



WESTERN AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

THIRTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT
FOURTH SESSION
1996

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 29 August 1996

Legislative Council

Thursday, 29 August 1996

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

PETITION - BHP BEENUP MINESITE, EXPANSION PROPOSAL

Hon J.A. Scott presented the following petition bearing the signature of one person -

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned residents of Western Australia oppose BHP's application to extend the Beenup minesite because of potential environmental damage that may be caused by the mining of acid sulphate soils.

Your petitioners therefore respectfully request that the Legislative Council call on the Hon. Minister for the Environment to:

Reject BHP's proposal to expand the approved Beenup minesite and to discharge dredge pond water into the Scott and Blackwood Rivers, because of the risk that such waste water, acidified by the disturbance of acid sulphate soils, will harm the ecologies of the Rivers and the Hardy Inlet.

Require the EPA to upgrade the conditions on the approved mining area in line with the Eastern States standards to ensure that environmental damage will not be caused by disturbance of acid sulphate soils.

Your petitions as in duty bound will ever pray.

[See paper No 543.]

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I seek leave to present a petition from 185 citizens on the same subject as the previous petition but incorrectly addressed.

Leave denied.

Point of Order

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Regarding the matter for which we have just denied leave, for my clarification, had that petition been sighted by the Clerk prior to leave being sought?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question the member raised is out of order. I am not interested in whether the Clerk saw it or not, and neither is the House. The House is interested in what the member himself said; namely, that his petition did not conform with standing orders. I do not know the way in which it did not conform, but members make the decision.

MOTION - URGENCY

Parliament House, Safety Audit

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths): I have received the following letter addressed to me dated 29 August 1996 -

Dear Mr President

At today's sitting, it is my intention to move under SO 72 that the House at its rising adjourn until 9.00 am on 25 December for the purpose of discussing glaring deficiencies in workplace safety provisions within Parliament House which have been identified by a safety audit carried out by the LHMU during yesterday's 'Spot a Hazard Day'.

Yours sincerely

Tom Helm MLC

In order to discuss this matter, it will be necessary for at least four members to indicate their support by rising in their places.

[At least four members rose in their places.]

HON TOM HELM (Mining and Pastoral) [2.38 pm]: I move -

That the House at its rising adjourn until 9.00 am on 25 December.

I do this more in sorrow than in anger. I take the opportunity to bring home to all members our health and safety responsibilities in this House. I am grateful to the representatives of the Trades and Labor Council and the Miscellaneous Workers Union who took part in spot the hazard day here yesterday; namely, Bob Bryant from the TLC, and Tonia Kluczniak. I hope they will excuse my pronunciation of their names, as I recognise their presence in the Public Gallery.

I take this opportunity to bring this matter to the House's attention because of the statements made by Minister Kierath on Monday announcing that yesterday would be spot the hazard day. Also, I will take the opportunity to advise the House about the way in which health and safety matters are dealt with in the workplace generally, and have not been dealt with in this place. I do not sheet home the blame for these matters to anybody in particular, but to all members of Parliament. Each member bears some guilt for the issues which were brought to my attention through the work of those two union representatives.

I will read to the House a press release which was prepared yesterday - spot a hazard day - because it is important that members are aware of the circumstances surrounding this issue. The press release is titled, "The Workplace On the Hill Opens a Door of Horrors" and I will table it at the conclusion of my contribution. The press release reads -

In 1994 a spokesperson for Mr Kierath said the responsibility for safety issues on the hill was that of the Speaker and President of Parliament.

This week we see Mr Kierath launch OHS week and today became "Spot a Hazard Day".

Mr Kierath stated at his launch of OHS week that he was going to use his workplace on the hill as an example -

It appears he has had a change of heart since 1994 when he said it was the responsibility of the Speaker and the President. The press release continues -

Members of the LHMU are extremely interested with Mr Kierath's findings, that is, if he even opened his eyes.

LHMU members have taken it upon themselves to do their own safety inspection today and would like to compare it with Mr Kierath's list.

Members had no Problems in finding hazards in and about the workplace, for examples.

Chemical storage
flammable components stored with corrosive component
no chemical data sheets
lack of ventilation

Fire Protection, Fire Prevention
lack of extinguish
out of date extinguish
no fire sprinkler systems
inactive Smoke Alarms
no Emergency lighting

The list goes on and I will not read it out because it extends to four A4 pages.

Hon Kim Chance: How many items are identified?

Hon TOM HELM: Thirty one items have been identified.

Hon Max Evans: Is that yesterday's report?

Hon TOM HELM: Yes and it is by the union representatives and the union members in this place.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I ask members to cease their conversations. I am trying to hear what Hon Tom Helm has to say.

Hon TOM HELM: It is probably because I am softly spoken.

Yesterday I had cause to go to the stationery office. Like other members I have been going there once a week or once a fortnight, and I have been doing that for 10 years. I am amazed at the amount of equipment, particularly paper, which is stored outside the stationery office. One has to avoid all the obstacles and it just like a maze. It occurred to me - I was prompted by this report - that if there was a fire in the parliamentary information office and members were unable to leave the building from the main entrance, they would have the devil's own job trying to get out of what would be a dark, smoke filled alleyway. I note with interest that apart from the parliamentary staff who are housed in that alleyway, the area is occupied by Labor Party members. In other words, the Labor Party could lose some of its members because of the inadequate access to the exits in that part of the building.

Hon Max Evans: Have you ever tried to burn bundles of paper?

Hon TOM HELM: These are the facts and the Minister should listen.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member should direct his comments to me.

Hon TOM HELM: Thank you, Mr President, I will do that.

I have been in this place for 10 years and it has been the same all that time. Members should not get upset or angry by what I am saying. Health and safety in this building are the responsibility of all members. If the incompetent Minister for Finance had kept his mouth shut and tried not to make political mileage out of this motion -

Hon Max Evans: We are grateful for what you have done.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Who is making mileage out of it?

Hon TOM HELM: Members opposite should know that in these modern days an audit is done in the workplace. A check list is prepared and either the health and safety representative or the members of the work force will mark off the items on that list. They will make sure that the health standards have been met and if they are not they draw the problems to the attention of management. All members are irresponsible in this matter. It is not a political stunt; it is a fact that there are health hazards in this building.

The fourth item on the list indicates that there is no hot water in the women's toilet block. Again, because of this report, I have made the observation that there is only one toilet in this building for the disabled. If a disabled person wanted to play billiards he could not do it. He could not even get to the media office because there is no wheelchair access. This is 1996.

Hon Max Evans: Take away the billiard tables.

Hon TOM HELM: If the Minister thinks this is a laughing matter, he should go ahead and have a good laugh. It is only the crazy people who see something funny in this.

I have already referred to the sixth item on the list which refers to the immediate area of the recreation facilities and notes that there is no wheelchair access. It is discriminatory. It is also noted that -

Many doors in the building do not open in the direction of egress which is important in the case of an emergency. Particular reference is made to the library area. This was drawn to the attention of Parliament House in April/May 1994 and has not been acted upon. This coupled with the fact that there are no fire protection sprinklers in the building is a matter of considerable concern.

I was not aware of that even though I often go to the library. I certainly was not aware that the doors open inwardly. That certainly is not acceptable and it would cause a real hazard in case of a fire. The press release continues -

The service staircase at the rear of the bar has no emergency lighting and is steep.

The chemical storage area behind the ground floor kitchen area (northern end) is inappropriate for the chemicals stored there. There is no exhaust ventilation. The storage area contains, amongst other chemicals, at least one 20 litre drum of methylated spirits which is highly flammable. The fire fighting medium provided adjacent to this area is a 2.25kg dry powder extinguisher which has not been serviced regularly by a service agent. (see tag attached to the extinguisher) Other extinguishers in the area have not been serviced regularly as is required.

There are no MSDS's provided or available to workers.

That has something to do with resuscitation.

Point of Order

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Mr President, will you direct the member to identify the document from which he is quoting?

The PRESIDENT: Will the member identify it?

Hon TOM HELM: The document is a media release and it is titled "The Workplace on the Hill Opens a Door of Horrors", and I will table it at the end of my contribution.

Motion Resumed

Hon TOM HELM: The press release continues -

There are temporary offices set up in the corridor in the Wages and Finance (W&F) area. These are inadequate work areas for the same reasons as were indicated for the Hansard Reporters temporary offices on the third floor (reported in the workplace audit carried out in April 1994).

The good news is that the dogboxes which the Hansard reporters had been using for the last 10 years that I am aware of, have gone. I am sure members have noticed that the corridor now looks as it should. I have not asked the Hansard staff, but I assume that they now have a far better working environment. Hopefully, it is healthier and safer. The press release continues -

When there is a presentation outside of the building in the gardens (as there was today with the Police exhibition and function in the tent) there is no external power point. What is done is that there is a 30 metre temporary cable run across the floor in the corridor in an unsecured manner creating a trip hazard for those working in that area.

I am sure that members have noticed that on Budget day the television crews have mobile units outside the building and power is run from this building to those units. Parliament House has no outside power connections. It is not until somebody points out the hazards that one realises how dangerous these things can be. That is what has been done here. The list includes a damaged power point in the Cabinet Dining Room servery; extension cords being used in wet areas in the main servery; and telephone and computer cabling running across the floor in the Parliamentary Library. This cabling had not been installed properly and was taped to the surface of the carpet. This introduced a trip hazard, and I understand that it took eight weeks to fix the hazard. That is an unacceptable delay to resolve a simple hazard in the workplace.

This list of 31 items was compiled by staff at Parliament House and two union representatives in less than an hour and a half. It was compiled on the quick. It was done in the hope that Mr Kierath or his representatives would do something about these issues that have been presented to us. If Mr Kierath or his representatives conducted a similar survey, I would be interested to compare the two. It should not take any more than one hour a month to identify these hazards and fix them.

I emphasise that this list is by no means complete. The items on this list are open to debate, because one person's hazard may be another person's method of working. We all have different views on these issues. In the real world, those matters are brought to the attention of a responsible management, so they can be debated. Some hazards are unavoidable; they cannot be removed, so safe work practices must be in place to accommodate those hazards. It may be necessary to deal with some matters on this list in that way, or to implement radical changes that will cost a lot of money. However, I suspect that is not the case and only minor work is required to fix these matters.

I would love to have a go at Minister Kierath. He is not, and never has been, my favourite person, although we should be grateful to him. If Minister Kierath had not said anything on Monday, another 10 years could have sailed by without these problems being raised. In an adjournment debate on Tuesday night I advised the House that a number of reports had been prepared on occupational safety in this place. The earliest report I have to hand was prepared in 1990 at the instigation of the former Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Mr Mike Barnett, who asked the fire brigade to undertake an extensive report. I do not know if matters raised in the 1990 and 1994 reports have been addressed; I doubt if I need to know.

Mr President, I was aware of some of the problems, and I feel guilty that I did not bring them to your attention personally. I have accepted the drawbacks and got by. That is not an acceptable way to behave. I bring these items to the House more in sorrow than in anger. The Minister for Employment and Training, who should know better, should be pushing the line that we are all responsible for our own safety. We all share the blame, and we should ensure that these issues are brought to the fore, and we do not let things go by because it is easier to do that.

HON DERRICK TOMLINSON (East Metropolitan) [2.53 pm]: I commend Hon Tom Helm for bringing this to the attention of the House. I regret that it is in the nature of a press release. I managed to get a copy, of a report titled "Spot the hazard - Occupational safety and health week 1996 hazard audit of the Western Australian Parliament House". It enumerates some of the hazards of working in this place. Unfortunately, the person who compiled this list of hazards did not visit my office.

Hon John Halden: I am about to make the same speech.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: My office adjoins the President's dining room. My office contains two desks and mine is the desk right alongside the window. There is no power point in the immediate vicinity of my desk. The power point to which I have access is on the other side of the room. Members might say that I should shift my desk, so that it is in the vicinity of a power point.

Hon Max Evans: That is a good idea.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: It is, except the layout of the room does not make that possible, so my desk must remain in its present position. Therefore, an extension cable is laid across the floor from the power point to a position underneath my desk. Plugged into that power point is a connection to the lights on my desk. From time to time I use a computer at my desk, and it is necessary for me to crawl under the desk and disconnect the extension cable - in the dark and the dust.

Hon P.R. Lightfoot: It would make a nice photograph.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: It would be a tremendous photograph!

Hon John Halden: It is your best aspect.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Certainly, that is where my brains are. It is then necessary for me to connect the computer and work in that way. I am conscious that every time I do that I undertake a hazardous exercise. I suppose I am guilty of using a modern implement in a 1930s' building; therefore, in taking that risk I make a choice.

The matters contained within this list are not frivolous. I present myself as a person who works in this building on a part time basis. I come into the Parliament from 20 to 26 weeks of the year; the rest of the time I work in my electorate. However, there are staff who work here permanently. The sorts of hazards to which the Hansard staff and the kitchen staff are exposed are enumerated in this report. The inconvenience to which the clerical staff are exposed is also enumerated in this report. I speak not in condemnation of this or any Government, but we have for too long been hiding behind the shield of public censure, being unwilling to put a dollar into this House to bring it up to normative safety and occupational standards, simply because we do not want to risk the censure of the public saying that we are feathering our nests. The time has come for us to hazard the public censure, because we are putting at risk not just ourselves but every person who works in this building.

The office which I occupy is alongside the President's dining room. The only escape in case of fire is down a wooden stairway. It is a wooden stairway on the north side of the building or a wooden stairway on the south side of the building or, alternatively, if one reaches the front of the building it is a marble stairway. It is time that this Parliament made the decision to invest some capital in this building, so we have a building which is safe and able to provide occupational health and safety and comfort for the people who work in this building full time throughout the year - not cold in winter and hot in summer - and about which the people of Western Australia can say, "That is our Parliament." It should be a place to which people can look with respect, and be able to say that it is their Parliament. As long as we hide behind the excuse of unwillingness to expend public money, because we will be exposing ourselves to the censure of feathering our nests, we will perpetuate the problem. People cannot respect this place because it does not earn or deserve respect, not simply because of the behaviour of individuals who come here from time to time, but because it is a place which is badly in need of raising to a modern and efficient standard of safety and occupational health and welfare.

HON JOHN HALDEN (South Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [3.00 pm]: I wish to expunge my guilt about a recent incident. Apparently a note went around Parliament House recently informing us that an office had almost caught fire. I think that member's office was mine! I wish to outline the dangers we face, not from neglect but from just doing our jobs. I was sitting in my office. I had the monitor on, watching and waiting for a debate to end so that I could enter the Chamber to participate in the next item of business on the Notice Paper. As I left the office, I moved my chair backwards towards the heater. Later, as I stood in this Chamber, I felt sure that I could smell something burning.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: You are lucky to have a heater!

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Luckily, I did not make a long speech filled with fire and brimstone, as I do from time to time. When I left the Chamber, I could still smell something burning. I returned to my office to find my charred chair. Had I spoken at length, because there was no-one in my office -

Hon Max Evans: That is a lesson for you: Keep your speeches short.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: It is a simple situation. It is not one of neglect. It is to do with the environment in which we work. We place not only ourselves at risk, but also everyone else in this place. If I had been on my feet in this Chamber making a longer speech, by the time the problem was identified it would have been too late. I am not sure whether we have a fire alarm system in this place; I think it is enclosed within another place. If I had taken longer to speak on that occasion, my office would have been well and truly alight and a number of people, including me, would have been placed in significant jeopardy as a result of my actions. That situation exemplifies the dangers involved in this building. I apologise to everyone for placing so many people at risk. I do not think that we can do much about it because, again, this is the environment in which we work.

I also wish to talk about the environment in which my staff work. My office measures about 12 feet by 12 feet. Three staff carry out their tasks in that confined space. The office also accommodates equipment, including

computer cables, heaters, a fax machine, a photocopier and a printer. Of course, my office is frequented by members of the Opposition when a matter is to be considered, so I may have a number of people in the area from time to time -

Hon Kim Chance: And even the Leader of the House occasionally.

Hon N.F. Moore: Not when you are smoking!

Hon JOHN HALDEN: If people in private enterprise or in the public sector were asked to work under these conditions, we would receive a number of complaints. My staff work under those conditions; they do not complain. More often than not, I complain. We must consider the future. We must consider providing the staff who work here permanently with a secure and safe work environment. The fact that I was not aware if a sprinkler system operated in this building - I have been advised since that we do not have such equipment - again, exemplifies the dangers in this building. The fact that I would not know where the nearest fire extinguisher is, if there were a fire in my office, again emphasises the problem. I do not know if there is a fire extinguisher on this level; if there is, I certainly have not seen a sign designating where it is.

To balance this discussion, I admit that a significant improvement has been made to the lighting in Parliament House. The lighting in this place used to be abominable.

Hon B.M. Scott: The lighting now shows up the dust.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Yes. I have just written a letter about that. We are beginning to improve this building, and I am grateful for the improved lighting.

The issue raised by Hon Tom Helm requires urgent attention for not only our immediate amenity where we work but also for our general safety. A Government of either political persuasion should address this matter. We must bite the bullet. I do not think we need a monument like the new Parliament House in Canberra. However, we must at least undertake some rudimentary procedures to upgrade this building. The sooner that happens the better it will be for us and for the people who work in this place.

This motion was not designed to be frivolous. Hon Tom Helm bent my arm about raising the matter -

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: He is to be commended for doing so.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: - rather than talking about other matters of political interest.

Hon Max Evans: This is the first real urgency motion we have heard for years.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am pleased that the Minister believes that. I am delighted that we have been able to meet the Minister's needs.

This is an urgent matter. It is not only urgent that we debate it. I have heard enough debates and seen enough reports during my 10 years in this place to suggest that the sooner we address the problem in a real sense, the better it will be for all of us.

HON MAX EVANS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Finance) [3.08 pm]: Hon Graham Kierath will be stunned as well as delighted that he has motivated Hon Tom Helm to do something about this matter. We are aware that often those two members have not been on the best of terms. Hon Tom Helm has been motivated by the Minister to take action. We commend Hon Tom Helm for the motion. The assertion in the question asked by the member the other night was found to be incorrect. The suggestion was that Hon Graham Kierath would do a spot hazard check of this House. During the adjournment debate Hon Tom Helm referred to press releases, and the matter was sorted out later that night. It was never the intention of Hon Graham Kierath to do a spot hazard check of this House. The member has done that himself.

I turn now to the comments made during an adjournment debate recently. Hon Tom Helm is not a member of the Joint House Committee; but everyone has a right to comment on this place. The member said that he did not take too much notice of the condition of this place, even though he was a safety representative with Hamersley Iron where he was a rigger; and he was trained to take note of such things. I have not been trained. However, I have written letters to the Joint House Committee in recent months regarding things that should be done. I work for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, of which I am now the auditor. I sort out all the financial matters and the balance sheets. All my life, if I have seen a problem I have tried to correct it. In the corridor here we used to have rubber matting. My wife commented on the danger, saying that similar matting had just been removed from a local hospital, because it was very dangerous when wet. I made a note of that rubber matting in our corridor.

Several members interjected.

Hon MAX EVANS: They would not want patients in the hospital adding to their woes by breaking their legs. That would be a double whammy.

We all have day to day responsibilities. Over the years I have phoned Bob Willis regarding things to be done or equipment which needs repairing. Today I rang him about a magnificent table in the ministerial offices because the table is splitting across the top. It was a tongue and groove joint and it was difficult to put together. I called in an expert to fix it. I have always tried to make these things happen. Hon Tom Helm has made members aware of many more matters of which they should take note. This debate should be taken in the right context. It is an urgency motion. Members opposite raised the issue yesterday and have raised it today so that members can record their complaints that have not been addressed in this issue. Hon Brian Burke had a major plan for Parliament House. However, he wanted to have a ballroom at the front reception area. As soon as people saw the word "ballroom" they rubbished the plan. It was a pity it was rubbished because it was a move to do something about the situation.

The number of members in this place has increased. There are also more staff here than there are members, which years ago was not the case. I am not critical of that, but the building is under pressure. Hon John Halden's comments about smoke alarms is correct. I do not think this building has any smoke alarms. All members should do safety hazard checks on their own homes. I have a few hazards in my house and I am always "gunna" do something about them. My wife asks when I am "gunna" put in smoke detectors, which I should do. Hon Mike Barnett banned smoking in various rooms in this building; however, fire is still a potential hazard. Electrical wiring can get old in buildings such as this. One day the alarm went off and we did not know what to do, which was a sad state of affairs. We knew that in nearly 100 years there had been no problems like that in the building. I hope members will work together in this matter. Hon Tom Helm is the only one I can see here who is trained in this area. I am not trained in this field; however, all my life I have made it my duty to be proactive if I see something wrong. I presume that Hon Tom Helm will direct this matter to the Joint House Committee.

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural) [3.12 pm]: I am delighted this matter has been raised by Hon Tom Helm. It is long overdue to be discussed. Like Hon Tom Helm, I am grateful that the Minister for Labour Relations raised this issue, even though I suspect, as my comrade does, that it was nothing more than a stunt. If it was a stunt, it was a stunt that has had some good effect. If I welcome what the Minister for Labour Relations has done, I am even more grateful for what the Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union has done in bringing the specifics of this case to our attention. There is a message in that: It tells the whole story of what has happened with industrial safety in this country. When politicians think that some short term political advantage is to be gained, they talk about industrial safety. However, regardless of who is in government, it has always been left to the unions to do the work. We have seen this repeated.

Hon N.F. Moore: Where was the union during 1983 to 1993?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I imagine the union was doing the same thing then as it is doing now; that is, trying to bring to the attention of members the dangers that exist in this place. A report was produced on that in 1990.

Hon N.F. Moore: Where is it?

Hon KIM CHANCE: Hon Tom Helm has it. That report was created as a result of pressure from unions to do something about the matter. We have always relied on the union movement to get anything done in industrial safety. That is a tragedy. I learned as recently as lunchtime today what the situation is with industrial safety in Great Britain at the moment. In all of those measures that we could call socially progressive, Great Britain now lags behind Australia and the rest of the world. However, after 15 years of Thatcherism and post-Thatcherism destroying that country, it leads Australia in the area of industrial safety, simply because it has not been left to the unions to carry the burden. In Britain industrial safety is considered as a matter that must be regulated at parliamentary level. The British have taken their responsibility in that area seriously. That is something Australia has failed to do, and all of us must bear responsibility for that.

The reason we must do that - this sits in stark contrast to our attitude to industrial relations - is the sheer economic cost of not doing it. Leaving aside the sons and daughters who are left fatherless and motherless by industrial accidents and all those who are in wheelchairs or who live at the Shenton Park rehabilitation hospital as a result of sloppy workplace practices, members should think of the cost. The cost of industrial accidents in this country far exceeds the cost of industrial disputation. However, what are we doing about improving industrial safety, other than, in our case, talking about it and leaving the work to the unions? In industrial relations, every time a conservative Government is in office - in this State it is the Court Government and in the Commonwealth it is the Howard Government - there is a massive preoccupation with sorting out the cost of industrial relations problems.

The employer organisations are no better. The Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the National Farmers Federation identify the main problem hindering progress in Australia as being the reform of the industrial system. In fact, the reform they identify in the industrial system does not save a fraction of the cost that would be saved if we were able to do something about industrial safety.

This is something I have said before and it is something of which we are not taking enough notice. We are looking for reward for effort simply in cold, hard, economic rationalist terms: We should be devoting far more attention to industrial safety than we are to industrial relations. Let us forget about workplace agreements legislation that is taken

up by 3 or 4 per cent of the work force and amounts to no reform. It has virtually no negative effect and no positive effect; it is a nothing. We have wasted hours of the time of this Government and this Administration talking about the margins when we could have been saving people from being in Shenton Park. Some children would still have their mums or dads who lost their lives in industrial accidents. Much pain and suffering could have been saved. Above all, we would have saved a huge amount of money.

In an instance that comes close to this place, only a couple of weeks ago in Hon Jim McGinty's office a young and extremely talented staff member nearly lost her life in an electrocution accident. She received an electric shock from a heater. That caused her vision problems and she was off work for a couple of days. It could have been far more serious. We are never far away from those dangers. We have heard today about simply one aspect, which was not mentioned in the safety audit, principally because the people doing the audit did not go into members' offices. The issue of power cords on the ground in improper places, which was raised by Hon Derrick Tomlinson, and heaters on the ground - a matter raised by Hon John Halden - is probably one of the most serious safety issues before us, particularly in circumstances where offices are sometimes left unoccupied. I hope members take a serious message from this. It is an urgent matter. I disagree with the Minister for Finance that it is the only one the Opposition has raised. This has been an urgent matter for many years; it is our fault that we have not addressed it.

HON I.D. MacLEAN (North Metropolitan) [3.19 pm]: I thank Hon Tom Helm for bringing this matter before the House in what is properly an urgency motion. While I was listening to Hon Tom Helm I glanced down at one of the heater cords near my seat. I used to be an electrician in the Navy. I noticed that the heater cord was of a type that has been banned. The insulation is a rubber compound which has been banned. The plug has been incorrectly fitted and is starting to burn out, and is very dangerous.

Sometimes when I am sitting here listening to the marvellous contributions made by members opposite I glance upwards and notice the cracks in the plaster rosettes. Those cracks appear to get larger as the evening draws on. I think how wonderful it would be if one were to crash down while I was sitting here. In fact, one night, just after the new ceilings fans were installed, a piece of plaster did come crashing down. I was out the door so fast that no-one noticed.

There is a problem. This building is getting old. Safety is one of those things that, because something has gone along in the same way for a long time and nothing has gone wrong, everyone assumes it is fine. I have worked in industry and workshops, and one of the things that I was always taught when I was training was that one does not leave things as they are just because they have been that way for a long time. One starts becoming complacent with this type of thing and, when a new employee arrives or something goes wrong, the dangers increase. The lucky people are only hurt, but the unlucky are dead. I am not suggesting that any member would be dead, although Hon Bruce Donaldson might be in a bit of trouble if he were to put his feet into the heater and it was on - it might give him a bit of a shock. That is okay - I would be gone.

We have a marvellous heritage building. This is a state asset and we are allowing it to fall down. When I came into the President's Gallery this afternoon I looked up and noticed that one of the plaster fittings over the door is coming away from the wall. If someone slams the door he will have a headache. We are allowing our State's heritage, history and asset to start degrading. I thank Hon Tom Helm for bringing this to our attention. I must admit that I was starting to accept some of the things going on around here as common practice. It is time we bit the bullet and put money aside. I would like to see the staff moved to better accommodation. I believe there was discussion at some stage about building an office block across the road for staff and linking it to this building. That would be an excellent idea. Staff would appreciate it because they would then be in modern office accommodation and we would appreciate it because we would then have extra room. The Ministers would not have to hang around like naughty schoolboys outside the Premier's office when they are meeting with people.

Hon John Halden: Most are outside my office.

Hon I.D. MacLEAN: I thank Hon Tom Helm again and commend his diligence.

HON J.A. SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [3.24 pm]: I support the motion and the comments of the previous speakers, including those of Hon Derrick Tomlinson. I think he hit the nail on the head in talking about the fear of members on all sides of politics of being labelled as spendthrifts by the general community for wasting money on themselves. As has been pointed out already, there are certainly many other people here besides politicians, and money spent on not only safety but also the better working of this place would make a great deal of difference - probably to the productivity of this House as well.

There is nothing more important than people's health and their life, and money cannot be better spent than in ensuring that that is looked after. For some time I have been concerned about those tiny chicken coops housing the Hansard staff. That is a particularly unsatisfactory arrangement, both for the general tenor of the place and the safety and comfort of those employees.

I can only endorse the statements made by previous speakers. Perhaps the Government could look to getting agreement from all sides of the House in relation to this issue. It could also do an audit of this place to see what is required and get all sides of the Parliament to support a motion to move this on from debate to a reality, because that is what is needed, not many -

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: We will include some expenditure in the next Budget.

Several members interjected.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am quite happy to put my name on that as well, even though -

Hon J.A. Cowdell: The wigs could be a fire hazard!

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am very pleased with the response to that suggestion and I hope that it can be taken up. If we can agree to do something along those lines perhaps we will see results.

HON TOM HELM (Mining and Pastoral) [3.27 pm]: I thank members for their contributions. It is good to see that the motion was responded to in the manner I wished for; it is a matter of great concern. The Minister for Finance is perfectly right: I suppose I am the only person in this place who has been trained by TUTA in the requirements of occupational health and safety. In the light of that, perhaps I am more guilty than others in this place. I have done the course run by the union movement and I have had experience with Hamersley Iron in the good old days. I probably should carry more of the blame for allowing these things to happen. I should be able to spot these hazards and do something about them, if only tell those responsible or you, Mr President. However, I have not done anything. Hopefully something will come of this motion. A recent media alert issued by the Miscellaneous Workers Union states -

Spot A Hazard Day - Hazards spotted in 1994 still not fixed at Parliament House

Yesterday I saw for the first time a report put together in 1990. I do not have a clue whether any or some part of the report has been acted upon.

Hon N.F. Moore: It was addressed to the former Speaker. It would be very interesting to know what he did about it.

Hon TOM HELM: The press release states -

In March/April 1994 there was an extensive Occupational Health and Safety audit done on Parliament House where 31 points were noted as Occupational Health and Safety hazards. Members of the ALHMWU are outraged today that Parliament House hazards identified in 1994 have not been acted upon by the President of the legislative council and the Speaker.

"It is scandalous that the Government has spent millions of dollars on audio/visual equipment to televise proceedings in the House, and yet have not attempted to meet any of the recommendations from the 1994 audit", Tonia Klucaniak, organiser with the ALHMWU said.

The Opposition have raised the issue of the occupational health and safety hazards with the Government by way of an urgency motion in today's proceedings in the Legislative Council.

"It also seems hypocritical that the Government launched OHS Week and named yesterday as "Spot a Hazard Day" when officers of the Parliament are working in a totally unsafe environment" Ms Kluczniak said.

"Employees are not prepared to work in this situation any longer and demand immediate action of the Government. Unless this is rectified they are considering further action."

That is the union's position on these issues. That indicates that there has been some conversation with people working in this place. The issue has never been brought to my attention, but if someone has brought it to the attention of the union then that is one step further than I have taken it. I have not brought it to either your attention, Mr President, or that of the Parliament House administration. I thank members for their contributions and the way in which the debate has been conducted.

[The motion lapsed, pursuant to Standing Order No 72.]

ELECTORAL LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 27 August.

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Affairs) [3.30 pm]: Forgive my enthusiasm, Mr President, in bouncing to my feet prematurely in order to respond to the comments of Hon John

Cowdell and others on the Bill. I can give you an absolute assurance that I will not take as long to respond as Hon John Cowdell took to promote his case, which we heard over a lengthy period. It went from Thursday through to the following Tuesday night.

Hon Kim Chance: Not non-stop.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It seemed that way. I thank the members of the Opposition and the Independent members for their comments and the general support that the Bill has received. As the second reading speech outlined, the intention of the Bill is to bring the state legislation essentially into line with commonwealth legislation on the disclosure of political donations and expenditure thereof. The reason for that is obvious. These days, most political parties in Australia are subject to both laws. It makes sense from the point of view of official administration to impose similar state and commonwealth requirements for political parties. In this Bill we have brought into line with commonwealth legislation the Bill passed in 1992. Some criticism has occurred about the delay in bringing this Bill to the House. I make the point that only relatively recently did the Commonwealth complete its legislative changes. As members would be aware, following each federal election is a process where suggestions and ideas can be put forward in respect of the way in which the election was conducted. The Commonwealth Parliament goes through the process of looking at those issues and then legislating if it deems it desirable. Our view was therefore that we should wait until the federal legislation had been completed and enacted before we proceeded with the final changes to ours, with the view of ensuring that they were in line with each other, as far as is humanly possible.

We were also interested, following the first drafts of our legislation, to look at the recommendations of the Commission on Government. Where possible, we have sought to include those in our Bill, bearing in mind that there are a number of different views about the COG recommendations. Indeed, I have been interested to hear from time to time about how the Labor Party is promoting the view that we should implement the COG recommendations, but when it suits its members, they say, "We agree with most of them, but we do not agree with a couple of them." That was evident in the comments of Hon John Cowdell the other night. If members want to get on to the high moral ground with COG, they must accept all of its recommendations. If they want to suggest that some of them are not right, then they must accept that there is a good argument for all of them being right or wrong. I remember only too well that when the first lot of COG recommendations came out, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr McGinty, said that the Labor Party agreed with all of them except three.

Hon J.A. Cowdell: That was the first report.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Yes. I must look a little further to ensure that that has not changed over time. As I have already pointed out to the House, one of the recommendations was that in the event of a member of Parliament resigning without just cause during the course of his tenure, he should be required to pay for the by-election from his superannuation or other sources.

Hon Kim Chance: I still think that is a good idea.

Hon J.A. Cowdell: I still support that reform.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I know the members do. It would have applied to one of their members.

Hon Kim Chance: You did not get the legislation through in time.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon Ian Taylor, as we all know, resigned for no other reason than to stand for the Labor Party in the federal seat of Kalgoorlie. I did not hear Mr McGinty say, "In the spirit of our support of COG, Ian, we want you to pay the Government \$100 000."

Hon Kim Chance: He might have said that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: He did not say it loudly enough for anybody else to hear it. If Hon Kim Chance heard it, he might tell us now. Mr Taylor would appreciate it, I am sure. Members opposite cannot eat their cake and have it too. They cannot come out on a high moral ground and say that they agree with the recommendations, but when a situation arises where they can do something about it, not because they have to but because it is morally right, put it aside because it is inconvenient at the time. We have looked at the COG recommendations and amended the Electoral Act to take into account most of them.

Most of the opposition to the Bill relates to our decision not to proclaim that section of the Act passed in 1992, which relates to the use of government funds for advertising and travel. I guess that in effect we are taking the same course of action as the previous Government; that is, one does not proclaim it because it is not practical. It is interesting that COG also recommended that there was no need to legislate for this issue, but a code of conduct or code of practice could be introduced. As I have indicated already, the Government's intention is to develop a code of practice for the way in which Governments use funds for advertising and travel in the pre-election period. That is our position and that is how it will remain.

As has been indicated, the Bill also clears up a number of housekeeping matters. I appreciate the Opposition's support in respect of those matters. They were raised with us by the Electoral Commissioner and are designed to try to make the running of elections and the electoral system more efficient. We have gone along with those recommendations. The \$500 nomination fee, which was included in the Bill that I have indicated we will amend, is based on the present figures around Australia. The nomination fee for the Senate and for the New South Wales Legislative Council is \$500. Throughout most of the other Parliaments, it is either \$200 or \$250. In Western Australia it is \$100. It was deemed appropriate that we increase that amount because, as most members would agree, a nomination fee of some description is needed. It came out in the debate that we need a nomination fee in order to discourage people who will simply put their name on the ballot paper to cause difficulty, to be a dummy candidate or whatever, when they have no intention of seeking to be elected as a member of Parliament. We need a figure to ensure that the person nominating has some intention of being a proper candidate in the sense that they are seeking to be elected and are not there for some other reason.

During the debate I was interested to hear the comments of Hon Sam Piantadosi and Hon Reg Davies. Hon Reg Davies mentioned that even some Independent candidates sought the support of other people to assist in their election. He talked about dummy candidates. A cynic might say that someone who talks about dummy candidates and uses them, and then complains about the fee going up, does so because he will have to pay extra money for the dummy candidate. I did not think that, because it is not part of the way in which I operate. I was also interested to hear Hon Sam Piantadosi say that with two hours to go before nominations closed for the Glendalough by-election he received a telephone call from the Secretary of the Labor Party asking him to find a candidate and pay the nomination fee. I can understand somebody in that position being unhappy about having to pay \$500, especially if he had to find a candidate rather than put someone forward in a proactive way. The member of Parliament was asked to put somebody's name on the ballot paper. That is dreadful behaviour. One can understand why there would be no enthusiasm to make the fee \$500, if someone wanted to employ that sort of practice. It is interesting that we get a lot of candidates in marginal seats and not very many in safe seats. Maybe that has something to do with the idea of dummy candidates. Maybe those people opposing the increase are supportive of the idea of dummy candidates.

Hon Kim Chance: Is a dummy candidate necessarily frivolous, even though it may be wrong?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I do not know. I suppose if trying to maximise a vote is frivolous, then it is frivolous; if it is not, then it is not.

Hon Kim Chance: Therefore by definition it is not.

Hon N.F. MOORE: No. Maybe in retrospect the word "frivolous" in the second reading speech was not the right word, because very few people stand frivolously, although it is possible for people to do that. When 27 names are on a ballot paper for a single member constituency, it makes it more difficult for people to cast a valid vote. Those people can cause difficulties for voters by putting their names down frivolously. The requirement to pay money up-front would eliminate people who put their names in for a frivolous purpose. The \$100 has been in place since 1973, when the Tonkin Government raised it from \$50 to \$100. I read through the debate and the Opposition at that time agreed with the increase. There was no debate of any consequence on that change. However, when we sought to raise the amount of \$100 to \$500, we raised even the ire of the editor of *The West Australian*. I am often surprised how easy it is to raise his ire on issues such as this. However, in the intervening years since the last change, the inflation rate has been about 480 per cent. I believe that an increase of \$100 to \$500 is keeping pace with inflation. It probably seems a bigger increase because it has not been done before. Maybe it should be indexed as the last Labor Government indexed the excise on tobacco and petrol. However, we were prepared to go along with the proposition that an increase to \$500 was too big a jump and therefore, I am moving that the amount be \$250. That will bring it in line with most of the States and the House of Representatives, although we will still be behind the Senate and the Legislative Council in New South Wales.

Some comment was made by members about the federal Liberal Party's submission on the existing Act. We have not taken those comments into account. That is the view of the federal secretariat and the party. The Government has not proceeded down that line, although there is sympathy for the view that, if donors as well as recipients have to disclose, there will be double reporting requirements. If one had to cross-check with the other, we could impose an unnecessarily onerous burden on some people. However, we do not intend to go down that path in this Bill. Therefore, no change is contemplated on that submission. However, if the Federal Act is changed in future, we will need to look at that to see whether our Act should be changed. As I said, the intent and the spirit is to try to ensure that the compliance processes on disclosure are efficient and effective and do not impose a significant burden on politicians, candidates, political parties and others involved in the political arena in a way which would require them to do enormous amounts of unnecessary paperwork.

The industrial legislation which requires that trade unions seek the views of the membership about who they give funds to was a decision made by this House last year or the year before. I cannot think of any reasons to change that. It is appropriate that members of an organisation like a trade union, in which there is often a degree of compulsion

to be a member and the funds all go one way, should be consulted about where the funds go. Therefore, I do not accept the argument that we should in this Bill seek to amend the industrial relations legislation.

A number of other issues were raised which I will not go into because they are not part of this Bill, although they are part of the electoral system. I have some sympathy with the voluntary voting argument raised by Hon Reg Davies. I know Hon John Cowdell does not. The Labor Party is vehemently opposed to voluntary voting, which means that its researchers tell it that it will not assist its cause, and if it will not assist its cause, it will not assist ours. I have never been persuaded one way or the other that it assists anybody. However, I have a fundamental, philosophical view that people should have the right not to vote if they wish. Therefore, we have decided not to proceed with that. If Hon Reg Davies wants to take it further, he has the opportunity as a member to move amendments in Committee to seek to have that situation changed.

[Continued below.]

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm

VISITORS AND GUESTS - MR DAVID SIBAMBO

Secretary General of the Assembly of Mozambique

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths): For a number of years I have been endeavouring to put in place a plan which would allow this Parliament to provide an opportunity to officers of some of the emerging democracies in the Commonwealth to visit this Parliament to gain experience of operating under the Westminster system in the manner that we do. I am delighted to tell the House that after all that time, and in conjunction with the Australian High Commission in Harare, this week we have had with us Mr David Sibambo, the Secretary General of the Parliament - that is, in our terms, the Clerk of the Assembly - of Mozambique. As members will know, after the recent election, Mozambique sought and was accepted as a member country of the Commonwealth. David is in the President's Gallery. I welcome him, and I hope his stay with us - even though it is a short time, and my plan is that these visits be much longer - is of benefit not only to him, but to the people of his country.

Members: Hear, hear!

[Applause.]

[Questions without notice taken.]

ELECTORAL LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Affairs) [4.33 pm]: A number of issues were raised in the second reading debate involving electoral matters which do not necessarily relate to the Bill. Optional preferential voting was raised by Hon Reg Davis, and it is not the Government's intention to move down that path at this time. However, that matter will be debated in political organisations for a long time, and the time may come for adoption of that proposal.

Public funding of political parties was also raised by Hon Reg Davies, a proposal the Commission on Government recommended against. Again, that is an issue to which we need to give some serious thought. This Bill, along with the commonwealth legislation, places enormous compliance requirements on political organisations regarding donations, and it may reach the stage in the future that no-one will contribute to political parties as a result of suggestions by some - Hon J.A. Scott has a similar view - that any donation is a corruption of the political process. Political parties are an integral part of the political process, and the time may come when public funding of parties is required in Western Australia. That debate is needed. I do not have a viewpoint on that issue at this time. I know that all political parties could use more money, and many see public funding as an easy way of obtaining money.

In respect of questions by Hon John Cowdell and others regarding the definition of a donation or gift, the only difference between the state Bill and the commonwealth Act is that the state measure will allow a maximum of \$200 to be counted as a subscription to a political party; the Commonwealth has no maximum limit. That \$200 is not disclosed if it is a subscription to a political party.

Hon John Cowdell asked about keeping records of a donation below \$500 when considering aggregates. Obviously, one could go to the trouble of recording every single donation, all of which could add up to more than \$1 500. It is the view of this Government, and the situation with the Commonwealth Government, that to make such a requirement as a matter of course would be too onerous. Members and parties are required to keep records of donations above \$500. However, the Government is prepared to keep an eye on this matter, and if it is aware that people repeatedly make donations of \$499, we will give some thought to introducing regulations to deal with the

situation. Our candidates in the Liberal Party are told to keep an aggregate record of every cent they are given, but it is not considered necessarily to put that requirement in the Bill at this stage.

Hon John Cowdell suggested that the Government is not fulfilling the COG recommendation that the true sources of all donations be disclosed. This is also an Australian Democrats concern. The Government is doing all it can, in line with the commonwealth Act, to reasonably establish the source of all donations. No doubt, some people will seek to bypass the legislative processes; however, this Bill, in line with the commonwealth Act, goes as far as humanly possible to make sure we know the source of funds. We have included in the definition associated entities and groups which are not strictly political parties in that their action must be disclosed in respect of donations. We need to keep an eye on that if any attempt is made to avoid disclosure.

The question was raised of placing a ceiling on anonymous donations. Some members say that no anonymous donations should be made, but people are entitled to do what they like with their money without telling anyone about it. Anonymous donations above \$1 000 must be given back or paid into consolidated revenue. The forfeiture of illegal anonymous donation involves forfeiture to the Crown if it is above a specified amount. The figure in the commonwealth Act is \$1 000 and it is \$1 500 in our Bill. Members raised the question of overseas donations. The matter is not referred to in the commonwealth Act, and it was decided, for conformity, not to pursue that matter in the state Act. One could argue that overseas money is no different from local money provided it comes from an appropriate source and is disclosed.

Hon John Cowdell asked about political intimidation, a point also raised by Andrew Murray, the Democrats senator. It is our intention to ensure that there is no political intimidation of those who make contributions to political parties. Although there is some difference in the wording of our Bill and the commonwealth Act, it is not suggested that what we intend will allow intimidation to occur. Part 4 of the Equal Opportunity Act covers this issue. The Government is strongly of the view that there should be no intimidation and that its legislation will ensure it does not happen. However, if it does happen, necessary action will be taken to ensure that it does not recur.

The member required an assurance that the amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act is only to reinstate the original form of the declaration of political neutrality. I am able to give an absolute assurance that there is no intention on the Government's part to change that. The amendment is simply to include in the Equal Opportunity Act the existing requirement of employees of the Electoral Commission; that is, to satisfy the requirements of the Equal Opportunity Act and not to change any of the processes or practices.

The question of electors deliberately exhausting their vote and the Langer incident is of concern and I have looked at it very closely. Essentially, section 191A(2) of the Electoral Act 1907 makes it an offence to distribute handbills and advertisements that contain a purported representation of the ballot paper likely to induce an elector to mark his ballot paper contrary to the directions on the ballot paper. An offence is created when material is published giving directions on a ballot paper of how to vote informally or incorrectly. People writing letters stating that some candidates should be denied an effective preference are simply exercising free speech and they are not covered by this provision. Prosecutions are a matter for the Electoral Commission, acting in consultation with the police and the Director of Public Prosecutions. Currently, they have a discretion regarding prosecutions and often decide not to prosecute minor breaches of the Act where there has been no intent to deceive. Therefore, it is most unlikely that any Langer martyrdoms will occur in the context of this State's legislation.

The member asked for an assurance that scrutineers will have access to the processes of automated accounting, and I give that assurance, which is contained in proposed section 146I(4). The member asked whether donors will have to report to both the Australian Electoral Commission and the Western Australian Electoral Commission. There is no such requirement. This Bill will not specifically require donors, as distinct from recipients, to make a report of their donations, but it will continue to be a requirement under the commonwealth Act. Therefore, donors will be required to report to the AEC. The member asked whether associated entities will have to make post-election returns and not annual returns. Proposed section 175 makes it clear that associated entities, like political parties, will lodge annual returns.

The member also raised a number of matters from a letter that Senator Murray was supposed to have written. I do not know whether I received a copy of it, but I will respond to a couple of the matters raised by the member. The question of immediately advising of any donation of \$10 000 or more to the Electoral Commission is one the Government does not support. It is not included in the commonwealth Act and this Government is trying to maintain uniformity in these matters. A requirement for the disclosure of expenditure by publishers and broadcasters is a provision in the commonwealth Act. Therefore, there is no reason to replicate it in this legislation. In effect, it is a crosschecking mechanism. The member also referred to local government elections being covered by this legislation and the Government is of the view that they are best dealt with under the local government legislation.

I have already raised the issue of direct public funding. It is interesting that the Commission on Government did not support that proposition. Many people do not support it, but it is worthy of consideration by this House at some time in the future in view of the changes which will be made to the legislation by this Bill.

Hon Sam Piantadosi raised the question of a ceiling of \$150 on political donations and asked what would happen if more than one person in a family made a donation. He asked whether members of a family would be deemed to be a family or individuals. The AEC is of the view that each person is an individual and whether individuals are members of the same family is irrelevant when it comes to making donations to political parties. I am of the same view. Within families there are individuals and sometimes they have completely different political views. To suggest that if one is a close relation of somebody making a political donation there is somehow or other a relationship between the two in the context of that donation, is not necessarily correct. The Government has not addressed that issue and family members will be treated as individuals.

I have responded to most of the questions raised in the second reading debate. No doubt, further questions will be raised in Committee. Hon John Cowdell said that somehow or other the Government was seeking to take credit for this legislation. The Government is going through the process of putting in place political disclosure legislation. It is doing so in a considered way. It has looked at the situation which applies in the Commonwealth. It has also considered the COG recommendations and talked to people about it. The Government believes the legislation it has brought forward is appropriate. The legislation introduced by the Opposition when it was in government has been amended to bring it up to date. This Government has made decisions about funding and other issues. It believes that the course of action it is proposing is the most appropriate way to go; that is, by having a code of conduct. What the Government has delivered in regard to political donations and amendments to the Electoral Act is worth promoting. Obviously, this Government did not support political disclosure for many years. There is no doubt that in 1992 the then Opposition argued about it. However, the relevant Bill passed through the Parliament. At the time, the Opposition parties were prepared to accept the principle of political disclosure. The reality is that it is in the commonwealth legislation and it applies to all parties. It makes sense to put in place laws in this State which make it relatively easy to comply with those requirements. It is a question not of trying to claim credit but of continuing this matter. It has evolved since 1992 and this Bill is appropriate for the time. I look forward to the Opposition's support of the Bill.

Hon Tom Stephens made a speech about a number of issues which were essentially irrelevant to this Bill.

Hon Tom Stephens: That is a reflection on the Chair and you should not do that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: In my view they were irrelevant to the Bill.

Hon Tom Stephens: That is still a reflection on the Chair.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Clearly, the Chair took a different view. The issue of roll cleansing was raised by the member. Of all the members in this House, Hon Tom Stephens is the last person who should be giving advice on the way people should cast their votes. He has been known to give advice to the Northern Territory Labor Party and other sundry groups on how to maximise votes from particular racial groups. To suggest that somehow or other the Liberal Party has cleansed the roll is absolute nonsense.

Hon Tom Stephens: It is right.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I attempted to tell the member by interjection when he was speaking that the decision about whether a person should be removed from the electoral roll is made by the Electoral Commission, not the Liberal Party, and that is how it should work.

Hon Tom Stephens: Have you been involved in roll cleansing?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Every time Hon Tom Stephens says it is an improper act and that somebody has been improperly taken off the electoral roll, he is reflecting on the Electoral Commission. If it was a legislative problem neither Hon Tom Stephens nor his party did anything to change it in the 10 years they were in office. If it remains a legislative problem he should move an amendment to this Bill.

Hon Tom Stephens: You are on.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is necessary for the Electoral Commission to ensure, as far as is practically possible, that those people who are enrolled on a particular electoral roll actually reside in that designated area. Hon Tom Stephens and I know there are many people in Western Australia who are on a particular roll but have not lived in the area covered by that roll for a long time. It is important for the Electoral Commission, within the best of its ability, to make sure that the rolls are legitimate. If somebody does not respond to correspondence, the possibility is that they no longer live at the address. I agree with Hon Tom Stephens, if a person's address is a post office box, the commission should take greater steps than simply sending another letter to the same post office box to see whether the person has left the district. It is not for me to direct the Electoral Commission; that is not how it works. I make the point again, so there is no doubt in Hon Tom Stephens' mind, the Liberal Party does not take people off the electoral roll.

Hon Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I always send returned letters to the Electoral Commission.

Hon Tom Stephens: Condemned out of your own mouth.

Hon N.F. MOORE: If I do an electorate wide mail out, I send those letters which are returned to the Electoral Commission. What is wrong with that? Mr Stephens has done that.

Hon Tom Stephens: It is a prurient and unhealthy interest.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon Tom Stephens has done that himself.

Hon Tom Stephens: Not that I recall.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The member should be absolutely certain who he accuses on these occasions. Whenever he says that the Liberal Party is taking people's names off the roll, he is condemning the Electoral Commission and he should apologise to it for that.

I thank Hon J.A. Cowdell and other speakers for their support and commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon Derrick Tomlinson) in the Chair; Hon N.F. Moore (Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title -

Hon J.A. COWDELL: I will comment on a number of matters raised by the Minister and on a couple of amendments that will not be on the Supplementary Notice Paper on the basis that they have been ruled out under our standing orders. The Minister referred to the delay in the disclosure provisions in this legislation. He stated that a significant reason for this delay was alterations to the commonwealth Act and Western Australia's desire to mirror as nearly as possible the commonwealth legislation. He also pointed out that the Commonwealth conducts a review through its Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters after each election, and then considers changes and usually makes changes. That is an ongoing process; it occurs every three years. I do not know that is an argument to delay making a start on the Western Australian legislation, in this case for three and a half years. The Minister stated that the Government had accepted most, but not all, of the recommendations of the Commission on Government on disclosure. It is peculiar that the Minister should put the view that one should accept all the COG recommendations or none of them.

Hon N.F. Moore: I said that when you take the high moral ground, you should be careful about what you say.

Hon J.A. COWDELL: I do not want to get bogged down in that line of argument. The Minister pointed out that the Government had not proclaimed the sections of the 1992 Act on advertising or travel because it was not practicable to do so, as the previous Government had found. The previous Government had only one month in which to make adjustments, and this Government has had three and a half years. In the first case it was not practical; in the second case it was practical. The Minister stated that not proceeding with those sections of the 1992 Act that would regulate government advertising expenditure was in accord with the Commission on Government, which saw no need for legislative action. I was critical of the Commission on Government for relying on circular No 1 of 1993 of Carmen Lawrence as the new convention in this regard.

I note that the Minister assured us that a proposed code of practice would satisfy the Opposition in place of sections 191B and 191C. I look forward to details from the Minister on when this code of practice will be enunciated, when it will be operational and how it differs from what the Commission on Government refers to as the now political convention on this matter, "Lawrence No 1 of 1993".

The Minister referred to the increase in nomination fees to \$500 in the first instance; however, he has indicated that the Government has reviewed its opinion on that. He stated that anyone who did not support an increase of significant dimensions was supporting dummy candidates or a range of other abuses.

Hon N.F. Moore: I would never have said that, Mr Cowdell.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Derrick Tomlinson): Two conventions should be observed during debate on the short title. I suggest that the honourable member is close to transgressing the first, which is that debate cannot revisit matters dealt with in the second reading debate. In Committee, clauses are debated in seriatim. The member is addressing each clause, during debate on clause 1.

Hon J.A. COWDELL: We will not consider all matters mentioned by the Minister and some that appear on the Supplementary Notice Paper will not be proceeded with. I make the point with respect to part 3 of the Industrial

Relations Legislation Amendment and Repeal Act, that I understand we cannot proceed with an amendment in that regard, although it is pertinent to disclosure. The Minister indicated that there was no need to proceed in this regard. I make the point in passing that section 97T of that Act referred to a reporting procedure for donors, which is now covered by a reporting procedure of almost the same dimensions to the Electoral Commission. The Minister managed to convey the impression that I was advocating the dismantling of all the section's requirements. I was not. It was a section pertinent merely to reporting to one body, not to two bodies.

One other matter will not be dealt with in Committee in *seriatim*. That is a matter raised by the Minister during the second reading debate concerning the threshold for the refund of deposits. In Western Australia, that is 10 per cent for the Legislative Assembly and 5 per cent for the Legislative Council. The Labor Party would have been willing and with subsequent legislation may have to look to uniformity with the commonwealth legislation at of 4 per cent. Otherwise it appears more as a revenue raising device than anything else. Obviously a group which could receive more than 4 per cent are not frivolous candidates but legitimate candidates. If they can get more than 4 per cent, they deserve a refund on the deposit.

I will deal with the other matters when we reach the relevant clauses. I am proposing an amendment with respect to the amended deposit figure and certain types of donors. The Minister dealt in detail with six or seven of my questions, where I needed information. He satisfied me on those matters. I do not think that I will need to raise those when we reach the particular clauses relating to donor reporting at the state level; the lodging of annual reports from associated entities; immediate reporting of donations of \$10 000 or above; the separate reports by publishers and broadcasters; the scrutineers' access to the coding of council ballot papers to allow a quicker count; and the declaration that would be required, overriding the Equal Opportunity Act, similar to the declaration currently used by the Electoral Commission. I noted the Minister's comments on the Langer question. If I understand the Minister, we will not have the same problems as the Commonwealth has in this regard, because anyone advocating that course of action in Western Australia will not be advocating the casting of an informal vote.

I note the Minister's assurances regarding the adequacy of the guarantee against political intimidation, and with respect to the true source of all donations, the ceiling for anonymous donations being in line with the Commonwealth, as well as the definition of "gift", where the Western Australian legislation imposes a cap of \$200 on the excluded category of membership of a political party. That is superior to the commonwealth definition which is open-ended. Therefore, those matters need not be pursued when we reach particular clauses. There will be three or four areas where the Opposition will comment on the individual clauses. The Opposition supports this legislation, in the main, but feels that it could be improved in three or four areas. Otherwise its passage should be speedy.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: In response to the second reading debate, the Minister made a couple of comments along the lines that he thought that if I still was serious about my objections to the deficiencies of the Electoral Act that enable him and his party to engage regularly in political roll cleansing, an amendment should be made that would protect the electoral roll's integrity from the onslaught that is regularly part of the strategies of the Liberal Party and the Minister. That is an invitation I would like the opportunity to take up. However, I have received advice from the Table that standing orders would not allow for an amendment of this sort to be encompassed during Committee on this Bill. That is a pity because the electoral rolls of this State must be protected from the likes of the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Affairs and his political cohorts and the *svengalis* of the Liberal Party that operate inside the Minister's office.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: Have you been to Pemberton again lately? You've been on those magic mushrooms!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I do not know even where Pemberton is; it is not on my electoral roll. The problem with which we are faced is that -

Point of Order

Hon N.F. MOORE: The matters being raised by the member have nothing to do with the Bill and certainly nothing to do with the short title. I ask you to bring him to order, Mr Deputy Chairman. If he wants to move an amendment at another time to another Bill, he can introduce his own Bill. However, his comments have nothing to do with this Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Derrick Tomlinson): Order! The Minister has raised a valid point. I request the member to address the matter before the Chair.

Committee Resumed

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I will, and I will be brief in so doing. The reason the Opposition supports the legislation is that regrettably it is the best that is on offer at the moment. It would have more fulsome support if it had provided more protection for the electoral processes Western Australia needs. Those processes are under assault at this

moment by the submissions of the Liberal Party of Australia to the federal Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters -

Point of Order

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Liberal Party's submission to the federal parliamentary committee has nothing to do with clause 1 of this Bill. I ask the member to be relevant so we can proceed with the Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The member is reminded that he is to address the matter before the Chair.

Committee Resumed

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I will. The short title of this Bill would be supported more fulsomely if it embraced a Bill that protected the electoral roll from the assaults of the Liberal Party of Australia evidenced in its submissions to the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters. If the short title of this Bill were a title for a Bill that enabled this Parliament to tackle this question, the Opposition would be even more fulsome in its support of it. That is, a need exists to protect the electoral roll from assaults that include efforts to prohibit people exercising their legitimate right to be on the electoral roll. Efforts are being made to limit the categories of witnesses that could be included in the enrolment process. Regrettably, those protections from these efforts are not in the Bill.

Despite that weakness of the Bill the Opposition does not have an opportunity to amend it. In those circumstances the opportunity for protecting the voters of Western Australia presumably awaits another process. I will commend that process to my colleagues; I commend it to the Minister. I hope he will desist from his past practices and get on with protecting the rights of all Australians to cast their votes without being frustrated by him and his party colleagues.

Hon N.F. MOORE: In the light of the debate we are now having on clause 1, I indicate that I have responded to all the matters raised by both members during the second reading debate and I am happy to respond further as we deal with the clauses if any other issues must be raised. Hon John Cowdell raised the question of whether the vote a candidate requires in order to have the nominated fee refunded will be changed to 4 per cent. The advice I have received is that it would make virtually no difference to who got the money and who did not. If members want to move an amendment in future in line with Hon Tom Stephen's propositions, they are at liberty to do so. It is not my intention to seek to change that provision at this time.

Hon Tom Stephens is so outrageous that for once in my life I am lost for words, which is probably within standing orders if the truth be known. One of these days he will be exposed for what he is and people will know what his background is. He does these things to try to convince himself that what he does is okay because everyone else is a little worse. What he says today is absolutely wrong and outrageous, and he is a disgrace to this place.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am pleased Hon John Cowdell raised the issue of the 4 per cent of the vote. I purposely remained silent on that matter, although I raised it originally. It is a critical issue. During the second reading debate I said that I would move an amendment to this provision. However, I discovered subsequently that that was not possible in this Bill.

Hon N.F. Moore: To save you some time today, why don't you bring in a private member's Bill and be done with it? We can deal with it then.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I was pleased to hear Hon John Cowdell say on behalf of the Labor Party that it would support such a move. I would be happy to bring forward such a private member's Bill. Does the Government have an opposition to having that sort of uniformity?

Hon N.F. Moore: Let us deal with that at the time. This issue is not before the Chair.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Perhaps to save time, instead of Hon Jim Scott addressing the Minister and the Minister in turn giving the member advice on how to conduct himself in Parliament, Hon Jim Scott will attend to the Chair and address the matter before the Chair.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: The matter is important. Although I am not a legal person, I see a direct relationship between the percentage required to get the refund and the amount that was imposed as a fee in the first place. I was disappointed to find that I could not raise it as an amendment in this Bill.

I am disappointed in the Government's response thus far in that it did not even take note of the matter in the second reading debate. It is critical in the light of the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters, and indirectly of the Commission on Government, that it should be made easier for smaller interest groups to gain representation in this place. However, this legislation does exactly the opposite.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I draw the member's attention to the same matter as I drew to the attention of Hon John Cowdell. That is, the matters to be dealt with in particular clauses are dealt with at the time of the clause. I draw the

member's attention to clause 8 and suggest that the matters he is now entertaining are better addressed when the Committee discusses clause 8.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman. I am merely seeking from the Minister some indication of the Government's position. We have here the appearance of a move forward in electoral reform, but, in fact, many of these things are already in place in federal legislation. While it has been pointed out that legislation of this kind was needed for dummy candidates, the real victims of this will be the smaller parties and the Independents. I would like an indication from the Minister whether his Government has any objection to the figure being 4 per cent. I am after a very simple explanation. In the long term, that would save this Committee a lot of time. If I were to introduce a private member's Bill -

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I again point out to the honourable member that the question he is now discussing was discussed at some length in the second reading debate. He is now revisiting issues previously discussed, and I ask him to address the short title - clause 1.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I merely want the Minister to address the area that he did not deal with in the second reading debate.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 7 put and passed.

Clause 8: Section 81 repealed and a section substituted -

Hon N.F. MOORE: I move -

Page 6, line 16 - To delete "\$500" and substitute "\$250".

We discussed this issue at great length during the second reading debate.

In respect of the matter raised by Hon Jim Scott, if he wants to introduce a Bill in this place we will discuss it at that time. I do not intend to respond on behalf of the Government because it has not considered the matter. It is as simple as that. However, if he wants to introduce such legislation, I will be happy to discuss it then.

Hon J.A. COWDELL: The Opposition supports this amendment. Obviously, rather than just deterring "frivolous" candidates, we could well have the situation of significant parties, such as the Greens or the Democrats, wishing to contest all 91 state seats and having to find \$45 000 - possibly their entire campaign fund - and that being forfeited to the State. Some may well contemplate this with glee, but it is a matter of concern.

The Opposition supports the amendment, but will oppose amended clause 8. If that is wiped out we will keep the status quo, which is the \$100 deposit. However, as a first step, we support the Minister's amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 23 put and passed.

Clause 24: Section 2 repealed and a section substituted -

Hon J.A. COWDELL: I move -

Page 19, line 14 - To insert after the word "proclamation" the following words -

provided that where section 4 of this Act comes into operation and section 5 and 6 of this Act remain unproclaimed, section 5 and 6 shall be deemed to commence operation 42 days prior to the polling day of the first general election subsequent to such day as section 4 comes into operation.

I have previously foreshadowed this amendment. It is simply to ensure that proposed sections 191B and 191C - that is, those governing limitations on government advertising and government travel expenditure - are not rendered dead letters by their non-proclamation. In his second reading speech, the Minister stated -

The priority in this legislation is to ensure that those sections of the Electoral Amendment (Political Finance) Act dealing with disclosure are made workable. The other sections are under review, but do not necessarily belong with amendments to the Electoral Act.

The Minister has indicated that he will not proclaim these sections. He makes reference to a review. We do not know what that means, nor do we know the consequences. He also refers to a code, but we have no details of that code, nor do we know when it will come into force. In the absence of any assurance of standards in that regard - and

even if there were assurances in that regard - we would look to something more substantive. The amendment proposed by the Opposition would ensure that proposed sections 191B and 191C became operable when the disclosure section was proceeded with.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government does not support the amendment. I indicated during the second reading debate that the Government will put together a code of conduct, which will be made available publicly well in advance of the election. In view of the arguments that we have already had on this topic, it is obvious that what this Government is doing is exactly what the previous Government did; that is, it has come to the conclusion - as did the Commission on Government - that legislating this in this area is not the appropriate way to go. The Commission on Government decided that a code of conduct was the appropriate way to look after this issue. I give an assurance to the House that this will happen in good time prior to the next election; so, there is no argument about what the Government should or should not be doing about travel and advertising. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Amendment put and a division called for -

Bells rung and the Committee divided.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Derrick Tomlinson): Before the tellers tell, I cast my vote with the noes.

Division resulted as follows -

Ayes (8)		
Hon Kim Chance	Hon N.D. Griffiths	Hon Bob Thomas (<i>Teller</i>)
Hon J.A. Cowdell	Hon John Halden	
Hon Cheryl Davenport	Hon J.A. Scott	
Hon Graham Edwards		
Noes (12)		
Hon George Cash	Hon P.H. Lockyer	Hon B.M. Scott
Hon Max Evans	Hon I.D. MacLean	Hon W.N. Stretch
Hon Peter Foss	Hon N.F. Moore	Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon P.R. Lightfoot	Hon M.D. Nixon	Hon B.K. Donaldson (<i>Teller</i>)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 25: Section 4 amended -

Hon J.A. COWDELL: I move -

Page 31, after line 9 - To insert the following new section 175ZH -

19. After section 175ZG insert the following -

“ **Conflict of interest precludes certain gifts from being accepted**

175ZH. It is unlawful for -

- (a) a political party or a person acting for a political party;
- (b) a candidate in an election (including a person included in a group) or a person acting on behalf of a candidate in an election;
- (c) a person included in a group in an election; or
- (d) a person (not being a political party, a candidate or a group),

to receive a gift made to or for the benefit of -

- (e) that party, candidate or group; or
- (f) that person for the purpose of the incurring of expenditure for a political purpose,

from any person, or body of persons, whether incorporated or not, who -

- (g) is engaged from outside the public sector to provide a service or services on tender or contract to the public sector; or

- (h) has been engaged from outside the public sector to provide a service or services on tender or contract to the public sector at any time in the immediately preceding period of 4 years.

Penalty \$1 500 ”.

This amendment is quite straightforward. The issues have been canvassed during the second reading debate. They are that certain classes of donations should be prohibited, and in this case donations from persons referred to in paragraphs (g) and (h). This is to guard against a set of donations to the incumbent Government based on the farming out of lucrative government contracts.

Hon Peter Foss: It could perhaps be called the Terry Burke clause.

Hon Max Evans: Indeed.

Hon J.A. COWDELL: If the Attorney General wishes to prolong the debate, that is fine, I have the amendment standing in my name. The concept of limitation of donations from certain sources has been canvassed during the second reading debate.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am very much in favour of this amendment. We are going through a period in which we are moving to more contracting out and many more sales of enterprises and services of Government to the private sector. It is a period where such payola might be a very attractive proposition in some circumstances. Such an amendment would make a significant change to the public perception of why political donations are often made. I very much support the amendment.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government opposes this amendment. The member is saying that a company which is successful in getting a government contract should not make a political donation. It is discriminatory in the extreme. The whole aim of this legislation is to require anybody who makes a political donation to disclose it. It will be on the public record. People can see who gets government contracts and who makes donations to political parties. They can make their own judgment, and they will do so at the ballot box in no uncertain terms. In addition, the media or anybody else who wants to comment on this will have it before their very eyes. They can see on the one hand that company A may get a contract and on the other hand that it makes a donation to a political party. It is upfront and public, so people can make their own judgment.

To provide that it is illegal for someone to make a contribution to a political party simply because he gets a political contract is discriminatory in the extreme and I oppose the amendment most vigorously.

Hon J.A. COWDELL: I make the point that the Opposition seeks something stronger than disclosure.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 26 and 27 put and passed.

New clause 7 -

Hon N.F. MOORE: I move -

Page 4, after line 27 - To insert the following new clause 7 -

Section 22 amended

7. Section 22 of the principal Act is amended -

- (a) by inserting after the section designation “**22.**” the subsection designation “(1)”;
- (b) by inserting before “such” the following -

“ , subject to subsection (2), ”; and
- (c) and by inserting the following subsection -

“ (2) The regulations may provide that particulars prescribed for the purposes of subsection (1) may be omitted when rolls are printed under section 24 or supplied under section 112. ”.

This seeks to amend section 22 of the principal Act to allow the printing of electoral rolls for use on election day which do not contain the occupation of the voter. That will allow the electoral rolls to be printed in a bigger font so they are more easily readable by Electoral Commission staff and to avoid some of the errors that occur because of the tiny print. That is a request from the Electoral Commission and is one the Government supports.

Hon J.A. COWDELL: The Opposition has no objection to the new clause.

New clause put and passed.

New clauses 28, 29 and 30 -

Hon N.F. MOORE: I move -

Page 32, after clause 27 - To insert the following heading and new clauses 28, 29 and 30 as follows -

PART 5 - REFERENDUMS ACT 1983

Principal Act

28. In this Part the *Referendums Act 1983** is referred to as the principal Act.

[* *Act No. 83 of 1983.*
For subsequent amendments see 1995 Index to Legislation of Western Australia, Table
1, p. 188.]

Section 2 amended

29. Section 2 (1) of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the definition of “officer” the following definition -

“ “official paper” means paper referred to in section 113 (4) of the *Electoral Act 1907*; ”.

Section 24 amended

30. Section 24 (1) (a) of the principal Act is amended by deleting “there is a water mark as prescribed by the regulations under the *Electoral Act 1907* in the paper of the ballot” and substituting the following -

“ it is printed on official ”.

Clauses 28, 29 and 30 relate to the same question; that is, they will allow under the Referendums Act paper other than watermarked paper to be used in the same way that we are seeking to amend the Electoral Act to allow the use of other than watermarked paper for ballot papers in an election. It is a tidying up measure.

Hon J.A. COWDELL: The Opposition supports these new clauses.

New clauses put and passed.

Title -

Hon N.F. MOORE: I move -

Page 1 - To insert at the end of the long title the following -

- *Referendums Act 1983.* .

Because of the decision to amend the Referendums Act, it is necessary to include that within the long title.

Amendment put and passed.

Title, as amended, put and passed.

Bill reported, with amendments, and an amendment to the title.

CURTIN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon N.F. Moore (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [5.46 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Curtin University of Technology Amendment Bill 1996 has two main purposes. The first is to establish a university campus at Kalgoorlie by the amalgamation of the Western Australian School of Mines and the Kalgoorlie College. The second is to update the present Curtin University of Technology Act with respect to a number of

matters including monetary penalties, the vesting of land under the Land Act, the power to sell land held in fee simple, and the composition of the board of a branch and of the university council.

Turning first to the university campus, a review of higher education in regional centres in Western Australia - Perth, 1991 - suggested that benefits might flow from greater cooperation between Kalgoorlie College and the Western Australian School of Mines. While there were instances of sharing of facilities and teaching, and some common membership on the college council and the Western Australian School of Mines board of management, these informal arrangements were fragile and vulnerable to changes in personnel. The detailed proposal to amalgamate the Western Australian School of Mines and Kalgoorlie College to form a university college in Kalgoorlie emanated from a study completed in October 1993, funded under the evaluations and investigations program by the Commonwealth and undertaken by the then Western Australian Office of Higher Education. The study was guided by a steering committee equally representative of the Kalgoorlie College and the Western Australian School of Mines and involved extensive consultation throughout the region, as well as first-hand investigation of relevant developments elsewhere in Australia, particularly those in New South Wales and Victoria. Subsequently the college was upgraded to a full campus status.

Both the Kalgoorlie College and the Western Australian School of Mines are successful operations, albeit with distinctive missions. The Western Australian School of Mines, a branch of Curtin University of Technology, is a specialised institution offering undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications mainly in mining, metallurgy and geology. The Kalgoorlie College, on the other hand, is an independent college established under the Colleges Act and offers a broadly based range of technical and further education courses, access programs and customised training as well as some, mainly first year, undergraduate courses on a contract basis on behalf of metropolitan universities.

There are very good reasons for amalgamation. Education provision in the region is characterised by low school retention rates, a low transfer rate to higher education and a very low participation in higher education. This is cause for concern. Continuation of the status quo is not likely to redress the situation. The best case for further investment in specialised infrastructure in a time of scarce financial resources lies in the amalgamation of the Kalgoorlie College and the Western Australian School of Mines. One institution with clear responsibility for covering the full range of post-secondary education and training will serve the needs of the community better.

Credit transfer opportunities will be enhanced and easy transition facilitated in the one institution by the removal of artificial barriers to the ready movement of students and the recognition of prior learning which arise in separately managed institutions. As a combined institution there will be opportunities to achieve economies of scale and for the sharing of resources which will enable the resulting savings to be applied to meeting the increasing and diverse education and training needs of the whole region. Improved access and greater participation will result. Formalised links with Curtin University of Technology will add to the stature and credibility of that provision both nationally and internationally. This will be important in attracting students from overseas and elsewhere in Australia. The additional infrastructure which will be provided will ensure that high quality professional education for the minerals industry continues to be delivered and that a strong industry focus is maintained.

A fundamental principle in the management of the university campus at Kalgoorlie will be the significant devolution of responsibility for local governance within the larger structure of Curtin University of Technology. To ensure that this is the case, the Kalgoorlie campus will have its own council with clearly defined powers and functions. At the same time, management and academic support from Curtin University is crucial to enable the new institution to be established and operate in an efficient and effective manner with appropriate quality control in academic developments. As a university of technology, Curtin has a comprehensive educational profile in applied science and technology, health sciences, business and administration, social sciences and humanities. Curtin will be able to bring to bear the very considerable resources of its Perth-based campuses and the Muresk Institute of Agriculture to support developments at the Kalgoorlie campus which otherwise would not occur.

Obtaining full advantage from the amalgamation will require additional funding.

On the higher education side, the Commonwealth will provide \$6m this year for capital development, together with additional operating funds of \$0.45m. The Commonwealth is committed to providing a further \$3m in capital funding in 1998 with prospects of \$3m more in 1999, as well as increased operating grants in 1997 and 1998. A program of land acquisition in Kalgoorlie adjacent to the existing campuses and capital works to upgrade and expand facilities is envisaged. Capital development will be staged. The Kalgoorlie campus will also have access to vocational education and training funds on the basis of an approved training profile and will be resourced through a statewide vocational education and training funding formula. In addition to public funding, corporate support from the private sector and from other agencies for the provision of customised training programs, research and development activity, commercial activities and capital investment in plant and buildings is expected to increase.

There is widespread acceptance of the advantages to the region as a whole that will accrue from the creation of the Kalgoorlie campus of Curtin University of Technology. The Esperance Tertiary Education Centre will be expanded, possibly in the form of the Esperance Community College. Enhanced delivery in the region will involve the

development of improved communication links to various towns, settlements and homesteads to enable interactive delivery of courses employing modern technology. The Kalgoorlie campus will play a significant part in the economic and social development of this important part of Western Australia. The establishment of the Kalgoorlie campus has the wholehearted support of the people of Kalgoorlie-Boulder, the interim council of the new institution, Kalgoorlie College, the Western Australian School of Mines and Curtin University of Technology.

The Bill also includes a number of changes of a more domestic kind that are intended to tidy up and update present arrangements which apply to Curtin University of Technology as a whole. For example, over the years the levels of fines and amounts payable for loss or damage to university property under the Act have not kept pace with present values. Dollar values for breach of by-laws, disciplinary offences and restitution for loss, damage or destruction of university property have been upgraded so as to constitute a more realistic deterrent. At the same time, the opportunity has also been taken to ensure that the university lands are vested under the Land Act. This will remove any uncertainties that have arisen regarding, first, the original vesting of the Bentley campus reserve and subsequent amendments to that reserve and, secondly, additional lands vested in the university and variations and amendments to those reserves. Contemporaneously, all leases entered into by the university council since the original vesting order will be validated. The university will also be empowered to sell or dispose of property which it holds in fee simple subject only to the terms of any deed, will or instrument under which the property was acquired. This will place Curtin on a similar footing to the other three public universities in Western Australia - the University of Western Australia, Murdoch University and Edith Cowan University - as far as the sale or disposal of property is concerned.

Changes are also proposed in the composition of the board of a branch of the university and the university council. The Curtin Act provides for the establishment of branches of the university. At present the Western Australian School of Mines and Muresk Institute of Agriculture are both branches of Curtin University although, with the passage of this legislation, the status of the Western Australian School of Mines will change. Further branches may be established in the future. A branch has an advisory body called a board, the composition of which is prescribed in the Act and includes seven persons appointed by the Minister "representative of education, the professions, industrial, commercial and other community interests". This does not make sufficient provision for appropriate regional representation from local industry without diminishing representation from education and the community. Accordingly, it is proposed to amend the Act to allow for cooption to the board of a branch of up to three local industry members by the board. Furthermore, it is proposed to provide for the chairperson of the academic council - the senior academic policy advisory body in the university - to occupy a seat on the university council in an ex officio capacity. At present the chairperson is accorded observer status at council meetings. These various changes are being introduced with the full support of Curtin University of Technology. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Bob Thomas.

WESTPAC BANKING CORPORATION (CHALLENGE BANK) BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon Max Evans (Minister for Finance), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON MAX EVANS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Finance) [5.54 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has been introduced at the request of the Westpac Banking Corporation. Westpac acquired Challenge Bank as a wholly owned subsidiary on 21 December 1995. This was approved by the Reserve Bank on the condition that the Challenge Bank would surrender its banking licence in due course. Upon Challenge Bank's surrendering its banking licence, it will be necessary for the individual assets and liabilities of Challenge to be transferred to Westpac. The objective of the Bill before this House is to facilitate the transfer of the banking business of Challenge to Westpac. Without legislation of this kind the transfer of the banking business would be time consuming and expensive, with separate documentation being required for the transfer of each individual asset. This would involve the preparation of new security documents for the borrowings of more than 83 000 loan accounts held by Challenge and transfer authorities to move some 330 000 existing deposit accounts to Westpac.

Recent precedents for legislation of this nature are the State Bank of South Australia (Transfer of Undertaking) Act 1994 and the Australian and New Zealand Banking Group Limited (Town & Country) Act 1995. A condition in each case, and in a number of earlier similar cases, was that the banks pay amounts in lieu of the state government taxes and charges which would have been applied if normal commercial transfers of assets and liabilities had been required. This legislation is consistent with the Government's objective of facilitating business efficiency within Western Australia while not prejudicing the integrity of the State's revenue base. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Tom Stephens.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [5.55 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Adjournment Debate - Road Safety, Mobile Road Show

HON B.M. SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [5.56 pm]: I bring to the attention of members an initiative launched by the Government yesterday which is a contribution to reducing the road toll in Western Australia. I commend the Government on its commitment to the mobile road show, which will travel around the State and be used in communities as a tool to educate young people, in particular, about the dangers and impact of accidents on pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Last year I had the privilege of chairing a task force for the Minister for Transport inquiring into traffic calming. As I have reported to this House before, many of the recommendations of the task force point to the fact that engineering and traffic calming devices try to achieve the ultimate aim of reducing the road toll. One of the major recommendations of that report pointed to the need for road user and passenger education starting at preprimary level. Some people may quickly look at this Parliament and its committees and task forces and query whether they always have a role to play. However, I am pleased today to affirm the Government's action and suggest that the task force recommendations had some impact on the initiative announced and launched yesterday. Of course, much credit also goes to the Police Service. Road user education, which was one of the major recommendations in the report, has been recognised as the most appropriate way to reduce the road toll.

The road show, which will move around the State, starting in the remote north west and the Kimberley region, is an interactive media which the task force suggested was most appropriate for young people. It also suggested that virtual reality technology be used and some of the games in the mobile van use that technology. The mobile van cost \$1m and I acknowledge the commitment of the Minister for Finance towards reducing the death toll from road accidents. I also recognise that funds were received from the Lotteries Commission, Healthway and the State Government Insurance Commission. I also acknowledge the contribution of all five Ministers who will form the road safety council. It will be the first time in this State that five Ministers have been committed to road safety. Yesterday's launch of the million dollar mobile road show was a significant contribution towards reducing the horrific road toll in Western Australia. I congratulate the Government for that initiative.

The other matter which I want to raise is also in relation to a recommendation made by the traffic calming task force. On a recent trip to London I was interested to read in one of the papers there that the London Ambulance Authority was forced to take off the road at least 60 of its ambulances as a result of severe undercarriage damage caused by speed humps. We recommended to the State Government that speed humps in Western Australia be taken out of all suburban streets by the year 2005. It has been acknowledged as a good suggestion by many suburban dwellers. In the main, speed humps cause an unfair transfer of traffic; that is, they may calm one street but the traffic moves to another. In our recommendation we warned the Government that litigation may arise for local government authorities as a result of their placing speed humps willy nilly across the State. Some cases were brought to our attention. It will be interesting to know whether individuals who have vehicle damage will move towards this litigation process against local governments. What a huge cost that would amount to. The fact that the London Ambulance Authority must remove 60 ambulances for repair highlights our point that, although speed humps may slow down ordinary traffic, they are a great inhibitor to the speed of emergency vehicles such as fire engines and ambulances. The damage occurs to ambulances when they are required to travel very fast over speed humps to reach their destination. If they are carrying a critically injured person with a spinal injury or someone suffering from a heart attack they cannot travel over the humps at speed without risking the comfort and safety of the passenger. That was highlighted in our report. It is a warning to those in local government here in Western Australia that if they continue to put in speed humps, repairs to our emergency vehicles may cost the State Government huge amounts of money.

Adjournment Debate - National Parks, Answers to Questions

HON J.A. SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [6.03 pm]: I am concerned at my inability to get clear answers about what is happening in our national parks in this State. Over a period, through the Minister representing the Minister for Resources Development, I have asked, for example, what is happening with mining plans for Mt Lesueur National Park. Although I received an answer from the Minister it was very light in detail and basically said that negotiations over leases were being held with CRA Exploration Pty Ltd. I received no other valuable information.

I recently asked a more complicated question without notice of the Minister representing the Minister for Mines about which national parks are the subject of mining exploration leases and of mining plans for the future. I accept that the question was reasonably complex, but not supremely complex. The response was that more time was required to compile the answer because the question was too complicated. Another question concerned leases held by CRA at Mt Lesueur which I understood were close to expiry or had already expired. It was a simple question,

but as the first question had not been answered I waited until the next day to see whether an answer had been provided. As no answer was provided to that simple question by the next day, it will go on notice. I understand that Ministers are able to say what they like in answer to questions. I sometimes question that because, quite frankly, they should be compelled to give honest answers as early as possible and this House should ask them to do that. This business of their being able to provide meaningless answers does not get us anywhere.

The future of our national parks is a very important question to people in this State. Erosions are already occurring in very important parks. A Bill was recently passed in this place to excise a very important area near Lake Jasper in the D'Entrecasteaux National Park. The Government did not seem to have any problem passing that Bill through this House. I want the Government to come clean on the overall plans for all our national parks. How many have mining and exploration leases over them and which projects are likely to go ahead? National parks are the property of the people of this nation and we have a right to know what the Government intends to allow to happen in them.

If the Government has a legitimate reason for wanting mining to proceed in some of those parks it is up to the Government to say so, rather than to provide information in little bits at a time. I want the whole picture so that people can understand to what degree mining leases are prevalent. I have a feeling that the Government is deliberately hiding this. I want the Ministers responsible to answer those questions promptly so that I can inform people. While people are not being informed they will, like me, be thinking that significant proposals are in place to mine in areas of Mt Lesueur and other national parks; and I will be encouraging them to think that way. They are very important questions to me and to the people in this State.

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan - Attorney General) [6.07 pm]: Notwithstanding the questions to which Hon Jim Scott has just referred, because I do not know anything about them, he has a tendency to frame his questions somewhat peculiarly. A number of his questions contain "Are you still beating your wife?" elements. They are often ambiguous and difficult to understand. I was very concerned to hear him say that he will help people to believe that things are happening in national parks.

I draw attention to what he has done to deceive the public recently. He asked me a number of questions about national parks, in particular the size of national parks, and whether any new areas had been added. I drew his attention to the fact that, based on international categories, we have category 1 and 2 reserves. Recently he said that category 2 conservation reserves were better than national parks. He criticised the suggestion of changing Two Peoples Bay from category 2 to category 1. He said that would give that area less support and less protection than it would get under category 2. I said that when looking at the total number of conservation reserves he should look carefully at category 1 and category 2. On that basis Western Australia had a greater number than the Australian average.

I said that we had added 104 000 hectares to the conservation reserve. I pointed out also that two parks had been remeasured - not that they had been cut in size - and were found to be smaller than we thought. We made that fact known. Notwithstanding that he knew that we had added 104 000 hectares to the conservation estate under those two categories, and that he knew any reduction was due to remeasuring, as opposed to a reduction in size, Hon Jim Scott made a public statement that we had reduced the national parks by 20 000 hectares. Frankly, not only is there a duty for Ministers to answer questions truthfully - as I have done - but also there is a duty for members in this House to use that information equally honestly.

A staff member at the *Albany Advertiser* rang me about the member's claim. Not only did he make that statement to the newspaper but also he appears to be persisting in spreading in public a false picture of the answers that were honestly and truthfully given in this Parliament. Ministers in this Parliament must be very careful when answering Hon Jim Scott because he has a tendency to misuse those answers. It is easy to do that - if we receive the sort of ambiguous questions he asks. I have taken to the habit in my answers to Hon Jim Scott to say that the question is ambiguous; that I find it difficult to answer, and that I assume this is what the member means. Were one to answer his questions as put, it would be like answering the question, "Are you still beating your wife?"

This cuts both ways. I am sure that Hon Colin Barnett is giving honest and straight answers - I know that my answers are so. I am disappointed that Hon Jim Scott is not prepared to treat that honestly given information properly in public. It is about time that he apologised to this House for his misuse of answers received at question time.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.12 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WESTRAIL - LOCOMOTIVES Q AND S CLASS, DELIVERY DATE

589. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When does Westrail expect to take delivery of its Q and S class Clyde built locomotives?
- (2) When did construction commence?
- (3) Is there expected to be an increase in the number of units to be built?
- (4) How many of these units will be utilised on -
 - (a) Hunter Valley; and
 - (b) Queensland,coal haulage tasks?
- (5) Which locomotives will be used for the tasks the Eastern States bound Q and S class locomotive were originally being built for?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) Delivery will occur between June 1997 and January 1998.
- (2) August 1996.
- (3) No.
- (4) None.
- (5) Not applicable.

WESTRAIL - NARROW GAUGE DIESEL RAIL CARS, ROUTES; CLASSIFICATION

590. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many narrow gauge diesel rail cars are owned by Westrail?
- (2) On which Westrail routes do they operate?
- (3) What are their classifications and how many in each classification?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1)-(3) The Australind train which operates between Perth and Bunbury is the only diesel powered narrow gauge passenger train owned by Westrail. There are five railcars in the fleet.

Three of the railcars (ADP class) have single driving cabs (at one end of the railcar only), and two of the railcars (ADQ class) do not have driving cabs.

WESTRAIL - LOCOMOTIVE DRIVERS, TRANSFERRED FROM ALBANY TO WAGIN

591. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When will the locomotive drivers be transferred from Albany to Wagin?
- (2) Will Wagin drivers be booking off in Albany at the end of the shift?
- (3) If yes, where will they be accommodated?
- (4) What provision will be made for hot meals -
 - (a) on arrival; and
 - (b) before shift commences,given that the majority of rail traffic in and out of Albany is at night?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) It is expected that five locomotive drivers will transfer from Albany to Wagin near the end of November 1996.

(2) No.

(3)-(4) Not applicable.

WESTRAIL - ACCIDENT AT MOSGIEL ROAD LEVEL CROSSING NEAR KENDENUP

594. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

With respect to the level crossing accident in the Tenterden district on, or about, Thursday, 25 July 1996 -

- (1) How many accidents have occurred at this crossing this year?
- (2) What was the cause of each of those accidents?
- (3) What is the road configuration at this crossing?
- (4) What action will be taken to improve safety at this crossing?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) One. The accident occurred at the Mosgiel Road level crossing near Kendenup on 25 July 1996.
- (2) A motor vehicle stopped at the crossing with the front of the vehicle protruding onto the railway line and was struck by an approaching freight train.
- (3) Gravel road with winding approaches. Current signing includes advance warning railway crossing signs and railway crossing signs at the crossing.
- (4) STOP signs are to be erected at this location. Main Roads will be requesting Westrail and the council to trim and control vegetation.

WESTRAIL - ACCIDENT AT MOSGIEL ROAD LEVEL CROSSING NEAR KENDENUP

595. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

With respect to the level crossing accident in the Tenterden district on, or about, Thursday, 25 July 1996 -

- (1) What was the number of the locomotive involved in this accident?
- (2) What damage did it sustain?
- (3) How long was the locomotive out of action?
- (4) From which depot was a tradesperson dispatched to repair the damage?
- (5) What was the cost of travel, wages and expenses to repair this locomotive?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) P 2012.
- (2) Bent cowcatcher and demolished step.
- (3) The damage to the locomotive was minor and the unit remained in service. Repairs were effected during a time when the locomotive was not required.
- (4) Avon.
- (5) Costs incurred were as follows:-

Travel	\$ 447.00
Wages	\$ 917.00
Accommodation Expenses	\$ 129.00
Material	\$ 185.00
	<u>\$1 678.00</u>

“PROVIDING THE BEST ROADS FOR THE FUTURE” - DISTRIBUTION

602. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Minister for Transport:

With respect to the "Providing the Best Roads for the Future" pamphlet, I ask -

- (1) What is the reason for the staggered distribution of the pamphlet?
- (2) When is it anticipated that every household will have received its pamphlet?

- (3) What areas have already received the pamphlet?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) All pamphlets were distributed between 28 June and early July.
(2)-(3) Households should have received a pamphlet by now.

WESTRAIL - LOCOMOTIVE DA CLASS, RUNNING OUT OF FUEL, CRANBROOK

610. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did a DA class locomotive run out of fuel near Cranbrook on the Great Southern Line recently?
(2) Who authorised the train to proceed to Albany without refuelling?
(3) Did the driver request it be refuelled at Wagin after it had made three return trips to the Dumbleyung area?
(4) Were any scheduled services disrupted as a result of the locomotive running out of fuel?
(5) What was the total cost of the disruptions?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) The locomotive ran out of fuel because insufficient fuel was inadvertently placed into its tanks at Albany. Under normal circumstances, properly fuelled, the train would have completed its return journey to Albany before requiring refuelling. The locomotive driver is responsible for ensuring his locomotive has sufficient fuel for the journey.
(3) The train did not make three return trips to the Dumbleyung area.
(4) Yes.
(5) \$100.

AGRICULTURE WESTERN AUSTRALIA - WORKPLACE AGREEMENTS

614. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Primary Industry:

- (1) Has State Cabinet approved an enterprise bargain or an enterprise bargain agreement for Agriculture WA staff and workers?
(2) Was this agreement supported by the Industrial Relations sub-committee of Cabinet?
(3) Why then is Agriculture WA requiring staff and workers to sign workplace agreements?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

The Minister for Primary Industry has provided the following response:

- (1)-(2) Yes.
(3) Workplace Agreements are available to employees as an option. Employees are not required to sign workplace agreements.

TAXI-BUSES - COST TO TRANSPERTH; PICKING UP STRANDED PASSENGERS

620. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Have privately operated taxi-buses been picking up passengers who have been left stranded after Transperth buses have failed to turn up at the designated time?
(2) When and where has this occurred?
(3) Why did this situation develop?
(4) How much did the taxi-buses cost to Transperth or the Government?
(5) What action has been taken to ensure that this situation does not occur again?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1)-(5) I refer the member to my response to question without notice 6, which was asked on 20 August 1996.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION - COMMONWEALTH BUDGET CUTS

648. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

In light of the Federal Government's planned termination of ATSIC's community training program, which provided support to Aboriginal organisations to increase the skills of their managers, financial administrators and administrative staff, does the State Government now intend to support these organisations through its employment and training departments?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has provided the following reply:

The Western Australian Government has yet to receive a detailed briefing from ATSIC on the nature and extent of cuts to be made to its programs as a result of the recent commonwealth Budget. Once the ATSIC Board has determined where cuts will be made in its existing program structure, detailed consideration will be given to the effect of those cuts on the Aboriginal community in Western Australia and an assessment made of any response or additional support which the Western Australian Government may be required to make.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION - COMMONWEALTH BUDGET CUTS

649. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

Part of the impact of the Federal Government's planned termination of ATSIC's Community and Youth Support Program will be to undermine the community based support networks currently in place and to remove one of the prime sources of indigenous employment, particularly in rural and remote area. Will the State Government now pick up its proper responsibilities in this area?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has provided the following reply:

The Western Australian Government has yet to receive a detailed briefing from ATSIC on the nature and extent of cuts to be made to its programs as a result of the recent commonwealth Budget. Once the ATSIC Board has determined where cuts will be made in its existing program structure, detailed consideration will be given to the effect of those cuts on the Aboriginal community in Western Australia and an assessment made of any response or additional support which the Western Australian Government may be required to make.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HAMES, KIM - RAFFLE APPROVED BY GAMING COMMISSION

683. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Some notice of this question has been given.

In response to question without notice 664 yesterday the Minister agreed to table the application and the approval granted by the Gaming Commission for Kim Hames, the member for Dianella, to run a raffle.

- (1) Will the Minister now table those documents and all documents relevant to this matter?
- (2) Will the Gaming Commission enforce the repayment of all moneys collected by the member?
- (3) What mechanism is the Gaming Commission putting in place in the event of litigation by the member or has it been determined that the member has no basis for litigation?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

- (1) I will table the documents. [See paper No. 544]
- (2) An audit of the refund to ticket holders will be conducted by Office of Racing, Gaming and Liquor gaming inspectors on behalf of the Gaming Commission, which is authorised under section 21 of the Gaming Commission Act of Western Australia.
- (3) In the event that a claim for litigation is made by Dr Hames, that matter will be referred to the Crown Solicitor.

This is not the only raffle application for which this situation has occurred. A Labor Party branch made an application, which has been returned to the branch for more wording. Applicants are following the format of 1992-94. Applications are sent in by committees and this is followed by a facsimile or telephone call to have the committee agree to change the wording in line with Crown Law advice. As happened with Dr Hames, tickets are being approved in the old format. To avoid this, we are suggesting to members of Parliament that they see two

people rather than just the duty inspector. About 5 000 raffle applications a year are processed - more than 100 a week. The same mistake could occur if members followed the format of the last raffle they applied for. Therefore we will suggest they send in a draft of the ticket. That should ensure this problem does not arise again. There was nothing illegal about the approval granted to Dr Hames; quite rightly his application was approved by the Gaming Commission. However, the ticket did not comply with the changes. I do not want any others to be processed in that way.

FORENSIC BEHAVIOURAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES - COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL POLICE INFORMATION

684. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has the Commissioner for Police provided confidential police information to the private body Forensic Behavioural Investigative Services?
- (2) Does the commissioner have the legal authority to make such disclosures at his discretion?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I apologise for being a little late; I was representing the State at the Hyogo visiting university.

I thank the member for some notice of this question. I ask the member to put the question on notice and I will endeavour to provide a response.

FORENSIC BEHAVIOURAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES - POLICE SERVICE REVIEW

685. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Attorney General Representing the Minister for Police:

Some notice of this question has been given.

- (1) Did FBIS do a review and make recommendations for changes to the Western Australia Police Service policy and procedures in the way statements of witnesses are taken, annotated and signed off?
- (2) Why was this task given to FBIS and not the WA Police Force?
- (3) What moneys were paid to FBIS for this review?

[M|S|N:FOSS|D:M]Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I have exactly the same answer to this question and another regarding FBIS: I have not had an opportunity to investigate them.

VOLUNTEER MARINE RESCUE GROUPS - WATER POLICE, FUNDING

686. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Emergency Services:

- (1) What level of funding is provided to -
 - (a) the Voluntary Marine Rescue Organisation;
 - (b) the West Coast Volunteer Marine Search and Rescue Association; and
 - (c) the Water Police?
- (2) How many local area groups are in the -
 - (a) Voluntary Marine Rescue Organisation; and
 - (b) West Coast Volunteer Marine Search and Rescue Association?
- (3) What is the difference between operations of these voluntary groups?
- (4) Why was the new rescue organisation, the West Coast Volunteer Marine Search and Rescue Association, formed?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) (a) \$35 000 is made available annually by the Minister to assist volunteer sea rescue groups in this State. This money is managed initially by a ministerial advisory committee for volunteer sea search and rescue funding. It is proposed that the following allocations will be made -

\$7 000 was made available to VMRWA for administration and has been received.
\$3 000 was made available to WCVMSRA for administration and has been received.

\$40 000 is required for insurance premiums to cover volunteers.
 \$5 000 is quarantined to assist groups in extended search operations.
 \$5 000 is given to each and every volunteer group as a base grant.
 \$85 000 is then distributed to each group on an activity level using an agreed points system.

Moneys made available by government are distributed fairly to each and every volunteer group in Western Australia regardless of which association they are affiliated with.

- (b) See (a)
- (c) the 1995-96 budget was \$195 000 for all Water Police operations, excluding salaries. There is no specific funding for sea search and rescue as it is part of their charter. The 1996-97 allocations have not been devolved to unit level at this time.
- (2) (a) VMRWA 26 groups;
- (b) seven groups.
- (3) There is no operational difference.
- (4) Because of internal differences with the VMRWA administration which could not be resolved. It must also be noted that this split in administration has not affected the funding of individual groups in any way.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT - NORTHERN DEMERSAL SCALE FISHERY, ENTRY CRITERIA CHANGES

687. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the recommended entry criteria to the northern demersal scale fishery agreed upon at the meeting of the working group on 1 and 2 March 1996 was changed by the departmental officer at the next meeting on 19 and 20 August to allow specific fishermen into the fishery?
- (2) Did this attempt to alter the criteria and override the previously unanimously agreed recommendation with regard to the entry criteria?
- (3) If this was done, why did it happen?
- (4) Did the Minister instruct, direct or ask officers of the Fisheries Department that recommendations of the northern demersal scale fishery of 1 and 2 March 1996, which put forward recommended criteria for the management of the fishery, be altered to favour a particular fisherman?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The Minister for Fisheries has provided the following response

- (1)-(3) The Minister has yet to receive the report and recommendations of the northern demersal scale fishery working group, the process and deliberations of which are a matter for the group's independent chairman and members.
- (4) No.

TAFE - COLLEGE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

688. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) To date, how much has been committed to the development of the college management information system?
- (2) Are there any outstanding difficulties with this system; if so, what are they?
- (3) Are all directors of TAFE colleges happy with the system?
- (4) Was there a maintenance and support tender let for the system?
- (5) If so, when were tenders called?
- (6) Has the tender been awarded?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) When is it envisaged that the tender will be awarded, if not already awarded?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question, which is now 10 days. Had the Leader of the Opposition put the question on notice he would have received an answer just as quickly.

- (1) The original 1991 cost estimate for the college management information system project was \$8.1m. Expenditure on CMIS development implementation and day-to-day support was approximately \$7.7m to 30 June 1996 and is in line with the initial estimate.
- (2) None, other than operational issues characteristic of a major systems development project, and implementation for all TAFE colleges scheduled for completion by early 1997. System development and enhancement is expected to be ongoing to meet changes in business requirements.
- (3) CMIS is a college management system and is effectively managed by college interests. The CMIS peak management group is responsible for all decisions necessary for the development and implementation of CMIS and is chaired by a college managing director.
- (4)-(5) A request for proposal for application support for the college management information system was advertised on 2 March 1996 with a closing date of 28 March 1996.
- (6) No.
- (7)-(8) As a consequence of a detailed assessment of submissions, the scope for the request for proposal was reviewed. A recommendation to State Contracts has been drafted for consideration at its meeting of 5 September 1996.

HAY PROPERTY GROUP LTD - ROTTNEST LODGE PROPOSAL; LEGAL POSITION

689. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Attorney General

- (1) I refer to the proposal by Hay Property Group Ltd with regard to Rottnest Lodge. Has the Attorney given consideration to the legal position of relevant state government agencies in the event that matters of dispute between such agencies and Hay Property Group Ltd are not resolved?
- (2) Has the Attorney involved himself in this matter with a view to avoiding litigation between government agencies and Hay Property Group Ltd?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

- (1)-(2) I cannot give any details, other than to confirm that I know nothing about it and have not been involved.

ROCK LOBSTER FISHERIES - TAGS REMOVAL REPORTS

690. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Has the Fisheries Department received reports that rock lobsters were submitted to processing plants during the 1995-96 season bearing signs that they had been tagged and that the tags had been removed?
- (2) Is it an offence to remove a tag from a rock lobster?
- (3) If such reports have been received, what action has been taken to investigate whether de-tagged lobsters have been sold and processed?
- (4) Has any investigation been able to confirm that the reports were accurate and, if so, who was responsible?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The Minister for Fisheries has provided the following response -

- (1) The executive director has advised that, at this date, Fisheries Department research staff responsible for the rock lobster tagging program have no evidence of tagged lobsters being submitted to processing plants showing signs of having had their tags removed.
- (2) It is not an offence under the Fish Resources Management Act to remove research tags from lobsters. The recovery of tagged lobsters by fishermen is a voluntary program which seeks fishermen's cooperation to either -
 - (a) measure the lobster and record the details, and return the lobster to the sea;
 - (b) remove the tag, return tag and details, and consign the lobster for sale; or
 - (c) hand the tagged lobster to the department and receive compensation.
- (3)-(4) Not applicable.

KELLY, JOHN - ACCIDENT, REPORT TABLING

691. Hon TOM HELM to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Mines:

I ask this question on behalf of Hon Alannah MacTiernan. On 5 July 1996, the office of the Minister for Mines advised that a fully independent review would be undertaken of Mr John Kelly's accident on 5 April 1995 while employed by Thiess Contractors Pty Ltd, and of its aftermath. In this context -

- (1) Has that report now been completed?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If yes, will the Minister now table the document?
- (4) If the Minister will not table the report, will he explain why?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The Minister for Mines has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes. I seek leave to table the report.

Leave granted. [See paper No 545.]

- (4) Not applicable.

GYPSUM - EXTRACTION FROM LAKE CHINOCUP, DECISION

692. Hon B.K. DONALDSON to the Minister for the Environment:

Can the Minister now advise when a decision will be made about the proposed extraction of gypsum from Lake Chinocup which is necessary for soil pliability, enhancing soil fertility and minimising water shedding, and also for assisting the protection of the remaining vegetation in the area?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I was informed by the appeals convenor that he would get his advice to me within two weeks. That is now probably one week, because one week has since expired. I will make a decision on the basis of that advice shortly thereafter.

BORAL LTD - RESERVE 1820, SANDMINING APPLICATION

693. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Boral Ltd has applied to mine reserve 1820 on the corner of Warton and Forrest Roads in Banjup?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that this reserve is part of the Jandakot Botanical Park?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that this reserve is also covered by a proposed water catchment reservation in the major amendment 981/33, which he released recently?
- (4) Is the Minister aware of ground water pollution at Johnson and Acourt Roads in Jandakot caused by backfilling of Boral sandmining pits with sludge from the Westfield sewage treatment plant?
- (5) Will the Minister for Planning approach the Minister for Mines and request him to use his powers to prevent sandmining of reserve 1820 in the public interest; if no, why not?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

- (1)-(3) Yes.
- (4) No. A quantity of sludge was deposited in a sandmining pit in Johnson Road, Jandakot last year. The company was directed to remove the material, and subsequent testing found no contamination of or threat to drinking water supplies. The Water and Rivers Commission is continuing inspection and monitoring of the site.
- (5) The Minister for Planning will make the Minister for Mines aware of the Western Australian Planning Commission's intention in the matter.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE - FINES ENFORCEMENT, COSTS

694. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Attorney General:

- (1) What is the cost to government of the enforcement of warrants by sheriff's officers employed in the execution of warrants against goods for fines enforcement in Western Australia?
- (2) What amount is apportioned to administrative costs in the functions of the Sheriff's Office for fines enforcement?
- (3) What are the details of the apportionment of rent for the functions of the Sheriff's Office for fines enforcement in Perth and in country centres?
- (4) What amount of money is received by the Sheriff's Office in full for warrants against goods for fines enforcement?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Sheriff's Officers, metropolitan area: Approximately \$148 000 for 1995-96 financial year; includes salary, vehicle and costs, travelling etc. Contractors, country: \$136 000 actual, inclusive of all costs, 1995-96 financial year.
- (2) \$158 000. Salary costs of various officers plus vehicle, travelling costs, etc.
- (3) Nil. Buildings owned by government.
- (4) Financial 1995-96, \$95 453.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE - FINES ENFORCEMENT; ACCESS TO INFORMATION FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

695. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Attorney General:

- (1) Can the Attorney confirm that at a meeting of fines enforcement sheriff's officers held in March this year, one of the areas discussed was access to information from Homeswest, Western Power, Telstra and the Department of Transport?
- (2) If yes, can the Attorney explain why the sheriff discussed gaining access to information from these government agencies?
- (3) Can the Attorney assure the House that officers from his department will not have access to confidential information about the clients of the above government agencies?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) To locate offenders to recover fines.
- (3) Only discussed. No action has been taken to formalise this approach.

JUSTICE, MINISTRY OF - CIVIL DEBT RECOVERY SYSTEM REVIEW

696. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Ministry of Justice undertaking an inquiry or investigation of administrative functions involving civil debt recovery in Western Australia?
- (2) Will the Attorney General table in Parliament any investigation of administrative functions involving civil debt recovery by the Ministry of Justice?
- (3) Will the Attorney General table in Parliament any investigations undertaken by the sheriff or by any of his staff into civil debt recovery?
- (4) When will the Attorney General table any reports on civil debt recovery?
- (5) What is the cost to the Government of any inquiry into civil debt recovery being undertaken by the Ministry of Justice or the sheriff?

(6) What is the intention of the Government in embarking on any inquiry?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A copy of the final report of the review of the civil debt recovery system will be made available to interested persons when completed.
- (3) Yes. As contained in the final report of the review of the civil debt recovery system.
- (4) After the report is finalised, following public submissions.
- (5) Salary costs estimated at approximately \$30 000.
Travel, approximately \$4 800.
Other incidental costs approximately \$500.
Consultation etc with other ministry staff, not quantifiable.
- (6) Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the current civil debt recovery system in the State.

MAIN ROADS WESTERN AUSTRALIA - REID HIGHWAY WORK COMPLETION, ADVERTISING COST

697. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

In relation to the wrap around on three community newspapers - the *Stirling Times*, the *Eastern Suburbs Reporter* and the *Wanneroo Times* - which advertised the completion of the work on the Reid Highway, I ask -

- (1) Did Main Roads Western Australia contribute to the cost of the cover?
- (2) If yes, what was the total contribution of Main Roads Western Australia?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The cost was \$1 816.68.

POLICE SERVICE - BUNBURY DISTRICT STATION PLANS

698. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Liberal candidate for Mitchell, Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan has announced that the Government will start construction on a new \$5m police station in Bunbury next year - this might be news to the Minister for Finance!
- (2) Is he also aware that Mr Barron-Sullivan said that he was given this information by the Police Service?
- (3) If the answer to each of the above questions is yes, can the Minister inform the House who in the Police Service informed Mr Barron-Sullivan that construction is listed in next year's Budget?
- (4) Can the Minister explain why this planned construction was not listed in the 1996-97 Budget?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Mr Barron-Sullivan did not announce the proposal for the district police station in Bunbury. That information was made available in a fact sheet prepared and released by the Bunbury community forum held on 6 August 1996. It is my understanding that Mr Barron-Sullivan followed up the information provided and incorporated this subsequent information into a press release he issued on 13 August 1996.

Hon John Halden: It is just not what he said to the Press.

- (2)-(3) I am aware of what Mr Barron-Sullivan has said. I am informed that Mr Barron-Sullivan followed the proper procedure in obtaining the information which he included in his release. The first answer said that he found out about it on 6 August and he followed up, in accordance with proper procedures, to get the information.
- (4) The funding for the planned construction of the Bunbury facility is listed in the forward estimates for the 1997-98 and 1998-99 financial years.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - KELLERBERRIN OFFICE, STAFF LEVELS

699. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) Is it intended to maintain staff levels at the Kellerberrin branch office of Family and Children's Services at the existing complement of one field officer and one clerical officer for the foreseeable future?
- (2) If so, will these two positions continue to be filled by the present officers?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, subject to satisfactory performance.

LAKE CHINOCUP - GYPSUM MINING PROPOSAL; USE OF A CLASS RESERVE

700. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for the Environment:

With regard to the proposal to mine gypsum at Lake Chinocup, if the appeals convenor approves the project, will that necessitate an excision being made from the A class reserve and will that come before this Parliament in a reserves Bill?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

The appeals convenor does not approve it. The appeals convenor gives a recommendation to me and I must decide whether to approve it. If it were approved, the matter would cease to be one for my concern; it would be a matter for Department of Land Administration and the Department of Minerals and Energy because it would involve the use of an A class reserve and it would also involve a mining permit.

My understanding is that to go ahead - it is only my understanding - it would require some sort of matter to come before this House and the other House before proceeding.

FIRE BRIGADES - KELLERBERRIN FIRE STATION REPLACEMENT

701. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Emergency Services:

- (1) Is the Government committed to its spending estimate of \$290 000 for the replacement fire station at Kellerberrin, as indicated by the 1996-97 capital works program?
- (2) Has the Minister been made aware that plans have been produced for a cheaper facility and that those plans do not meet the needs of the local brigade?
- (3) Will the Minister provide an assurance that he will not authorise an inadequate building?
- (4) When is construction of a new building due to begin?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Strategic asset management principles have been implemented by the WA Fire Brigades Board and have been applied in the decision to replace the Kellerberrin fire station. The original estimate of \$290 000 was based on the standard station being built at that time. The current design provides full functionality and, due to cost savings, enables services to be provided in other locations currently not serviced.
- (2) Management of the WA Fire Brigades Board has met with the executive of the Kellerberrin Volunteer Fire Brigade and agreement has been reached in writing by both parties on the selected option of station replacement.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Allowing for the normal process of building design, estimates and tender process, construction should commence in November or December and be completed by July 1997. My understanding is - I hope it accords with what the member opposite says - that the fact one has an estimate does not mean that one does not try to achieve the appropriate result at less cost to the taxpayer.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PACKAGES - FOR COMPANIES, REPORT TABLING

702. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Commerce and Trade:

- (1) When will the Minister table the report listing the financial assistance given to private companies by the State Government since its election?
- (2) Will the Minister undertake that this material will include loan agreements and contracts with these companies?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The Minister for Commerce and Trade has provided the following reply.

- (1) In accordance with the statement made by the Minister for Commerce and Trade in the Legislative Assembly last year, the information requested by the member will be tabled annually for financial assistance packages of \$250 000 and less. The report for 1995-96 is close to completion and will be tabled very shortly. The member will be aware that the details of packages in excess of \$250 000 are tabled as soon as practical after agreement has been reached with the company concerned. Several such packages have already been tabled.
- (2) Due to the large number of financial assistance packages, the Minister will provide information on specific loan agreements and contracts on an as requested basis.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT - GARDENING POSITIONS AT DUNCRAIG SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
PADBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL, TUART COLLEGE**703. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Education:**

- (1) Has the vacant position for a gardener or gardener-handyman recently been filled at -
 - (a) Duncraig Senior High School;
 - (b) Padbury Primary School; and
 - (c) Tuart College?
- (2) If so, for each of the three schools, what were the positions and the hours of employment, and when did the new employees start in their positions?
- (3) For each of the three schools, were the appointees from the list of the Education Department redeployees?
- (4) If not, why not?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(4) The Minister for Education has asked that I ask the member to put this question on notice as it is not a matter of urgency; rather, it is a question seeking factual information.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT - BUDGET ALLOCATION, IMPACT OF COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

704. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Health:

The Western Australian Budget allows for estimated expenditure of over \$1.5b in 1996-97 for health, and I ask -

- (1) Has the federal Budget had any impact on that figure?
- (2) If so, what is the revised figure and what areas will be affected?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(2) The impact on estimated health expenditure of \$1 547.544m for 1996-97 is still being assessed, as the Federal Government did not provide the amounts for specific purpose payments in Budget Paper No 3. I have a certain feeling of deja vu about this answer. To some extent I think we have already discussed it. At this early stage there is the likelihood of a reduction in expenditure of at least \$3.7m, primarily under the dental program of \$3m and a number of programs, which were subject to efficiency measure reductions

of broadbanding, of at least \$0.7m. It will be some time before the full impact of the federal Budget can be analysed in detail. At that time, a more comprehensive response will be provided.

SCHOOLS - KWINANA SENIOR HIGH

Part Time Cleaners, Vacancies

705. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Education:

I ask this question with some trepidation that the Minister in the other House may feel it should be put on notice. However, I have given some notice. I ask -

- (1) Are there vacancies for part time cleaners at Kwinana Senior High School?
- (2) When did these vacancies arise?
- (3) How many positions are there and what hours are required in each position?
- (4) Have redeployees from government cleaning jobs that have been contracted out been offered these positions?
- (5) If yes, why have they not taken up these positions?
- (6) If the answer to the fourth part of the question is no, why have the redeployees not been offered a position at the Kwinana Senior High School?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

The member's prediction is correct; I ask him to place the question on notice.

MAIN ROADS WESTERN AUSTRALIA - GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY LANDSCAPE PAMPHLETS, COST

706. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Transport:

Some notice of this question has been given. With regard to the recently distributed Main Roads Department glossy four-page pamphlet titled "Great Eastern Highway Road to Great Eastern Highway Streetscape Enhancements", I ask -

- (1) How many of these pamphlets were distributed?
- (2) What was the cost of -
 - (a) production;
 - (b) printing; and
 - (c) distribution?
- (3) Was the printing of the pamphlets tendered for?
- (4) If yes, who received the tender for the project?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Five thousand pamphlets were printed, and approximately 1 500 were delivered to businesses and residents in the immediate area. Other pamphlets have been handed out at public displays, which occurred over the past two weeks at Ascot and Belmont Forum Shopping Centres.
 - (2)
 - (a) \$2 000.
 - (b) \$4 000.
 - (c) \$400.
 - (3) The production of pamphlets was a requirement of the consultancy in contract 607/95 - Great Eastern Highway development of landscape concept - which was awarded in April 1996.
 - (4) Landscape Architectural Services has the contract. The Minister understands that the company subcontracted out the work to a firm named Copyright.
-