refer to a significant instance in which a private landowner has been treated very differently regarding the number of units and the density allowed on that property from the East Perth Redevelopment Authority's allowance on its own property. This case relates to the conflict between the planning and development powers of the authority. I cite the example so the Parliament knows it is not only hearsay that people are being treated differently by the authority. I will detail the one example. At location 19 Wickham Street the owner had R160 zoning.

Mr Lewis: What does this have to do with the Bill?

Mrs ROBERTS: I know the Minister is sensitive about this issue as he supported the authority in denying the property owner's opportunity to develop to the R160 level. The authority said it would approve her proposal if she kept to a maximum of 10 dwellings in accordance with the dwellings density envisaged for the area under the East Perth redevelopment scheme. In the early stages, this was dated 17 February 1994, the authority was already telling people with existing R160 zoning that they would not be allowed to develop to that potential. Eventually a compromise was reached in that instance. She received more than the R100 zoning, but less than the R160. Advertisements have appeared in the newspaper in this regard. I have alluded to the one of 17 August of this year regarding the development of lot 29, North Cove of some 897m<sup>2</sup>. The development has been put out to tender with the potential for 14 units, which equates to R160. This example highlights the conflict between the authority's planning and development roles. This is not the only instance of the authority using the averaging principle, one not used by other local government authorities when putting their property out to tender, to maximise the dollar returns. At the least it is ironic that the Minister who permitted this to happen alluded in the passing of the East Perth Redevelopment Bill to this conflict between the planning and development roles. It seems that now, as the responsible Minister, he has taken an entirely differently attitude.

Paragraph four of the Minister's second reading speech indicates that the city northern bypass project provides a similar opportunity for us to redevelop areas of Northbridge, which have been underutilised as a result of reservation for road purposes, with most of the land owned by the WA Planning Commission and Main Roads WA. The Minister is correct that the opportunity exists to redevelop those areas of Northbridge which have been under a planning blight for many years. The difficulty, again, is the way the Government is implementing this project.

The most recent example is the change in tune on the plan for the St Brigid's precinct. I understand the Catholic Church had seen the preliminary plan and was part of the consultation with the local community. The church was quite excited by the inner city renewal plan for the region. Part of that project was to turn St Brigid's convent again into to a primary school and to develop a church precinct with the church and the primary school because of the

vaunted inner city housing in the immediate region. Many years ago the area contained housing and a primary school. In fact, my grandparents were married in St Brigid's Church and they, among many others, lived in a vibrant community in that West Perth area. It is an exciting project to provide inner city housing in the west end of Perth.

One testament to the fact that such inner city housing projects work is the very successful Fini project in Northbridge, the opening of which I attended a couple of months ago. A number of houses have already been built in that area. As part of that plan, over the next 10 or 12 years the Catholic Church wanted to develop an inner city primary school as a feeder school to Trinity and Mercedes Colleges and to form part of a very nice precinct. This proposal is now fobbed off by the Government as only a concept plan. Its spokespersons indicate that the covering of the tunnel, and its western portal, which was to go about 30 metres beyond Fitzgerald St, will now be shortened. One might say, "What's the difference?" From a financial point of view, the difference is about \$170 000 or \$180 000 per metre for the shortening of the tunnel roof.

From any other point of view, be it aesthetic or the function of that precinct, it is a very significant change. Effectively, instead of the lid of the tunnel progressing most of the way down alongside the church, a significant part of it will be open. I do not see how an open trench running alongside the church, with the volume of traffic projected, will leave St Brigid's Church or the precinct viable. At best, that point is a matter of conjecture. Noise monitoring equipment is currently strapped to the side of the church. Claims have been made by government that once the tunnel is constructed there will be less noise than at present. That should not be a matter of conjecture - it should be secured. It is not sufficient to say that the agreed plan was just a concept plan, as it was not.

Mr Lewis: You don't know what you're talking about.

Mrs ROBERTS: To the best of my knowledge four options were presented to the local community. The plan for the tunnel extending some 30 metres beyond Fitzgerald St was not just one of the options; it was the concept plan agreed to with the community.

I had concerns about that plan, but I am also concerned about the shortening of the cover over the tunnel, which will result in a longer open trench. The Minister may say that I do not know what I am talking about, but he does not know what he is talking about. The Government does not know what impact the noise will have on St Brigid's Church. The Minister will be long gone. In five or 10 years it will not be his problem if people cannot conduct church, marriage or funeral services or if the prospect of a primary school at that location is not viable. It will not be any skin off the Minister's nose.

I am concerned that some of the promises made in the past regarding the impact of roads and freeways on residential areas have not been met.

Mr Lewis: What promises?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs ROBERTS: The traffic volume has increased. The Minister should settle down. I will come to that later.

Mr Lewis interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, the member has made it clear that she does not wish to respond to your interjections. The Minister knows that in those circumstances we strongly deter interjections.

Mrs ROBERTS: I know what I am talking about. The freeway cuts through my electorate. In one area of West Leederville, residences have been adversely affected by the freeway changes as a result of the northern suburbs railway cutting through the area. Promises were made regarding sound walls to protect the Homeswest development. The claim was that no-one would be worse off because land would be resumed. However, a number of houses close to the freeway in West Leederville have not had the problem satisfactorily addressed.

Mr Lewis: You don't care about these people. You are going to Midland.

Mrs ROBERTS: Undertakings were given to these people. It appears they have been pushed from one government agency to another. Representations were made to the Perth City Council regarding how far the sound wall would go and who would be responsible for it. The inevitable red tape between Main Roads, Homeswest and other authorities has resulted in people being shoved from pillar to post. In the end, the sound wall was not built to the extent indicated in the diagrams. I have written letters and raised questions in Parliament, and spoken to the residents. They have real concerns.

In Mt Hawthorn, in the vicinity of the freeway, residents are subject to very excessive noise levels. I have presented petitions and asked questions in this place. I have written to the responsible Minister asking for some protection for these residents in Mt Hawthorn. Anyone who uses the freeway from the northern suburbs will know that as they

approach the city on the left hand side, some residences are very close to the freeway. It is easy to say that some of these people purchased their homes subsequent to the freeway's establishment, and that others have known about that development for a long time. However, the sound levels have increased as the traffic volume has increased by many percentage points over the past 10 years.

The effect on people's way of life and general attitude, as a result of their sleep and daily lives being interrupted, is significant. Moves have been made in some of the more progressive areas in the Eastern States to protect residents from freeway noise. For St Brigid's Church the results of the Government's proposals will be dubious. People who claim to know something about noise levels say that the only way to protect a building or home is to build a sound wall close to the buildings concerned. The only way to protect St Brigid's Church, which is listed by the Australian Heritage Commission, would be to build a sound wall very close to it. Sound travels in much the same way as water. It travels up the side of the wall, over the top, and down the other side. Therefore, to protect St Brigid's, a wall would have to be built close to the church, and the sound would probably be dumped on the convent and other buildings. We would not want any kind of wall or construction close to the church, because the building has been heritage listed. Also, we would not want the noise dumped on the convent or any other buildings. The matter cannot be fobbed off. Scientific tests must be done to prove beyond all doubt that St Brigid's Church will be protected. It is not just any building. The church is very dear to the people who currently use it and to those who have held funeral services, christenings and other celebrations in the church in the past. It is important for future generations, because if we are committed to inner city housing, we need community support facilities for these people, such as community centres, churches and schools. For all those reasons, this matter should not be fobbed off lightly by the Minister. It needs proper and earnest consideration.

I am concerned that these shortcuts, in the name of saving money, are occurring at the beginning of the tunnel building process, and that community consultation which took place over the past couple of years has been shoved to one side as a mere concept plan, while the Government plunges ahead. We have witnessed this divide and conquer mentality as property owners have been bought out and have moved on to take up their lives and businesses elsewhere in the metropolitan area. The few remaining property owners and leaseholders have become the minority. It is a shame that this Government works in this way.

Much has not been resolved for the leaseholders along the route of the tunnel. I refer to people such as Harry Farrante, who has a seafood restaurant in Northbridge and who still has not received any undertakings about his future. I understand that he put a proposition to the Government, because his kitchen area is in the path of the tunnel. He wants to move the kitchen area forward into his restaurant. That will probably result in a loss of seating for up to 16 people. However, he wishes to come to an agreement with the Government, and perhaps fund that change himself, in return for some arrangement regarding a long term lease at that location.

Mr Lewis: He is a leaseholder.

Mrs ROBERTS: Yes. As a long term leaseholder -

Mr Lewis: He is not a long term leaseholder; he is a short term leaseholder.

Mrs ROBERTS: For how many years has he had the lease?

Mr Lewis: He has 15 months to run on the lease, and notice must be given to quit at a certain time. That notice has been exercised. That is how he took the lease in the first place.

Mrs ROBERTS: Has the Minister asked him to quit the premises?

Mr Lewis: He was told that the back of the property would be required.

Mrs ROBERTS: How long has he had the lease on the restaurant?

Mr Lewis: I do not know - for some years.

Mrs ROBERTS: I described him as a long term leaseholder. In saying that, I meant that he has had a lease there for a long time.

Mr Lewis: You meant to imply that the lease has a long time to run, when it has not.

Mrs ROBERTS: The Minister is wrong. I know his lease has only a short time to run; that is part of the reason that he is so concerned. The undertaking that was given during the community consultation process was that everyone would be accommodated.

Mr Lewis: He has been.

Mrs ROBERTS: Is the Minister telling me the matter has been resolved with Mr Ferrante?



Mr Lewis: I am not. You may be, but I am not. However, I know that the proper course of negotiation is still in train. What is wrong with that?

Mrs ROBERTS: It has not been resolved.

Mr Lewis: Why not stop your whingeing?

Mrs ROBERTS: I am saying that we are still at the stage where negotiations are taking place with both owners and leaseholders along that tunnel path, yet the bulldozers have started. We are finding that, little by little, these people are being divided and conquered; one by one, they are being dealt with.

There was an earlier proposal to amalgamate some of these leasehold sites, because the Government would achieve the greatest return by selling larger greenfields sites. That was rejected by the Northbridge community, because those of us who know anything about Northbridge know that it comprises very small lots and small shops and restaurants. There are not many large sites in Northbridge. Many of the owners of those small shops and businesses have ethnic backgrounds, and they regard those small shops and businesses as quite precious. They have not been willing to sell and allow those sites to be amalgamated into larger sites. That has been to the credit and benefit of Northbridge. One of the big protections for Northbridge in the last 20 or 30 years has been that because those many small sites have not been able to be amalgamated, it has not been possible to build the monstrosities that we see in the city and elsewhere in the metropolitan area. The character of Northbridge has been retained with single level and, at the most, double level buildings. That kind of streetscape is what makes Northbridge so attractive, and it is the kind of streetscape that the people who were consulted in the community consultation process want to retain. They want to retain small sites with the small, individual style businesses which add so much to the character of Northbridge.

In making these comments, I want to sound a warning to the people who are still in that negotiation process to stand their ground, not to be bulldozed by this Government, not to accept compromise, and to push ahead with their expectations. I hope that prior to any state election, they will get commitments from the Government about their future leases and the value of their properties. They should look very closely at the plans that were approved as part of that community consultation process and ensure that the Government keeps its word.

As recently as the last few weeks, the plan that is on display at the tunnel office in Northbridge has shown that the western end will be dealt with in accordance with the original agreed concept plan, not in accordance with the changes which have been made to that plan. If the Government does not stick to its principles at the start of the project, it does not augur well for the tunnel as it progresses along its path towards its end in East Perth.

The other concern that I signal is with regard to the operation of the East Perth Redevelopment Authority. It dealt recently with a proposal for a concrete plant in East Perth. I am pleased that the Minister has now rejected that proposal, but that site was offered to the company originally by the Government; that was its proposal for East Perth. It was rejected by the residents of East Perth, the City of Perth and the Town of Vincent. When the East Perth Redevelopment Authority met to discuss this project and make its recommendation to the Minister, it was not prepared to tell those affected residents, the councils or anyone other than the Minister what its recommendation was. The East Perth Redevelopment Authority is a public authority and is dealing with public money, and it should be open and accountable in its decision making. I do not see the need for this secrecy. I am not suggesting for a moment that the board meetings should be open to the public, but it should make public any decisions or recommendations that it makes to government. You would be aware, Mr Speaker, that this Government was elected on a platform of being open and accountable, and the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, as an authority dealing with public moneys, should operate in an open and accountable way. It should not be kept under the thumb of the Minister, where it is not able to speak out ahead of the Minister's decision about this matter.

I note also that when the Minister for Planning was in opposition, he made great play of the fact that the Perth City Council would have a community representative on the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, and he argued, quite successfully, that that representation should be increased from one representative to two representatives. The end result was that the Labor Government accepted two representatives from the City of Perth. During the 18 months that the commissioners were in place, two of the Court Government appointed commissioners acted on the board of that authority. In my view, that cut out a community viewpoint because those commissioners neither represented the East Perth community, nor had any long term interest in that area. In dealing with the City of Perth Restructuring Bill, it would have been a very simple amendment to ensure that proper community representatives filled those two positions during that time. The Minister's attitude in government is very different from his attitude when in opposition.

I note that in providing contract services for projects in those areas which are contiguous to the East Perth redevelopment area, certain checks and balances will be put in place. It is important, as the Minister has said, that those extensive planning and land resumption powers are not extended to projects in the city northern bypass area.

The Bill refers only to areas which are contiguous to the EPR area; it makes no reference to the city northern bypass project. Is the Minister considering any other areas to which the EPRA will provide contract services which are also contiguous to the EPR area, given that the northern city bypass area is not the only area that is contiguous to the EPR area?

I note also that the East Perth redevelopment will be subject to an agreement between the Western Australian Planning Commission, Main Roads and the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, and to approval by the Minister and the Governor. If that is not the case, I ask the Minister to clarify that. I understand the Governor will need to approve everything, project by project. I hope that as this occurs the Minister will inform the Parliament on a regular basis about any projects for which the EPRA is contracting services and which have been approved by the Governor.

**DR EDWARDS** (Maylands) [10.50 am]: As members will know, the East Perth redevelopment area lies on the edge of the business district of Perth. Although it has been there since the city began, in recent years it had fallen into a grave state of disrepair. However, all that changed with the East Perth Redevelopment Act in 1991 and the establishment of the East Perth Redevelopment Authority in 1992. Since then we can all have a sense of achievement about that site and be extremely proud of what is going on there. I was pleased last weekend to take some visitors there. One of the people had lived in the city as a young child and she was amazed at what has happened there - at the clean-up, at what has been done with the cove, at the landscaping around the area, and at the way what was once unattractive and polluted has been made attractive and a real asset to the city. There is no doubt that the East Perth redevelopment adds a real dimension to Perth and it is a part of Perth of which we can be extremely proud.

One of the features of the strategy that I am interested in is the idea of establishing an urban village. There is a call from people to get the sense of a village again. In East Perth that is being done magnificently. Members can be proud of the integrated, cleaned-up environment in East Perth that includes living facilities and access to public transport, and of the way the planning has been thought through so that people have the capacity to live and work in the same locality. I will be interested to see how it develops over time and whether it lives up to the vision at the outset.

There is no doubt that the development of this area is a catalyst for development in surrounding suburbs and a model for what can occur in other places, such as in my electorate of Maylands, where an opportunity exists for the redevelopment of the old claypit site. One of the things the East Perth redevelopment has been successful at is cleaning up a contaminated site. It is an interesting situation because it is a good example of development driving the clean-up. It has been done extremely well. When problems associated with the clean-up have been drawn to my attention, I have received good cooperation from the authority to explain to people who are worried about it exactly what is going on, where the contaminated material is being taken, and, as was a concern to my electorate, what the trucking routes were and what was in the trucks travelling along Guildford Road.

The redevelopment is a good example of the demand for housing and the commitment to do something about a degraded area driving the clean-up of a contaminated site. It highlights the need for the clean-up of other sites like this and the need for contaminated sites legislation. It is estimated there are about 1 500 contaminated sites in Western Australia. As pressure for housing in the city increases, there will be a call to develop more of these contaminated sites like the East Perth site. In this instance a special Act of Parliament was required to create the authority, and the authority has reasonable funding and has been committed to its task. The one body has overseen the development and has had the ability to oversee the clean-up.

Mr Lewis: And the planning. That is very important.

Dr EDWARDS: I agree, because planning underlies the whole process. The difficulty with other sites is that there is not a such a body and such a vision about how the clean-up and development should occur. That is where the need for contaminated sites legislation comes in. In some of the other contaminated sites in the city, such as Midland, there is the problem of people still buying homes next to the contaminated site, apparently unaware of exactly what the problem is. It is difficult to understand that although some people can buy homes and move in, at the same time others who want to move out because they are concerned about the health effects cannot get real estate people to list their homes for sale.

If this State had contaminated sites legislation, there would be much more transparency about this process and we would be able to put on titles of previously contaminated land a warning to the people who bought the land that the site was once contaminated but had been cleaned-up to particular standards. It concerns me that as pressure mounts to develop the other sites, if the overarching legislation is not in place, we will not have the planning to which the Minister referred and the redevelopment will not be done as well as is occurring in East Perth.

I turn to some environmental concerns I have in this area. I refer to the Minister's comments that the East Perth Redevelopment Authority will have the capacity to be the project manager for other projects in the area and on the

boundaries. In the context of that I refer to the city northern bypass and the Northbridge tunnel. One of the problems associated with the development of the tunnel is the air quality studies that have been done on it. In this instance, Main Roads appears to be the body that was overseeing the development, and an overseas company got the contract to do the studies on the air quality and the monitoring and modelling of the air quality.

Mr Lewis: That is true, but it was referred by a Western Australian consultant on the basis that the technology and, I suppose, the ability to do the work - the experience - was not here in Western Australia. The company has imported that technology and expertise to advise. It was not a direct contract to a company overseas; it went through a local professional office.

Dr EDWARDS: The difficulty I have is that I have obtained documents through the Freedom of Information Act and I have talked to a number of people, who I believe to be local, credible experts, who have pointed out a number of deficiencies in what was done. The first issue I take up with the Minister is his statement that the expertise is not available in Perth. We unquestionably have the expertise here. A certain person at Murdoch University is attached to the United Nations and does air quality work all over the world. He has an international reputation.

Mr Lewis: Yes, but he is not in consultancy.

Dr EDWARDS: Even within the Department of Environmental Protection are acclaimed international experts in this field.

Mr Lewis: It is not for the Department of Environmental Protection to critically analyse a project like that.

Dr EDWARDS: No-one is saying that it is critically analysing. I am saying that the work could have been done in-house and that the Minister's argument about the experts not being in Western Australia is false.

Mr Lewis: The EPA's job is to set the standards and then monitor the performance to those standards.

Dr EDWARDS: Certainly, but the Department of Environmental Protection has scientists who are already working on other air quality studies and who have the expertise to do it. Aside from those people, our community has scientists who have that capacity. It is sad that this is another example of the Government's resorting to going overseas to do this work when it could be done in this State.

Mr Lewis: It is fallacious for you to make that statement.

Dr EDWARDS: It is not. I have spoken to the experts. They have read the material. The expertise is in Perth.

Mr Lewis: The original contract was let to a Western Australian firm. That Western Australian firm has international connections and associations with other firms. It was its decision. It believed there was not the credibility or competence here to do it. It was the contractor that was appointed and it imported that expertise. Don't blame the Government.

Dr EDWARDS: The firm may well have imported the expertise, but the feedback I have is that the equipment that those people used to do their monitoring was outdated, and their results in turn were fed into the model. We in Western Australia, with our own air shed studies, have more modern equipment. We have moved on a whole step from the expertise of these international experts.

Mr Lewis: That is a matter of personal opinion.

Dr EDWARDS: It is not a matter of personal opinion; it is a matter of fact when we in Western Australia have modern, up-to-date equipment and do not rely on outdated equipment brought in by overseas companies. My argument is that if we had better project management, as has mostly occurred with the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, we would be getting a much better deal for Western Australians, a better environmental outcome and more work done locally.

That report indicates that the air pollution guidelines will not be exceeded, but the authors forget to mention world health standards. In fact, World Health Organisation standards will be exceeded when the Northbridge tunnel and the city northern bypass are in operation. Yes, there are a number of standards, and some of the high standards will not be exceeded, but some of the lower world health standards will be exceeded. We should be worried about that. It is not good enough to say that we are planning for transport needs into the next century, knowing that air pollution limits, which will fall over time, will be exceeded. I argue that if we were using more of our own local expertise, and if the Environmental Protection Authority had done the right thing and requested a formal environmental assessment of the project, local comment would have been made formally by that government body. Unfortunately it did not do that; therefore, we are relying on other people to point out the truth.

The report states that the air pollution levels will be higher at chimney stacks and portals. However, the report indicates that those two sites are not near residential areas so it is okay because there will be dispersion over an area. I dispute that and I want to know how the authors could give that guarantee so far into the future. How do we know that we can rely on their results, when those experts were using old equipment rather than the modern up-to-date equipment we have here? Even in the report they speak of uncertainties with this type of testing.

I was alarmed earlier this week when I received a copy of a journal put out by a British medical group of companies showing the most recent short term effects of air pollution in the European context. That was a coordinated study of air pollution across a number of European cities. It covered London, Paris and Helsinki and cities in the Netherlands, Poland and Greece, to name some. The findings from that journal are that health is affected by air pollution, even at below-standard limits. Those comments sound a warning and indicate that air pollution is a much more serious health problem than any of us have realised. It is criminal that the Minister is sitting on two reports, one of which is the photochemical smog report, which he has deigned to give out to 30 organisations on the basis that it be embargoed indefinitely, but which he will not present to Parliament.

Mr Lewis: That is nonsense. How can it not be public if it is given to 30 people?

Dr EDWARDS: The recipients initially had to sign an embargo until Tuesday, but then they were told there were problems and it was changed to be embargoed indefinitely. The Minister has been caught out.

Mr Lewis: If it has gone to 30 people, it is public.

Dr EDWARDS: Those 30 people have signed a piece of paper and they are not allowed to release the document.

Mr Trenorden: Have you not seen it?

Dr EDWARDS: I have not seen it; I wish I had. If the member for Avon has a copy, I hope he will leave it on my desk. I would love to see it.

Mr Lewis: I understand you can get it out of the EPA library.

Dr EDWARDS: No. If that were true I would have been there and read it months ago. That study has yet to see the light of day. Ozone levels and smog are shown in this report to cause health problems at lower levels. I was told in April that a second study, the haze study, would be released in two weeks. In May I was told that it would be out shortly. The latest news is that it will be out some time in November. The Minister has admitted that 75 extra deaths a year result from the haze caused by air pollution, but we have not seen that study. That raises another issue. The air quality study undertaken as part of the Northbridge tunnel did not examine what makes up haze. Particulate matter, which we know - the Minister for the Environment has told us - kills 75 people a year, has not even been considered as part of the Northbridge air quality studies.

Mr Trenorden: It is not killing people; it is participating in that process.

Dr EDWARDS: It is linked to their deaths.

Mr Lewis: Everyday in everyone's life things are linked to people's death.

Dr EDWARDS: The air quality studies show that the link is causal. That means that it is a cause. For medical scientists to say something is causal is a bit of an understatement. We have all been in select committee meetings where we have tried to get medical scientists to say something very strong, but they have been careful to say that something is "linked". However, recent literature indicates that the link between particulate air pollution and early deaths is causal. It is therefore fair to say that, as pointed out by the Minister for the Environment, 75 deaths a year are caused by air pollution. The pollution causing those deaths is particulate air pollution. When the Northbridge air quality studies were done, particulate matter was not investigated. I reiterate the point I made before: If we had used Western Australian experts, they would have examined particulate matter. The only things examined were carbon monoxide and the oxides of nitrogen. Although I acknowledge they should be considered, it is particulate matter that kills 75 people in this State and it has not even been examined. That is ludicrous. It shows that the management of this project is not being carried out adequately, certainly not to the standards of 1996.

Undoubtedly we are all very proud of the East Perth redevelopment. It is an excellent example of a cleaned up contaminated site. However, I warn the Minister that, based on the deficiencies we have uncovered, we will keep an eye on what happens with this Bill, particularly other developments outside that area that will come under the umbrella of the authority. We hope that improvements will be made and that in the long run we will have a site that we can be very proud of.

**MS WARNOCK** (Perth) [11.07 am]: This Bill will enable the East Perth Redevelopment Authority to manage the Northbridge urban renewal project for the Western Australian Planning Commission. It is a very small Bill that

allows the EPRA to provide contract services for projects and areas that are contiguous to its redevelopment boundaries, as the Bill puts it. Presently the authority cannot operate outside its own boundaries as provided under the East Perth Redevelopment Authority Act. However, with this amendment to the Act which established the authority, it will be able to do so. The Government considers the East Perth Redevelopment Authority the appropriate body to carry out work on Northbridge urban renewal. Some of us in this House have different views about how we might go about that Northbridge urban renewal. Nonetheless, there is no doubt that it is necessary and we agree that that renewal activity will benefit Northbridge.

In general I agree that the authority has done its work well. Like my colleague the member for Maylands, I am an admirer of the activity that has taken place in East Perth. I have been familiar with the East Perth area for many years and its history of being an inner city residential area and in later years an industrial area. As that became dilapidated and worn down it became obvious that something had to be done and in the late 1980s and early 1990s discussion about a possible urban renewal project took place under the previous Labor Government. As we know, in the early 1990s the East Perth Redevelopment Authority was established and this magnificent urban renewal project was begun. I will return to that fascinating period later.

It is interesting to know how this huge urban renewal project came into being.

First, I turn to more contemporary matters, particularly those which concern this Bill. It disturbed me a great deal when it became very obvious that the East Perth Redevelopment Authority had offered a piece of its land to Boral Concrete for a concrete batching plant in Summers Street, East Perth. Mercifully, the proposed batching plant has been knocked on the head by the Minister. This is one of the few times I find myself agreeing with the Minister; certainly, it was the right decision.

Mr Trenorden: Usually you are not a nasty person.

Ms WARNOCK: People keep telling me that. We should judge a person by his actions and I am afraid I am obliged to disagree frequently with the Minister.

What disturbs me about this instance is that the authority obviously thought it was all right to offer the land, which is on the edge of its territory and directly opposite a very pleasant residential area. It seemed to be a very bad idea and I wonder at the authority's wisdom in seeking to do that. I advise the House that the plans for the proposed concrete batching plant were not extremely well advertised and no big sign was erected in East Perth. There was a small notice in the local paper, but the local residents were not given official notice of the proposal. On being contacted by a group of the residents I became very active, as did many of the residents, and wrote letters to various Ministers, the authority and the local government authorities. I also attended the demonstration outside the EPRA's office on a recent Friday. It was the day of the most recent board meeting of the EPRA and the board was considering the merits of the proposed concrete batching plant in Summers Street. Dr Wally Cox, a man whom I admire and a very able head of the authority, spoke to the 80 or so protesters who congregated outside the authority. I understand that later on radio he said the plant would be there for only 10 years and it seemed a bit churlish to complain about a possible concrete batching plant causing pollution when the building of the northern city bypass would continue for about five years. When I heard that it seemed to me he was implying that things would be pretty bad in that area for at least five years while the bypass construction was taking place and he could not understand why a fuss was being made about a concrete batching plant. The implication of that conversation was not carried through because the Government apparently saw reason, as a result of the very vigorous efforts of the residents in that area who put up a most remarkable and energetic fight about the matter. The Government decided to knock back the proposed concrete batching plant in East Perth. It was a very bad idea in the first place and I am glad it has been recognised as such by the Government. Why even suggest something so astonishingly inappropriate in a residential area? Heavy industry and young children certainly do not mix. It should never have been on the agenda and I hope that sort of suggestion will not be made again.

From the early 1990s until now some quite remarkable work has been taking place in East Perth. I am sure everyone in Western Australia is aware of the work which has been going on, even those people who are not familiar with the East Perth area as a matter of course. The urban renewal, the building of the Claisebrook Inlet, the commencement of a residential area, the green gardens and public sculptures have made it into an extraordinarily beautiful residential area. As the local member, it is certainly my intention to make sure it stays that way. I certainly have no objection to the mixture of commercial and residential or even light industry and residential. A bakery can be quite pleasant. In my street there was a brewery for many years and it was not terribly noxious. However, heavy industry is totally inappropriate for a residential area and I certainly hope there will not be further suggestions of that kind for development in the East Perth area.

I am also a bit disturbed to find that having had one concrete batching plant knocked back, two others are to remain in the area.

Mr Lewis: Come on! It is an existing use.

Ms WARNOCK: The Minister should keep his churlishness to himself for a moment or two.

It seems a great pity to me that Pioneer Concrete (WA) Pty Ltd and CSR Construction Materials will apparently go ahead with improvements to their plants in East Perth. These plants are around the Claisebrook Road and Edward and Lord Streets area and I know they have long term contracts. I also know there is no chance of moving them on because the contracts were signed some years ago and they are long term. One of the great worries about the proposed batching plant in Summers Street was that while on the one hand the concrete company and some of the planners were saying that it was only for 10 years, on the other hand the residents were saying, "If it is for only 10 years what is to stop them applying for an extension for a few years after that." Unfortunately, the existing concrete plants have very long term contracts and will be there for some time. I and other residents will be watching to make sure that these plants carry out their activities in a proper way and that there are not excessive levels of pollution to distress residents who are moving into the area. It is okay for the Minister to say that they were set up when it was mostly an industrial area. That is true, but it is an area people are being encouraged to live in and it is not helpful to have these batching plants in the area. Let us hope that all the support for inner city living will not be in vain and residents will not be driven out by existing heavy industries or other heavy industries that might seek comfort from this and set themselves up in the inner city. An argument put to me by the Boral group was there were already two other companies there and there was no need to make a fuss about the proposed concrete batching plant. It was a very poor argument.

I repeat I am a great supporter of inner city living as are the present Government, the past Labor Government and the Perth City Council. We do not want heavy industry in the inner city. I certainly want to see urban renewal in the north of the city area, but there must be both sensitive and sensible developments. I am aware that these plants have been around for some time, but I hope they will be very conscious of their obligations under the environmental protection legislation. As they know they are operating in a different environment because of the growing residential population, I hope they will be very responsible and aware of their responsibilities to run a clean operation.

The Perth City Council tells me that it made it very clear when giving those two plants the go-ahead to refurbish that running a concrete batching plant is not a proper long term use of the land. I agree with that. I repeat: I will be watching to see how the two heavy industries manage to merge with the growing residential occupation of that area.

I will refer to one or two other things associated with the East Perth Redevelopment Authority's project. I will briefly look back on the debates which took place at the time of the launching of the project. I will refer also to the affordable housing question.

My federal colleague Stephen Smith and I spent a lot of time a year or two ago trying to pin this Government down on its commitment to the affordable housing component of East Perth housing. Under the Better Cities program with the previous Commonwealth Government, the State Government must provide a certain amount of affordable housing to give everyone in the community a right to share in the good things that have been provided by this huge government sponsored redevelopment. I am not talking about a private development, but one which has a large amount of government money in it. It is in the order of \$100m. Stephen Smith and I are still watching and wondering about this component. With the change in the complexion of the Government at a federal level and noting the rather disappointing view of public housing it has, it will be very interesting to see whether the commitment to affordable housing still stands. I certainly hope it does. I await an answer from the Government on that subject. It is important to remember that it is not an ordinary private development; it is an urban renewal, funded by the Government to the tune of approximately \$100m. It should benefit people of modest means as well as those who are well off.

In conclusion, I return to the beginning of the debate on the East Perth Redevelopment Authority and the launching of the development. My colleague the present member for Armadale was very involved as an upper House member in the debate at that time. The Minister for Transport at the time, Pam Beggs, said in the second reading debate in November 1990 -

The East Perth project is the largest urban renewal project ever to be proposed for Western Australia. The project aims to provide the catalyst for the revitalisation of East Perth by transforming an unattractive area of industrial land into a new urban community, attracting thousands of Western Australians back into the inner city to live, study, work and play.

She also referred to the objectives of the redevelopment. It is pleasing to see a number of years later that most of those objectives have come to pass. It has become an area where many people will seek to live because it has been so well developed by the East Perth Redevelopment Authority and the planners involved in that authority. When the present Deputy Premier spoke during the debate in November 1990, he said -

I suggest that the Swan Brewery and the East Perth redevelopment project . . . do not deserve the priority they have. What does deserve priority are those fundamental bread and butter issues such as schools, hospitals, roads and railways. All those things are what is important.

That is the argument I put to the Minister in regard to the Northbridge tunnel. The Deputy Premier also said -

The Government will never get its priorities right if it is prepared to give the East Perth redevelopment project and the Swan Brewery priority above those important bread and butter issues.

In another speech from *Hansard*, the member for Cottesloe said -

I am pleased to add my support to the East Perth Redevelopment Bill and, indeed, to the East Perth redevelopment project. I trust that the East Perth project will prove to be successful in revitalising what has become a degraded and neglected inner city area.

As the member for Perth representing that area, I am pleased to say that that has come to pass.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I hope you are aware that in my electorate there is probably the next best urban renewal, the Northbank development, on the old Anchorage site. Despite the history of politics, that is an excellent urban renewal.

Ms WARNOCK: It is an excellent development. I drive past it occasionally. There is an opportunity there similar to the opportunity that was offered in East Perth, although it is not such a large site.

I could say many other things about the East Perth redevelopment. However, I have said many of them in debates on the Northbridge tunnel; therefore I will let it be on this occasion. We support this amendment, but will watch very closely all of the developments in that area because they are of interest to people in my seat as they are of interest to people in the whole of Western Australia.

**MR KOBELKE** (Nollamara) [11.23 am]: In his second reading speech, the Minister for Planning alluded to the fact that the East Perth Redevelopment Authority and the project under its control and supervision has been an outstanding success. I will take up that point and provide qualifications. Many fine things have taken place in the redevelopment of East Perth. However, some things have not been done as well as they could have, and some things in the current project will not fulfil the promise which the project originally provided.

The project was first put forward by Terry Burke, the then member for Perth, who had a keen interest in ensuring that we made maximum use of an area which was degenerate, in which there were disused industrial sites, and which was so close to the city that it should have been providing facilities which would benefit the people in that area. The Burswood development during the 1980s provided a huge transformation of the other side of the river. That area, which was previously a rubbish tip, has become a fine gateway for people coming to Perth from the airport. The area has been landscaped and people can now relax and enjoy themselves in an area that has fine vistas across the river to the city. On the other side of the river is the area which is the core of the East Perth redevelopment project. The centre of the project is the old Claisebrook drain, which was derelict. At a function recently I met a gentleman who owned a company in that area that manufactured clay pipes. He said that, with the introduction of plastic piping and plumbing, his company did not have a big future. The value of the land was such that it was not worth his while recommitting to new technology.

Mr Lewis interjected.

Mr KOBELKE: As the Minister points out, there were problems with contamination. I will come to aspects of contamination in a moment.

The area goes back to the early days of white settlement in Perth. The cemetery on the hill is a part of this State's heritage. However, on the whole, the area was underutilised and was not achieving its potential. In the 1980s the Labor Government realised it had to do something to enhance the central city area by making the best use of that area. The thrust came later to give emphasis to inner city living. One of objectives for the authority was to provide housing in the area for people to enjoy a lifestyle which was different from the dominant form; that is, people living in the suburbs on their quarter acre blocks. It offers people a different lifestyle where they can be close to the centre of the city and enjoy the attributes that go with that form of urban development.

One of the problems with the current project is that this Government is not committed to affordable housing. The funding for the project was provided by the Commonwealth and State Governments. The Commonwealth funding was provided through the Better Cities program. I will not speak at length about that. However, one of the key components of that Better Cities program was to provide the necessary capital injection to undertake a major redevelopment such as this. The State would have found it difficult to put the necessary amount of capital upfront to redevelop the area if it had to rely solely its own resources.

Mr Lewis: It still contributed \$70m, with the Commonwealth contributing about \$30m.

Mr KOBELKE: The \$70m capital contribution from State sources will be largely picked up through the sale of the land, although not totally. The Commonwealth's \$30m was a straight injection without any need for that to be repaid. We must acknowledge the important role played by the Commonwealth in finding funds for this project. It is with some regret that I note the current Government has moved away from providing funding for that sort of urban infrastructure. The former State Government saw the potential for this area. The current Government, in opposition, was not so wholehearted in its support. Things were said, as the member for Perth has indicated.

Mr Lewis: That is not true. I supported it 100 per cent.

Mr KOBELKE: I did not say the Minister opposed it; I said that this Government, the then Opposition, was not wholehearted. The quote to which the member for Perth referred indicated that the now Government was a little critical and it thought we were giving it too high a priority.

Mr Lewis: I certainly did not.

Mr KOBELKE: Some members of this Government did not think it should be given the priority that it was by the former Labor Government. From what we have seen take place there so far, the hopes and the dreams that were put forward as being possible are starting to be realised.

I have become quite pessimistic about whether this Government will be able to deliver affordable housing. It is absolutely crucial that it be provided. I believe the quality of our urban environment rests on a whole range of issues. One issue that is quite crucial is that a range of different types of people live in a suburb, in a community. If a community becomes too homogenous, it will not work. I could give lots of examples, but I will touch on only one. Mirrabooka, a new suburb in my electorate, was established in what was basically sandhills. Young families, first home buyers, moved in. At a later stage of that development Homeswest built a number of aged pensioner units. That has led to the suburb blossoming. There is now a range of age groups living in the suburb, not simply first home buyers, young families and young children. The people who live in Mirrabooka perhaps do not have such a wide spread of income; they tend to be middle to lower income earners. It is also important to try to achieve that spread of income while at the same time considering the practicality of doing so.

In the East Perth development, I hope the Government tries to achieve some spread in the age range, but that is not to say that the number of families who have young children would be low. I know there are no plans to put a school in that area. However, we should ensure children will live in that suburb. I do not see how a community can be vibrant when no families with children live there, albeit they may be only a small percentage of the families who will take up residence in that area.

Similarly it is very important that people with a range of different incomes live in the area. There may be a bias towards people on higher incomes, people with capital assets, who can afford the prices of some of the places that are being built in East Perth. If the Government is driven only by maximising its return on the redevelopment, we will not end up with a quality environment in that community.

The original objective of ensuring affordable housing in the area is crucial. I hope the Government will give a commitment to providing more affordable housing, irrespective of the means it uses to do so. That whole area of state housing is in the throes of being changed, and I have some difficulty with those changes. Putting that aside, I hope the Government can find some form of affordable housing in that area for people on lower income.

I put to the Minister a proposal that was put to me recently. In an area such as East Perth, which is centrally located and close to services, it may be appropriate to ensure one or two projects provide housing for people with disabilities. All members will be aware of people who have been supported by their parents, and who are now in their thirties and forties. Their parents have reached their senior years and they are very concerned about who will look after their adult child when they are no longer alive or no longer able to look after the child. There is a pressing need on the Government - I must say the Government has made very genuine moves to address it - to ensure that an area like East Perth could easily provide land for several projects to cater for people with these special needs. The Subiaco Redevelopment Authority can also look at this matter. That is just one area where there is a specialised need for which the Government could provide what has generally been called affordable housing.

The Minister alluded to the problems that existed in the area with pollution and contamination due to the industries that have been located there, the key one being the old gasworks. A range of chemicals soaked into the soil, among them some that were carcinogenic. The cost of cleaning that up was a major problem faced by the former Labor Government. The current Government has solved that problem, and I congratulate it on doing so. I have some questions as to the methodology, but it seems to be a solution that has met the required standards.

Mr Lewis: The cutting edge of technology.



Mr KOBELKE: The Minister likes to use the in-phrase "cutting edge". The approach taken by this Government was different from the one looked at by the former Labor Government. This Government's approach was to change the basis on which the risk assessment was carried out. In a way I accept that because the experts have convinced me that it was quite an appropriate way to go. Because the risk assessment methods were changed, different technology could be used; therefore, it was possible to do something. It cost under \$20m, whereas the initial figures given to the former Labor Government suggested the clean-up could cost between \$60m and \$70m, which was prohibitive, to enable good use to be made of that land.

Mr Lewis: You never turned one sod of soil.

Mr KOBELKE: I do not accept the implication in the interjection from the Minister.

Mr Lewis: It is true.

Mr KOBELKE: The former Labor Government very carefully put together a quality development proposal, which was getting underway. If the Minister thinks he can score a cheap point on that issue, perhaps we can talk about the Subiaco Redevelopment Authority and how the time scale there has slipped out by not just months, but years, in terms of what was intended to happen. The costs have also blown out by a huge factor.

It is not easy to take on major redevelopment projects. The previous Government had adequate consultation with interested parties about the East Perth redevelopment. It did not run into the same degree of flak from the local community as the current Government is running into with the Subiaco proposal.

Mr Lewis: There were no people living there, that is why.

Mr KOBELKE: Instead of trying to score political points, the Minister might like to be a little more objective about the difficulties faced in getting these projects off the ground in a way that ensures people are listened to and there is community consultation.

I have been sidetracked from the point I was trying to make; that is, there were major problems with contamination of the area. Although it is not appropriate to go into the detail here, they have been addressed. That has meant that land can now be integrated into the urban development in that area to provide an enhancement to the central city area. Just by walking through the area, people can see the available opportunities and the huge improvement that has taken place in that urban environment. As I said, to achieve a living, vibrant community, an area of which we can be proud, we must look to the provision of affordable housing. I hope the Government will not see that matter as being of such a low priority that it simply lets it fall off the bottom of the list.

I am concerned about two other small issues, but perhaps I will have time to touch on only the first one. It relates to where the East Perth Redevelopment Authority has not achieved what I believe is the best possible outcome. I refer to the demolition of a property in Waterloo Crescent. The documents put out by the East Perth Redevelopment Authority clearly designate Waterloo Crescent as a heritage precinct. That is not to say that all the buildings have heritage value, but that the street has a history going back to the early days of white settlement and has a magnificent view over Gloucester Park, the WACA ground and the river. Although the East Perth Redevelopment Authority saw Waterloo Crescent as being a precinct of heritage value, it gave approval which led to a demolition order over two of the properties in that street.

Mr Lewis: Because they did not rate.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister should listen to what I say and not go off on a tangent. I said that the precinct, not individual houses, was seen as having heritage value.

The Minister knows the cases well. He was involved in the appeal when a person wished road entry access. This was rejected by the council on the basis that it would destroy the streetscape. The Minister on appeal granted street entry. I do not take issue with the Minister about that decision. The street entry was made in such a way - I assume in keeping with the guidelines and requirements laid down, I do not know the detail - that it was tasteful and did not destroy the streetscape. I do not have a problem with the Minister allowing the street entry to the property.

We find now that two of the properties in the middle of that group of houses have been demolished. That came about as a result of the mistake of the East Perth Redevelopment Authority. It was possibly a simple error which should never have happened. Unfortunately, it has undone the potential preservation of the heritage characteristics of the area.

Mr Lewis: That went to court, and the court found that the authority had acted responsibly. You ought to know that.

Mr KOBELKE: I was aware that it went to court, but I did not know the final decision. However, the person or people who took the case, in relation to the demolitions -

Mr Lewis: It was a neighbour's argument

Mr KOBELKE: Yes. It was because the neighbours genuinely felt that the streetscape had heritage value, and the East Perth Redevelopment Authority stated that view in some of its documents. Therefore, it was a mistake which should never have occurred. If there were consistency in the authority, it would not have given approval for the redevelopment. I do not say that the redevelopment should not have occurred, but it should have had conditions placed on it not to change the streetscape. Rear access to the blocks was available and redevelopment could have occurred without changing the streetscape.

This Bill will provide powers so the East Perth Redevelopment Authority can take on work on a contractual basis for the redevelopment of the area with the northern city bypass - the tunnel - on the northern side of the city. The Government refers to that as the Northbridge urban renewal project. In the long term it will be of benefit to the area and wider Perth. It involves a popular area in Northbridge which has maintained a great deal of heritage character. This redevelopment proposal is very much second best because it results from the road system to be placed through Northbridge, not because the Government is driven by any desire to improve the planning and general amenity in the area. Nevertheless, I hope that improved amenity will be the result of the project. I regret that this will be at a huge cost. It is not appropriate to enter into the detail of that project in this debate.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Mr KOBELKE: Again I place on record my total disagreement with the Minister. The Minister believes it is necessary to have the bypass constructed for transport purposes, but I do not accept that. We cannot here go back through the facts and the study undertaken. I take issue with the Minister. He can stack up his argument, and I can do the same. I believe I am right - the Minister believes he is correct. Regardless of that, the Government has not demonstrated the need to build the project at this time, but it is committed to a project which will cost in excess of \$400m.

Mr Lewis: That is not true.

Mr KOBELKE: I said the total, not the construction cost. It will clearly be in excess of \$400m when one takes into account the full costs and the land involved. Can the Minister give a figure for the annual maintenance cost of the tunnel? The Minister does not want to give the figure. When the Opposition asks the Government to detail this matter so it can take issue with the Government's final conclusions, it will not provide the details. The details will confirm the Opposition's point of view. In this case, the cost of the project will be in excess of \$400m. It will be a huge waste of money. Clearly traffic problems should be resolved, but this Northbridge bypass is not the answer. It will create more problems than it will solve. People know that, and that is why the Government refuses to give the detail. When those figures come out, they will totally confirm my position; that is, that the project is a waste of many hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is regrettable that the Government has used this Northbridge urban renewal project as a way of putting a better face on what is happening in the area. As I have already indicated, the money to be wasted on the bypass project has received a huge amount of publicity. The Government is saying, "You might believe that a huge waste is involved at that stage, and that we will cause disruption in Northbridge, but look at the wonderful thing we will end up with." Therefore, the Government has put a huge amount of effort into the Northbridge urban renewal project. Unfortunately, it is doing so to put a little decoration on a project which people do not support.

Moving to the positive side, great potential exists in this area, but we must ensure that the potential is realised. Development within the road reserve for the northern city bypass will fit into, and add to, the surrounding suburbs. We could have a range of facilities which provide for public open space with the popular nightspots and restaurants blending into courtyards, whether they be parkland or something with a southern European flavour. Potentially, we can ensure that the land above the tunnel provides some benefit although it is at a huge cost.

In conclusion, the additional powers to be given will not apply to some sections of the East Perth Redevelopment Act. Therefore, under the Bill, the authority can extend its functions regarding the development of certain other lands. That other land must be contiguous with the existing area and must be approved by the Government, of course, with Cabinet approval. Given something which happened recently, we cannot believe that the Government acts on Cabinet's determination. The areas excluded relate to the power of the planning scheme and the control of land. I hope in his response the Minister will cover that matter in a little more detail than that provided in the second reading speech. I accept the bona fides of the Minister in stating that this is the best way to deal with the matter.

I take it that the East Perth Redevelopment Authority will act simply as a consultant. What powers will it have as a consultant? While I support government agencies taking on these roles, we must ensure that government departments do not work together to the detriment of ordinary citizens. Unfortunately, that does happen from time to time. I think the Minister is aware of the case of Mr and Mrs Napolitano, who have been caught up in that

process. While some people may regard government agencies as colluding in order to achieve an end, and I would not go so far as to say there is evidence of that, there clearly is evidence of government agencies working together in order to allow another government agency's project to proceed in the most efficient way, and that has meant that the interests of individual property owners are not always considered fully.

Mr and Mrs Napolitano bought a property on the edge of the East Perth Redevelopment Authority area and sought to proceed with a development on that site, in keeping with the zoning. However, Homeswest was involved in a development alongside, and in order for the Napolitanos to gain the maximum number of units under the zoning, they needed to access a laneway adjacent to that Homeswest land. The Napolitanos found that decisions were made by the City of Perth when it was under the commissioners, and by the Department of Land Administration, which in every instance benefited Homeswest, and in some cases were clearly to their detriment. The Napolitanos have lost a huge amount of money. They still have the land, but the potential to develop that land and get those properties onto the market at a time when the market was riding high has disappeared. Homeswest has completed its development; that went ahead without any problems. The Napolitanos put in their application for development prior to Homeswest making its application, but their interests were not considered. When the Department of Land Administration took action with regard to the laneway, which was to the benefit of another party, the Napolitanos should have been considered a party to that action, but they were not even informed of it.

Mrs Napolitano has attempted to get responses from this Government, but she has been fobbed off time after time. I do not blame the Minister for Planning, because he has been quite sympathetic to her case, but because a range of government instrumentalities is involved, no-one has been willing to pick up their case. Mrs Napolitano has spoken to the Premier on several occasions on talkback radio, but no action has been taken, other than that he has passed it on to an officer, who has passed it on to a Minister, who has passed it on to another Minister, who has passed it to another officer. It has gone around in circles.

Mr Bloffwitch interjected.

Mr KOBELKE: She lives in a Liberal electorate - Canning Vale. It is not a Labor electorate.

This Bill will give the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, as a government agency, the power to work with other government agencies, the Ministry of Planning and Main Roads. One hopes it will use that power in a way which does not jeopardise the rights of individuals who have property in that area.

**MR LEWIS** (Applecross - Minister for Planning) [11.54 am]: I listened with interest to the opposition speakers on this Bill. I was interested that they spoke, in the main, about things other than the legislation. This Bill is very simple. It is intended to allow the East Perth Redevelopment Authority, which I think has demonstrated quite clearly its expertise in urban renewal, to project manage the urban renewal that is required to be undertaken in association with and subsequent to the city northern bypass project which this Government has initiated.

The member for Nollamara, and I think also the member for Glendalough, mentioned the powers of the EPRA. It is not intended that the planning and resumption powers which the EPRA enjoys currently in its area of jurisdiction will be devolved to it with regard to this project. The expertise of the EPRA to manage a project of this size has been evidenced at East Perth, and it was considered that it would be the most appropriate government agency to effectively carry out this urban renewal, under the stewardship of a standing committee of the Western Australian Planning Commission.

I have gleaned from the debate that the Opposition supports the Bill, although it has not stated it, and I thank it for its support.

Mr Kobelke: What powers will the EPRA have?

Mr LEWIS: The only power it will have is to act as project manager on behalf of the Western Australian Planning Commission. It will not have resumption or planning powers. The planning powers will continue to reside with the Western Australian Planning Commission. The EPRA, as the project manager, will put into effect the resolutions of the Planning Commission with regard to construction and development.

Mr Kobelke: What about the control and ownership of the land?

Mr LEWIS: That will remain with the Western Australian Planning Commission and Main Roads Western Australia. A subcommittee of the Cabinet, or a ministerial council comprising the Minister for Transport and me, will oversee the project in general, and particularly from a Cabinet point of view. The urban renewal project will be under the stewardship of the Minister for Transport and me, or a future Minister for Planning, whoever he or she may be.

I listened with interest to the laudatory comments about the East Perth project. I remind the Opposition that when I became the Minister for Planning, not a sod of dirt had been turned. The member for Nollamara touched on the

fact that considerable decisions needed to be made about the remediation of contaminated sites and the like. At the end of the day, we sorted out the remediation of the gas works site for about \$13.5m to \$14m, which demonstrated the innovation of this Government, because it was a far cry from the \$60m plus which had been spoken of by the member for Nollamara and was put to me when I first became the Minister for Planning.

The debate ranged far and wide. It touched on Subiaco and the EPRA and its management. On the one hand, there were laudatory comments; on the other hand; there was contradictory castigation. I wonder how members opposite can have it both ways; either the EPRA has done a good job or it has not. We live in a world where errors are made. We can never obtain the absolute optimums for which we are aiming. The performance of the EPRA in East Perth can only be commended. One must accept that from time to time all government agencies and Governments make errors. It is rather churlish to suggest that the East Perth Redevelopment Authority has done a great job and then in the next breath criticise it for some minor event that may have occurred. We must look at the big picture and the outcomes. At the end of the day the project will go down as one of the best managed urban projects that has ever occurred. I thank the members of the Opposition for their contribution to this debate and their obvious support for the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time, proceeded through remaining stages without debate and transmitted to the Council.

### **MOTION - ORDER OF THE DAY No 3 BE NOW TAKEN**

**MR C.J. BARNETT** (Cottesloe - Leader of the House) [12.02 pm]: I move -

That Order of the Day No 3 be now taken.

I indicated this morning that it was proposed that the Minister for Police introduce the Firearms Amendment Bill 1996 along with the Consolidated Firearms Bill and regulations. We intended to table that entire package at 2.30 this afternoon. At this stage I cannot guarantee that the consolidated Bill or regulations will be printed by that time. The Minister now proposes to present the Firearms Amendment Bill along with the second reading. The Government will make available the consolidated Bill and hopefully the regulations at a later stage this afternoon.

Question put and passed.

### **FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR WIESE** (Wagin - Minister for Police) [12.04 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Firearms Act 1973, among other things, makes provision for the control and regulation of firearms and ammunition and for the licensing of persons possessing, using, dealing in, manufacturing and repairing firearms and ammunition. Since 1973 the Act has been subject to only minor amendment. The Bill makes provision for significant amendments to the Act. In addition to rectifying numerous existing anomalies and inadequacies, the Bill also incorporates resolutions emanating from the special meetings of the Australian Police Ministers' Council relating to national uniform firearm laws. Since first being appointed to the position of Minister for Police, I have publicly announced that it is my intention to make the Act a Statute that meets current community expectations in respect of the regulation and use of firearms and ammunition. It is my very strong belief that the majority of firearm licence holders in this State are responsible, law abiding people. Accordingly, it is not intended to prevent the possession and use of firearms and ammunition by those who have a legitimate occupational, recreational and sporting need to possess and use firearms.

To enable members of the House to fully appreciate the history of the wide-ranging amendments, I will now detail the principal events that have impacted on the Bill's development.

Previously identified anomalies and inadequacies: For many years concerns have been expressed by members of the firearms trade, the judiciary, the police, shooting organisations and other interested parties, in respect of the adequacy of the Act. As a result of these concerns several reviews have been undertaken, the last independent review being in 1981 when the then Liberal Government appointed Mr Oliver Dixon to examine and report on the Act. His report and at least two or three subsequent reviews of his report have never been acted upon. Since this Government came to office, I have been progressing the issue to the stage where in May of this year, to ensure the widest possible input into the proposed amendments, the State coalition Government released for public comment the Firearms Amendment Bill in the form of the Firearms Green Bill. The Green Bill was available for comment between May and 1 August 1996. The public was notified of the Bill's existence by advertisements placed in the printed media, press releases

and many public announcements made by me urging interested persons to make submissions. Copies of the Bill and accompanying summary notes of the amendments were freely distributed from my office, the Police Service and the State Law Publisher. Additionally, copies of the Green Bill were forwarded to major stakeholders, including community groups, firearm industry groups, professional bodies and various government agencies. Over 800 submissions were received and examined, with numerous suggestions being reflected in today's Bill.

Australian Police Ministers' Council: Due to the less than satisfactory legislation operating in several other jurisdictions I have been determined to progress, via the APMC, the issue of national uniform firearm legislation. In progressing national uniformity, I have not been prepared to compromise this State's very effective firearm licensing and registration system, which has served our community well, and which I believe is generally considered by all to be a commonsense approach to firearm control. Australian Police Ministers have been working towards the introduction of a scheme of national uniformity for at least the past three years, and a special meeting of the APMC was scheduled for early 1996, hopefully to finalise the issue. However, the meeting was postponed following the announcement of the federal election and the subsequent state election in Victoria. Despite the difficulties that confronted several jurisdictions in the implementation of various initiatives, for example, registration of both licence holders and firearms, there was a determination that agreement would finally be reached. It is now history that immediately following the tragic events in Port Arthur, Tasmania, the Prime Minister, Mr Howard, announced a ban on all semi-automatic firearms and called together all Australian Police Ministers in Canberra on 10 May 1996. Ministers were committed from the outset to reaching an agreement that would see certain minimum standards of firearm legislation introduced nationally. Over a two month period outstanding matters were refined, culminating in the final agreement being reached on 17 July 1996. It was pleasing to note that jurisdictions could apply a higher standard than the agreed minimum standard, thus allowing States and Territories to tailor legislation to meet the circumstances and needs existing in their own jurisdiction, and which in our case enabled our current high standards to be retained. The Bill I introduce to Parliament today reflects all the matters agreed in the three Australian Police Ministers' meetings.

Buy back/compensation scheme: As a result of the ban on most semi-automatic firearms, the Australian Police Ministers at their meeting on 10 May 1996 recognised that many persons who are currently authorised to possess category C and D type firearms would in respect of category D be required to dispose of those firearms and in respect of category C be required to either requalify under the new licensing criteria or dispose of those firearms. In order to minimise the financial loss of disposing of those firearms, the Federal Government has undertaken to provide fair and proper compensation. A compensation price list of firearms was developed by the Federal Government. The price list is based on research undertaken into dealers' advertised prices as at March 1996. Indications are that these prices are generally considered fair and realistic. To accommodate instances where a person has a firearm with a listed value in excess of \$2 500, and they are not satisfied with the listed price, the person may have the firearm independently valued by an approved adjudicator. Due to the impact of the new legislation on firearm dealers, provision has been made for contribution compensation to be made available in respect of loss of business and existing stocks of prohibited firearms.

I will now outline in some detail the key amendments contained in this Bill. To enable the members to follow the changes clearly, I will deal with them in the clause order in which they appear in the Bill.

Clause 4 will amend section 4 in respect of the term "ammunition", to include primers and propellant manufactured specifically for use in making ammunition. This amendment is intended to ensure that these items may be sold only by firearm dealers to, and possessed by, persons authorised by the Act.

Clause 5(1) will amend section 13 of the Act that relates to the commissioner's delegation of the licensing functions that are partly contained in the Act and partly in notices published in a 1987 *Government Gazette*. This amendment will incorporate the delegations in the Firearms Regulations 1974 making them more accessible and clearer.

Clause 6 will establish section 5B "firearms advisory committee". The purpose of the committee is to ensure that trends and issues impacting on the Act and its administration, including the concerns of persons who have a related interest in the Act, may be appropriately examined and considered. The committee will be chaired by the Minister for Police and will consist of the Commissioner of Police and representatives from the following areas and professions: Primary producers, firearms trade, general community, health profession and firearms users.

Clause 7(a) and (b) will amend sections 6(1) and 6(1a) that relate to the grounds for the prohibition of ammunition and firearms by incorporating items that are not in the "public interest" to be possessed, for example, accelerator - imprint free - ammunition that prevents the ability to identify the firearm from which a projectile has been discharged.

Clause 8(1)(e) will amend section 8(1)(g) that relates to the exemption for commercial carriers, currently referred to as common carriers, and warehousemen, by requiring those persons to be approved by the commissioner. The

intent of this amendment is to ensure that access to firearms and ammunition is limited only to those persons working in those industries who are considered "fit and proper".

Clause 8(1)(g) will amend section 6(1)(i) that relates to the exemption for employees of primary producers when using their employers' firearms for the destruction of vermin, by extending the provision to incorporate the destruction of stock and, pursuant to clause 8(2), allows "family members" of the primary producer to similarly use such firearms.

Clause 10 will amend section 10 relating to the minimum age for a person to hold a licence, by increasing the age from 16 years to 18 years. This will not apply to those 16 and 17 year olds who currently hold a firearm licence.

Clause 11 will amend section 10A by requiring firearm licence applicants to successfully complete a prescribed training course before being issued with a licence. It is intended that the course will incorporate basic knowledge of firearm safety and firearm laws.

Currently, a national working party is establishing the core components of the course that each jurisdiction will then implement taking into consideration local conditions. It is intended that in Western Australia these training courses will be carried out by approved sporting shooters' clubs.

Clause 12 will amend section 11(2) that relates to the persons to whom the commissioner shall not grant an approval or permit, or issue a licence, by providing that the commissioner may, when determining a person's suitability, specifically take into consideration whether a person has a history of or a tendency towards violent behaviour.

Clause 12 will enable in section 11(4) the commissioner to require, in writing, an applicant to provide within 28 days such relevant information on which to satisfactorily determine an application. Failure to comply with the request within the period, or such further period as the commissioner may approve, will result in the application lapsing.

Clause 12 will in section 11A deem what are "good reasons" for acquiring or possessing a firearm or ammunition. An applicant will, before being granted an approval or permit, or being issued a licence, be required to satisfy a "genuine reason" test. Essentially, an applicant will have to demonstrate that he requires a firearm or ammunition for one of the following reasons. The firearm or ammunition -

- is for use by the person as a member of an approved shooting club and the person is an active and financial member of the club;

- is for use by the person as a member of an approved organisation - for example, a police and citizens youth club;

- is for use in hunting or shooting of a recreational nature on land the owner of which has given permission;

- is required by the person in the course of their occupation;

- forms part of a genuine firearm or ammunition collection;

- is for another approved purpose - for example, amateur theatre productions.

Acquiring a firearm or ammunition for personal protection is deemed not to be a genuine reason.

Clause 12 will in section 11B require applicants for certain types of firearms, in addition to satisfying the basic "genuine reason" test, to also satisfy a "genuine need" test. The new concept of "firearm categorisation" - that is, the classification of firearm types into alphabetical groups - will enable "genuine need" criteria to be prescribed in the regulations. For example, in schedule 3 to the regulations -

- Category B: Applicants applying for a category B type firearm, such as a single or double barrel centre fire rifle, will be required to satisfy the commissioner that a category A type firearm, such as a single shot rim fire rifle, would be inadequate or unsuitable for the required purpose.

- Category C: Applicants applying for a category C type firearm, such as a self-loading rim fire rifle with a magazine capacity of no more than 10 rounds, and a self-loading or pump action shotgun with a magazine capacity of no more than five rounds, will be required to satisfy the commissioner that a category A or B type firearm would be inadequate or unsuitable for the purpose for which the firearm is required.

Additionally, the regulations will prescribe specific restrictions on the eligibility of persons able to licence category C and category D type firearms. For example -

- Category C: A category C type firearm will be able to be licensed only by the following classes of person and under the following conditions -

Primary producers may, subject to satisfying the genuine reason test, license category C type firearms for the purpose of destroying vermin or stock.

Where a primary producer would qualify to have a category C type firearm and is not licensed in respect of a firearm of that category, he may nominate to the commissioner another person in his place.

In instances where the primary producer may either operate a very large property or operate properties which are widely separated, the primary producer may in addition nominate to the commissioner further persons to license category C type firearms to destroy vermin or diseased stock on his property or nearby.

Professional shooters may, subject to satisfying the genuine reason test, license category C type firearms for the purpose of destroying vermin or stock.

Active and financial members of approved shooting clubs may license category C type shotguns for the purposes of training for, and participating in, an approved national or international shooting discipline such as clay target shooting competitions.

Category D: A category D type firearm - for example, a self-loading centre fire rifle, a self-loading or pump action shotgun with a magazine capacity of more than five rounds, a self-loading rim fire rifle with a magazine capacity of more than 10 rounds, will only be able to be licensed for State and Federal Government purposes.

Category H: There has been only minor change to the licensing requirements for handguns, previously referred to as pistols.

Category H: A category H type firearm - for example, a handgun, will only be able to be licensed by the following classes of person and under the following conditions -

Active and financial members of approved shooting clubs requiring a handgun to train for, and participate in, a club, interclub, state, national or international shooting discipline.

For occupational needs.

For State and Federal Government purposes.

A person will not have a genuine reason to acquire or possess a category H type firearm for the purposes of hunting, recreational shooting - other than those associated with approved shooting club purposes - destroying stock or vermin.

Clause 14 will amend section 15 by substituting the existing provisions relating to curio licences with a firearm collector's licence. Applicants for a licence, or holders of a licence wishing to have endorsed additional firearms, will now be required to demonstrate that the firearm has significant -

Commemorative;  
historical;  
thematic;  
heirloom; or  
sentimental value.

Similar to the requirements for an existing curio licence, a collector's licence only authorises the licence holder to possess but neither use nor carry the firearm. However, unlike the curio licence, that is issued for life, a collector's licence will attract an initial licence fee of \$40 - the same as the existing curio licence - and will be renewed every five years at which time a further fee commensurate with that of a normal firearm licence - currently \$22.00 - will be charged. A saving provision will be applicable to transitional licences.

Clause 15(1)(d), (e) and (f) will amend section 16(1)(d), (e) and (f) to enable holders of dealer's licences, manufacturer's licences and repairer's licences and their employees, to transport firearms and ammunition more easily in the ordinary course of business. The existing provisions that require the holder first to obtain a temporary permit have been repealed. Clause 15(1)(d)(i) will amend section 16(1)(d) by enabling the holder of a dealer's licence to receive firearms for the purposes of dismantling for parts, and to arrange repair or servicing by the holder of a repairer's licence. Clause 15(1)(h) will enable persons to collect ammunition. A licence holder will be entitled lawfully to acquire, dispose of, possess and carry, but not use, all types of ammunition other than those types that are prohibited in regulation 26B. An ammunition collector's licence will attract an initial licence fee of \$40 - the same as a firearm collector's licence - and will be renewed every five years, at which time a further fee commensurate with that of a normal firearm licence - currently \$22 - will be charged.

Clause 18(c) and (d) will in section 18(6) require an applicant applying for an initial firearm licence to wait 28 days from the date of making the application before a licence may be issued. Should an applicant not proceed with the application within a further 28 days, the application will automatically lapse. The intent of the amendment is to ensure that an applicant has had sufficient time to consider the merits or otherwise of acquiring a firearm, and to prevent a firearm from being acquired on the spur of the moment. Clause 18(e) will in section 16(8) require the commissioner to inform a licence applicant in writing of the reasons for any restriction, limitation or condition imposed on his licence. Clause 18(h) will enable in section 18(13) the commissioner to require, in writing, persons connected with licences of a commercial kind, for example, corporate dealer's, manufacturer's and repairer's licences, within 28 days to provide information relating to the management of the business or premises. Failure to comply with the request will with respect to a licence application be a ground for refusal to issue an approval, licence or permit; or in relation to an existing approval, licence or permit be a ground for revocation, but only after the holder has been given an opportunity to make a submission to the commissioner.

Clause 21(a) will amend section 20(1), which relates to the commissioner's ability to revoke an approval, licence or permit, by extending the provision to include the alternative option of "refusing to renew" a licence, as opposed to an immediate revocation. Additionally, the following further grounds for refusing to renew and revocation have been provided -

The person would not, because of section 11 - genuine reason or genuine need - then be able to qualify for an approval, licence or permit. For example, the provision of this section may be used to revoke a licence in respect to a category C or D type firearm, should the holder be unable to meet the new genuine need test.

The licence or permit was issued, or approval was given, incorrectly due to an administrative or procedural error. For example, this provision may be used to revoke a licence in respect of a specific firearm, such as a handgun being inadvertently licensed contrary to the commissioner's licensing delegation.

In the public interest. For example, this provision may be used to revoke a licence when the licensing authority is satisfied that the holder is unable to adequately restrict access to a firearm, such as a holder who resides with persons who have been convicted of armed robbery offences.

Clause 21(b) will in section 20(1)(a) enable the commissioner, in writing, to request a person within 28 days to produce relevant information on which to satisfactorily determine whether the person is "fit and proper" to hold an approval, licence or permit, or make a submission showing cause why the power of revocation should not be exercised. Failure to produce the information or make a submission within the period, or such further period as the commissioner may approve, may result in the approval, licence or permit being revoked.

Clause 23 will in section 21A ensure that the businesses of dealer's, repairer's and manufacturer's licence holders are managed correctly, and are at all times accountable by providing that -

Licence holders will always be responsible for the conduct of their business;

licence holders will personally supervise and manage each premises, or may appoint an agent or employee for that purpose. An agent or employee who breaches the Act, or contravenes any condition, limitation or restriction imposed on the licence, will be liable to the extent that the holder would be liable; and

depending upon the circumstances either the licence holder, their agent or their employee may be charged individually, or two or more may be charged, in respect of the same offence.

Clause 23 will in section 21B ensure that a corporate body or a partnership that holds a dealer's, repairer's or manufacturer's licence will be accountable, by providing that if an offence is committed with the consent or connivance of, or is attributable to any failure to take all reasonable measures, any officer or other person concerned in the management as well as the body corporate is liable and deemed to have committed the offence.

Clause 24 will in section 22 establish the Firearms Appeals Tribunal. Persons aggrieved by a decision of the commissioner will now be able to choose whether to have the matter reviewed by either a court, as is currently the case, or the tribunal. However, an appeal to either the tribunal or the court will extinguish any right of appeal to the other. While the court or the tribunal will review the commissioner's decision on the basis that it was made on an improper or irrelevant consideration, the tribunal is intended to provide appellants with an alternative that is less costly, and less formal, and may deal with matters more expeditiously. The chief stipendiary magistrate may constitute one or more tribunals that will be able to sit throughout the State. A tribunal will be chaired by a magistrate, who will be assisted by a person selected from a panel nominated by the commissioner and a person selected from a panel nominated by the Minister, who in the opinion of the Minister has an occupational, recreational or sporting involvement or expertise with firearms or ammunition. The tribunal in determining an appeal may inform



itself on any matter in such a manner as it thinks fit, and according to the substantial merits of each case without regard to technicalities or legal form or precedent.

An appellant appearing before the tribunal may appear either alone or with an advocate, or be represented by an agent. However, a person acting as an advocate or agent can neither be a legal practitioner, nor demand or receive any fee or reward. Appeals to the tribunal will attract a fee. However, the tribunal may, where the appeal is upheld, make an order for the payment by the commissioner of expenses reasonably incurred by the appellant. Regardless of whether the matter is determined by the court or tribunal, if an appeal is upheld, the commissioner's decision may be varied or set aside, or have conditions, limitations and restrictions imposed by the tribunal.

Clause 25(a) and (b) will amend the provisions in section 23(1) and (2) by substituting the words "intoxicated or excited by reason of being under the influence of alcohol or drugs" with the word "affected". The current provision has been criticised by the judiciary as being difficult to apply, especially when trying to interpret the word "excited". Although the current and proposed provisions are by their nature subjective, it is intended that "affected" will be interpreted as meaning that the consumption or ingestion of alcohol and/or drugs has contributed towards that person being less responsible in their actions towards, and the safe handling of, firearms and ammunition. It is interesting to note that during the 1995-96 financial year, police preferred 16 charges involving persons in possession of a firearm while being affected by alcohol and/or drugs. In the majority of cases police attention was drawn to the offender as the result of their threatening or antisocial behaviour or other offences being committed.

Clause 25(g)(iii) will in section 23(9) delete the word "knowingly". This and other offence provisions have had the word "knowingly" deleted to refocus the responsibility on the person for doing or omitting to do an act.

It has been confirmed by legal advice obtained from the Crown Solicitor's Office that section 23 of the Criminal Code offers adequate protection for persons from being prosecuted in instances when a breach of the Act or regulations results from an act or omission that occurs independently of that person's will, or for an event that occurs by accident. Under that section, an act occurs by accident if it is not intended, not foreseen and not reasonably foreseeable.

Clause 25(g)(v) will in section 23(9)(d) require a person who is responsible for the storage of a firearm and ammunition to store the firearm and ammunition in accordance with requirements prescribed in regulation 11A. The requirements, among other things, provide -

Firearms and ammunition are to be stored in a metal and lockable cabinet or container that at least meet the specifications described in schedule 4. However, where a person is able to satisfy the commissioner that they have a suitable alternative storage arrangement, the commissioner may approve of that arrangement. For example, the commissioner, under certain circumstances, may decide that in respect of certain types of firearms such as air rifles, single shot .22 calibre rifles and single shot shotguns, an approved locking device may be adequate. This will also enable the commissioner to approve existing adequate storage cabinets that have already been installed by many very responsible firearm owners, but which may not quite meet the new standard.

A magazine is not to contain any ammunition when stored.

Ammunition is not to be stored in a cabinet or container in which a firearm is stored, unless the ammunition is in another locked metal container that is securely affixed so as to prevent its easy removal.

In order to determine how a licence applicant intends to comply with the requirement, and what facilities an existing licence holder has, the person may be required, pursuant to regulation 11C, to supply the commissioner with a statutory declaration as prescribed in form 17A.

Where a person fails to comply with any of the storage requirements, including the tendering of the declaration, the commissioner may, pursuant to clause 12, in respect of an applicant, refuse to issue a licence or, if the person is an existing licence holder, pursuant to clause 21(a)(iii) either not renew or revoke the licence.

A person who refuses to permit a police officer to inspect the storage facilities, after having been given reasonable time in writing, will pursuant to clause 25(g)(v) commit an offence for which the maximum penalty is \$1 000.

Clause 26 will provide in section 23B a protection to medical practitioners from any criminal or civil action or remedy, should they supply the commissioner with details of a patient who is either unsuitable to have access to a firearm or ammunition, or who is seeking or has sought medical assistance for a firearm or ammunition related injury. It does not, however, compel the medical practitioners to so act.

Clause 27(d) will in section 24(7) enable a police officer to enter a premises without a search warrant when the officer is reasonably of the opinion that there is an immediate threat of harm being suffered by a person and the delay in first obtaining a warrant would be likely to increase the risk or extent of such harm.

To ensure that adequate checks and balances exist and are complied with, provision has been made requiring an officer who has exercised this power to submit to the commissioner a written report. The procedures to be followed by the officer, and the officer in charge of the firearms branch, are prescribed in regulation 22A, which, among other things, requires the -

officer to notify the officer in charge, firearms branch, as soon as practicable, in order that the relevant computer records can be adjusted to prevent the person from immediately applying for another firearm;

officer to submit the report within seven days of exercising the power;

report to detail the circumstances leading to the exercise of the powers; the grounds on which it was suspected that any firearm or ammunition might be found; the need to act speedily; why a warrant could not have been obtained and, where applicable, the fitness of the person to hold an approval, licence or permit.

officer in charge, firearms branch, unless a prosecution has been commenced, within 21 days, either to revoke the approval, licence or permit; commence proceedings under the Act requiring the person to dispose of the firearm or return the firearm to the person from whom it was seized or other person lawfully entitled to possess it.

Clause 28 will in section 26 extend the grounds under which a search warrant may be issued, to include an offence under any written law involving a firearm, ammunition, silencer or other contrivance. The warrant will be extended to authorise the seizure of any document or other thing connected with the offence.

To complement the police powers contained in section 24(2), a justice may further issue a search warrant, for the purpose of entering a premises, where there are reasonable grounds to suspect that a firearm or ammunition may be found in the possession of a person and that such possession may result in harm being suffered by any person or that the person is not at the time "fit and proper".

Clause 29 will in section 28 extend the power of a court, upon convicting a person, to order a forfeiture of any firearm and ammunition, to include any silencer and in respect of any written law.

Clause 32 will in section 30A(1) and (2) require a person who advertises a firearm for sale to ensure that the advertisement includes details of the firearm's type, make, serial number and calibre. In the case of a firearm dealer or manufacturer, the holder will be required to advertise only their licence number and sufficient details to identify the holder, for example, the business name. The intent of the amendment is to enable the police to identify more easily the sale of unlicensed firearms. Failure to comply may result in a maximum penalty of \$1 000.

Clause 32 will in section 30A(3) require a person who sends a firearm by post to a destination outside this State, to address the firearm to the premises at which the business of a dealer may lawfully be carried on and, should ammunition also be sent, that it not be packaged with the firearm. Failure to comply may result in a maximum penalty of \$1 000.

Clause 32 will in section 30B(1) require any person lawfully entitled to possess a firearm or ammunition to report to the commissioner as soon as is practicable the loss of a firearm or ammunition, and the destruction of a firearm. Failure to comply may result in a maximum penalty of \$1 000.

Clause 32 will in section 30B(2) require a person who is entitled to possess a firearm under the Act and who disposes of it either in a place or to a destination outside this State to report to the commissioner as soon as is practical the details of the disposal, including the particulars of the firearm, the manner and date of the disposal, the details of the person to whom disposed and that person's licence details. Failure to comply may result in a maximum penalty of \$1 000.

Clause 36(1)(a) will in section 34(2)(g) enable regulations to be made restricting the quantity of ammunition that a person may possess. However, I inform the House that in light of the widely varying needs of different firearm user groups across Western Australia and in light of provisions implemented in other States, it is not intended at this stage to impose any limitation.

Clause 36(1)(b) will, in section 34(2)(ga), enable regulations to be made regulating the sending or conveyance of firearms or ammunition. This is an additional provision that will complement those other requirements that place an obligation on persons who transport or dispose of a firearm or ammunition.

Clause 40 will, in section 22A, enable the commissioner to issue an extract of licence to licence holders and other persons authorised under the Act to possess firearms and ammunition. This has resulted from the need to increase the integrity of licences in respect of the identification of the holder and to produce a more durable form of licence.

Further, the concept of mandatory photographic identification, as required by the national agreement, will be implemented on this extract of licence.

The extract of licence will be in a form similar to that of a motor driver's licence and, among other things, will contain the holder's name, photograph and certain licensing particulars. Initially the extract will be issued to new and existing licence holders who will, pursuant to regulation 7A, be required to attend at a nominated facility, or where due to circumstances that will present unreasonable difficulty for people in complying with the request - for example, excessive distance - they may provide their own photographs in accordance with the commissioner's specifications.

To ensure the integrity of a person's identification, regulation 7B requires the person to provide evidence of identity in a manner approved by the commissioner. It is intended that a 100-point check system, similar to that required when obtaining a passport or opening a bank account, be utilised for this purpose.

Where a person fails to comply with the photograph requirements, the commissioner may, pursuant to clause 12, in respect of an applicant refuse to issue a licence or if the person is an existing licence holder, either not renew or revoke the licence, pursuant to clause 20(1)(a)(iv).

A person to whom an extract has been issued will, if in possession of a firearm or ammunition, be required to produce the extract to a police officer or a person from whom the holder is seeking to obtain services in relation to that firearm or ammunition. Failure to produce the extract on demand may result in a maximum penalty of \$1 000. Similarly a holder will, upon request by a firearms dealer, be required to produce the extract when purchasing ammunition.

Clause 48 will amend existing provisions relating to indictable offences by enabling the prosecution to request the Court of Petty Sessions to deal with the charge summarily. Where the court considers it can adequately deal with the matter, having regard to, among other things, the nature and particulars of the offence and antecedents of that person, the court may deal with the matter, rather than referring it to a higher court, and where the charge is proved, impose the applicable summary penalty.

Penalties: To ensure the penalty provisions more adequately provide a deterrent and reflect community expectations, both the maximum monetary penalties and terms of imprisonment have been increased substantially. For example, section 19, among other things, provides the offence of unlawfully selling, possessing or otherwise coming into possession of, any firearm or ammunition. Pursuant to clause 46(a) the current maximum penalty of \$300 will be increased to \$2 000. When the firearm concerned has had numbers or identification marks either defaced or removed, has been altered from the design or characteristics of its original manufacture, or is a hand gun - all of the above are inclusions to the Bill pursuant to clause 25(d) and (e) - the maximum penalty will be imprisonment for 18 months and/or a fine of \$6 000.

Section 19(4) provides the indictable offence of unlicensed dealing in, repairing or manufacturing firearms. Pursuant to clause 46(c) the current maximum penalty will be increased from, upon indictment, imprisonment for three years to five years; and summary conviction, imprisonment for 12 months and/or \$500 to 18 months and/or \$6 000. Section 23(9a) provides the offence of discharging a firearm to the danger of, or in a manner to cause fear to, the public or any person. Pursuant to clause 49(5) the current maximum penalty of imprisonment for six months and/or a fine of \$800 will be increased to two years or a fine of \$8 000.

In view of the complexity of the overall firearms legislation package which is contained in both the Act and the regulations, it is my intention to follow a slightly unusual course of action and to table, firstly, a consolidated copy of the Act, incorporating the amendments; and, secondly, a draft only of the firearms regulations. This is, I believe, the third draft of the regulations. It is not the final draft, and it is subject to further drafting before finalisation. However, it does give members a very clear indication of the key areas of the overall firearms package.

I also intend that a consolidated copy of the regulations be distributed to members as soon as it has been finalised. It is anticipated that will be within the next week. However, the printing of the consolidated copy and the draft regulations has not yet been completed. I anticipate that copies will be available for distribution to all members this afternoon, and that will then be done. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Ms Warnock.

#### **STATEMENT - MEMBER FOR BALCATT**

*Irving, David, Visa Refusal*

**MR CATANIA** (Balcatta) [12.45 pm]: I express the concern that I have had since discussion has arisen about the possibility of Mr David Irving obtaining a visa to enter Australia. In the past he has been refused a visa, and rightly

so. In the present climate in Australia, issuing a visa to this person is an act of treachery towards the Jewish population in this country and it will result in the resurrection of prejudice and hurt that this community has long suffered over what happened during the Second World War.

We cannot hide behind this statement: We disagree with his views, but he has a right to express them. If we agree with that statement in relation to David Irving, we are avoiding an unacceptable situation. It should not be considered. Allowing him to obtain an Australian visa is saying that we allow prejudice and racism in this country.

#### **STATEMENT - MEMBER FOR AVON**

*York-Beverley Turf Club; Avon Valley Greyhound Association Meetings*

**MR TRENORDEN** (Avon) [12.46 pm]: I bring to the attention of the House two events that will occur in the Avon Valley this weekend. They are very historic events. The first is that this is the second meeting of the York-Beverley Turf Club Cup since the club was disbanded. When it was reconstituted last year, 6 000 people visited the club. I can tell those who have never been to the York-Beverley Turf Club that it is a very beautiful track at the base of a mountain in the historic town of York. I recommend all members go to it. When this event occurs this Sunday, it will be attended by visitors who are members of a parliamentary delegation from the United Kingdom. Mr Lance Ludgate will be host to those people.

Even more important, the Avon Valley Greyhound Association will hold its first race meeting on Monday of next week. It is the third club of this type in Western Australia. Mr Tony Glenny, the president of the club, deserves huge congratulations on the enormous effort he has put in to get this organisation off the ground. I am a past vice president of that organisation. Right now the Avon Valley is in glorious condition and a trip on Sunday or Monday, or both, is well recommended.

#### **STATEMENT - MEMBER FOR MAYLANDS**

*Stojanovic, Greg; 1837 Imperial Judgment Act*

**DR EDWARDS** (Maylands) [12.48 pm]: I raise an extremely serious issue relating to one of my constituents, Mr Greg Stojanovic. He recently had a legal judgment against him which he is appealing, but it will take one year before the appeal is heard. My constituent is in pain, is unemployed and has no income. Tomorrow his family home will be sold. Unfortunately his employer, Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd, has placed a caveat on his house. Despite the fact that the house is in joint names, when the house sale goes through tomorrow the money will flow to CBH.

This is an absolutely disgraceful situation. The Department of Land Administration is allowing an 1837 imperial judgment Act to be used in a disgraceful way against people who are already in extremely difficult circumstances. Tomorrow a married woman - a mother with three young children, including a baby - will be out on the streets. It is an absolutely dreadful situation and I fear for the fate of this family.

This 1837 Act is an anachronism. CBH is abusing the power of this Act by placing the caveat on a title where there is joint ownership. This is a new practice that the Government should outlaw, and I urge the Minister for Lands to look into it. This family does not have the means to test this application of the law in court, and I doubt that any of the other people who have been affected by it recently have the means either.

I call on the Government to stick to due process and to stop hounding people in this way. The man is currently suicidal. Be it blood on the hands of the Government if this goes through tomorrow.

#### **STATEMENT - MEMBER FOR COLLIE**

*Ecotourism, Collie Electorate*

**DR TURNBULL** (Collie) [12.51 pm]: I inform the House of the great moves being made in relation to ecotourism in the electorate of Collie. Last week we opened a magnificent facility called Perup Lodge in the Perup Forest in the Perup conservation area. This is a beautifully built rammed earth building tastefully constructed in harmony with the forest. The Perup area is renowned for the numbats and woylies living there. A fine night walk is conducted during which people can view the nocturnal animals. The Perup Forest links up with other conservation areas in the Collie electorate such as the Badjaling Forest, to which a large number of native animals have returned.

We are also working at Potters Gorge, where we hope that land will soon be available for a fine tourist development; namely, an up to four star quality facility focusing on ecotourism. These three projects emphasise the great potential of the Collie electorate for ecotourism.

**STATEMENT - MEMBER FOR KALGOORLIE***Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital, Jobs Uncertainty*

**MS ANWYL** (Kalgoorlie) [12.53 pm]: I criticise the treatment of long-serving and dedicated staff in the laundry and catering department of Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital. The Court Liberal Government has its priorities wrong as it is prepared to throw long-serving and dedicated staff on the scrap heap in a quest to prove that privatisation is best. This is a form of ideological madness.

Repeatedly the Government fails to provide the proper detail of its tendering out process. Westrail staff have been ruthlessly discarded; in fact, over 1 400 hundred jobs have been identified to go, resulting in a decrease in standards and the destruction of morale throughout Westrail. The *Prospector* railcar and track maintenance has reached an all-time low. Fourteen workers, who continue to provide excellent service, have worked an average of 10 years each in the laundry division of Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital. Although the Health Service Board will make a final decision on tendering, I question the point of the rural benchmarking research if it is to remain secret.

Evasive answers have been provided to me regarding the agenda. The air of uncertainty around workers' jobs is disgraceful. Tendering has been on the agenda for long enough to enable the Government to come clean about its intentions at Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital.

**STATEMENT - MEMBER FOR SWAN HILLS***Elections, How-to-Vote Cards, Waste of Paper*

**MRS van de KLASHORST** (Swan Hills) [12.55 pm]: I air my concerns about the use of how-to-vote cards. Candidates usually print one card for each elector to use when voting. It appals me to see the waste of paper: After one use, the how-to-vote cards are immediately thrown into the rubbish bin.

My suggestion is to recognise legally by regulation a formulated procedure by which an election staff member is given the responsibility at each polling booth of gathering how-to-vote cards and depositing them in a specially provided recycling bin, which would allow candidates and their helpers to use the cards repeatedly. If this can be made a legally recognised part of polling day procedures at all polling booths, candidates need print many fewer how-to-vote cards, saving mountains of paper throughout the State.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEAVY TRANSPORT - MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT'S RESPONSE  
TABLING**

In accordance with Standing Order No 378, Mr Lewis (Minister for Planning) tabled the Minister for Transport's response to the Select Committee on Heavy Transport.

[See paper No 554.]

*Sitting suspended from 12.56 to 2.00 pm*

**VISITORS AND GUESTS - TASMANIAN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Clarko): I welcome to the Speaker's Gallery distinguished members of the Legislative Council of Tasmania: Hon Tony Fletcher, chairman of the delegation; Hon Michael Aird, Hon Ray Bailey, Hon George Shaw, Hon Jim Wilkinson, together with Mr Scott McKenzie and Mrs Jane Patten. These members are inquiring into the role and functions of the Legislative Council in Tasmania.

[Applause.]

[Questions without notice taken.]

**CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION AMENDMENT BILL***Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Prince (Minister for Health), read a first time.

**VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING BILL***Returned*

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

**APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED FUND) BILL (No 3)***Second Reading*

Resumed from 19 September.

**MR THOMAS** (Cockburn) [2.35 pm]: I wish to use this debate to discuss some areas of energy policy that concern me. I am pleased to note that the Minister is in the Chamber, and I hope that he will be here for the next 30 minutes or so because I will raise a number of quite important matters in the energy area that are concerning the public - and they have the right to be concerned about them. There is some trepidation that decisions are likely to be made by this Minister without the public having the opportunity to be consulted and to participate, as is their right.

Several members interjected.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Conversations should be terminated.

**Mr THOMAS**: Of course, I am referring to the statement made last week by the Minister when he tabled figures showing the demand projections of Western Power for the next 10 years, and the advertisement that appeared in the newspapers over the weekend inviting expressions of interest in the purchase of the Dampier to Bunbury natural gas pipeline and expressions of interest to act as a consultant to the pipeline sale committee, or some such body that has been established to advise the Government on these matters.

When the Electricity Corporation Act was passed by this Parliament in 1994, we were hopeful that it would lead to a greater degree of accountability in the energy area. Hitherto, the State Energy Commission of Western Australia had operated largely as a law unto itself and there was limited opportunity for parliamentary scrutiny of its operations. During the second reading debate, I said that I believed it was most appropriate that there be a utilities committee of this Parliament so that members could scrutinise the operations of the utilities. I was referring primarily to the energy utilities, but it could be extended to include the Water Corporation and other such bodies. There should be the opportunity for parliamentary scrutiny of the operations of the energy utilities. The Minister said that he understood that and that he had once passionately argued in favour of that proposition.

**Mr C.J. Barnett**: I did not argue for that proposition; I made some similar comments in the budget debates in this House.

**Mr THOMAS**: If he did not argue for that proposition then he was lying when he said he had.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**Mr C.J. BARNETT**: Mr Speaker -

**Mr THOMAS**: I withdraw.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr THOMAS**: His precise words were that he had argued passionately for it himself some years ago. I will get the *Hansard* record for the Minister. Of course, it may have been hyperbole.

**Mr C.J. Barnett**: I was referring to some facility within the budget debate to ask questions of agencies such as Western Power, Homeswest and the like. I still have that view.

**Mr THOMAS**: The Minister has not done anything about it. Every time I make a proposal to increase the accountability of the utilities, the Minister opposes it. We are entering a new and exciting phase in the development of the energy industry in Western Australia, and it will be a matter of concern to a number of people, industries and competing industries. I am sure the member for Collie was interested last week, when the demand projections were tabled in this House, to learn that in a six year period a further 400 megawatts of generating capacity will be needed.

**Dr Turnbull**: I was pleased to see that one of the options was a further 300 MW to be supplied at the Collie power station.

**Mr THOMAS**: Another option was for a new power station. One of the accountability measures introduced with the Electricity Corporation Act, which I was most pleased about, was detailed in schedule 7. That schedule prescribes that there shall be a competitive process for the acquisition of new generating capacity. The statement by the Minister indicated that the process he began, with the publication of the demand projections and various options and the short ministerial statement accompanying them, was the start of the competitive process prescribed in schedule 7. However, I am concerned that schedule 7 contains some loopholes that can be used by the Minister to evade his responsibilities under the legislation, accountability and scrutiny by the Parliament and the proper competitive process that the Act envisages should occur. Those loopholes are: First, the Act refers to the acquisition of

generating capacity and not to power purchase agreements. A statement by the Minister in this House 18 months ago indicated that he thinks the acquisition of new generating capacity by power purchase agreements is caught by schedule 7 to the Act, but I do not think it is. I have been advised by lawyers within Western Power who are responsible for the Act that it does not cover power purchase agreements. If the Government were to exercise that option rather than build a power station or purchase generating capacity, and it entered into a power purchase agreement with some other provider, it would be able to evade the provisions of schedule 7.

The second point relates to the 3 per cent threshold, which in round terms relates to 100 MW of generating capacity. If the power is purchased in increments of less than 3 per cent, the provisions of schedule 7 do not apply. The member for Collie should be concerned about that aspect because the first increment that will be required in four years' time is 100 MW, with a further 300 MW being required two years later. The high case scenario is four years and the medium case scenario is six years. The member for Collie should be most concerned because Western Power has already in the last year or two contracted for a power purchase agreement for approximately 80 MW, and it did so in a secret deal. The Minister has refused to reveal to the Parliament the price being paid for that electricity but he has given order of magnitude indications to the effect that the price is 1.5¢ a MW more expensive than electricity supplied from Muja. It is worth about \$10m to the energy consumers of Western Australia, based on usage of 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The member for Collie should be concerned that the Minister has used the loophole in schedule 7 to avoid the competitive, open process prescribed by the Act in such a way that the energy consumers of Western Australia are paying an additional \$10m a year to subsidise the gas industry at the expense of the Collie coal industry. I would be most upset about that if I were the member for Collie and a member of the coalition Government, and I would raise it in the party room, if not in the Parliament. In the next couple of months I will raise this matter with the people of Collie, because they should know that this Government has made a major power purchase agreement and has used the loophole to avoid the open competitive process at the expense of the Collie coal industry. That is to the Government's eternal disgrace, and it has been criticised twice for it by the Commission on Government.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The last time members of the Labor Party talked to the Collie coalminers, they were booed. I know because I was there. They were booed because of 10 years of promises and a failure to get a project under way.

Mr THOMAS: I have spoken to the people of Collie several times in the past two years and they have never booed me. They would certainly like to talk to the Deputy Premier some time but I do not think he has been to see them. In the next six to seven years an additional 400 MW of electricity will be required. That is an exciting prospect and, should more industrial projects come along, such as a pulp mill, the figure could be even higher. I am pleased that is the case. However, I am concerned that, based on past performance, the provisions in schedule 7 of the Electricity Corporation Act might not be complied with. I ask the Minister whether he is prepared to make a commitment to the House that he will observe schedule 7 of that Act. If I am right and he is wrong and it does not catch power purchase agreements, but catches only the acquisition of new generating capacity by Western Power, will he give an undertaking that the open-ended process will be followed? If power purchase agreements are part of the equation - they will be - will the competitive process still apply and will the price of the electricity from the successful tenderer or supplier be revealed?

Mr C.J. Barnett: I will not give a commitment on the second part because I am not convinced it is appropriate. It is certainly my understanding, and the intent of that section was, that if Western Power is acquiring extra electricity, it will apply whether it results in the building of new plant or a power purchase agreement from an existing plant. I cannot think of an example where that would occur. However, that is the intent, and it is my attitude.

Mr THOMAS: Would the Minister be prepared to support that? I am not a lawyer, but I read the Act and that does not seem to be the case.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is clearly the intent.

Mr THOMAS: Why not make it crystal clear by amending the Act to make sure it does?

Mr C.J. Barnett: I do not see it as a problem. There may be a need at some stage to tidy up the Act. I do not see it as a problem, but if you think it is a problem I am prepared to have someone look at it.

Mr THOMAS: Let us do that then.

The first of those increments is only 100 MW, so it could be under the 3 per cent threshold. Is the Minister still prepared to apply the provision of the Act even if it is below the 3 per cent threshold?

Mr C.J. Barnett: No.

Mr THOMAS: The Minister got around it with Mission Energy-BP by stating it was a 78 MW contract so the provision did not apply. The first increment is predicted to be about 100 MW, so the Minister could well be signing a contract of a magnitude which does not fall below the threshold.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Generally, if Western Power has an arrangement to purchase power from an independent or third party, it will be for 100 MW or more. That is why it is there. If you were to take it lower, especially far lower, you would immediately cut out of the marketplace any renewable energy projects which were independent, and any cogeneration projects. You will appreciate - other members will not - that it is difficult to compare contracts as distinct from baseload operations where a plant operates during peaking time. It is difficult simply to compare price. That plant down there is an example of that.

Mr THOMAS: I know it is difficult to compare, but nonetheless, some of us like to try to compare and it is difficult to do so without the information.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The test will be when Western Power needs new capacity. Can some body outside of Western Power do it cheaply at the right quality and time? If some body can, it is bound to go to that organisation.

Mr THOMAS: It will not be bound to do that if the requirement is less than 100 MW, and they are predicting that the first requirement will be 100 MW. Notwithstanding that, will the Minister let the competitive process apply?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Not necessarily. We would not have any landfill gas production -

Mr THOMAS: That is 2 MW; I am talking about 80 MW or 90 MW.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The criteria has been set at 3 per cent. That is reasonable. Your view is otherwise. The reality for a large utility when acquiring significant purchases is that they will be at least 100 MW-plus.

Mr THOMAS: The member for Collie should note that the Minister is not prepared to guarantee that the open competitive process will apply for the first increment, which will be about 100 MW. That could well put Collie at a disadvantage. The people of Collie should be made aware of that. It will be a couple of years before the process comes to finality and the Minister should be badgered to ensure that he observes the propriety.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Implicit in your comments is the assumption that a second 300 MW unit at Collie will be cheaper than a similar size cogeneration unit. It may well not be.

Mr THOMAS: I am talking about 100 MW; there is not a way out with 300 MW.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You cannot have 100 MW at Collie.

Mr THOMAS: One can overcapitalise early if it is cheaper in the long run to do so.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Mr THOMAS: That is an interesting scenario and one which we will need to debate many times over the years to come.

The second issue arising in the energy sector, to which I alluded earlier, is the sale of the Dampier to Bunbury natural gas pipeline. An advertisement appeared in the newspaper on Saturday which sought expressions of interest both for the purchase of the pipeline and for a consultant to assist Western Power in that complex process. That is taking place when a couple of resources companies indicate their need for another pipeline. That makes the economics of the pipelines very interesting; it will be intriguing to follow over the next few months while the decisions are being made.

My concern - I have made statements on this in the past - is that it seems to be a shifting field. Initially the Minister said that he intended to sell a 50 per cent stake in the pipeline, but the advertisement which appeared in the newspaper on the weekend called for expressions of interest for all of the pipeline or a part purchase. I presume that the Government is open for representation from somebody interested in purchasing 100 per cent equity in that asset. My response to the Minister when he proposed to sell a 50 per cent interest in the pipeline was that the whole might well be worth more than the sum of its parts; that is, it would probably be better business to sell a 100 per cent equity.

Mr C.J. Barnett: If you transfer a monopoly status to the private sector, sure, they would pay more than the going rate for it - I would too. However, we are not about to confer that status on a private group.

Mr THOMAS: That was the second point I wanted to make.

Pipeline guidelines are emerging through the Council of Australian Governments process. Seminars were held in Perth two or three weeks ago with the COAG working party, which includes the Coordinator of Energy of Western



Australia, which is drafting guidelines for the operation of pipelines with government and third party access, tariff procedures and such processes. My concern is that as these utilities have a guaranteed cash flow, they can be attractive to superannuation-type institutions looking for a guaranteed cash flow rather than a high rate of return. Obviously, they like to have both, but sometimes the priority is for the cash flow. The pipeline could be an attractive investment. Obviously, the pipeline is a strategic part of the Western Australian economy and tariff fixing cannot be left to a monopoly with no restraint.

Mr C.J. Barnett: As you will again appreciate, it is double-edged sword: With the obligation to expand, the new owners may find a huge capital demand too.

Mr THOMAS: I know. At the end of next week we will have four pipelines operating in this State with four different regimes. The COAG working party has been through a fascinating process trying to have uniform rules operating for the whole of Australia.

Mr C.J. Barnett: They are erring on the side of being far too prescriptive. I accept what you are saying about the different regimes in the State which have developed historically, but the light-handed approach in this State is generally regarded as the way to go by the industry.

Mr THOMAS: That may be the case if it works. If, for example, we end up with a privately owned pipeline which has the potential to hold Perth and industry to ransom, one needs the capacity to control the price and the value.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The transport charge.

Mr THOMAS: Of course. The others are a completely different variable.

One of the matters considered by people who contemplate regimes for pipeline ownership is the fact ideally they should not be owned by people who are either gas producers or gas consumers. If they are gas producers, they will have an advantage over competitors relating to access to pipeline and the market. Gas consumers clearly would have a competitive advantage.

Although guidelines can be put in place, and we can have referees and regulations to attempt to restrain the advantage that gas producers or consumers might have, we are trying to regulate a contrary economic interest. All the commentators in this field agree that it is ideal that an owner of a pipeline be neither a gas producer nor a gas consumer. Given the process that commenced last Saturday, is the Minister prepared to give an assurance that the Government will not sell the pipeline to either a gas producer or consumer?

Mr C.J. Barnett: I will not make that commitment. I expect there will be some interested consortia coming forward. However, we will not exclude any player from the process.

Mr THOMAS: That is unfortunate, because every commentator who has considered the subject agrees that it is most ideal that the operators of pipelines should not be gas producers or consumers because they would have a competitive advantage over other people in the industry.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Do you have a problem with the ownership of the goldfields pipeline?

Mr THOMAS: Yes, and the Minister would probably say it is better to happen and then regulate the interest. I have received representation from people who are very unhappy. They are asking about \$3.30 a gigajoule for transportation - which is not the cheap gas that people expect. Many people are disillusioned.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is expensive to transport, but it is a relatively small pipeline. This is a long pipeline, but there are substantial savings.

Mr THOMAS: It beats diesel -

Mr C.J. Barnett: I would like to have seen a bigger pipeline.

Mr THOMAS: It is nowhere near the cheap gas for the goldfields that was spoken about before the election.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Prior to the election we spoke about a decrease of up to 50 per cent, or savings of about 65 per cent in energy costs -

Mr THOMAS: Some people were looking for gas prices which would approximate -

Mr Grill: What is the saving in Kalgoorlie-Kambalda?

Mr C.J. Barnett: It depends on how much is used. The general figure I have heard is between 20 and 30 per cent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members have had their interjections. Let us give the member a chance.

Mr THOMAS: The final consideration in the sale of the pipeline is the purpose for which the money will be applied. AlintaGas is encumbered with about \$1.2b-worth of debt. As I recall, about \$800m of that is attributable to the pipeline. Our position is that the money acquired from the sale of the pipeline should be used to retire AlintaGas debt. It should not be used elsewhere in government. Does the Minister have a position on that?

Mr C.J. Barnett: We will retire AlintaGas debt.

Mr THOMAS: I am pleased about that because I believe it is most important that the money is used for that purpose.

The Minister has been able to assuage my concerns in one or two areas. However, I am still very concerned about the prediction that the next substantial acquisition of energy or electricity by Western Power is 100 MW. The Minister is not able to provide an assurance that the open, competitive process prescribed by legislation will be used in these circumstances. I am pleased that he is able to say that if it is above the 3 per cent threshold the open competitive process will apply to purchase agreements as much as it would to the acquisition or construction of a power station. However, again, I am disappointed that he is not prepared to give an undertaking that the prices agreed to will be made available.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The only qualification is that you may have to make a distinction between buying 100 MW at peak capacity compared to base load. If the demand from Western Power is for extra peaking capacity it cannot be compared with a base load operation. It is not just price, but a price for a purpose.

Mr THOMAS: The Minister is not telling us anything. We are talking about base load. The Minister is not prepared to indicate that the price will be made public. Once again, the energy consumers in this State will not know what they are paying and what agreements have been entered into on their behalf by the State Government.

Finally, turning to the proposed sale of the Dampier to Bunbury natural gas pipeline, I am concerned that the Government is not prepared to say at this stage that the sale will not be to a gas producer or a major gas consumer. Every commentator who writes on the subject says it is most ideal that the owners of the pipeline should not be in a position to distort the market by virtue of their position as pipeline proprietors. The Minister cited the Kalgoorlie pipeline and said that it might not have happened had the interested parties not been prepared to build a pipeline which they would use. That situation does not apply here. We are not talking about a relatively small market, as we were with the Kalgoorlie pipeline. We are talking about a major pipeline and a supply in a major metropolitan market.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I understand the argument, but another consideration is that whoever buys it, one thing to look for is a group with a long term commitment to the State. A financial institution may not have that. That is the experience in Victoria. I do not want to see a pipeline bought and sold around the world, regardless of the interests of Western Australia. That is the danger. We must have a long term commitment.

Mr THOMAS: I agree with that. We should have people who are neither gas producers nor consumers who are able to give that long term commitment.

**MR GRILL** (Eyre) [3.08 pm]: I contribute to this debate by referring to the current controversy concerning a gold royalty. Some members opposite might think it is inevitable that I make a speech on this subject, and I tend to agree with them. I will propound an argument shortly which will indicate that the situation is a good deal more complicated than some government members would have us think.

The Leader of the House, the current Minister for Resources Development, is working, largely behind the scenes, within his party and elsewhere to foster a gold royalty. Some public support is coming to him from the Leader of the National Party, the Deputy Premier, who says that a gold tax is "inevitable", and that the gold mining companies should simply get together with the Government to work out the form of royalty to apply. On the other hand the Treasurer says somewhat disingenuously that a gold tax is not on the agenda. To say that a gold tax is not on the agenda, when the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Resources Development are actively fostering a gold tax or gold royalty, is stretching our credulity a long way.

The truth is that although the Treasurer can say that a royalty is not on the agenda at this time, we all appreciate that once the election has been held a gold royalty will be well and truly on the agenda whether we like it or not. I do not like it. The proposition being put forward in essence by the Minister for Resource Development is that gold is no different from any other metal and should be treated in a similar fashion to any other mineral or metal. That is a simple argument and I think a number of simpleminded people have picked up and run with that argument. Unfortunately, among those people are some of the journalists attached to *The West Australian*.

I urge members to consider the matter more deeply. The argument that gold is no different from any other metal, in truth, is simplistic and, when examined, does not hold water. In fact I believe a gold tax will be counterproductive

to the State's economy and damaging to the State's best interests and will ultimately do no good if it is introduced on the basis that gold is no different from any other mineral or metal.

In attacking the simplicity of the argument put forward by the Minister for Resources Development, I remind him - I think he is already aware - that gold is and has always been treated differently within Australia and internationally. It has been different because ever since the days of antiquity gold has had a pre-eminent position in world financial affairs. I suggest it will continue to play a very significant financial role in the world economy.

Mr C.J. Barnett: So what? The only difference with gold is there is no longer a gold standard, a Bretton Woods system or a fixed price of gold. All you can say about gold is that it is probably the most readily marketable asset in the world. It is no different from any other product.

Mr GRILL: The point I am making contradicts the simple point the Minister is making that gold is the same as any other mineral. It has never been the same.

Mr C.J. Barnett: To a producer it has an advantage because no other product is so readily marketed as gold. Probably the closest is oil. If there is a difference, it is to the advantage of the producer.

Mr GRILL: It is true that there is always a market for gold and that it is sellable. That does not detract from my argument that historically, from the earliest days of antiquity, gold has been treated differently, not only in Australia but also throughout the world and it continues to play a significant part in the world financial economy. Most of the major banks still have significant hoards of gold. The International Monetary Fund still has a significant amount of gold in its repositories to back its activities, even though it sold some gold recently. Most of the significant national currencies around the world today have large amounts of gold backing them. I submit that gold is very different, will continue to be different and requires different treatment.

In Australia, gold has always had different treatment. Until 1991 it attracted neither income tax nor company tax.

Mr C.J. Barnett: A Labor Government changed that. I agree that it did the right thing.

Mr GRILL: It did with my opposition and against the interests of Western Australia. When it comes to putting the interests of Western Australia first, I am sure the Minister likes to be seen at the forefront with people like me.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Why are we producing more gold now than in 1991?

Mr GRILL: If the Government puts a royalty on gold, the industry will go backwards. To place the issue in some sort of context, world economies have always treated gold differently. However, they have not always promoted the price of gold. In the interests of those countries which held significant hoards of gold - the United States and Great Britain - the Bretton Woods agreement to which the Minister referred, pegged the price of gold at \$35 an ounce, albeit in the wartime years I admit. That was to the great detriment of gold producing countries such as South Africa and Australia and the communities I represent. Those communities were forced into penury over that period because of the way in which gold was treated.

Once again, I underline the point that gold was not like other minerals during that period; it has never been like other minerals. The Bretton Woods agreement under which the major economic powers in the world pegged the price of gold for a significant number of years until 1971 was very much to the detriment of the communities I represent. As I have said before in this House, I can remember very clearly a meeting I attended in the Boulder Town Hall in 1976 with many of my colleagues and the citizenry of that area, when it was announced that the last goldmine in that area would be closed. That situation did not change for a long time. The Bretton Woods agreement pegged the price of gold for about three decades.

However, in 1971 a change occurred when President Nixon of the United States realised that even with the price of gold pegged at \$35 an ounce, the United States was still unable to guarantee to recoup the American dollar at the same value as gold. That came about because of the vast expenditure that the United States put into the Vietnam War. In 1971 it was forced off the gold standard. For a period a large part of the financial world endeavoured to devalue the price of gold through an active campaign. That occurred on the basis that gold, as they saw it - I do not subscribe to it - was an antiquated metal and they endeavoured to denigrate its price and push it down, once again to the detriment of the community and citizenry I represent.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You are right; the development of the Eurodollar market was part of that instability, but there was also a period of great exchange rate instability in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The whole Bretton Woods system was built around gold for a standard of exchange rate stability and worked for 20 or 30 years. It was the breakdown of exchange rate stability that led to the breaking of convertibility in 1971. Both factors were at work.

Mr GRILL: The Minister for Resources Development's attitude towards this subject stems from his academic background. The academic background in the universities was, for a long time, to denigrate gold as an antiquated metal in the financial affairs of the world. Those academics with that school of thought fostered a climate against the interests of gold producers. The Minister for Resources Development is coming from that background. It is from that background that he puts forward a proposal to bring in a gold royalty, against the wishes of many of his colleagues.

The Minister would like members to believe that gold is the same as any other mineral. However, it was subsidised by the Commonwealth Government for a considerable number of years after the Second World War and up to the late 1960s or early 1970s when the subsidy became irrelevant. I am not sure when it was actually wiped out. It was in place for at least three or four decades and at its highest level the subsidy was \$12 per ounce. The subsidy was in recognition of the fact that gold was different from other metals and that the fostering of the mining of gold was very much in the interests of the Western Australian and Australian communities. I suggest to those people who put forward the simplistic argument that gold is like any other mineral and a royalty should be imposed on it, that they look back over recent history. They will find that successive Commonwealth Government's, of both colours, took the view that gold was very different and that fostering the production of gold was very much in the interests of Australia. It was so much in the interests of this country that they were prepared to pay a subsidy to see it produced.

Today, gold still backs a fair degree of the financial economy around the world, not only in the developed countries, but also in many of the undeveloped countries which have unstable economies. The first proposal for a tax on gold actually came from a Labor Government - the Minister is correct in that respect.

Mr Cowan: Are you talking about tax as opposed to royalties?

Mr GRILL: I am about to talk about tax as opposed to royalties.

Mr Cowan: It came from your friend Peter Walsh, the dean of the Doodlakine school of economics.

Mr GRILL: It is the same school the Minister for Resources Development came out of.

Mr Cowan: I hardly think so.

Mr GRILL: I do not think the Deputy Premier's economic views are always parallel with those of his colleagues any more than my economic views parallel those of my good friend Peter Walsh.

Mr Blaikie: Your views have widened considerably now that you are no longer in government. You are showing a more statesmanlike approach now. You had blinkers on when you were in government.

Mr GRILL: My views on a gold tax or royalty are well known and have been well documented.

I actually attended the tax summit in 1985 with the then Premier, Brian Burke. I was the only person who delivered a paper against taxing gold, although there were a number of delegates who shared my view.

Mr Cowan: It was not the same conference where you delivered a paper on uranium mining, was it?

Mr GRILL: It was not that sort of conference.

Mr Cowan: I heard a story about a mobile phone.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRILL: This might be an appropriate time to request an extension of time.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Mr GRILL: The tax summit of 1985 was the brain child of the Hawke-Keating Government. The White Paper presented by the Government to that conference proposed an immediate tax on gold profits. The paper I delivered did bear some fruit because that tax did not come about. Instead, an inquiry was set up at my instigation and it was headed by an economist, Gerry Gutman. The Gutman inquiry looked into the taxation of gold profits and ultimately brought down a report recommending that a gold tax be introduced at a federal level. In time the relevant legislation was introduced and a gold tax was brought in. It did not become effective until 1991. In the interim period the goldmining companies, which principally were located in Western Australia, saved hundreds of millions of dollars.

I refer to the question of a royalty versus a tax on gold. Those people who talk simplistically about a gold royalty do not understand the ramifications of their advocacy. A royalty is a very different animal from a gold tax and it has a very different effect on the gold industry - an income tax or a company tax on the profits of gold is a tax on profits. A royalty does not tax profits. A royalty is indiscriminate in terms of profit. It simply skims off the top a percentage

of the gross value of the product. Another major difference between a royalty and a tax is that a tax takes into account the cost of production. The cost of production can be written off against the profits; therefore, the cost of production can be written off against the tax. A royalty is of a different colour and the cost of production cannot be written off against it. A royalty comes off the top before income tax is assessed. It is a very damaging tax because it means that inevitably some marginal goldmines will close and that all mines will have to mine a higher grade of ore. Some potential mines will not open if a royalty is instituted and all mines will have a shorter life. All these factors would lead to a dramatic decrease in the employment potential for the goldmining industry.

One cannot, with any degree of honesty, make all those assertions about either an income or company tax. Both income and company taxes are based on profit; royalties are not. They are very regressive taxes and can be destructive. I am sure the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Resources Development and the Parliament understand that, but I do not know whether *The West Australian* does. I also do not know whether some of the people who have picked up this simplistic argument understand that royalties, by their very nature, are destructive. Royalties are very different from a rent resource tax. My good friend Peter Walsh is a great advocate of a rent resource tax.

Mr Cowan: You know why.

Mr GRILL: Yes, I do. At the end of the day a rent resource tax is flexible. Unlike a royalty, it can be tailored to accommodate profit. A rent resources tax is nowhere near as harsh as a royalty and it does not have the same effect because it can be tailor made to suit the circumstances. A royalty is not that flexible.

Mr Cowan: That is not the reason Peter Walsh favoured it.

Mr GRILL: He probably advocates it for the same reason the Deputy Premier does. He wants to get his hands on the money. The Deputy Premier should not excuse himself though. He is in the same boat. In his rush to get his hands on the money, he should not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Mr Cowan: We certainly won't.

Mr GRILL: I think that is the road the Government is going down.

Mr Cowan: A tax on profits made from gold did not kill the goose. Neither would a reasonable royalty and you know it.

Mr GRILL: I am making a distinction between a royalty which is not based on profit, and a company income tax which is based on a royalty. I am making the further distinction between a royalty, which is a very blunt instrument, and a resources rent tax, which can be tailor made to suit the industry to which it applies. Royalties are not susceptible to any great flexibility or to any sculpturing of their application or their effect.

Mr Cowan: Is this State able to raise a resources rent tax? I do not think it is.

Mr GRILL: I am about to get onto that. The problem is that royalties are very blunt instruments. If the State could apply a resources rent tax, it would. It would not get the same arguments against a resources rent tax that it gets against a royalty. Most of the political commentators on this subject are unable to make the distinction between a resources rent tax and a royalty, and most of them are economically illiterate and cannot make the distinction between a company tax and a royalty. Therein lies the problem. Those people who simply advocate a royalty are talking about less employment, fewer mines and the high grading of mines that we would not be talking about if we were talking about a resources rent tax. The reason that we cannot tailor make a royalty to suit an industry or to suit the weaker components of the industry is that soon we will start fiddling around with it, and as soon as we start trying to tailor make it to suit the profitability or the costs of the industry, it becomes an excise. As soon as it becomes an excise, it is then beyond the constitutional scope of the State to be involved. Therein lies the problem.

Let me tell the House something else about the mining industry that makes it a bit different in this State. By and large, the goldmining industry in this State is home grown. It does not just operate in this State. Those companies that are engaged in the industry - the Chamber of Commerce and Industry tells me there are something like 80 home grown Western Australian mining companies - are by and large Western Australian. Sure, Western Mining Corporation Limited and the like have their head offices in Melbourne. However, they started here and the great bulk of their operations are in this State. However, a multitude of companies has grown up during the last decade that are Western Australian companies with Western Australian stockholders and Western Australian directors. They have made a unique contribution to this State; a contribution that the mining and extraction of other metals and petroleum and gas have not made. They have not made the contribution because they are not home grown, they have not been sourced from local capital, they do not have local boards of directors, and their service delivery is not focused on this State. It is not entirely the case that gold is focused on this State either, because there are a number of multinationals involved in the goldmining industry.

Mr Cowan: There certainly are.

Mr GRILL: There certainly are. Big Australian multinationals are involved in the goldmining industry, including BHP. However, no other industry of comparable size has such a great preponderance of Western Australian share holding, interests and directorship. That has meant that we have a capital raising market of some dimension in Western Australia. The capital raising market in Western Australia has been largely associated with the goldmining industry. I do not think any other industry can make that boast. At the same time, there has been a whole array of associated concomitant service industries grow up alongside the goldmining industry. A number of manufacturing industries have also grown up alongside the goldmining industry, and they are largely Western Australian owned and operated. More recently, because of the maturing of the goldmining industry, we have a new export market. As these Western Australian companies have grown up, they have matured and gone offshore. Some people have lamented that. Others like me have seen it as a maturing of the industry and a very good feature of it. However, as those companies go offshore, they take with them the Western Australian service and manufacturing companies. Why do they do it? They do it because those service companies and those manufacturing companies are the best in the world at what they do. Very few Australian industries have been able to do that.

I suggest to the House and, in particular, to the Deputy Premier, that the Government will need to get some analysis of the goldmining industry and the outstanding contribution it is making to the economy of this State before it takes away its tax free or royalty free status. I suggest to the Deputy Premier that, before he kills the goose that lays the golden egg, he get his economists in government to put together a paper that sets out on one side the assets and the benefits that are being generated by the goldmining industry in its tax free status and what it will lose as a result of introducing a royalty. Until it has done that exercise, I do not think anyone on that side of the House, including the Minister for Resources Development, can contradict the assertion that placing gold in the same position as any other mineral - that is the rationale - is good for this State, because no other commodity and no other industry in this State has burgeoned in the same way as the goldmining industry with the same spinoff of other beneficial effects. I include in that the petroleum industry and the gas and oil industry, because largely - there is a greater investment in that industry at the present time; it is now the biggest industry, just passing gold - the spinoff effects of those industries have gone overseas. However, the spinoffs from the goldmining industry have stayed within this State and generated new export income from the export of services and manufactured goods, the manufacture of technology, and expertise. Even the financial expertise we find in our State today largely stems from the expertise which has been generated within the goldmining industry by dealing with gold futures.

I suggest to the Government that it think very carefully before proceeding down this path which some of its members have advocated and that it do that paper I have suggested.

**MR MARLBOROUGH** (Peel) [3.39 pm]: I want to follow up on my colleague's line on the position this Government finds itself in today with the resource boom and its inability to turn that resource boom into maximising the benefits for Western Australians. That is why we are seeing today divisions between the Premier - I refer here to his views on a gold tax - and the Deputy Premier and Minister for Commerce and Trade, and the Minister for Resources Development, the Leader of the House.

Mr Cowan: Profits from gold are already taxed. Call it a royalty; get it right.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: I will not get into an argument with the Minister for Commerce and Trade. The difference at the highest level of the conservative parties today on whether an industry like the gold resource industry should be taxed is -

Mr Cowan: Canberra taxed them years ago. I did not hear you bleating then.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: I am not bleating about any tax on the gold industry, nor would I necessarily bleat about any future tax. The point I am making is that the reason these differences are occurring today among conservative Governments is the strongly held view in certain sections of the conservative Government at a state level that, unless we find new ways of taxing industries in this State, we will not be able to put in place the infrastructure that is urgently required so that we can get the manufacturing based industries which will create the job opportunities, and the downstream processing of the assets that we presently dig out of the ground and send overseas. That is the big argument behind the doors of the conservative parties. That debate has been further fuelled by the role of the Federal Government.

The worst thing that has happened to this state conservative Government is the election of a John Howard led Federal Government. In the short term, the Howard Government will prove to be the Federal Government that has been most detrimental to this State's future and its ability to grow. The John Howard conservative Government sees no role at all in providing any resources - that means money - for infrastructure requirements. I will give members an example of how it has already affected the future of industry in this State. We need look no further than the industry which

has outshone all others in my electorate in its growth potential; that is, the light shipbuilding industry. That industry produces over \$350m of export income for this country, of which some \$278m came out of the Henderson shipyards alone. The Federal Government which has just been elected to power has made it more difficult for that industry to compete against the international market. It is not because our tradespeople and engineers are less skilled, or we cannot deliver a product on time or to cost. The Federal Government has deemed the most important thing to do is to pay off a debt. Measured against other OECD countries, we are the second most capable nation of paying off a debt in relation to our gross domestic product. However, the Federal Government, driven by its mad desire to pay off this debt, must cut its cloth somewhere. One of the things it has decided to do is to cut the 5 per cent bounty to the shipbuilding industry.

As the Minister for Commerce and Trade knows, that bounty, which was based originally some 10 or 12 years ago on 30 per cent, has gradually been decreasing. The shipbuilding industry was more than happy that was decreasing. However, in cutting that 5 per cent bounty, the Federal Government has disadvantaged our shipbuilders. In the OECD countries all of those shipbuilding industries that are delivering ships for export are underpinned to the tune of at least 5 per cent. In Italy those shipbuilders are underpinned by the Government to the tune of 15 per cent. If a company were to build an 800 seat catamaran in Italy to be sold into the Norwegian market, the Italian Government would give that export shipyard 15 per cent of the cost of building that product, because that would deliver jobs, technology and opportunities to Italy.

Our Federal Government sees this massive growth industry - industrial technology at the cutting edge of technology - where we are exporting our knowledge, and cuts the bounty. Just as it can be argued that we lead the world in mining technology, so today do we lead the world in all facets of light shipbuilding technology. The Federal Government, in its first attempt to pay off a deficit, says that one of the areas it must cut is the 5 per cent bounty to the light shipbuilding industry. What we will see throughout Europe is a bounty of at least 5 per cent - in Italy it is 15 per cent - being paid until 1998-99. The experts in the shipbuilding industry tell me that it will probably go beyond that. The shipbuilding industry in Australia and particularly in Western Australia is asking for the opportunity to compete on an even playing field. That is where the conservative Government is already starting to stumble and fall. That is why we are starting to see the headlines that we saw in *The West Australian* yesterday with the Premier criticising industry. The Premier should criticise the Federal Government not industry for being slow off the blocks. Industries are as confused about the Federal Government's policy on assistance for the future of industry as is this State Government.

The Department of Commerce and Trade cannot even get a foot in the door in Canberra. The Federal Government has closed the door on that department. The Department of Commerce and Trade is trying to plan for infrastructure needs. The Minister for Commerce and Trade knows where the future of the resources boom and the shipbuilding industry lies. He knows that, if Australia and Western Australia, in particular, is able to compete in the Asian market with shipbuilding, we must urgently put in place massive infrastructure. That is what is beating us in Korea, Singapore, the Philippines and Indonesia. We knew about it when we were in government. It can be argued that we did not move rapidly enough. However, in the shipbuilding area alone we recognised those needs and started off the process. We put in place the Henderson industrial area, a 10 000 tonne ship lifter of which \$8m was paid for by the then Labor State Government, and \$10m by the Federal Labor Government. Today if this Government went to the Federal Government it would have the door closed in its face. If it said, "We want another ship lifter, another dry dock in Henderson so we can maximise the benefits from the North West Shelf gas instead of its going offshore" the Federal Government would close the door on it. The State Government has not received from the Federal Government one cent of the \$150m that is required to develop Henderson over the next six years. The Federal Government has told this Government it is not interested; the Federal Government does not have a policy of involving itself in industry in that way. The Johnny Howard led Federal Government believes that, if there is a production benefit, industry will put in the money. What a nonsense. To give credit, the Minister for Commerce and Trade realises that is nonsense. Let us see why it is a nonsense in language that everybody can understand.

In the Henderson shipbuilding area all of the land on the waterfront, outside of the light shipbuilding area, is owned by the Government, and it has determined - rightly so, as we did - that that land should be for offshore development, for the jackets and the platforms that must be built for use in the north west. It should also be for the heavy shipbuilding industry. In the main it should be for the work that we want to attract to this State for the biggest gas field in the world; that is, the North West Shelf. In putting that together, if and when the waterfront develops - I will come back to the problems of the if and when -

Mr Cowan: I prefer you to use the word "when".

Mr MARLBOROUGH: Absolutely. The Government is panicking about this window of opportunity.

Mr Cowan: Concerned, not panicking.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: That window of opportunity has been slammed shut. The Government is panicking - we are seeing it all over the West - because it knows that window of opportunity is being slammed on its fingers by the Federal Government. That Government does not have the mentality nor the capacity to think of anything other than getting rid of the national debt. Anything else that gets in the way of that, regardless of how good it is, of how productive it is, of how long term it is, the Federal Government just slams the door on it. However, to his credit, the Deputy Premier sees that, unless he kicks and fights for assistance now, the window of opportunity could go altogether. We have only about another 10 or 15 years, while this resource boom is taking place, to create the opportunities of downstream processing.

Mr Cowan: I do not agree with you. You are right about the window of opportunity for a construction base, but through life maintenance is always going to be around.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: No. Through life maintenance cannot occur at the moment. The Asian countries are now benefiting because they had the foresight and the will of government to put in place infrastructure 20 years ago in the case of Singapore; 15 years ago in the case of Korea; and in the past 10 years in the case of India. As a result, they have captured the very market that we are still desperately trying to get hold of - the manufacturing of the vessels that are required for the oil rigs in the Timor Sea and off the North West Shelf.

Mr Grill: We captured the fishing vessels down at the Fremantle boat harbour.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: Absolutely. They are now benefiting from the ongoing maintenance only as a result of their putting in place the infrastructure to capture the manufacturing industry and from having produced the initial vessels and vehicles that had to be built for offshore gas fields; the ships and whatever. If the infrastructure is not in place, countries cannot benefit from the maintenance. We need not look much further than the boundaries of Western Australia and South Australia. What will happen with the new submarines? Because we do not have the infrastructure here to do the repairs on the new submarines to be stationed at *HMAS Stirling*, they will go back to South Australia for that work.

Mr Cowan: It is not as simple as that.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: It is. The other difficulty is that we allowed the Transfield group - the former government played a role in this - to get its hands on the ship lifter in 1987. I encourage the Deputy Premier to get it back off that group as quickly as he can. The State cannot afford any single industry to blackmail our attempts to get work done in Henderson by putting an unrealistic figure on the use of that ship lifter. The Deputy Premier and I know that is what that company has been doing in terms of other companies trying to gain work that requires the use of that ship lifter. That is a fact of life and no State can allow a company to do that. While that sort of thing is happening in Henderson and the infrastructure is not in place, we do not have to go overseas to find an argument that supports my position. Not only do we not get the manufacturing but also we do not get the flow-on maintenance from it either. The big fight at the moment is over taking the Australian naval vessels, including the submarines, back to the east coast for ongoing maintenance because that is where all the infrastructure is.

This is causing a crisis in the State Government at the moment because the Federal Government has closed the door on all of the assistance that is required; none whatsoever is coming through. It leads me to my earlier point: It is because of that crisis, created by the Federal Government, that we are now seeing the debate that is taking place at the highest level of the Liberal Party, about whether a gold tax should be introduced, or whether, as my colleague the member for Kalgoorlie recommends, it should be a resources rent tax. Those opposite can call it what they like, but we all know there are differences of opinion within the coalition. An argument is going on about where we get the money from for the cost of the infrastructure. Some people in the Government recognise no money will come from the Federal Government and the only way we will get this infrastructure in place, within the window of opportunity that is left open to us, is to find other ways by which the State can fund it. If it is not through a gold tax, it will be through some other tax somewhere else.

It may well be that the money gained from selling off assets will go into the infrastructure. I would not be surprised if, in the near future, the Government looked at either a gold tax and/or a decision to sell off assets, and a statement was made that all of the money gained from selling off the Pilbara to Perth pipeline would not go into paying off the pipeline debt, but that some of it would go into infrastructure in places like Henderson. That will be the next big argument. Somewhere the Government must find the shortfall that has arisen because of the cut in funding to the State by the Federal Government. The money is just not available. We will see a crisis in the conservative government of this State. It is now recognising that, in the very short time the Howard Government has been in place, the greatest problem faced by the State Government is a Federal Government that is not in touch with the needs of Western Australia and is not establishing the sorts of policies that will assist this State.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]



Mr MARLBOROUGH: The headlines we have seen over the past two or three weeks are about some of the conservative members, led by the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Resources Development, recognising that the Federal Government is out of touch with the needs of Western Australia. The problem they have is convincing the Cabinet and the Premier that the way forward in the best interests of the State is to look at means by which the money for infrastructure costs can be raised at a state level.

I make my position totally clear: I absolutely support the role of the State, with Federal Government involvement, putting in place the infrastructure that is needed. If we do not get that infrastructure in place in time, we will miss out on the creation of many thousands of jobs that should be implemented in this State in the next 10 years. In the main those jobs will go to Asia. That is where they are presently, and we will continue to miss out on them. Already the \$150m plan for Henderson has had to be rethought and the Deputy Premier knows there is a unique possibility of our picking up work for the Woodside company in its new Timor Sea gas field, but it involves a time limit. That company needs certain things in place by 1998, and it requires infrastructure.

Henderson needs a 12 metre deep wet berth fairly quickly and a sea wall that will protect that berth. It needs a lot of other infrastructure. It would be appropriate to install at the same time cranes with lifting capacities of over 500 tonnes. That is the infrastructure that we are competing with in Asia. Not only are we competing with the infrastructure that is in place in Asia, but also we are now competing with a Federal Government which considers that it has no role to play in putting one cent into the provision of infrastructure to assist industry. In the past two or three months, we have seen the Federal Government stop funding for technology and science. We have seen it stop funding for the Better Cities program; and that will affect cities and, therefore, industry. We have seen a policy which closes the door on the ability of the Deputy Premier's officers to go to Canberra to argue what is best for the State.

On Monday of this week, I met John Rothwell, the head of Austal Ships Pty Ltd. He told me that he and John Farrell went to Canberra urgently to speak to the federal Minister for Industry, Science and Tourism about the abolition of the 5 per cent bounty that was announced four weeks ago. They are very busy men; they are trying to sell Western Australian technology on the international market in a very competitive field. The federal Minister, who I think is Senator Hill -

Mr Cowan: No; Hon John Moore.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: - confronted them in his office. He walked in, half an hour late, and said to these two heavyweights of the light shipbuilding industry, which last year exported \$34m worth of product for this nation, "You have got 10 minutes to convince me about the bounty." The Deputy Premier knows John Rothwell. John Rothwell first came to see me, as his local member, in 1987, when he owned a little tourist boat that took people to Penguin Island, and the City of Rockingham Council would not allow him to load people onto the boat from the beach; he had to build a jetty. He later had a problem with his tourist boat at Coral Bay. At a personal level, we have been very close since that time. John Rothwell was not impressed by this Federal Government's attitude to an extremely important industry to this State and nation. These senior spokespersons for the light shipbuilding industry in this nation said to this John Howard-led Federal Government, "You are wrong about this 5 per cent bounty. We are not asking for any more than that you allow the 5 per cent bounty to remain, in line with what the Europeans are doing, until the end of 1998. That is all we are asking. We will be happy to let it go then because it will be an even playing field." The way in which they were treated by the federal Minister, when one of them had flown to Canberra from Western Australia and the other from overseas, was disgusting.

That is an example of the difficulty that is being faced by the state coalition Government at the moment. It cannot get the door open either. That is why we have seen the Minister for Resources Development and the Premier attack industry. It is a sign of panic about their conservative policies, and about a Federal Government that does not understand the industrial needs of this State. I predict that in the next two or three months, before an election is called early next year, we will see this State Government and the Federal Government go further down the track of fighting with each other about how to raise the money to put in place the necessary infrastructure.

The final point is: What are the benefits to the Western Australian community? There is no better example of the difficulty faced by this Government in selling the benefits to ordinary men and women than the way it has treated the City of Rockingham. I ask members to think about how politically stupid it is that the largest city in Western Australia attached to an industrial area, and which comprises some 60 000 people, has not had one cent spent on its inner city infrastructure in the four years that this Government has been in office. If the Government were politically smart, it would keep that community onside because it would want the industrial strip of Kwinana to at least double in the next 30 years as that is in the best interests of the State. The only way that can happen is if the local community can see direct benefits from that industry, not only in jobs, but also in lifestyle once they leave the factory gate.

The State Government should be smart enough to recognise that that is where it should put its money. However, this State Government has played party politics and engaged in pork barrelling. It has gone 30 kilometres down the coast to Mandurah and has pork barrelled Mandurah in order to hang on to two seats there. That is not unusual in politics; what is unusual is that the Government has done it at the same time that it has absolutely ignored the needs of Rockingham.

The Rockingham City Council put in place in 1989-90 a city centre project that should have been supported by any Government. It was the southern metropolitan reflection of what was happening in Joondalup. It was equally well planned, and it would have provided the opportunity for growth, but it needed Government support and infrastructure. None of that has happened. This State Government has not been smart enough to see that if it is planning long term for industry to be competitive and in demand, it must put in place the infrastructure that is required not only by industry but also by the community - only Governments can do that - so that the community can see that it is receiving a direct benefit.

The headlines that we are now seeing, with the Minister for Resources Development and the Premier pleading for industry to move faster, are also a reflection of their concerns about the Federal Government, which does not recognise that it must play a role in putting in place the major infrastructure that is needed to provide jobs downstream. There is no better example than Henderson, which needs \$150m-worth of infrastructure within the next five years so that it can secure a lifetime of manufacturing and maintenance industries, which will otherwise disappear through that window of opportunity. The crisis that this Government has on its hands is that the Federal Government refuses to recognise the needs of Western Australia.

**MR BROWN** (Morley) [4.09 pm]: I will deal with a number of important issues of concern to my electorate and with matters that fall within the responsibilities given to me by the state parliamentary Labor Party. I will focus first on the effects of the so-called boom that we are experiencing in Western Australia.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is not a word that I use, although I get quoted as using it.

Mr BROWN: Some people and groups in our society are doing very well out of the boom; there is no question about that. However, it is the responsibility of government to ensure that in a society that attempts to have some measure of egalitarianism, those who are the most disadvantaged and who are in most need are not left behind.

Last year I visited the United States of America, where I listened to a speech made by President Clinton to the national governors' association. He referred to the economic data that was then current in the United States. He pointed to the fact that there had been growth in employment and in a number of industries then operating in the United States, and to the fact that the United States could boast more millionaires than before. If that economic data were considered as a measure of the community's health, the United States looked exceptionally well compared with the rest of the world. However, President Clinton went on to say that one had to consider other factors to measure the wellbeing of society. He talked about the fact that half the middle class had not had a real wage increase for 20 years; that the middle class was reducing at a rapid rate; that the underclass - I do not mean the working class - was increasing dramatically; that the number of Americans earning the minimum wage was increasing dramatically; and that crime and imprisonment, features of poverty and despair, were getting progressively worse. There was a clear difference between whether the success of the United States' economy was measured by looking at hard economic data, or whether one examined what was happening in the community and what was affecting ordinary Americans.

Much the same can be said here in Western Australia. Let us contrast two things that are happening simultaneously. I feel sure from the public comments by the Minister for Resources Development and the Premier over the past couple of days that some time in the next three or four weeks a number of announcements about big projects will be made.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I'm sure you're right.

Mr BROWN: That is the way politics is played. The projects will have been agreed to already and they will be announced at the most strategically important times in the next three or four weeks. If it were legal to have a bet at the TAB on these matters, I would put my wallet on the line because as sure as night follows day, new projects will be announced. Whether those new projects will come to fruition remains to be seen. We have seen front page stories in the newspaper about new projects, and then stories on page 55 that the projects have fallen over or are not going ahead.

Mr C.J. Barnett: In fairness, that is because of the project proponents, not the Government. Some have an eye on the share price more than the capacity.

Mr BROWN: Sure. The State Government plays a role in influencing employment, but it is not a dominant role. The issues that concern investment decisions in Western Australia are related to a variety of things, one of which is

where the resources are. They happen to be in Western Australia. They were not made by the Court Government. Some people think they were, but they were here before the Court Government came to power. If the rest of the world needs those resources, they cannot suddenly be manufactured or invented overseas; they must be dug out of the ground here. The first thing that is driving the boom is demand. Unless there is demand, nothing happens. The State cannot sell more iron ore to the Japanese if they do not want to buy it; it cannot sell more gas unless the South East Asian economy is expanding.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is not entirely true.

Mr BROWN: I agree that it is not entirely true, because the State can try to compete in other markets and take a market share from other countries.

Mr C.J. Barnett: If the price falls, a low cost producer can increase not only share, but total sales in the market. The alumina industry is an example of that.

Mr BROWN: I agree with that. Those opportunities certainly exist. Whether the unit cost can fall depends on a range of variables. It depends in part on energy costs, but most significantly on the use of technology. The mining industry has always been a capital intensive industry, but now it is even more so. In the mining industry production has increased dramatically and employment has decreased, proportionately speaking. I cite, for instance, Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd, Robe River Iron Associates and BHP.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You must be careful because while their productivity in that sense has increased, they deliberately contract out a lot of functions that they previously did internally. Their direct employment levels are misleading.

Mr BROWN: That is true. They have done what a number of companies have done and have contracted out non-core services. Even taking that into account, the new techniques that are used by companies, such as blending and transport techniques, are highly sophisticated. There are new innovations almost every day. Those companies with the financial capacity to implement them are doing so. The techniques that were used in that industry five to 10 years ago are almost horse and buggy procedures compared with the techniques that are used today. I am sure that in 10 years the techniques that are used today will seem old hat as well. The technology and capacity is moving quickly. All these things are labour saving devices and devices designed to enhance product.

We are seeing a change in the economy of Western Australia in this area of resource development. Certain groups in our society are seeing the benefits of that. One need only go to certain sections of the State to see that that wealth is permeating the community. Unfortunately, as is occurring in some other Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development countries, the level of poverty at the other end is increasing. One of the measures of that is what is happening with non-government agencies that provide emergency assistance to the most vulnerable and the poor. Anglicare, a group that assists the most vulnerable in our society, announced this month that so far in the 1996 calendar year it has helped 10 000 people. Last year it was called on to assist 8 000 people over the whole year. This year the demand has been so great that it has assisted 10 000 people in the first eight months of the year, but in the ninth month, this month, it could not assist any more people. For the first time in its history since it has been helping those who are less fortunate it ran out of assistance. That shows that although some groups are doing well out of the expansion in the resources sector, many ordinary working people, retirees and people who are not able to participate in the work force are finding life very difficult.

We are seeing an even greater difference between the haves and have nots. Some may say that has always been a problem in Australia and other Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development countries. However, in Australia that problem is being exacerbated and as it continues to be exacerbated there will be real costs for the community. I will give some examples of costs from the United States' experience. In the United States a report was compiled in 1991 for a former President. It indicated that one in five workers - not one in five people, but employees - in the United States lived in poverty; that is, their wages and conditions were not sufficient for them to live above the poverty line. We can correlate from that what happens with other social factors that are influenced by those low incomes. We find that in the United States the rate of crime is very significant. At that time Australia had an imprisonment rate of a little under 80 people per 100 000 people, whereas in the United States it was five times that level at 400 people per 100 000. The cost to society in terms of human misery on the one hand, and the costs of security and the police on the other, are enormous. Unfortunately, an even greater divide is taking place in Western Australia. That must be a worry to all Western Australians. Although some people may take the view that their personal circumstances come first, the fact of the matter is that we all live in a community and associate with one another. If our communities are unsafe, if it is not safe to walk the streets, everyone is affected. When I listen to the stories about the resources boom, I try to put them into the context of what is happening in the community and the Government's commitment to its most vulnerable people. I do not believe that in the so-called better economic times the Government is committed to the most vulnerable, because of the lack of funding. The family crisis program was funded by the former Labor Government to the tune of \$5.1m and is currently funded by the Court Government

to the tune of \$2.6m, which is a 50 per cent reduction in the funding for destitute families. It is a disgrace that this has happened at a time when the State's revenues have increased from \$5.3b to just on \$7b.

The second matter I refer to is the Government's workplace agreements legislation. I will refer to it in passing. I am glad the Minister for Police is here. I notice that he has rejected his own Government's workplace agreements legislation. I was interested to receive from the Minister for Police an answer to a question on notice about how many police officers were employed on workplace agreements. The Police Union was opposed to them, whereas the Commissioner of Police or the Minister endeavoured to push cadets into workplace agreements some time ago. Notwithstanding that, I am pleased the Minister for Police rejected workplace agreements for police officers. Either he or the commissioner has said that workplace agreements have no place in the Police Service and that, "We do not want them; they are divisive, hopeless and out of place in our service. We will have negotiations and enterprise agreements with the relevant union."

Mr Wiese: You may assume that I did not say it. I assure you that the enterprise agreement we have in place is very effective and doing a very good job.

Mr BROWN: I am sure that when prison officers, who had to concede \$8m to get their enterprise agreement, compare what happened to them with what happened to police officers, where the Government put in an extra \$22.5 for their salaries, they will monitor the situation very carefully indeed. For the police officers it is not a bad deal; the Minister has supplemented the budget item. However, for many government workers the Government has not supplemented the budget item at all. Many government workers have been told that if they want a pay increase, they will have to find it out of their own budget. That effectively has meant that they have had to trade away conditions of employment equivalent to or greater than their pay increase.

Mr Wiese: That is not so in all cases. Certainly there were significant trade-offs in the police.

Mr BROWN: No there were not, according to the information the Minister gave to me.

Mr Wiese: There were significant trade-offs.

Mr BROWN: Whether there were or not, according to the information the Minister provided me in answer to that question on notice the Government supplemented the Police budget by about \$22m a year to make up for the salary increases.

Mr Wiese: At the same time we got some very significant buy-backs with that process.

Mr BROWN: Indeed, but nevertheless the Government put in an extra \$22m. The point I am making is that many government employees had not an extra cent put into their departments to make up for wage adjustments. They were told, "If you want a salary adjustment, the only way to get it is to trade off existing conditions." For some others it was even worse, particularly prison officers, who had to trade off conditions to the tune of \$8m of their payroll. They had to do that to prevent their jobs being sold off to the private sector. We can see that in terms of the Government's ideology, the Commissioner of Police or the Minister for Police has rejected the Minister for Labour Relations' workplace agreements. We congratulate him because it points out overwhelmingly that they have no place in service organisations such as the Police Service. We understand that the Minister has given to the Police Union some form of commitment that workplace agreements will never be put in place in that service. We agree with that. That is a different stance than that taken by other Ministers and other government employers on this issue. It makes a lie out of the oft repeated claim that workplace agreements are wonderful and a good thing for employee-employer relationships, when a department of the Government has said, "Not in my area. Workplace agreements are hopeless and a dead duck. They are no way to go. We don't want them."

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Mr BROWN: That is an important beacon to hold out for the community whenever anyone from the Government says that workplace agreements are the best thing since sliced bread. We will be able to say that probably the most significant department, bearing in mind the issue of crime and law enforcement, has said that workplace agreements are okay but not in its area. That underlines and enforces the inconsistency of the public rhetoric.

Mr Bloffwitch: It surprises me.

Mr BROWN: It does not surprise me, because we have always said this, and the Minister for Police has confirmed it. We are very pleased with his decision; he is to be commended. He is one of only two Ministers who has said no to the Minister for Labour Relations' push on workplace agreements. One other Minister has held out against the push and he has done a very good job. Basically he has told the Minister for Labour Relations to jump in the lake, he will not implement those arrangements. The rest have -

Mr Board: Who was it? Share it with us.

Mr BROWN: The member will have to do his own research; I have had to do it. There are not too many secrets; one must simply be prepared to do the research. We will announce that at the appropriate time.

Last night I briefly referred to the public sector and the changes occurring in relation to contracting out and the impact of those moves. I raised the issue of insecurity for public sector workers and the question of their being forced into the private sector when their jobs are sold off and, as a result, they are earning lower wages.

Another thing happening in the public sector is quite interesting. The Government is moving people out of the public sector or getting them to sign workplace agreements, and salary packaging arrangements are being negotiated. The Opposition has collected some case studies and has found that some very senior public servants, who are conscious of the Government's drive for more workplace agreements, have asked themselves how they can be seen to be accommodating the Government's desires while at the same time ensuring they are relatively well looked after. We have found in quite a number of cases that people at senior levels - who have had perhaps 10, 15 or 20 years of service and therefore have multiples or four or five times their annual salary in the superannuation fund - are opting to trade in their employment conditions about 12 months before they retire. They might be on a salary of \$60 000 and they trade in their employment conditions to pick up a salary of, perhaps, \$70 000 or \$75 000, and a year later they retire and collect a multiple of that salary. If it is a multiple of four, and the differential is \$15 000, they pick up an extra \$60 000. While that satisfies the Government's political objective of having people on workplace agreements -

Mr Bloffwitch interjected.

Mr BROWN: Certainly; there is no question at all about that. However, what is the benefit for the taxpayer? The taxpayers are now paying out another \$60 000 or \$70 000 that they did not pay previously. There is no productivity gain in that. If there were a productivity gain -

Mr Bloffwitch interjected.

Mr BROWN: There is no productivity gain because the next person who comes in may not elect to take the salary package. There is a very significant cost to the taxpayers; I am talking about millions of dollars. I know some of the senior public servants who have done this, and they think it is a windfall. They have never been committed to workplace agreements, but they are signing them in order to benefit in the short term. If it were a question of trading away leave entitlements for the next five or 10 years, working longer hours and so on, they would not be in it. However, there is a short term gain, so they are quite prepared to accept it.

The Opposition has raised a couple of areas of concern in relation to workplace agreements. We predicted that certain things would happen. First, of course, the Minister for Labour Relations has been sitting on recommendations to adjust the minimum wage. The Opposition has always said that the lowest paid workers would miss out. The current minimum wage in Western Australia is \$317 per week. The Minister removed the power to determine the minimum wage from the Industrial Relations Commission in 1993, and said that he would decide the rate on the recommendation of the commission. I understand that the recommendation has been with the Minister for six months and there has been no adjustment for lowly paid workers in Western Australia. We have always said that the lowest paid would be the most disadvantaged, and the Government has proved us correct.

There is also no requirement under workplace agreements for men and women to be paid at the same level and we are now seeing differentials in rates of pay. In addition, when the Minimum Conditions of Employment Act was introduced, the Government promised it would review it after three years and make appropriate adjustments. It is now three years down the track and nothing has happened. The most vulnerable in the work force are being disadvantaged most.

I see that the Attorney General is now proposing further changes to the criminal justice system in relation to juvenile justice, notwithstanding the changes that have already been made. The Government has boasted that it would make parents more responsible for the offences committed by young people. The Act has been an abysmal failure in that respect. Where a restitution order is imposed, that order must be enforced by the victim of the offence. The enforcement mechanism is deficient and in a number of instances no penalty has been imposed. In theory the court has made a decision and a court order has been issued, but that order has not been enforced and there is no mechanism to enforce it, apart from the victim's pursuing it personally. Two or three constituents have approached me about that matter and asked me to raise it in this place. I have raised it previously and taken it up with the Attorney General, but all I get back is words on paper. That shows that there is no commitment to improving the juvenile justice system. It is a matter of perception and words used by the Minister in seeking to create the illusion that somehow the Government has improved those arrangements.

When one looks at the issues I have raised in totality, one sees that, while the boom is advantaging some, this Government has deserted the most vulnerable in our society - the lowest paid or the battlers.

**MR KOBELKE** (Nollamara) [4.40 pm]: I take this opportunity to express some of the concerns raised with me about the Government's proposal to increase the age at which children start school. It has been the subject of debate in the community for some time and it will not go away while this Government persists in making a change that will be detrimental to the education of our children. The suggestion to increase the age at which children start school is stupid. It will be detrimental to the children caught up in the change, whenever that takes place. The issue has been embroiled in confusion and has involved misinformation rather than the Government's laying out a clear case for discussion and consultation in the community. It is a complex matter. Even if the Government had the best of intentions and wanted public consultation, people would have difficulty understanding the comparisons between the school starting ages in different States. There are complexities and difficulties in the various systems and people do not understand what may or may not be possible with regard to a uniform school starting age. However, when the whole process starts with misinformation and the Government tries to trick people, there can be no rational debate and people will not understand all the issues involved. I refer to the complaints reported in this morning's newspaper about the lack of consultation and the way in which this Government has run a sham consultative process with respect to the views of parents and community members on this change.

In August this year the Minister wrote to schools - I am not too sure how many - and said he was open to comments about the proposal to change the school starting age. He requested their input to the process. I have previously referred to the attachments to that letter, so I will not detail them again. However, they clearly distort the facts. Information was provided in a table and realigned to create a false impression. The details in some of those tables were internally contradictory and did not make much sense. At the end of August the Minister released a document entitled "School Starting Age - Issues and Options". The first I knew of that document was when the Minister alluded to it in debate in this House on 28 August. He said it had been circulated on 20 August. I do not think that is true. The document is dated 20 August, and that may have given the Minister the impression that it was circulated at that time. However, the following day I contacted people in my electorate and they had not received a copy of the report. I understand it became available in a limited number of schools in early September. The deadline for the return of submissions on this issues and options paper is tomorrow. That is not sufficient time for formal bodies, such as parents and citizens' associations, to respond to the paper. Many of those associations may not have received the document until their last meeting. If it arrived at the school at the beginning of September, and the parents and citizens group did not meet until the second, third or fourth week of September, certainly they would not have had sufficient time to respond to the Minister's paper by tomorrow. The Minister will not shift the date.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am not shifting the date but I am not being inflexible. All people know that. I will not do what WACSSO wants and put the process on hold for two months.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister would be well advised to accept that advice. I now comment on the document. It has an introductory page, and on the following page under the heading "The Issues", five points are listed. The first is -

To consider the expansion of the early childhood education program in Western Australia and the planned change in the entry age cut-off date for education in government schools.

That certainly should be discussed but the questions contained in this report do not provide for broad discussion of these issues. The questions allude to it but do not open the subject in a general way. The second issue is to consider the new entry age cut-off date. Clearly, that will be in keeping with the Minister's directive. It is not asking people to comment on whether there should be a change, but is inviting their input to the timing. Within the constraints, it is a fair question. The third issue is how and when a change could be implemented. The fourth issue is -

To consider the procedures that should be built into the education system to give it the flexibility to cater for both the more advanced and less mature children.

Again, that is very important but it opens a very wide issue and this discussion paper does not address that issue in an appropriate way.

The fifth issue is to consider what effect the change in entry age cut-off date would have on curriculum and the organisation of the school system. That is a very important matter. Anyone who knows anything about education will quickly recognise the breadth of issues encompassed in that short sentence and the fundamental nature of the issues involved. The fifth point cannot be taken up in a single sentence question and answer approach. It indicates what a sham this consultation process is. How can the Minister address such fundamental issues as the curriculum and the organisation of the school system with a simple set of one sentence questions and answers? It is not possible to do justice to such an important issue by approaching it in that way. It requires a major review. In the early 1980s the Beazley committee made major recommendations on the education system. A report was released after thorough

and proper consultation, and the recommendations were acted upon. However, this Minister proposes to consider the curriculum and organisation of the school system on the basis of a few simple questions and answers. It makes a joke of the whole system. It is a fundamental issue. The changes started by this Minister will have repercussions throughout the school system, but the Minister does not appear to understand that. He has little or no understanding of the huge resource cost involved in this change. He seems to be motivated by trying to save a few dollars.

Mr C.J. Barnett: This cohort will change the early childhood, preprimary and primary levels. They will be the watershed throughout the system. I understand what is involved and that is why we are doing it.

Mr KOBELKE: Will the Minister give some indication of the amount involved?

Mr C.J. Barnett: No. We are talking in the order of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister is talking about additional expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars -

Mr C.J. Barnett: Yes, over the next 20 years.

Mr KOBELKE: - to adjust the school system to a new structure.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Yes, and to develop middle schooling and senior colleges and to have a thirteenth year of education in this State. That is what it is all about. It is one step down that path.

Mr KOBELKE: I am glad that the Minister has put that on the record.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is extremely expensive but very much worthwhile, I'm sure you will agree.

Mr KOBELKE: I am glad that the Minister has finally come up to speed. Anyone embarking on an enterprise to change the school starting age should have looked at those aspects at the start. Rather than thinking about a few million dollars which will be saved by moving back the school starting age, anyone with a knowledge of education would have started by looking at the structure of the school system. No mention was made of that when the process was kicked off. The issues were addressed only when the realities started to come home to the Government and the Minister. Today we heard the first admission that we are embarking on a major restructure of our education system which will cost hundreds of millions of dollars; however, this Government has not even put out a press release on the implications of the plan. It is only by interjection to my contribution today that we get a statement from the Minister indicating that he has some comprehension of the extent of the implications for the system of the small changes in the school starting age. Nevertheless, the change to be made is on the basis of a discussion paper which is full of nonsense, distortions and inaccuracies; it is simply not logical.

Mr C.J. Barnett: What is the Labor Party's position? Do you oppose the changes to the school starting age - yes or no?

Mr KOBELKE: We totally reject the Minister's change to the school starting age. The Opposition is about quality of education, not a piecemeal fiddle to try to find some benefit leading to the stack of cards falling causing the fundamental issues to then be addressed. We have had an admission today from the Minister - for the first time to my knowledge - that he is talking about changing the whole structure of the State education system at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. At least we have the got that far.

This debate is more limited than the matters the Minister has opened up in his interjection. I now look at the discussion paper. Some of its anomalies make more sense in the light of what the Minister has revealed to us today. Page 4 of the paper contains the statement that Western Australian children are on average the youngest in the country when they start year 1. That is true. However, the words are carefully crafted to correct the misinformation the Minister has been putting out - perhaps unknowingly - for some time that children start school at a younger age in WA than in other States. That is not true. They start year 1, not school, at an earlier age. Most other States have year 1 as the second year of schooling, not the first year. The Minister was totally wrong on that point.

The wording in this document is correct, but deceptive. As with many releases from the department under this Minister, the document lines up year 1 in other States with year 1 in Western Australia. That is totally false. If one wishes to line them up properly, one must line up our year 1 in Western Australia with kindergarten in New South Wales and with the preparatory year in Victoria. Those are the closest equivalents to be found in these structures. The department has the wording right, but the deception continues. The next question on page 4 reads -

I have seen reports that say children need more early childhood education. By increasing the age of children starting school wouldn't we be going against this?

The answer given is "No, quite the opposite." I know we use language in different ways. We use it cynically to put a message across by saying the opposite to our meaning. A document like this should be a little more logical than that. The answer to the question I just quoted is yes, but the answer given is no. Maybe that is for effect, but it is

factually wrong. It does not state that the Government's program in total is not extending early childhood education. The Government is providing additional resources and an additional year, which Labor promised four years ago. Regarding the total package, if one moves back the starting age and adds another year, the answer to the question is correct, but that was not the question asked. We find simple, factual mistakes in the document. It continues -

This is the introduction of universal access for children to full-time Pre-primary programs at government schools State-wide.

Again, it is not factually true. Full time schooling is not four days, but five days, a week. Maybe the Minister will make another momentous decision today and tell us he will extend the program to five days a week. If so, when? That is not current Government policy. Furthermore, the program is not universal.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It will be 80 per cent by the end of next year and 100 per cent the year after.

Mr KOBELKE: There is certainly a government move to increase the number of places and make it readily available. In two years, as the Minister said, it will be available to 100 per cent of children. However, that is not universal. Will he make it available for all five-year-old children who want it at the location closest to their home? That is the meaning of "universal". If a parent turns up in an area, the child will be given a place in that area. That is not the case at the moment because the system is being expanded. Fair enough. As an interim arrangement, if there is not a place at the local centre, the parents enrols the child at the next nearest centre with a place available.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I expect within reason that all primary schools will be operating a five-year-old program in the government sector, and that the same will happen in non-government schools. You may get anomalies in country areas with small numbers.

Mr KOBELKE: I understand that. The point I make is subtle but important as it has large cost implications. I accept that the Government is providing the five-year-old program across the State and provides enough places for all children who want to take it up. To that extent, it is a 100 per cent undertaking to the program. That is not the issue.

The document says that the program will be universally available. The common usage of that term means that if any parent turns up with a five-year-old to enrol the child in the program at the school closest to home, the child will be guaranteed a place. That has huge cost implications. There may be 25 children in that group already - the maximum number - so the Government must provide an additional class or an additional multi-age grouping arranged to accept that child within the area. If the universal principle applies in the kindergarten year, the Government is guaranteeing a higher level of availability and a cost is involved. Is the Minister willing to guarantee universal availability?

Mr C.J. Barnett: You make your speech - I will make mine.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister is not willing to guarantee that. No agreement is made to a universal system. The Minister is a very bright man; he comes to grips with matters when he puts his mind to it. He has started to realise that he kicked off an avalanche by changing the school starting age. He has committed this State to spend hundreds of millions of dollars without laying out a planing process to prove that this proposal will improve the standard of education in this State. If one accepts that the hundreds of millions of dollars will be spent, an important question remains: If one has \$3m, 4m or \$5m extra to spend on education, is this the best way to spend it? Could we have more value in education by planning what we want to do? That has not occurred. It has been an avalanche kicked off by the Scott report and the previous Minister for Education, Hon Norman Moore. This Minister has become caught up in it and is now indicating a commitment of hundreds of millions of dollars.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Mr KOBELKE: The next part of the question is perhaps explained by the remarks by the Minister earlier. It reads -

At the same time, planning will also be well underway for the expansion of the Pre-primary program from four to five full days a week. The Kindergarten program, currently two half-day sessions a week, will be doubled to four sessions a week.

That is another cost undertaking. How much will that cost?

Mr C.J. Barnett: I have not set a date for the expansion to five days.

Mr KOBELKE: I am talking about from two to four.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We have not made a commitment. We will start from the year 2000.

Mr KOBELKE: It is on the never-never.



Mr C.J. Barnett: No, because this Government has managed it. As the member will know, 160-odd schools next year will have full time preprimary programs. This is happening at a rate which has never been seen in this State.

Mr KOBELKE: I have quoted from the Minister's document relating to the kindergarten program, which will move from two half-day sessions to four half-day sessions. This is a further expansion.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Yes.

Mr KOBELKE: But the Minister does not know how much it will cost. It is just part of the hundreds of millions of dollars being thrown at education.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I thought the Labor Party supported spending money on education. That is what the Government is doing, so why criticise picking out kids at an early age?

Mr KOBELKE: We would plan to ensure the money was effectively spent. Our concern is that this Government's plan has been to reduce expenditure, but suddenly it is willing to throw hundreds of millions of dollars into education without a plan. This is the fourth year we have experienced cuts in all sorts of areas, and now the Government is making a commitment of hundreds of millions of dollars, without a plan. The Minister has been caught up in the avalanche which began with the Scott report.

Mr C.J. Barnett: This year we will spend another \$100m on education because when the public sector is run properly, it can be done - and we are doing it.

Mr KOBELKE: Is the Minister saying that the hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent in future will be in addition to other normal growth factors, or will it just be part of that growth?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Early childhood education is expensive.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister said that the whole structure of schooling will change -

Mr C.J. Barnett: - and developing senior colleges and middle schools is expensive. However, we are committed to putting resources into education at a level the State has not seen before. It is happening before the member's very eyes.

Mr KOBELKE: It will be a pity if it is a waste of money because it has not been planned. The Minister has not planned this. He may come from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry but he has no experience of the real world. When it comes to committing hundreds of millions of dollars on programs, we want to see some value for money. We want to consult people - which the Minister knows nothing about; we want to plan the structure of our schooling system to ensure some benefit from the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. The Minister has been caught out; he has embarked on a program which he says will cost hundreds of millions of dollars, but he does not have a plan. The Minister knows that he does not have a plan.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We have announced the program. We have three year forward estimates. You should read the budget papers.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister is showing his ignorance again. The cost of moving year 7 students to high schools has not been addressed. The Minister cannot provide the cost of moving kindergarten programs from two days to four days. He cannot provide costings on middle school arrangements. The Minister has not planned. He has been caught up in it. I give it to the Minister: He is bright. He will manage it. He may be able to surf the avalanche. We will see. However, the chances are if the Minister does not come a cropper, our state education system will. Major changes should not be embarked upon without some planning, to know what we set out to achieve.

I turn to another question: Our children will be, on average, six months older when they reach high school. Will there be changes to the curriculum because of that? The answer was -

This is an issue that would be considered by the Curriculum Council. Comments from educators and parents will be welcomed on this issue.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is true.

Mr KOBELKE: This is motherhood stuff. It goes nowhere. It gives no idea of what the Minister is trying to do. The Minister simply says that he will restructure the whole education system and spend hundreds of millions of dollars more. The answer in the discussion paper ran to one sentence: Comments will be welcomed. If it were not such a serious matter, it would be laughable.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The Curriculum Council has undertaken an interim study. Today I signed letters inviting 80 people to join the various advisory committees.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister might get away with that in the Liberal Party, but not with the member for Roleystone, who understands education. The Minister is talking trite nonsense. He is suggesting that answering my questions with something totally different addresses the issue. It does not.

The last point relates to the question: Is there any evidence that the current 31 December cutoff date has adversely affected consideration in Western Australia? Part of the answer suggests that it has. This is another example of trite nonsense. He does not understand what educational research is about. Part of the answer reads -

In Western Australia there is evidence that children with late birthdays have been affected. A study of TEE students in this State has indicated that a smaller proportion of children with birthdays in the second half of the year stay at school through to the end of Year 12. Fewer students in this group sit for the TEE.

The two issues are coincidental. They are not causal. One relates to the fact that we have a 31 December cutoff date. The other says that if we have an age cohort which stretches over 12 months, the younger children whose birthdays are at the end of the period did not do as well in getting in to the TEE as did the older students whose birthdays were at the start of the period. The question of performance in the TEE relates to the 12 months' spread within the cohort. It indicates nothing about the cutoff date. If the cutoff date were changed to 1 December or 29 February, it would not change the fact that the cohort stretches over a year. Therefore, the age differentiation might be picked up with a differential performance in the TEE. The results showed a differential performance on one criteria, because of the age range, not because of the starting date, which measured the year cohort. Therefore, the suggestion is arrant nonsense. The same answer reads, further on -

In Victoria where the entry age cut-off date was changed to April 30, research evidence supported the view that children in the youngest group within a class were most likely to suffer educational disadvantages in relation to their peers.

That supports my argument. They were in the same age cohort; therefore, there may be some measure of differential between the youngest. I do not say that would happen, but it could. However, that bears no relevance to a particular date as a starting point for the age cohort. This is the nonsense that is put out as a discussion paper on a matter that the Minister says will cost the State an extra amount, running to hundreds of millions of dollars. I am astounded. I thought this was trite nonsense, cooked up by people who did not know what they were doing, and the Minister had simply bought it. The Minister seems not to have simply bought it, but to have gone for it hook, line and sinker. He has committed the State to expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars without a plan for our education system. If the Minister has any concern for education in this State, if his economic rationale suggests that the money will be well spent, I strongly advise him - it would be politically astute - to back off and set up a major inquiry so that these issues can be addressed in a fundamental way, and we will get some value for the hundreds of millions of dollars that the Minister wishes to spend.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Thank you, but no thanks. I decline your gratuitous advice!

Mr KOBELKE: This advice comes not only from me. A statement was made by the president of the Interim Curriculum Council. I am not saying that she supports all I have said, but some six months ago she raised with me concerns about the structure of schooling. The Minister has done nothing to address it. He has thrown extra stones into the avalanche that will change our education system in a major way without a thorough review of what we hope to achieve. The Minister leaves me astounded. I thought he would have shown a more sound approach to education than he has today.

**MS ANWYL** (Kalgoorlie) [5.10 pm]: In addressing some of the short term problems facing my electorate at this time, particularly the need for constructive policy from both the major political parties, my submission is that many of the problems are not being dealt with adequately by the Liberal Government. It is in that context that I also know that there is a large degree of cynicism in my electorate. That probably extends to the electorates of most, if not all, members present in this place about the commitment of both political parties to carry out what are commonly referred to as promises at election time. It was in that context that I attended a meeting on Monday night of the local Prospectors and Leaseholders Association. In talking about the gold royalty, which is the one issue that is on everybody's mind in my electorate, it is interesting that the average person in the street has a certain reluctance to acknowledge the policy positions of the major parties. The Labor Party in this State has given the commitment that if it is re-elected a gold royalty will not be imposed. A number of speakers in this debate have referred to the royalty.

The cynicism in the electorate has culminated in the delineation of promises by the Howard Liberal Government into two categories of core and non-core promises. What better cause for cynicism than distinguishing promises according to what must be an artificial formula. Rather than core and non-core it would be better to refer to expedient and non-expedient political promises.

Having said that, the Labor Party's position is clear. Although in question time last week the Premier referred to his party's position on the gold royalty, it is fair to say that no clear position was given. When the position was put to him we heard the Premier both in this House and by virtue of the media -he did not accuse *The West Australian* of distorting facts, as is often his wont - acknowledge that he would not impose a royalty which would affect small producers or marginal productions. Although he said that, no detail has been provided of the type of royalty that could be imposed.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am waiting for the industry to tell me.

Ms ANWYL: I believe the Minister for Resources Development has a hide to comment like that when he and the Premier are continually telling me that they have almost daily discussions on this matter with the industry. Now he has the hide to tell me he is waiting. Which is it to be? Is he having dialogue with the industry or not?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Only informally; there is no formal process.

Ms ANWYL: Is he referring to informal weekly discussions?

Mr C.J. Barnett: The issue of gold royalties has been raised twice today already. That is a typical day.

Ms ANWYL: Without any discussion of detail? Surely in the Minister's position it would be appropriate to enter into some detail, given it clearly is a matter on which the electorate is seeking some decision. The Minister shrugs. The difficulty I have in accepting the Premier's position that the royalty is not on the agenda is that it is clearly being discussed, albeit in informal discussions with the industry, and the Minister for Resources Development has just confirmed that. The meeting I attended on Monday night of the Prospectors and Leaseholders Association was interesting. The smaller prospectors and leaseholders are an important sector of the industry. Although their total production last financial year of almost seven tonnes represented an insignificant proportion of the overall gold production, the number of people involved in that aspect of the industry is significant. What really bothered the members of that association was what they termed the flow-down effect.

It is in that context that it is worth noting that many of the members of that association are involved in joint ventures of one kind or another. They have recently been slugged with changes to the federal taxation law which will mean that there is much less incentive to enter into exploration on the scale of those small players. The reality is that during, I believe, the calendar year of 1995 the gold industry accounted for 76 per cent of exploration dollars spent in this State. We are talking about a significant chunk of the exploration market. Therefore the flow-down effect will be felt keenly in my electorate should there be any real change to the current culture of exploration.

I have said in here before that I too have discussions with mining companies. One of the points that is frequently made to me is that it is becoming increasingly attractive to spend those exploration dollars offshore. I welcome expansion of all relevant producers, but not if that expansion is to the detriment of the moneys spent in this State.

Regarding the so-called resources boom - I note that many commentators in the industry spoke of the need to use a word other than "boom" and to encourage the concept of sustained growth. I refer to a lack of infrastructure in regional areas.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You are absolutely right. After 12 years of neglect this Government is doing something about it, particularly in your area.

Ms ANWYL: After 10 years of a Labor Government - the coalition has had almost four years.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We have started the goldfields gas pipeline and the goldfields to Pilbara road.

Ms ANWYL: When will that be completed?

Mr C.J. Barnett: The stage to Mt Keith is being constructed, and consideration is being given to the next stage. We have new power stations.

Ms ANWYL: Four years down the track the Government is considering the stage after Mt Keith?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Mt Keith was constructed only a couple of years ago by this Government.

Ms ANWYL: Is the Minister telling me that he has a finite plan for when the road will be complete? Will we be told four years after the election that another couple of hundred miles are being considered?

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is not my portfolio, but we are committed to the Kalgoorlie-Pilbara link and will put it in place.

Ms ANWYL: That is encouraging, but it saddens me that we have this continual banter about the infrastructure being completed in 10 years, four years or 13 years.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Not by this Government.

Ms ANWYL: The reality is that regional areas are being further affected by federal Budget cuts. This Government must certainly do much better than did the Federal Government. I referred earlier to cynicism in the electorate. I have here the policy document "The Goldfields Western Australian Coalition Policies for the Nineties". The policy document was produced in 1993 and many of the issues raised in it have not been addressed.

I turn now to the need for infrastructure. Another advantage of the current resources boom is an increase in employment. The reality is that without the necessary infrastructure in regional areas like my electorate, jobs are transitory. While I welcome the announcement of the Bulong nickel project of Resolute Samantha, the reality is that the 300 construction workers required for the project will not be housed in Kalgoorlie or Boulder because adequate accommodation is not available. Some controversy is raging at a local government level on the desirability of establishing single persons' accommodation to cater for those workers coming into the town on a temporary basis. However, it does not address the longer term problems associated with a massive increase in jobs in the area.

The irony of the current gold royalty debate is that it comes soon after the successful opposition to cuts to the diesel fuel rebate scheme. The Federal Government has failed to come clean about the exact nature of the cuts to that scheme. It has been estimated that in excess of \$110m must be found by tightening eligibility to the diesel fuel rebate within the first year of the changes. Discussions are continuing on that front.

Having been critical of the Minister for Mines for his silence in the diesel fuel rebate debate, I am again concerned at the lack of a statement from him about the Government's policy position on a gold royalty. He is quoted in an article in a mining journal I was perusing today, in the context of the diesel fuel rebate, as saying that penalising an industry which produced so much of the nation's wealth was not a sound idea. Things are happening in Canberra in relation to the cut in eligibility for the diesel fuel rebate. I suggest the Federal Minister for Resources and Energy, Senator Parer, is not entirely clear about the effect of these further eligibility criteria on the industry.

The gas pipeline from the Pilbara to Kalgoorlie is a wonderful project for regional Western Australia. It is interesting to note that this Government places a great deal of importance on it and although it is a wonderful thing for the State, it was, to my surprise, that I received an invitation to attend not one official opening ceremony, but three. The Premier will make a day out of it. It is good that the Premier will spend a whole day in my electorate. The official opening of the pipeline will not be confined to a celebration at the Kalgoorlie south terminal. The official opening of the acid plant at the Kalgoorlie Nickel Smelter will also be held and later the same afternoon a civic ceremony will be held in the main street of Kalgoorlie. I note that the Premier will have a captive audience because visitors will not be able to use their own cars; they must travel in an official bus. The celebration will commence at 10.00 am and conclude at approximately 4.00 pm. It is important to note the emphasis the Government has put on this project.

The potential for further development in my electorate will not be realised unless adequate facilities are provided for workers. Another problem facing this State is a lack of skilled workers. I do not propose to deal with this issue at length; however, the need to train young workers appears to have been overlooked in this debate. A great deal of emphasis has been put on the need to import skilled workers. While I accept it is probably a short term reality, there has been a lack of emphasis on medium and longer term solutions. To that end, the Labor policy of creating in excess of 1 000 new apprenticeships is important.

I hope the gas pipeline will lead to some development of the Mungarie industrial estate, which to date has been a white elephant. Unfortunately, it does not have any access to reasonably priced water. Another reason for establishing this industrial estate is to promote some form of diversification within the goldfields. It requires long term planning.

While the coalition's policy document that I adverted to contains plenty of rhetoric, very little practical work has been done in that area. People in my electorate continue to raise with me the issues of education, health, housing and recreation.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Ms ANWYL: In Kalgoorlie and Boulder there have been constant calls for cooperation between the mining industry and the State Government to establish infrastructure. It is interesting to note that today in the *Kalgoorlie Miner*, Western Mining Corporation Limited is talking about divesting itself of all its infrastructure that does not relate specifically to mining. It means, for example, that housing and other resources in the company town of Kambalda may no longer be run by that company. It will be interesting to note what occurs.

The reality that rents in Kalgoorlie and Boulder are extremely high has not been addressed for a long time. The cause for these high rents is a most perplexing problem. If we add to that the likelihood of a shortage of accommodation, some ordinary Western Australians will be prevented from having a role in the so-called resources boom. The inability

to find satisfactory accommodation means that families cannot move to Kalgoorlie or Boulder. Those people who live in the area often talk about the cost of a wide range of services. Many families are required to have two breadwinners because the cost of living is much higher than it is in the metropolitan area. To that end, it has been particularly disturbing to witness the impact, at this early stage, of the Federal Government's cuts to the child care budget. The average decrease per child is \$25 a week. There does not appear to be any real understanding in the federal Howard Government's policy of the fact that regional Australians will be impacted upon by the policy more than people in metropolitan areas. The reality is that there are few private child care centres in Kalgoorlie-Boulder.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Johnson): Members, I am having trouble hearing the member, as are the Hansard reporters because they have signalled to me. If members want to have a conversation, they should keep it low or step outside because Hansard will not be able to record what the member says.

Ms ANWYL: The reality is that parents of children attending child care centres in regional centres will be hardest hit by the Federal Government cuts because many parents are required to work due to the high cost of living. Rent is the highest cost in Kalgoorlie-Boulder where the average house rent is in the range of \$250 to \$400 a week. People are forced to go to work to afford those costs. Many families do not have any extended family in the goldfields; therefore there are not the resources that one finds in the metropolitan area. If the lack of private child care facilities is added to that there will be a crisis. A number of women have approached me and asked me what the Federal Government wants. They have asked whether it wants them to have only one child. They have three or four children and it will cost families with four children an extra \$100 a week to put the children into child care. They cannot afford that. If the women cannot work, the families will leave Kalgoorlie-Boulder. Therefore, one must query the wisdom of the budget cuts and their longer term effects on regional areas. It is nonsense to suggest that the National Party stands for country people when it is allowing its coalition partner to introduce policies that decimate the regional communities.

I said that education is an extreme concern. There is no doubt in my mind that we are failing to deal with the lack of educational facilities in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. Six months ago I raised with the Minister the need to do something about the Eastern Goldfields Senior High School. I was pleased when I was given a response by the executive director for schools, eastern districts. When I asked him what would happen next year at the high school, the glib answer provided was that enrolments were expected to increase next year! Perhaps he could have told the community something it did not know. We had worked that out for ourselves. With the enrolments now nudging the 1 200 mark and expected to increase to in excess of 1 300 next year, the lack of accountability of the Ministry and the Minister for Education for what will happen at Kalgoorlie-Boulder next year is staggering.

Further advice given was that the Education Department was currently in the middle of its annual planning cycle to determine the schools across the State which would require transportables for the beginning of the 1997 school year. We are almost into October and apparently the planning is to be completed by early November. That does not leave a lot of scope for the school to work out its precise arrangements for the increase in the number of students expected in 1997. I also asked what were the long term plans for the school. The answer was that the department was undertaking a review of the school's needs. There was a clear undertaking in the coalition's policy document of January 1993, to which I have referred a number of times, that the Eastern Goldfields Senior High School will determine the demand for secondary education in the Hannan area with a view to establishing a district high school or a senior high school in the area. Nothing has happened. We might get a few transportables by early next year if we are lucky, according to the department, and there will be planning. I find it difficult to take much comfort from the Government's position on that issue.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Johnson): Order! The member for Kenwick has been in this place long enough to know that she cannot walk between the member speaking and the Chair.

Ms ANWYL: Another matter of concern about the education issue is the announcement recently that the goldfields district education office will cut three full time staff in 1997. One of the jobs which will be affected is one that I see as crucial for the Kalgoorlie-Boulder education system; that is, the welfare officer position. In answer to a question on notice on 3 September I was advised that the reduction of the welfare officer's position would occur next year. That caused me some concern because I have been involved over the years, in my capacity as the chairperson of a youth centre, with a program known as the students at risk program at the high school. That youth centre has provided a centre for students who no longer attend school, but are required under Statute to attend school. I have some knowledge of the workings of that scheme. It is my understanding that truancy rates have not improved at the high school. In fact, the answer to my question on notice confirmed that to be the case. The rhetoric in this answer is incredible because in answer to my question about truancy rates, I was told that, in part, the cut in the school welfare officer's time was due to a drop in truancy rates in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder schools. Apparently there has been a slight increase in truancy at the Eastern Goldfields Senior High School. I have investigated that further and I would not call it a slight increase; there are alarming levels of absence in year 10. Although I accept there may have been a significant decrease in truancy in the primary schools - at least, that is what I was told in this answer - I do not think there is a slight increase at the high

school. It is incredible that, at a time when the students at risk program - a program which relies on the assistance of the welfare officer - has had its success acknowledged by an Australian award, it is to be dealt a blow by reducing that welfare officer's position by half. I do not know what level the officer is. However, I cannot imagine that the position would earn him a large amount of money for what is a fairly onerous job.

We have heard from the Minister about the need to do something about Aboriginal education. I expect if I delve further into the truancy rates that a number of Aboriginal children will be represented as significant truants. If the Government is at all serious about doing something about that problem, it is a nonsense to cut the position of the welfare officer who is the only member of the education office in the goldfields who has direct responsibility for that problem. The rhetoric is fine, but the practice does not match the rhetoric.

There are ongoing other problems in a number of other areas in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. I refer to the position at the Kalgoorlie fire station. I am pleased that the Minister for Emergency Services is present. The question I asked of that Minister on 20 June was answered on 24 September. That was interesting timing, given that three months had elapsed. The Minister's answer confirms that frequently only three firefighters at a time are on duty at the fire station in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. That is not good enough for one of the largest regional centres in Western Australia. That centre has more airport traffic than any other regional centre and has significant mining operations, where the transport of hazardous chemicals is commonplace. To suggest that Kalgoorlie-Boulder have a staff of only three firefighters is not good enough given the huge number of potential risks in the area. Although I acknowledge the great service carried out by volunteer firefighters, is it the Government's intention that those volunteers should take over the whole load or some sort of fee for service subsidise the operation of the fire service?

Mr Wiese: I can assure the member for Kalgoorlie that neither of those suggestions is the case.

Ms ANWYL: I am pleased to hear that. The situation at the fire station has been unsatisfactory for some time. It is a busy industrial centre, and I hope that problem will be cured shortly.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Ripper.

#### **FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL - TABLING OF DOCUMENTS**

**MR WIESE** (Wagin - Minister for Police) [5.41 pm]: Earlier today I indicated that I would table and make available to members a copy of the draft regulations and the consolidated Bill. The consolidated legislation is now in a readable version that will make it possible for members to understand all of the material that is included in the Bill. Those parts that are ruled through are deletions; those parts that are underlined are new inclusions. I also indicate that the regulations are in draft form; it is not a complete document.

Specifically, I will highlight two sections which still require work to be done. One of those sections is on page 21 of those draft regulations dealing with restrictions for category C type firearms. Subsection (2) deals with the issues related to primary producer exemptions. It is trying to pick up the Australian Police Ministers' Council resolution, which allows for more than one category C firearm on larger or widely separated properties. Members should be aware that that section is not yet correct or finalised. Similarly, schedule 4, which deals with the specifications for the storage cabinets, is in the early preparation process; it has not yet been finalised and considerable work needs to be done. I ask that members bear that in mind when reading those regulations. Members will be able to obtain those copies before they leave the Parliament. Those who do not will have them posted out by the Bills and Papers Office tomorrow morning.

[See papers Nos 555 and 556.]

#### **ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - SPECIAL**

On motion by Mr C.J. Barnett (Leader of the House), resolved -

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 15 October, at 2.00 pm

*House adjourned at 5.44 pm*

---

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - "REPORT ON INQUIRIES INTO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIVE SERVICES"; MEETING 19 SEPTEMBER 1994

1479. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Further to question on notice 24 of 1996, what investigations and inquiries were being undertaken on 19 September 1994?
- (2) Were the inquiries being undertaken by the -
  - (a) police
  - (b) Ministry of Justice?
- (3) Who was in charge of each of the inquiries?
- (4) Was the report prepared on any of the inquiries then being undertaken?
- (5) On what inquiries was the report prepared?
- (6) On what date was each of the reports prepared?
- (7) Subsequent to the meeting on 19 September 1994, but prior to the establishment of the section 9 inquiry under the Prisons Act 1981 on 29 September 1994, did the -
  - (a) former Attorney General;
  - (b) Director of Public Prosecutions,
 hold any discussions with the Ministry of Justice and/or the police on using section 9 of the Prisons Act 1981 to undertake inquiries then under consideration?

Mr PRINCE replied:

The Attorney General has provided the following reply -

As the question involves factual issues, arising before 21 December 1994, the Ministry of Justice has provided the following answers -

- (1) On 19 September 1994 an internal investigation ordered by the then Executive Director, Corrective Services Division into management issues at Canning Vale Prison was being concluded.
- (2) Ministry of Justice.
- (3) There was one inquiry conducted by Superintendent P. Moore, Wooroloo Prison Farm.
- (4) A final report was submitted on 23 September 1994.
- (5) A number of issues were investigated as follows: Five disciplinary matters relating to a prison officer; two disciplinary matters relating to another prison officer. Additional issues raised but not investigated: Three issues relating to concerns over the promotional selection process; issues relating to the prison officer reform package; that is, intimidation/disruption; the manner in which the determination of minimum manning levels at the prison was arrived at.
- (6) The above issues were contained in one report dated 23 September 1994.
- (7)
  - (a) The member is referred to the responses to the questions he asked in 1995 on this matter, specifically questions 333(1) and (2), 1245(24) to (27) and 2223.
  - (b) The Ministry of Justice is unable to ascertain whether any such discussions took place involving Ministry of Justice officers.

#### JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - "REPORT ON INQUIRIES INTO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIVE SERVICES"; MEETING 19 SEPTEMBER 1994

1480. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Further to question on notice 23 of 1996, were all the matters detailed on pages 4 to 11 in the Report on Inquiries into the Department of Corrective Services, under investigation on 19 September 1994?

- (2) If these matters were the subject of investigation on 19 September 1994, what was the reason for establishing the two section 9 inquiries on 29 and 30 September 1994 to investigate the same matters?
- (3) Is it true that some of the matters investigated by the section 9 inquiries were only uncovered during the course of the inquiries?
- (4) If so, precisely what matters were the subject of inquiries and investigations on 19 September 1994, that date being 10 days before the section 9 inquiries commenced?

Mr PRINCE replied:

The Attorney General has provided the following reply -

As the question involves factual issues, arising before 21 December 1994, the Ministry of Justice has provided the following answers -

- (1) Not known.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Not known.

#### SUBIACO OVAL - WA FOOTBALL COMMISSION, LEASE

1611. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) With reference to the article in the *Subiaco Post* of 22-23 June 1996 regarding the lease between Subiaco Oval and the WA Football Commission, can the Minister confirm that the terms of the lease effectively mean that Subiaco Council has the ultimate right to determine whether night football, or any other activity after sunset, will take place at Subiaco Oval?
- (2) If yes, what effect do the terms of the lease have on the installation of lights at Subiaco Oval, the conditions attached to the operation of the lights, and the general use of Subiaco Oval after sunset?
- (3) If no, under the terms of the lease between Subiaco Oval and the WA Football Commission, or otherwise, is the Subiaco Council able to influence the decision to hold night football at Subiaco Oval, or the conditions attaching to night football?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1)-(3) Subiaco Oval is situated on reserve 41874 vested in the City of Subiaco. The use of the reserve by the WA Football Commission is the subject of a lease agreement between the city and the commission. All arrangements under the lease about the use of the reserve are between the parties. The only potential involvement by the Government is set out in clause 4 of the lease. This provision requires the parties to refer disputes about the use of the reserve extending beyond sunset to the Minister for Lands, or if the Minister is not prepared to accept the reference, an independent third person acting as an expert in accordance with clause 3.5.

#### DISABILITY SERVICES COMMISSION - RESIDENTS MOVED FROM CARRAMAR TO PINDARRA

1641. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Disability Services:

- (1) Why are people to be moved from Carramar to Pindarra?
- (2) When will this move be started and completed?
- (3) What is the budgeted cost for the move?
- (4) Have the people at the complex had all their needs identified?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) Is there a care and training plan for each?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) Are those who could live compatibly together known?



- (9) If not, why not?
- (10) Would the Minister consider directing and resourcing the commission to move the residents only once; that is, from Carramar to the community?
- (11) If not, why not?
- (12) What adverse consequences are likely for those people who have to be moved twice?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) Residents are being moved from Carramar to Pindarra so that maintenance costs to Carramar can be minimised. The resources saved will be used to develop more appropriate accommodation options within the community.
- (2) Moves will begin and be completed during September 1996.
- (3) Approximately \$6 000.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Not applicable.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) Not applicable.
- (8) Yes.
- (9) Not applicable.
- (10) No.
- (11) Successful moves from Carramar to the community will require careful planning. It is not a process that can be rushed.
- (12) There will be sufficient time between moves to ensure a successful outcome for the individuals involved.

#### AGED CARE SERVICES (COMMONWEALTH) - TRANSFER TO STATES DISCUSSIONS

1712. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Health Department of Western Australia preparing for the transfer of aged care from the Commonwealth to the State?
- (2) If yes -
  - (a) what planning is being undertaken; and
  - (b) what policies will be used in the delivery of aged care services?

Mr KIERATH replied:

Western Australia is participating in joint discussions with other States and the Commonwealth regarding the possible transfer of commonwealth aged care responsibilities to the States. The discussions are at an early stage. It is not certain whether any transfer will occur, what services would be involved or when it might take place. Obviously substantial joint work by state and commonwealth officers and community consultation will be required to progress consideration of these issues. I support in principle the State taking responsibility for aged care services on the basis that this could improve services for the aged.

The State Government is better placed than the Commonwealth to be responsive to community needs. Moreover, having responsibilities rest with one level of government instead of two would facilitate better coordination between services. That said, I would be prepared to accept the responsibilities only if the policy roles and financial arrangements can be satisfactorily negotiated. The State must be directly responsible for policy rather than put in a position of merely administering commonwealth programs. There also must be a sufficient transfer of funds to accompany the shift in responsibilities. In this regard, I am concerned about the state of existing nursing home facilities and would need to be assured that the Commonwealth is willing to provide the capital funding to bring the facilities up to an acceptable standard as part of the transfer.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - WARDS OF THE STATE, NUMBERS; IN SUBSTITUTE CARE;  
IN FOSTER CARE

1768. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) How many children were made wards of the State for each month of 1995 and each month of 1996?
- (2) How many of them were taken into substitute care?
- (3) How many of those were fostered?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

(1)	January 1995	7	January 1996	8
	February 1995	17	February 1996	3
	March 1995	20	March 1996	8
	April 1995	29	April 1996	11
	May 1995	16	May 1996	5
	June 1995	1	June 1996	7
	July 1995	21	July 1996	7
	August 1995	33		
	September 1995	28		
	October 1995	9		
	November 1995	6		
	December 1995	11		

- (2)-(3) Information on this is being collated and will be provided directly to the member as soon as it is available.

WESTERN PACIFIC - LAUNDRY CONTRACT

1784. Mr McGINTY to the Minister for Services:

- (1) Has Western Pacific won the contract for the laundry once run by Healthcare Linen?
- (2) On what date will Western Pacific commence work?
- (3) Has the start date changed at any stage since Western Pacific was awarded the contract?
- (4) What reasons have been given for changing the start date?
- (5) Has Western Pacific, at any stage, had to go back to its bank to reassess the viability of the contract?
- (6) Has Western Pacific, at any stage, had financial problems?
- (7) Have there been any problems with the paperwork associated with the letting of the contract and, if so, what have been these problems?
- (8) Did Western Pacific submit the lowest tender for the contract?
- (9) What is the total cost of the administration and negotiation of the tender to date?
- (10) Have any of the workers in the laundry been financially penalised by the uncertainty as to the starting date of the new contractor?

Mr MINSON replied:

I have been advised by the State Supply Commission -

- (1) Western Pacific Consulting in joint venture with Mr Stan Boskovic, Healthcare Linen employee, were the successful tenderers for the purchase of Healthcare Linen's inventory, plant and equipment and service contracts with public sector clients.
- (2) The commencement date for the new owners was 16 September 1996.
- (3) 16 September is the first definite commencement date announced. It was initially hoped that commencement could be achieved by 1 July to coincide with the new financial year. However, this was an optimistic time frame which was not achieved by either party.
- (4) The start date has never been changed.
- (5) To the best of my knowledge the viability of the contract has not been questioned.

- (6) Investigations conducted as part of the sale process have not identified that Western Pacific has experienced financial problems. The confirmed financing arrangements remain basically as presented in its original bid.
- (7)-(8) No.
- (9) The estimated cost to date for running the current tender process, negotiations and preparation of final sale documentation is \$110 000.
- (10) No employees at Healthcare Linen have suffered any financial penalty as a result of the uncertainty of the starting date.

COMMONWEALTH REHABILITATION SERVICES - CLOSURES AND RESTRUCTURING,  
RESPONSIBILITIES TRANSFERRED TO STATE

1912. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Disability Services:

- (1) Further to closures and restructuring of the commonwealth rehabilitation services, what responsibilities have now been transferred to the State?
- (2) What programs are they?
- (3) How many people are affected?
- (4) What budget has been allocated by the Minister's agency to ensure the impacts are minimised?

Mr MINSON replied:

Please refer to the answer to question 1911 of 1996.

CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

1952. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Health; Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) In each department or agency under the Minister's control, how many contracts does the Government have with the private sector for work which was carried out by government employees when the Government was elected to office in February 1993?
- (2) What is the name of each contractor?
- (3) What is the nature of the work provided by each contractor?
- (4) What is the contract price paid to each contractor?
- (5) How many government employees used to carry out the work that is now carried out by each contractor?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1)-(5) The specific information sought in this question is not collated or recorded centrally. Individual agencies would need to dedicate significant time and numbers of staff in order to extract the information and present it in the format requested. Furthermore, it is likely to be difficult to ensure the accuracy of all relevant information over the period requested. The member for Morley has already been provided with copies of the reports on the first two annual surveys of competitive tendering and contracting and the third survey report will be completed towards the end of this year.

CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

1956. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) In each department or agency under the Minister's control, how many contracts does the Government have with the private sector for work which was carried out by government employees when the Government was elected to office in February 1993?
- (2) What is the name of each contractor?
- (3) What is the nature of the work provided by each contractor?
- (4) What is the contract price paid to each contractor?
- (5) How many government employees used to carry out the work that is now carried out by each contractor?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1)-(5) The specific information sought in this question is not collated or recorded centrally. Individual agencies would need to dedicate significant time and numbers of staff in order to extract the information and present it in the format requested. Furthermore, it is likely to be difficult to ensure the accuracy of all relevant information over the period requested. The member for Morley has already been provided with copies of the reports on the first two annual surveys of competitive tendering and contracting and the third survey report will be completed towards the end of this year.

#### CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

1957. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) In each department or agency under the Minister's control, how many contracts does the Government have with the private sector for work which was carried out by government employees when the Government was elected to office in February 1993?
- (2) What is the name of each contractor?
- (3) What is the nature of the work provided by each contractor?
- (4) What is the contract price paid to each contractor?
- (5) How many government employees used to carry out the work that is now carried out by each contractor?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1)-(5) The specific information sought in this question is not collated or recorded centrally. Individual agencies would need to dedicate significant time and numbers of staff in order to extract the information and present it in the format requested. Furthermore, it is likely to be difficult to ensure the accuracy of all relevant information over the period requested. The member for Morley has already been provided with copies of the reports on the first two annual surveys of competitive tendering and contracting and the third survey report will be completed towards the end of this year.

#### CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

1959. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) In each department or agency under the Minister's control, how many contracts does the Government have with the private sector for work which was carried out by government employees when the Government was elected to office in February 1993?
- (2) What is the name of each contractor?
- (3) What is the nature of the work provided by each contractor?
- (4) What is the contract price paid to each contractor?
- (5) How many government employees used to carry out the work that is now carried out by each contractor?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1)-(5) The specific information sought in this question is not collated or recorded centrally. Individual agencies would need to dedicate significant time and numbers of staff in order to extract the information and present it in the format requested. Furthermore, it is likely to be difficult to ensure the accuracy of all relevant information over the period requested. The member for Morley has already been provided with copies of the reports on the first two annual surveys of competitive tendering and contracting and the third survey report will be completed towards the end of this year.

#### ASSET SALES - OVER \$100 000

2012. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Mines; Works; Services; Disability Services; and Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Has any department or agency under the Minister's control sold any assets over the value of \$100 000 since February 1993?
- (2) What assets were sold?

- (3) How much was received for each asset?
- (4) How were the proceeds of each asset sale used?

Mr MINSON replied:

In the case of the Department of Minerals and Energy, I am advised -

- (1)-(2) The Department of Minerals and Energy has sold a Midway drilling rig 8 x 4 crane type carrier.
- (3) \$200 000.
- (4) Proceeds were paid to Treasurer's Advance - drilling advance account.

In the case of the Department of Contract and Management Services, I am advised that, in view of the fact that the department only came into being with effect from 1 July 1996, the information sought has been provided separately for both the Department of State Services and the Western Australian Building Management Authority.

- (1) Yes, both the Department of State Services and the Western Australian Building Management Authority.
- (2) DOSS: Stock, plant and equipment associated with the State Printing Service that was sold.  
WABMA: Portion of the land and buildings at the authority's Welshpool site.
- (3) DOSS: Stock - \$3 469 000; plant and equipment - \$385 000.  
WABMA: Land - \$335 000; buildings - \$135 000.
- (4) DOSS and WABMA: Proceeds went back to the consolidated fund.

In the case of the State Supply Commission, I am advised -

- (1) No.
- (2)-(4) Not applicable. However, it should be noted that the State Supply Commission has approved contracts for some agencies which may have involved the sale of assets over the value of \$100 000.

In the case of the Disability Services Commission, I am advised -

- (1) The Disability Services Commission has sold two real properties each over the value of \$100 000 since February 1993.
- (2) House and land at Warnboro and vacant land at Eden Hill.
- (3) The Warnboro property realised \$112 000 at a private sale and the Eden Hill property \$180 000 in a sale to the Ministry for Planning.
- (4) Proceeds from sales of the two properties were credited back to the DSC trust account and applied to minor capital works.

#### JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - INQUIRIES INTO, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS REPORT

2043. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

I refer the Minister to the report of the Director of Public Prosecutions on inquiries made into the Department of Corrections, dated 20 November 1995, and ask -

- (a) is the Minister aware that on page 8 of that report, reference is made to a meeting between the then Attorney General and others at which the prospect of holding a royal commission into certain matters in the Ministry of Justice were discussed; and
- (b) were the matters of concern at the time so affecting the stability and management of the Ministry of Justice as to warrant the policy inquiry and the subsequent two section 9 inquiries?

Mr PRINCE replied:

The Attorney General has provided the following reply -

- (a) No.
- (b) I am not in a position to answer this; I was not the relevant Minister at the time.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ROLE, GOLDFIELDS REGION

2077. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) Does Family and Children's Services have a role in community development?
- (2) If so, what resources of the department are directed towards community development in the goldfields region?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) As there are components of community development in most of the department's services, it is not possible to determine the specific proportion of resources used.
- (3) Not applicable.

KALGOORLIE-BOULDER - NON-ORGANISATIONS YOUTH SERVICES FUNDING

2079. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) What non-government organisations in Kalgoorlie-Boulder receive funding for youth services?
- (2) What is the total amount per annum of such funding?
- (3) What are the recipients' names and addresses?
- (4) Will any recipients' budgets be affected by recent federal budget cuts?
- (5) Is funding for youth services recurrent?
- (6) Which, if any, of the said recipients received funding following an advertisement for expression of interest?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) YMCA and Golden Mile Youth Hostel.
- (2) YMCA - \$12 722; Golden Mile Youth Hostel - \$159 068.
- (3) YMCA, PO Box 179 Kalgoorlie 6430; Golden Mile Youth Hostel Inc, PO Box 2401 Boulder 6432.
- (4) No.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) None.

KALGOORLIE-BOULDER - YOUTH AT RISK FUNDING

2080. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) What amount of funding is made available for youth "at risk", in Kalgoorlie-Boulder, and who are the non-government recipients of this funding?
- (2) What amounts were available in the financial years ending -
  - (a) 30 June 1994;
  - (b) 30 June 1995;
  - (c) 30 June 1996;
  - (d) 30 June 1996 to date?
- (3) Who are the non-government recipients of this funding for agencies in -
  - (a) Bunbury;
  - (b) Geraldton;
  - (c) Karratha;
  - (d) Port Hedland;
  - (e) Broome;
  - (f) Kununurra?

- (4) What was the annual amount of funding for those recipients in (3) above?
- (5) Is the funding recurrent for those recipients in (3) above?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) YMCA - \$12 722 per annum; Golden Mile Youth Hostel - \$159 068 per annum. An additional amount of \$34 320 per annum is available and the department is currently negotiating with Nindeebai Pirniku Inc as a preferred service provider to establish a youth service using these funds. Total funding is \$206 110.
- (2) (a) \$159 528  
(b) \$201 619  
(c) \$188 904  
(d) see (1).
- (3) (a) Bunbury Workready South West \$23 203  
(b) Short term accommodation for youth \$185 094  
Geraldton Youth Support Service \$53 211  
(c) Karratha youth housing \$216 109  
(d) Youth Involvement Council \$110 229  
East Pilbara Youth Council \$163 380  
(e) Broome Youth Support Group \$52 545  
Broome Burdekin project \$64 873  
(f) Kununurra Youth Services Inc \$136 311
- (4) See above.
- (5) Yes.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - KALGOORLIE-BOULDER OFFICE, ALLEGATIONS OF CHILD ABUSE/NEGLECT

2081. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) How many allegations of child abuse or neglect were received at the Kalgoorlie-Boulder office of Family and Children's Services, for the years ending -  
(a) 30 June 1994;  
(b) 30 June 1995;  
(c) 30 June 1996;  
(d) 30 June 1996, to date?
- (2) What is the estimated percentage of total duties spent on such complaints for all staff?
- (3) Were any complaints or reports received, including from police, in respect of children engaged, or alleged to be engaged, in solvent or paint abuse for the years ending -  
(a) 30 June 1994;  
(b) 30 June 1995;  
(c) 30 June 1996;  
(d) 30 June 1996, to date?
- (4) What protocol and actions are in place to deal with such children?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) (a) 282.  
(b) 204.  
(c) 125.  
(d) 10.
- (2) It is not possible to provide an accurate figure.
- (3) (a)-(d) Yes.
- (4) The department has recently released a volatile substance abuse policy, which provides guidelines to field staff dealing with children engaged in volatile substance use. In addition, a local protocol enables police and other referrers to contact a designated staff member who provides an immediate response whenever possible.

SMOKING - BANS, INTRODUCTION

2086. Mr PENDAL to the Minister for Health:

I refer to the proposed regulations to prohibit smoking where food is served indoors in restaurants, cafes and hotels, and ask -

- (a) Does the Minister acknowledge the 1994 survey, of almost 3 000 people, conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, for his department, which found that 96 per cent of adults, smokers and non-smokers alike, believed smoking should be banned in these places;
- (b) if so, does the Minister intend to take action to introduce the bans; and
- (c) if not, why not?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) The issue has been referred to the recently established task force on passive smoking in public places chaired by Hon Ian Taylor.
- (c) As above.

PRISONS - CAPACITY; MUSTER; FUTURE INCREASE

2089. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What is the current capacity of Western Australian prisons?
- (2) What is the current prison muster?
- (3) What is the anticipated increase in the prison muster for the next -
  - (a) two;
  - (b) five;
  - (c) 10; and
  - (d) 20

years, including the anticipated increase in prison populations, assuming the Criminal Code Amendment Bill (No 2) 1996 is enacted without substantial amendment?

- (4) What capital works are planned for the construction or modification of prisons to accommodate Western Australia's anticipated needs?
- (5) What is the anticipated increase in expenditure, recurrent and capital works, to adequately accommodate Western Australia's existing and projected prison population?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) The capacity of prisons as at 20 September 1996 was 2 110 standard beds and 171 special purpose beds.
- (2) The muster in prisons as at 20 September 1996 was 2 277.
- (3) Prison muster forecasts will depend on the extent of the impact of the Sentencing Act and the new initiatives taken by the Ministry of Justice to reduce the rate of reoffending. To this end, the Ministry of Justice is currently engaged in calling for tenders to review all prison number projections.
- (4) Upgrade to Greenough Regional Prison has been completed. Fifty-two beds are available. Modifications to Bunbury Regional Prison will add a further 20 beds. The Ministry of Justice is currently engaged in calling for tenders to review all prison number projections. An updated capital works program will then be developed.
- (5) See (4).

PRISONS - IMPRISONMENT RATE

2090. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What was the rate of imprisonment per 100 000 people in Western Australia for each of the following years -



- (a) 1991;
- (b) 1992;
- (c) 1993;
- (d) 1994;
- (e) 1995, for

- (i) burglary offences;
- (ii) generally?

(2) What is the available data on general rates of imprisonment in other States?

(3) What was the rate of reported crimes per 100 000 people in Western Australia for each of the following years -

- (a) 1991;
- (b) 1992;
- (c) 1993;
- (d) 1994;
- (e) 1995, for

- (i) burglary offences;
- (ii) generally?

(4) What is the available data on general rates of reported crimes in other States?

Mr MINSON replied:

(1)(i) Rate of imprisonment for burglary - Western Australia: □

(a) 1990-91	(b) 1991-92	(c) 1992-93	(d) 1993-94	(e) 1994-95
22.6	29.5	25.0	23.7	25.2

(1)(ii) Rate of imprisonment for burglary - Western Australia: o

(a) 1990-91	(b) 1991-92	(c) 1992-93	(d) 1993-94	(e) 1994-95
152.3	155.3	150.0	165.1	164.8

(2) Rate of imprisonment in other States: o

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	Tas	NT
(a) 1990-91	129.3	69.1	101.5	87.2	70.8	394.5
(b) 1991-92	134.2	66.9	94.9	97.2	76.1	397.8
(c) 1992-93	135.9	66.8	89.0	101.5	74.5	373.4
(d) 1993-94	137.9	73.9	94.6	108.7	71.9	384.6
(e) 1994-95	135.9	71.8	109.2	118.6	74.2	393.9

(3)-(4) This information is held by the Police Department.

□ Source: Ministry of Justice.

o Source: 1990-91 to 1991-92 - Australian Prisoners 1992, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.  
1992-93 to 1994-95 - Report of Government Service provision by the Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision.

#### HOSPITALS - KALGOORLIE REGIONAL

##### *Paediatric Unit, Funding*

2091. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the total state government contribution for the proposed paediatric unit to be based at the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital?
- (2) What other funding will be made available and what is the source of such funding?

- (3) When was the decision made to site the unit at Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital?
- (4) When was the administration of the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital made aware of the decision?
- (5) Where precisely will the unit be situated within the hospital?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) The State Government will contribute \$400 000 over two years.
- (2) The Lotteries Commission will contribute a further \$400 000 over two years.
- (3) The intention to site the unit at Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital formed part of the original May 1996 proposal from the University of Western Australia.
- (4) 31 July 1996.
- (5) The precise location of the unit is still under consideration.

#### DENTAL HOSPITALS - ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

2094. Mr PENDAL to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What are the eligibility criteria for treatment at the state dental hospitals?
- (2) Is it correct that the Commonwealth Dental Health Scheme, which provided treatment for some low income earners ineligible for the state scheme, is to be abolished?
- (3) If the commonwealth scheme is to be axed, is the State likely to extend its treatment scheme to couples whose income is of a low level and consists of part private superannuation and part social security aged pension?
- (4) If not, can the Minister advise of any other dental treatment assistance that is available to people in such financial situations who find difficulty in meeting the costs of private dental treatment?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) The eligibility criteria for state dental service treatment covers persons in receipt of a full or near full pension or a benefit from the Department of Social Security as well as those in receipt of independent Austudy. To access non-emergency care, the person has to have been in receipt of the pension or benefit for six months.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No. The commonwealth scheme will cease from 31 December 1996 after three years' operation, and the state dental health program will continue to operate in the same manner as it has applied for many years prior to the introduction of the commonwealth scheme. The eligibility criteria that previously applied will continue to apply without change.
- (4) The matter is under review.

#### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES - UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE; BETWEEN 21 AND 25 YEARS OF AGE; RECRUITMENTS

2114. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Family and Children's Services; Seniors; Fair Trading; Women's Interests:

- (1) In each department and agency under the Minister's control, how many employees -
  - (a) under 21 years of age;
  - (b) between 21 and 25 years of age,were recruited in the 1995-96 financial year?
- (2) How many employees between these ages were recruited in the -
  - (a) 1993-94 financial year;
  - (b) 1994-95 financial year,by each department and agency under the Minister's control?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

## Women's Policy Development Office -

(1)-(2) Nil.

## Family and Children's Services -

(1) (a) 12;  
(b) 52.

(2) This information is not readily available.

## Office of Seniors Interests -

(1)-(2) Nil.

## Ministry of Fair Trading -

(1) (a) Three;  
(b) six.

(2) (a) Under 21 years of age two  
Between 21 and 25 years of age eight.  
(b) Under 21 years of age four  
Between 21 and 25 years of age eight.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES - UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE; BETWEEN 21 AND 25 YEARS OF AGE;  
RECRUITMENTS

2116. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Water Resources:

(1) In each department and agency under the Minister's control, how many employees -

(a) under 21 years of age;  
(b) between 21 and 25 years of age,

were recruited in the 1995-96 financial year?

(2) How many employees between these ages were recruited in the -

(a) 1993-94 financial year;  
(b) 1994 -95 financial year,

by each department and agency under the Minister's control?

Mr NICHOLLS replied:

(1)	(a)	Water Corporation	40
		Office of Water Regulation	Nil
	(b)	Water Corporation	94
		Office of Water Regulation	Nil
(2)	(a)	Water Corporation/Water Authority	79 under the age of 21 107 between the ages of 21 and 25.
		Office of Water Regulation did not commence operations until 1 January 1996.	
	(b)	Water Corporation/Water Authority	59 under the age of 21 101 between the ages of 21 and 25.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES - UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE; BETWEEN 21 AND 25 YEARS OF AGE;  
RECRUITMENTS

2125. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for the Arts:

(1) In each department and agency under the Minister's control, how many employees -

(a) under 21 years of age;  
(b) between 21 and 25 years of age,

were recruited in the 1995-96 financial year?

- (2) How many employees between these ages were recruited in the -
- (a) 1993-94 financial year;
  - (b) 1995-96 financial year,
- by each department and agency under the Minister's control?

Mr NICHOLLS replied:

The Minister for the Arts has provided the following response -

Arts WA -

- (1) (a) One  
(b) One.
- (2) None.

Screen West -

- (1) (a) One  
(b) None.
- (2) (a) None  
(b) Two.

LISWA -

- (1) (a) 11  
(b) Seven.
- (2) (a) Four  
(b) Five.

Art Gallery of WA -

- (1) (a) One  
(b) Six.
- (2) (a) None  
(b) Two.

Perth Theatre Trust -

- (1) (a) Five  
(b) None.
- (2) (a) One  
(b) None.

Western Australian Museum -

- (1) (a) 15  
(b) 18.
- (2) (a) Nil  
(b) Nine.

#### JUVENILES - WORK CAMPS; DETAINEES ATTITUDE

2140. Mrs HENDERSON to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

Will the Minister give an undertaking that before any juveniles are placed in any future juvenile work camp that detainees' attitudes will be measured before they enter the camp to enable a determination to be made on whether there has been a change of attitude as a result of the program at the camp?

Mr MINSON replied:

The ministry is in the process of forming an evaluation committee to review future programs. Advice will be sought from this committee on the most appropriate way of evaluating any future work camps.

## CAMP KURLI MURRI - DETAINEES ATTITUDE, MEASUREMENT

2141. Mrs HENDERSON to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Before Camp Kurli Murri was opened to detainees, who made the decision not to establish a program to measure any change in attitudes of detainees as a result of time spent in the camp?
- (2) Did the Minister approve of such decision?
- (3) Was Cabinet aware that no measures were put in place to determine such attitudinal change in the detainees?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) Evaluation initiatives were initially undertaken, focusing on attitudinal changes on outlook and effect, by psychological services of the then juvenile justice division. A review of these measures after six months suggested problems with validity, and this evaluation was subsequently suspended pending resolution of these issues.
- (2)-(3) Not applicable.

## JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAM COMMITTEE - ABORIGINAL DETAINEES, RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP PROGRAM

2142. Mrs HENDERSON to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Who assessed the suitability of the responsible citizenship program for use with Aboriginal detainees?
- (2) What was the outcome of this assessment?
- (3) When was the last occasion on which this program was assessed for use with Aboriginal detainees?

Mr MINSON replied:

I am advised that -

- (1) The responsible citizenship program was assessed by members of the Juvenile Justice Program Committee. This committee includes the Aboriginal welfare officer from Longmore Detention Centre, deputy superintendents, the Manager Custodial Services and the Manager Psychological Services.
- (2)-(3) The program was originally rewritten following recommendations from the program committee. It was considered the program required further adaptation and this was in progress at the time the decision was taken to close the camp.

## JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - CAMP KURLI MURRI, LAVERTON

2149. Mrs HENDERSON to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

Was the lack of effective leadership at Kurli Murri, as pointed out by the Newman report, a result of lack of total support from the Ministry of Justice?

Mr MINSON replied:

No.

## JANDAKOT AIRPORT - LEAD CONTENT IN THE AIR MEASUREMENTS

2159. Dr WATSON to the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) What studies, if any, have been done to measure lead content in the air as a result of use of air space into and out of Jandakot airport?
- (2) Are the results available?
- (3) If no study has been done, will the Minister require his department to undertake these measurements?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr MINSON replied:

The Minister for the Environment has provided the following reply -

- (1)-(2) The Department of Environmental Protection has not conducted any such studies.
- (3) No.
- (4) The Department of Environmental Protection does not consider atmospheric lead concentrations in the vicinity of Jandakot airport to be an environmental health risk. This comment is based on the department's monitoring of atmospheric lead in William Street in Perth's central business district, and comparing that data with the National Health and Medical Research Council's guidelines of 1.5 micrograms of lead per cubic metre. Atmospheric lead values from motor vehicle traffic in William Street is less than 0.25 micrograms of lead per cubic metre.

Recent traffic data in William Street from Main Roads indicates some 28 000 daily traffic movements passed the department's monitoring location. This figure is provided to indicate the magnitude of the potential for lead emission. It is the department's opinion that data from William Street present a worst case scenario for atmospheric lead in Perth's urban environment. This opinion is confirmed by atmospheric lead monitoring at Caversham, Kenwick, Hope Valley and other metropolitan sites.

#### HEALTH DEPARTMENT - SEXUAL ASSAULT REFERRAL CENTRES, BUNBURY; GERALDTON, ALBANY

2174. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many FTEs are employed at the Sexual Assault Referral Centre - or similar in -
- (a) Bunbury;
  - (b) Geraldton;
  - (c) Albany?
- (2) Is a 24 hour, seven day a week service provided at each of these?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) Assuming there are differences between the level of services offered, how will the Government redress these apparent injustices?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) (a) The Waratah Support Centre in Bunbury has four people employed.
- (b) The Geraldton Sexual Assault Referral Centre has two people employed.
- (c) The Albany Mental Health Clinic has a part time person employed to assist sexual assault clients.
- (2) A 24 hour, seven day a week service is provided at both Bunbury and Geraldton. A similar service does not exist in Albany.
- (3) A 24 hour, seven day a week service is not currently offered in Albany due to funding limitations. Access to out of hours emergency services is available within mainstream health services. This situation is continually monitored and will also be reviewed within the context of the recent SARC best practice evaluation.
- (4) The Government is currently completing a state evaluation of funded sexual assault referral services and a best practice review. The recommendations of these reports concern the establishment of new services and will be considered by the Health Department.

#### FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - SOUTH WEST REFUGE, FUNDING; WARATAH PROGRAMS, FUNDING

2176. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) What is the funding for -
- (a) the women's refuge in Bunbury;
  - (b) the programs coordinated from Waratah in Bunbury?
- (2) Is this sufficient?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) (a) \$174 841.

(b) \$84 748.

(2) The funding level for South West Refuge is under review.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - REGIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PLAN, BUNBURY

2177. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) Has \$35 000 been provided to develop a regional domestic violence plan for Bunbury?
- (2) What is the period for which the plan is to be developed?
- (3) For how long is the plan funded?
- (4) What services are to be provided?
- (5) Does the Minister agree that a comprehensive regional plan requires -
  - (a) crisis workers;
  - (b) court advocates;
  - (c) an access centre and worker;
  - (d) children's programs;
  - (e) perpetrators' programs;
  - (f) women's programs?
- (6) How will these services be funded and when?
- (7) Can it be assumed that other moneys provided for the development of regional plans will be funded for similar arrangements to the Bunbury plan?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) Yes. Bunbury has been allocated \$35 000 to develop and to coordinate the implementation of a regional domestic violence plan.
- (2) All regional domestic violence plans are expected to have a life of two years.
- (3) The funds are to be expended by 30 June 1997.
- (4) None. The funds are for developing regional plans and implementing those plans by June 1997.
- (5) No. Guidelines set out the requirements for a regional plan. These are -
  - (i) A formal list of the membership of the Regional Domestic Violence Committee and an outline of each member's role and responsibilities within the committee.
  - (ii) An outline of the consultations undertaken across the region to develop the plan.
  - (iii) An audit of the existing regional services and responses to family and domestic violence.
  - (iv) A description of the means for making those services and responses more effective.
  - (v) A list of gaps in services and responses that are essential to the plan.
  - (vi) Prioritised list of proposed new services and initiatives and an indication of the resource requirements.
  - (vii) Written protocols for an integrated collaborative service provision by relevant agencies across the region or an outline of the strategies for their completion.
  - (viii) A description of how the committee will monitor and evaluate the plan over two years.
  - (ix) A list of any information materials required to ensure community awareness of domestic violence services.
  - (x) A list of towns or communities in the region currently omitted from the regional domestic violence plan. Reasons for current exclusion and recommendations for inclusion in future plans should be stated.
- (6) Decisions concerning the funding of services that arise out of the regional domestic violence plans will be made when all the regional plans are completed and collated into a statewide resource plan.

- (7) Yes. All the regional committees funded to develop a regional plan are required to follow the same guidelines.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - SOUTH WEST REFUGE

2178. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Bunbury refuge is unable to provide access to night time crisis advocates?  
(2) What is the solution to this?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) No.  
(2) The current situation is that the South West Refuge has workers available on call after hours.

"LANDLORD'S HANDBOOK" - GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION

2226. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Fair Trading:

- (1) Has the Government/Ministry of Fair Trading produced a publication "The Landlord's Handbook"?  
(2) Has the Government/Ministry of Fair Trading produced a tenant's handbook?  
(3) Is "The Landlord's Handbook" meant to be for landlords and tenants?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) Yes.  
(2) No, because the publication by Government of a document entitled "Information for Tenant" is provided for under the Residential Tenancies Act, which requires all tenants to be given a copy by the owner/agent free of charge at the commencement of a tenancy. Furthermore, the Government has contributed to the cost of publications produced by the Tenants Advice Service including booklets for tenants in 13 languages and a resource manual for community workers advising tenants.  
(3) The "Landlord's Handbook" is available for purchase from the ministry and from commercial retail outlets. Although primarily intended for the 40 per cent of private rental investors who choose to manage their own properties, much of the information would help all parties involved in the residential rental market. The "Landlord's Handbook" includes a set of tenancy notes which have been recently updated by the Ministry of Fair Trading. These notes, which further explain the provisions of the Act, are provided free of charge to any person on request.

MENTAL HEALTH - NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS, FUNDING

2239. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many applications have been received from non-government organisations wishing to access funds from the Mental Health Services budget in 1996-97?  
(2) Who will consider these applications?  
(3) Who will make the final decision in respect of the allocation of funds?  
(4) What will be the criteria applied in assessing applications this year?  
(5) When does the Minister expect to be in a position to announce the funding grants?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) To date 38 submissions have been received.  
(2) The mental health division will consider applications for funding based on priorities set by the Ministerial Taskforce on mental health and the state mental health plan. The division will be advised by the interim policy and planning and clinical development committee about areas of need and priority within the plans.  
(3) The general manager mental health.



- (4) The principles that the interim committee are using to allocate resources across the mental health system in accordance with the State Mental Health Plan and Ministerial Taskforce on Mental Health are -
- allocate resources on the basis of need;
  - allocate resources to population groups rather than facilities;
  - allocate resources based on defined catchment populations, taking into account the demography and special characteristics of each area;
  - aim that each designated catchment population be provided with access to a comprehensive, integrated range of mental health services, as far as possible available locally;
  - increase expenditure on community based services;
  - develop expenditure on community based services;
  - allocate resources across public, private and non-government sectors; and
  - ensure the best use is made of resources.
- (5) Purchase of services will be a phased process. Some services have already been contracted for or have had funds allocated for their purchase. Over the next three months the bulk of remaining funds will be allocated after expressions of interest from non-government providers have been called for.

#### MENTAL HEALTH - BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR EXPENDITURE, IMPACT OF COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

2241. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the federal Budget impact on the State's estimates for expenditure in the areas of -
- (a) child and adolescent mental health;
  - (b) mental health services;
  - (c) Aboriginal mental health services;
  - (d) mental health services for the aged?
- (2) If yes, what is the impact on the estimates in the state Budget?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) (a) No.  
(b) Not known.  
(c)-(d) No.
- (2) The reduction in MBS fees for private psychiatrist consultations by 50 per cent once a limit of 50 visits to a psychiatrist per year has been reached may result in some people using public services more heavily. It is not possible to assess the impact on the state Budget at this time.

#### MENTAL HEALTH - ABORIGINAL, BUDGET ALLOCATION; EXPENDITURE

2242. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the total amount of funding set aside in the 1996-97 state Budget for Aboriginal mental health?
- (2) On what services will that money be spent?
- (3) What was spent on Aboriginal mental health in -
- (a) 1993-94;
  - (b) 1994-95?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) \$107 800 has been allocated for one exclusively Aboriginal mental health service. A further \$1.5m is allocated for the North West Mental Health Service which is a bicultural service. Other mental health services see Aboriginal people; however, it is not possible to specify the proportion of funding dedicated to them.
- (2) Aboriginal psychiatric service based at Graylands Hospital and North West Mental Health Service.
- (3) The following information relates only to services exclusively for Aboriginal people. Other mental health services see Aboriginal people; however, it is not possible to specify the proportion of funding dedicated to them.

- (a) \$57 700.
- (b) \$506 200.

MENTAL HEALTH - CHILD AND ADOLESCENT SERVICES, BUDGET ALLOCATION; EXPENDITURE

2243. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the Minister indicate what is the total amount of funding set aside in 1996-97 for child and adolescent mental health services?
- (2) What was spent in this area of mental health services in -
  - (a) 1994-95;
  - (b) 1995-96?
- (3) On what services will the money be spent?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) \$11 061 390. This includes approximately \$1 200 000 from the \$6m of new funding for mental health in 1996-97.
- (2)
  - (a) \$7 760 000.
  - (b) \$8 564 410.
- (3) A range of clinical and community services including in-patient services, community based clinical and support services and non-government services for children and adolescents.

WATER CORPORATION - SEWER LINE, ELLENBROOK SUBDIVISIONS

2244. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) When will a sewer line be provided to the subdivisions within Ellenbrook?
- (2) What arrangements are currently in place for disposing of sewage from these subdivisions?
- (3) What back up is available in the event of situations such as unavailability of tankers or power failures?
- (4) What other contingencies have been provided for in back up plans?
- (5) Who covers the cost of tankering the sewage?
- (6) What is the householder contribution to this service?

Mr NICHOLLS replied:

- (1) Construction of a wastewater pressure main to provide an outlet for wastewater from the Ellenbrook subdivision is scheduled for completion before the winter of 1998.
- (2) Arrangements are in place for all wastewater from Ellenbrook subdivision to be pumped from a manhole at Bronzewing Avenue and tankered to the Rogers Way Wastewater Pumping Station in the Landsdale industrial estate.
- (3) In the event that the tankers currently being used by the contractor to remove wastewater from the Ellenbrook subdivision were not available, these tankers would be replaced by one of a number of other tankers owned by the contractor. In the event that none of the contractor's tankers were available, one of a number of other cartage contractors known to the corporation would be used to deliver the service. As there are no aspects of the current Ellenbrook wastewater system which are dependent on electricity, loss of power is not a relevant contingency in this case.
- (4) Tankering of wastewater is regarded as a normal aspect of the corporation's management of domestic wastewater services. Cartage contractors are required to have contingency plans in place for any accident or incident that occurs during the cartage of wastewater.
- (5) The Water Corporation covers the entire cost of removing wastewater from Ellenbrook subdivision.

- (6) The cost of tankering wastewater from the Ellenbrook subdivision is met from the normal wastewater rates and charges levied on domestic customers, as authorised in the corporation by-laws.

#### SHELL GATEWAY SERVICE STATION, AUSTRALIND BYPASS - UNDERGROUND FUEL TANK LEAK

2248. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Following a leak in an underground fibreglass petrol tank at the Shell Gateway Service Station, will the Minister table the report compiled by the Department of Minerals and Energy relating to the incident?
- (2) Will changes be made to the dangerous goods regulations as a result of this incident?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) Investigations into the incident are continuing and the Department of Minerals and Energy report may not be complete until late October. It may be tabled on completion.
- (2) The need for any amendment to the dangerous goods regulations 1992 will be considered following completion of the report into this incident.

#### EDWARD MILLEN HOME - HERITAGE PROPERTY

2251. Mr PENDAL to the Minister for Heritage:

I refer to the property in Albany Highway, East Victoria Park, sometimes known as Edward Millen Home and ask -

- (a) is the building itself on the heritage register;
- (b) if so, is all surrounding land, including the 1.8 ha comprising the land in front of the building, down to Albany Highway, included on the register;
- (c) if no to (b), will the Minister give an unequivocal assurance that he will intervene in any bid to sell the land in question?

Mr LEWIS replied:

(a)-(b) Yes.

- (c) As a state government owned property, the place is subject to a Cabinet agreed "Government Heritage Property - Disposal Process"; the agency responsible for disposal is required to refer to the Heritage Council details of the property to be disposed, at least three months prior to placement on the market. This process will ensure that appropriate conservation planning is implemented prior to disposal of the property.

#### MENTAL HEALTH - BENTLEY AND ARMADALE SERVICES, BOUNDARY CHANGES

2274. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the problems being created by the changed service boundaries for Bentley and Armadale Mental Health Services?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that residents living in or near Bentley now have to access services in Armadale and that this is causing enormous inconvenience?
- (3) What is the reason for the changing of these boundaries?
- (4) How can the Minister justify the change given the obvious benefits of community based care?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) There have been no changes to the Bentley and Armadale-Kelmscott psychiatric services boundaries since June 1994. Some changes have occurred recently in the area with the reconfiguration of services provided by the Fremantle Mental Health Service.
- (2)-(4) Bentley Health Service continues to provide in-patient services to the Armadale catchment, while outpatient community services are provided by Armadale. While some degree of inconvenience is recognised, services are continuing to be provided from Armadale and the issue is currently under review with an aim to provide community based services locally utilising community and child health centres.

JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - PRISON OFFICERS; PRISON ADMINISTRATORS, REDUNDANCY  
PACKAGES; PRISON POPULATION

2284. Mr BROWN to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Further to question on notice 469 of 1996, can the Minister advise if -
  - (a) any prison officers have recently been granted redundancy packages;
  - (b) any prison administrators have been granted redundancy packages?
- (2) If yes -
  - (a) does this affect the recruitment status in relation to prison officer numbers;
  - (b) what was the cost of the redundancy packages?
- (3) What was the total complement of prison officers on the first day of each month between June 1995 and September 1996?
- (4) What was the total prison population on the first day of each month between June 1995 and September 1996?

Mr MINSON replied:

The Ministry of Justice has advised the following -

- (1)
  - (a) 1996-97 financial year - 23.
  - (b) 1996-97 financial year - 11.
- (2)
  - (a) No.
  - (b) \$2 223 562.44.
- (3)

June 1995	1 173 - estimate, records keeping system changed.
July 1995	1 202 - estimate, records keeping system changed.
August 1995	1 260
September 1995	1 249
October 1995	1 263
November 1995	1 263
December 1995	1 251
January 1996	1 239
February 1996	1 240
March 1996	1 229
April 1996	1 217
May 1996	1 203
June 1996	1 251
July 1996	1 252
August 1996	1 250
September 1996	1 255
- (4)

June 1995	2 213
July 1995	2 205
August 1995	2 193
September 1995	2 239
October 1995	2 277
November 1995	2 256
December 1995	2 286
January 1996	2 196
February 1996	2 252
March 1996	2 197
April 1996	2 200
May 1996	2 218
June 1996	2 228
July 1996	2 254
August 1996	2 234
September 1996	2 268

JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - FORMER DIRECTOR GENERAL DAVID GRANT; PURPLE CIRCLE

2286. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

Further to question on notice 754 of 1996, can the Minister advise what comments the Attorney General made to ABC Radio in early January 1996 regarding -

- (a) the former Director General Mr David Grant;
- (b) the so-called Purple Circle?

Mr PRINCE replied:

The Attorney General has provided the following reply -

(a)-(b) No.

#### PRISONS - DRUGS

2293. Mr BROWN to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Further to question on notice 3323 of 1995, can the Minister advise how providing figures on prisoners who have tested positive to drug use at Casuarina and Canning Vale Prisons and the Canning Vale Remand Centre could compromise certain strategies and measures that had been introduced to combat illicit drug use in prisons?
- (2) Have the additional four teams referred to in part (11) of that answer been trained?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) Providing figures of those prisoners who have tested positive to drug use would indicate the effectiveness or not of current antisubstance abuse strategies and measures. Providing such intelligence, which may filter through to suspect parties, is not in the best interests of the ministry.
- (2)-(3) Arrangements are in progress to commence training of these teams on Monday, 7 October 1996.

#### JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - RESTRUCTURING; SHIFT IN MANAGEMENT OF OFFENDERS

2298. Mr BROWN to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

Further to question on notice 56 of 1996, can the Minister advise how the shift in focus in the way that offenders are managed has been communicated to staff by -

- (a) staff training;
- (b) advice to prisoners;
- (c) policy statement or documents?

Mr MINSON

- (a)-(c) The shift in focus in the way in which offenders are managed has been communicated to staff within the Ministry of Justice by internal newsletter. Changes have also been made to the entry level curriculum for probationary prison officers to reflect the new focus and will be included in training programs for existing prison staff in the near future. In addition, the Government's policy requirements of the Offender Management Division of the ministry have been distributed to all branch heads and have been incorporated into divisional objectives and program statements.

#### PRISONS - CASUARINA

##### *Officers, Additional*

2299. Mr BROWN to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Further to question on notice 65 of 1996, can the Minister advise for what period the additional officers will be required at Casuarina Prison?
- (2) What is the additional cost per month for these officers?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) This is not a temporary increase in staffing levels. An appropriate staffing level to meet the prison's increased and sustained operational need has now been authorised.
- (2) Annualised wages for shift prison officers range from \$3 002 and \$3 383 per month per officer, dependent upon length of service.

PRISONS - CRITICAL INCIDENTS, DEFINITION IN ADULT OFFENDER DIVISION

2303. Mr BROWN to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Further to question on notice 1508 of 1996, will the Minister advise on how the ministry pre-empt critical incidents?
- (2) Can the Minister define the meaning of a critical incident in the Adult Offender Division?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) By monitoring trends within prisons; gathering intelligence of strategic value; information received from a range of sources; analysing the sum of the above in the context of prison operations at branch and state levels; and decisive action through early intervention.
- (2) No formal definition exists. However, critical incidents are generally considered to be a major fire, a hostage taking, riotous behaviour by prisoners or a major prison disturbance. These are reported in the Director General's annual report.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL - EXEMPTION

**548. Mr McGINTY to the Minister for Police:**

I refer to clause 10 of the Firearms Amendment Bill which exempts primary producers from the ban on some category C firearms. I note with some alarm that the Minister proposes to allow some primary producers to nominate further persons as category C firearms licensees.

- (1) Is this not a deliberate loophole designed to allow non-primary producers to keep their semiautomatic rifles and shotguns?
- (2) Is it the case that the Minister has done exactly what his National Party colleague, the member for Collie, urged him to do on 28 May; that is, to exempt people who shoot vermin on farms?
- (3) Is it a fact that this breach of the national agreement on gun laws will allow thousands of people who currently own prohibited semiautomatic weapons to keep those weapons as long as they know a friendly farmer?

**Mr WIESE replied:**

- (1) Western Australia has always had the best, most sensible, practical, and workable firearms legislation; it has always had the strongest firearms legislation anywhere in Australia. That is acknowledged Australia-wide. The clause referred to will allow a farmer or pastoralist who does not wish to get rid of vermin himself to nominate a person to carry out that role. That nominated person will make an application to the Commissioner of Police and the commissioner will deal with the application in the same way as he deals with any other exemption. The end effect of the change is that either the primary producer will own a firearm to get rid of vermin, or another person will perform the same role and have access to a firearm. This is a very sensible provision to meet the legal requirement of primary producers to get rid of vermin.
- (2) If I have agreed with a suggestion by the member for Collie, firstly, I do not remember her suggestion; and, secondly, it is most unusual for me to agree with anything the member for Collie suggests to me. If I have finally managed to agree with her, I am very pleased, because not only are we introducing sensible, workable firearms legislation but also I will be able to continue my association with the member for Collie on a good footing in future weeks.
- (3) That is not the case.

FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL - SEMIAUTOMATIC WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION REGULATIONS

**549. Mr McGINTY to the Minister for Police:**

- (1) Why will the new firearms legislation not ban semiautomatic weapons under the law but merely leave it to regulation?

- (2) Why will the law not ban the stockpiling of huge amounts of ammunition such as we recently saw in Geraldton?

**Mr WIESE replied:**

- (1) The exemption in our legislation is the same as that applied as a result of the Australian Police Ministers' Council resolution. It is for primary producers and for members of sporting clubs who shoot clay targets. The exemption for professional shooters has always been part of the APMC resolution. That situation remains. We are not inserting anything different in the legislation -

Mr McGinty: Why not put the provisions into the law, instead of into regulations?

Mr WIESE: We are reflecting the situation across Australia. That provision will remain within the regulations because for many years firearms have been banned in Western Australia by regulation. The banning of semiautomatic, high-powered firearms came into force in Western Australia in the late 1970s. It has been very effective, and it is the reason Western Australia has not had the same proliferation of high-powered, semiautomatic firearms as in Queensland, New South Wales and Tasmania. The ban is enforced by regulation. We will continue with that situation.

- (2) The legislation, through regulation, will prescribe the maximum amounts of ammunition that people may possess at any one time. It will be difficult to meet the varying requirements. There are people who are professional shooters and are involved in clay target shooting. I spoke to one in only the past two weeks who fires 30 000 or more shells in a year. On the other side of the spectrum there are people who, like me, would not use a packet of shotgun shells in five years. It is difficult to prescribe the appropriate amount of ammunition. That is the difficulty other States have found when they have had to deal with the same situation. Other States have applied the ban by allowing a person to have a year's supply of ammunition. That is a nonsense. If the circumstances show that the Government must prescribe an amount, it has the ability to do that. However, what we are doing is a reflection of the sensible attitude that Western Australia has applied to the regulation of firearms in Western Australia in the past and will, I hope, continue to apply.

#### POLICE SERVICE - INNALOO STATION, CLOSURE PLANS

##### **550. Mr STRICKLAND to the Minister for Police:**

Does the Government plan to close Innaloo police station?

**Mr WIESE replied:**

I suspect this question is a result of some of the very misleading and mischievous speculation by sections of the community, and perhaps even by people within this Parliament, about the situation at Innaloo police station. In the past Innaloo has been a one man police station. For about the past year and a half the majority of police officers who are based at Scarborough have been based at Innaloo while the new police station was being built at Scarborough. Those officers have moved back to the Scarborough station. The Police Service is in the process of relocating 32 officers and 14 cars to Innaloo so the officers may continue to work out of Innaloo police station and provide the traffic presence for that district.

Mr Kobelke: For which district?

Mr WIESE: This is for the Mirrabooka district.

Mr Kobelke: Mirrabooka cars and police officers will be based at Innaloo? Are you serious?

Mr WIESE: Absolutely.

Mr Kobelke: This is raising political pork-barrelling to a new high.

Mr WIESE: That comment is a classic example of the way members of the Opposition continue to berate the Government and mislead the public over the Commissioner of Police's operations and the carrying out of his role and responsibility for the location of police officers. I hope the member for Nollamara will take the opportunity to get a briefing from the commissioner, or even from the district officer, to find out the facts. Those officers are being relocated to Innaloo and will operate there for the next two or two and a half years until the Mirrabooka district complex is built. Will the member opposite complain about the building of a district complex at Mirrabooka as well? This Government made an election commitment before it went to the people in 1993 that it would not close any one-man police stations. That commitment remains and will continue into the next term of this Government. One of the great results of the Delta program is the putting in place of better resources and extra police officers.

Mrs Roberts: Sit down.

Mr WIESE: Members opposite do not like it. Scarborough police station, which services that area, has had a 50 per cent increase in its number of police officers. People of Scarborough and Innaloo can look forward to a strong police presence operating out of the Innaloo police station in the foreseeable future.

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT - SCHOOL ENTRY AGE

##### **551. Mr KOBELKE to the Minister for Education:**

I refer to the parental anger over the Minister's refusal to allow parents to respond beyond tomorrow to proposals to change the school starting age.

- (1) How does the Minister justify this absurd rush, given that the decision will not take effect for several years and will be dumped by an incoming Labor Government?
- (2) Is the Minister attempting to fool people into thinking that he is properly consulting parents in the community when he gave them so little time to comment on a very biased and prejudiced document?
- (3) How does the Minister justify the rush, given his earlier support for national uniformity, the fact that New South Wales is carrying out a full blown inquiry, and that there is not yet any agreement between the States on a uniform school starting age?

##### **Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:**

- (1)-(3) I will retrace a little history. The issue of the school starting age first surfaced in this round of debate in mid-1993 when the Scott report was released. During debate about the Good Start program last year there was debate on this matter for virtually for 12 months. The issue has been left almost hanging in the air since that time. At the beginning of this year when I took over the Education portfolio I made it clear to all people interested in early childhood education that there were three issues to resolve: The five year old program, which has been resolved; the four year old kindergarten program, which has been resolved; and the school starting age issue. I addressed the state council of the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations in May this year and outlined those three issues and my view on school starting ages. I again addressed the state council in August this year to update it on the issue. It indicated to me that it would make its position known at that state council. I am disappointed that it was not able to reach a decision at its state council meeting.

As to the circulation of information, around 4 000 letters were sent to state school organisations throughout the State at the beginning of August. Over 500 letters were sent to independent and Catholic schools. An issues paper was circulated in late August that initially had a print of 10 000 copies, but because of a lot of interest, 2 500 extra copies were circulated. WACSSO to its credit organised a public meeting at the trotting ground. I think 22 people turned up to discuss the issue. The issue has been in the community for two to three years. One of the differences between the Labor Party and the coalition in government is that we will make a decision.

There is no rush. The decision will be made properly and in good time. The request from the president of WACSSO to me was that the organisation had not reached a decision; therefore, could the Government defer submissions to the end of term 4? What a coincidence that would be, and what an insult it would be to parents who want advice, particularly prospective parents who are planning families. Throughout this year I have undertaken to parent groups that the Government will make a decision around October-November. The Director General of the Education Department will meet her colleagues in other States next week and will try to get agreement on a uniform starting date and on uniformity of terminology. I have not made my decision. My views are well known. WACSSO still has the opportunity, as it well knows, to give me its view. If it cannot form a definitive position, that is all right. It can also discuss with the Government some of the issues, as it has done and as it will continue to do. Many issues must be considered, and there is plenty of time to do that. I will not put the matter on hold for another six months, because by then children will be born for whom the decision could have been made. That would be inappropriate. I have given a commitment to parents that this Government will make a decision, which will be made properly in October-November.

#### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT - FOUR YEAR OLD KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

##### **552. Mr KOBELKE to the Minister for Education:**

Page 5 of the Minister's issues and options paper on the delaying of the school starting age states that the kindergarten program would be doubled from two half day sessions a week to four sessions a week, and that these extensions to the program would not take place unless there was a change to the entry age cut off date.



- (1) Is this not just a form of blackmail?
- (2) What will be the cost to government of such a bribe?

**Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:**

- (1)-(2) The member for Nollamara really does lower the debate in education. The commitment of the Government to the kindergarten program is well known. As from 1999 two sessions of kindergarten will be available for all children in Western Australia. From the year 2000 that will be progressively increased to four sessions. We do not yet know how long that will take, but it will be accomplished as rapidly as possible. There is no bribe or threat; we are committed to the kindergarten program. I and my colleague the Minister for Family and Children's Services reached agreement yesterday on the continuing transfer of responsibility for kindergarten children from Family Services to Education. Many of the issues relating to kindergartens have been sorted out. It is quite a complex issue and child care issues arise too. However, the commitment to both the five year old program and the kindergarten program is well known, and the Government is totally behind it.

#### RESOURCES (MINERALS AND ENERGY) - FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS

##### **553. Mr DAY to the Minister for Resources Development:**

I refer to discussions with constituents and business people in my electorate about the flow-on effects to the local economy of the continuing resources surge and ask whether the Minister can advise the House of any further developments in the resources sector that will continue this encouraging trend?

**Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:**

It is well known that some of the consumer spending orientated sectors of the economy have for some time continued to be at fairly low levels of activity. The resources sector is carrying this State, as it will for the next 30 years, and will continue to be the dominant form of investment. Resource projects are large and do not all come neatly, as people might like to see happen; they are lumpy and come in a random way. The momentum of development is continuing, as are the developments flowing through. The member and the member for Kalgoorlie might be interested to know that Resolute Samantha has today announced that it will go ahead with the Bulong nickel project. It is a \$184m project situated 30 kilometres east of Kalgoorlie. Construction will start before the end of this calendar year. The project will come into production at the beginning of 1998. It will employ 300 people during construction and have a permanent work force of 160 people. It is an excellent example of high value added project. It includes not only the mine, which is the simple part, but also the project's taking the resource right through using a chemical leach process to produce nickel metal for export.

Much has been said lately about local content. Another announcement today is that BHP Petroleum has awarded a \$24m contract to a joint venture of Kvaerner R.J. Brown Pty Ltd and a local firm, United Construction Pty Ltd, for a major upgrade of the *Griffin Venture*, the floating production facility. There was discussion earlier this week about the oil and gas industry. That \$24m high technology job was given to local industry to be done in the Jervoise Bay-Kwinana area. Both new projects and local content are working in this State. The Opposition should be supporting it because it is in all our interests.

#### JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - NYANDI DETENTION CENTRE, ESCAPE

##### **554. Dr GALLOP to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:**

I refer the Minister to the escape of seven prisoners, including one convicted of manslaughter, from Nyandi Juvenile Detention Centre and the guarantee that he gave me on 20 August that before any juveniles were transferred from Riverbank to Longmore-Nyandi he would "have to be assured that security is of an equivalent level to that existing at Riverbank".

- (1) Does the escape confirm that the closure of Riverbank was primarily a cost-cutting measure and that security concerns took second place?
- (2) Is it true that overcrowding in Longmore necessitated the shift to the less secure Nyandi, from which the juveniles escaped?
- (3) Given the Minister's commitment in August, will he accept full responsibility for this debacle, which threatened the safety and security of residents of Swan Cottage Homes and Rowethorpe Retirement Village?

**Mr MINSON replied:**

- (1) No, it was not a cost-cutting exercise. The number of juveniles in detention in Western Australia has steadily declined due to various programs that have been put in place.

Dr Gallop: How come you have reopened it?

Mr MINSON: Just hold on. The Ministry of Justice realised that it had three institutions, none of which was full. It was obvious that if we consolidated them, it would be much easier and more efficient and, yes, it would save money, but that was not the primary reason for closing Riverbank. It is quite sensible to stage our moving out from the old institutions in preparation for going into Banksia Hill next year, which we hope will be in July or August.

- (2) No, it was always planned to use Longmore and Nyandi as a complex. That is why we spent the extra money, from memory \$380 000.
- (3) With respect to responsibility, of course under the Westminster system the Minister must be responsible, and I am. However, the special operations unit is the appropriate body within government to be brought in to look at the security arrangements. The special operations unit was brought in, and all of its recommendations were put in place, bar one. That one recommendation was felt to be inappropriate and was not put in place. It had nothing to do with the escape.

Dr Gallop: Why has Riverbank been reopened?

Mr MINSON: I will get to that. I was very surprised to hear that moveable gymnasium equipment had been brought into Longmore-Nyandi, because it is not normal to provide movable gymnasium equipment. Normally, exercise equipment is provided only when people can use their own body weight to exercise rather than use bars and dumbbells. I have reservations about the circumstances of this case, but I await a fuller explanation.

Mr Brown: Do you say that the special operations unit recommendations were put in place?

Mr MINSON: I asked for a report and I have been informed that all bar one were put in place.

Mr Brown interjected.

Mr MINSON: I am concerned that moveable gymnasium equipment was brought into that institution and that someone was able to take back to his cell a 5 kilogram dumbbell. That was inappropriate. I have asked for a full explanation of it. Although I have no qualms about accepting responsibility for the proper operation of any of my departments, that does not mean that things will not happen in those institutions or departments that I would rather not have happen.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to begin to conclude.

Mr MINSON: Mr Speaker, I will take your guidance. What was the member's interjection?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MINSON: There was one other. I take responsibility but, no, it was not just a cost-cutting exercise.

#### FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES - COMMUNITY FIREGARD PROGRAM

#### **555. Mrs van de KLASHORST to the Minister for Emergency Services:**

Following two recent public meetings at which several new street groups were set up to reduce the danger of fire to their areas, will the Minister please advise the House of the progress of community fireguard activity in the Hills area?

**Mr WIESE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The community fireguard program that we launched in March of this year is proceeding very well in the shires of Kalamunda, Mundaring and Armadale. It has the very strong support of the three local government authorities and members of Parliament in those communities. For those who do not know about it, the community fireguard program is all about people who live in some of our high risk bushfire areas getting together with fire service personnel and putting in place strategies to protect themselves, their assets and the local community.

To date, across the three shires, we have five local facilitators, who are already fully trained. They are now assisting 10 street groups that have been formed in those areas, and those groups have already started working on fire safety activities in the various shires. I also understand that a further nine groups are expected to be established within the next couple of months. Recently a couple of very successful community meetings involving more than 150 people have been held in the Darlington area, and that is significant. As a result of that activity another 20 street groups will be formed in the area.

The program is all about encouraging people to undertake very simple fire prevention activities around their homes, such as cleaning gutters, lopping overhanging tree branches, getting rid of all the scrub and undergrowth and putting in plants that are much more resistant to fire than some of the existing native plants. The groups also get together and work to clean up street verges; they work with Western Power -

Mr McGinty: This is fascinating, but it is a waste of time. How about sitting down so that we can ask more questions and make the Government accountable for a change?

Mr WIESE: I would have thought -

Mr McGinty: You should not be wasting your time as a Minister telling this House about these -

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WIESE: I would be very interested to hear whether the Leader of the Opposition has gone to the Darlington area and looked at the potential for tragedy there.

Mr Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: The member for Balcatta will come to order.

Mr WIESE: Of all the areas I have seen in the hills, that area is probably the worst. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks that cleaning gutters is standard procedure, I suggest that he look for himself or send his colleague behind him to look at the mess there.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to conclude his answer promptly.

Mr WIESE: I get a bit stirred up when we get such stupid comments from the other side of the House. When I am talking about something as serious as fire, fire prevention and a very good initiative that is encouraging people to take responsibility for their own community -

Mr Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: I will call the member for Balcatta formally to order if he keeps interjecting. I am aware of what is happening.

Mr WIESE: - I am justified in getting upset. The community fireguard project is working well. It is a terrific initiative, and I am pleased to tell the House what is going on in that area.

#### AIR QUALITY - STUDY, CARBON MONOXIDE PROBLEMS, NORTHERN SUBURBS

#### **556. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment:**

Notice of this question was given at 10.30 am today.

- (1) Has the Government commissioned a major air quality study that has discovered that carbon monoxide poisoning is a genuine problem in the northern suburbs?
- (2) If yes, what are the details?
- (3) Is this one of the reasons the results of the study are being hidden from the public?

#### **Mr MINSON replied:**

- (1)-(3) While the member may well have lodged the question this morning, the Minister's office has not responded, perhaps because the Minister is not in Western Australia. In view of the fact that Ministers must sign off on questions, I suggest that the Minister's staff have not been able to fax him the question and get back the answer. If the member would like to put the question on notice, I will ensure she gets an answer.