



WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

THIRTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT
FOURTH SESSION
1996

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 13 November 1996

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 13 November 1996

THE SPEAKER (Mr Clarko) took the Chair at 11.00 am, and read prayers.

IRON ORE (YANDICOOGINA) AGREEMENT BILL

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

BILLS (3) - RETURNED

1. Mental Health Bill.
2. Mental Health (Consequential Provisions) Bill.
3. Criminal Law (Mentally Impaired Defendants) Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

PETITION - ALINTAGAS, REBATES

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [11.04 am]: I present a petition couched in the following terms -

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

We, the undersigned call for AlintaGas to establish a scheme of rebates or discounts for senior citizens, pensioners and other low income earners.

AlintaGas is alone among the public utilities in not providing some form of assistance for low income earners and the elderly and we call on it to display social responsibility in conducting its business affairs.

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

The petition bears 11 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 211.]

PETITION - STRATA TITLES ACT

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [11.05 am]: I have a further petition -

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

We, the undersigned urge the Government to recognise the considerable concern and confusion caused by changes to the Strata Titles Act particularly to duplex owners and we call on the Government to fully explain how people must comply with the statutory obligations particularly in relation to workers compensation insurance and if the Government is unable to do this, we further call on the Government to repeal or simplify those sections of the Act.

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

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

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

[See petition No 212.]

PETITION - FIREFIGHTING APPLIANCES AND STAFF, NO REDUCTION

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [11.06 am]: I have a further petition -

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

We the undersigned petitioners call on the Parliament and State Government to ensure that there is no reduction in Firefighting appliances deployed throughout the Perth metropolitan area. That there is no

reduction in the number of Firefighting staff and the safety crewing levels on all appliances including country appliances are maintained at all times.

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

The petition bears 34 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 213.]

PETITION - MOTOR VEHICLES ANNUAL COMPULSORY CHECKS PROPOSAL

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [11.07 am]: I present a final petition -

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

We, the undersigned urge the Government not to adopt the proposed annual compulsory vehicle checks. We note that the Office of Road Safety has stated that such checks would be unlikely to reduce the number of car crashes on our roads. We believe the vehicle checks will place yet another financial burden on families who can ill afford the additional costs that would be involved.

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

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

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

[See petition No 214.]

PETITION - BREAST CANCER RESEARCH FUNDING

MRS van de KLASHORST (Swan Hills) [11.08 am]: I present the following petition -

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

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

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

The petition bears 894 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 215.]

PETITION - SENIORS' MOBILITY PROGRAMS, FUNDING

MS ANWYL (Kalgoorlie) [11.09 am]: I present the following petition -

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

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

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

The petition bears 62 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 216.]

SELECT COMMITTEE INTO CHILD MIGRATION*Interim Report, Tabling*

MR M. BARNETT (Rockingham) [11.10 am]: I have for tabling the interim report of the Select Committee into Child Migration, and I move -

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

I recognise the competing demands for time in this place; however, this interim report is of such significance that it demands a few comments be made. This committee was formed only four months ago and comprises the members for Mitchell, Vasse and Wellington. The staff of the committee were Tamara Fischer, Pat Roach and Nigel Lake in the administrative field. Each of those people has made an excellent contribution. We were particularly fortunate, following the appointment of the administrative staff, to obtain the services of Ms Kirsten Robinson as our research officer. I say "fortunate" because the skills she has brought to this committee are second to none. Her ability and the amount of work she has contributed has meant that we have been able to produce this interim report, which is quite large, in a very short time.

The need to produce an interim report has been born of two reasons: The first is that we normally would have expected to report on 21 November, but it seems unlikely Parliament will sit on that day; therefore, it was necessary to bring some form of report to the Parliament before then. Second, it seems to me that because of the election, Parliament will be prorogued in the very near future and without some form of interim report to the Parliament, the committee's work would automatically be terminated. The report outlines sufficient information to encourage both the Parliament and the Government to enable the work of the committee to continue unabated in one form or another. The report contains about 100 pages, which is significantly larger than most interim reports. Nonetheless it only scratches the surface of the complex and intricate web of child migration issues that we have uncovered.

When we initially moved the motion for the formation of the committee, we thought child migration was established in this State in the early 1900s and continued until 1967. In fact, the committee has discovered substantial child migration went back as far as 1834. The body of the report outlines the basics of the schemes, which are very interesting. The continuation of the committee's task is important. We have developed a considerable amount of experience and a number of skills on the team. If the committee does not continue, those skills will be lost. Furthermore, the trust that has been engendered in the committee by a number of former child migrants will also disappear.

The basic task of the committee was to establish the number of former child migrants. Members will be aware that a wide range of numbers have been quoted in various articles about former child migrants to this State. We figured that if we could not establish the numbers more accurately than has been the case in the past, we would not be able to suggest the appropriate solutions and resources that are required. In short, we needed to identify the size of the problem before proceeding to a solution.

The report demonstrates the difficulty involved in doing the task. I will give a couple of examples quoted in the report in some depth. In 1912 Fairbridge started the Fairbridge Farm School at Pinjarra. There are four sources for the number of children who came to that farm at the outset. One is a pamphlet by the Fairbridge organisation which says that 12 children came. In her book Ruby Fairbridge, the wife of Kingsley Fairbridge, quotes a number of 13. In the dominions royal commission the farm is described as having 30 children who arrived in the first party, and Kingsley Fairbridge, in an article in England, states that 35 children came to the farm.

With regard to the numbers of child migrants involved in the post-war scheme, the committee uncovered a statement of intent from the Commonwealth Government indicating that 918 children had gone to Fairbridge prior to the war. The Old Fairbridgian Association quotes a figure of 1 937, and during our visit the United Kingdom Fairbridge organisation told us yet another figure. After years of research, Dr Barry Coldrey came up with a set post-war figure for Catholic child migration. In the past two months the organisations and agencies in the United Kingdom, with which we have spoken, have increased that number by in excess of 50. Yesterday *The West Australian* quoted 20 000 child migrants as having come to Western Australia since World War II, but I think that figure is somewhat inaccurate. Nevertheless I have demonstrated the difficulty we had in ascertaining a precise number at this early stage of our work.

Incidentally, a paragraph in that newspaper article suggests that in my introductory speech to set up the select committee I said that children as young as four years old had migrated to Western Australia and had been sent to service positions in the Outback. The committee office received a call immediately following the publication of that article and a former child migrant said, in no uncertain terms, that the statement was wrong. This report demonstrates it was not wrong. There is ample evidence and information to show that people were brought here to service agricultural pursuits and, furthermore, that they were brought over at a very early age. The youngest we uncovered

was three years. The only incorrect part of the article was to do with the age, and we found children even younger than four years were brought over as migrants.

People continue to send to the committee submissions on their experiences, and I will outline one of them in a few moments. I draw to the attention of the House a telephone call that was received last Friday in the committee's office. It was from the wife of one of the child migrants with whom we had been in contact. She told us that, unfortunately, her husband had recently died and, therefore, would be unable to contribute any more of his experiences or information to the committee. I have raised this because it emphasises the urgency of the continuation of this committee and the task that has been set for it.

It was also clear from our examinations that this is not a finite problem; it will not simply go away when former child migrants die. No matter how many former child migrants there are, their deaths will not see this problem go away. The Canadian experience has gone on for far longer than that in Western Australia and from our examination of the agencies handling child migrants in the United Kingdom, it is clear there has been an exponential growth in the number of inquiries in England relevant to the Canadian experience. If we do not handle this matter now, it will not disappear; it will get larger and larger.

I wanted to raise a number of things, but I recognise the time so I will cut to the chase. The report recommends and demonstrates the need for the committee to continue with the work that the House has given to us, and we request that there be no hiatus in our work. We want to retain the current expertise of the staff and the trust that former child migrants have developed in the committee. This morning I received a letter, and rather than paraphrase it, I will read three paragraphs from it. It states -

Dear Mike. I have just read in today's "West" yet another article re Child Migrants from Britain. I note that you too were one, as was I.

I was dispatched to this country near to being nine years old, having spent my life since 2½ years in Dr Barnardos Girls' Village Home where I was very happy & doing especially well at school. My mother used to visit me regularly, & hopefully we would be reunited.

I suddenly found myself at Pinjarra's Fairbridge Farm School, stripped of my shoes & socks & coat etc, no one I knew, & frightened. It was 1931 in July.

I fretted & kept asking for my mother to be found, she had died 18 months after I arrived in Australia, never knowing where I had gone, they (in Britain) never bothered to find her.

But! I've pushed myself to go back to London & go through Somerset House records, no real idea what to do. I've been back & forth costing money I could ill-afford. The situation upset my marriage, I had three sons, but I couldn't cope with having no identity, it crippled me psychologically.

That letter demonstrates very capably the sorts of problems that we have been uncovering in the four months that we have been working.

The report outlines the need to continue with the work and to find a mechanism that is appropriate to deal with this matter. We must retain the power of protection for witnesses to ensure that they have no fear of adverse legal consequences when they bring information to us. We must have the power to examine the statements by those witnesses to ensure that no people are maligned unfairly. We must retain the power of coercion, because it is becoming clear that we will need to see a number of documents and speak to a number of people who may not wish to speak to us. We have chosen the only mechanism that we can find that is capable of providing all of those things; namely, an honorary royal commission. The report demonstrates and gives information about the reasons for this and the past practice in respect of converting select committees into honorary royal commissions. We cite three recent examples, and we are aware of at least eight select committees which have received that conversion. I hope the House and/or the Government will accede to that request, and I commend the report to the House.

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [11.24 am]: I support the member for Rockingham's comments to the House. I sought to be on this committee mainly as a result of the speech that the member for Rockingham made in moving for the establishment of this committee, and I am very pleased that I made that decision, not because it is the first select committee of which I have been a member in 14 years that has travelled overseas, but because of the work that the committee has been doing. When one sits down with the child migrants who want to give evidence to the committee, one is immediately impressed that these are real people suffering from real problems as a result of the decision that they be migrated, not on their say-so, but on the say-so of other people, from their country of origin to Australia at a very early age.

During our trip, I was impressed by the fact that most of the people whom we met overseas are now well aware of the problems that were created by the child migration program, partly as a result of having done their own

investigations in response to the media coverage of *The Leaving of Liverpool* and other publications, and also because child migrants have contacted them in later life in order to trace their family. It was also clear that the principal angst that these people now feel, and the way in which we can most help them, is tracing their relatives and, where possible, arranging reunions.

It is very clear that at the moment all the institutions in the United Kingdom have the goodwill and concern for the former child migrants to provide access to their records; and, in some cases, to arrange counselling and assist with tracing family and arranging family reunions. However, I fear that window of opportunity will be lost, for two reasons: Firstly, as time goes by, the availability and maintenance of these records may not be as good as it is at present; and, secondly, as personnel change in organisations, the goodwill and the contriteness that one receives from these organisations at present may also change.

There was one exception, in my view, in the organisations that we met in the United Kingdom, and it seemed to me that the absence of contriteness on behalf of that organisation arose from the fact that there had been a change in its membership and in the objects of that organisation, and it seemed to be taking the attitude, "Well, it happened a long time ago; this organisation has moved on since then; and while we will make our records available, we do not feel any direct responsibility to be involved in the solutions." That trend will develop as the time lengthens between the publication of *The Leaving of Liverpool* and the media attention that has been given to this matter, and the actual contact with child migrants.

It is also clear that the number of migrants who are now seeking knowledge of their roots is increasing, partly because people over the age of 50 want to clarify some of the events of their lives and be able to communicate to their children and grandchildren about their roots and personal history in order to give them some sense of identity. The publicity that is attached to *The Leaving of Liverpool* has also led to an upsurge in the number of people who are seeking that kind of information. Regrettably, it is largely hit or miss in the sense that some of the organisations have well developed information systems that facilitate the provision of information and provide full access to all the records, but others have not gone to the trouble of collating their records and it requires a great deal of research by the person who is trying to get the information. Others are seeking to exclude certain information from those records. Some of the organisations have well developed protocols about counselling people personally or arranging for counselling and advice for people before that access occurs and through each step of researching and tracing the family, and in arranging family reunions.

For others, there are no such protocols. We know how important it is in the adoption area to have in place proper protocols on people obtaining information and counselling before they seek contact; counselling after they have accessed the records; counselling before they seek to make contact with the relinquishing family; and counselling afterwards if it does not work out as well as they had hoped. That sort of system is not in place for these child migrants. I emphasise that while this window of opportunity of goodwill from the sending institutions in the United Kingdom exists, we should use that to examine the question of how this State and the British Government should assist to ensure that those records are preserved, that proper access is permitted to those records, and that in a legislative sense proper protocols are in place, as there are in adoption, to govern how that information is researched and to support people through the reunion process.

The committee has gone to the trouble of attaching to our report one of the submissions we received from the Catholic Child Welfare Council in the United Kingdom. That submission was useful to me in a number of senses, partly because of the detail of the information it was able to provide, but also because of the information it gave about the ages and numbers of children who were sent to Australia. That information reveals that the average age of children sent by the Catholic agencies was 9.4 years. The figures on the ages of children who were sent are as follows: One child of two years, three children of three years, 11 children of four years, 54 children of five years, 83 children of six years, 98 children of seven years, and 164 children of eight years. The Child Migrant Trust building has a photograph of four of these children preparing to leave. One child about four years of age is in the middle, carrying up by his chin a suitcase that is about four times as wide as he is. That photograph brought home to me what this inquiry is about: That is, how terrible the scheme was in sending children as young as four from their country of origin to an institution to Australia, which may or may not have been city-based, and leaving the supervision of their care to that institution and there being no family contact thereafter. The inquiry is about a system that was very much supported by the Government and the community here and in the United Kingdom, but its outcomes have been wrong for a great number of people. It affects real people.

At one of the organisations the committee visited in the United Kingdom I was a little remiss in that I took up a lot of time asking the person who provided the information a number of questions. It was the one occasion on that trip that I felt some disquiet from the chairman when I left. It was only afterwards that I realised that the organisation we had been talking to was the agency that arranged for the chairman to be migrated to this country as a child. Because I had been so active in seeking information myself, in a way I deprived him of the opportunity of asking

those questions. That brought home to me again that we are dealing with real people, in many cases people we know, who have contributed to this community, but who in some respects still feel that disquiet about being uprooted from one country and transferred to another.

I place on record my appreciation of both the chairman and the staff of the committee, Nigel Lake and Kirsten Robinson. Nigel Lake and Kirsten Robinson demonstrated to me how fortunate we are as a Parliament to have staff of the quality we have. Those two in particular are tremendously qualified and well intentioned people who will be an asset to this Parliament in future years.

MR BRADSHAW (Wellington - Parliamentary Secretary) [11.34 am]: I also support the printing of this document. I became involved in the select committee primarily because of some constituents who approached me some years ago about their circumstances. Even though the select committee is looking at various aspects of the issue, my prime objective is still to help those child migrants to be reunified with their families and to find out about where they came from and who their families were. In putting this select committee report together we had to look at the whole issue of child migration. From that angle I am in two minds about the issue. It probably does not hurt to try to put the history of child migration together in a well researched and documented way. That appears to be the way the committee is going. However, I reiterate that my primary objective of being a member of the committee is to try to help former child migrants.

Since the select committee was established I have received calls from several of my constituents. They want to know why child migration occurred. Unless one has been in that situation, it is difficult to understand the inner feelings and the strength of commitment these people have to find out some of these answers. They have been frustrated; they have been trying for years to find out this information. They write letters and visit places and they are still frustrated about the lack of information that is forthcoming. I am not sure that this select committee will come up with the answers for those people; however, it is essential that we try to do our best to put the jigsaw together so that those people will have somewhere to go to find out all about their background and the information they require.

It has been an interesting select committee in the sense that we have visited institutions in Western Australia from Perth to Geraldton, including to Tardun and Bindoon. In the main we have had cooperation from those organisations. It has been gratifying that they are prepared to help where they can. Some of the institutions are worried that the report might raise all the negatives about child migration to these institutions. It would be sad if the committee went overboard in that direction. Many of the child migrants who went through those institutions are happy. They feel that they were great for them and that they were their homes. Many return to get married at those places and they have fond memories of them. We must be wary that we do not focus too much on the negatives and pull down those institutions in the eyes of people who have got a lot of benefit from them. I am concerned about that as well.

I have been contacted by people who have gone through those institutions and have fond memories. They also have concerns that we may be heading in the wrong direction. It has been well documented that some children who went through those institutions were abused both physically and sexually. To me that is disgraceful and it should never have occurred. Those who perpetrated those abuses should be brought to task over that. However, it is not necessarily the committee's concern to pursue that line of inquiry. It should be pursued by the child migrants through the legal system. I fully support getting to those people who may have perpetrated those acts of violence and abuse.

I support the comments of the previous two speakers and agree that Nigel Lake and Kirsten Robinson were excellent. When members read this document they will be surprised at the amount of information that is included in it. I was certainly surprised when I read the report the first time. A great contribution was made by our research officer in putting together this document.

It is important to continue this investigation, one way or another. Probably the best way would be for the select committee to continue as an honorary royal commission, because such a royal commission would have the powers described by the member for Rockingham. That can be sorted out in due course. The work of the committee should continue because a lot of information has been gathered and the committee has the expertise to support that work. It would be a pity to lose the valuable information that has been collected. I support the printing of the report.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [11.40 am]: I wish to comment briefly in support of the members who have spoken on this interim report of the Select Committee into Child Migration. I support the recommendation that the select committee be converted to an honorary royal commission prior to the prorogation of Parliament. When members and the general public have had an opportunity to peruse the material that has been collated in this interim report, in such an extraordinarily short time, they will understand how much work has been done. However, in the full context of child migration, very little has been achieved and a lot more must be done.

An extension of the terms of reference of the select committee will allow child migrants to discover the existence and whereabouts of parents or siblings. A major inquiry into Aboriginal children being taken from their parents has

attracted Australia-wide attention. However, as matters begin to unfold, the consequences of this select committee's inquiry will be far more wide-reaching and will gain more publicity, because parents and children were placed in the same situation on the other side of the world. We accepted our responsibility to inquire into the situation of Aboriginal children, and we have the same responsibility to ensure that as much as possible can be done for child migrants, because there is nothing more destructive than the break-up of families, for whatever reasons. As time passes, family circumstances change, and it is very important that the work of the select committee continue. One cannot emphasise too much the importance of assisting the reunification of child migrants with relatives.

Although members referred to the implications of sexual abuse and other forms of maltreatment - all of which I abhor - my concern is that further investigation be undertaken into whether adequate standards of education were provided for those children who will be the subject of an ongoing inquiry. I implore the Government to undertake an inquiry into the standard of education provided for those children - whether they achieved some degree of fluency, learning, and understanding. An early indication was that may not have been the case. How can a person without literacy skills at an advanced age have the capacity to find his or her family? I do not want to pursue that matter now but it is an area which must be considered in the context of the whole question of child migration.

I have not been able to give my full attention to this inquiry, because I had the dreaded lurgy and was not able to visit the United Kingdom. However, I am mindful of the work undertaken by the committee. The interim report should be very carefully read by all members and understood by the media. I hope that the media's reporting to the wider community will canvass the need for the work of the select committee to continue beyond the life of this Parliament. I strongly endorse the report.

Question put and passed.

[See paper No 782.]

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR EDUCATION

School Education Bill Proposal

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe - Minister for Education) [11.46 am]: The purpose of this statement is to inform the House of progress in the development of a School Education Bill to replace the State's present Education Act and regulations.

Western Australia's school education legislation is the oldest in the country. Since it was enacted in 1928, more than 50 amendments have been made, the most recent being those in the Education Amendment Act 1996. The review of the Education Act was initiated in 1994 with a view to introducing a new Bill in the life of this Parliament. This task has taken longer than was originally planned. Drafting has been delayed in part due to the volume of other legislation. Some delay is also due to the significant disruption in government schools during 1995 as a result of industrial action by teachers. I did not think it would be fair to impose a major legislative change on schools during 1996.

The proposed Bill will deal only with school education and will be called the School Education Bill. It will cover government, non-government and home schooling for all Western Australian children from kindergarten through to Year 12. The current Act was written in the context of circumstances prevailing in the 1920s. It is clear that its wording, structure and context need to be modernised. The Government is keen to have a new Act which will take us with confidence into the next century.

In making provisions of a new Bill, keeping things in balance is the key. I am keen that the new Act have the appropriate balance of rights, duties and responsibilities for children, parents, teachers, schools and school systems.

The new Bill will contain separate parts related to compulsory education; the management of government schools; parent involvement in government schools; registration and management of non-government schools; community preschools; home schooling; and administrative matters, including the role and functions of the Minister and the Director General of Education; and the management of teaching staff of the Education Department.

A reference group is overseeing the development of the new legislation. Chaired by my colleague Mr Fred Tubby, Parliamentary Secretary for Education, it has members who provide expertise and views from the school sectors, the general community, the tertiary sector and the legal profession. A classroom teacher will also be appointed to the group, to represent the views of the teaching profession.

Public submissions were sought during the early part of 1995, when the review was in its preliminary stages. A number of useful suggestions came forward and have been taken into account in the preparation of drafting instructions. Consultation has also occurred with the Education Department, the non-government school sector, as well as other key stakeholders in the management of schooling.

We need school education legislation in Western Australia which will reflect the variety of forms of schooling not just today, but well into the next century. I am confident that the Bill will complement the rapid and exciting development which is occurring within our schools. Once the Bill is complete, it will be widely circulated for public discussion and feedback before being brought to Parliament for debate. All the people of the State will have the opportunity to examine its provisions and to make comment and suggestions for its improvement.

This public release is planned to occur during the first half of 1997. The earliest date for the enactment of the new legislation is the beginning of 1998. Despite the delays, I think it is important that we take the time to get this undertaking right. I look forward to the new Bill being brought before the House in the course of 1997.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR WOMEN'S INTERESTS

Centenary of Women's Suffrage in Western Australia 1999

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley - Minister for Women's Interests) [11.50 am]: The year 1999 marks the centenary of women's suffrage in Western Australia. New Zealand was the first self-governing nation in the world to grant universal suffrage in 1893. Australia was a close second with South Australia the first Australian State to grant suffrage in 1894. Western Australia has the distinction of being the second State to recognise the right of women to vote.

The Constitution Amendment Bill was passed in 1899 after first being introduced in 1893 and being rejected four times. This State has a particularly prominent role in the history of female participation in Australian Parliaments, with Edith Cowan having the distinction of being the first woman appointed to any Australian Parliament. However, I remind members that in the 75 years since Edith Cowan's election, only 32 women have served in the Western Australian Parliament.

The centenary of suffrage represents a major opportunity to celebrate 100 years of women's progress in all spheres of life and develop the foundations for further progress in the next century. The Government is looking to the widest possible involvement of the community in celebratory activities and I look forward to a bipartisan approach being taken in recognising the contribution women have made to all aspects of life in Western Australia.

I am pleased to announce that a committee of outstanding Western Australian citizens has been formed to help plan and oversee activities for the centenary year. The committee, to be known as the Centenary of Suffrage Committee, will include Jenni Ballantyne, internationally acclaimed business woman of the company Second Skin; Associate Professor David Black, School of Social Sciences, Curtin University; Dr Jennifer Browne, President of the Women's Advisory Council; Kath Finlayson, Australian Broadcasting Corporation's WA Rural Woman of the Year 1996; Pat Giles, former Senator for Western Australia; Magistrate Sue Gordon, AM, of the WA Children's Court; Sandra Jamieson, Marketing Manager, West Australian Newspapers; Judge Antoinette Kennedy, WA District Court judge; Margaret McAleer, former member, WA Legislative Council; Margaret Nadebaum, Principal, Methodist Ladies College; Ruth Reid, Chairperson of the Family and Children's Advisory Council; Professor Leonie Still, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Edith Cowan University; Cheryl Vardon, Director General, Education Department of Western Australia; and, Gina Williams, television presenter, Golden West Network. In addition, Mrs Marlene Jeffery has accepted the role as patron of the committee.

I welcome both the appointment of the committee and the opportunity to involve the whole community in reaffirming the importance of women's participation in our democratic system. I invite all members to become similarly involved.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Homewest, Keystart Home Loans

MR KIERATH (Riverton - Minister for Housing) [11.53 am]: I rise to announce good news for Western Australians with Homewest and Keystart home loans. More than 13 000 borrowers through these schemes will have the normal variable interest rate on their loan drop from 9.5 per cent to 8.75 per cent per annum. The change comes into effect from 16 December and means the rate for Homewest borrowers will be the same as Australia's biggest bank, the National Australia Bank. On a normal loan of \$90 000 there will be a saving of about \$46 per month.

In the past, when Homewest has cut interest rates, some borrowers have seen the benefit of making extra payments and have chosen to continue payments at the higher level, saving them even more in the longer term. The interest rate improvement not only will ease the burden on those people already committed to buying their own homes through Homewest, but also will encourage more people who are renting to consider owning their own homes. This reduction is particularly pleasing given the strong performance of Homewest's home loan schemes in the face of other States having to wind down their borrowing programs because of excessive funding costs. Homewest's borrowing schemes have proved so successful that more than 10 500 Western Australians are currently involved in buying their own homes through the Keystart program.

Keystart, the major part of Homeswest's home loan scheme, approves about 2 500 loans a year. This is a very successful scheme that has helped thousands of Western Australians into home ownership who otherwise would not have had that opportunity. Not only will cheaper interest rates encourage more buyers into the housing market, but also it will further strengthen Western Australia's building industry.

This Government is proud of its strategies to help more people own their own homes and falling interest rates are just one way in which we have been able to do that for Western Australians. Working with the building industry we have reintroduced the NOW campaign, which provides benefits worth up to \$5 500 for buyers who purchase land and start building within two months of the purchase date, to make it easier for prospective home buyers to get their own homes.

Homeswest has other programs to help with home ownership targeted at Aboriginal families, the disabled and low income earners. I have impressed upon Homeswest that all its programs must help as many Western Australians as possible fulfil their dream of home ownership without placing them in housing poverty.

I am pleased to report to this Parliament that we are delivering that goal in a way that fulfils dreams, that provides a tangible benefit to the local housing industry and, most importantly, does not send this State broke.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Hospitals, Elective Surgery Waiting Lists

MR PRINCE (Albany - Minister for Health) [11.55 am]: The Government of Western Australia recognises that waiting lists for elective surgery has been an issue for a long time. Cases are being added to the lists every year despite additional funding being provided specifically to reduce them. The only way to avoid waiting lists altogether would be to have more resources available for elective surgery than the demand requires. Experience in other States has shown that funding aimed specifically at reducing waiting lists has a tendency to be ineffective. The lists continue to grow if rewarded with additional funding.

The approach we are adopting in Western Australia is aimed at reducing the amount of time people are on the waiting lists before being admitted to hospital. As a result, an innovative waiting list strategy has been developed to address many of the issues which give rise to long waiting times for patients needing elective surgery. There is no doubt that as a result of this strategy, access to elective surgery will improve over the next two years.

It is our intention to ensure that everyone gets treatment within the appropriate time for their conditions. For people with a classification of urgent, the national standard is that they should not have to wait more than 30 days, while routine patients should be treated within 12 months. The major points of the new strategy include -

The granting of \$30m in funding for additional procedures in WA public hospitals over the next two years, to be used specifically for patients in the urgent category. This should result in more than 2 500 additional cases being completed before the end of June 1997. This will, of course, be above and beyond the normal workload of surgical activity.

A wait list help line will be established which will give patients and doctors information on the average waiting time for general surgical areas and some specific procedures at the teaching hospitals.

Service plans for each of the major specialties will be developed and implemented. This will help to correct problems in the supply side of service provision, which leads to long waiting times. It involves extensive consultation with the professional medical and surgical colleges, the hospitals and other interested parties.

Other system improvements at public hospitals will include a focus on increased accountability for performance in areas such as cancellations - by the patients and by the hospital - outpatient waiting times and waiting list auditing procedures.

The Health Department has developed guidelines for classifying urgency categories in 15 major surgical procedures. This is the first work of its type in Australia and will ensure patients are treated equitably across the State.

A discussion paper on the strategy has been developed and a working group has been established to look at how it could best be implemented - quickly, effectively and in a uniform way in all hospitals. This group has started to meet and is progressing through the work plan.

With the development of better information systems, more rigorous accountability and better targeted funding, we are confident that waiting time on elective surgery lists will be much better managed in the future. I table the report.

[See paper No 783.]

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - MINISTER REPRESENTING THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Swan River Trust Act Review

MR MINSON (Greenough - Minister for Mines) [11.58 am]: Section 71(1) of the Swan River Trust Act requires that -

The Minister shall carry out a review of the operation and effectiveness of this Act as soon as is practicable after the expiration of 5 years from its commencement, and in the course of that review the Minister shall consider and have regard to -

- (a) the effectiveness of the operations of the Trust;
- (b) the need for the continuation of the functions of the Trust; and
- (c) such other matters as appear to him to be relevant to the operation and effectiveness of this Act.

The Minister is required under section 71(2) of the Swan River Trust Act to "prepare a report based on his review made under subsection (1) and shall, as soon as practicable after the preparation thereof, cause the report to be laid before each House of Parliament".

In 1994 the previous Minister for the Environment appointed an advisory committee to assist him in examining the operation and effectiveness of the Swan River Trust Act. The advisory committee comprises Dr David Carr, planning consultant, and Mr Allen Gale, Principal Environmental Manager of Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd, consulting engineers. Events have since overtaken the review process. The Government has commenced the restructuring of the water industry. The recommendations of the advisory committee will be taken into consideration as part of this program. The Waterways Commission has been replaced by the Water and Rivers Commission. The Swan River Trust is now supported by the Water and Rivers Commission, which has a wider jurisdiction and more resources available for waterways management.

The commission and the trust have been working together to increase the level of support to the trust, streamline trust operations and provide better integrated management of the catchments of the Avon, Swan and Canning Rivers through the commission's regional structure. Further adjustments to the water industry and legislative changes are planned for the next four years to complete the Government's program of reform. The report by Carr and Gale is entitled, "Review of the Swan River Trust Act and its Relevance to State Waterways Management (August 1994). I table that report.

[See paper No 784.]

STANDING COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM LEGISLATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Leave to Sit when House is Sitting Wednesday, 13 November

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

That the Standing Committee on Uniform Legislation and Intergovernmental Agreements be granted leave to meet while the House is sitting on Wednesday, 13 November.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE OFFICIAL CORRUPTION COMMISSION

Council's Resolution

Message from the Council requesting concurrence in the following resolution now considered -

Paragraph (a)(ii) - To delete the words "official corruption" and substitute the following words -

"corrupt conduct", "criminal conduct", "criminal involvement" and "serious improper conduct" as defined in section 3 of the Anti-Corruption Commission Act 1988. Conduct of any of these kinds is referred to in this resolution as "official corruption".

Motion to Concur

MR COURT (Nedlands - Premier) [12.01 pm]: I move -

That the amendment made by the Council be agreed to.

MR THOMAS (Cockburn) [12.02 pm]: The Opposition will support this motion, but members on this side of the House will speak in support of it somewhat longer than did the Premier. The Opposition is not supportive of the way in which the Premier has handled this issue.

Last night this House discussed the fact that in the dying days of this Parliament the Government is moving to establish a joint standing committee on the Official Corruption Commission. The Government has had four years in which to do that and for most of that time a motion to do just that has been on the Notice Paper. On each occasion the Government has had the opportunity to act on those motions, it has explicitly rejected them. We are now witnessing the ultimate fraud because a motion has been moved to establish the committee and, as everybody knows, it is the Government's intention to prorogue the Parliament within 48 hours. Should that be the case, this committee would cease to exist. The Government is seeking to gain one more tick, because it does not have too many on its score card, by implementing a recommendation of the Commission on Government and the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters, but it will have no practical effect. It is a cynical fraud.

Mr Court: We have put our position on the COG recommendations. When is the Labor Party going to put its position on the recommendations?

Mr THOMAS: I suggest the Premier put that question to the Leader of the Opposition and he will provide an authoritative answer. If the Premier's research staff went through some of the statements the Opposition has made on the COG recommendations -

Mr Court: I want to know whether you will state your position. We have put our position and I am waiting for you to state your position.

Mr THOMAS: One of the things the Premier will say is that the Government has acted on the recommendation to establish a joint standing committee to inquire into the Official Corruption Commission. Members of the public will consider that statement and say "It is good the Government has done that."

Mr Court: What you are trying to say to me is that you will not put your position on the COG recommendations.

Mr THOMAS: I am not saying that at all. This motion is a cynical fraud because anybody who reads the Notice Paper and is aware of the proceedings of this House will know that the Parliament is acting on a COG recommendation and that, for a number of years, motions in various forms have been on the Notice Paper to do that. The Government moved this motion knowing that it would have no practical effect.

Let us consider the cowboy proposition before the House. The Government moved a motion which seeks to amend a resolution of this House to establish a joint standing committee on the Official Corruption Commission. Where is the Official Corruption Commission? It no longer exists because it has been replaced by the Anti-Corruption Commission. Surely the Government should draft its resolutions in such a way as to get the nomenclature correct. This is a token effort and somebody in the Premier's office must have bothered to give it at least 30 seconds' attention because the Anti-Corruption Commission Act, which was passed by this Parliament earlier this year, broadened its scope to include not only official corruption, but also serious improper conduct. The Act contains a lengthy definition to that effect. I am sure that when the commission has completed its investigations the Premier and other members opposite will be found to have engaged in behaviour which falls within the scope of the definition of "serious improper conduct". However, that is not a matter for this House to debate; it is a matter for the Anti-Corruption Commission and the people who answer to it to consider in the fullness of time.

This motion is a token effort to bring the resolution in line with the legislation and seeks to extend the scope of the committee to look at not only official corruption, but also serious and improper conduct. If the committee exists for only a couple of hours, it will not have an opportunity to meet, but it will have a definition which relates in a proper way to the legislation.

I am sure the Premier has not thought about whether this committee will be able to look at the activities of the Anti-Corruption Commission given that it relates to the Official Corruption Commission.

Mr Court: You know the legislation still uses the term "Official Corruption Commission".

Mr THOMAS: It does not.

Mr Court: We amended the original legislation and this amendment is to cater for the expanded definition.

Mr THOMAS: That is correct. The Premier knows that this motion is expanding the scope of the committee to look at not only official corruption, but also serious improper conduct. The principal function of the resolution which is being amended is -

That a joint standing committee of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly be appointed -

- (i) to monitor and review the performance of the functions of the Official Corruption Commission established under the Official Corruption Commission Act 1988.

The Premier knows the Official Corruption Commission no longer exists. On the face of it, this Mickey Mouse motion will have no serious effect because, when the Parliament is prorogued, the committee will no longer exist.

Mr Court: All the committees will no longer exist and you know that when a new Parliament is formed it will re-establish those committees.

Mr THOMAS: A motion, in one form or another, has been before this House for four years, but for various reasons the Government has evaded the option of forming the committee to let it carry out its very important function. When I moved a motion to establish the committee in 1993, almost three years ago, the Deputy Premier who is the author of the motion that the committee should be established, said he expected it would be created some time the following year. We waited the whole year and nothing happened.

When the then Attorney General was responding to another motion I moved, in answer to a question as to when she thought the committee would be created, she said she did not have responsibility for it because she was acting for the Premier and did not have instructions. On another occasion when I asked when the committee would be created, she said that, for a joint standing committee to be established, the consent of both Houses of Parliament was required. I think that was also the Deputy Premier's excuse. The then Attorney General said, "Who am I to speak for the Parliament?" What sort of raw prawn excuse is that? It came from the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the former Attorney General. They know they are the Government only because they control the Parliament. To sit back and say they are not able to indicate when the committee will be created because it is up to the Parliament, is a facile answer.

Over three years ago and on several occasions in the intervening years when the same proposition came up, I said, "I suspect the Government is not serious about establishing a committee. The fact that the Premier has not given any instructions and the Parliament must appoint the committee were facile excuses and the Government does not want to establish a joint standing committee on official corruption." Irrespective of the words used, the behavioural evidence supports my thesis completely. An incompetently worded motion is brought to this House on the last day of this Parliament, even though the House will be prorogued and the committee will cease to sit. This prorogation procedure happens with the Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee and other committees, which must become honorary royal commissions if they are to continue to exist when Parliament prorogues. Why did the Premier not act on this matter earlier? The only answer I can think of - this view is confirmed by the behaviour of members opposite, if not by their words - is that the Government does not believe in the notion of the Anti-Corruption Commission being accountable to the Parliament.

Enormous powers are vested in the Anti-Corruption Commission, and it should be accountable to somebody; everybody must be accountable to somebody in the scheme of things in public life. The Anti-Corruption Commission tabled its annual report in the House yesterday, which makes very interesting reading, more for its omissions than for what it says. It essentially states that because of the confidential nature of the matters it considers, it is not able to provide any detail of its activities. It provided some raw statistics. If somebody wants to know how the fight against official corruption and serious improper conduct is going, he or she would be none the wiser after reading the ACC annual report. I accept that limits must be applied to this body when compared with other government departments regarding what can be contained in the annual report. Nonetheless, some measure of accountability must apply, and that is why a standing committee of this House recommended a number of years ago that a standing committee carry out that accountability function. It was not recommended that the committee oversee the day to day operations of the commission. Nevertheless, it should have the capacity to ensure that the body carries out the important function for which it was created by Parliament.

This is a cowboy motion put forward by a mickey mouse Premier, if I can use a mixed metaphor: It seeks to extend the jurisdiction of a committee to monitor a body which no longer exists. Does the Premier believe that the standing committee will have the scope to look at the Anti-Corruption Commission? Has he thought about or considered that aspect, or are we dealing with a farcical motion to give the Government some appearance of taking some action to deal with the issue of accountability of the Anti-Corruption Commission? The resolution we are amending does not refer to the Anti-Corruption Commission, only the OCC. If the commonly held view were wrong and an election were not held until February and Parliament were not prorogued for a few weeks and the committee could meet and elect a chairperson and get on with the job, does the Premier believe that the committee would be able to deal with the Anti-Corruption Commission, given that the resolution refers only to the OCC? Could that work be done even if the Premier were to move from shadow into substance?

Mr Court: The advice I have is yes.

Mr THOMAS: On what is the advice based?

Mr Court: On the amendment in front of you.

Mr THOMAS: The amendment does not extend the terms of reference of the committee. The committee is formed in a resolution which is found in the blue pages at the back of the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly. The committee is the Joint Standing Committee on the Official Corruption Commission. I will put the Premier's mind at rest, although he is obviously not concerned about this matter. It says in the Interpretation Act, also found in a blue folder before the Premier, that where an Act repeals a provision and replaces it with another provision, where the provisions are not inconsistent, the reference in the first provision is read as a reference to the second provision. That is legal jargon for stating that if we change the name of the Official Corruption Commission to the Anti-Corruption Commission, it will not be a problem. However, the ACC is doing more than having its name changed; its terms of reference are being extended to enable it to look at serious improper conduct. This is correcting the situation to provide the committee with an extended definition of official corruption; therefore, the motion will do the job.

However, would it not be better if the Premier were serious to move a complete amendment - which could probably be drafted in half an hour as it is not a big job - to delete the Official Corruption Commission, replace the Anti-Corruption Commission and to insert a proper definition clause so a person who reads the resolution which creates the committee would understand what the body does? In that way, people would not need to refer back to a motion passed at an earlier time, and to be familiar with the Interpretation Act to know what the resolution means. Somebody who picked up this piece of paper containing the motion would not know what the body was doing unless that person had some familiarity with the Interpretation Act. They would look at the resolution and say, "That is a shame; it is yet another stuff up by the Government." After going through the farcical procedure of seeking to create this committee, it cannot look at the ACC.

I made the prediction in 1993 when I heard the words of the Deputy Premier, who had formerly been a member of the committee of this House which looked at the OCC Act, that the Government was not serious about having proper parliamentary scrutiny of the bodies responsible for official corruption in this State. I was assured by the then Attorney General, the present Minister for Family and Children's Services, who had carriage of the relevant legislation, that in due course - that lovely phrase - the Government would support a resolution to create a committee. Firstly, it wanted to get its legislation through the House and it would then deal with the committee. Subsequently, by way of interjection to some points I made, the Deputy Premier seemed to be hedging his bets. That caused me some concern which I expressed at the time. I made an observation, from which my prediction flowed, that the Government was not serious about parliamentary scrutiny of these bodies and that the Government would not support a motion authored the by Deputy Premier and the member for Geraldton.

I could be said to be wrong in one sense; that is, that ultimately the Government moved a motion in the Parliament to create such a committee. However, how can the Premier not be absolutely shamed by his actions? He knows that he is making a farce of the Parliament. Why detain the Parliament at all with such matters when he knows that they will have no practical effect? The Premier shrugs his shoulders and says, "It's the same with all of these committees." However, such committees are not formed on the last days of the Parliament. Most committees are created in the first couple of weeks so they have some life and time to get on with their job. It is highly unlikely that a motion will be moved today to make reference to the Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee. Members will not say, "I raise an important matter and refer it to a very important committee; we will amend the terms of reference to enable it to perform this important job." It may be as important, for example, as keeping an eye on serious improper conduct in this State. If that happened, members would be laughed at as being shallow and engaging in matters of shadows with no substance, and they would be exposed as not being serious about matters with which such motions purport to deal.

That is precisely the situation. As I said three and a half years ago, the Government is not serious about this. When I heard the Deputy Premier hedging his bets in April or May 1993, I thought something was wrong. That turned out to be the case. When the former Attorney General, the member for Kingsley, evaded questions about when such committees would be created, that confirmed my fears. The Premier's latest excuse is that the Government was awaiting the recommendations of the Commission on Government. It has had those recommendations for almost two years, and has not acted on them. On the second last day of this Parliament, when the Government knows this measure can have no practical effect, it has introduced this motion. I said when I spoke on another aspect of this matter yesterday, that it is a cynical fraud. Irrespective of what the Premier says, his behaviour demonstrates that it is a fraud and it should be exposed as such.

MR KOBELKE (Nollamara) [12.21 pm]: I support the comments of the member for Cockburn. The amendments contained in the message with which we are dealing are all about appearances. This Government is very good at putting up a good appearance, even though it may be paper thin. It also shows the lack of substance in this Government. The member for Cockburn has made very good arguments illustrating that the Government is without

substance. I, together with the member for Cockburn, the Deputy Premier and others, served on the select committee in 1992 inquiring into the then Official Corruption Commission. The report of that committee was brought to the Parliament in late 1992. When this Government came to office in 1993 it had before it a range of recommendations which sought to improve the functioning of the Official Corruption Commission. This Government did not act on those recommendations at the time, and did so only when its credentials with regard to fighting corruption were very much in doubt. I have said to this Premier before, and it is confirmed by the Government's actions today, that the Court Government is soft on corruption. It is concerned with appearances but does not want to address the substantive issues of corruption in this State. I will not go into the reasons for that because it has been debated previously.

It is a clearly established fact that the Government is not willing to address issues of substance relating to corruption. In 1994 the Government picked up the recommendations from the 1992 report and sought to introduce changes to the OCC Act. However, the Minister with carriage of that Bill and, I presume, most Ministers of the Cabinet, had not even read the Bill. Had they done so, they would have known that the Bill contained reference to the committee with which we are now dealing. In 1994 the Government had no commitment to establishing that committee; however, it introduced legislation which contained reference to that committee. That clearly indicates that prominent members of the Cabinet had not read the Bill before its introduction. That reference to the committee could have been removed in a couple of minutes by a legislative draftsman. If Ministers had read and understood the Bill, knowing that the Government was not committed to the establishment of the committee, the reference would have been removed. It did not happen.

The member for Cockburn alluded to the farce whereby for several years the Government has refused to establish this committee. In the dying stages of this Parliament it has shown a sudden interest in establishing a committee to oversee the work of the Anti-Corruption Commission. At the eleventh hour it has demonstrated an interest, although throughout its term its members have not read the legislation and have voted against motions introduced by the Opposition to implement the recommendation.

My last comment relates to section 54 of the Act and how it relates to the working of this committee. It is important that the work of the Anti-Corruption Commission be carried out largely in secret. It is not a matter that can be dealt with in the full gaze of the public, and that is why the committee is so important. There must be some accountability for that committee. The annual report was tabled in this Parliament yesterday, but such reports do not provide much insight into the effectiveness of the OCC. This has led many people to make the judgment that it is totally ineffective and has not been able to tackle corruption in any effective way. I will not enter into that debate. There must be a better form of accountability than the annual report to the Parliament. The reason for establishing this standing committee of the Parliament is to provide some accountability for the Anti-Corruption Commission. As the member for Cockburn suggested, even the change of name has not been picked up. Clearly the member for Cockburn and other members have taken a keen interest in the Anti-Corruption Commission and have tried to ensure Western Australia has an effective corruption watchdog. However, no member of the Government seems to have taken a similar interest and clearly no Cabinet member has taken such an interest, otherwise the trivial matters to which I have referred would have been picked up. Ministers of the Court Government show a complete lack of interest in fighting corruption. The smallest modicum of interest would have led people to read the legislation and pick up these minor flaws and inconsistencies to which I have referred.

Mr Minson: We do not have corruption.

Mr KOBELKE: The Minister said the Government has no corruption; certainly it has no interest in tracking it down. The Minister is either suggesting there is no corruption in the State, in which case there is no problem - I do not know that many people would agree with him - or he is suggesting he has no interest in fighting corruption and can use the glib political line that it belongs to the other side of politics. That might have worked four or five years ago but clearly it will not work today. People understand the corruption that is rampant under the Court Government, but the Government does not want to face up to it. I do not know whether the Government or its mates are involved in corruption, or whether it is just too hard for the Government. The fact is that it does not want to do anything about the problem.

I give another example of this Government not taking any interest in the legislation. Clause 54 relates to restriction of publication of certain information or allegations and states -

(1) Subject to subsection (2), a person shall not publish or cause to be published in any newspaper or other written publication or by radio or television -

- (a) the fact that the Commission has received or initiated, or
- (b) any details of,

any information or allegation referred to it under section 13 subsection (1) unless that fact or those details -

- (c) is or are to be published; or
- (d) has or has already been publicly disclosed,

under, or in connection with the execution of, this Act.

I am not a lawyer but that seems fairly clear: The fact that the commission has received or initiated an investigation cannot be published in a newspaper, written publication, on radio or television. Also any referral to the Anti-Corruption Commission cannot be published. The proviso is that it must be published in accordance with the Act. Under section 54(2), if this committee presents a report, it can be rightly published. That is why this will be an important standing committee. As I have indicated, it will provide a level of accountability. Other than that, and the specific requirements of the Act, the reading of that clause is straightforward. It provides that one cannot make a report to the Official Corruption Commission and then publicly tell people about it.

I was a member of the select committee that voted for a provision of this type because when members of the committee had discussions in Queensland with the Criminal Justice Commission, we were advised that, when local government elections arose, it was part of the "sport" that candidates made a report about opposing candidates, regardless of how frivolous, and told the local newspaper that Joe Bloggs was being investigated by the Criminal Justice Commission. It was a total abuse of the system. It was necessary to tighten up on that and as a result that amendment was recommended by the select committee.

Mr Court: You would never do that, would you?

Mr KOBELKE: No. I am coming to the Government. That very thing seems to have happened in the past week. The point I am making is that there is a very good reason that we should not be able to publish the fact that someone has been reported to the Anti-Corruption Commission. Some people have come to my office with complaints that they wanted to take to the Anti-Corruption Commission. Someone rang me about two weeks ago and said that he had been to the Anti-Corruption Commission and intended going to the Press about the matter. I advised him that he could be acting illegally and he should not speak to the Press or anyone, perhaps not even me, on a report he had made to the Anti-Corruption Commission. That is not well known in the community. One does not expect ordinary members of the public to be aware of this provision in the Act.

In many of those cases people may have the best of intentions. They may not wish to blacken the name of someone they have reported; they may simply believe that the facts should be revealed.

Mr Court: I can remember a few people doing that just before the last election.

Mr KOBELKE: Is it not strange that it should happen again just before this election. What was in the Press last week? An article appeared in *The West Australian* about pressure on the Government over allegations of corruption surrounding state grants to businesses. It was associated with the Deputy Premier. I am not making accusations against him because the Press may simply have associated his name with it. I read in the Press that the corruption allegations regarding government grants to business had been referred to the Anti-Corruption Commission. Was that not correct?

Mr Court: You are telling the story.

Mr KOBELKE: The Premier looks good, but there is no substance to him. He will not take up an issue when he knows the wood is on him.

Mr Court: I said it was good enough for your members to make outrageous allegations before the last election.

Mr KOBELKE: What about the allegations in the Press last week that the Deputy Premier's department had been referred to the Anti-Corruption Commission?

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Allegations were made of corruption relating to the Department of Commerce and Trade. To the best of my knowledge there was never any allegation of corruption relating to the Deputy Premier. I hope the member is not impugning the reputation of the Deputy Premier. He is a very honourable person. If he does not withdraw his remarks, I want him to make that clear.

Mr THOMAS: The member for Nollamara did not say anything which directly cast aspersions on the Deputy Premier. It is inappropriate for the Leader of the House to rise during someone else's speech on what he purports to be a point of order in some pious hope that the member for Nollamara may direct his speech elsewhere. Irrespective

of what the Leader of the House likes, points of order can be taken only if there has been a breach of standing orders. Quite clearly there has not been as his purported point of order concedes.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Warnock): I did not hear the member on his feet impugning the reputation of a member. There was some discussion about allegations of corruption having surfaced or been reported in the media. I heard no impugning of the reputation of a member of this House. Therefore, I do not believe there is a point of order. Nonetheless, the member should be aware that that is something we do not want him to do.

Debate Resumed

Mr KOBELKE: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. The Leader of the House was perhaps not listening carefully to what I said because he sat in his seat only part of the way through my remarks. I indicated that I had no evidence that the Deputy Premier had made that report and that the Press simply may have associated his name with it. The fact remains that a report was published to the effect that this matter had been referred to the Anti-Corruption Commission. That was done in order to take the heat off the Court Government. Whoever it was, we might not be blamed for believing it was someone within the Government, such as a press secretary or whoever, trying to take off the heat about the need for a proper inquiry into allegations of corruption by saying that the matter had been referred to the Anti-Corruption Commission. I concede that the purpose of the article was in no way to blacken the name of or abuse an individual, but simply to use the Anti-Corruption Commission as a way of taking the heat off the Government.

I suggest that the Premier have his legal advisers examine whether section 54 has been breached in making such a statement to the Press. It may be that it was simply a minor oversight and can be redeemed by an apology. That would educate the wider community that making reports to the Anti-Corruption Commission and then publicising the effect for whatever intention is prohibited. I am not suggesting that in this case the Government's intention was to attack an individual. It was clearly to take the heat off the Government because corruption was an issue and the Premier was not sure how to handle it. The idea would have been to pass over the matter to the Anti-Corruption Commission and tell the public about it, so that would kill the issue until the election was out of the way. That is another example of the cynical use the Premier has made of the Anti-Corruption Commission. There has been no sign of dedication to making it happen.

One of the members of the other place who has been nominated to be on this standing committee is Hon Sam Piantadosi. When I was driving through the electorate of Yokine, I noticed that he had signs up advertising his candidature for election to the lower House. If the Premier were to call the election tomorrow, Hon Sam Piantadosi would have to resign in the next week; therefore, he could not be a member of this committee. That is an indication of the Premier's total cynicism. He is asking us to establish a committee of the Parliament which will not exist in a couple of days if Parliament is prorogued. Further, he has allowed the upper House to nominate a member, who by all indications and public statements, will not be a member of Parliament one week after he announces the election. It is obvious that the Government controls the numbers in the other place. When he wanted to get the anti-Mabo legislation through, he had no trouble applying the guillotine; he should not play his rough games implying that it is a separate House which he does not control. When he wants, he and his Crichton-Browne faction have the numbers there. The nominated member, Hon Sam Piantadosi, will have to resign from the other place in order to contest a lower House seat. That is another example of sheer hypocrisy.

Mr Thomas: A well thought through proposition!

Mr KOBELKE: The member for Cockburn makes it clear that this Government has not thought through a single one of its moves in relation to the Official Corruption Commission.

Time and again this Government has been found wanting in relation to tackling corruption. This Government's usual approach is to look for a publicity stunt. It focuses on how it can preserve its appearance. Forget the substance: This Government has no substance. How does it dress up its appearance to look as though it is doing something about corruption? Time and again it moves some minor motion or introduces a Bill without reading it or thinking through its consequences. As the member for Cockburn has correctly pointed out, we have seen that again today. The appointment of Hon Sam Piantadosi shows that no account has been taken of the functioning of this committee and how it can assist in improving the operations of the Anti-Corruption Commission. A member has been appointed who will not be able to fulfill that role if he holds to his intention of resigning from the other place to contest the lower House seat of Yokine.

The members of this committee will have a considerable responsibility placed upon them. The committee will not have the ability to look into operational matters. However, the extension in this council minute indicates that it will be able to look into matters of serious improper conduct as well as criminal involvement in relation to the working of the Anti-Corruption Commission. That places a very considerable burden on the committee members. If they have

any direct matters of interest relating to the commission, that could be seen to taint the processes of a body designed to make the Anti-Corruption Commission accountable. The Queensland parliamentary committee overseeing the Criminal Justice Commission has the power to look into operational matters. That places an incredible burden on its members. Hand in hand with that responsibility go very heavy penalties if any member discloses any matters that might be seen as operational within the ambit of the CJC, which is that State's equivalent to our Anti-Corruption Commission in a very vague form. The members of this committee carry a great responsibility. One hopes that at some time in the future - it will certainly not happen under this Government - the committee will become a functioning unit that can assist the commission and report to the Parliament on improvements that should be implemented to ensure the functioning of the corruption fighting agency in this State, regardless of how strong or weak that body might be.

Question put and passed; the Council's resolution agreed to, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 25 September.

MRS ROBERTS (Glendalough) [12.42 pm]: In its four years in office, the Court Government has failed the people of Western Australia in relation to road safety. Two key issues point to this, the first of which is this year's road fatality record. It is not a record of which any Government could be proud. Road fatalities are up by more than 30 on the same time last year; we are looking at one of our worst years on record. The Police Commissioner stated yesterday that the current fatality figure is 219. In fact, he told a gathering yesterday morning that when he wrote his speech at 7.00 am the figure was 217 and by the time he gave it the figure had risen to 219. In addition, we have had more than 330 serious motor vehicle accidents. This very poor record is highlighted by the fact that in 1992, by the Government's own admission, Western Australia had the best record on road safety of any State in Australia. Yet, in four years, this Government has taken this State back to the ruck; we are ranked fourth.

The Minister had the audacity to say that road safety is to be given the highest priority. He is simply not credible on that issue. Over its four years in office, this Government certainly has not given it the highest priority. A further indication of that lack of commitment is the fact that we are now dealing with this Bill on what is probably the last sitting day before the election.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You have said that about every piece of legislation we have dealt with in the past few weeks. Sooner or later we must deal with all the legislation.

Mrs ROBERTS: The Leader of the House may be a little vexed about this.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, I am not; you are just repetitive.

Mrs ROBERTS: That is not a fair criticism of me because I do not think I have said it about anything in the past few weeks.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am talking about the Opposition.

Mrs ROBERTS: If the Leader of the House wants to reflect on anyone, he should direct his comments to that person and not to me.

The Office of Road Safety, the Police Service and others involved have been waiting for the passage of this Bill for months. In fact, it was introduced in the Legislative Council months ago.

Mr Catania: Two and a half years ago the Select Committee on Road Safety recommended these changes. Now, 30 seconds before the next election, we get the changes.

Mr Omodei: Stop talking nonsense!

Mrs ROBERTS: The member for Balcatta is correct: This was recommended by the committee on which he was serving two and a half years ago. That committee has produced a number of important reports. It is not sufficient for the Minister for Local Government to interrupt and ask what the Labor Government did in 10 years. I have already pointed out that after 10 years of Labor Government Western Australia had the best record in road safety of any State in Australia. That was something of which we could be proud; we certainly cannot be proud of the statistics four years later.

It is clear that the Government has not given this matter a high priority. I know it annoys the Leader of the House my pointing out that the Government has introduced this measure in the last minutes of this Parliament. It hurts him because it is true; it is two and a half years late. At the very least, it should have been introduced at the beginning

of this year, when it was ready. It has been left to languish on the Notice Paper and will now be dealt with in the dying days of this Government. That is no commitment to road safety.

Part IIA of the Bill outlines the functions of the Road Safety Council. It will be required to identify measures to improve safety on the roads of the State, to reduce deaths, injuries and damage to property resulting from incidents occurring on the roads, to recommend to relevant bodies the action that should be taken, and so on. It appears that, at the end of four years, this is another admission that the Government has failed the people of the State in relation to road safety. It is at long last setting up the Road Safety Council to establish what should be done. The Select Committee on Road Safety produced a number of excellent recommendations that could have been adopted immediately. The Government has failed; those measures could have been adopted some time ago.

It is also interesting to note that one of the functions of the Road Safety Council is to evaluate and monitor safety on our roads. Perhaps the Minister can provide the details of the council's budget to undertake the duties described in the Bill, particularly the evaluation and monitoring of safety on the roads of this State. To undertake that process effectively it would need a sizeable budget and considerable autonomy. The way these clauses read, it appears that the council is not likely to have an appropriate degree of autonomy. I hope that it will not become yet another toothless tiger; that is, a committee continually making recommendations to the Minister that are kept secret from the Opposition and the public. We are not in a position to know what the Road Safety Council is recommending to the Minister and on what he is failing to take action. I signal some caution there.

In the past few months this Government has had an incredible number of bells and whistles launches in the area of transport, particularly in road safety. It must be only too conscious of how badly it has failed the people of Western Australia in the last four years. To disguise the fact, the Government has had a number of these big bells and whistles launches with show bags and giveaways.

Mr Lewis: You obviously never got a show bag.

Mrs ROBERTS: That is the kind of pathetic comment I have come to expect from the Minister. Just so that he knows, I got two.

Mr Cowan: You wanted another one, did you? Don't be so greedy!

Mrs ROBERTS: These show bags are full of all kinds of glossy pictures and so forth. Only a couple of months ago the Road Safety Council was launched. One would have thought that the Government would have had this in place, yet it did not. It then launched the Road Aware rig. It had another big launch at one of the truck stops with TruckSafe. Only yesterday morning it had another launch at Scitech, which had many of the same features as the Road Aware rig. These all had show bags and giveaways. They included key rings from the Minister for Transport and all kinds of glitzy things. We were told at all the launches that education is vital. We do not disagree with that. Each of the initiatives is good. The Road Aware rig, the TruckSafe campaign and no doubt the display at Scitech will be very popular and serve a useful purpose. In themselves those kinds of things are not sufficient to improve road safety in our State. They are important measures as part of a very long-term campaign, including particularly educating children and young people of the dangers and hazards on the roads.

However, at each one of these launches the emphasis has been put back onto the people and their driving habits. At first glance one might say that is reasonable, because when we look at the reasons for the crashes, the biggest, by a long way, is driver error. That is followed by problems with the roads and with vehicles. Both those categories are quite insignificant in comparison to driver error. It is simplistic though to say that the biggest contributing factor is driver error and therefore we will educate people to be better drivers and so have fewer crashes. Instead of looking at the drivers and their errors, the Government should look at itself to work out what it should be doing to improve conditions for drivers on our roads. The key factors which can lead to driver error include speed, alcohol, drugs and fatigue. I find it hypocritical of the Government to have its Minister for Transport continually lecturing people on road safety, when he boasts of losing his licence a number of times.

Mr Lewis: Don't get personal.

Mr Catania: He wants open speed limits on our roads.

Mrs ROBERTS: It is a matter of credibility.

Mr Lewis: You are belittling yourself by getting personal.

Mrs ROBERTS: It is a matter of "do as I say, not what I do". Every one of us sometimes breaks the road laws, but that is not the point. To lose a licence a number of times would certainly seem to indicate that somebody is not following the road rules on a regular basis. Many people slip up from time to time. That is not the problem; the problem is when people lose their licences a number of times over.

Mr Cowan: Have you ever lost your licence?

Mrs ROBERTS: I have never lost my licence.

Mr Shave: You probably never qualified for one.

Mrs ROBERTS: That is a bit nasty from the member for Melville.

Mr Cowan: You are better able to judge that than anyone else.

Mrs ROBERTS: It is hypocritical when a Government has a Minister with no credibility in this area fronting all these campaigns and lecturing adults and school children about being safe on the roads.

When we look at the key factors of speed, alcohol, drugs and fatigue, we must also look at the choices we are providing to drivers. As I have said, it is not sufficient to blame the drivers. People may be influenced by alcohol or drugs, or they may be very fatigued, because they have had a late night or because of their working conditions. They face a choice about how they can get home. We find that the choice is quite limited. Unless someone has made a prior arrangement for a lift, he has to look at staying where he is or catching a bus, train or taxi. As a result of the way this Government has operated our public transport system, public transport options are not practical in many circumstances. The Government has not extended the times when one can catch buses and trains. If someone wishes to go to any of the middle or outer suburbs after midnight, his only choice is to drive a car or catch a cab.

Mr Cowan: That is absolute nonsense. Consider the facts.

Mrs ROBERTS: It would be nice if everybody could afford to catch a cab. If someone wants to go to somewhere in the suburbs some distance away, not everybody can determine, "I have had a little too much to drink. I will catch a cab." They simply cannot afford it. The Government should be looking at providing good public transport options, so that people have realistic choices.

Mr Cowan: You really do talk nonsense at times. Are you suggesting that someone can afford a car and not a cab?

Mrs ROBERTS: That is right.

Mr Cowan: That is nonsense.

Mrs ROBERTS: That is what happens in practice. The Deputy Premier is quite out of touch with people who live in these outer suburbs.

Mr Cowan: I am not.

Mrs ROBERTS: To catch a cab to some of their homes costs them in the order of \$30.

Mr Cowan: Do you know how much it costs to run a car each week?

Mrs ROBERTS: A significant amount of money.

Mr Cowan: Yes, indeed it does. So the proportion of money that someone would spend on a taxi cab on those few occasions to which you are referring would be negligible, and you know it.

Mrs ROBERTS: So the Deputy Premier does not believe that we should be providing public transport options to people because, in his view, if they can afford cars they can also catch cabs, and he just washes his hands of them. That is not good enough.

Mr Cowan: That is not what I said and you know it.

Mrs ROBERTS: It sounded very much like it to me.

Mr Cowan: You are a past master at trying to put words into other people's mouths. You need to pay a little more attention to it. It gives you a great lack of credibility.

Mrs ROBERTS: Perhaps the Deputy Premier needs to look at the *Hansard* record to see exactly what he has said on the matter. That is the way I interpret it. He is saying that if people can afford cars, they can afford cabs.

Mr Cowan: If they need a cab, the answer is yes.

Mrs ROBERTS: The Government must provide more choice so that people can choose to travel home by public transport at hours when it is not profitable to run a public transport system. The other thing the Government has done over the last couple of years, in order to restrict those choices and make people concerned about the choices they can make instead of driving their cars home if they are fatigued or affected by drugs or alcohol, is to destroy the faith in

our taxi industry. The Government has made a complete botch of it. It took photographs out of the cabs and now it is putting them back. It relaxed the laws towards deregulation and now it has turned around and is insisting on uniforms and so forth. Only this week I understand there has been a determination to look at the tenders received for video surveillance. It would be interesting to hear what the Deputy Premier could tell me about that and whether it is a fact that the Government has abandoned the tendering process for video cameras in taxis. That is what we have been waiting for all year. Has his Minister abandoned that process?

Mr Cowan: I have not been advised on that.

Mrs ROBERTS: Perhaps the Minister could find out and advise us in his response on the Bill.

[Leave granted for speech to be continued at a later stage of the sitting.]

Debate thus adjourned.

[Continued on page 8304.]

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm

[Questions without notice taken.]

MATTER OF PUBLIC INTEREST - ELECTION CAMPAIGN, GOVERNMENT CONDUCT; USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS

THE SPEAKER (Mr Clarko): Today I received within the prescribed time a letter from the Leader of the Opposition in the following terms -

Pursuant to Standing Order 82A I propose that the following matter of public interest be submitted to the House for discussion today -

That this House calls on the Government to conduct itself during the pre-election and election periods in accordance with the principles of democracy, integrity and the proper use of taxpayer funds and in particular to cease -

- (a) the blatant and corrupt use of taxpayers' money for party political advertising; and
- (b) making expensive unfunded promises which will never be honoured.

If at least five members stand in support of the matter I will allow it.

[At least five members rose in their places.]

The SPEAKER: The matter shall proceed on the usual basis with half an hour being given to members on my left, half an hour to members on my right and five minutes in total to Independent members should they seek the call.

DR GALLOP (Victoria Park - Leader of the Opposition) [2.35 pm]: I move the motion.

We are about to enter a campaign for an election that will be held either before Christmas or just after Christmas which will be the first campaign since the Commission on Government reported to the Parliament on the ways and means by which our political system should be improved. It reported not only on the system but also on the way in which politicians should conduct themselves. It is important to note that the five reports of the Commission on Government were written on the basis of two developments. The first was the original Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters report, the spirit of which it has incorporated in its views on these matters. Secondly, it consulted widely with the Western Australian community on what should be done to improve our parliamentary system.

On the basis of those two sources it developed a very comprehensive report. It said that politics in Western Australia should be placed on a new foundation. It was referring in the first place to a new constitutional foundation so that improvements can be made in the way elections are conducted, the Parliament is elected, Parliament operates, the two Houses are distinguished from each other, the Parliament acts in relation to the Executive, and the constraints placed on the Executive.

The major issue that comes through in the report very clearly is the need to understand and recognise the position of the Executive in our structure of government. First and foremost, the Executive is responsible to the Parliament and it is the role of the Parliament to hold the Executive accountable. However, there is another element in what the commission said. The executive arm of government should conduct itself according to new understandings and new principles. It has been a tradition in Western Australian politics for the executive arm of government to attempt to rule unhindered and to use all its powers to guarantee that, whichever party is in government at any time, it is

re-elected to that position. That means using its powers to prevent information from getting into the public domain, using the public purse to promote the activities of government and using the expenditure from the consolidated fund to maximise its political benefits towards the end of its term of government.

As hard as it may seem for any Executive, the royal commission and the Commission on Government said we need a new framework within which the Executive will operate. It was partly a question of providing new rules and partly a question of encouraging a new culture. In that respect the Government has failed miserably the challenge given to it.

Mr Trenorden: That is your point of view.

Dr GALLOP: The only point of view I can have is mine!

The first issue relates to the rules of the game. It is the Opposition's very strong view that the coalition Government has not kept its election promise to be open and accountable and to carry out the reforms recommended by the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters. Its response to the royal commission's recommendation to set up a Commission on Government was very tardy and that body was established only at the end of the day. By the time it brought down its report it was very convenient for the Government to say that it would deal with it after the election. It completely ignored the fundamental reform of the electoral system and the different electoral basis for the two Houses of Parliament despite COG's recommendation that it should be implemented as a matter of high priority. The Government has put off consideration of that until after the election.

This Government puts off a lot of things. It puts off dealing with recommendations by saying it will consider them after the next election and if the issues are particularly tough, it puts them off for 20 or 30 years and expects the people of the State to believe it will honour its promises.

This Government has not proclaimed the electoral finance legislation and it has indicated that the section dealing with government advertising will not be proclaimed. It is interesting to note the following comments by Hon Peter Foss in the debate on the Electoral Amendment (Political Finance) Bill, which I introduced into this Chamber, in 1992 -

We are dealing with political financing because we hope to improve the purity of the political process.

Further on he said -

Surely, an ethical Government would not be spending money trying to be re-elected; it would not be holding campaign meetings and buttering up constituents at the cost of the people of Western Australia.

That is the issue of the rules of the game. The rules have not been changed in the four years of coalition Government.

I turn now to the culture and practices of the coalition Government and the way it conducts itself in government. It is a true indication of what it believes to be the role of the executive arm in the Westminster system of government. Since this Government was elected millions of dollars have been spent on dubious self-promotion, government travel and consultants. I remind the House of the extent of the largesse that this Government has given itself. It amounts to nearly \$400m - \$13m on publications; \$100m on government travel; \$191m on consultants; \$4.2m on opinion polling; and \$89m on advertising.

We have seen some very crude examples of this Government's approach to its executive power. An amount of \$110 600 was spent on the glossy Mabo brochure which did not explain anything to the people of Western Australia; it simply outlined this Government's political position. An amount of \$43 500 was spent this year on promoting this Government's Budget and \$500 000 was spent on promoting its highly contentious industrial relations legislation.

The Premier should understand the public's anger when they see figures like this and their names are on waiting lists for elective surgery. In some instances, their loved ones are waiting for care in the State's mental health system. Many people in the schools are finding that the standard of cleaning has significantly declined since the change in policy. The Government has been engaged in a continual campaign of self-promotion since it was elected. It goes right against the spirit of both the royal commission and COG.

The electoral finance legislation which passed through this Parliament recently made it clear that government advertising which dealt with general promotion rather than specific information - for example, bus timetables - should be ruled out six months before an election. The legislation was originally passed by the Legislative Council in 1992 and accepted by the Legislative Assembly in the same year, but it was not proclaimed throughout the course of this Government. When the electoral finance legislation came back to this Parliament a few months ago and was passed, the Government made it clear that that section would not be proclaimed. In other words, the laws of this land are being flouted by the Executive through its failure to proclaim that part of the legislation. They are flouted by the Executive in its day to day practice. Let us look at the examples: The extravagant wraparound featuring the pre-

election policy on the Gngangara pine plantation; the state planning strategy showbag - how can the Government justify a showbag being given to the citizens of this State to explain its state planning strategy on grounds other than political self-promotion; and a \$150 000 strata titles advertising campaign which constantly features the Minister for Labour Relations and tells the public nothing about the decisions made by this Government. There have been full page advertisements on minimum wages as well as the full page advertisements featuring coalition pre-election promises. We saw it on the education and salinity commitments. It is an insult to ordinary people and small businesses which have been struggling over the past 12 months in the so-called resources boom. The Government has not shown the degree of self-restraint which should be shown, given the conclusions of the royal commission and COG.

Western Australia is left with government by way of public relations. The Government of Western Australia has become a public relations machine. Western Australia is no longer being governed and there is no longer any substance in the decision making process. It has been driven and fed by public relations and marketing ideas and there has been no concern for detail. A strong emphasis has been placed on propaganda. There is a massive abuse of taxpayers' money and a manipulation of surveys to suit the Government's political leanings. Glitz has replaced substance. It is an indictment on the Government and an insult to the people of Western Australia. It goes further than that: What we need in the election campaign is a very clear statement from the Government and the Opposition on their priorities for the next four years of government. They must outline how they will fund those priorities and the amount of money which will be spent on the particular programs so that the people of the State will have a clear view of how they should vote.

The Opposition has made a commitment that it will be financially responsible and will address the issues which the people of this State want addressed. I remind the Premier what those issues are: Health, education, job security, public transport, community safety, environmental amenity both in the metropolitan and the non-metropolitan areas, and the quality of this State's Public Service which, of course, is a prime responsibility for any Government.

The Australian Labor Party will go out into the communities and suburbs and talk to people about the basic issues which affect them. The Labor Party will go back to basics. It certainly objects to the campaign the Government is running and which is coming from the Premier's office and is dominated by public relations concerns, fed by taxpayers' money and pumping out propaganda. It is not in the interests of good government in this State. We find that the pre-election promises that have been put out by this Government in the phony election campaign amount to about \$4b. In just four weeks this Government has committed taxpayers to \$4b of expenditure - that is more than half of WA's entire annual Budget and comprises the salinity plan, \$3b; public transport, \$325m; Oakajee port, \$250m; early education, \$122m; Neerabup waste plan, \$50m; the freeway extension, \$25m; the Kalgoorlie-Meekatharra road, \$15m; three new primary schools, \$10m and the air quality strategy, \$3m. In some cases funding for those promises must come from the Federal Government. We have heard the Premier justify two of those promises today in question time: I assume that the road commitments are now part of the forward estimates that this Government will release.

Mr Court: Yes.

Dr GALLOP: The Premier acknowledges that those road commitments are now part of the forward estimates. However, we have not heard how the Premier will fund the major Gngangara development, the university campus at Midland and the university at Merredin. This Government is hellbent on pork barrelling at the expense of the taxpayers of Western Australia.

Mr Court: You must be giving this speech tongue in cheek.

Dr GALLOP: No, I am not. The Opposition will outdo the Government in this election campaign. The Premier is so driven by his dark-suited public relations consultants that the Opposition will outdo the Government on financial responsibility - make no mistake about it. This issue that the Premier has raised before the election campaign will backfire on him, because he is wasting taxpayers' money. The Premier's commitments which have now been commenced, indicated bad priorities in public investment decision making. I go no further than the Northbridge tunnel to indicate that. The Premier has not yet delivered on the federal aspects of his salinity promise. It is currently in the Senate of the Australian Parliament and the Premier cannot confirm that commitment can be met. Labor's commitments will come out of state revenue and they will be commitments for the next four years of Government, because that is what the people of Western Australia want to hear. The Government has made promises that are conditional on federal funding and are a public relations propaganda exercise that cannot be justified by the principles outlined by the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters. They go against the spirit of democratic government in Western Australia today.

In summary, the coalition came to Government on the back of the royal commission report, but it was never serious about carrying out the recommendations of that report. At best the coalition was lukewarm; at worst it was hostile.

That hostility and arrogance had no check in Western Australia, because this Government had the numbers in both Houses of Parliament. The Opposition, *The West Australian*, and political commentators have raised the arguments. However, the arrogant coalition Government rumbled on in its road train down the Terrace implementing its policies without constraint. In so doing it showed its disrespect for the processes that were set up by the royal commission. What is happening in the election campaign is the end result of that arrogance. It is the end result of a Government that does not understand the concept of checks and balances, of a Government that will use its power and its resources no matter what the consequences. The consequences are that government money is going into propaganda campaigns, and promises that the Government knows it cannot meet are being offered to the Western Australian people. The environmental movement will not be fooled. At the last election the member for South Perth was a very credible spokesperson on the environment. It will not work this time, because the environmental movement throughout this State has seen the colour of this Government's money, of its prejudices and priorities and they are not in the direction of a greener and cleaner Western Australia. The promises that have been made in the past two days should be treated for what they are.

I ask the Premier to tell us about the genesis of the Gnangara commitment. Did that go to Cabinet? When did the Department of Conservation and Land Management develop its propaganda campaign to back up the Government? When did CALM start getting this propaganda campaign together? It was about a week ago when the heat went on the Government's environmental record, and it was grasping for straws in trying to convince the people. That commitment is crumbling by the day because of the haste with which it has been put together and the disgraceful way in which it has been sold to the Western Australian electorate.

Along comes dieback. We see a very clear statement of the disgraceful state of affairs that our forests have fallen into under the stewardship of this Government and the potential for our forestry system to be ruined by this dieback infestation. We deserve better from the Government of Western Australia. The battlers of Western Australia, the small business people of Western Australia, the retailers, the housing industry, the agricultural industry, and the people in our suburbs deserve better. However, the problem is that the vision of this Government does not extend beyond St George's Terrace; it is framed by marketing people and designed by public relations consultants, and that is where it ends. Members opposite have no concept of ordinary people who are battling against the odds. They have no concept of what it is to have a political reform agenda and to act on the basis of that agenda. They have thumbed their noses at the royal commission, the Commission on Government, and accountability. The Government will pay the price in this election campaign.

MR McGINTY (Fremantle - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.56 pm]: The issue of the improper use of taxpayers' money to fund the reelection of the Government of the day has bedevilled Western Australia for some time. I will read a brief extract from *Hansard* from September 1992. It reads -

It is a serious problem that despite the fact we know this State is short of cash this Government is spending an awful lot of money on what are plainly political promotions . . . we do not have sufficient money for police, hospitals, education or social services in this State. We do not have sufficient money for the things we need. It is patently clear from the rash of glossy brochures which have been published recently that it is not legitimate Government expenditure; it is the Government paying for all of its advertising material, pamphlets and holding election community meetings out of the public purse.

It continues -

The essence is that the Government has a large amount of money which it can devote to advertising and which at election time it is able to abuse in order to run its political campaign instead of using the money for legitimate Government purposes to inform people what is happening. It is often hard to find where one crosses the fine line in relation to this matter. It is difficult to define where that line is, but a time must come when the Government stops doing these things because it cannot be trusted to do them properly.

That was a member of this Government immediately prior to the last state election. If ever there has been a case of duplicity, of double standards of rank hypocrisy, it is to be found in those very quotes. The Premier might have thought that was me, the Leader of the Opposition, or someone from this side of the House levelling the criticism at this Government for the pork barrelling of millions of dollars it has spent to try to get itself re-elected. The Government is stealing money from the taxpayers of this State to buy votes for the Liberal Party and the National Party. That is what the Premier has been doing, and what his party so roundly condemned four years ago in a roughly similar time frame in the lead-up to the last election.

Since then we have had the advantage of the royal commission report, the Commission on Government report and, more importantly, the Liberal Party's legislation on this matter. Immediately prior to the last election in the upper House, the Liberal Party, in opposition, moved an amendment to the legislation, designed to require political disclosure. That amendment prohibited any government from doing what this Government is now doing. The current

Attorney General moved an amendment that prohibited non-essential, non-emergency advertising in the last six months of a term of government.

If the Premier believed in what the then Opposition was doing on that occasion, he should have stopped the glossy, no information, feel good, the Government is wonderful sorts of promotions we have seen in community newspapers at a cost of \$75 000 this week. The Premier should have stopped the \$400 000 promotion of the great plan for salinity the Government has for the future, if it gets re-elected. He should have stopped the Minister for Labour Relations in his absolutely partisan, self-promotions which include his photograph, his beating of the drum about the mess he created about strata titles legislation, saying how he had moved to fix the problem and how he would solve it for everyone. If the Premier were not such a hypocrite, he would have stopped those promotions. This provision is written into the law as a result of the Liberal Party's initiatives four years ago. Like all these questions of accountability, the Premier has walked away from them. He was happy to trumpet them in the lead-up to the last election but, hypocritically, to walk away from them after the election.

As the Attorney General said when the Bill was introduced, if the Government had any semblance of decency, honour or integrity, the Premier would not have to use taxpayers' money to get re-elected. The Premier is a hypocrite. I will tell members exactly where he stands on this issue: He will not push for the proclamation of the legislation covering political disclosure. Will the Premier have that legislation proclaimed before this election? He will not, because he wants to use the public purse to fund the Government's re-election campaign. We all know the Liberal Party is in receipt of political donations for this campaign. We on this side of the House expect to be outspent 20:1 in the coming election campaign. In that context, it is a scandal for the Premier to be putting his hand into the taxpayers' till, taking the money quite improperly and using it for the Government's self-promotion. The Liberal Party and the National Party should be sent the bill for the party political self-promotion in which they have been engaging in recent times. It is an absolute disgrace.

I will now turn to some of the amazing pledges that came from the Premier. We all know the promise to abolish payroll tax in this State by the next term of Government, worth \$650m, is outstanding from the last election. I ask the Premier this: If the Government is re-elected, will that promise be honoured?

Mr Court: I will give you that answer when I get up in a couple of minutes.

Mr McGINTY: The Premier never does. He has said that payroll tax will not exist in Western Australia by the end of the coalition's second term in government. That is worth \$650m. It was not that amount when it was first promised, but the Premier's reliance on payroll tax has grown because over time he has done nothing about reducing its incidence. Increases in the threshold do not result in an abolition of that tax, which was promised in unequivocal terms prior to the last election.

I ask him to give the costings for the Gngangara proposals when he responds. It seems to me that a lot of money is being spent on promoting it. How many dollars will the Government put into the Gngangara proposal? It is uncoded. Two weeks ago in this place the Premier piously, self-righteously, unctuously, asked whether the Opposition would reveal the details of its costings. Yet the Premier has spent more money on promotions than he is prepared to reveal. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I do not think this matter ever went to the Cabinet. It was too hurriedly concocted. The head of the department, in trying to ingratiate himself with the Government, personally placed these advertisements in the community newspapers in the lead-up to the election. If this is not blatant party political promotion, if this community notification is essential, why could these promotions not have taken place after the next election or at a reasonable time before it?

People are sick and tired of being bombarded with glossy brochures that have no substance. I ask the Premier this: How much money will be spent on the Gngangara proposal? He owes the public an answer. He has failed to give it so far. How much money will be spent on the great university at Merredin - pork-barrelling at its worst? The Premier has refused to cost it. How much money will be committed to the Midland university and to the Subiaco redevelopment proposal? Those questions need to be answered.

MR PENDAL (South Perth) [3.05 pm]: I am aware that Independents have five minutes in which to speak, should they wish to exercise that option. At the end of that brief period I intend to trigger the provisions of Standing Order No 174 that states -

The House may order a complicated question to be divided.

I indicate that because, firstly, I think paragraph (a) of the motion is a valid signal to the Government that it must be prudent between now and election day in its use of taxpayers' funds. I will return to that matter in a moment. Secondly, I forewarn the House that I am not prepared to support the Opposition in paragraph (b) of the motion for reasons I will explain if I get the chance. As has been mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, paragraph (a) was the subject of a Bill introduced into the other House just on five years ago. I happened to be the person who

introduced the Bill on behalf of the then Opposition. Essentially the Bill said that Governments of the day should not abuse their position by using taxpayers' funds to advertise their achievements, less than six months leading up to a State election.

I have not changed my mind about that. I remind members on this side of the House that every coalition member at the time supported the introduction of that Bill. When I trigger Standing Order No 174, if the House does not agree to treat the two subparagraphs separately - I suggest they are complicated in the sense they deal with two discrete, distinct and separate issues - I intend to absent myself from the vote on the motion in the form presented by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Therefore, in accordance with my remarks, I move -

That the question before the House be divided into two parts for the purpose of the vote.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (22)

Ms Anwyl
Mr M. Barnett
Mr Brown
Mr Catania
Dr Constable
Mr Cunningham
Dr Edwards
Dr Gallop

Mr Grill
Mrs Hallahan
Mrs Henderson
Mr Kobelke
Mr Leahy
Mr Marlborough
Mr McGinty
Mr Pandal

Mr Riebeling
Mr Ripper
Mrs Roberts
Mr D.L. Smith
Dr Watson
Ms Warnock (*Teller*)

Noes (28)

Mr Ainsworth
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr Board
Mr Bradshaw
Mr Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Day
Mrs Edwardes
Dr Hames
Mr House

Mr Johnson
Mr Kierath
Mr Lewis
Mr Marshall
Mr McNee
Mr Minson
Mr Nicholls
Mr Omodei
Mr Osborne
Mrs Parker

Mr Shave
Mr W. Smith
Mr Strickland
Mr Trenorden
Mr Tubby
Dr Turnbull
Mrs van de Klashorst
Mr Bloffwitch (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr Thomas
Mr Graham
Mr Bridge

Mr Wiese
Mr Blaikie
Mr Prince

Question thus negatived.

Debate (on Motion) Resumed

MR COURT (Nedlands - Premier) [3.13 pm]: I listened with some interest to the comments of both the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition did his usual over-the-top trick when referring to funding for the next election campaign. He said that it was well known that money is rolling in for the coalition parties, which will be outspending the Labor Party by 20:1. What absolute nonsense! The member knows that with disclosure legislation, he will be only too well aware how much money is going to both the coalition parties.

It might be a fine line for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to present for the media to say that the Opposition will be outspent by 20:1. However, it is known for a fact that the Labor Party is always well funded in election campaigns as it has many sources of funds not available to the coalition parties.

Firstly, it is quite proper that government advertising, apart from essential advertising, stop during an election campaign. The Government at any time always has a sizable advertising budget. I agree that advertising should stop during an election campaign, and that will certainly be the convention under which this Government will operate. However, members opposite must have tongue in cheek when they talk about advertising for blatantly political purposes, as they developed that into an absolute art form during their years in government.

We have used advertising to deliver messages to the community. It would be a waste of time launching a salinity strategy without telling the land owners about it, the problems involved and how they will be addressed. Members opposite must be in cloud cuckoo land if they think that a strategy can be launched without providing information to the community. People want information about the state Budget regarding revenue, expenditure and major programs. It is appropriate that such information be made public.

The second part of this motion talks about making "expensive unfunded promises which will never be honoured". What an absolute sham coming from the Opposition!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will come to order.

Mr COURT: We are please that the Leader of the Opposition has raised this issue of funding election promises, as this election campaign will be the first in the State's history in which the Government of the day has the books open. The State will be given a current financial picture of the revenue and expenditure changes since the Budget was brought down. It will be the first time that the Government has put out the forward estimates so that those programs -

Dr Gallop: We have got those!

Mr COURT: No. I refer to forward estimates, including the election commitments. The Leader of the Opposition said he would outline to the public how he will fund his election promises. Will he tell us how he will do that?

Dr Gallop: Of course. I will tell you when it is appropriate to do so. I do not answer to the Premier; I answer to the public of Western Australia.

Mr COURT: For the past couple of weeks the Leader of the Opposition has refused to say that he will provide that information. Again, he is stating that he is not prepared -

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McGinty interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I formally call to order the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. If he interjects again, I will call him to order again. Anyone with any capacity to assess debate during the past half-hour would know that two speeches were given by opposition members which received only one or two interjections. No more interjections than that should be directed on government members when dealings with the motion framed by the Opposition. They should be given an equal opportunity, no more, to have their say.

Mr COURT: If the Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to tell the public -

Mr McGinty: Tell the truth. You cannot lie straight in bed and you know it!

Mr COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is consistent.

Mr McGinty: You're lying, Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! I formally call to order the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the second time.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr OMODEI: I distinctly heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition call the Premier a liar.

Mr McGinty: I said he was lying.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition called the Premier a liar, or words to that effect, I ask him to withdraw.

Mr McGINTY: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Mr COURT: The Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to tell the public how the Opposition will fund its election promises.

Mr McGinty: Yes he is. He said the exact opposite. Get the wax out of your ears.

Mr COURT: I just asked him how will he make that information available.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wishes to continue to interject when I call order, he will have to suffer the consequences. I do not wish to do that, but he is taking over the whole debate. He is speaking as much as the member on his feet. That is totally out of order.

Mr COURT: Now that the Government has a system whereby the Budget comes down and the forward estimates are put out for the three years -

Dr Gallop: Will you tell us what is in them? Of course you will not.

Mr COURT: This week, the Leader of the Opposition was briefed by Treasury with regard to the State's financial position -

Dr Gallop: No detail, just generalities.

Mr COURT: He was told what the revenue and expenditure projections were -

Dr Gallop: I want to know what you will spend your money on, and the people want to know that too.

Mr COURT: The people will be told. This is the difficulty that the Leader of the Opposition faces.

Dr Gallop: This will be the trick!

Mr COURT: This is not the trick. All the election promises that are made will be funded. If the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to go down that path, it will be a great day for this State, but we should not hold our breath, because he has already been caught out. We released a salinity strategy and we outlined how we would fund it. It is all in the forward estimates.

Dr Gallop: Is Gngangara in the forward estimates?

Mr COURT: Yes. If the Leader of the Opposition had read the publications that he seems to want to criticise, he would see that part of the funding proposal is that CALM will make a contribution to the salinity program, and the moneys will come from a number of sources, including sale of the timber from Gngangara. It is estimated that some additional funds may be available as a result of CALM's selling some of its other timber stocks. It is all set out how it will be funded. Members opposite cannot accept the fact that we actually spell out how we will fund these proposals.

Dr Gallop: Was Gngangara a Cabinet decision? Yes or no?

Mr COURT: The salinity strategy includes Gngangara.

Mr McGinty: Further fabrication!

Mr COURT: I do not know what has gotten into members opposite today. Yes, they were approved by Cabinet. Members opposite cannot comprehend that we have spelt out how the program will be funded.

Dr Gallop: Just like the payroll tax commitment that was spelt out prior to the last election!

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, cease interjecting.

Mr COURT: Members opposite have asked me about the salinity package, and we have outlined in detail how it will be funded.

Dr Gallop: How you would like it to be funded. There is a big difference.

Mr COURT: No; how the state component will be funded.

Dr Gallop: I see. Why do you call it a \$3b plan if you do not yet have the federal and the private money?

Mr COURT: The Leader of the Opposition is unbelievable!

Dr Gallop: You are the unbelievable one.

Mr COURT: We had to spell out how we will fund the state contribution, and we have done that. We had to spell out how we will fund the infill sewerage program, and we have done that. We live in a different environment these days. We take a responsible approach to these things. How will the Opposition fund all those railway lines?

Dr Gallop: We will tell you.

Mr Omodei: Borrow some money!

Mr COURT: Borrow, borrow, borrow. That is the name of the game.

Dr Gallop: How will you fund Oakajee?

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition.

Dr Gallop: Mr Speaker, this is an interchange between the Premier and me. He is inviting interjections.

The SPEAKER: Order! What the Leader of the Opposition has said is quite incorrect, because he will notice that when he is the only one interjecting, he gets a considerable amount of latitude. What is not acceptable and tolerable by anybody in this place is three or four members doing the same thing. I accept the point, if the Leader of the Opposition is making a point, that the Premier is from time to time asking him a question, and I allow that, but I cannot allow the person who is replying to go on forever. There is too much interjecting, and I suspect the Leader of the Opposition knows that.

Mr COURT: The financial figures that we will make available will be the reference point, because that will explain where the State's finances are currently. Members opposite can say they will spend money all over the place, but they will have to spell out how it will be done.

Dr Gallop: So will you.

Mr COURT: That is exactly right, my friend.

Dr Gallop: I bet you will, as you did with the payroll tax commitment at the last election.

Mr COURT: Let us talk about that. The Leader of the Opposition asked me about it some months ago and I said quite openly that that would be a very difficult commitment to meet without changes -

Dr Gallop: That is not what you said before the last election.

Mr COURT: - to the commonwealth-state financial arrangements.

Dr Gallop: So is the salinity package.

Mr COURT: No. The salinity contribution is clearly funded. Does the Leader of the Opposition not agree with the funding that we have put out for it?

Dr Gallop: I am talking about the federal component. If you think stingy John Howard will give you money, you have another think coming. The sooner we get rid of him, the better.

Mr COURT: The leader of opposition business said today -

If the Commonwealth money's not there, these promises aren't going to be realised, and that's what the Opposition is warning Western Australians about. Richard Court has got hold of John Howard's cheque book, but the cheques aren't signed and there's no money in the account for Western Australia.

Dr Gallop: That is an excellent line!

Mr COURT: He also talked about the funding to extend the Mitchell Freeway.

Mr Ripper: Have a look at the salinity program. You have not settled the federal funding, yet you describe it as a \$3b program.

Mr COURT: He said we do not have the funding for the plan to extend the Mitchell Freeway, expected to be released today. We do have the funding. We would not make the announcement if we did not have the funding. The difficulty is that members opposite cannot accept the fact that we have made a commitment and funding is in place for it. They cannot accept that we have announced a comprehensive salinity strategy and we have all the funding in place for the state component of it.

Mr Ripper: But not the federal component. That is my point.

Mr Brown: There is a \$3b commitment. We have got 10 bob and are putting that in, and we will give you a commitment about the rest some time later! The cheque is in the mail, but it is not signed! Do not worry; I am an honest broker!

The SPEAKER: Order! I formally call to order the member for Morley for the first time.

Mr COURT: It is music to my ears to hear that mob opposite giggle away.

Dr Gallop: You are under pressure, Premier. You are starting to wilt.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition.

Mr COURT: We have committed \$58m, and if there is \$30m from the feds on top of it, that will increase to \$88m, but all members opposite can do is sit there and giggle! This morning, the member for Belmont said, "Court said he would extend the Mitchell Freeway, but he does not have the money." We do have the money now. What does he say about that?

Mr Ripper: Let us check it out, because you misled us on the salinity program.

Mr COURT: In what way?

Mr Ripper: You described it as a \$3b program, but you are putting in only a small amount of state money and you do not have the commitment from the Federal Government for the money that you require.

Mr COURT: Small amount? I suggest the member for Belmont read the material. We have gone from a situation -

Mr Ripper: When did you get the commitment from the Federal Government?

Dr Gallop: Is it written?

Mr COURT: Early this week.

Dr Gallop: Exactly!

Mr COURT: Does it matter?

Mr Brown: The Premier says, "John, we are in a bit of trouble. We need a bit of money", and Mr Howard says, "No worries Richard; we will send over that cheque"!

The SPEAKER: Order! I formally call to order for the second time the member for Morley.

Mr COURT: The Leader of the Opposition said we had no influence in Canberra. He said John Howard is stingy and does not give the States any money. Members opposite have made a large number of election promises, and we will watch with great interest how they will be funded. It is not possible to build railways around the State and to electrify the Bunbury railway system without sizeable sums of money. Members on this side will certainly watch the Opposition with some interest.

Dr Gallop: Will there be a philosophy department in the new university?

Mr Cowan: I am intrigued to hear about this university at Merredin.

Mr COURT: Are members opposite sure they are not confusing Merredin with Midland?

Dr Gallop: No, it is Merredin.

Mr COURT: Members opposite have talked about hypocritical behaviour, but the federal Leader of the Opposition thinks nothing of releasing newsletters to promote the Labor Party candidate. Is that an appropriate use of funds?

Dr Gallop: That is your description, I do not necessarily agree with you.

Mr COURT: The newsletter states that federal Labor leader, Kim Beazley, has welcomed the news that Mandurah mayor Keith Holmes will be a candidate in the next state election, and it continues with a big wrap-up for the Labor Party candidate. Do members opposite think that is appropriate?

Mr Marlborough: Absolutely, it is a newsletter.

Mr COURT: What are the Opposition's guidelines for using taxpayers' funds? The motion states that the Government has stopped governing. Do members opposite not regard the Government's action on the salinity program as a major initiative?

Dr Gallop: You have not done anything yet. It is a glossy announcement.

Mr McGinty: You are into a marketing phase and not a doing phase.

Mr COURT: That often happens before an election.

Mr Marlborough: Is your federal colleague doing the same thing?

Mr COURT: Members opposite are criticising the use of taxpayers' dollars but they are doing the same themselves. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot talk about double standards. The advertising is quite appropriate.

Dr Gallop: Do you think the CALM wrapround is appropriate?

Mr COURT: Of course it is appropriate to ask people for their input into the development of a park that will be one hundred times the size of Kings Park. The point I make is that when the State moves into an election campaign, it is appropriate for all advertising to stop apart from that of an informative nature.

Mr McGinty: So you will stop all those in the next few days?

Mr COURT: I said when the State moves into an election.

Dr Gallop: Our law says it is six months before an election.

Mr COURT: The second point of the motion relates to the unfunded election promises. One of the features of this next election campaign is that the public will demand that election promises be funded, and if the Opposition will not spell out how it will fund all its proposals, including the railway lines around the countryside, its credibility will be zilch. The Government is glad the Opposition has raised the issue of unfunded promises because I believe it will be critical in this campaign.

MR COWAN (Merredin - Deputy Premier) [3.35 pm]: I am intrigued about the alleged university at Merredin. I have not seen a report on that, but I must say how pleased I am. I would like to know how authentic the claim is. Unfortunately, it is probably in the same category into which many other statements of the Opposition fall; that is, speculation and myth.

On the eve of the close of the parliamentary session, it is disappointing that the Opposition cannot produce a matter of public interest that can be supported by all members of Parliament. Had they turned their minds to it - if they could find them - they would have been able to introduce a motion that members on both sides could support. Opposition members cannot help themselves. They must have a parting shot. As a consequence, the Government must make it clear that it will oppose this MPI.

Nobody in this Parliament opposes some of the principles espoused in the motion. However, the Opposition cannot help accusing the Government of doing something it is not doing. As a consequence, the Government must oppose the motion. Even our harshest critics - the Opposition is in that category but there may be others - will acknowledge that it is the responsibility of the Government to ensure people understand and to make them aware of what it is doing.

Dr Gallop: To get the proper spin on it?

Mr COWAN: I will accept that description. Very clearly, whatever Government is in office, attempts have always been, and will always be, made to indicate to the public what the Government intends to do with regard to its policy and implementation of that policy. I do not think anyone would be greatly surprised that throughout its term this Government has indicated very clearly some of the policies that it wants to implement. That has occurred not just in the past two or three weeks or two or three months.

The Government stated a position and gave a broad outline of where it wanted to go. I could quote many examples but perhaps the best, and the one for which the public is most grateful, is the Government's promise that it would retire debt. It then produced an action plan showing how it would retire and reduce debt to get rid of the legacy it inherited from the Labor Government in the early 1990s. No-one criticised that process but some people thought it could not be achieved. The record stands and people will judge this Government on that record.

The same has been done with law and order. The Government said it would toughen the penalties and produce an action plan, and it has done that. It began with additional resources for the Police Service. An additional 800 officers are on the beat; 500 came through the Police Academy and 300 have been released from civilian duty. That action plan has been ticked off. The Government has made progress step by step. It has been through the justice system penalties and the law, and it must now face the consequence that, as a result of its legislative packages, more people are being sentenced to terms of imprisonment. Society has demanded that, whether or not the Government likes it. Therefore, this State now has a problem with overcrowding in its prisons. That must be dealt with, and I am sure the Government will be supported by the Opposition with regard to the construction of new prison facilities.

Mr Kobelke: Do you have any figures to show whether the increased muster in the gaols was due to the tough legislation the Labor Government put in place or your own increased penalties?

Mr COWAN: My memory is pretty good. I am sorry, but I fail completely to recall any alleged toughened penalties that the Labor Party may have introduced and that were ever applied when it was in government. I can remember the great internal problems that were caused to the Labor Party by the repeat offenders legislation. No more than a

handful of people were sentenced under those provisions, yet a great deal of song and dance was made about those changes to the law.

Mr Kobelke: I suggest you look at the dates the muster increased. You will find that in large part it could not be attributed to your Government, because it was before your legislation was enacted.

Mr COWAN: I am not sure of the exact timing of the events, but it would have to be acknowledged that the Opposition when in government - I do not want to keep going back in time - was pretty light on when it came to introducing legislative packages that increased the penalties.

Mr Kobelke: The statistics are there. You can produce them if you want.

Mr COWAN: I do not mind acknowledging that I am wrong if I am wrong; however, I do not think I am. If the statistical data is available, the member for Nollamara will provide it and I will give him acknowledgment if he is correct. However, I doubt very much that he will be able to provide that data. Inevitably, at any time the Government has a responsibility to determine a policy, develop that policy and announce that policy, and with that announcement, provide an action plan. That is something the coalition has been doing from its first week in office. However, what we are doing now is attracting attention because, as everybody knows, an election is reasonably imminent.

Dr Gallop: Is the emphasis on imminent or reasonably?

Mr COWAN: I do not mind; I am quite ambivalent. I suggest that the National Party is well prepared for the election, irrespective of when it is called. We have been in training for a long time. We have reached our peak already, but we are confident that we are fit enough to be able to continue that peak, right through to whatever period is necessary.

Mr Ripper: Is this your last election campaign?

Mr COWAN: Mine? You wish! What has occurred over the past eight weeks, perhaps even longer, is something that is natural and that has occurred throughout the life of this Government. Other than an election being imminent, I do not see any reason that has caused the Opposition to bring forward this motion.

Reference has been made to the salinity issue. That matter has been debated by the Government for a period of at least 12 months in order to get it right. That is how long it has taken the Government to bring together four government agencies to ensure they would all coordinate their efforts and focus on the issue at hand rather than build barriers between themselves that would not be broken down and, therefore, merely repeat what has happened in the environment debate or the conservation issues that we have tried to tackle in the past. The Government has done as much as it possibly can to break down those barriers and to get a coordinated effort.

That approach has been released. It is the classic approach: Here is the position of the Government and here is the policy; this is how we will implement the policy. I see nothing wrong with that. It will be the coalition's responsibility, as political parties, to promote those policies, but it will do that at its own cost and in its own time. Under no circumstances does the Government intend to use public funds to promote anything other than a government position. If the Leader of the Opposition could not draw a distinction between a government position being declared and promoted and a party political matter, I would be surprised.

Mr Kobelke: Where would you draw the line?

Mr COWAN: I draw the line the day the writs are issued for an election. The Government has a responsibility to indicate to the people of Western Australia what it is doing. That is what we have done. The moment the writs are issued it is up to us as political parties to spend our own money to promote them.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (20)

Ms Anwyl
Mr M. Barnett
Mr Brown
Mr Catania
Mr Cunningham
Dr Edwards
Dr Gallop

Mr Grill
Mrs Hallahan
Mrs Henderson
Mr Kobelke
Mr Leahy
Mr Marlborough
Mr McGinty

Mr Riebeling
Mr Ripper
Mrs Roberts
Mr D.L. Smith
Dr Watson
Ms Warnock (*Teller*)

Noes (27)

Mr Ainsworth
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr Board
Mr Bradshaw
Mr Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Day
Mrs Edwardes
Dr Hames

Mr House
Mr Johnson
Mr Kierath
Mr Lewis
Mr Marshall
Mr McNee
Mr Minson
Mr Nicholls
Mr Omodei

Mr Osborne
Mrs Parker
Mr Shave
Mr W. Smith
Mr Trenorden
Mr Tubby
Dr Turnbull
Mrs van de Klashorst
Mr Bloffwitch (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr Bridge
Mr Thomas
Mr Graham

Mr Wiese
Mr Prince
Mr Blaikie

Question thus negatived.

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MRS ROBERTS (Glendalough) [3.49 pm]: I note that at page 8 of the Bill one of the functions of the Road Safety Council will be to identify measures to improve the safety of roads in the State and under subclause (2)(e) to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of any such measures. I could make a few suggestions now about how to improve the quality and safety of roads in our State. One key suggestion would be to halt privatisation and contracting out of road building and repairs. Failing that, at the very least, the work done by contractors should be properly supervised. Main Roads Department should ensure that roads are built to a standard and that repairs last much longer than a year.

Last Friday, the day after the truck accidents on Great Eastern Highway in the vicinity of The Lakes turn-off, I visited the site. It was a wet day. A total of three accidents occurred and five trucks went out of control. It was on a section of road constructed only last year by Ertech Pty Ltd, one of the many private contractors used by Main Roads. That road was not constructed to an appropriate standard.

Mr Lewis: Come on; that is an outrageous statement.

Mrs ROBERTS: The Minister for Planning is clearly not as aware of the standard of that road as are people who regularly drive on it. I am not alone in my criticism of this. People more likely to be on the Minister's side of politics have contacted me about the state of our roads, particularly that road. Sections of that road had to be redone because within a very few months of their being laid they became potholed and inadequate. I think the Minister advised the other place that Ertech had used an inferior substance in its construction which led to the road breaking up. As a consequence, sections of that road were replaced.

With a tow-truck driver last Friday, I inspected that road constructed by Ertech. Clearly visible on the Friday, although it was not raining on that day, were long sections of smooth road, which had been repaired at a later stage because of the problems with the original construction. On the previous day, when those sections were wet, driving on them was like driving on a skating rink. The tow-truck driver with whom I inspected the road had considerable experience and had been driving a tow-truck for a long time. His vehicle had the capacity to tow trucks. He towed one of the trucks that had gone out of control the day before. In his view, those trucks being out of control had nothing to do with driver error, but had everything to do with the state of the road. I have every reason to believe what he told me. I understand that spokespersons from Main Roads acknowledged to *The West Australian* that the road, with water on it, had become like a skating rink. As part of corrective measures the contractor had thrown loose stones on the road. I saw what was left of the area the following day. When the workers who were putting those loose stones on the smooth areas of road were asked how effective they would be, they said that they knew the measure was ineffective but they felt they had to be seen to be doing something.

On Monday I was again contacted by people using that section of road and told that the very hot weather on Monday had caused the road to pothole and break up even more. The private contractors were trying to roll small stones into the soft bitumen that had replaced the smooth areas, which had caused trucks to go out of control in the rain.

The Minister for Planning cannot say there is not a problem because clearly there is. I understand that the Minister has had discussions with the head of Main Roads about the huge problems with that section of road.

Mr Lewis: Surely it was built to a specification prescribed by Main Roads?

Mrs ROBERTS: The fact is that only a year after its construction and repair the road is not holding up. That did not previously happen. Main Roads built roads to a specification. Many truck drivers, livestock transporters, tow-truck operators and other people who use those roads tell me how inadequate they are. I have heard an immense number of complaints about Great Eastern Highway in the vicinity where Ertech built the roads. It was potholed from the start. Huge sections are like skating rinks on wet days. The very fact that Ertech was out there on Monday on a hot day trying to roll stones into the soft bitumen is testimony to that.

The tow-truck driver told me that on the wet day when he was required to tow some of the trucks from where they had crashed on the side of the road, at 30 km an hour trucks went out of control when drivers applied the brakes. He raised the issue and spent time driving out there with me because he was genuinely concerned. That was probably not in his best interest given that a percentage of his business derives from accidents. I believe that in good conscience he felt he could not fail to highlight the problem.

When five trucks went out of control on the wet road they did not crash into any on-coming traffic and no-one was killed. If something is not done to fix that road properly, when there is next a very wet day it is likely that trucks will again go out of control and another vehicle could become involved. When a car meets a truck head-on very serious injuries or fatalities can occur. It is clear that the condition of our roads is a factor in these accidents. It is one of the measures that the Road Safety Council to be set up under this Bill is expected to examine.

I hear many complaints about the area between Apple Street and Wubin. In the past few days I have been advised that the shoulders of the road on the Perth side of Bindoon Hill are breaking away. The road is winding, narrow and rough. Truck drivers have told me that it is difficult to keep their trucks on the road. Trucks travel at speed to get up the hill. Apparently only last week, at the most dangerous point, someone wrote on the road "Fix this bloody road". That is an indication of the state of that road. It was designed in 1956 and now carries 1996 volume of traffic and the Minister for Transport has allowed triple road trains to travel on it. The Government should be addressing some of these matters.

While on the topic of private contractors and their effect on our road safety, a number of instances have been brought to my attention of where road markings have not been adequately drawn by contractors. This was not brought to Opposition members' attention before private contractors were given the job. I have heard reports of white lines being marked incorrectly and having to be redone. Worse than that, I have heard of them wearing off within only a matter of months or even weeks after being painted on the road. I have also had cases drawn to my attention of markings at Stop signs and so on wearing off not long after they have been painted. There are some huge failures in the system. Contractors are not being properly supervised or monitored and the job is not lasting. When a job does not last, we face some unfortunate consequences: First, it places people's safety at risk and, secondly, it costs the public more because the job must be redone because it was not up to standard in the first place and did not last.

These are not isolated examples of problems with the roads. Such problems are drawn to my attention frequently. People are very concerned about the state of Great Eastern Highway in the vicinity of The Lakes turnoff. People are very concerned about the state of the Great Northern Highway immediately north of Bullsbrook. One of the difficulties with the way the Minister has set up regulations relating to road trains is that he is allowing road trains on a road which should not be used for that purpose. A curfew is in place until 6.00 pm, but after that time a convoy of double road trains can travel up from Apple Street, and beyond that point triple road trains operate in convoy on a road which was not built to a standard suitable for road train use.

Mrs van de Klashorst: Where do you say the triples travel? They do not go down that far. Only doubles travel as far as Bullsbrook.

Mrs ROBERTS: I am talking about Apple Street -

Mrs van de Klashorst: Only doubles travel down that far.

Mrs ROBERTS: They travel through to Wubin. The Minister has allowed triple road trains to travel from Wubin onwards. Previously road trains did not use that route because they could not go through Wubin to travel further north. Now, double road trains are going forward from Apple Street in the direction of Wubin. I am advised that when they hit Wubin they are converted to triple road trains. Prior to the Minister's approving the use of that route they were not able to take triple road trains north of Wubin. The road is not built to a standard to accommodate triple road trains.

Clause 7 relates to wardens and their duties in relation to the controlling of vehicles and pedestrians at children's and pedestrian crossings. This is another area about which I have heard complaints, particularly from someone whose children attend Bayswater Primary School. However, it is a problem common at many crossings. Crosswalk attendants are allocated to attend crossings early in the morning - as is the case at Bayswater - but they finish their duties at the time that school starts. Although children should not be late for school, on occasions they are five or 10 minutes late, for a variety of reasons. It would make sense to reconsider the situation and have traffic wardens on duty for at least 10 or 15 minutes after the school starting time, to pick up the latecomers. It may not be necessary to increase the time spent by wardens on duty; perhaps they could begin work later. The problem is that if children are running late for school they may be more inclined to run across the road without looking.

The second reading speech states that the Road Trauma Trust Fund is to be credited with all fines collected from camera detected traffic infringements, rather than the current one-third. It states that it would appear appropriate that those who put road safety at risk contribute to the cost of improvement to our roads. The Opposition has supported that provision for some time. This points to the fallacy of the Government's earlier argument that it, unlike previous Governments, put all money raised from road traffic fines back into the road system. It is good to see that at long last the Government has made a move to put the funds collected from speed camera detected infringements into the Road Trauma Trust Fund.

The Bill divides the enforcement of the provisions of the Road Traffic Act into two distinct functional areas. The licensing provisions will be enforced by the Director General of Transport and on-road enforcement will remain the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police. I hope the transition goes smoothly. When the Department of Transport took responsibility for taxi licensing from the Police Department that transition did not go smoothly. Over three months, concerns were expressed about the way the system was being operated. People were receiving taxi drivers' licences when they did not really qualify. That became an ongoing problem. It is all very well to divide the two areas between the Police Department and the Department of Transport, but the transition must be effective. People must not slip through and receive a licence without being qualified; and records must be kept appropriately.

Another function of the Bill is to correct a minor anomaly whereby inspection of buses and taxis can be required only on the renewal of a licence. The second reading speech states that this placed an unfair burden on operators who renew their licences six monthly rather than annually. We support the rectification of that anomaly. However, a matter of concern is that many people who drive their vehicles for a living must wait an inordinate time relicensing their vehicles. I refer here particularly to taxi drivers, many of whom have told me that they have wasted half a day and more getting their taxis checked. In some instances, drivers have shown up in the afternoon, joined the queue to have their taxis inspected, only to be told that time has run out and they must come back the next day. On other occasions, drivers have had to wait around for one or one and a half hours, when they could have been driving a cab. That is not an acceptable level of service. People should not need to take their vehicles off the road for that length of time. I hope they will spend less time off the road as a result of the provision for annual inspections instead of six monthly inspections. This is another area which the Government needs to consider very carefully. I will be interested to hear if any records were kept of the length of time it takes taxi drivers or perhaps bus drivers to have their vehicles inspected, and how much time was lost through their being off the road.

The Government has failed people badly in the road safety arena. The level of fatalities and serious crashes has increased. The Government has introduced this long overdue legislation, in its dying days. It is handballing the problem to the Road Safety Council. Although we support the establishment of the Road Safety Council, as we support this Bill, we are very concerned that despite the Government's rhetoric it has not given the necessary priority to road safety. During this Government's term in office we have witnessed a significant decline in road safety. This State had the best road safety record in Australia, but has now slipped to about third or fourth place. The Government has adopted a "trust us" approach. I would like some assurances from the Minister about the budget of the Road Safety Council and about the openness with which the council will be operating. If the council is to make recommendations to the Minister on road safety in this State, we are entitled to know what kind of recommendations will be made, how long the Minister - whoever he is - takes to act upon those recommendations, and to be informed about any decision by the Minister regarding recommendations made by the Road Safety Council.

This is not something that should be filtered. The Minister should not be able to sit on recommendations - for example, from the Road Safety Council - for months on end and not provide details of those recommendations. The system must function openly; the council's recommendations should be made public and we should know whether the Minister intends acting on them. I am not saying that in every instance it would be appropriate for the Minister to act on every recommendation; the Minister may choose for very good reasons not to act on a particular recommendation. However, it should be an open process so that we know what this body is doing. We are told that it is being set up independently and that it will have some level of expertise. We should be informed of its recommendations, whether the Government is acting on them, and, if not, why not. That is the kind of openness I

would like to see in relation to this council. I would like some assurance from the Minister on that issue and also in relation to the council's budget, because that may impact on its ability to carry out the tasks set out in the Bill.

MS WARNOCK (Perth) [4.11 pm]: I take this opportunity to make some comments about road safety and the State's appalling road toll, which sadly continues to increase. It is now commonplace that our road toll is at a very serious and shocking level. Something very forceful should be done. This State once had a good road safety record, but sadly it appears to have been getting steadily worse, despite the best efforts of the Police Service and others concerned with trying to reduce the road toll. The parliamentary Select Committee on Road Safety has made more than 130 recommendations, some of which I am glad to say have been implemented by the Government, including the recommendation we are debating today: The setting up of this special organisation to oversee road safety in this State. However, many of the committee's recommendations still have not been taken up.

In supporting this Bill, the Opposition urges the Government to implement all of the committee's recommendations. One in which I have a particular interest is using all moneys collected from speed and red light camera fines to improve road safety. It is vital that we do everything possible to encourage people to change their attitudes and therefore their behaviour as drivers. That is the nub of the problem: We can fix the roads and ensure that everyone is driving a car that is not falling apart, but human error causes deaths on our roads. We must address that fact very directly. As a community, we must decide to deal with the road safety problem. The core of the problem is our attitudes as drivers. We are driving too fast and carelessly and too many of us are continuing to drink and drive. We simply must change. Even though it is difficult to swallow that fact, we must take that message on board as a community, as individuals and as drivers.

I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to accept the committee's recommendations in relation to the setting up of the Office of Road Safety, the so-called booze buses and the compulsory wearing of bike helmets. All of the recommendations in the committee's eight reports should be accepted and funded. They are part of a very seriously thought out plan for road safety and saving lives in this State and we would like to see the Government take them on board.

Driver education was addressed by the committee. It must be dramatically improved; there is no question about that. One is sometimes tempted to use word "re-education" in relation to driver education, although it has echoes of Chairman Mao, therefore I tend to avoid it. Too many of us who have had a licence for a long time need a refresher course. There are too many people of my age driving who exhibit truly bad habits, such as forgetting to use an indicator or tailgating. Driver education must be improved and very soon. I hope that the Government - through its new Office of Road Safety - will decide to invite Professor Kore Rumar from Sweden, whom the committee met while overseas, to give us the benefit of his great knowledge and skills. I mention this because Sweden once had an extraordinarily bad road safety record and a tremendous problem with drinking and driving. It has dramatically improved that situation and it now has one of the world's best road safety records. That is because it was realised very early that problems on the roads were 90 per cent human error - the main problem was the attitude of drivers. We managed to change many people's attitudes to smoking with our justly famous Quit campaign - one of the best such campaigns in the world. Given that success, we can also change attitudes to driving, but it will take a long time; there is no quick fix. With a very good continuing road safety campaign - funded by the revenue from red light and speed camera fines - we will perhaps go some way to addressing the appalling road toll we have in this State.

I urge the Government to put as much energy as possible into fighting this battle. Yesterday morning I attended the launch of one of the Government's road safety initiatives. The Police Commissioner talked about two road deaths having occurred between the time he got up and made his speech notes and when he appeared at 9.30 am to make his speech. It is a depressing fact that the toll has grown steadily and with frightening speed this year. Obviously, as a community we must do something about that situation. It is very worrying that we still have the so-called "silly season" to go through, when notoriously we experience many road deaths. I hope that the Government will implement the committee's recommendations and get the new Office of Road Safety up and running as soon as possible. If it does that, we might be able to decrease this terrible toll. The Opposition supports the legislation, and I urge the Government to make every possible effort to fight the depressing road toll in Western Australia.

MR AINSWORTH (Roe) [4.17 pm]: On what could be the last day of this Parliament and as the chairman of the now defunct Select Committee on Road Safety - which ran for the virtually the full term of this Parliament and which presented over 140 recommendations - I am pleased to see the culmination of its work. This is a very important piece of legislation, which sets up the Office of Road Safety and makes one Minister responsible for the coordination of road safety in this State. It was that lack of coordination and coherence in this area that saw this State's record slip behind that of other States. We have now put in place the mechanism to rectify that situation. It will not happen overnight; it will take a little time to turn around this trend. However, it is very possible that we will see a decline in our road toll as a result of this legislation. It will take some time for the measure to have an effect, but have an effect it definitely will.

Along with other members of the committee, I hope that some of the other recommendations still being considered by the Government will be implemented. Not only would we have this new Office of Road Safety with its road safety coordination role having an impact on the incidence of road deaths in this State, but some of the other measures would also reduce what is a very costly impost on this State, both in monetary and human life terms. I am happy to support the Bill.

MR CATANIA (Balcatta) [4.20 pm]: I support the Bill, which has been introduced not before time. The Minister's second reading speech contains some very sickly motherhood statements. He said -

Road safety is to be given the highest priority by this Government and the newly formed Ministerial Council of Road Safety comprising the Ministers for Police, Education, Health, and Local Government and chaired by the Minister for Transport . . .

What a sickly statement that is. Following the handing of responsibility for the Road Traffic Act from the Police Department to the Department of Transport, that is a damned sickly statement.

Mr C.J. Barnett: As you are the only member of the Opposition in here, will you facilitate the passage of this before private members' time?

Mr CATANIA: We will facilitate it. It is very important. That is the first sickly motherhood statement. The second is -

Pivotal in this Government's strategy is the adoption of a partnership approach to road safety . . .

Those sorts of wonderful, motherhood statements continue throughout the second reading speech! The road safety committee to which my colleague, the member for Perth alluded, made the very recommendations that are included in the Bill over two and a half years ago. After the road safety committee spent over \$350 000 of taxpayers' money travelling around the world to obtain the very best of information and came up with the best of recommendations, we find in the dying seconds of Parliament that we must this Bill without debate, while the road carnage in Western Australia continues. A road toll of 250 has been projected for this year, with over 15 000 people being hospitalised. It has also been projected that the road toll will cost our economy over a billion dollars. Good men and women will be lost to the work force. Yet the Minister for Planning, in the second reading speech, gives us these sickly motherhood statements.

The monthly bulletins on road fatalities around Australia indicate that, in 1995-96 in Western Australia, there has been a 55 per cent increase in pedestrian deaths, a 68.4 per cent increase in motorcyclist deaths, and a 100 per cent increase in pedal cyclist deaths. The Assistant Commissioner of Police, Mr Hay, has said that the road toll this year will be the worst it has been for 10 years. He said that pedestrians and cyclists are the ones who are being killed. Each week the *Sunday Times* carries alongside its banner the latest road toll figures. Last Sunday the figure was 214, with 94 deaths in the metropolitan area and 120 deaths on country roads. The corresponding figure for last year was 183. There has been a huge increase in fatalities and in the hospitalisation of people in Western Australia. We are constantly seeing headlines in our newspapers such as "Toll heads for 7 year high" and "Horror on our roads". These were comments made by newspapers after consulting with police. Commander Graham Lienarthas said that there are problems on our country roads. He has nominated Great Eastern Highway to Northam and the Brookton Highway on which there have been many deaths.

What has the Government done to address this carnage on our roads? The Road Traffic Board has regurgitated commercials from Victoria onto our television screens. They are outdated and outmoded and so was that board. Thankfully it no longer exists. As my colleague said, only a third of the revenue gained from the use of Multanova cameras goes into road safety; two-thirds goes into the consolidated fund. Over \$5m is being pulled in because of the increase in the number of cameras being used; because of the additional cameras, revenue is increasing. How many of us see Multanovas at the bottom of hills?

Mr Shave: Disgraceful!

Mr CATANIA: Does the member agree with me?

Mr Shave: They are disgraceful at the bottom of hills.

Mr CATANIA: The member agrees. They are placed there for one reason only; it is not to stop people speeding, but to fine them to bolster the coffers of the consolidated fund. That is all they are used for. The Auditor General believes that is a misuse of Multanovas in Western Australia. It is a disgrace, with the increasing revenue being generated by Multanovas, that only one-third of the revenue is earmarked for the road trauma trust fund to improve our road safety record. Two-thirds of it goes into government coffers! The old adage that they are roadside cash registers is correct in Western Australia.

Mr Day: Do you support their use?

Mr CATANIA: I support them if they are used properly. They have not been used properly in Western Australia.

What has been the reaction of this Government to our road toll? It will provide the Police Department with six unmarked vehicles with cameras to sneak around corners and to hide behind bushes to take photographs of people speeding. That decision is not to deter people from speeding, but to catch them after they do. That has been the reaction of this Government to the road toll and its contribution to road safety!

As I said, the forecast road toll is 250. I have said more than once in this Chamber that if a disease were causing 250 deaths, millions of dollars would be thrown at research to ensure that the cause of that disease was found. Approximately 250 people will be killed on our road with approximately 15 000 being hospitalised and what does this Government do? Nothing. It has not put in place driver training tracks as it promised before the last election. It said it would provide two driver training facilities, one south and one north of the river. Nothing has eventuated. The road safety committee recommended 160 changes and the Government has adopted only 52 of them. This Government's road safety record is appalling. Money that should have been directed to road safety has been used by the Government for other purposes. It provides no driver education. We may have an improvement with the passing of responsibility for the Act to the Department of Transport. That improvement will not be before time. The change should have been done at least two years ago when the parliamentary road safety committee recommended it. Pedestrians and cyclists are being killed at a far greater rate than they have been in the past and this Government is doing nothing.

The Opposition supports, without question, the Road Traffic Amendment Bill. However, it expresses deep concern that consideration of this Bill is taking place in what it considers is the last 30 seconds in the life of this Parliament.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Kobelke.

[Continued on page 8323.]

MOTION - IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

MR McGINTY (Fremantle - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.32 pm]: On behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, I move -

That this House recognises the importance of political leadership and expresses concern that the Premier has failed to meet standards expected of his high office in that he has -

- (a) presided over a decline in standards of ministerial behaviour especially by the Ministers for Fair Trading, Planning and Industrial Relations;
- (b) substituted pre-election opportunism for sound policy making thereby introducing great uncertainty into the government process by completing policy backflips whenever confronted with a vocal interest group;
- (c) created and fanned speculation about an unprincipled early election when he should be concentrating on the good government of the State; and
- (d) failed to use the time of Parliament during 1996 to pass the reforms to our system of government called for by the WA Royal Commission and Commission on Government, in the process thumbing his nose at the principle of parliamentary accountability.

It is important on what may well prove to be the last day the Parliament sits this year for the House to review the progress that has been made during the year and to consider the areas in which, on the Government's report card, the Government has been found wanting. The motion calls upon the House to recognise the importance of political leadership. It is something we all see as an imperative. It is important that the Premier shows that leadership to the whole community.

A debate has been occurring at a national level on the question of racism. The Prime Minister has been criticised for failing to show the requisite degree of political leadership by allowing a very damaging debate to take place in the community which has unleashed racial fears on the community and has failed to take into account Australia's interests and the cohesion and harmony within the community. The Prime Minister has not attempted to influence the course of that debate. Obviously it was the Prime Minister's view not to take part in the debate because he perceived it to have a populist political component to it.

I am sure all members appreciate the importance of political leadership and this is an opportune time for them to examine the extent to which the Premier has met the standards expected of the office of Premier in this State. I reiterate this may be the last opportunity for members to do that.

The motion identifies four areas in which the Premier has failed to meet those standards. Firstly, he has presided over a decline in standards of ministerial behaviour. All too often the cry from members opposite over the past four years has been, "Well, you people were no better back in the 1980s."

Mr C.J. Barnett: You were worse.

Mr McGINTY: It is interesting that members opposite use that as their yardstick. To justify their actions in the mid-1990s they use as their reference point pre-royal commission conduct, which most members on both sides of this House are round in their condemnation of. It is not something which is peculiar to only one side of politics. It is disappointing that all too often members on this side of the House are told, "When you were in Government, you did this", and we even heard it today. Quite frankly, it shows a complete lack of vision, understanding and principles that should guide the Government in 1996, heading towards a parliamentary session which will take us into the next decade, to say, "You people will be judged by the standards that prevailed in the previous decade."

I will refer to the ministerial behaviour which has been the subject of very round criticism. I will not deal with the three Ministers in the order their portfolios are listed in the motion. At question time we witnessed a comical performance by the Minister for Planning. It will be his last performance in this House unless he decides to make a farewell speech tonight, which should be equally entertaining. Having been defeated on a fundamental principle where he was both legally and morally wrong, he sought to frustrate the operation of the Freedom of Information Act. He could not bring himself to say in the Parliament at question time today, "I fought the fight, but I was defeated. I accept that decision."

Mr Shave: He said he would abide by the decision.

Mr McGINTY: We had to work through a nice piece of theatre to get the Minister to say he did not accept that decision. Ultimately to say he has to abide by the decision is nothing more than a statement of the obvious.

Mr Shave: He said he would abide by it.

Mr McGINTY: That is stating the obvious. A person must abide by a court decision which finds against him. There was no grace about the man and no statement that he fought the issue, was defeated and would graciously accept defeat.

The previous Labor Government accepted the challenge of accountability in the post-royal commission era and passed the freedom of information laws. Those laws were designed to bring in an era that would give Western Australians the power to obtain information on government decisions which affected them. Every attempt has been made by the Minister for Planning to frustrate that law and to behave improperly to achieve that.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Will you concede that the Minister for Planning has been an outstanding Planning Minister in terms of putting together a state planning strategy as well as a regional plan? I am not trying to be political. You should give him some credit because he has been the Minister who has pushed planning ahead of development and that has not happened in the history of any Government.

Mr McGINTY: Given that this is the Minister for Planning's farewell day I will be nice to him. I like the man and his wife. He has been a very controversial Minister for Planning. He has upset a lot of people and he has used his powers capriciously. His obsession with his right to override local government authorities and to make decisions has been controversial. He has not done it in the way it should be done. I do not wish to detract from the man on an occasion like this, but his obsession with secrecy, to the extent of the matter described in the Information Commissioner's report of his altercation with her -

Mr C.J. Barnett: I know all that and I know you will argue that. Will you concede that he has through the state planning strategy and the regional plan progressed planning in this State? You may not agree with the plan or the process, but you cannot deny that the member for Applecross has done a great deal in progressing planning ahead of development.

Mr McGINTY: I would not be that lauding in my praise of him. He has been a very vigorous Planning Minister.

Mr C.J. Barnett: He had a big picture for planning in this State. Ministers from both political parties have not had the breadth of vision he displayed.

Mr McGINTY: I give him credit for his preparedness to make hard decisions on controversial issues. I will not detract from him in that sense, other than to refer to his obsession with his right to make the decisions and override

local government authorities. We can argue the merits of individual planning decisions; however, for the purpose of the argument I am putting today, that is neither here nor there. The attempt by the Minister for Planning to improperly influence the Information Commissioner and his desire to frustrate the Freedom of Information Act has meant that he has behaved improperly.

The second issue I raise, apart from his obsession with secrecy and freedom of information, is the innumerable conflicts of interest he has presided over through his business interests, his house in North Fremantle and his strong connections with people who have donated to the Liberal Party. All too often the Minister presided over decisions affecting his friends. The Minister should never have put himself in that situation. He should not have dealt with those appeals. He should have demanded that those appeals be handed to the Town Planning Appeals Tribunal. We cannot have the sorts of conflicts of interest over which the member for Applecross presided, because that leaves people with no confidence in the system and the decisions that are made in those cases. The Minister has presided over numerous cases where a conflict existed, including his interest in a shopping centre south of the river, his house, the North Fremantle incident, and with benefactors of the Liberal Party. As the Minister he sat in judgment upon appeals against local authority decisions against those people and, generally speaking, found in favour of his mates. That may have been purely coincidental; however, a Minister should not put himself in that position in the first place. He was wrong to allow himself to be subject of allegations of conflict of interest, because he simply should not have done that.

This side of the House has a view about the processes that should be involved in appeals against local government decisions on planning matters. That is an effective administrative appeals mechanism as recommended by the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters and the Commission on Government. We do not want to get tied up with too much legalism. We want the advantages of the relative cheapness and time efficiency of the ministerial appeal system. However, a Minister cannot sit in judgment on the sort of appeals that the member for Applecross has. The whole system has now been discredited. Serious allegations exist in the public mind of improper behaviour arising out of those appearances of conflict of interest.

The Premier should have shown leadership on those matters and requested the resignation of the Minister for Planning when the Information Commissioner tabled her report in the Parliament. There is no doubt about that. Everyone in this place knew that the Minister for Planning was coming to the end of his political career and he did not want to go out on the note of a forced resignation. However, when an adverse finding is made against a Minister of the Crown, in the execution of one's duties as a Minister, the only option available is to resign. The Minister for Planning did not resign, and the Premier did not require it; it should have happened.

I know many people say a lot of things about what occurred during the 1980s. However, during the past five months of the last Labor Government in this State two resignations occurred, namely, Bob Pearce and the member for Cockburn, the Minister for the Environment and the Cabinet Secretary respectively. In neither case were the causes of those resignations findings of enormous impropriety, of any corruption, or anything of that nature. The royal commission made findings adverse to those individuals who then did the honorable thing and resigned from their positions as Minister and Cabinet Secretary. The same rule should apply to the Minister for Planning, because of the way in which he treated the independent office of Information Commissioner. Once that allegation was made in the strong terms in which it was, it was improper for the Minister for Planning to stay in his position. However, the greater impropriety is the Premier's allowing him to stay in that position and not requiring his resignation. The message the Premier was sending out to his Ministers was, "You can seek to improperly influence; you can abuse your position as Minister of the Crown." That is unacceptable.

The second example is the Minister for Labour Relations. Again, he is a controversial Minister and not in any sense a popular Minister. However, let us put those two issues to one side. When the Minister for Labour Relations was the Minister for Health he improperly used his position to require the Commissioner for Health to break the law in this State. That improper influence exercised by the Minister in demanding the Health Commissioner breach the Public Sector Management Act in respect of two senior Health Department officials, Messrs Solomon and White, was a clear matter requiring resignation. Again, that did not occur. Also the Minister for Labour Relations improperly used the names of people who were members of the building industry portable long service leave fund to address them politically. The Minister gained improper access to those names to which he had no right, and that should have resulted in the resignation of the Minister. Each of those examples is a matter of significant improper behaviour by a Minister that was left unchecked by the Premier, who should have done more than he did. The Premier should have removed those people from their positions and required them to resign as Ministers. If they refused to resign he should have sacked them.

We also have the Minister for Fair Trading, previously the Attorney General in this State. The litany of improprieties associated with the member for Kingsley is legendary.

Mr Bloffwitch: Nothing was ever proved.

Mr McGINTY: Let us look at her recent track record of denying that a deal had been done with the used car yard salespeople. The Minister for Fair Trading, like a guilty person in the dock, her eyes darting everywhere said, "No, I haven't done anything like that." We told her on which day she would make the announcement, it was so well known. Members of the industry had told us that the Minister had done a deal with them. We heard a denial from the Minister. She was not telling the truth. She was not being honest with the Parliament. If members needed any further evidence of that sort of improper behaviour by the member for Kingsley they need look no further than the "Four Corners" report on the City of Wanneroo. She was like a rabbit in a spotlight. She was as guilty as sin; her eyes were darting around the place trying to think how she could get out of the situation. It would be obvious to anyone who has ever been in a court and seen someone in the dock who is clearly guilty of the crime.

Mrs Edwardes: How often have you been in a court?

Mr McGINTY: Not as often as the Minister and generally speaking in a more honorable position than that which the Minister has been in. The Minister was like a rabbit in the spotlight. She was as guilty as sin. Her eyes were darting around the place. She was obfuscating and trying to think of a tricky answer that would not come back on her. Everyone could see "guilty" written across her forehead. It is those sorts of improprieties that have bedevilled this Minister's career that I want to be critical of today. The Minister's sheer incompetence is not the issue I want to deal with today. We saw enough of that during her administration of the Ministry of Justice. While she was the Attorney General in this State incompetence bedevilled her in that role. The Premier should have acted much earlier than he did on a number of occasions and required the resignation of this Minister.

In his dealings with the Minister for Labour Relations, the former Minister for Health and the Minister for Fair Trading the Premier adopted a new standard of ministerial impropriety. The Premier is quite prepared to tolerate unacceptably low standards of behaviour by his Ministers. I gave the examples of the three Minister whom I have just addressed. Frankly, that is not acceptable.

I will now move to the question of what we have seen during the lead-up to the coming state election, and the matter that is specified in paragraph (b) of this motion. It is a criticism that the Premier has failed to meet standards expected of one who holds his high office. He has substituted pre-election opportunism for sound policy making, thereby introducing great uncertainty into the government process by doing policy backflips whenever he is confronted by a vocal interest group.

These groups have been numerous in recent times. This is bad government: A decision is made and then the Government decides to do a backflip because it might get it a few votes in the forthcoming election. We have seen that scenario on too many occasions. The very unfortunate Minister for Fair Trading has been the device through which these policy backflips have been achieved. I will list these groups. The first is the real estate agents. We all know what happened. There was an unprecedented deproclamation of a law, without reference to the Parliament, because the real estate agents threatened to run a \$1m campaign against the Government in its marginal seats. The law was passed by the Parliament. It was proclaimed by the Governor. The real estate agents confronted the Minister for Fair Trading with a threat that a million dollars would be used against the Liberal Party in the coming election.

What did we see? We saw an unprecedented action being taken, with no reference to the Parliament. For that reason alone, the Minister stands to be condemned. Let us not blame the poor, hapless Minister for Fair Trading; the person who must accept responsibility for that behaviour is the Premier because he authorised this whole process that, in my view, has brought this Government and the democratic process into disrepute, and all because a group said that it did not like what the Government was doing and threatened to run a campaign against it. The Premier obviously then said, "We can't have that; you people are financial donors to the Liberal Party; we don't want your money being applied against us." It was extremely grubby. Then we had the denials, but, unfortunately, it was documented that the Premier was involved - that \$1m was involved. We need only look at the Carruthers inquiry in Queensland, which investigated political corruption. The buying of favours with the threat of a \$1m campaign against the Government is as corrupt as it comes. Yet we see the Premier trying to excuse it.

I have already mentioned the car salesmen. We all knew a deal was done. Yet the Premier and the Minister tried to pretend it did not happen, and it would not happen. We knew the date on which it was to happen; there was an absolute inevitability about it. The Minister for Fair Trading sought to give it a shroud of respectability, by saying that an independent survey would be conducted and the Government would be guided by the outcome of that survey. That survey was inconclusive. Suddenly the Minister for Fair Trading saw the great light of inconclusiveness guiding her decision making in this matter. What a farce! We can all see through exactly what she was doing, and why she was doing it. The car salesmen had taken a trick out of the real estate agents' book. They knew that if they stood up and threatened, particularly when they are the natural constituency of those on the other side of politics, they would get what they wanted, notwithstanding the philosophy outlined by the Government before that.

I will move on - the Minister for Local Government is in the Chamber - to the question of beach front parking. One minute the Minister says that it is fair enough if the council wants to come up with a proposition along those lines, and that the Government will go along with it. He then thought an election was in the wind, so the next day he said in an answer in question time that he did not agree with it at all. The Minister showed great flexibility, in the form of a big backflip in the pike position.

Mr Omodei: What happened to the Bill you were going to introduce? What happened to the Bill from the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr McGINTY: It was introduced.

Mr Omodei: No it was not. It never hit the Table.

Mr McGINTY: That was one of the things that forced those opposite to back down.

Mr Omodei: Where is the Bill?

Dr Gallop: I will give it to you, if you like.

Mr Omodei: You have yet to introduce it in the Parliament.

Dr Gallop: I have it.

Mr McGINTY: Once again, we see an enormous backflip when the Minister was faced with this issue.

I refer to the Anti-Corruption Commission. The Premier spent the best part of a year defending the Official Corruption Commission for reasons that escaped everyone, and I expect all members on the other side as well. He was a great fan of the discredited OCC: Some nice retired people were on it and it would not present him with too much difficulty. What did we see once the Premier started to come under pressure in the lead-up to the election? Suddenly the Official Corruption Commission needed a significant revamp: Let us change the name, give it new powers and go halfway towards what the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters and the Commission on Government recommended. This is yet another enormous backflip by the Premier about a body that he defended, that he said was very effective and good. It is obvious that the Premier has no idea of what he should be doing; however, he has a well-honed sense of political survival. He has surrounded himself with people who can give him good lines to run. When the heat from some of the traditional sources gets a bit too hot or when public opinion is turning, he holds his finger in the air and a policy backflip follows, as we saw on the Anti-Corruption Commission.

More recently the Premier came out with a statement saying that in the short term he would not look at the prospect of a people's convention to review the Constitution in Western Australia, that it could be left until well after the Commonwealth looked at its changes to the Constitution and the federal convention took place. It was a low priority as far as he was concerned. He copped a caning in the Press for not being committed to the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on Government. Within 24 hours the Premier was back in the Press saying that we would have a people's convention within two years. There is no reliability or predictability, except in one sense: When the political pressure comes on, a backflip will be involved. We can almost set our watches by it.

I turn to the retail tenancy legislation. The major property owners put pressure on the Government and wrote letters to it. Again the Minister for Fair Trading was involved. Suddenly a Bill, with amendments, appeared and the Government did another big backflip, saying that it must be put on the never-never because a bit of pressure was coming from its constituency. That is no way to govern this State. We need sound policy making and principles to guide us; we do not need this charade, this farcical continuum of policy backflips, of the public laughing at the Government because of the way in which it responds to its interest groups. It is destabilising the institution of Government, and it brings the whole process into contempt. If groups have the ear of Government and enough money, they can buy their way with this Government, and everyone in Western Australia knows that.

Then we have the speculation created by the Premier - not by anyone else - at, if not before then, the Liberal Party state conference this year that there would be an unprecedented December election. We have never had one in Western Australia.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It will be fun then; it will be different; it will be a new experience.

Mr McGINTY: It certainly will.

Dr Gallop: You are against it, though.

Mr McGINTY: He is against it for very sound reasons. The farmers are getting in their crops. Who wants to take the farmers off their tractors and tell them that they must spend a day going into town to vote? If the election is held

on 14 December, the schools will have broken up the day before. The students in private schools will certainly have finished their work and in most government schools, while the teachers will stay on for a few days during the following week, most of the students will finish on 13 December. This will be an unprecedented election, essentially during school holidays. This election should not be held on that date for a range of reasons. It brings our processes of government and politics in this State into contempt when a blatant show of selfishness, of opportunism, of the promotion of self-interest is put ahead of the interests of the State. That brings the whole process into disrepute. We should not have an election on 14 December. It is wrong from every point of view except one - it is in the Liberal Party's narrow self-interest to secure another four years of government. It wants to grab the moment now, and to hell with the consequences. We have not had an early election since the war. The only election held other than at the scheduled time was delayed because of the war. One must go back to the first decade of this century to find the last time that an unscheduled election was called, as, I presume, members opposite are contemplating for tomorrow. One must go back 90 years to find such an opportunistic and unprincipled mob in power which grabbed the moment to go to the polls at the expense of many interest groups.

Retailers have made their position clear: They do not want an election to interfere with business. They have had a rough time and are moving into the Christmas period, when they expect to make the little profit they will make for the year. The psychological impact of an early election, whether logical or not, is that people will not spend during periods of uncertainty. That is what will occur, and that is why retailers have spoken out against an early election.

The interests of retailers, families, farmers and every group around the State are being ignored. Against stability in politics and the integrity of the organisation of which we are part, we will have an early election. Good on the Premier, but he should not expect anyone to ever say that he has integrity or is other than a rank, blatant opportunist for taking this action. He is demeaning the standards we have come to expect from the Premier of this State. A significant number of members opposite agree with me on this proposition as they know that an early election should not be held - it is wrong. However, members opposite must live with that situation as they have not reined in the Premier and exerted influence on him and his naked pursuit of power. A price will be paid for that action.

Parliament should sit for another month, during which time we could pass a great number of recommendations from the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters and the Commission on Government. Accountability is one of the pressing issues in this State. Legislative reform is required. A real commitment from the Government is needed to implement the recommendations arising from the \$36m of taxpayers' funds spent on the royal commission and the Commission on Government. Members of Parliament should spend time on those matters, not be out on the hustings. I hope the Leader of the House will tell me that we will sit for the next four weeks to deal with those matters, but I suspect that he will not do so. We should be dealing with important problems confronting the State.

The Premier has been alone out in the community fanning speculation about an early election. While engaging in that speculation, he has completely taken his mind off the game. He is no longer concentrating on good government of the State. For the last three to four months he had been busy fanning the speculation and playing the pre-election game. Frankly, the people of this State deserve better. Richard Court, as the Premier this State, has let down the people of Western Australia.

DR GALLOP (Victoria Park - Leader of the Opposition) [5.03 pm]: I formally second the motion. As this Parliament grinds to its inevitable close and we look forward to the announcement which it appears the Premier will make tomorrow that we will have an election before Christmas, it is a useful moment to ask a simple question: How does one judge the performance of a Government? I put forward three factors which can be taken into account in making that judgment.

First, how have members opposite left our system of government? Of course, they came to office in 1993 and will go to the polls in the forthcoming election. What is the present state of our system of government in Western Australia? Is it today better placed than it was in 1993 to meet the challenges that any democratic system must face as technology and society changes?

Second, how has the Government performed and how has it conducted itself? I refer to the way the Executive arm of government has acted in relation to the people, interest groups in the community and Parliament and how its procedures are organised. In many ways, one of the best ways to judge someone is by the way he or she exercises power. Of course, a Government has great powers. If those powers are used in a right and proper way, one would conclude that in some respects it has been a good Government.

Third, what is the wellbeing of the people of Western Australia, and how is that wellbeing affected by the performance of the Government? Members should note that I use the word "wellbeing", for the time has come for Western Australia, indeed, for all jurisdictions, to move away from gross domestic product as a measure of wellbeing, welfare or progress. We now understand that the GDP simply cannot tell us enough about what is taking place in

society to indicate whether people are better off than they were before this Government came to office. One of the Government's big mistakes was to judge itself by the GDP; in so doing, it acquired a mistaken view about what is occurring in the community.

The first criterion for judging a Government is how it leaves the system of government. Western Australia has been through an interesting period of self-reflection, probably one of the most profound periods of self-reflection during any time in our history. A common pattern has emerged post-1890 with responsible government and the establishment of our two Houses of Parliament based on election of the people, even though the definition of "the people" has changed through time; namely, that despite the presence of different parties in government, our political system has pretty well been taken for granted. From time to time arguments have been made about reforming our electoral system, but the structure of the system has basically been accepted.

In recent years, debate has ensued in the community about whether the system is a good one. The Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters started that debate, which fed off to the Commission on Government. The conclusion of that debate was that any Government which takes power has a responsibility for not only governing the State, but also ensuring that the system of government passed on to the next generation is better than the previous system.

The first failure of this Government has been not to change our system of government, as a result of its hostility to political reform. It saddens those of us who believe strongly in political reform that the Government has not taken up that challenge, despite the urging of the royal commission and the Commission on Government. In respect of the first criterion outlined in part (d) of our motion, the Opposition expresses a mixture of anger and disappointment about what the Government has achieved. This reluctance to consider political reform is as a result partly of the urging of the National Party in the coalition, partly of the Government's hostility to the concept of political reform, and partly of the view expressed by members opposite; that is, "We are in Government now and we will enjoy the power which goes with that." Government members are not interested in the recommended reforms. The people of Western Australia at this election will certainly not be inheriting a better political system than the one passed on in 1993 when government members came to power.

The second criterion for judging the Government is the practice of government. This aspect interests me most. We always judge people by what they do. When one is in government, one has power, resources, authority and strength. In the case of this Government, that power and strength have rested in both Houses of Parliament. It is interesting to look at how people use power. A person who is in a powerful position can use that power to suit his short term interests, his party political interests or his sectional interests, or what I could call the public interest. That is very difficult, because any person who has power is subject to temptation, and temptation can get the better of any person.

This Government has exercised its power in such a way that it stands condemned. I will give some examples. Has the Government used its power to discipline its Ministers to ensure that we have good government in this State? Has the Government vigorously supported and promoted the concept of ministerial responsibility? This Government has failed when we look at the performance of individual Ministers in carrying out their duties, and at the contempt that they have shown for the principles that have been espoused by this Parliament in its legislation and for releasing information that is needed by the community to debate issues. This Government has been easily influenced by people with money and power, rather than by the ordinary public, in the decisions that it has made. For all of those reasons, and others, the Government has failed in the practice of government.

Of the three tests that I have given, the most interesting test on which the Government has failed is its lack of discipline and adherence to some of the important principles of ministerial responsibility. That has been no better represented than in the past few weeks, when the temptation to use the power and authority of government to seek re-election rather than to support good government has become too much for the Government. It has not been able to resist it. It is using all its resources to try to convince the people of this State that it should be re-elected, with massive amounts of money being spent on propaganda campaigns and political advertising.

It is sad to report that I would also have to fail the Government on the second test. Had the Government introduced fundamental reforms to our system of government to bring greater checks and accountability to government, perhaps it would have been encouraged by those checks and balances to be a Government that adhered to ministerial responsibility, but it certainly did not do that.

The third criterion for judging the Government is the wellbeing of the people. This is where the Government has made its biggest mistake, because it has focused on state gross domestic product as the measure of the wellbeing of the people. However, that gives a false view of what is happening in society. It does not indicate how many hours people are working or the sacrifices that people have to make to earn their income, what is the state of the environment, whether crime in our community is being tackled, what is the general amenity of the people and what is the distribution of income. For that reason, it does not give a snapshot of the wellbeing of society. The bad

mistake that this Government has made is to go into the community, look at all the measures that are available to judge wellbeing, pick out one of them, and think that it has judged the wellbeing of society. That does not work, and that is a bad mistake that no Government should make.

We should have a proper measure of wellbeing. I have proposed, and I will take it into government, that we develop a genuine progress indicator as an alternative to the gross domestic product. An interesting fact about the genuine progress indicator as it has been developed in America and Great Britain is that the economic historians put this indicator into the economic history of America and Great Britain in the post-war era, and until 1970, the genuine progress indicator did show improvements, but from 1970 onward it has shown a decline. Most people think that their lives, generally speaking, have become harder in the western democratic industrial world -

Mr Bloffwitch: Do you think you were better off in the 1970s than you are now?

Dr GALLOP: The indicator shows in many ways the difficulties that people must confront to make ends meet and the commitments that they must make to earn the same level of income. It is as though they are on an escalator and are going the wrong way but cannot move. The GPI is a better indicator, and we will use it in government.

We have to report that in the dying days of this Parliament, under those three headings, the Government has failed. Criterion No 1: Is the state of our democracy, our political institutions and our Constitution better today than it was in 1993? The answer is no, and the reason is that the Government is not committed to the principles laid down by the royal commission. Criterion No 2: Has this Government practised using the power, authority and resources that are available to it to promote a better style of government rather than adopt a cynical, self-serving style of government? On that criterion, the Government has failed. Criterion No 3: Has the wellbeing of the people been improved? As I said, the Government judges itself on a definition of wellbeing that is flawed - that is, gross domestic product - and we need a better definition.

We will go into the election on those three issues. We will tell the people of Western Australia that under Labor, there will be substantial constitutional reform and better checks and balances than existed under the conservative Government. Secondly, we will remind people of the performance of this Government, with the powers that it has had available to it - the arrogance that it has shown and that is so well illustrated by that median strip in the electorate of my colleague the member for Belmont.

Mr Bloffwitch: It is very easy to get to the airport now.

Dr GALLOP: That indicates where the member for Geraldton is coming from and the interests that he represents.

Mr Bloffwitch: It improves the traffic flow.

Dr GALLOP: It is just a through road to the airport! What about the people who live there? The member for Belmont can use that quote in one of his pamphlets in the electorate.

Mr Ripper: I certainly will. It will be circulated.

Mr Bloffwitch: We have lived with bypass roads in Geraldton for years and years. Of course the people on the highway will complain, but whose interests are we looking after - the general public or a vested group? You are telling us we are looking after vested interests.

Dr GALLOP: The tunnel in Northbridge and the median strip in Belmont illustrate only too well the arrogance of this Government.

Mr Trenorden: What do you mean by "arrogance"?

Dr GALLOP: Did the member for Avon not see the Minister for Transport on television?

Mr Trenorden: How can it be arrogance?

Dr GALLOP: No consultation with the community; done for self-serving, narrow political reasons rather than for the broad public interest.

Mr Trenorden: Do you think Main Roads should provide for every access road? Roads like that should have very few access roads on them. My constituency thought it was the greatest thing that ever happened.

Dr Gallop: We know only too well why the decision was made.

Mr Trenorden: I have been lobbying for it for some years.

Dr GALLOP: Does anyone else in the National Party want to contribute to this debate? What would happen if someone from the city wanted to build a highway through the middle of Geraldton going to Carnarvon?

Mr Bloffwitch: There already is one.

Dr GALLOP: There is a bypass road.

Mr Bloffwitch: No there is not.

Dr GALLOP: Yes there is. The member for Geraldton knows only too well that the bypass road takes people from the central city area of Geraldton. It is simply not good enough, and the Opposition feels the Government has failed in all those important respects. It is the Opposition's sad duty to inform the Parliament of that failure.

MR RIPPER (Belmont) [5.21 pm]: I am astonished that the Premier has not responded to this motion. Perhaps it is consistent with his behaviour in the past few days and weeks. It strikes me that the Premier has lost his nerve.

Mrs Edwardes: At least you speak the common language.

Mr RIPPER: I hope it is not too common. I have been surprised at the Premier's behaviour in recent days and weeks because he seems to have lost his nerve. With the published polls and the official forecast of the State's future, the Premier may have been feeling some confidence - perhaps misplaced - about his future electoral prospects. Instead, the Premier has shown every sign of extreme political and electoral nervousness, and that has been a revelation to me. There are a number of examples of this apparent loss of confidence and failure of nerve, such as the unprecedented speculation about an early election. Who started that speculation? It was started by the Premier in July at the Liberal Party state conference. After solemnly telling the Parliament and the public that there would be no early election, he decided to redefine the meaning of "early election". Instead of that description applying to an election held any time before the traditional date in February, the Premier decided it would exclude an election held in November or December. That statement sparked the early election pressure and speculation. The Premier has ducked, dived and wavered on the election date. It could have been 30 November or 7 December, and now it is an open secret that the election will be held on 14 December.

Mr Marlborough: I do not think it will be.

Mr RIPPER: Of course there is the odd contrary view about the election date, but it is still the case that most people around the corridors are saying the election will be held on 14 December. A flurry of announcements has been made recently. This Government has told the community it is financially responsible and that it will not make unfunded or extravagant promises. However, press statements have been released in recent days containing promises which are not funded and which are based on federal money, and promises that involve funds one hundred times the amount the State will contribute. The salinity program is a classic example. It is a \$3b promise based on \$10m of additional state funds. Where will the rest of the money come from? It will come from the Federal Government. What is the source of funding? It is the part sale of Telstra Corporation Ltd. Perhaps the Premier has not caught up with Senator Harradine's view on the part sale of Telstra. He has said it is not on. Therefore, that source of funds will not be available and the funds for the salinity program will not be available. The funding for the program has fallen into a hole.

My colleague the member for Cockburn drew attention to the announcement about the Gngangara pine plantation and the park that will be established. The Premier said the advertising is about consulting people. I do not think so when the leaflet states that the Government is moving the pines from Gngangara to create the biggest park in Perth. That sounds like an election promise. I find it remarkable that this was wrapped around my local newspaper distributed in Belmont. Gngangara is a fair distance from Belmont, and I see it as taxpayers funding party political propaganda. The member for Marangaroo has said it is an absolute disgrace that days before a state election is due to be announced, this level of taxpayers' money is spent on political advertising to promote the Government's cause. It is not the only example.

The Minister for Labour Relations is an expert at this type of political advertising. I refer to the strata titles advertising campaign day after day on radio and in the newspapers. The newspaper advertising carries a picture of the Minister with the statement that the Government has fixed the problem. Of course, taxpayers are paying for propaganda by the Minister for Labour Relations in which he states that he has fixed the problems, but he caused those problems in the first place. The workplace agreements campaign was a political advertising campaign. It was a disgraceful campaign designed to foist on people the Government's industrial relations philosophy. It was a taxpayer funded advertising campaign on perhaps the most controversial issue in this community, and the most sensitive issue which divides the political parties in this State. It has been the subject of heated debates in this Parliament, and the Government has spent taxpayers' money to convince the public that what the Government has done is right.

Mr Trenorden: Do you remember four years ago when a certain railway line in the northern suburbs was opened days before a certain election and the mega dollars that were spent on that opening to which 1 500 people were invited?

Mr RIPPER: The defence from the Government seems to be that Labor members behaved in a way that coalition members criticised at the time, and now the coalition members will behave in exactly the same way. I do not recall anything like this magnitude of taxpayer funded political advertising. There has been a flurry of it in recent days. Public money has been used to convince people of the merits of the Liberal Party's political position. It is not as though the Liberal Party will be short of funds in the election campaign. There is no doubt that the coalition parties will outspend the Labor Party in the forthcoming election by a great deal. It will have a very well funded election campaign compared with the moneys available to the Labor Party.

Dr Hames: Before I got into Parliament, in 1989 my surgery in Bedford -

Mr RIPPER: Which the member still operates, even though he is a member of Parliament.

Dr Hames: - which was part of your previous leader Dowding's electorate, received a glossy brochure with his picture on the front cover. It had something to do with family services. Two weeks later exactly the same production was on the front page of his pamphlet for the election.

Mr RIPPER: Does the member for Dianella think it is appropriate for taxpayers' funds to be used to support party political activities?

Dr Hames: I do not think it is appropriate.

Mr RIPPER: Then why does he tolerate it from his own Government now? If the member does not think it is appropriate, why does he sit quietly in the party room and let this sort of activity I have been talking about go on? Why does he let the Minister for Labour Relations do what he is doing? Why does he let the strata titles advertising go ahead?

I want to raise another issue. It is well known that the Deputy Premier supports an election in February.

Mr Shave: How do you know?

Mr RIPPER: I think it is fairly well known also that the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, the Leader of the House, supports an election in February. I would like to see them come into this House and deny that that is the position they have put in discussions on the coalition side. I do not think there is any doubt that the two most senior people in the coalition Government after the Premier support an election at the traditional time. However, the Premier and his advisers want to go to the public early. What does the Premier know about the future of this State that his two deputies do not? Why does he want to rush to an election when they do not? What does he know about the Liberal Party's political position, the State's financial position, or the political outlook that leads him to support a very early election, when his two deputies, the Deputy Premier and the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, are well known around this House for not supporting an early election?

I have left until relatively late in my speech the most strange announcement of all - the Elle Macpherson announcement. It has been said that the road to Elle is paved with good intentions, but on this occasion it is not because the Government is spending \$1m on some glitz and glamour to promote the Premier's political position. There is a lot of cynicism in the community about this expenditure. It is a sign that the Premier is looking for all sorts of sensational and circus-like activities to promote his Government's re-election campaign.

Mr Shave: Do you support it?

Mr RIPPER: I support the promotion of this State's tourist potential, but I do not support giving \$1m to someone from outside this State to augment the re-election prospects of the coalition side of politics. In recent days this Premier has given up the business of government in this State in favour of public relations announcements, unfunded promises, and promises based on federal funding that will not materialise. The organs of government have been taken over by the spin doctors and the public relations men. The Premier does not care what he says or what he promises right now, so long as he has the right political result in the community. He does this while he lectures the Labor Party on its promises and while he pretends that the Opposition will not go to the community with fully funded and fully costed promises. He pretends that opposition members will be irresponsible; will try to mislead the community; and will make promises they cannot possibly keep. Opposition members are very responsible in their approach to the commitments they will make during the forthcoming election campaign. Everything will be fully funded and fully costed. The Government cannot have it both ways: It cannot pretend to be a responsible, financial manager; to be governing in the interests of the State in a statesmanlike way; and use that pretence as a basis on which to attack the Opposition while the Government makes billions of dollars worth of promises in the four week period leading up to the announcement of the election and engages in substantial taxpayer funded propaganda and PR and spin doctor motivated gestures to enhance its own political position.

It is either a responsible, prudent Government, governing in the interests of the State, or a bunch of politicians, anxious to be re-elected like all other politicians. The Government is trying to have it both ways. It pretends that it is financially responsible and prudent while it attacks the Opposition for its promises, and at the same time it engages in behaviour that is anything but financially responsible and prudent; that is, market driven and PR driven gestures to try to opportunistically win a few votes. That is not the leadership the Premier should be displaying. That is why the Opposition has moved this motion.

MR COURT (Nedlands - Premier) [5.37 pm]: I found the contributions of members opposite interesting. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked in this Parliament whether the Government was negotiating with Elle Macpherson to promote Western Australia and he asked a few other questions. That afternoon I was inundated by Labor Party members who wanted to help conclude those negotiations with Elle. The Opposition cannot have it both ways: It cannot say that it wants to be a part of the negotiating team and then say that the sponsorship is not on.

Mr Ripper: Did the member for Kalgoorlie make that request?

Mr COURT: That decision is seen by people throughout the community as a marketing coup.

The first part of this motion states that the Premier has failed to meet standards expected of his high office in that he has presided over a decline in standards of ministerial behaviour. How could there be a decline in standards after what this State has gone through? Ministers in the Labor Government were found to have acted improperly.

Mr Ripper: Who was Premier when that was said?

Mr COURT: Half the members opposite were there.

Mr Ripper: Who presided over that Government against which those accusations were made?

Mr COURT: The document I have lists Brian Burke - improper; David Parker - improper; Peter Dowding - improper; and Julian Grill - improper. It states that the Ministers elevated personal or party advantage over their constitutional obligation to act in the public interest.

Mr Ripper: Wasn't that last decade? Aren't you going back a decade?

Mr COURT: I am talking about the Ministers who were with the Labor Party until the last election, some of whom are still in the Parliament. Their own leader did not tell the whole story about the losses inside the third party insurance fund. How could there be lower standards than those shown by previous Ministers, some of whom are still in this Parliament? What could be of a lower standard than the way the Swan Brewery deal was put together by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he was in government?

Mr Kobelke: Get out of the gutter.

Mr COURT: Members must be joking to say that I preside over a decline in standards of ministerial behaviour. To this day they still do not accept the concept of collective responsibility of Cabinet. They come out of Cabinet and shoot back to their electorate saying something is awful and they have not agreed to it.

Mr Kobelke: Have you not woken up; we are not in Cabinet?

Mr COURT: This motion is an absolute nonsense. I do not think this State will see a decline from those standards for many decades; they will probably never see them. It makes me laugh. The Leader of the Opposition said on the radio this afternoon that a Labor Government would show responsible financial management. When in government he did not even have the courage to tell this State that its third party insurance fund was broke. How could people take him seriously? How can the Labor Party be good at financial management when it caused the State to be \$1.5b down the gurgler? Members opposite have challenged the Government on the many commitments it has made over the past few weeks. It has indeed made those commitments, every one of which is funded. Members opposite do not like that.

Mr Kobelke: Where is the \$340m savings?

Mr COURT: We have had to save hundreds of millions of dollars each year. State debt has declined by \$1.9b under this Government - almost a \$2b decrease.

Mr Shave: What happened when they were in government?

Mr COURT: It increased by that much in two years.

Mr Ripper: What are your asset sales?

Mr COURT: Approximately \$1b.

Mr Ripper: How much extra in revenue are you getting each year over and above what the Lawrence Labor Government received?

Mr COURT: Not much more.

Mr Ripper: One billion dollars in asset sales and \$1b in additional revenue.

Mr COURT: Members opposite borrowed money to do school maintenance. As a result, in future our children will be paying back money used to pay for maintenance carried out on schools in the past, and they talk about our irresponsibility.

The Opposition's motion also states that the Premier has "failed to use the time of Parliament during 1996 to pass reforms to our system of government called for by the WA royal commission and the Commission on Government". We have not heard a response from members opposite to the Commission on Government recommendations.

Mr Ripper: You will.

Mr Kobelke: We had ours out before the Government.

Mr COURT: They have still not done that. The member for Nollamara says it has been done and the member for Belmont says it will be done.

Mr Ripper: They are different reports.

Mr COURT: When will the Opposition put out the balance?

Mr Kobelke: When it suits us.

Mr COURT: Members opposite are all wind. They talk about the Government being accountable and they keep talking about the Commission on Government. They said that they supported all the recommendations and would implement all of them. Then they said they would not support an increase in the number of members of Parliament.

Mr Ripper: Do you support electoral reform?

Mr COURT: The Government put its position on all the recommendations.

Mr Ripper: What is your view on that recommendation?

Mr COURT: I cannot take members opposite seriously. They talk about a decline in ministerial standards, but no-one could get as low as previous Ministers. They talk about what has been done. This Government has done something members opposite did not do. It has been operating under freedom of information. The previous Government passed the legislation but did not proclaim it. This Government established the Commission on Government and passed the Public Sector Management Act, which provides for public sector codes of ethics. Employing authorities must act independently in staff selection and appointments. This Government appointed a Commissioner of Public Sector Standards; established an independent commission to review the State's finances; amended the Official Corruption Commission legislation to establish the Anti-Corruption Commission; and amended the Criminal Code to include Ministers and members of Parliament under the definition of "public officer". It is just as well that was not done a few years back; if it had, there would be fewer people in the House.

The Statutory Corporations (Liability of Directors) Bill would have created an interesting situation a few years ago. This Government publishes all the travel and consultants' reports in the Parliament; it publishes polling results; competitive tendering reports are presented to Parliament; it has introduced accrual accounting throughout government; and has introduced huge changes inside the Police Service. The list goes on. This Government has done things to make the Government more accountable, and members opposite cannot even tell us what is the Opposition's response to the Commission on Government recommendations.

Mr Kobelke: We had them out before the Premier even thought of them. We will give the other ones when we are ready.

Mr Ripper: Do you support electoral reform in both Houses of Parliament?

Mr COURT: I said that the Government believes there should be changes. Has the member for Belmont not read its changes? The Government put its position forward; it believes there should be change.

Mr Ripper: One-vote-one-value?

Mr COURT: The Government will head towards it.

Mr Ripper: By 2050.

Mr COURT: The motion refers to policy backflips. I am proud to say that four years ago this Government set out an agenda on which it has delivered. It has been prepared to make some bold decisions and has achieved, for example, an infill sewerage program, a policy on the salinity strategy, balanced Budgets, reduced debt and increased funding to disability services.

Mr Tubby: There is a gas pipeline.

Mr COURT: Yes; there is a pipeline, not a Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd project on which this Government had to repay even more money to settle the legal action.

Mr Osborne: What about the Collie power station?

Mr COURT: The Collie power station comes to mind when members opposite talk about policy backflips. I wish the Leader of the Opposition were in here. He said the 600 MW Collie power station must be built by the private sector. He promoted that both inside and outside the Parliament. Now he is running around saying the Opposition is opposed to privatisation. When he was a Minister he was quite prepared to have a privately built Collie power station. This Government decided that the sums would not add up if it built a 600 MW power station at the time.

Mr Ripper: Is there not a difference between community services such as hospital services, education services and public transport, and economic assets such as power stations or pipelines?

Mr COURT: They are still services.

Mr Ripper: We draw a distinction.

Mr COURT: When people turn on lights, does it matter whether they are driven by private or government power?

Mr Ripper: I do not believe it does.

Mr COURT: I do not believe it does. I have no problem with privately owned power stations. Virtually all future power generations in the State will be privately run. Members opposite should not say in this Parliament that they are opposed to privatisation when the Leader of the Opposition spent years trying to establish a privately owned power station and failed.

Mr Ripper: We are opposed to privatisation in the hospital system and in public transport. Those are important community services. We support privatisation of economic assets such as the pipeline, but we will not support it for vital community services.

Dr Turnbull: What about the power station?

Mr Ripper: We are not opposed in principle to privately generated power.

Mr COURT: Is the member for Belmont saying that delivery of health services from a privately owned hospital is not as good as delivery of services from a government hospital?

Mr Ripper: We do not support privatising hospitals.

Mr COURT: The member would not know what he stands for. He is prepared to jump in on any little issue that will give a short term advantage. He has no principles on policy!

Mr Ripper: You should talk!

Mr COURT: If the union movement says that it does not want privatisation, members opposite run around saying that they do not want privatisation.

Mr Minson: It is interesting that this motion has been moved but neither the Leader of the Opposition nor the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is in the Chamber.

Mr COURT: Would the Minister for Mines stay in the Chamber if he had to defend a decline in the standards of the ministerial behaviour of members opposite?

Mr Minson: They should tell us about the brewery.

Mr COURT: If our decline in standards were the same as that of members opposite, we would all be locked up.

Dr Turnbull: The only person opposite with standards is the only member sitting on that front bench at the moment!

Mr Ripper: That is the kiss of death. Thank you, but no thanks.

Mr COURT: The member for Belmont is a good member, because he is prepared to defend the private power station. However, he is not prepared to defend private hospitals. That gives us ammunition.

Mr Ripper: I am not prepared to defend the privatisation of our public hospital system.

Mr COURT: I do not want to delay the House. The motion is nonsense.

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley - Minister for Family and Children's Services) [5.51 pm]: This afternoon we have heard a series of lectures which indicate how out of touch the Opposition is with the ordinary person in the street. Members opposite have stopped listening. They have been complaining about the consultative process that the Government has undertaken. Members opposite have forgotten that process, and for the past three and a half years their main aim has been to denigrate me. They have forgotten the ordinary people outside this place who are very interested in many issues.

I turn to women's issues. Members opposite had the greatest opportunity when they had a woman Premier, five women Ministers and a woman in charge of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. However, they did not achieve much for women in this State. I point to the Western Women fiasco.

Dr Watson: What have you ever done?

Mrs EDWARDES: The member should wait. Members opposite argued about the public interest. The greater public interest is being able to listen to people, and to ensure that programs are set up to look after those people. Our economic impact study on letting fees was a responsible decision. Changing Saturday afternoon trading hours to Wednesday evening for the motor vehicle dealers was a good decision which the industry supported. Consumers were ambivalent about the decision, but we arrived at that position after listening to many people.

In the Fair Trading portfolio we have increased liaison with industry and consumers, with the establishment of many reference groups. If members consider what we have done as a Government, they will realise that we have been working with and listening to the people we are supposed to look after.

We have taken the leadership role in advancing the status of women in Western Australia. We have done far more than members opposite ever did. Instead of holding hands and having cups of tea, we have made sure that women's issues have been mainstreamed across government. All issues are women's issues. We do not wish to have a small office of women's interests, primarily dealing with women as customers, because all women are customers of transport, health, education, planning and small business, across the whole of government. We have been working very hard, not only to increase the number of women on boards and committees in a decision making role, but also to encourage the private sector to play a leading role in this regard. We have undertaken research for programs to be implemented in all areas of government, and we have evaluated those programs. Wider consultation has occurred under the Women's Advisory Council. Nine women members sit on that council, with regional affiliates throughout the State, ensuring that they network with every woman in Western Australia. Therefore, every woman in this State has a voice and the ability to approach the Government. The Government can listen to and consult the women on whose lives we will have some effect.

The Opposition will claim that it raised domestic violence issues, but the previous Government's reports went in the top drawer and no action was taken. We have provided new money to address family and domestic violence, far more than the Opposition provided when in government. With the establishment of 16 regional committees we have provided base funding for the development of regional plans, to ensure the personal safety of families and children. We have introduced restraining orders legislation to ensure that people are helped and, when faced with a difficult situation, they will not need to make a decision in possibly a traumatised state. We have done something with new money for women, children and families.

Several members interjected.

Mrs EDWARDES: While members opposite have been involved with three and a half years of personal denigration, we have got on with the job!

We have based all our programs and strategies in the Family and Children's Services portfolio on research. We have focused on parenting. We have a tremendous program to ensure we underpin the foundation of families in Western Australia. We have provided family information centres, and parent link home visiting services so that parents can obtain some basic information to help them through what is sometimes a difficult situation - which we all know about as parents. Similarly, when families and children are at risk, we will be there with a helping hand.

Over the past four years the Government has taken an internationally acclaimed approach to child protection and family support. Our approach is well recognised in the latest newsletters from industry bodies that are very interested in child protection. The Government has done far more than any other Government in the past to protect the best

interests of the child in a family situation, and to support families where appropriate. Through the Family and Children's Advisory Council we have provided opportunities for community input.

We are changing community attitudes to aging as a result of our five year plan. In the year 2021, one person in four will be a senior. Therefore, we will have more seniors than children, and the community will need to support seniors. They will not be the seniors of the 1950s or even the 1990s; so, as a State, we must ensure that our planning is far-sighted. I am pleased to be able to report that under this Government the situation for families, children and seniors has been strengthened.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (16)

Ms Anwyl
Mr M. Barnett
Mr Catania
Dr Edwards
Dr Gallop
Mr Grill

Mrs Hallahan
Mrs Henderson
Mr Kobelke
Mr McGinty
Mr Riebeling
Mr Ripper

Mrs Roberts
Mr Thomas
Dr Watson
Mr Cunningham
(Teller)

Noes (24)

Mr Ainsworth
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr Blaikie
Mr Board
Mr Bradshaw
Mr Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Day
Mrs Edwardes

Mr House
Mr Kierath
Mr McNee
Mr Minson
Mr Nicholls
Mr Omodei
Mr Osborne
Mrs Parker

Mr Shave
Mr Strickland
Mr Trenorden
Mr Tubby
Dr Turnbull
Mrs van de Klashorst
Mr Bloffwitch (Teller)

Pairs

Mr Brown
Mr D.L. Smith
Ms Warnock
Mr Marlborough
Mr Graham

Mr Wiese
Mr Lewis
Mr Marshall
Mr Prince
Dr Hames

Question thus negatived.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

STANDING COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM LEGISLATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Reports Tabling

Mr Pental presented for tabling the Standing Committee on Uniform Legislation and Intergovernmental Agreements' Report on the Evidence Law and the committee's report from 1 June to 31 October 1996, and on his motion it was resolved -

That the reports be printed.

[See papers Nos 789 and 790.]

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MRS HALLAHAN (Armadale) [7.34 pm]: In addressing this Bill, the member for Glendalough made some very important comments about the Court Government's performance in relation to road safety. The second reading speech states that the Government is committed to tackling the appalling injuries and loss of life that occur daily on Western Australian roads. During the life of the Court Government, the road toll has increased appallingly and Western Australia has gone from displaying a leadership role in this area to being well down the list in comparison

with other States. Once again, this Government has been unable to justify its rhetoric. The Opposition hopes that the changes proposed in this Bill will lead to a much better performance on the part of this Government in taking steps that will bring down the road toll.

The appointment of the chairperson of the Road Safety Council will be very interesting. I will not go through the job description because, if the Opposition enjoys success in enough seats at the next state election, it will ensure that the person appointed is suitable for the job.

I would like the Minister to explain how these amendments will enable officers from the Department of Transport's mobile transport unit to enforce more effectively the provisions in this legislation dealing with heavy haulage. What are the current shortcomings; how will this Bill overcome them; how will it better target road safety in regard to the heavy haulage industry; and what will that mean for other road users? Those issues are not outlined in the second reading speech; it contains bald statements without any explanation.

This Bill also contains an important change in relation to the licensing authority for all driver and vehicle licensing in our State. We accept that this change must be made and, to some extent, the Bill gives legal sanction to changes that have already been made administratively.

I will highlight one point and again criticise the Court Government for its long delay in making changes relating to vehicle inspections, particularly in respect of the taxi industry. At present, taxi owners are required to have their vehicles inspected every time they renew their licence. If they cannot afford to pay one year's licence fee and opt to license their vehicle for only six months, they are required by law to pay for two inspections a year. On the other hand, someone who has plenty of money, and has their vehicle inspected only once, pays for only one inspection. This problem was pointed out to the Government and it has taken nearly to the death knock of this Parliament to rectify this problem.

Taxi owners are often kept waiting for lengthy periods to have their vehicles inspected. One taxi driver relayed to me his experience last week. In this instance the delay was not as long as has been the case in the past. This taxi owner waited for about an hour before his vehicle was inspected. The inspection took eight minutes, but he had spent \$400 putting his vehicle in order. I wonder what message that sends to other operators. Why would they bother to spend \$400 and have their vehicle off the road while that work is done if the inspection is over in about eight minutes? They see others who have not been so thorough in their preparations still getting a safety clearance and a renewed licence.

I would like the Minister for Planning, who is handling this Bill, to tell me which clause sets out that taxis will be inspected annually rather than biannually, as is the case now, if the owners pay their renewal fee on a six monthly basis. Will it be laid down in regulations? I have read the Bill and I want an explanation.

Mr Lewis: Now?

Mrs HALLAHAN: Obviously I do not expect it now, but the Minister has staff here. I am not asking the impossible.

Mr House: He will let you know when we next sit.

Mrs HALLAHAN: I would like to know tonight. The Minister for Primary Industry should not be too arrogant. The Minister handling the Bill has plenty of staff on high salaries. I can see a couple who must have very big salaries! I am sure they are very good bureaucrats and they could give the Minister the answer, if he would simply ask them for it.

Mr Lewis: What is the question?

Mrs HALLAHAN: Where in this Bill is the provision that taxis will have to go for inspection on only an annual basis?

Mr Lewis: I had better look that up!

Mrs HALLAHAN: I am sorry, but the taxi industry is very keen to have this clarified. It has waited for the Minister's Government for nearly four years to introduce this legislation. As far as we know, the Parliament will close down in a few hours. The Government wants this Bill to go through, but I want to be assured that this Bill will do what the industry has long waited for and is expecting the Government to enact. Because of the pressure on time tonight, as the Government has apparently reached a decision that it will be going to an election on 14 December, and all the signs are that that will be announced tomorrow and everybody is responding to that likelihood, it therefore gives us a very limited sitting time to deal with the Bills that the Government wants cleared. I will not extend my remarks but I want to be quite clear about the relevant clause, because it is critical to the taxi industry. I have been approached a number of times about it.

I am sure the Minister's people are taking notes. I would also like the Minister to tell us how we will regain Western Australia's supremacy as the leading Australian State in road safety, which is a position we have lost under the Court Government.

MS ANWYL (Kalgoorlie) [7.44 pm]: I also seek to keep my remarks brief. I see that the Minister for Education is nodding his head.

Mrs Hallahan: He is like a school teacher.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am learning.

Ms ANWYL: He does not have the background but he might want to assume some of the characteristics of teachers.

The Road Safety Council will be established by this legislation, which makes good sense. Given the comments that have been made on this side of the House about the poor road safety record to which the Government has taken the State, I understand that we have gone from number one to number four in Australian States. It is certainly a complex area. I accept that it is desirable to have a body looking at the issue, but it is also necessary to consider a number of other factors which must contribute to road safety. We must look at the conduct of drivers, the quality of roads and so forth.

Recently the Director of Road Safety Strategy and Coordination visited my electorate and conducted a public forum. I applaud that. One of the alarming results which were made public as a result of that visit was that data collected over several years showed a simple example of the decline in standards: One in 12 people failed to wear a seat belt. That problem is being attacked vigorously by the Police Force in Kalgoorlie. With the appointment of Commander Balchin and Superintendent Watson, very real moves have been made to free up as many general duty police officers as possible to attack the problem. The merging of the general duties and traditional traffic branches should lead to more police on the roads. Therefore, one hopes that there will be some real advance in apprehending problem motorists. I believe that two of the major problems identified by the coordinator are drink driving and fatigue. Given that those are major problems, we must look at methods of combatting them. Country drivers have a particular problem with fatigue because they must commute quite frequently to the metropolitan area.

One of the greatest problems I have faced since being the member for Kalgoorlie is the absolute decline of the *Prospector* rail service. It makes no sense at all when talking about combatting things like driver fatigue to cut back government services such as the *Prospector* and thereby require more people to take to the roads in order to travel the distance between Kalgoorlie and Perth, which is 600 km via the Great Eastern Highway. This Government has a particular knack of giving the impression that lots of funding is going into the *Prospector* service when the reality is that the service has been downgraded right through the course of this Government's term. Westrail's annual report identified some time ago a great deal of work to be done, yet it is only now on the eve of an election that commitments have been made to repair the track. I suggest the track has deliberately been allowed to fall into disrepair. A novel feature of that disrepair is that the track is decidedly worse between Merredin and Kalgoorlie than Perth and Merredin.

Mr Lewis interjected.

Ms ANWYL: The Minister may laugh, but I am talking about relieving the need for people to travel long distances by car. Certainly that aspect of road safety must be taken into account by this Government. The *Prospector* is an example of where one would expect a Government to be doing what it could to enhance the public transport system in order to encourage people to travel by a means other than road.

Another example of what I suggest is the mindless push to privatisation and how it is affecting the quality of road safety was highlighted only last week by some constituents who pointed to the recent marking out of lines on the roads in Kalgoorlie. It has been of an extremely poor standard. For example, in Lionel Street, Kalgoorlie, the bicycle lane of a designated bicycle way, largely for school children, was marked out in September of this year, but those lines are almost invisible now. I understand that was done by private contractors. Large amounts of government money are being channelled through private contractors and the quality of work being done is so poor as to be nonexistent. I wonder what on earth can be the logic for that sort of decision. Those lines were previously marked by the staff of Main Roads. We now have private contractors doing what must be substandard work. Either the work is substandard or the quality of paint being used is substandard.

It has surfaced in my electorate this week that people are being encouraged to use public transport. People in the country do not have the same level of access to public transport as people in the city. A great deal of concern has been created by the decision to privatise many of the public transport services in the city. However, in Kalgoorlie-Boulder people are reliant on the Eastern Goldfields Transport Board which provides a bus service six days a week. Rumours about that board have been circulating for some time. The rumours have become more

substantial that there are moves afoot to privatise that board. That privatisation is likely to result in a reduction in services. If that is the case, a large number of bus drivers who have been employed for more than 10 years will face uncertainty. All those drivers have dependent wives and children and, given that we are approaching Christmas, one would have thought the Government would move quickly to quash any speculation about this. However, I understand that approaches to the Minister led to the Minister's staff suggesting that it is a matter for the Department of Transport. When that department was approached, it said it had no comment about what was going on.

In respect of road safety, it is desirable that public transport services be available. Considering the two main killers on our roads are drink driving and fatigue, alternative transport services must be available. People in Kalgoorlie-Boulder work extremely long hours in a variety of occupations associated with the mining industry. Bus services should be available to them. Once again the push for privatisation will result in reduced services. Apart from that aspect, security of employment should be available to those who are employed in that industry.

Those are simple examples in my electorate of how road safety is being affected by attacks on public transport, and by lines on roads fading within two months leaving young children without marked bicycle lanes.

DR TURNBULL (Collie) [7.56 pm]: I support this amendment Bill. This Bill which creates the Office of Road Safety, results from the report of the Select Committee on Road Safety. That committee, and the Select Committee on Heavy Transport, emphasised the multifaceted aspect of road safety. The transfer of the management of road safety from the Police Department to a special unit, the Office of Road Safety, within the Department of Transport is a very important move. We will be able to concentrate on all the components of the road safety issue.

This important move made by the Government will target the wide range of issues involved in road safety. One of the aspects to have special focus will be the education of road users, including truck drivers, car drivers, motorbike riders, bicycle riders and pedestrians.

MR LEWIS (Applecross - Minister for Planning) [7.57 pm]: I understand from the comments by the Opposition that it supports the Bill. This legislation will allow the Government to better regulate safety on our roads, which is commendable. It will remove some of the current legislative impediments and allow the Government to address the road safety challenges.

The member for Glendalough asked what will be the budget of the Road Safety Council. It is intended to be about \$6.1m. The total take of fines from Multanova cameras currently is about \$12m. A third of that goes to the \$6.1m budget. As the member should have gathered from the second reading speech, it is the intention over time to try to appropriate all of that \$12m which comes from fines and licence fees.

Mrs Roberts: Won't that happen immediately?

Mr LEWIS: Not immediately. It is intended that it will happen over time.

Mrs Roberts: Over how long?

Mr LEWIS: I cannot tell the member. It is not intended to happen in the near future. However, the intention is that it will happen.

The member for Armadale asked about the licensing of taxis and the like. I draw the member's attention to clause 6 which amends section 29. Paragraph (c) enables the Minister to cause inspections to happen on an annual basis rather than when a licence is renewed.

The member for Glendalough seemed to imply that the Government has complete control over road safety and that under a Labor Government things were much better. I suggest that is somewhat like the Minister for Water Resources claiming that he caused the dams to overflow.

Mrs Hallahan: It was your Minister who claimed that.

Mr LEWIS: No, he did not. That is the analogy. Everyone in this House and in the community would like to see the road toll lowered. I believe it goes through cycles. Unfortunately this year is not going terribly well. However, this legislation will enable the Government to attack vigorously the rising road toll.

I thank the speakers who have supported the Bill. Although members of the Opposition support this legislation they never stop bleating.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Osborne) in the Chair; Mr Lewis (Minister for Planning) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8 put and passed.

Clause 9: Section 47 inserted -

Mrs ROBERTS: In the second reading debate I asked the Minister for an assurance that the operations of the Road Safety Council would be open and accountable. Under this Government, boards have operated in secrecy. What confidentiality provisions will apply to the Road Safety Council and will the recommendations it makes to the Minister be made public? If they are made public, at what stage will that occur? I do not want a situation to arise where the council makes recommendations to the Minister for Transport and the Minister implements them without the Opposition and the public being made aware of them. Subclause 2(f) states that one of the council's functions is to recommend to the Minister how moneys standing to the credit of the road trauma trust fund should be spent to implement such measures and to facilitate the council's functions. In other words, the Minister has a role to play. I look forward to the Minister's response.

Mr LEWIS: The member is speaking to the wrong clause. I direct her attention to clause 10, which clearly indicates that members of the public will sit on the council. Clause 13 requires the council to report annually on its affairs and deliberations. It is also required to report to a ministerial council of five Ministers. The accountability will be through this place and the Government and that would happen in the normal course of events.

Mrs ROBERTS: I am not satisfied with the Minister's response. He said that under clause 10 members of the public will sit on the council, but that means very little to me. Members of the public sit on boards such as the East Perth Redevelopment Authority. Simply because members of the public are appointed to boards does not mean they are at liberty to reveal any discussions they have with, or recommendations they forward to, the Minister.

I understand from the Minister's comments that the recommendations will not be made public as a matter of course. In other words, the Opposition will have to look to the annual reports to glean what information it can. That is not good enough. The council should operate with a little more openness. Members of the council should be able to disclose the nature of the recommendations. The Minister did not clarify the situation. He said some members of the council will be members of the public. I already knew that. He also said it would report annually. Again I knew that. The Minister did not answer my question and he certainly has not allayed my concerns.

Mr LEWIS: I have nothing further to add. I do not know what the member expects me to say.

Mr CATANIA: I ask the Minister to clarify subclause (2)(f). The Minister's second reading speech indicates that one-third of the revenue raised from Multanovas and red light cameras is allocated to road safety and two-thirds to consolidated revenue. In other words, most of the money goes into the State's coffers rather than to road safety measures.

Mr Strickland: That is what occurred when you were in government.

Mr CATANIA: A huge number of Multanovas are now used on the roads and they are raking in the money. The money is not used for road safety measures, but to bolster the State's coffers. In other words, they are kerbside cash registers.

Will the total amount of moneys raised from Multanovas and red light cameras go towards road safety? It is anticipated that there will be 250 deaths on Western Australian roads this year and that 13 000 people will be hospitalised because of injuries sustained in road accidents. However, 30 seconds before the next election this Government amends the Road Traffic Act.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Osborne): The member appears to be speaking to clause 5.

Mr CATANIA: With due respect, I am speaking about the road trauma trust fund.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is in clause 5. The Committee is debating clause 9.

Mr CATANIA: I am sure I can direct my comments to that clause. Can the Minister assure the Chamber that the total revenue from Multanovas and speed cameras will be devoted to road safety in Western Australia?

Mr LEWIS: I do not know what that has to do with this clause. As the current legislation stands the allocation is quarantined to one-third of the fines that are accrued by speed cameras. That legislation was put in place by a Labor Government. The Minister for Transport has foreshadowed his intention to bring in legislation to increase it to 100 per cent. That will require legislative amendment.

Mr Catania: Why didn't you do it here?

Mr LEWIS: I am not the Minister and the member for Balcatta knows that. It is difficult at the best of times to comment on someone else's portfolio. The Minister for Transport has clearly enunciated his intention to bring legislation to this Parliament so that 100 per cent of fines accrued through speed cameras will go towards road safety.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 53 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Lewis (Minister for Planning), and passed.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED FUND) BILL (No 4)

Second Reading

Resumed from 30 October.

MRS HENDERSON (Thornlie) [8.14 pm]: I want to make some remarks in relation to this Bill and these will probably be the final remarks I make to the House.

There is no question that it is an enormous privilege to be elected to this Parliament. There can be few jobs that provide the same opportunity to come into contact with many hundreds of ordinary people from the community, to talk to and to consult with them and to bring forward their issues. I have had a tremendous opportunity to interact with the people of Thornlie, and previously of Gosnells, by their hundreds, including individuals, families, and members of community organisations. This job gives one the opportunity to appreciate the enormous amount of work that those organisations contribute to the community. As everyone knows, those organisations range from sporting to service groups, through to self-help groups and all the community organisations that run community facilities such as family centres, SkillShare centres and so on. The amount of work that the hundreds of individuals put in on a voluntary capacity deserves wide recognition. As a member of Parliament one gets to see that hard work.

It was also a particular privilege to serve as a Minister for five years. It is a rare opportunity to be involved in a political party, to develop policy, and to have the chance to see that policy come to fruition by being in government and translating it into legislation and administrative action that brings into effect some reforms that one was involved in drafting as party policy maybe 15 or 20 years earlier. It is for that reason that the people of Western Australia, despite the criticism of the party system, are very well served by it. They know when they vote for a party roughly what they are voting for. They know the package of policies, issues, ideals and objectives for which they are voting, and that is very different from voting for a single issue party or an individual.

I have been extremely proud to have represented the Australian Labor Party in this Parliament. The objectives of the Labor Party are mine. They have always been a fair go and a decent standard of living for ordinary people. It has been my view that it is not just the Labor Party that has represented that, but also the industrial wing of the Labor Party. This wing includes the trade unions and their members who represent the working people of the State. The Labor Party will continue those objectives. It is the only party that will always represent the right of the ordinary person to a decent standard of living and a fair share of the wealth of the State.

It was not my intention today to talk about particular issues, because people have probably heard more than enough from me over the years. However, I could not let the opportunity go by without mentioning a couple of issues in the community. One of those is the particularly ugly race debate that has emerged. Pauline Hanson is clearly, unequivocally and totally wrong in her comments. Her comments have been ill-informed, ignorant, highly damaging and dangerous. Not a single person in this room would not acknowledge that the contribution that migrants have made to this country over the years has been enormous. Migrants were the backbone of the goldmining industry more than 100 years ago. They have been the backbone of the mining industry in the north west, and the horticultural and market gardening industry. They have been extremely hardworking, resourceful people. They have also been prepared to take on some of the most menial and poorly paid jobs but, nevertheless, jobs of great importance to the community. For example, they have been greatly represented in the cleaning industry. They have worked extremely long hours running things like green grocer shops and small local goods shops. They have been prepared to put in an enormous effort and our community has been enormously enriched by their presence. They have made a

contribution not only to the economy but also to our culture. They have enriched it not just through the wide range of fashion, foods and music they have introduced to Australia, but their planning methods and ideas and their contribution to our literature have been outstanding.

Migrants have not taken jobs from Australians; they have helped to create new job opportunities. Many of the qualities associated with being intrinsically Australian - qualities like our warmth, hospitality, friendliness and informality - in many ways can be traced back to our migrant population. When people arrive in a country knowing no-one, they know how much they need the hand of friendship. Because so many in this country know that experience, know what it is like to leave their family, friends, community and neighbourhood and start a new life, it has contributed to Australia being such a warm and hospitable country. That reputation we carry overseas is partly due to the migrants who have come to this country from all around the world. Australia has been privileged that vast numbers of people have made their home here. When the dangerous and ill-informed comments of people such as Pauline Hanson continue to be reported, it makes those people feel isolated and unwanted. It is incumbent upon every one of us to reject those comments and to show some leadership.

Pauline Hanson is also to be condemned for her comments about Aboriginal people. It is not a matter of opinion that Aboriginal children are more likely to die before they complete their childhood; that Aborigines suffer more illnesses; have poorer housing; are less likely to have access to running water, power and sewerage; experience very high levels of unemployment; die younger; and are over-represented in our gaols and juvenile detention centres - it is fact. These people are disadvantaged. If in the past various techniques and methods that have been tried to improve that position have failed, it is no reason to give up; it is a reason to look for new solutions and at those things that have worked and to expand them. It is certainly not a reason to apportion blame and to criticise those who are most disadvantaged for their own plight.

I am sorry my colleague the member for Mitchell is not here tonight. When the Easton royal commission sat some months ago, the member for Mitchell made a principled decision that he would not divulge confidential proceedings of Cabinet to that royal commission. That principle is a basic, fundamental tenet of the Westminster system. I have listened in this Parliament to Minister after Minister refusing to comment on discussions that have occurred in Cabinet - and that is quite right. It is a basic essential for the Westminster system to work. Because the member for Mitchell refused to divulge that information, he is now being prosecuted through the courts. That did not just flow naturally from his refusal; it was not an automatic process. It involved a decision by the Attorney General to initiate prosecution against the member for Mitchell.

I do not know whether the Attorney General has thought this through. It is a tragedy for someone who has contributed 14 years' service to this Parliament; who, in my view, has been an outstanding member of this Parliament; and who has served the community of Bunbury well - as you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Osborne) will know - to face prosecution in the court, with the possibility that if he is convicted, as is likely, he might never be able to follow his chosen career, his profession, as a lawyer again. It is vindictive; it is highly reprehensible; and I call on the Premier - I am sorry he is not in the Chamber tonight - to intervene to make sure the charges against the member for Mitchell, which serve no purpose, are dropped.

Mr Thomas: Hear, hear!

Mrs Hallahan: Well said.

Mrs HENDERSON: It seems to me that this Parliament and the people of Western Australia are well served by its adversarial system. The Opposition is probing, it questions, and it carefully scrutinises legislation that comes before this Parliament, and that keeps the Government honest as far as is possible. The Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters was a very expensive exercise, costing millions of dollars. One of the key findings of that royal commission was the complete dominance by the Executive of this Parliament. Executives of all political complexions have treated this Parliament more or less as a rubber stamp. The view has always been that the spoils of office when political parties become the Government are that they take their legislation through the Parliament; they try to get it through as quickly as possible; and any debate is an inconvenience, almost an irritation.

The royal commission commented that was not a good state of affairs for Western Australia, and I agree. Notwithstanding that it made a number of recommendations about how that situation can be improved, it has not changed. In the past four years the Executive has treated this Parliament in exactly the same way as did the previous Executive, and the one before that. There has been no change whatsoever. As long as careful and detailed scrutiny of legislation by an Opposition in this Parliament, of whatever political complexion, is given no coverage by the media, there is no incentive for any Opposition to do its job properly. So long as a rowdy demonstration or a protest by a single interest group is more likely to be given attention than carefully considered amendments or comments on legislation, the public will never know what job the Opposition is doing in the Parliament.

Mr Lewis: Spot on; I agree.

Mrs HENDERSON: The public and the community as a whole are the poorer for that; not just because the Labor members are in opposition. The same occurred when they were in government. I continue to be appalled when I go into the community to find that the level of understanding of legislation that goes through this Parliament is abysmal. People do not even know about the legislation that went through the Parliament the previous week, so it is not a matter of their forgetting. They are totally unaware of the legislation that impacts on their lives, of the arguments that go on in this Parliament, the issues that are raised and the debate that occurs. In my view, if this Parliament is to work effectively, the people of Western Australia should be given more information about the content of legislation, the debate, the amendments and so on. That should be more significant than the grief and anger motions that get coverage in this Parliament, yet legislation gets almost no coverage.

Mr Omodei: Hear, hear!

Mrs HENDERSON: Most people who make final comments in this Parliament, of course, extend their thanks to various people who have assisted them. I start by thanking those around the Parliament who have helped me; in particular, the staff of the Legislative Assembly, the dining room, bar and kitchen staff, the door attendants, the Hansard reporters, who do an excellent job, and the library staff. I also say this: Over many years in this Parliament I have heard people thank the staff members, who are courteous and willing and go out of their way to render service to members of Parliament but, at the end of the day, they work in this building under some of the most appalling conditions. Early this year members of staff seemed to have been driven to go on strike. It behoves all of us not only to pay more than lip service to thank the staff of this Parliament for the good work they do, but also to support their efforts to improve their working conditions.

When I first came to the Parliament, the staff here were not classified as "workers" under the industrial relations legislation. They were treated the same as domestic servants. Along with domestic servants, they were excluded from the definition of "workers". That has now changed and they have been brought into the twentieth century. Even so, it seems that their conditions at times are worse than conditions of people in equivalent jobs working in the general community. Work needs to be done in that area.

I especially thank all my supporters and helpers within the ALP, particularly people in the local branches in my electorate who have worked tirelessly over the years. Those people generate the ideas and the objectives for which we are in the Parliament. They watch carefully what we do, and by and large they stand by us. I thank all of them.

Also, I thank my staff, both as a local member and as a Minister. I have had a succession of extremely competent electorate officers who have worked very hard. I was fortunate to have had some wonderful staff work for me as Minister over the years. I thank those people too. During my period as Minister, I was extremely impressed by the professionalism and competence of the public servants in the departments with which I came into contact. I am saddened by the way the Public Service is being slashed, and many loyal, impartial and dedicated public servants have been treated shabbily over the past four years.

I thank my colleagues. I have enjoyed being part of a team, as politics is very much about being part of a team. I thank members on the government benches who have listened to my contributions. Government backbenchers' main task is to keep the House and listen to the many speeches delivered by opposition members. I thank government members for listening on those occasions.

[Applause.]

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [8.32 pm]: This will be my valedictory speech to the Parliament. Having been elected in 1971, I have been very thankful for the support I have received from my wife, Betty, and family. I appreciate the support I have received from an extraordinary electorate which has returned me as the member for Vasse to eight Parliaments. I am very grateful and thankful for that honour.

As the member for Thornlie indicated, special tribute must be paid to the staff of the Parliament. From my first days in the Parliament through to dealing with staff in the library this afternoon, I have found the staff to be absolutely superb in the work they do. We place many demands on them, and they have responded readily and frequently on many occasions over the 25 years that I have been a member. I must have worn out all the staff as I am unaware of a staff member who has been around the place for 25 years! We always want information yesterday, yet the staff come up trumps. To all the staff, including those in the dining room, Hansard, and all the attendants, it has been a wonderful association.

I also pay a special tribute to the Clerks at the table and the staff within the House itself. I have seen Clerks of the Parliament and Deputy Clerks of the Parliament, and I have seen many changes in those areas. This occasion is an

opportunity to reflect on my years in this House. One remembers the very good times as well as the times which were not as good as they should have been. I will comment in that regard later in my speech.

I was preselected for the Liberal Party in 1970. At the time I was a farming contractor. I had had a big involvement with service clubs, and I was involved with local government. One of my pride and joys at the time was that I was a founding member of the Leeuwin Conservation Group. Therefore, I had wide experience in the community.

I stood for election. One of the most salutary lessons I learnt was that people said Vasse was always a blue ribbon seat. That may have been the case when Stewart Bovell was the local member. However, in 1971 the Brand Liberal Government was pretty well on the nose and five candidates stood for election. On election night the then Leader of the Opposition, John Tonkin, claimed the seat of Vasse for the Labor Party. For something like 16 days afterwards the Liberal Party believed he was right - so did I. It was only on the sixteenth day when the final votes were eventually counted that I finally won the seat by 302 votes. I will never forget that election. I have endeavoured to pass on to all members, on either side of the House, that one's election to this place starts on the day after one's election.

Mrs Hallahan: We will not be ungenerous and say "What a shame".

Mr BLAIKIE: I had regard for John Tonkin. I thought his politics were wrong, but I had high regard for him as a person. He stood for the seat of Sussex in 1928. During his valedictory speech he paused and I interjected that I was glad he did not win the seat. He replied as quick as a flash, "So am I. I would probably only have held the seat for one term and would not have been in the Parliament since." He went on to represent North-East Fremantle and other areas, and subsequently went on to be Premier.

I was fortunate enough to be in the Parliament with luminaries like John Tonkin and Sir David Brand, an extraordinary person who was warm and affectionate and for whom leadership was natural as people flowed towards him. When I first entered the Parliament the late Herb Graham was Deputy Premier. My first three years in opposition was a fascinating experience and I endeavoured to represent the seat of Vasse. As I won by 302 votes, the Labor Party thought it would win that seat at the following election.

I realised later that adverse government decisions can well be positive decisions for a local member. The Government decided to close the Port of Busselton. It was the most catastrophic event since the founding of the town, and as the local member I tried to do something about the matter. When the Government closed the port, Minister Colin Jamieson had not realised he had effectively sacked 60 waterside workers. They have never forgiven him for that, and I have reminded them of that decision ever since, as well as their families, their children, grandsons and granddaughters! There are times of absolute panic in the face of adversity when one wonders what one should do, but it was not my decision and I endeavoured to help people overcome the problems.

Another exercise which was quite traumatising for a raw local member was when the Stateships service to Darwin was to lose its subsidy and the ships were to stop running the routes. We worked to change that decision.

It was fascinating when the Tonkin Government had a majority of one in this place. I was here the night that Speaker Merv Toms collapsed and subsequently died, following which the Government had no majority at all. Subsequently, a by-election was held. Two people nominated for the seat of Ascot who changed the face of politics in Western Australia; namely, the ultimate winner Malcolm Bryce and Fred Chaney. If people had worked harder for Fred Chaney, politics might well have changed further in this State.

Again during the same era, Deputy Premier Herb Graham retired, and a new candidate was put up for the Labor Party, who fell over the line by 35 votes, and that was Brian Burke. In that 1971-74 period, people who came into the Parliament through by-elections had a significant effect in changing the direction of political history in this State.

Sir Charles Court, when he was Minister for Industrial Development, used to arrange every three years for all members of Parliament to travel north, and that was a wonderful opportunity. However, on the one occasion during the Tonkin Government's northern visit there was a bit of a fracas between Malcolm Bryce and Tommy Dadour. I will not say which one was soft and which one was pretty tough, but Malcolm came back with a blood nose and carried on in a most undignified manner, while the member for Subiaco said, "I didn't give him a hit at all; it was just a slight backhander", but the result was that all trips were cancelled from then on.

A tradition that I recall with fond memories is the Christmas functions, which were attended by almost 100 per cent of members and their partners. At those Christmas functions, certainly for the next 10 or 12 years, each side would pass to the other the usual degree of courtesy and understanding on that one night of the year, whether it be the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier, or anyone else. It is an indictment of this Parliament and its members that we no longer have a Christmas function, because in all the cut and thrust of debate, which is so important, if we cannot get

around the table afterwards during a meal to socialise and renew friendships, both the members and the Parliament are the losers. The Parliament has suffered since those early periods.

I want to pay a special tribute to all of the people with whom I have worked. Although I have argued with one or two of my colleagues, they have all been pretty well intentioned. Over the years, one of the wisest people whom I ever came across was the Shire President of Busselton, the late Joe Torrent, who said during his valedictory speech that he had known literally scores and scores of councillors - my comment is that I have known scores and scores of members - and he had found that every one of them had given everything they ever had to further the cause in which they were engaged. Of course, quite a few did not have much to give, but they gave everything they had. I wanted to get that in before somebody else referred to it!

The Parliament and what I believe the conduct of members should be has been absolutely fundamental. Members may recall an occasion when the Deputy Speaker, George Strickland, was in the Chair, and by mistake I happened to be on the wrong side of the House during a division. I have views about how that could have been handled, but it was not handled, and I had the prerogative to either stay where I was or make another decision. My decision was that I should stay on that side of the House and vote with the Opposition. I would never move from that view, because the integrity of the Parliament is so important to me.

I put on record my deep sense of privilege, and my equally deep sense of responsibility, at being a member of Parliament. However, the privilege and the responsibility do not occur in isolation; they occur together. The reason they occur together is the relationship that exists between a member of Parliament and the people of his electorate who send that person to the Parliament as their representative. The privilege of being a member of Parliament exists not in the member but in the people of his electorate, and it is bestowed by them on that person, whom they are prepared to trust. The responsibility that I have of legislating and of governing Western Australians is not vested in me because I am Barry Blaikie. That responsibility is vested in the people of Vasse, and it is bestowed upon me only because I am the person whom they have chosen. This relationship between a member and the people of his electorate is at the heart of what it means to be a member of Parliament, and a member of Parliament who keeps that in his heart will not go far wrong. A member who understands that relationship will not forget the need for absolute loyalty to his electorate for the privilege and responsibility that the electorate has bestowed upon him.

As a democracy, it is very hard to exaggerate the importance of the Parliament. In a very real sense, the Parliament is the mind, heart and soul of the community. The Parliament is not merely the individuals who comprise it at any one time; it represents the desire, hope and trust of the community. That is why the Parliament is so important, and that is why the ethics and integrity of members of Parliament are so important. The idea that members of Parliament can behave unethically while passing laws to compel everyone else to behave ethically is an absolute farce that belongs in the world of Alice in Wonderland. Sadly, however, it has been an all too frequent occurrence in the House for a large amount of the time that I have represented the electorate of Vasse. I have been very critical in the past of what I refer to as the Burke years. Although he only started the process of dishonesty, it continued under his leadership, and all members of Parliament had to accept the indignity of it all.

The monstrosity of those years can be expressed in many ways, but one of the clearest is a comparison between the attitude of many members of Parliament to what happened then and the attitude of the same members of Parliament to the perceived problem of juvenile crime. Members of Parliament are always in a great hurry to come down like a tonne of bricks on a juvenile who has misused someone else's car, but some members of this House misappropriated literally hundreds of millions of dollars for their political benefit and for the benefit of their political party. Is it any wonder that the parents of a troubled teenager, whose child has simply "borrowed" a car for the night, wonder why the community comes down on their child like a tonne of bricks when, on the other hand, members of Parliament can act dishonestly and unethically and nothing is said? Parliament's attempt to legislate its ethical standards in the community are meaningless if Parliament will not protect its own integrity.

In recent years there have been two full royal commission reports and one interim report - that is, the WA Inc report, the Marks report and the Roger Davis report - which have made sorry reading for anyone interested in the integrity of Parliament. However, none of these reports has made any finding about the behaviour of members of Parliament in the Parliament. There have been findings that the Labor Party in government spent hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money for its own purposes, and findings that Premiers had been untruthful in the House, but there have been no findings about conduct or behaviour in the Parliament. There have been no findings about those who misappropriated money or told untruths in the House. That conduct is totally unacceptable to the community, as it must be to all members.

There are no such findings because no royal commission or any other court is allowed to examine the performance of members of Parliament in Parliament. That is why on this, my final day in Parliament, I raise these matters that are of fundamental importance to the Parliament and to true democracy. Exemption from scrutiny befits the

importance of Parliament, but it is only an exemption from scrutiny; it is not an exemption from the demands of integrity.

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

Mr BLAIKIE: The fact that members cannot be examined outside the House only adds to their responsibility to maintain high standards of integrity in the House.

Although there can be no legal examination of the performance of members in the House, there is one institution in society that has the freedom and capacity to examine the performance of members of Parliament - the Press, or as it is more commonly known these days, the media. It is of deep regret to me, and I hope to many members of Parliament and, I imagine, some journalists, that the media failed the community for much of the Labor decade. The now infamous editorial published by *The West Australian* that virtually canonised Brian Burke on his retirement from politics is an extraordinary testimony to how incompetent the media can be. I will quote from the first and last paragraphs of the editorial of *The West Australian* of 26 February 1988. The rest is there for all to see. It states -

It is likely to be some time before WA has another leader whose political influence is as pervasive as Brian Burke's has been in the past five years . . . History will be the final judge of Brian Burke's Premiership. In the meantime, all West Australians should applaud this man who so enriched our society.

I do not condemn Brian Burke; I condemn the policies and practices that were applied and I condemn the media that failed miserably to understand, because they were doing the reporting - they were here, they knew, they saw. It can be a matter only of conjecture about whether the media's failure was primarily due to incompetence, inadequacy, or a wilfully partisan approach to a time of hectic political conflict. The failure was not universal. There were journalists who understood that things were seriously wrong. They did their best to uncover the evils of the day. However, the overall performance of the media was of little help to the community at a time when accurate reporting of the Parliament was required. That fact is worth remembering by the media and the community.

In the years since WA Inc, almost endless attempts have been made to create new systems that in themselves are supposed to somehow prevent future dishonesty. The Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters, the Commission on Government, the media, and many others have been almost desperate to put new forms of bureaucracy in charge of democracy in the futile belief that if enough controls are installed, the crooks will be prevented from being dishonest. That also is Alice in Wonderland stuff.

During all this time I have not been aware of any serious attempt to examine how the performance of the media could be improved for the future benefit of the community. I would not suggest that bureaucratic structures be erected to control the integrity and performance of the media, but I would dearly love to see the media do a far better job of reporting on Parliament and on government. I see little hope that that work will be improved with the current crop of journalists. The lack of accuracy and depth of parliamentary reporting is best exemplified by the extensive and largely irresponsible coverage given over a long period to the totally unsubstantiated allegations of the member for Peel. Sadly, that suggests that the media have learnt nothing. I sincerely hope that that will not always be so.

I will deal with one of the other excuses that has been advanced in defence of those difficult years, the media, and anyone else who was responsible for a poor performance during those days. While all the excuses were given, some in the community were able to witness shining examples of integrity in business under great pressure. I refer to the late Norman Payton and his family company, the Bunbury-based Payton Finance. Members who have memories long enough will remember that about the same time as the Government was pouring millions of dollars into shonky credit societies and Rothwells Ltd, the very well credentialled Payton Finance ran into trouble. It had played a long and honourable role in the south west, but was refused government assistance of any kind. Interestingly enough, it received no publicity - good, bad or otherwise. The family set out to try to recover their situation and by hard work and their own individual sacrifice, I am advised that they paid all their creditors in full, plus a margin which, from memory, was 9¢ or 10¢ a dollar. They did not pay 9¢ or 10¢ in the dollar, but 9¢ or 10¢ over the dollar. However, that was rarely reported on.

I mention this partly as a tribute to Payton Finance and partly as a reminder to members that integrity is always possible. It is simple. The path of decency may not always be easy, but it is clear and it is available to all of us. It is a matter of personal choice. The integrity of the Parliament rests not with the courts or the police or any other enforcement agency, but on the personal choice and direction of its members. The change of government has done much to improve the effectiveness and integrity of government in this State, but one side alone cannot restore the integrity of the Parliament. All members must acknowledge the need for simple integrity in all that is said and done in this House. Without that, members are nothing but empty shells and our Parliament will become a place of lost hopes and trust betrayed. Without it members cannot truly live out the privilege and responsibility that they have as members of Parliament and that I have enjoyed for over 25 years. This is a matter that I have always found

fundamental to my beliefs. It is a matter to which I sincerely hope there will be changes in future. That integrity is important, and I hope that integrity to preserve the institution of Parliament will be paramount in the minds of future members of this place. I thank all the electors of Vasse who have returned me here over the years. I have always endeavoured to do what I believed was the best I possibly could. I thank the electors for that extraordinary privilege during this period.

[Applause.]

MRS HALLAHAN (Armadale) [9.00 pm]: I welcome this opportunity to place on record my appreciation to the people of Armadale for the opportunity of representing them in this Parliament. It has been a very great privilege. I represented the people of Armadale for almost 10 years in the Legislative Council as both the member for South East Metropolitan Province and subsequently East Metropolitan Region. I transferred to this House at the last general election in 1993. It was particularly gratifying that the people of Armadale, who had had an opportunity to assess my performance, supported me in that election. I am fortunate to have spent thirteen and a half years as a member of State Parliament, a position I found very satisfying most times and at some other times impossibly demanding.

Members will appreciate that tonight I have mixed feelings. On the one hand I feel great sadness about leaving something that has been very important to me for virtually taking up my whole life, for the past thirteen and a half years. On the other hand I have been fortunate in the people with whom I have associated and the support I have had in the time I have spent in the Parliament. I look forward with cautious optimism to the future.

For people who have not been involved in politics it is difficult to understand how dependent we are on the support of people in the wider community and our colleagues within our political party, and of friends and family who see us through often daunting times. Members will appreciate that Alannah MacTiernan, who is presently a member of the Legislative Council, has been endorsed by the Australian Labor Party as the Armadale candidate in the forthcoming general elections. She has my full support.

Mr Cowan: Are you going to make comparisons between the two Chambers?

Mrs HALLAHAN: The Deputy Premier, who one could say is sometimes a congenial chap, asked if I would like to make a comparison between the two Chambers. It has always been difficult to do that. When I was in the Legislative Council the Labor Party was in government. When I transferred to this House we moved out of government into opposition. I always felt that change was somewhat more important than the change in Houses. A feature of my career is that the Labor Party has not had the numbers in either House. As members will appreciate, in the history of the Legislative Council, the Labor Party has not had a majority. We had to negotiate every clause of every piece of legislation in a hostile House. The Deputy Premier will appreciate that in government he has the numbers in both Houses. In the other House the coalition could always impose its will through its numbers in that House. It has been a very unsatisfactory situation from a democratic point of view that the other House in this State has never been held by the Labor Party. It was one of my dreams that before I left Parliament I would see a Labor majority in the Legislative Council. I addressed that in my first speech in 1983. I am sad to say that the electoral system still does not fairly reflect the number of voters. I thank the Deputy Premier for reminding me of that.

Mr Cowan: I didn't.

Mrs HALLAHAN: I say to my friends in the Public Gallery that I appreciate their coming in tonight. They have supported me at various times throughout my career, some of them for a long period. They know how important it has been to me and what this change will mean. Once again I say to them how much I appreciate their presence and support here this evening.

Alannah MacTiernan is a woman of incredible energy and ability. She has already shown herself to be a very capable and outstanding parliamentary representative. I am therefore very happy to support her and to work very hard for her campaign in the hope that she will be the next member for Armadale. I believe she will work and fight hard for the residents and voters of Armadale in a most satisfactory and effective way. If I did not think that somebody of her calibre and integrity were following me I would not be happy to relinquish my seat in Parliament. I do so confident that the people whom I now serve and will continue to serve fully until midnight of the next state election, perhaps as early as 14 December, will be well served if she is elected. Her opponent, announced last night, will have to work very hard to unseat somebody with the tenacity and capability of Alannah MacTiernan.

This is an occasion to thank people. As I said, it is impossible to do this job without a great deal of support. I thank my oldest friend, Barbara Hargreaves, who is in the gallery tonight. She is three months younger than me and we were brought up on a very small timber mill, called Tullis, outside Boddington, which has now been demolished. Barbara is one of those loyal friends whom one could neglect for years but always find her there when one needed her. That is a rare quality and one I have come to fully appreciate latterly in life. We will enjoy the remainder of our days as very good close friends.

My brother Rodney Downing is here tonight. As is often difficult for family members he has found it rather difficult having a sister with a high public profile. It is not easy to adjust to that situation. Sometimes they hear accolades and sometimes trenchant criticism. For somebody neither involved nor particularly interested in the political process that is not always easy to deal with. I place on record my understanding of Rod's situation.

I will spare members the process of acknowledging everybody in the gallery tonight. However, I acknowledge my former husband, Pat Hallahan. I have often thought it generous of him after we divorced not to object to my carrying on and doing all sorts of things under his family name and not my family name. When I resigned from the upper House and said I would contest the seat of Armadale Pat said, "I am sure, Kay, that with your ability to assist people and to spend money you will need more money than you now have." He kindly transferred thousands of dollars into my bank account to get me through that last general election. That was an extraordinary gesture by a true friend. While we seemed to blow our marriage apart in a grand way, we will remain very firm friends for the rest of our lives.

With Pat tonight in the gallery is his sister, Grace who has been very generous to me. My parents died at an early age, and neither Rodney nor I have children to boast about, or to draw comfort or get headaches from. Grace Klein always made sure that I was included in the Hallahan-Klein-Hunter families in a very wonderful way. I have appreciated that, because again I have been a most neglectful friend. Tonight I want to thank very much the people who have shown an appreciation for my circumstances and need to be included.

Another person in the gallery tonight is Taffy Davies, a Welshman who gives the Howard Sattler program what-ho when they will allow him on the show. Taffy is a great Labor stalwart. He has a magnificent voice and a greatly developed political sensitivity. I do not suppose he will mind my saying this, but sadly he has been told that he has a heart condition. He has been told also that if he had \$2 000 he could have open heart surgery tomorrow, but as he does not have \$2 000 he must wait and hope that he survives until some time early next year. Many of us love Taffy very much. We hope that he can have some preliminary treatment. In Taffy's eyes, and in the eyes of many people in Armadale, one of the trenchant criticisms and commentaries on the Court Government is the increase in the number of public hospital patients on the waiting lists. It is reprehensible and cuts across all the rhetoric about fairness, people's choice and opportunities. Within our Labor Party family in Armadale one of our greatest supporters has faced that bald statement by the medical profession with great dignity despite the inequity and threat to his life.

I want to acknowledge my friend Joy Utting. She is a great campaigner who helped George Gear win a marginal seat over multiple elections. She certainly helped me in the seat of Armadale. It was Joy who arrived tonight with this beautiful bouquet of flowers and a wonderful card. She and I might one day go into business together. We are plotting the future, but we do not know where that may lead. Joy has been a great supporter of Labor candidates and campaigns, and of all the values that Labor represents.

I also acknowledge Rosetta Lazzari. Rosetta and I have a very odd relationship because we can hardly speak each other's language. Next year we will take an epic trip, and spend her seventy- seventh birthday in Italy on 2 April. Rosetta will be returning to Italy after 45 years in Australia. Life has been very hard for Rosetta. However, she befriended me after coming to my office and showing me that she was authorised to collect for the Liberal Party. I said, "Good gracious me! Do you think I am a Liberal member of Parliament?" She said, "Si, si". We sorted it out, and became good friends. Rosetta has cooked many wonderful meals for me. She is one person who is absolutely appalled about my current diet, because it does not fit with Italian cooking. She has become a sort of argumentative mother figure in my life, and it is a real trial to argue when one person is speaking Italian and the other English.

Also in the gallery tonight is Kevin Clarke, the president of the WA Taxi Operators Association. When I became the shadow Minister for Transport, it was a new experience for me and the complexities of the taxi industry were confounding. Although Kevin Clarke was not of our persuasion at that point, he kindly made his knowledge and experience available to me. He has continued to assist Michelle Roberts since she took over from me in that shadow portfolio. That has been very much appreciated, because it was very necessary for a member of the Opposition to have access to someone in the industry with long experience and a willingness to impart that knowledge. It was very much appreciated.

I quickly place on record my appreciation of people I have met in local government. Those people carry out an extraordinarily generous job on behalf of the community, on a voluntary basis, and they put in long hours. My friends understand how many hours members of Parliament put in, but not many people in the community have that close association with the parliamentary process and they do not appreciate what is involved. The same can be said of people's appreciation of local government. Without naming people in local government who have been very supportive of me, and helpful and pleasant in their dealings, I offer them my appreciation.

I must express this appreciation en globo because the Court Government was very mean and vicious to many people when the change in government came. I can understand that, to some extent, regarding ministerial staff, but I did not

understand those actions against public servants. Therefore I am very concerned, and for that reason I will not name people, some of whom are still in the Public Service. Others were pushed out by the Court Government despite their incredible skills and knowledge, and some of those people have had to go interstate to get jobs. I place on record my appreciation of the professional and clerical staff who assisted in my ministerial office over the years - the professional people with whom I worked in government departments, who these days are undervalued. They certainly must be feeling that their contribution and commitment to the community of Western Australia has no value for the Court Government. In my view, they made and continue to make a very substantial contribution. I say that, not overlooking the fact that some public servants are difficult. However, it would be a great mistake to overlook the great expertise and professionalism of the vast majority of those people.

I also recognise the staff of many community agencies who assisted considerably with a number of portfolios I held when the Labor Party was in government. I thank also my electorate officers. I will mention, first, Sue Howard-Smith who could not be here tonight. She was my electorate assistant for five years and worked very hard, because I had a passion about working an upper House seat as if it were a lower House seat, which made life extraordinarily busy for me and for Sue. She was a most energetic and committed woman who did a wonderful job. I often said to her that her work, which was very thorough, led in great part to my being considered for the Ministry.

The second electorate officer I recognise tonight is Nellie Anderton, who is in the gallery, and who has worked very hard as my assistant in the seat of Armadale. The Armadale electorate contains many people who have many needs. Nellie is the most patient, compassionate person, and she is a strong advocate on behalf of those needy people. Many people who have been in the most desperate circumstances have found in her one of the very few people who have been able to provide not only solace but also practical help. Well done, Nellie. From all the people you have helped and from me tonight, thank you very much indeed. I also recognise Nellie's children, Shayna and Blayne who are also in the gallery. They are fine young people, who obviously have had to deal with a parent who has a very stressful job.

I also thank members of the Labor Party. I can see in the gallery Jane Gerrick, our branch secretary, and the young centre is here in some strength. They have been very supportive of me. They actually called me "Auntie Kay" in their magazine, and it took me a while to work out that that was a positive term. I thank all those people who have made my experience as a parliamentarian so much the richer.

Two Labor endorsed candidates are in the gallery tonight: Tom Hoyer, whom I would love to be the member for Roleystone and who is doing a great job on behalf of the Labor Party; and Paul Andrews, the Labor Party's endorsed candidate for Avon, who will also represent it very well indeed in that electorate. I value their friendship and I appreciate their efforts on behalf of the Labor Party.

I have another good friend in the gallery. This person helped me to achieve the highest profile I have ever had, and I have been trying to live it down ever since. I refer to Darren Foster, who was my media adviser and secretary. A more tenacious and hard-working person one could never find. If any members want to enhance their ability to communicate with the electorate, I recommend Darren and his skills to them. He has become a great friend. He has since married and has a young son named Jack, who is adding immeasurably to his quality of life, although that has not slowed him down in his work.

I thank the people who have seen the value and necessity of increasing the number of women in Parliaments. I have had support from both men and women. It is necessary for women to understand that we need the support of men simply because they still occupy most of the positions of power and influence. I say that purely pragmatically; if they do not occupy those positions of power and influence I am sure we will still refer to them for good advice.

Members in the upper House have made some very funny valedictory speeches. I asked the members for Glendalough and Belmont, with whom I worked in a ministerial capacity, whether we had any funny moments. They could not think of anything. That suggested to me that I was the most grotesque person with whom to work, and that is probably right. In 1982, I was preselected for the Labor Party, and Bob Hetherington, whom many members will remember, said, "Oh dear. How will we represent you to the electorate? You have never been in the armed forces or anything like that." I had been in the Police Force and I thought that that was probably close enough to armed service. I was later elected and Bob and I sat side by side in the upper House. While that story might reflect badly on him, I will now restore his reputation. He had been a lecturer in politics and he was a great mentor, educator and advocate on my behalf and I was lucky to have that support.

I was also lucky to have a close working relationship as Deputy Leader of that House with Hon Joe Berinson and Hon Graham Edwards, both outstanding human beings and parliamentarians. It was a pleasure to work with them.

I thank the staff of Parliament House in all its various departments: Clerk of the Parliament and the staff within the House; the committee staff; Hansard; the library staff; the dining room and bar staff; the stationery department staff

and the administrative staff, who I think put our salaries together. This seems a very inadequate way of thanking them all, and I am sure they often feel we do not appreciate their efforts to assist us in performing our job. In this small way, like other members, I pay a tribute to them tonight. I say that for both Houses, because I have had that probably uncommon experience of serving in both places.

I particularly appreciate the expressions of support I have had from Labor Party members, and one would expect to get that support. I also very much appreciate the support I have had from local government and community organisations. I also particularly appreciate people who did not agree with my philosophical position but who went out of their way to show some measure of support. That is a generous thing to do and it is part of the value of living in a democracy.

A democracy has a number of important planks. Firstly, it must have a very fair electoral system free of manipulation and corruption. As I have said, sadly that has not been achieved in this State. Secondly, the judicial processes must be free and independent of government interference. There has been a disturbing trend under the Court Government in relation to royal commissions. It is very concerning that they appear to be politically driven or arranged and manipulated. That could lead to very serious corruption. All future members and the wider community need to be very vigilant about those issues. Thirdly, there must be a free and open Press and a strong, free and independent trade union movement. Those elements do not exist in places like Singapore. Those institutions are incredibly important in safeguarding people's respect and freedom as individuals in a society. They are absolute safeguards that can be provided only in such a democratic system. We are very lucky to live in this system and we should work very hard to ensure those planks are not torn away or, as is more likely the case, gradually worn away as a result of various decisions made and accepted under some or other pretext. We should be very vigilant about that.

I wanted to refer to some things with which I have been associated, but I will not have time. However, I will mention the Seniors' Card, because I am now 55 years old and technically a senior. I had not expected it to be of assistance, but perhaps in a month I will consider applying for one.

I was lucky to be in government when Labor was in power at both the state and federal levels. There was a revolution in the provision of child care, in emergency accommodation and funding for women's refugees. I do not want to see those things torn away under the conservatives at present in power. The Labor Government had the opportunity to implement the family centre program, to bring about adoption law reform, to commence the East Perth redevelopment, to save Araluen, and to implement the voluntary full time preprimary program for five year olds, which, after criticising it before the last election, the current Government now appears to think is a sound idea. I was the first Minister for the Family and Minister for Heritage, and brought in convoluted but very important legislation, again opposed by the now Government when it was in opposition. The Labor Government played a very significant role in promoting TAFE and skills development, and providing opportunities for all young Western Australians in either education or training. They were great achievements for Labor. As members will appreciate, I cannot cover all portfolios. I am however, proud to be associated with those things.

I will continue to be active and interested in the Armadale community. I hope to remain involved in a number of community organisations; in fact, I have indicated that I would like to be more involved with the Heritage Country Tourism Association, the establishment of our community radio station, and continue with Armadale lotteries house, the Starick House women's refuge and other important organisations. I will continue to watch with great interest the treatment of that community in terms of road trains, which Labor clearly will not have in the metropolitan area, the new hospital which is needed for the community, and the infrastructure which needs to be put back into Armadale. The Liberals have taken out of the community the police district office and nearly all the staff of the education district office. Those moves have caused great concern.

I conclude my remarks by thanking all my colleagues, particularly my Labor colleagues, and wish them well in the forthcoming election. Given our democracy, I appreciate the associations I have had with colleagues opposite. I wish them good wisdom in their careers, if not good luck in the next election. If they took advice from our side maybe they would do a better job.

[Applause.]

MR LEWIS (Applecross - Minister for Planning) [9.32 pm]: I have not been a member of this House as long as the members who have spoken before me. In that regard perhaps I will contain my remarks proportionally to the period I have been here. I see being a member of Parliament and representing the people as a great privilege. It is a privilege that does not come to many and it has to be very highly regarded. It is a position of absolute trust in my mind as to how members conduct themselves with regard to their constituencies and the people of Western Australia.

I have had the great privilege of being endorsed by the Liberal Party to be its candidate for the seat of East Melville and more recently for the seat of Applecross over the past 11 years. I was elected on 8 February 1986. I came into

the House with another new Liberal member, Hon Ross Lightfoot. At that time the stocks on the Liberal side of the House were probably at their lowest for many years. From that time I am very pleased to say that the political pendulum swung and the Liberal Party has rebuilt itself. Today I am proud to be part of a very good coalition Government, ably led by Premier Court. It has also been my great privilege to serve as a member of his Cabinet and a Minister for the past four years.

I want to reflect on a point made by the member for Vasse. A lot of our work comes back to ethics and perhaps how we as politicians should conduct ourselves. I can remember when I was a young person political luminaries such as Bob Menzies, Arthur Caldwell, John Tonkin and Sir David Brand. There was great respect for them in the community. They led by example. The community saw the position of member of Parliament as one of honour and great trust. What saddens my heart today is that politicians, by their actions, have caused the community not to look up to and aspire to be politicians. They do not in any way have that great appreciation of and feeling of trust in their politicians. It saddens me greatly to think that if one is a politician today, especially a member of the Government and a Cabinet Minister, the first credential one must surely have in the public's mind is that one is something of a crook and a bad person. We as politicians on both sides of the House drag ourselves down.

I would like to see the ethics of parliamentarians raised so that we play the ball and debate the principles and issues rather than look for cheap political shots and try to create a perception in the community that politicians or a particular person may be dishonest. I take people on face value; I believe that all people are good and true. In that regard I do not believe it is right for parliamentarians on both sides of the House, as has happened, to look for cheap political shots in an endeavour to disparage a person's character. At the end of the day all it does is drag down everyone's character. Today, rather than be looked up to in the community, politicians are looked on with some disdain. The perception is that we are self-serving and not here for the high ideals for which we all nominated ourselves to be elected. That saddens me. As parliamentarians we have to raise our game, conduct ourselves better, be scrupulous in our debates, leave personalities out of it and try to lift the whole ethic of parliamentary life. Over time I would like to see members rebuild the standing of politicians in our community so that once again they are respected as people who are good and true, honest and honourable, which I believe most of us are. Unfortunately, we went through a difficult time in the 1980s, when the representative Government of the day did things which brought the Parliament and the Government into disrepute. It will take a long time to undo those things. Notwithstanding that, we should not keep dredging up the past but look to the future and try to get on with the job.

I also have been very disappointed with the conditions in which I have had to work in this House. As a member of Parliament I had the privilege of sharing a desk in a room with four other members. I had no problems with that because I appreciated they were the best available conditions. What does concern me greatly is that having been appointed a Minister in this Government I seem to have lost the privilege of being able to have somewhere to hang my coat, answer the telephone or even put my bag. I just wonder how we can have such a situation in 1996 where we are supposed to meet people, who are coming to see us about matters to do with our portfolios, in a corridor. What has been so wrong with the administration of both Houses of Parliament is that there has been some prejudice by the Presiding Officers against Ministers. I am not necessarily referring only to Ministers in this Government. Previous Ministers have been treated just as badly. That is very small-minded. I would like to believe that, as a member of Parliament, whether a Minister or not, I am entitled to at least a telephone, a desk, a chair and a coat-hanger. It is extraordinary to think that because I am a Minister, I have been denied those things. That did not happen because the rooms were not available; people were not prepared to make rooms available and provide those fundamentals to the people who were dispossessed from having anywhere to even sit and write a letter in this place. If members of this House have any guts at all, they must gather their wits and find the money to do something about the dreadful accommodation that exists for not only the members but also the staff who serve this Parliament. The conditions in this place are absolutely abominable.

Mr Thomas: The problem we have is that the House does not control members' conditions; it is the Joint House Committee. Ultimately the Government controls its funding. You are the Government and you have done nothing about it.

Mr LEWIS: We should not let the debate degenerate to that level because it has been that way for many years. The point I am making is that the Presiding Officers have been small-minded. They have not recognised that Ministers are still members of this House and they are entitled to the fundamentals to which every member of this House is entitled. I took great exception to that.

I thank my colleagues on this side of the House for their friendship and courtesies. I have friends on the other side of the House also. The public has the funny perception that because we are on different sides of politics, we must hate one another. That is probably a false impression that is generated by this forum. I would like to think that people respect each other. While we do not have to associate with or like people, we should always be courteous. I also believe we should be able to have friendships with people on the opposite side of the House. We live in a free

and mature society and as there should be no prejudices on the basis of creed or colour, there should be no prejudices associated with politics. It is one's philosophy. We should accept each other's views and agree to disagree. I would like to see more fellowship across party lines. I agree with the member for Vasse; when I first came into this place, there were friendships across party lines in the bar and in the corridors of this place. However, during the Burke era it was seen as wrong by the Government of the day, which was a Labor Government, for any of its members to be friendly with members of the conservative Opposition. That has been lost. For this place to work well, we should be able to come in here, fight like the devil, and then go outside and be human beings, respect one another and exchange friendships.

That brings me to the conclusion of my remarks. I have been treated with courtesy by all the staff of the House over the 11 years that I have been a member. I know that it is trying for everybody when the House sits late. Sometimes tempers get a little short. From time to time there are sharp words from members who are tired. I have always tried to treat staff with respect and courtesy and I have appreciated the courtesy with which I have been treated. I am grateful for the advice I have been given by the Clerks in particular and by the staff.

It has been a pleasure and a great privilege to be a member. People have asked me whether I will miss it. I must be honest; I do not think I will. I was in Opposition for seven years and one thing I learnt was that, to be a competent member of this House, members should have served on both sides. It is jolly hard work in opposition. Everything we did we had to generate ourselves. That is when one learns how to be a good parliamentarian. When the political pendulum swings and the Opposition becomes the Government, members who have a stint in opposition are better equipped to assume higher office.

I was rather vociferous in opposition and I do not apologise for that. There is a lot of theatre in this place. That is part of Parliament's uniqueness. While points are made hard and with vigour, and from the heart in many respects, we all appreciate the theatre of this place. If we do not recognise that perhaps we have not been here long enough. In opposition I took it up to the Government of the day because I believed we had a job to do, just as the Opposition has a job to do today. One thing I learnt in opposition is that the Opposition does not have to oppose everything the Government does. There is too much of that in this House. We should recognise that Governments of both persuasions make good decisions. Oppositions should be big enough to accept that all legislation cannot be bad.

I thank the House for its indulgence and its courtesies. I will leave here while I have the opportunity and am not too decrepit to do something else with my life. I have had 25 years in public life, including 14 years in local government and 11 years in this place. I am looking forward to getting my life back. While I will reflect on my time in this place from time to time, I do not think I will miss it.

[Applause.]

MR M. BARNETT (Rockingham) [9.50 pm]: After 23 years in this place it will come as no surprise -

Mr Cowan: It was a very good year.

Mr M. BARNETT: Yes, the Deputy Premier and I were elected in the same year.

I want to point out to members the justification and the reason for the Public Gallery being so full of people and the Press Gallery being so full. Members will understand why that is when they have been in this place for 23 years. Those members who came to this place in 1974, as the Deputy Premier did, were a particularly good vintage. The most important person in my life is actually in the Public Gallery tonight and I want members to know who it is. So that members can pick her out among the throng, I point to the young lady who is on my left.

[Applause.]

Mr M. BARNETT: Members know that without a particularly good partner they could not properly serve their electorates. When I went home and told Ros that I had finally made the decision to leave Parliament and go on to other things, she asked me how I felt about it. I had all sorts of mixed emotions, but I told her that I felt really sad. She said, "That is interesting, so do I." I asked her why she felt that way and she replied, "Because from now on you will be home on Tuesday and Wednesday nights, and they are my nights"! The rule in my house is that I must find other things to do on Tuesday and Wednesday nights. If next year members see a lonely face in the Public Gallery, it will be because I have been thrown out of my house, where I will not be recognised on Tuesday and Wednesday nights.

Mr Thomas: Try darts.

Mr M. BARNETT: The member for Cockburn is not supposed to interject on me.

In trying to determine what I would say in this speech I cast my mind back to the beginning of my political and parliamentary career. I remembered that in 1973 the Australian Labor Party told me that the seat of Rockingham could not possibly be won by the party because the area had been looked after by Cyril Rushton and he always won his seat with a two-thirds majority. The party told me it was not sure about me, but it was prepared to give me a test run. It told me if I turned out all right, it would select me for a winnable seat at a later stage. That was the start of the process by which I was selected for the seat of Rockingham in 1973. In 1974 somehow or other I fell over the line by 187 votes. Within a couple of days the local media came to my home and took a photograph of me at 27 years of age. I raise this matter because one of the things that members who have been in this place for some time are supposed to do is drop pearls of wisdom and other such gems. I will not do that, but I will have time to tell members a couple of yarns. To come back to the photograph, it is of me and my family when I was 27 and they were younger. My electorate will be interested to see photographs of me on my retirement date because I have been using that photograph ever since I was first elected. I do not think they will recognise me. I will table the photograph for the balance of today's sitting.

[The photograph was tabled for the information of members.]

Mr M. BARNETT: In those days Serpentine, Jarrahdale, Keysbrook, Byford, Singleton, Golden Bay and Rockingham made up the electorate of Rockingham, which had 8 000 electors. The electorate covered quite an area to get that number of electors. At the time it was a country electorate and it has changed a lot since then.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. BARNETT: I do not want members to interject on me because I do not want to extend my time if I can avoid it. I certainly do not want members to miss any of my pearls of wisdom.

The high school had just been built and there were no traffic lights in Rockingham. It was a huge electorate and covered almost half the State to give the electorate 8 000 electors. Currently, there are 62 000 people in Rockingham and I am unable to tell members the number of traffic lights and other facilities in the town.

Mr Kierath: Do you claim credit for the 62 000 electors?

Mr M. BARNETT: No, but I do claim credit for every one of the public facilities that have been provided in the time I have been in this Parliament. None of them would have been provided had it not been for me. They were provided because the third electorate office to open in this State was the office I occupied in Rockingham. Electorate offices were first established in 1974. The Deputy Premier is shaking his head and he would not be doing that if I were right. What is he trying to tell me?

Mr Cowan: At the risk of incurring the wrath of the Acting Speaker (Mr Ainsworth), electorate offices actually commenced under the leadership of John Tonkin. Very few members on the conservative side of Parliament took them up.

Mr M. BARNETT: The Deputy Premier is exactly right. As always, there is a shade of grey. The electorate office of Rockingham was the third electorate office to open. Mal Bryce's electorate office was the first to open and that was under the leadership of John Tonkin. At the end of John Tonkin's three year term as Premier he had agreed in Caucus to the opening of electorate offices. The Deputy Premier is right - the conservatives did not take up the offer. We did not tell them until after all the Labor Party members had made their arrangements.

Mr Thomas: The member for Merredin has caught up.

Mr Blaikie interjected.

Mr M. BARNETT: Excuse me, I did not particularly like the speech by the member for Vasse.

Mr Blaikie: I like yours.

Mr M. BARNETT: It is because of the electorate office that members are able to properly communicate with their electorate. Constituents are able to visit members on a regular basis rather than make trips to Parliament House, which is where members of Parliament used to hide before 1973. Members are now aware of exactly what is happening in their electorate and they know what people think about them and what their requirements are. It is a longwinded way of saying that I was responsible for all the things that occurred in the 23 years I have been in Parliament. Obviously, I was not, but I like to think I played a small part in some of them.

My first visit to Parliament House was an interesting day. Almost immediately after being elected I came to this place and when I was 27 years old I was more naive than I am today. I distinctly remember walking along the corridors of power, with chandeliers all around, and thinking it was a grandiose place. I kept looking behind me for the person who I thought would tap me on the shoulder and say, "What are you doing here, you are not supposed to be here."

After a short time I became used to it and I was given the opportunity to make my maiden speech. It was at that time I recognised the good sense in the dress patterns in this place. My fear was so great that had I worn anything other than long trousers people would have seen my legs shaking and my knees knocking together. John Tonkin recognised that fear and after my speech he came to me and said, "Mike, what is wrong?" I said, "I am just so nervous after making that speech. It was not as good as I wanted it to be." He said, "Mike, I have been in this place for 40 years and I still get nervous before every speech I make." It gave me great hope and I sat in this place for quite some time before I gained the courage to make another speech.

When I first came to this place Rockingham had very few facilities, but I thought, in my naivety, if I worked hard enough I would do something for Rockingham. I stole for Rockingham from Kwinana a decision to establish a technical and further education college and a hospital. I thought I had convinced the Government to move these facilities to Rockingham, and that the people of Rockingham would be so happy with the hard work I had done. It transpired that it was not through my hard work that those facilities were moved to Rockingham. The Government was trying to buy Rockingham. It did not take any notice of me. It had moved those facilities into Rockingham because it was a marginal seat and it thought if it filled the area with all those goodies it would win it back. That did not happen. However, it is interesting to note that the philosophy has not changed at all. I cannot blame only the current Government, because the previous Labor Government did the same thing. Have members seen the facilities earmarked for Mandurah? They are unbelievable. It is half the size of Rockingham and growing at half the rate. All the facilities that should be in Rockingham are going to Mandurah. One Government after the other has favoured Mandurah. Do members think that the electors of Mandurah deserve those facilities? Of course they do not. Governments keep trying to buy their vote. We should serve the electorates in a much more balanced way. I know that is long way off, but it will happen at some stage or other.

It is right that I should mention the Rockingham-Kwinana District Hospital. As the local member of Parliament I was fortunate to be invited to attend the opening of the hospital. That was on a Friday. On the Sunday I played rugby, and on the Monday I was the first patient in the hospital's operating theatre. Interestingly, the twenty-first birthday party of that hospital was held this year. After going through its records, the hospital invited me to its celebrations in two capacities: The member for Rockingham and the hospital's first patient! That was an honour and a thrill.

Another injury I incurred during the time I was a member happened when I was knocked off my bicycle. I had been riding home from my electorate office on my push bike, keeping very fit so I could work hard for my electors.

Mr Board interjected.

Mr M. BARNETT: The member for Jandakot thinks I would have got \$60 000 if my name had been Leo McLeay. Riding home from my electorate office, I went round the roundabout and a car came from the left and knocked me flying. The bike was ruined and I landed on the other side of the roundabout.

Mr House: Those Liberals will do anything to win the seat.

Mr M. BARNETT: Exactly. I was in great pain; I had broken my leg and I could hardly move. The bloke in the car rushed over and said, "I didn't see you Mike; I'm so sorry." I thought, "Goodness, he's recognised me, isn't that good." He asked me whether I was all right. I was so pleased he had recognised me that I said, "I'm fine", so he got in his car and drove off. I was left lying on this roundabout with a broken leg. Ros was driving down the street at the same time, and she said to the kids in the car, "Look at that poor man; he's been knocked off his bike." That was fortuitous; luck just follows me around. Ros was there to pick me up, and the bloke recognised me! What more could I ask for as a member of Parliament?

I have been a member for a long time. I often think of Albert Facey's *A Fortunate Life*. If I ever have the chance to write my history - which I will not - it would show that Albert Facey's life was nothing compared with my life. I have been the most fortunate person with all the people around me and all the opportunities that have been afforded to me.

Five Speakers have been in this place since I became a member, and I was one of them. I well remember the first day I was appointed as Speaker, and the look of horror and disgust on the face of the now Deputy Premier at the appointment of the member for Rockingham, whose antics and behaviour on the back bench were outrageous and as a Deputy Chairman of Committees probably not much better. I suppose I started from a bad base. I hope that by the end of the two terms I served as Speaker that the Deputy Premier and all those around him felt that I had finally come to terms with the job of Speaker of this place and was performing the duties in a fair and impartial way to the benefit of the Parliament.

I have also served under six Premiers. I have contested seven elections, and my constituents have treated me extraordinarily well. I do not believe a member of Parliament has been treated any better in any electorate than I have

been treated. From time to time even the conservatives have been particularly good to me. I can remember some elections when the conservative party members came to my office and said, "Mike, we can't vote for you; we couldn't possibly bring ourselves to vote Labor, but here are all the pamphlets we were supposed to put out." Who could ask for more than that? That is an incredible gesture of support for a member who really wants to look after his electorate.

There have been nine leaders of the Labor Party since I came here. I have seen eight of them off. The current leader is an excellent leader. All the current members of the Labor Party are top quality members of Parliament, and some are in the early stages of their careers. Most, if not all, will make excellent members of government when that opportunity is given to them. That is not to say there are not excellent people on the conservative benches and I am sure some good things should be said about them at this stage, so I should do that - no, not that! Could someone help me out? I am trying to think of some good things to say about the conservative members of Parliament. In all seriousness, I find that it has been a pleasure and privilege to serve in this Parliament with members of both sides. Although I take the opportunity from time to time to tease my opponents I do find that many of them are excellent members of Parliament. I do not wish them long and illustrious careers; however, I wish them well in the future.

I thank the staff of the Chamber, the Clerks of the Chamber, the people who service all our wants and needs, and the Press, although most of the time the Press have a totally different agenda from members. I want to thank all those people for the contribution they make to the Parliament. I should mention too that one of the most fortunate events that I remember in relation to the Press related to a local newspaper in Rockingham called *The Eagle*. It was established at the time I was first elected as Speaker. It published an article about my election that I took exception to, so having been a member for a long time I chose not to give it any news for about three years. The newspaper took such strong exception to not getting any news from me that at the next election it took out a series of quarter page advertisements that were in the form of blank sections of the paper with only one or two words. They were, "This space was set aside for Mike Barnett, but he will not use it." I thought that was particularly helpful. The newspaper's agenda was slightly different from mine, but it was helpful.

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

Mr M. BARNETT: I particularly thank Hansard. Some of my first speeches in this place were dreadful, and some people might think they are still. I well remember a speech in which I mentioned that the Government had altered the boundaries of Rockingham dramatically. In my speech I said, "This is an outrage; I can't believe what the Government is doing with the electorate of Rockingham. It is just like that bloke in America did when he rigged the boundaries over there." When the speech came down from Hansard it said, "This is a gerrymander, similar to the one conducted by Governor Gerry in Massachusetts in 1812." I have never forgotten that. I reckon I should have known it then. I tell all members that Hansard is a great benefit to us all. If I have messed up anywhere in this speech, I am sure Hansard will look after me again.

I acknowledge the hard work that the staff in the library do for members. I am particularly grateful for the assistance they have given to me. The education section attached to the library has also been most helpful. What can I say about those in the finance department? We cannot survive without them. They do an excellent job. I also thank Vince Pacecca and all of the dining room staff, the kitchen staff and the gardening staff. Given the huge number of hours we work, we cannot survive without the good work they do. I thank the staff at the annex at 34 Parliament Place for the excellent work they do.

Mark McGowan, the candidate selected by the Australian Labor Party to stand for the seat of Rockingham is an excellent prospect to take up a high office in this place.

Mr Grill: Hear, hear!

Mr M. BARNETT: He is a Royal Australian Navy lawyer; a young man who is about to be married to a lovely young lady who has a long history with the community of Rockingham. Although it has been an honour and a privilege for me to serve in this place, I am convinced that, no matter how long that man is in this Parliament, he will serve Rockingham as well as, and probably better than, I have. I hope he will go on to provide a service to this State from a high office. In fact, I am sure he will.

I must mention my family again. No member in this place can do the job well, in here, in the electorate or at home without a very strong support base. My strong support is here tonight, hoping that I have already found things to occupy myself outside the House on Tuesday and Wednesday nights. I must admit, that I have not done that as yet, but I will try.

The member for Applecross has already told the House that when I was the Speaker he was vociferous. That is an understatement - he was rabid; he was any words that can be linked with that description. He was fair dinkum about getting his job done, and I was just as fair dinkum about getting my job as the Speaker done. In that situation there

must be a clash - and we clashed. When I was the Speaker I decided to work on developing the sister state relationship this State has with other countries. Members will know about our sister state relationship with the Hyogo Prefecture in Japan. I went to the then Leader of the Opposition, Barry MacKinnon, and I told him I was going to Japan to further the sister state relationship and I wanted to take with me a person from each political party. I asked him to select a member from his party. He said, "Yes, Richard Lewis." I asked him not to kid about, that that was not possible and to give me someone else from the party who I could take with me, who would fit in. He said, "Richard Lewis."

I was devastated because I knew our relationship in the House was so drastic that this visit could not possibly work successfully. I was absolutely convinced of that. When we got to the airport all members of the party were together, except the member for Applecross. We checked in our suitcases and had them tagged to go to Osaka. The member for Applecross was not there. When we checked, we were advised that he had already been checked in. I thought he must have been desperate not to sit beside me on the plane! When we got to Osaka, the welcoming delegation came towards us. Members who have been to Japan on these sorts of visits will know how delicate that operation is. It is well planned, down to the last second. We all got off the plane, including the member for Applecross. We picked up our suitcases - with the exception of the member for Applecross. His suitcase had been sent to Tokyo. I said, "There you go, you just can't do anything right; you won't come with us to the airport; you put your suitcase on the plane and have it sent somewhere else; you are absolutely hopeless. I told Barry MacKinnon it would not work." I must tell members that by the end of the trip I recognised that the member for Applecross was a human being. Ever since then, irrespective of the view held by other people, I have had a sneaking, grudging respect for him, and on many occasions I have been able to have civil chats with him. I recognise that by working together, we can achieve a great deal. I hope other members, without having to go to that extent, can achieve a good working relationship after the next election, no matter who wins.

Mr Thomas: What about Monty House?

Mr House: Chrissie bathed naked with him in a hot spring.

Mr M. BARNETT: We will not talk about the photographs! The member for Kalgoorlie will not forgive me if I do not tell the House about TJ, the world junior champion sheepdog that came to live with me two years ago. Every morning TJ and I walk in the most fantastic environment that members can possibly imagine - Warnbro Sound. It is a beautiful ocean vista, surrounded by sand dunes and a pristine beach, and looks out over miles of water. I can see so far from Warnbro Sound that I swear this morning I saw David Dicks sailing his boat. It is a phenomenal place. Every morning, without exception, between two and six dolphins cruise along within 25 or 30 metres of the beach.

I can hear members ask why I am telling them the story. It is a marine park adjacent to which is the Port Kennedy Scientific Park comprising 400 hectares. Adjacent to that is the Lark Hill complex, which comprises a further 200 ha of vacant land which could be linked to the land about which I have already spoken. If that were to occur, that land would be immediately adjacent to Lake Cooloongup and Lake Walyungup. It would make a national park of 4 000 ha - a fantastic greenbelt area around Rockingham which would satisfy all the planning requirements and protocols and would provide for Rockingham and the whole of the State a magnificent national park, linked to the marine park. It would be a gem for not only Rockingham but Western Australia. Furthermore, it would provide ecotourism jobs by the hundreds, possibly by the thousands, if properly executed and used.

In conclusion, I deem it an honour and a privilege to have been given the opportunity to be a member of Parliament for 23 years and to have served my electorate for that time. I wish each and every member well in their chosen careers, and I thank members for the time they have shared with me in this place.

[Applause.]

MR W. SMITH (Wanneroo) [10.31 pm]: As this will be my last opportunity to address the House, I will present a short overview of some of the achievements made in my electorate and community since the 1993 election. Certainly, it was an honour to contest the seat of Wanneroo in 1993, and perhaps a greater honour to wrest the seat from a Labor candidate who had held the seat for 10 years.

Tonight I will touch on some philosophies I have gained over the past couple of years and some of the achievements made. Also, I hope I will have time to talk about an injustice to an individual going back to the 1970s in my past employment in the Police Force.

When we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that our lives are all that really belong to us. How we use our lives determines what kind of people we really are. It is my deepest belief that only by giving our lives do we find the true meaning of our life's worth. I have given 23 years of my life to the general public of Western Australia, firstly, as a police officer and a local government councillor and, finally, as a member of this Parliament. In the end

I hope to be acknowledged and remembered for not only what I achieved, with the help of many others, but also what I tried to achieve for the betterment of the community.

I now touch on an issue regarding parliamentary privilege. We have witnessed over the years a deliberate attack on the values of a fair go and justice with one being innocent until proved guilty; these are cherished democratic beliefs for Australians. Gnawing away at those values are blatant attacks to undermine these fundamental beliefs and values. Often these attacks are made by people who are the first to insist on their own civil rights and on justice, yet seek to deny those rights to me and others in this House, and certainly to other members in the general community.

I now comment on the media, which thrive on crisis. When none exists, they certainly attempt to create one. I will not talk about why the news is not always true because although I have had my differences with the media at different times, I have gained an insight into some of the media's workings and a respect for people in the media generally. However, there are individuals in the media who take and print the news which is not always the truth.

It is never pleasant to read about things which are not agreeable news. Although we never like such news, we wish it had not been written and we disapprove of it, undoubtedly we could not do our job in a free society in this State without a very active Press. On the other hand, the Press has the responsibility not to distort matters for political purposes nor to be selective in its presentation. Some people use the media to either prove a political point or to exaggerate a point. The media should present stories in a way which is directed towards getting as close to the truth as possible rather than satisfying some journalistic or political motivation.

That point was echoed in the WA Inc years, which have done great damage; the media had a part to play in that problem. Members of the Press should report the facts as they find them and describe the issues as they see them. However, they should beware of the danger of either magnifying or oversimplifying an issue.

I have picked up a couple of philosophies over recent years: Journalism is a profession, the business of which is to explain to others what people do not personally understand themselves. Journalism is popular but it is popular mainly as fiction; life is one world and life seen in the newspaper is another world. I have a couple of quotes which continue along that vein, but it is not appropriate to mention them at the moment. Normally the media are in endless pursuit of controversy. What is the end? Is it to enlighten or to profit? What is the end result? Is it to inform or to confuse? How does the ongoing exploration or exploitation of more action, excitement and drama serve the community at large? In fact, bad news drives out good news which creates controversy. The media seek and find a crisis which they can use to fill up space in the newspapers.

The upshot of all the controversy relating to me for some years has been a narrow and distorted picture. In a life in politics one must be prepared to take those things on the chin and get on with the job of being a good member.

I now touch on some issues which have arisen during my years as the local member in my community. I gave my maiden speech in Parliament on 23 June 1993 in which I made a commitment to work for the people in my electorate to address the many needs of the community, such as health, education, employment and youth and community facilities which had suffered from the neglect of the self-serving rule of the previous Labor Government. That Administration was driven by arrogance and entrepreneurial leaders who forgot the true sense of serving the people they were elected to represent, rather than themselves. We are only now emerging from those WA Inc years through the careful management by the Premier, Richard Court, and my colleagues with whom I have been proud to work. We have shown the courage to make the hard decisions of which I have been proud to be part.

Since my somewhat of a demise, a number of people, including some of the media, have wanted me to bucket the Premier and my colleagues in the Liberal Party in general. I have not done that and I will not do that. I have always been straight, and I have taken on Ministers who have not done what I consider appropriate in my community. That has not always benefited my position within the party, but I do not regard the party in the way that some of my colleagues regard it; my constituents come first and the party comes second.

To that end, as a blueprint and in order to be proactive in my approach to the job, I utilised a document which I drafted, and which was adopted and subsequently launched by the Premier in Wanneroo prior to the 1993 state election, entitled "Wanneroo into the 21st Century". It was a policy document that I spent some years drafting, and I have been working on that blueprint ever since in the challenging role that my electorate has presented to me. That was a commitment to the electorate by a coalition Government, led by the Premier, to not only maintain, upgrade and extend services and facilities, but also introduce and establish a range of innovative new measures which would benefit the wider community. It contained no fewer than 40 separate items that were regarded as priorities by the community in addressing its needs and not just the Government's needs. I am happy to report that 32 of those 40 items, or 80 per cent, have been achieved, along with others that were added with each successive budget year. The remainder of the items are long-term commitments that are now progressing. One of those long-term commitments

was an alternative use of the Gngara pine plantation, which the Premier has now announced will become a conservation and recreation park.

One of the highlights of the blueprint, for which I was delighted eventually to receive support, was the upgrading of the Wanneroo townsite. That is dear to me, as I have strong ties with the area through my family history, my grandparents, the Spiers, having been pioneers in the early 1800s not only in Wanneroo but also the State, where they built many of the roads around what are now Wellington and Barrack Streets.

I will mention a few of the other items in the blueprint. Law and order: Increase manning levels and establish a community policing resource centre at Joondalup Police Station; and establish a pilot program of night Courts of Petty Sessions and a victims of crime unit at Joondalup. Education: Establish primary schools at Merriwa, Kinross and Currabine; establish a high school at Clarkson; complete stage 2 of Clarkson Primary School; and establish further works to Belridge High School. Employment: Expand the role of the Wanneroo Economic Development Group, which is now the Regional Economic Development Group; and establish the Business Enterprise Centre at Joondalup. Health: Support the development of Wanneroo Hospital, which is now called the Joondalup Health Campus; and establish a children's ward at that hospital. Community services: Provide a youth development officer at Yanchep-Two Rocks; and establish neighbourhood centres at Merriwa and Kinross. Transport: Support private operators to operate selected public routes, about which there was a lot of controversy during my campaign. I solidly believed that we needed private operators rather than public operators because for too long there had been insufficient services for my electorate. To continue: Install numerous traffic lights in the area. Lands: Secure funding and progress for the upgrading of the Wanneroo townsite; establish a youth group and develop a youth centre in Joondalup; and establish the new regional Returned Services League memorial in Central Park. Tourism: Establish a regional tourism body; establish the blessing of the fleet at Yanchep-Two Rocks, which is now an annual event attended by thousands of people and visitors to the area; and establish support for the upgrading of Yanchep National Park.

During my time as member for Wanneroo, I continued to forge links and to cooperate with many community groups, sporting clubs and business associations to maintain my push towards happiness and prosperity within the wider community. I feel comfortable that my vision for Wanneroo has been achieved, albeit in a relatively short four years, and I cannot help wonder what we might have achieved had we worked a lot longer together.

I need to thank many individuals, and it would be remiss of me not to mention some of them by name. Under education, I thank Howard Crump, President of Clarkson Community College P & C; Diane Guise, the Labor candidate for Joondalup; and Sue Murphy and Rosalie Smith of Beaumaris Preprimary. Under business, I thank Ray Foster, President, Wanneroo Chamber of Commerce; Greg Boyd, Director, Armstrong Jones; and Ivan Ivankovic, IDL Farms. Under community services, I thank Julie Arnold, Chairperson of Granny Spiers Community House, and Mary Stewart, coordinator; Alan and Shirley Carstairs of the Townsite Rejuvenation Task Force Committee; Wendy Goodwin, Beaumaris Play Group; Rosalie Birmingham, Joondalup Residents Association; Gordon Lamb, The Stables, Yanchep; Dale Lings, Burns Beach Ratepayers Association, whose wife passed away some time ago, which caused great sadness in the area; and Audrey Hine, who is a well known resident of Wanneroo. Under tourism, I thank Rosemary Charsley, Deputy Chairperson, Town Site Rejuvenation Task Force, coordinator of the blessing of the fleet, and adviser for seniors' issues; Chris Trump, North West Metro Tourism Association; and Alan Briggs, head of the Department of Conservation and Land Management in Wanneroo. Under youth, I thank Peter Cook, President, Joondalup Youth Task Force, and Paul Kadak, media liaison officer, who has now, I am proud to say, become a journalist at one of the major television stations; and Tanya Charsley, Project Coordinator, Joondalup Youth Centre.

Under transport, I thank John Ashton, Manager, MetroBus Joondalup; Peter Waugh, Director Operations, Main Roads Western Australia; and Des Woods, Driving Australia. Under junior sports, I thank Rob and Marlene Fuller, Joondalup-Kinross Junior Football Club; and I acknowledge and thank the late Kim Wood, founder, Joondalup Little Athletics Centre. I would also like to thank the media in my area, Merv Day, Editor of the *Wanneroo Times*, and Kay Sinclair, journalist, for their balanced reporting of community issues.

Many people have supported me over the years, and their commitment and work has led to a better community than we had prior to my election. I thank my wife Diana, who was my original electorate officer prior to becoming my wife, for the ceaseless work that she did for the community in the office and for her solid support over many difficult years. Last but not least, I thank my current electorate officer, Terry Darby-Smith, who was injured the other day, who is working very hard, not only in the electorate office but also at my office in Parliament. His dedication and commitment to the task have been commendable, and that is probably an understatement. Mr Darby-Smith's high standing in the community is acknowledged, as is his dedication to serving the residents of the local area, which is illustrated by the many community positions that he holds: President, Joondalup Residents Association; President, Joondalup Primary School P & C; Chairperson, Joondalup Family Centre; member, Joondalup Business Association; major committee member, Granny Spiers Community House; and founding member, Joondalup Community

Foundation and Trust. There are many dedicated members of the community whom I do not have time to thank individually tonight, but I thank them with my whole heart.

With all that support, I was asked time and time again to run as an Independent. Hundreds of telephone calls were made to my office. However, in the best interests of maintaining my Liberal philosophies and out of respect to the leader of the Liberal Party I decided not to take that option. In doing so, I trust that the Liberal Party candidates for both Wanneroo and Joondalup will sustain a certain amount of independence in supporting the community, rather than just following a party policy agenda set by the coalition Government - something I did that may have attributed to the reluctance of a number of lay party members to support me after almost all the 35 members in all the branches in my electorate supported me. However, I have no regrets about taking that line as I believe it is most important. To be a true representative of the people one must be a servant of the people and not simply of party politics. Should I have run as an Independent, I would have chosen the seat of Wanneroo because of the traditional ties I mentioned earlier in my speech, and not the seat of Joondalup that I acted on in the interests of the party. Together we have made a difference for the betterment of our community. I thank all those who have supported me during difficult times.

I now take up another issue. I want to try to right a wrong that was done to a person I suppose I can call a previous colleague. He was fondly known as Spike Daniels and he was a superintendent in the Police Force. The Report of the Royal Commission into Matters Surrounding the Administration of Law Relating to Prostitution in 1976 referred to an effort by some witnesses to show that Superintendent Daniels was suffering from some sort of mental illness that gave rise to his becoming a driving force to put controls on prostitution. He was condemned by some witnesses, including his own colleagues, for highlighting the shortcomings in the Police Force and the Labor Government at the time. In his time he tried hard and believed that his efforts were for the good of the community. However, his tireless efforts to fight against the evil that at times is attributed to and attracted by prostitution ended with his demise in the Police Force after 35-odd years of service. In fact, he died a broken man, which was somewhat caused by the issue he took up. I quote from the report -

Mrs. Dorothy Flatman . . . came to Western Australia from Sydney in 1969 to set up a brothel. She had arrived in Sydney from England some four years previously. She was associated with brothels in Sydney. She alleged that her reason for coming to Western Australia was that she had heard that in Western Australia prostitution was more or less tolerated.

That situation exists today and it is why many prostitutes come to this State. Members heard recently about prostitutes coming from South Africa. The report states also -

All witnesses who spoke upon the matter, including Supt. Daniels, expressed a firm opinion that it was not possible to eradicate prostitution. The practice has been therefore to control it and by that control to contain within such limits as were practicable what was recognized as an ineradicable evil.

That included organised crime and drugs. The report states that there should be controls to ensure that the more socially dangerous issues of prostitution are avoided. These are the things we are chasing today. Governments have tried to curb the problems surrounding prostitution. The report suggests that the major evils are venereal diseases and the involvement of criminals in the brothels. It identifies the following problem -

Those police to whom was entrusted over the years the duty of dealing with prostitutes worked out from their collective experience and by discussion a means whereby they sought to control and contain what they knew they could not eradicate.

That is the problem today. He was right then. Another issue I will mention, which Superintendent Daniels raised at the time, is the position the media took. It is something about which I am critical, as was the Fitzgerald inquiry in Queensland. In my opinion, under the present laws in Queensland, newspapers in this State, both the *Sunday Times* and *The West Australian*, would be aiding and abetting the offence of prostitution. I have sat in committees and heard how massage parlours and those involved with massage parlours and prostitutes pay exorbitant fees to both those newspapers to place advertisements. These newspapers know that the advertisements are about prostitution, yet they continue to accept them for one reason - profit. One asks: Where are their morals over prostitution?

As the Fitzgerald inquiry criticised those people, I stand here tonight and criticise those who allow illegal conduct to be advertised every day in the personal columns. As Superintendent Daniels said at the time, prostitution will continue to grow and continue to be a problem. The media at that time printed a few articles on that matter. A check on the newspapers just the other day indicated that more than 400 individual advertisements were placed for massage parlours and prostitution. One wonders whether young people would be drawn into prostitution if that advertising did not occur. Advertisements in those newspapers ask people to attend interviews to be prostitutes, as occurred during Superintendent Daniels' time. He was condemned because he criticised the media at the time. I do the same

thing here tonight and criticise the media. The media look at other issues relating to members of Parliament in this place, but they should look at themselves because they could help our job by not making profits out of something that is illegal.

There should be controls in legislation. The coalition Government set up a committee and I drafted a sex industry control Bill for the committee to look at. I believe that would have solved the problem in this State if it had been acted upon. I am sure the proposed legislation will be acted upon by the next Government.

One may criticise the Government over this matter. However, during the Tonkin Labor Government a commitment was given that the Government would immediately address the problem. No Government since that time has done much about legislation on this matter. Because of Superintendent Daniels' task of taking on those people over prostitution, a psychiatrist was brought in to try to have him declared medically unfit. He was not medically unfit. One thinks about Robin Thoy, who was involved in the Argyle Diamonds inquiry, and the attempt to push him out of the Police Force because it was thought that he was medically unfit. He just went about doing his work on matters that he thought were wrong in the Police Force. There are others: Frank Peters was a deputy commissioner and was forced out because he attempted to right some wrongs in the Police Force during the Labor Government.

It seems that history repeats itself when those who tried to eradicate a problem become a problem for the Police Force. In an effort to force them out it compiles dirt sheets or anything it can on them through all sorts of clandestine inquiries such as bugging either their office or their home like mine. Having started from humble beginnings and hardship Daniels fought for causes that his extrovert personality embraced, usually the underdog. Daniel's great concern for prostitution at the relevant time arose from the attitude he developed towards his daughters whom he considered could face great harm if prostitution continued in the way it did. He was concerned that other girls like his daughters may be drawn into prostitution. I am not saying that his daughters were; but he was concerned about the welfare of other young girls. It is a concern to which we should all pay attention today.

Superintendent Daniels, named in this royal commission into prostitution report, should be appreciated for what he did. He saw a problem of the day and tried to do something about it. He was not crazy or ill; his actions were completely justified. I hope that the media has picked up on my words tonight and will report that his predictions have come true today.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Cowan (Deputy Premier).

VALUATION OF LAND AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 25 June.

MR RIPPER (Belmont) [10.51 pm]: This Bill will provide the Valuer General with legal authority to sell information which his agency collects in the course of its duties. I understand from the second reading speech that the Valuer General's agency has undertaken this for a considerable period. However, some conflicting legal advice has cast doubt on whether the practice is authorised under the Act. It seems to be one of those cases which attracts a high degree of legal caution within Government. According to advice from the Government - perhaps the Minister responsible for the Bill will confirm this - there has been legal advice that the existing practice of selling valuation information is within the legislation. However, other legal advice suggests the practice conflicts with the Act.

It is a very good policy for some of the costs of the Valuer General's operation to be met by the sale of useful information to other sectors of the community such as the real estate sector. With the advent of improved technology, information can be much more easily collected and disseminated in a form which is useful to other people in the community. Technology is very powerful in this area and makes available information in a way not previously accessible over decades. There is great demand for this type of information. It is appropriate that the Valuer General be able to sell the information and recoup some of his agency's costs. I hope - perhaps the Minister responsible for the legislation will confirm this - that the Valuer General may be able to make a profit from this sale of information, thereby offsetting some of the costs that would otherwise be charged to the taxpayer.

The one caveat to my general support for this proposition of selling that information is the question of privacy. I would be interested in the comments of the Government on the matter. I notice that proposed section 39A(3) defines the term "goods and services" so as not to include copies of, or extracts from, valuation rolls, or other material furnished under section 28(1)(c). That may be the protection in the legislation for which I am looking. This is very much a machinery piece of legislation which will validate what is in practice now. The legislation makes it clear that the Valuer General is able to provide goods and services derived from or related to his functions to any entity, person, body or authority with the approval of the Minister. I do not see any objection to that authorisation, particularly as it legitimises a practice that has been conducted for some time.

MR COURT (Nedlands - Premier) [10.57 pm]: I thank the member for his support of the legislation. His comments will be noted and communicated to the Minister.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time, proceeded through remaining stages without debate and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 12 November.

MR BROWN (Morley) [10.58 pm]: This is a very interesting Bill.

Mr Court: I will give you the speech: It extends the powers of the Ombudsman and you fully support it.

Mr Kobelke: The Premier always has the right answer but the wrong question!

Mr BROWN: The Opposition will be very pleased if this Bill does what the Premier says it purports to do. It has been a long time coming.

A deficiency in the capacity of the Parliamentary Commissioner to deal with matters referred to his office, relates to the resources allocated to that office by the Government of the day. On a number of occasions constituents have sought my advice about referring matters to the Parliamentary Commissioner, when they have been aggrieved by the positions taken by government agencies. Frankly, I have not been terribly enthused about recommending that constituents refer matters to the Parliamentary Commissioner's office. That is not because of any doubt I have about the ability of the Parliamentary Commissioner or his officers. Rather, it is about the capacity of that office to deal with the myriad matters referred to it. Some time ago I was aware of matters which were with that office for an inordinate time. Mr Deputy Speaker, you may recall that about 18 months ago we debated in this place the manner in which prisoners at Bandyup Women's Prison were treated. It was proposed that we should establish a parliamentary select committee to examine the issue. During debate on that proposal it was suggested that rather than the Parliament investigating those matters, they should be referred to the Parliamentary Commissioner's office, in the first instance, and depending on the outcome of that investigation, the Government may be prepared at least to consider a proposal for a select committee of this House to investigate those matters. The Parliamentary Commissioner's office investigated the issue. It was a detailed investigation, but it seemed to take an inordinate time to conclude. Therefore, any enhancement of the role of the Parliamentary Commissioner and his office would be welcome. Equally, any improvement in the resources allocated to that office would also be welcome, because it is important for officers of that nature to have the necessary resources to fully carry out their work. I do not want to unnecessarily delay the House. As our main speaker has arrived -

Mr Court: That was a very good speech.

Mr BROWN: I have only 25 minutes, but in the interest of time I will defer to my colleague, the member for Fremantle, who is more familiar with the precise detail of this Bill than I am.

MR McGINTY (Fremantle - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.05 pm]: The Opposition supports the Bill. The legislation is long overdue, and it is not necessary for me to add to the comments in the second reading speech relating to the contents of the Bill. Some concern has been expressed recently about the method of appointment of the Parliamentary Commissioner. It is time this Act was further reviewed to enhance the position of the Parliamentary Commissioner as an officer of this Parliament, with the appointment being made by the Parliament. That would be a significant step forward in enhancing the independence of the position and the position itself. The new Parliament next year should give serious consideration to that proposal.

To the extent that this legislation broadens the number of government agencies over which the Parliamentary Commissioner has jurisdiction - and therefore the capacity to inquire into those agencies - it is an admirable step forward. In recent years it has been a major anomaly in law that, as a result of changes over time, a great number of government agencies were excluded from the jurisdiction of the Parliamentary Commissioner. This legislation will substantially correct that defect and, to that extent, it has the Opposition's support. In the dying hours of this Parliament I will not hold up the House any further. I commend the Bill to the House.

MR COURT (Nedlands - Premier) [11.07 pm]: I thank members for their cooperation, and their support for this important expansion of the coverage of the Ombudsman.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time, proceeded through remaining stages without debate and passed.

LICENSED SURVEYORS AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Resumed from 13 June.

MR KOBELKE (Nollamara) [11.08 pm]: This Bill is required to address a few issues that cannot be delayed. Therefore, the Government has brought forward those reforms in this Bill rather than wait for the major rewrite of the legislation covering this area. I will make a few comments on the importance of surveying, and then direct my remarks to the amendments contained in the Bill.

The second reading speech does not indicate the extent to which the legislation with these amendments will be uniform, or at least compatible, with the legislation covering licensed surveyors in other States. With the push to establish national standards, I hope the Minister will give some guidance on whether the changes in this legislation will assist in achieving greater uniformity across Australia or whether they will go the other way. I have no knowledge of the regime for the licensing of surveyors in other States. Therefore, I will be interested in the response by the Minister regarding the effect the amendments will have on achieving a greater level of uniformity in the registration of surveyors throughout Australia. The whole area of surveying has undergone huge technological change. It is a pity the Minister for Planning will not get the chance to contribute to this debate, because that is an area in which he has a great deal of expertise.

Mr Court: Don't suck up to him now.

Mr KOBELKE: While I have acknowledged differences with the Minister, I have respect for his ability. He has the qualifications and lengthy practical experience from which to speak on this issue, and I have none. My comments are based on information passed on to me and what I have been able to glean from reading various documents and the legislation. However, because this legislation is so important, it is necessary for the Opposition to make some comments and to tease out the implications of the changes we are making. We have had too many pieces of legislation passed through this Parliament during the life of this Government that have been found to be flawed or totally ineffective. While I admit that I have no expertise in this area, it is incumbent upon the Opposition to play its role, to pass comment on the legislation as best it can and to seek information from the Minister who has passage of the Bill to get the best possible understanding in the short time available to us. In that way we will achieve some vetting of the legislation, which is clearly the role this House is required to play.

I was addressing the huge technological changes that have taken place in surveying and in the control and registering of titles. Although it is fast becoming something to be found in museums, all members will be aware of the old system of steel links used to measure distance. They have now been relegated to history and we see incredible electronic equipment that can measure distances with great accuracy and incredible speed and efficiency. We have seen the utilisation of satellites in global positioning systems, and aerial photography obviously plays a role in establishing the data lines and basic points from which surveyors work. For some time, surveyors have used field computers to register the data they need to collect. They are moving away from field books and logbooks to record the measurements necessary to prepare the various maps and drawings that are required. Laser technology has also been introduced. I mention those techniques and equipment to give some indication of the incredible changes that have taken place in surveying in recent times. Yet, we are dealing with a 1909 Act. Clearly, there is a need to upgrade the Act.

Mr Lewis: Just because it is that old?

Mr KOBELKE: No, because of technological change.

Mr Lewis: The fundamentals do not change; just because something is old does not mean the principles change.

Mr KOBELKE: I am not suggesting that the principles change. I appreciate the Minister's advice to the extent that he has expertise in the area.

Several members interjected.

Mr KOBELKE: I did hear the valedictory speech. I do not think it is appropriate to comment on it now and, if I did, I would not comment negatively. The interjection from the Minister addresses only part of the issue. I accept his statement that the fundamentals will not change. However, the legislation contains provisions setting out how the various standards will be met and the requirements placed on surveyors. The way in which the profession is working is open to change because of the introduction of new technology and other factors to which I will allude.

Registration of titles and survey of documents is also the responsibility of the Department of Land Administration. This is another area that has experienced huge changes. Much of that title data is now captured in electronic form.

The process by which titles can be issued and various surveys registered has undergone major changes. These changes result from two major factors. I have already mentioned the changes in technology used to register and capture information. The second major factor is the changes in government practices, which have required efficiencies and updating of procedures to introduce more modern and effective techniques. While I have some concerns about that, I must simply accept the advice I have received from senior officers of DOLA, whose professionalism and integrity I greatly respect. This area is very much a black box to me and I must accept their professional judgment as to the efficiencies and integrity of the new systems.

In simple terms - because my understanding is quite clearly at a simplistic level - under the new systems, the surveyors are now given a much greater degree of autonomy in the certification of the survey data recorded by DOLA. The old system required that DOLA check the registered survey data. We are now moving to a system of self-certification. That being the case, there is clearly a need to ensure that standards are maintained. I understand that there was a reasonably high error rate in the survey documents being lodged when this system was first trialled. DOLA, by whatever means, has tightened up the process. It has ensured that the necessary levels of accountability and oversight have been put in place. In addition, it has provided an improved level of training to ensure that surveyors meet the high standards required. This legislation reflects those changes, which is just one element to which I have alluded.

This legislation focuses on the need for a system of the certification of practising surveyors. It is based on the acceptance of surveyors as professionals who can be relied upon to provide a quality service and guarantee that the survey work they lodge will stand up to the highest possible standards. Such a high level of professional service is clearly central to the lives of ordinary Western Australians; it is fundamental to the right of people in Western Australia to be owners of private property. The right to own private property and the protection of that property in the form of real estate should be adequately covered by the laws of the State. From time to time mistakes have been made where a person has built a house and, because of bad advice or incorrect surveying, the house has not been located on the land owned by the builder of the house.

That leads to a whole range of complicated legal problems. The result quite often is a loss in the asset, either in part or total, to the owner of the home. That is simply one small example of the need to ensure the highest possible standards in surveying.

I will mention one example that came to my notice in my office in Nollamara. In Nollamara and parts of Balga there are quite a number of access ways which people are keen to have closed, because of a range of antisocial problems and breaking and entering offences. People believe that their houses would be safer and they would have a quieter life if they could close the access way adjacent to their home. Without explaining the whole process involved, because it is not central to the amendments before us today, part of the process requires that there be a survey of the public access way so that the titles can be drawn up and amended for the adjacent landowners to purchase a part of the access way. Having assisted some constituents in Nollamara through the whole range of processes required for a public access way to be closed, I noticed that surveyors were working in areas adjacent to a public access way for several days. A week or two later surveyors were up and down the streets adjacent to the public access way. It seemed strange that surveyors should be working in a well-developed suburb such as Nollamara. No other major work was being conducted, such as work for infill sewerage. As I have a fairly high level of interest in my area, I made some inquiries. It transpired that the public access way which they surveyed had previously not been correctly surveyed. They had quite a dickens of a job tracing it back through the building of the suburb in the late 1950s and early 1960s, to try to find some discrepancy in the survey plans, so that they could correct the record of the siting of that public access way. I will come to it later, but that matter relates to the first major area of amendments in this legislation, which allow for the resurveying of areas. That example clearly indicates the very close watch that must be kept on survey data. We must ensure that surveys are accurate. We would certainly not want to deal with the range of problems that could arise with competing interests and conflict between neighbours, if we were not able to rely on the veracity of the survey of the land on which we live.

I will give one other example which relates to the Neapolitano family. I am sure that Mrs Neapolitano will not mind my mentioning her name because she has spoken on talkback programs with the Premier umpteen times and has not had her grievances properly addressed. I respect her tenacity in trying to uphold her interests in land and have her rights properly respected. She is clearly an extremely intelligent woman. Without a legal background or experience she delved into the Acts involved and got on top of the technicalities of land titles and survey advice. She has been able to provide me with a huge range of information involving the anomalies and government departments' judgments which were to the detriment of herself and her husband. One aspect of her problem was quite complex, in that she had land in East Perth which abutted Homeswest land. She sought to develop units at the same time that Homeswest did. Without going into the range of difficulties, she had her land surveyed in order to lay out the site for the construction of her units. Because she would ultimately need strata titles for the units, she had to go to a full survey rather than a building survey in order to certify the exact dimensions of her land and the placement of the units on

it. The results of the survey showed a problem with the fence line, which encroached onto her land. She advised Homeswest of the problem. She thought it would be a simple matter of coming to some arrangement and having the fence properly relocated along the boundary alignment. This relates to the subject under discussion. Her problems arose because the survey documents were misread. One would have thought that as Homeswest is involved in building, it would have the expertise to make a proper judgment based on the information provided by Mrs Neapolitano. The information she has given me, which seems to stack up because she has given it in some considerable detail, indicates that Homeswest got it wrong. Its people did not correctly read the survey document. Homeswest told her, "No, you are wrong. It is okay." Mrs Neapolitano has no training in surveying or technical matters relating to land, and she thought that, having gone Homeswest in good faith and told the people of her survey results, when Homeswest said it was okay that would be the end of the matter. Unfortunately, it was not. It turned out that the information from her original surveyor was correct, and the mistake by Homeswest simply compounded a range of other issues which she has taken up with the Premier and other Ministers. Her complaints, which are of considerable substance, have not been satisfactorily dealt with. That is just one issue involving fence alignment. It may not have been the fault of the surveyors, but of the people who put in the fence many years ago. However, a mistake was made in reading the survey documents which was not rectified when it could have been.

I turn now to the main provisions of the Bill. The first one alluded to by the Minister in his second reading speech is the amendment to the definition of "authorised survey". "Authorised survey" in the principal Act is expanded because as it currently stands - I take the advice from the Minister's second reading speech - when there is a need to resurvey it cannot be picked up in the definition of "authorised survey". I do not know when the definition was put into the Act. It seems a little strange that the Act has been operating for quite some years with the existing definition. We are now told that resurvey becomes a bit of a problem under the definition. When the Minister for Lands responds he might be able to give us a little of the history. Will the Minister give some background on why this has come to light? Perhaps there was a court case that threw doubt on the veracity of that resurvey section.

The definition of "authorised survey" is in new paragraphs (c) and (d). Without going through those in fine detail, they mean that an authorised survey can include "a survey of land which re-establishes the boundaries previously established by a survey of land so authorised or required" with conditions placed on that. Paragraph (d) requires that "the lodgment of a plan with a Government department for acceptance or adoption by that department" will be done according to certain criteria. That is a more detailed definition of "authorised survey" which will ensure that boundaries that are re-established will be accepted as an authorised survey.

The second major area of amendment is what the Minister claims to be the modernising of disciplinary processes including charges and penalties. That is not clear in any part of the Bill. When we go into Committee we may be able to tease out some of the detail of how that fits into the whole process.

There are two areas relating to penalties on which I will comment. The first is section 16(4) of the parent Act which relates to powers of licensed surveyors and states -

Any person who practises as a licensed surveyor or makes or attempts to make any authorised survey, contrary to this section, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars.

That penalty has been amended to \$10 000 - a hefty increase. We are placing a greater power of self-certification on surveyors. We have to ensure that people who are not so qualified do not practise as licensed surveyors. Section 17(3) relating to surveyors entering upon lands refers to a penalty and states -

Any person obstructing a licensed surveyor or his assistants in the exercise of the powers hereby conferred shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty dollars, which shall be considered to accrue from day to day while such obstruction lasts.

That has been amended by taking out the penalty of \$20 a day which shall accrue over the number of days in which the obstruction lasts and instituting a straight penalty of \$2 000. Again, that is a quite marked increase in that penalty for someone who is obstructing a surveyor from entering upon land. As I read the amendment, the cumulative effect no longer applies if that obstruction continues for a number of days.

There are a number of other minor amendments, one of which relates to section 9 of the parent Act. That section refers to the issuing of a certificate of competency. Subsection (2) states -

No person shall be admitted to the final qualifying examination, unless he has attained the age of twenty years . . .

That will be amended to 18 years by the Bill. I am not sure from that whether the courses are changing and people will come in through a different set of educational courses or whether we are making allowance for some students who may progress ahead of their age group and therefore qualify at an earlier age. Why is that required? Does it

to relate to some people moving ahead because of their ability for promotion due to the fact that they have coped with the course or are we dealing with a different training program so that people can receive that certificate of competency through different courses and by that means gain the certificate at a younger age?

A number of parts of the amending Bill relate to the introduction of periodical renewal practising certificates. While I will not attempt to tease that out now, I am not sure how the structure will work. I assume its introduction is tied to the requirement for educational programs.

Mr Kierath: Ongoing training.

Mr KOBELKE: Ongoing training to ensure that people are up to date with the new requirements for the lodgment of survey.

Mr Kierath: New technology requirements and a whole range of things.

Mr KOBELKE: And in keeping with the move to a higher level of reliance on the surveyor rather than any checking by the government department.

Mr Kierath: A certain amount of traditional training must done by any licensed practising surveyor.

Mr KOBELKE: There are two elements to that. Technology is clearly changing. There could also be changes in DOLA's requirements for lodgment.

The other part on which the Minister has not commented is the greater reliance on the professional integrity and the quality of work of the surveyors. Therefore the Government has to keep a closer check -

Mr Kierath: If you give them greater reliance you will do two things: You will make sure they keep abreast of changing technology and information and you will make sure that the penalties are there if they breach it.

Mr KOBELKE: That leads to a number of amendments which relate to the register of licensed surveyors. They will now go on the register and, through the amendments in the Bill, that register will indicate whether each licensed surveyor listed holds a practising certificate. They not only have to be a licensed surveyor; they must also have the practising certificate. As the Minister said, that practising certificate is a way of ensuring there is a continuing up-date of practising surveyors in respect of the requirements and that their standards are also checked. The information will be recorded rather than their only being on the list. It will also record whether the person is a licensed surveyor, whether the person holds a practising certificate, whether the person possesses the qualifications herein mentioned, whether the person has had his licence cancelled or suspended, and whether the person's practising certificate has been cancelled or suspended. The register will become a working document. People may be listed on it in a suspended form. While they are licensed surveyors, they will not have the practising certificate and therefore they will have a different status. They will be required to actually fulfil the requirements of the Act to gain the practising certificate to be able to practise as a licensed surveyor. It is an important move to ensure that standards are guaranteed. I am not versed in this area and I will accept the advice of the Minister and his advisers that it is a workable procedure.

The last concern I have is indemnity from personal liability for members and officers of the Land Surveyors' Licensing Board. I am not sure of the effect of the changes on the board. In the other place the shadow spokesman, Hon Mark Nevill, thought it would be better to make it a requirement that the board must have regulations by deleting the word "may" and inserting the word "shall". I will not move an amendment because I would be going over what clearly is a lost cause. The situation as it stands is adequate. It means that the board would have to make regulations covering indemnity insurance. The regulations would be varied from time to time as the need arose. The clause dealing with this provision covers almost four pages. I am not sure of the real intent of the clause and I do not know how it compares with the existing Act. I hope the Minister will provide me with some advice.

Mr Kierath: To what were you referring?

Mr KOBELKE: I was referring to the fourth key area to which the Minister alluded in his second reading speech; that is, professional indemnity insurance. I am not taking issue with the relevant clause, but I am not sure what the Minister is trying to achieve and why it is necessary. Indemnity is clearly an area of which we must take full account. I reiterate that we must place importance on the reliability of the survey information. For example, if somebody loses his home because it has not been built on the land he purchased and the error can be traced back to the surveyor who surveyed the land, there must be some form of indemnity insurance should action be taken. It is a complex issue. A few years ago there were moves across Australia to set uniform standards for indemnity insurance. I do not think that proposal got anywhere. I do not know how far this Bill will go, but I hope it will improve the situation and ensure some recourse is available to people who have suffered a loss because of a professional error or incompetency.

Mr Kierath: The legislation provides for a maximum limit. They are still liable for indemnity insurance. It puts a cap on it.

Mr KOBELKE: It is a very difficult area. An aggrieved householder does not have the financial resources to plead his case through the courts and he will be at a decided disadvantage in trying to have his rights upheld. He will suffer a major loss especially if his house, being his major capital investment, is affected because of an error in the original survey. This legislation does not provide him with additional assistance. The Bill will ensure that the system works for surveyors because it provides for indemnity insurance at a level which will not drive up the costs for surveyors. It is a need and we cannot afford to let it get out of control, which is what occurred in other professions. For example, members of the medical profession have moved out of obstetrics because the level of indemnity insurance is too great.

In all sincerity, the Minister tends to go too far in assisting professionals, and does not uphold the rights of consumers who are in a position of weakness when it comes to pursuing their rights when they suffer a loss.

Mr Kierath: The legislation will provide for regulations in relation to indemnity insurance. It is not the Government's wish to weaken that aspect of the legislation. There are loopholes, but the Bill will make it easier. In the case of a new development the survey could be modified to make sure that the consumer was properly covered.

Mr KOBELKE: My comments are genuine. We all have different opinions on issues. My judgment of the Minister is that he tends to sit on the side of efficiency which reduces costs. I go the other way. It comes down to a balancing act and one cannot afford to go too far either way. I try to ensure that the ordinary people who are disadvantaged and do not have access to the courts have the best possible opportunity of prosecuting their case to uphold their rights when they are affected by professional negligence. However, in a range of areas the Minister moves towards the cost efficiency side, which means that often the people who are affected find it difficult to get justice.

Mr Kierath: I had no input into the drafting of this Bill. It was introduced by the former Minister. My involvement is in the carriage of this legislation through this place. I certainly had no involvement in the ideology, strategy or thinking behind this Bill.

Mr KOBELKE: I am not trying to imply that there is an ulterior motive. It allows the issue to be guided by regulations and then it comes down to how the regulations and the provisions in the Bill will be implemented. If the Minister is given the opportunity after the forthcoming election to continue in the portfolio of Lands, I hope he will lean more towards looking after the rights of ordinary people rather than cost efficiency. Whoever is the Minister next year will be confronted with the same range of conflicting interests and the need to make a balanced decision. I certainly hope that in the case of indemnity insurance the rights of the ordinary landholders will receive consideration.

The Opposition supports the passage of this Bill. Members may have the opportunity to deal with it in more detail in Committee.

MR KIERATH (Riverton - Minister for Lands) [11.49 pm]: I will try to answer as best I can most of the concerns raised by the member for Nollamara. At the outset I reiterate that I have had no involvement in the drafting of the legislation. It was introduced into the other place by the former Minister. I can assure the member that he does not have to worry about the cost effective part of the legislation because I had no say in it.

The member for Nollamara commented earlier on uniformity throughout Australia. Reciprocal arrangements, though not necessarily uniformity, have been in place in the surveying profession for the best part of 100 years. That is a credit to the profession. There are differences from State to State. However, as Western Australia occupies one-third of the country, it has special needs that are not appropriate to the other States. I talked to a forum of professional surveyors as part of a national conference held in Perth. They were keen that these provisions go through.

The Government acknowledges that the Act needs a major overhaul, and that is under way. The amendments contained in this Bill are matters that cannot wait for that overhaul. A review was commenced in 1987, which predated this Government. There has been no radical change of direction under this Government. The legislation is above party politics; it will implement the wishes of professionals in the industry. The Act does require changes and they will be addressed after a further review.

Mr Kobelke: How is the current definition of authorised surveyor inadequate?

Mr KIERATH: One of the reasons for a new definition is that early issue plans and file plans are not currently covered in the definition; they are roped in with other provisions. The penalties contained in the Act are outdated and the profession agrees that much stronger and updated penalties are required.

The important point is that this Bill has the agreement of the profession and its associated bodies. The member for Nollamara also raised the issue of Mrs Napolitano. I give the member full marks for trying. However, that issue is not associated with this Bill; it is different altogether.

Mr Kobelke: I did not raise that from the point of view that it would get justice. It was providing another example of the importance of correct interpretation of survey land.

Mr KIERATH: Mrs Napolitano's problem is more complex than a correct survey. There was a matter of a fence being erected over a boundary and other issues associated with land law.

Mr Kobelke: I mentioned it was one element of a complex problem.

Mr KIERATH: The member for Nollamara will forgive me if I do not address those issues in this debate. The member is correct that this Bill will accommodate the changes in technology. Surveying technology has had a rapid impact on the profession and that is one of reasons we cannot wait to update these provisions; something must be done now. These provisions have the support of all the bodies concerned. The amendment to "18 years of age" is simply a routine provision. As in other parts of the world, 21 used to be the adult age; it is now 18. Students are passing through the education system at a younger age. I attended the graduation ceremony at the Willetton High School. The dux of the school was a young lady who graduated two years ahead of her time. She is the brightest student they have ever had. Those sorts of things are happening.

My judgment is that the practising certificate helps to control and discipline the profession. Perhaps in a major review of the Act that provision would be incorporated in other areas. However, I am advised it is an important requirement to cover the various ranges of surveyors. Perhaps a surveyor is still licensed, but does not want a practising certificate.

Some areas in the profession require more indemnity insurance than others, and this legislation will allow for that. It will also provide that regulations can be made as those issues change. Changes in technology have caused the profession to rethink some of those indemnity issues. This is not a major change of emphasis. I reassure the member that I had no input whatever.

Mr Kobelke: I was not suggesting that the changes were trying to shift the balance.

Mr KIERATH: I am sure that balance will be addressed.

I thank members for their comments and support for this Bill. The profession is waiting for this Bill to pass through both Houses. This Bill has generally had the support of everybody involved.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time, proceeded through remaining stages without debate and passed.

CIVIL AVIATION (CARRIERS' LIABILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 29 October.

MRS ROBERTS (Glendalough) [11.58 pm]: This is yet another Bill that is overdue. I note that the Bill arises out of events of the past two or three years involving serious air crashes in which passengers were killed. This is a matter of concern, because there was a problem with the insurance of those carriers. In some instances their policies were void and the insurers refused to compensate the families of the victims of the crashes. At long last this Bill will provide that all commercial operators will have the necessary third party liability insurance, so that those circumstances will not recur. This legislation will prohibit exclusions on safety and voluntary agreements between carriers and passengers which could void the liability in the event of passengers being killed or injured.

I note that state and territory Transport Ministers Australia wide have agreed that this kind of legislation should be introduced. It has been suggested that we are the last State to introduce this legislation. I seek clarification about whether Western Australia is the last State to introduce this legislation. If not, what stage have the other States reached in this uniform legislation which will bring Western Australia into line with other States and, hopefully, protect people travelling on commercial air flights? I note that in the second reading speech the Minister suggests that not only are all the States and Territories of the Commonwealth proposing similar legislation, but also that legislation will be proclaimed on a common date. I seek some clarification from the Minister as to what the common date will be. This is a matter of considerable importance. It surprised me somewhat that the legislation was brought on at such a late hour in the Government's term, as we approach the next election.

In the expectation the Minister will not want to take this legislation to the Committee stage, perhaps he can answer some questions. I note that section 41D of part IVA of the principal Act refers to the insurer's liability not being affected by exclusions or breaches, except as prescribed by the regulations. What are the exceptions where the insurer's liability is not affected by the exclusions or breaches? I seek further clarification about the provisions of section 41E dealing with carriers to be covered by acceptable insurance. Subsection (1) provides that a carrier must not carry passengers by air unless an acceptable contract of insurance is in force in relation to the carrier. What checks and penalties are in place to ensure this is the case?

The fact that this Bill is brought in at this very late hour, without any advance notice to the Opposition, is yet another example of the poor management of business in this House by the Government. It was not on a list of Bills as presented to the member for Belmont earlier in the week, although I was aware that this legislation had been dealt with in the Legislative Council some time ago and that the Labor Party Caucus made a decision to support this Bill.

I do not intend to delay the House by speaking on this Bill at length; however, I seek some answers to those very simple questions. The Opposition supports this legislation wholeheartedly. Passengers on these aircraft must know that they are covered by appropriate insurance, that the required safety measures are in place, and that the insurer's liability is not affected by any shortcomings in the safety of the aircraft in which they are carried.

MR LEWIS (Applecross - Minister for Planning) [12.03 am]: I thank the Opposition for supporting this legislation. To be perfectly frank, I do not know whether Western Australia is the last State to pass this template legislation.

Mrs Roberts: Is there someone in government who knows?

Mr Cowan: Yes, there is.

Dr Turnbull: It does not matter.

Mrs Roberts: It does matter.

Mr LEWIS: At this moment I cannot answer those questions.

Mrs Roberts: Why not? Do you know what the common date is?

Mr LEWIS: This is template legislation, if all the States in Australia agree to bring insurance claims into conformity.

Mrs Roberts: Do you know what the common date is? Do you know when it comes into force? Why not?

Mr LEWIS: The member has had her chance.

Mrs Roberts: You should know. It refers to a common date. It is a simple question and deserves a simple answer. Is the Government on top of this legislation or not?

Mr LEWIS: The Government is always on top because it always has the numbers. That is something the member must always remember. The member for Glendalough is asking questions I could answer if I had the advice of people associated with the Minister for Transport. Obviously those people are not here this evening.

Mrs Roberts: Do you feel I should take this into Committee so that I can get some answers?

Mr LEWIS: The member should do what she likes. If she wants to keep her colleagues up for the rest of the night, that is fine. If she wants to be seen as a small-minded person, it is up to her. This is all about goodwill. She is being pedantic and nonsensical at this time of night, and at the conclusion of the twenty-third Parliament that is fine.

Mrs Roberts: This is a very simple question. Do you think it should be answered? What is the common date of the legislation?

Mr LEWIS: The member is too smart by half. She is a novice in this place, and it is about time she realised that. Be that as it may, I thank the Opposition for its support of this legislation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time, proceeded through remaining stages without debate and passed.

TRANSFER OF LAND AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 29 August.

MR RIPPER (Belmont) [12.09 am]: Mr Acting Speaker -

Mr Prince: You know nothing about this!

Mr RIPPER: That is right; however, I want to hold the floor for a moment while we await the arrival of our shadow Minister to speak on this legislation. The Government has had a fairly easy ride tonight. Quite a number of Bills have been passed without much significant debate. I do not want this Bill to go through entirely without opposition scrutiny. It was interesting earlier in the proceedings this evening that the Premier appeared to know absolutely nothing about the Valuation of Land Amendment Bill, which was put through the House in about 10 minutes.

Mr Lewis: He needed my help.

Mr RIPPER: It is a pity that the Minister for Planning was not there to provide a last service as a Minister to the Premier. As an aside, I enjoyed the valedictory speech of the Minister for Planning. I wanted to jump up and endorse some of the remarks he made, but such action might have caused some damage in the forthcoming electoral contest!

Mr Prince: When are you going to talk about the Transfer of Land Amendment Bill?

Mr RIPPER: I am still waiting for the shadow Minister for Lands to join the debate. I am trying to emphasise the need for proper scrutiny of the legislation at this time. I see that my endeavours to ensure that the legislation is properly dealt with have met with success and our spokesperson on land matters is in the House.

MR KOBELKE (Nollamara) [12.11 am]: I commend the member for Belmont for making such an excellent contribution to the debate on the Transfer of Land Amendment Bill. I do not wish to try to outdo him, other than to say that the Opposition supports the Bill.

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [12.12 am]: Some members may recall that at one time I was Minister for Lands. I note that most of the amendments contained in this Bill were approved by me and the Cabinet of the former Government for drafting when I was still Minister for Lands. That fact says something about our parliamentary process: It has taken all of four years of this Government for this legislation to reach the House. The transfer of property and legislation dealing with property rights is a very important element of our commercial life and of all our personal stakes. This area should be updated to allow modern technology to be used in relation to most transfer forms to expedite conveyancing as much as possible. This will ensure that the processes relating to property held in this State cater for the needs of a modern and changing world.

I reiterate that it is disappointing that it has taken so long for a Bill of this kind to come before the House. It is disappointing that this 125 page Bill will pass through the Assembly in the space of a few minutes. It is neither doing the public a great service nor enhancing the reputation of this Parliament. I urge members who will be here next year to join with the Leader of the House, whoever it may be at the time, to ensure that procedures are put in place to enable legislation to be dealt with in a much more comprehensive way, and to expedite Bills into the Parliament once they are approved for drafting.

MR KIERATH (Riverton - Minister for Lands) [12.13 am]: I acknowledge the contribution of the member for Mitchell, and I thank members for their comments.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee and Report

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

Third Reading

MR KIERATH (Riverton - Minister for Lands) [12.14 am]: I move-

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR RIPPER (Belmont) [12.15 am]: I place on record my disappointment that the Bill has not been given more scrutiny by the Parliament. The Opposition was not sent a letter this week advising it of the weekly program foreshadowed by the Government, as is the normal practice of the Leader of the House. During the last two weeks the Opposition has been left to make its judgment on what legislation might come before the House during the week. It seems that some of our members have been surprised by the fact that this Bill has been brought on for debate. That is unfortunate. The Opposition would have liked to give every Bill scheduled proper scrutiny, as our role as parliamentarians requires. The usual practice of informing the Opposition of the weekly program should have been maintained so we were better informed.

Mr Cowan: I tried to persuade everybody to come back next week.

Mr RIPPER: The Deputy Premier did not seek my support for that proposal!

MRS ROBERTS (Glendalough) [12.16 am]: I endorse the comments made by the opposition leader of the House. The Government also did not advise the Opposition that the Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Amendment Bill would be dealt with this week. As the opposition transport spokesperson, I was familiar with that Bill as I had Caucus make a determination on it. Also, the Opposition was given no notification of the Transfer of Land Amendment Bill, for which I am not the opposition spokesperson. I concur with the comments of the opposition leader of the House and the member for Mitchell, who is a former Minister for Planning and Minister for Lands, and has had a long involvement in this field, about this shabby treatment of the Bill. In the dying days of the Government - some members opposite are tired of hearing that phrase, but they will continue to hear it - the passage of this number of Bills at the conclusion of valedictory speeches is incredible. These Bills have not been subject to the appropriate scrutiny of this House, and the Opposition takes no responsibility for Bills put through with three or four minutes' notice.

The opposition leader of the House has pointed out that the Opposition was given no notice of the Bills to be dealt with this week. Although I am a new member of this House, I understand that that kind of shabby treatment was never imposed on members previously. It is all very well for the Deputy Premier to wave the Notice Paper, but year in, year out, much business is not dealt with in the year of its introduction. Members opposite know that very well. A general courtesy has been extended by Governments to let Oppositions know which Bills will be dealt with in any given week. That is a courtesy not extended to the Opposition this week. I can only suggest that the Government did not want appropriate scrutiny of and debate on the Bills; it did not want opposition members to be prepared on the Bills so they could ask the hard questions on the issues involved.

The fact that I was prepared on the aviation Bill and asked questions to which I had already turned my mind indicated that the Minister was not prepared on the Bill. He could not answer the questions asked. The Government Whip, the member for Geraldton, had to point out some basic factors regarding the aviation legislation as it applied across the States. It is a brief Bill with a two page second reading speech, which states that the legislation will be proclaimed on the common date with other State and Territories. However, the Minister could not even advise me of that common date or whether we were the first or last State to consider the legislation. That indicates his unpreparedness.

Members opposite may treat Parliament as a rubber stamp. However, when they bring on such legislation in the last moments of the Parliament with no notice because it is not considered that the measures will bear scrutiny and because Ministers are not prepared to answer questions, bad legislation results. The Minister for Lands should know about that because he introduced bad strata titles legislation over a year ago which created a bag full of enormous problems. It has resulted in more than \$100 000 or more being spent on an advertising campaign in an attempt to rectify that problem. When legislation is not appropriately examined by the House, mistakes are made.

Although the Transfer of Land Amendment Bill appears to be satisfactory, had the Opposition been given notice, it could have subjected that Bill to more scrutiny and could have asked a few more questions. With regard to the Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Amendment Bill, no-one was present to assist the Minister in answering the Opposition's legitimate questions. Who was in the Chamber to answer questions on the Transfer of Land Amendment Bill?

Mr Lewis: Me.

Mrs ROBERTS: There was no-one, because the Government is treating this Parliament like a rubber stamp, and when it does that, it is treating with contempt not just the Opposition but all those people whom the Opposition represents.

MR KIERATH (Riverton - Minister for Lands) [12.20 am]: If I can give the House some assurance, this Bill was laid before the other House in November or December 1995. There has been wide consultation, and most interest groups have had a say.

Mrs Roberts: What about the remainder of the business that you are not dealing with? Should we have prepared for those matters as well?

Mr KIERATH: That is a different issue. This Bill has been the subject of extensive consultation. Because it is a Transfer of Land Amendment Bill, it is acknowledged that further amendments will be required. In the end, the cut off date was determined last year. I give the member an assurance that if the Opposition wins government, it can review it; if the coalition wins government, it will further review this Bill next year.

Mrs Roberts: May I ask a simple question?

Mr KIERATH: Let me finish, and I will take the interjection.

Mr Cowan: Please don't; get on with it!

Mr KIERATH: I was trying to show a bit of goodwill. There will be ongoing amendments to this Bill, and two land administration Bills are also before the House which will be debated next year and which relate to this Bill. The overhaul of the Land Act and associated Acts is a major transition. As the member for Mitchell pointed out, this Bill has been four weeks in the making. It is not something the Government cranked up overnight.

Mrs Roberts: Why did you not advise us on Tuesday that you intended to bring on this legislation this week?

Mr KIERATH: I cannot answer that.

Mrs Roberts: Did you advise the Leader of House that we needed to debate this legislation this year?

Mr KIERATH: I think the second reading was on 29 August this year. I accept the concerns the member has raised, I give an assurance that there will be reviews of this legislation next year, and I thank members opposite for their comments and support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTION - STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Notices of Motion Nos 23 and 25 be Considered

MR COWAN (Merredin - Deputy Premier) [12.22 am]: I move, without notice -

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Notices of Motion Nos 23 and 25 to be next considered.

MR RIPPER (Belmont) [12.23 am]: The Opposition supports the suspension of standing orders to allow these two motions to be dealt with. There is, I understand from the Minister for Planning, an administrative requirement that the possibility of disallowance by this House of these planning matters be dispensed with so that people can proceed to act in accordance with these metropolitan region scheme amendments. Were we not to deal with these motions, people might be prevented from acting on these scheme amendments with absolute confidence until the House resumes following the election.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

MOTION - DISALLOWANCE OF METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT No 978/33-DARLING RANGE REGIONAL PARK

MR BLOFFWITCH (Geraldton) [12.24 am]: I move -

That Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment No 978/33 - Darling Range Regional Park, first published in the *Gazette* on 3 May 1996 and tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 15 October 1996, be disallowed.

Members should be aware that this amendment has sat on the Table of this House for 10 sitting days, which is two days short of the statutory requirement of 12 sitting days. The amendment has taken considerable time to prepare, and there has been strong public support for the proposal contained in the amendment. This motion is, therefore, a procedural motion to ensure the passage of the amendment before this Parliament rises, which is expected to be later today. I expect I will be the only person to support this motion.

MRS ROBERTS (Glendalough) [12.25 am]: I oppose the motion moved by the member for Geraldton. I support the Darling Range Regional Park and the amendment. However, in doing so, I point out, once again, that this is another indication of the Government's poor management of the business of this House. It is clearly running scared going into an election and has had to rush this amendment through the House because, as the member for Geraldton has pointed out, the prescribed time for which an amendment should sit on the Table of the House is 12 sitting days but, in fact, it will have sat on the Table for only 10 sitting days. I am disappointed that the Government cannot organise itself better. This is yet another indication of its total disorganisation and poor planning of its legislative program.

The Opposition supports the Darling Range Regional Park, which, as all members of this House know, was initiated by the Labor Party a number of years before the current coalition Government came into power. The coalition Government procrastinated on this matter for some time before bringing this matter to conclusion, and it has taken it the full four years to bring this matter to fruition. I made some representations, on behalf of a community group, to the Western Australian Planning Commission with regard to this scheme amendment for Darling Range Regional

Park. I am pleased that the people on whose behalf I spoke, who are in the state seat of Roleystone, received favourable treatment from the Western Australian Planning Commission and their properties were excluded from the Darling Range Regional Park for the reasons I outlined to the Western Australian Planning Commission.

However, some landowners in the seat of Swan Hills are aggrieved by the treatment they received from the Western Australian Planning Commission and from the Government in the formation of the Darling Range Regional Park. I met with and received representations from Pam Austin and Patsy Molloy, who live in the vicinity of Nolan Street, Middle Swan. The initial proposal showed only a small reservation over the property owned by them and others in that vicinity, but what eventuated was a much larger reservation. They advised me that they were having ongoing consultations with the Western Australian Planning Commission and the relevant department or ministry, and that this matter is of great concern to them. They put the case to me that the submission period was at a time which was not suitable for people involved in vineyards. Members opposite who have any understanding of farming or horticulture know that at certain times of the year farmers are very busy. That period in which public submissions were taken was a busy time for those involved in viticulture, and it meant that at their busiest time of the year they were expected to turn their attention to their property rights as they relate to the formation of the Darling Range Regional Park.

The final proposal varies from the initial proposal. However, it does not vary in the landowners' direction; they have a larger reservation over their property. It seems to be a "trust me" approach for Pam Austin and others who have owned property there long term that those reservations will not be acted on and that they will continue to have full use of and access to their properties. It alters people's attitude to a property if a reservation is placed over it. It is a little like having a sword hanging over their head: They do not know at what moment in the near or distant future the Government may act to call on that reservation.

The Government must look at the size of the lots involved and their commercial viability for viticulture. I am not convinced that those considerations have been properly taken into account. In these kinds of amendments, the overall picture must be considered in balance, and the overall picture is that the creation of the Darling Range Regional Park is a positive initiative. This is a great initiative of the former Labor Government that is finally being acted on by the coalition Government. I am disappointed that those problems in the Swan Valley area were not sorted out to the landowners' satisfaction. I hope that future negotiations will not limit those property owners' use of their own properties or the safety, security and financial viability of those properties.

In summary, I support the establishment, at last, of the Darling Range Regional Park. The establishment of such regional parks is vital to our expanding city and the Perth metropolitan region. I commend the Government on bringing this amendment before the House.

MRS van de KLASHORST (Swan Hills) [12.33 am]: Like the previous member, I support the Darling Range Regional Park concept. However, I want to put on record - I feel strongly about this - that any Government, not just a coalition Government, must seriously consider the fact that these parks and other reserves are moved onto people's private property. I know of a woman who developed diabetes because of this park. She is an Italian migrant who came to Western Australia when she was very young. She and her husband bought land in the Darling Range and she has lived her life there. Her husband has died and she is ready to retire there, and the Government has taken three-quarters of her land for this park. Although I know that the benefit of the park as a whole is important, the Government must try to establish more of these parks on crown reserves rather than on privately owned land.

People in the Swan Valley with orchards and land along the river flats that they have held for three or four generations have been told the Government wants their land. It is important that these people be given more time. There has been a lot of hurt in the community, and it might help if landowners could attend the meetings at which the parks are formulated. I can speak only from the perspective of people in Swan Hills who have had land for many generations and of people who have bought land and held on to it. Even though it can be said that nothing on the ground changes and that these people can hang on to it for the rest of their lives, in many cases the Government has taken away something that belongs to them. One woman is likely to make over \$1m out of this regional park, but she does not want it; she wants her land and she feels that the Government is taking it.

Although I support the establishment of the park, when these decisions are made by any Government, those who own land must be involved in the decision making. Their concerns must be taken into account when blanket decisions are made. It concerns me that the Government must take so much private land that belongs to individuals who love their land. People who live in the country areas have a special affinity to the land. Although I support the establishment of the regional park, on their behalf I ask that the Government be careful in the future about what it does and how much land it takes from private landowners.

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [12.35 am]: I strongly support the establishment of this park. The Darling Range is the backdrop to metropolitan Perth and gives metropolitan Perth that almost rural, bushy feel, even though so much

of it is now urbanised. I take this opportunity to congratulate Fred McKenzie and all those who have been involved for a long time in trying to develop this regional park.

Mr Lewis: Fred hasn't been there for four years.

Mr D.L. SMITH: I know, but he did most of the work. I remember the meetings with Fred at which he constantly complained about the lack of progress in getting the plan to finality. It has taken a further four years to get it to finality. The impact of creating regional parks where the Government does not acquire the land, but leaves it in private ownership, was very much under focus when I was the Minister for Planning. To some extent the current Minister for Planning has enabled this sort of thing to occur through the amendments he made to the legislation. However, it is an area to which more attention must be paid in the future so that some of the angst the members for Swan Hills and Glendalough mentioned is eased, and the sort of heartache that many people could feel when the Government moves to use similar systems in other areas is avoided.

It must be borne in mind that the principal reason it is being done in this manner is that there is no way the State could acquire all the land in this regional park. The cost of that would be so great that it would balk at the idea of creating such a park. In circumstances where it is in the interests of the taxpayer and the State as a whole that it be done in this way, it must be recognised that nonetheless the State owes a great level of responsibility to those who own the land; to ensure that the level of financial loss is not too great and that they properly understand and agree with what is happening to their land.

Question put and passed.

MOTION - DISALLOWANCE OF METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT No 979/33- SOUTH EAST CORRIDOR OMNIBUS No 2

MR BLOFFWITCH (Geraldton) [12.38 am]: I move -

That Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment No 979/33 - South East Corridor Omnibus No 2, first published in the *Gazette* on 10 May 1996 and tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 15 October 1996, be disallowed.

MR KOBELKE (Nollamara) [12.39 am]: I will make a brief comment on proposal No 13 contained in the South East Corridor Omnibus Amendment No 2. This relates to the siting of a high school in Canning Vale. The member for Kenwick, who is running as a Labor Party candidate for Southern River, has taken a close interest in the provision of a high school for Canning Vale. She presented a petition to the Parliament signed by 247 people in that area who opposed the siting of the high school for Canning Vale in the area between Comrie and Fraser Roads. The owners of that privately owned land have expressed their objection. In the report two of those owners have objected and a third owner has advised of his concerns over the possible compensation they will be paid for their land. The area is not central to the growing area of Canning Vale and local residents are concerned that it is not the most appropriate site. In addition to the concerns of residents, grounds exist for concern about whether proper planning has occurred.

On coming to government after the election we will review where Canning Vale Senior High School should be sited. Planning for a senior high school is necessary. The Government is correct in putting aside a site and that is the purpose of proposal 13. I will not vote against the amendment. The Opposition would ensure a proper study was done in the area to see whether a more suitable site could not be found for the construction of the Canning Vale school in the near future.

Question put and negatived.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION - SELECT COMMITTEE INTO CHILD MIGRATION

On motion without notice by Mr Cowan (Deputy Premier), resolved with an absolute majority -

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable consideration forthwith of a motion relating to documents of the Select Committee into Child Migration.

SELECT COMMITTEE INTO CHILD MIGRATION

Royal Commission, Transmission of Documents or Records Authorisation

On motion by Mr Cowan (Deputy Premier), resolved -

That where -

- (a) the Select Committee into Child Migration has not finally reported to this House, and

- (b) one or some of the members of that committee are appointed as a royal commission with terms of reference similar to those of the select committee,

the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly is authorised to transmit to the royal commission, upon its request, any documents or things held as records of the committee.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - SPECIAL

Adjournment Debate - Election Campaign; End of Thirty-fourth Parliament

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe - Leader of the House) [12.44 am]: I move -

That the House at its rising adjourn until a date and time to be fixed by the Speaker.

This year has seen the passage of approximately 80 Bills through this Chamber. It has also seen democracy at work. Approximately 2 356 questions were asked of which to this stage 95 per cent have been answered. It is up to individual Ministers to continue to provide responses. It reflects the dying moments before we head into an election campaign and the end of this thirty-fourth Parliament.

First, I acknowledge support and assistance of many people associated with this Parliament, especially you, Mr Speaker, in your retirement. I thank you on behalf of the House for your role as Speaker. You have had a long and distinguished career as a parliamentarian and Minister concluding, fittingly, as the Speaker.

I also acknowledge the other retiring members of this House, the members for Applecross, Vasse, Thornlie, Mitchell, Rockingham and Armadale. In hearing the valedictory speeches tonight there is no doubt that, despite all the adversity within this House and the banter, humour, conflict and debate, the vast majority of members of Parliament are dedicated to their constituents, the causes they believe in and this Parliament. In almost all cases there is a great deal of agreement and commitment. It is somewhat sad that the members of the wider community may have a disparaging view of parliamentarians. We at least, perhaps self-indulgently, appreciate that we work hard and with genuine desire for the good of the community.

I also thank the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees for the work he has done. Through the Select Committee on Procedure he has set the seeds for what I think will be ongoing and fundamental reform of this Parliament. I thank the Acting Speakers, Deputy Chairmen and the Government and Opposition Whips. I also acknowledge my opposition colleague, the member for Belmont. Although over the past four years we have enjoyed a relationship which has had its moments, I regard him as a man of honour and dignity, with the occasional slip. We have enjoyed a good relationship.

Mrs Roberts: Lucky you said that so that he can maintain his reputation!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I also acknowledge the role of Peter McHugh, Doug Carpenter, John Mandy and the Chamber staff Stefanie, Nicky, Tamara, Tony, Peter, Victor, Nigel, Keith, Neil Burrell and the Hansard reporters and all associated staff; Vince Pacecca, the dining room staff, bar staff, switchboard operators, Cathy, Marilyn, Maureen and all parliamentary staff. We all recognise the role they play for this Parliament in making it operate as it does.

It is not necessary for me to reflect on the legislative program or the election that approaches us. This thirty-fourth Parliament has been interesting in the development of government within Western Australia. I do not seek to be political, but I guess the last Parliament was characterised by the Royal Commission into Commercial Activities of Government and Other Matters; it probably ended up being the dominant factor. During this Parliament we have appointed the Commission on Government, had debates about the role of the Parliament and had the Select Committee on Procedure which will prove to be very important. In many respects this has been a Parliament of reflection on how our democracy in Western Australia has performed and what the future may hold.

Although it is not up to me to foreshadow the future, I suspect that history will show that the thirty-fifth Parliament in many respects will be the defining Parliament for Western Australia. It will be the Parliament that takes us through to the centenary of federation and I suspect it will see changes in electoral reform and probably very fundamental changes in the operation of a Parliament.

If change is desirable it should have an element of bipartisan support. It is also necessary that the community understand and support those changes. History will determine what will happen at the end of the day.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, for your role as Speaker. I feel like the lucky kid on the block to have had the role of Leader of the House. I appreciate the support the Deputy Premier has given me. Although he is a bit of a country hillbilly there is no doubt -

Mr House: I have been working on him; he is improving.

Mrs Hallahan: He is suave compared with the Minister for Transport.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not think there is any doubt that Hendy Cowan understands and treasures this Parliament perhaps more than most of us. On numerous occasions during the past four years I have been floundering and if I have got away with it, that is because the Deputy Premier has been supportive.

I thank the Premier for his support, and members on both sides of the House. We have a unique responsibility for government in Western Australia. No matter what we may say about it, government is shared by both sides of this House at all times. As I say, I have been very lucky to have had the role of Leader of the House. If I do it for another 20 years, which is highly unlikely, I may start to understand it. Parliament is a unique and interesting institution. This parliamentary session has had its moments of controversy; it may be the session of the guillotine. No doubt in the first few years that was probably the most controversial element. However, that will play its role. The use of the guillotine or the sessional order, whatever one may call it, is part of what will be ultimately a process of modernising the operations of this Parliament. It is not ideal but it is part of the process that will lead us to be a more efficient and functional Parliament. Many changes and reforms need to be made to ensure that the Parliament of Western Australia is strong. If Parliament and parliamentarians in this State are not strong, government in Western Australia will not be strong. That is a responsibility we all share.

I thank all members. We head into an election campaign which we will thoroughly enjoy. I am optimistic about the result, and I wish all members of Parliament goodwill but I do not wish them equally good success.

MR MCGINTY (Fremantle - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [12.50 am]: As we come to the end of this four year term of Parliament, on behalf of the Opposition I wish all members opposite all the best for the forthcoming battle, as we gird our loins and enter the community in an effort to win the hearts and minds of the public of Western Australia. As we put forward our respective ideas for the future of this State, I wish everyone well in that very important endeavour. It is very important, because all too often we hear people disparaging the institution of Parliament and the occupation which we all pursue. That is very unfortunate for our democratic system. It is important that the members of the public have confidence in their Parliament and in our democratic process. It is very important that we do everything we can to raise the stature of Parliament and the politicians in the eyes of the community, because no occupation can be more important for the wellbeing of the people of this State. It causes me some pain from time to time to observe that people enjoy taking a cheap shot at the work we do. There is not enough public support for the very important undertaking in which we are engaged.

I wish every member of this House well, as we end the parliamentary session and move into the election which will no doubt be called tomorrow. Mr Speaker, occasionally we have crossed swords; however, I wish you well in your retirement. I thank you for the work you have done for this House during the past four years. I wish the retiring members well in their retirement from this place. It is commonplace these days that retirement from the House does not mean retirement from useful occupations -

Mr Lewis: You can be sure of that!

Mr MCGINTY: - and certainly not retirement from public life. I look forward to meeting the member for Applecross and his wife in circumstances that are unconstrained. I have always enjoyed the company of the member and his wife, Helen. That will only be enhanced by the member's retirement from Parliament.

Mr Shave: If he does not look after you, I will!

Mr MCGINTY: I have the same views about meeting the member for Melville socially.

I thank all parliamentary staff at all levels. The Leader of the House has listed the people involved. On behalf of the Opposition I extend our thanks for the great effort put in by the gardening and catering staff, the Clerks and other staff. The support that has been given, at times in tense and difficult situations, is very much appreciated by all members of the Opposition. As we move towards the end of this parliamentary session, I thank all staff for their efforts. I thank members, the parliamentary staff and others for the good humour with which various matters have been handled. I appreciate the commitment that each and every person has shown to the endeavours that were placed before them.

I look forward to the challenge over the next four weeks and, I think, two days. I particularly look forward to coming back to Parliament in the new year.

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell) [12.55 am]: I use this motion to make my valedictory speech. I thank those involved in making sure that the House kept going long enough for me to return from Bunbury to make this speech. It is a speech which I should have prepared, but it is also the speech that I least want to make. For that reason I have not prepared it; in any event, why spoil a perfect record? On the other hand, it is probably the speech that most members want me to make, but not necessarily to hear. It is a speech I have been reluctant to make because I have enjoyed

my life as a parliamentarian. In many respects, I wish that I could continue as a parliamentarian. However, considering my future effectiveness, it is time to go; certainly, considering the great debt I owe to my family and friends, it is time I started to accumulate a few points in repayment of that debt.

I have been very fortunate with the women in my life: My mother and sisters; Flo Harrison; my mother-in-law, Marie Demarte; and all the women who have worked for me or with me in my legal or electorate offices, or here at Parliament. The star among all those stars, of course, is my wife. She has given me absolute loyalty and support. She has been with me through my strengths and weaknesses, and that support has never wavered no matter how hurtful to her some of my weaknesses may have been. She has had the additional obligation of being the homemaker, the gardener, and mother and father to my children. All country members are aware of the enormous contribution that women like my wife make. She has also held down a full time job, and has been my constant companion at the all the functions we have attended in my electorate and many of those outside.

I take pride in the fact that I have never had an answering machine at home, nor at the unit in Perth. At home, that means that 99 per cent of the time when people ring the house they get the Smiths, and almost all of the time they get Treslyn and not me. I do not think people understand what an enormous burden that can be for a wife, especially when the husband is a Minister - and especially for my wife when I was the Minister for Community Services, when some of the phone calls were obnoxious. Nonetheless, my wife stood by our policy of answering the phone ourselves. Without her as my best researcher, best doorknocker, and best supporter, I would not have lasted anywhere near the 13 years and 10 months I have been able to serve the people of Mitchell and this Parliament.

I also want to place on the record my appreciation for all the people who have been of service to me, both in my electorate office and when I was a Minister. It is a long list. I do not wish to distinguish between people, because I very much appreciate the quality of work offered to me, and the loyalty and affection in most cases people have given to me. I thank John Whitelaw, Mike Cole, Diane Hill, Gladys Gulson, Denise Fallon, Tim Hillyard, Graham Burkett, Lauren Heath, Jill Toohey, Jennifer Smith, Dianne Meehan, Gary Newcombe, Trevor Ramsden, Mavis Stone, Helen Hart, Tina Grasso, Vanja Burmaz, John O'Brien, June Belton, Peter Murray, Anne Spencer, Michael Schaper, Ruth Phillips, Mary Collura, Terry Flanagan, Sean Boyle, Heather De Cruz, Lisa Solomon and David Pedlar. I thank also my press secretaries Baden Pratt, Judy Goldman, Ross Storey, Peter Rosendorf, Charles McCloughlin, and my ministerial staff Dom Van Gent, Collette Fitzgerald, Shiree Wenn - now McGee, Vanessa Lewis, Alice Marais, and Kate Crockford; my south west press secretaries Kim Ferguson and Tony Snelling, and all of my drivers when I was a Minister.

In addition, of course, there is the staff of my electorate office: Rhonda Forrest, Diane Hill, Tania Bell and Luella Jenkins. Rhonda Forrest was my legal secretary and was mad enough to agree to become my electorate secretary. In many ways she established the office and, to the extent that there is one, its reputation. She was followed by Diane Hill, who now works in Parliament, and by Tania Bell and Luella Jenkins. In each of those staff members, I have had not only a great worker and advocate but also a great friend. That is especially true of Diane Hill, who has not only had to put up with me while working for me directly but also while nominally working for other people in Parliament.

I first met John Whitelaw while doorknocking as a candidate for election to the Bunbury City Council. He had only recently arrived from Victoria and, in due course, became my principal private secretary and was involved in most of my campaigns. He is another who has been with me through thick and thin. Without his strength, guidance and equanimity I could not have continued to perform in the way that I have.

I appreciate all of the staff of Parliament. Again, I do not want to point out people personally, but Romeo, Evelyn, Leo, Angelo, Victor and the telephonists deserve special mention. The telephonists do an absolutely outstanding job acting as a buffer between us and the people who want to ring us and in ensuring that we answer the phone. In a way, they are the first voice of the Parliament. They are often put under enormous stress because there are 57 parliamentarians in the lower House and 34 in the other place, as well as all the staff, and everyone wants to speak us. When one thinks of that and compares the workload they have to that of our electorate officers or ministerial officers, one sees that it is tremendous. They especially deserve our admiration. The people in the stationery office, Ken Foster and so on, not only make this place work but, with their constant good humour and welcoming smiles, also make this a very pleasant place in which to work. I will miss those welcoming smiles and that support. I do not want to exclude anyone. This has been a tremendous place in which to work. I commend the House staff, the Hansard staff, the security staff and everyone who plays a part in this place. I know that on occasions I have not been the easiest person to deal with, and I do not have the happy returning smile that perhaps people are looking for on my face all the time. Nonetheless, I want them to know, at the end of my parliamentary career, that I have enjoyed their support and assistance.

In the electorate one must rely absolutely on one's own branch. I have always had the absolute loyalty of everyone in my branch. It is not a large branch, but the people in it do an enormous job. I am sure they will continue to do

the same work for the next member for Mitchell, who is a very attractive blond young woman who will add enormously to this Parliament.

However, in a valedictory speech I should express some of my concerns about the direction in which Australia is headed and the Westminster system of democracy. The Pauline Hanson factor worries me enormously. I cannot understand how a person with such views can be represented as somehow adding to any debate in this country on any issue. She is un-Australian and does not in any way reflect the views of which I am proud as an Australian. I hope that people can put to rest as soon as possible her views and those of her supporters. I do not stand by political correctness; we should have free and open debate. However, that debate should involve us as Australians talking about the future of Australia. We should not do that in an un-Australian way, which seems to be the norm as a result of Pauline Hanson's intrusion into the political arena.

My second concern relates to some minor issues, one of which relates to immigration. It seems to be popular rhetoric in this country that we cannot afford to have more people in what must be the most underpopulated State and country in the world. In this State we have 400 000 people living outside the metropolitan area - in an area roughly 2 300 km by 1 500 km. Most of those people live in relatively small communities that suffer as a result of their size - they do not have the diversity of community resources and the extra community advantages that exist in the metropolitan area. To say that we in the country should be permanently sentenced to living in those sorts of communities and not have any aspirations for advancement and development because some people believe that this State is overpopulated leaves me incredulous. It is one popular theory that I hope is put to rest. If we are to take full advantage of this country, protect its environment and properly advantage the world in the way Australia should, we need the multicultural diversity and immigration that we have had in the past to increase our population, especially in rural areas where people are so scarce.

I refer to the issue of parliamentary democracy. The Leader of the House said in his closing remarks that he hoped the thirty-fifth Parliament would be the defining Parliament of this State. I regret that; the thirty-fourth Parliament should have been the defining Parliament for this State.

I was one of those who was sceptical about the work of the Commission on Government in relation to the nature of the task it was given and because it comprised people I did not know and who, on the face of it, did not appear to have all the appropriate qualifications. I wondered whether the Premier was organising the commission in an inappropriate manner. Whatever the reasons for the membership selection and whoever suggested the members to the Premier, the commission has done a truly remarkable job. It has not only dealt with all of the very difficult and complicated issues but also it has done so in a manner that has led to its presenting to us as a community sensible recommendations which are easy to understand and which, as a cumulative set, make a great deal of sense about how we can improve our electoral democracy and parliamentary systems. I very much regret that not more of the recommendations have been acted upon and that this Parliament has not been the defining Parliament in ensuring that all the recommendations have been implemented. I hope that the Leader of the House is correct and that the thirty-fifth Parliament will see the implementation of many of the commission's recommendations.

Without wanting to sound like a martyr or claiming undue credit, I will pay a fairly high price for my belief in the Westminster system of democracy, in terms of the privileges of this Parliament and what I regard as the role of the three separate and distinct parts of our Westminster system, namely, the Parliament, Executive and judiciary. Although the system is imperfect and needs the sorts of improvements that the Commission on Government has recommended, it is really the best system in the world. It is time that we as parliamentarians started to stand up for it. If we do not stand up and argue the case for parliamentary privilege, we will lose it. If we do not stand up for the idea that Parliament must be the suprema of that triangle - that it is paramount to the judiciary and Executive - we will lose the best elements of our Westminster system. We have attempted in the past 20 or 30 years to add to our Westminster system such officers as the Auditor General, the Parliamentary Commissioner and the Information Commissioner. We must understand that they are officers of the Parliament. We must read their reports. I do not want to reflect on anyone mentioned in those reports, but the letter from the Parliamentary Commissioner to the Parliament that accompanied his report this year was of special concern to me. I find it quite strange that when a person writes a letter of the kind that the Parliamentary Commissioner did, even if he is incorrect, it should pass through Parliament almost without comment. They are officers of the Parliament whom we expect to perform particular roles and we must be more supportive of them.

I am proud in a way of my involvement in the freedom of information legislation. People may say that it was tardy and came in at the end of our term in government, but it is the best system of information availability that we have anywhere in Australia. I want particularly to mention Lauren Heath, who was the person in my office who primarily had responsibility for drafting that legislation. Having acceded to the principles involved in freedom of information, it is critically important that we support the commissioner in every way that we can. I was one of the people who were critical of her appointment in the first instance, but she has done an outstanding job. I have read the judgment

of Mr Justice Parker in a case decided today. He seems to have made some observation and perhaps criticisms about the commissioner's using the speeches, the objects clause and long title of the freedom of information legislation when making her decision. I respect Mr Justice Parker but he has got it wrong. If the judiciary does not understand that people who are appointed as officers of this Parliament should use as the first basis for the way in which they operate the second reading speech, the debates of this place and titles of Bills as a means of interpreting what they are doing on our behalf, I start to wonder about the proper division between the Executive, judiciary and Parliament.

I will not take the extra time because I did not prepare this speech. However, I especially want to again mention my wife, John Whitelaw, Diane Hill and all the other people I have mentioned already. I also want to say to my colleagues on this side of the House how much I have enjoyed being part of the parliamentary Labor Party. Some of those who have fallen out of favour, such as Brian Burke and David Parker, still have my great affection and support. It is a sad fact that in our society the good that men and women have done is oft forgotten on conviction. It is sad that the enormous contribution and compassion that Brian Burke brought to his task and the ingenuity, intelligence and application that David Parker brought to his task are forgotten. For people like Keith Wilson, Pam Beggs and Gavan Troy I bear nothing but affection.

This is the last speech that members will hear me make. I bear no ill towards anybody. I hope that all members will understand that I do not bear grudges of any description and that whatever I have said tonight has been simply from the bottom of my heart. I hope members will recognise me as a person who will always regard people with whom I have worked, no matter what disagreements or catcalling has occurred across the Chamber, as people to whom I will bear no ill will. I accept full responsibility for whatever has happened in my life; it is my responsibility alone. I want members to remember that I have been proud to be a member and to be associated with all of them. I hope that when I come back as a retired member, members will bear me the same goodwill that I bear each and every one of them.

[Applause.]

MR COURT (Nedlands - Premier) [1.15 am]: Mr Speaker, you have had a very distinguished career in this Parliament. I wish you, Edith and your family all the best in your retirement. All of the other retiring members - the members for Applecross, Vasse, Thornlie, Mitchell, Rockingham, Armadale and Wanneroo -

Mrs Roberts: And the member for Dianella!

Mr COURT: I was about to say that they are fortunate because they are retiring voluntarily. Of course, in this business with involuntary retirements members do not have the opportunity to make a final speech. I add my thanks to all the members who have made Parliament operate in the way it has. The Leader of the House spelt out the many people involved. I want to thank them for the very professional way in which this Parliament is run. I would like to add to those thanks Nick Hagley and Russell Stranger, who are sitting at the back, who have been good enough to help us run the business from this side of the House. Very long hours and a lot of preparation are involved, for which we say, "Thank you." I wish all the members the best in the coming election. Most importantly, I take the opportunity to wish all members and their families a very happy Christmas and a safe and prosperous new year. In this business we must pay a sacrifice when it comes to the time that we can spend with our families. I believe that Christmas particularly is an opportunity for us to catch up on the lost ground that has occurred during the year. To all members, I wish them and their families all the best.

MR COWAN (Merredin - Deputy Premier) [1.19 am]: I know that the speeches tonight have been somewhat repetitious, but as Deputy Premier and Leader of the National Party it is appropriate that on behalf of the National Party I pay recognition to those members retiring voluntarily. I do not think that in my time I have known as many as eight members who have indicated that they are not continuing. To you, Mr Speaker, I wish all the best in your retirement and also to the current father of the House. I will single out also the member for Rockingham because, Mr Speaker, as you know, 1974 was a very good year indeed. I would like to comment on those members who joined with me and that member who entered the Parliament three years before me and wish them well in their retirement. I also wish all of those other members who have decided that it is time they retired from this place the best for the future. The member for Vasse's successor - I am not talking about the person who will occupy the seat which he is vacating - to that other position he holds in an honorary capacity, should he be re-elected next year, is not looking forward to that one bit.

I wish all members and their families a very merry Christmas and a prosperous new year. I also commend all of the people who are involved in the management and operations of Parliament House. As usual it has functioned very smoothly. Notwithstanding the degree of adversarial conflict one finds in this Chamber, the courtesy and disposition of all the staff in all capacities compensates for the way in which we, the members, conduct ourselves in this place. I thank them for that and wish them and their families a merry Christmas and a prosperous new year.

Enough philosophical views have been expressed tonight. I do not have any great expectations about what we might see in the next Parliament. I have been here long enough to know that every one is different. We can expect to see some changes. However, one thing I can guarantee is that, no matter what happens, 57 members will have a different idea about who is right about what democracy represents and about what good government represents.

In the four years that I have experienced working as the Deputy Premier it has been a pleasure working with the Premier. It has been a privilege to work as his lieutenant. To all my ministerial colleagues, particularly the Leader of the House and the Deputy Leader of the National Party, I say I appreciate their contribution and their loyalty.

THE SPEAKER (Mr Clarko): The thickness in my voice is due to my cold. I blame my two year old granddaughter. If she did not go to day care, I probably would not have the problem. I am prepared to undertake that my speech will be slightly shorter than the one given by the Presiding Officer in another place today. After tonight, I will never again address this House. Never again will I stand in this Chamber and speak to all assembled members. That is rather momentous, at least for me, because I have been here 23 years, and that is a long time.

Since I gave my maiden speech - perhaps that is sexist - in 1974 I have spoken here many times. On some occasions those speeches were well prepared. However, once the speech was totally unprepared. The story is similar to others. I refer particularly to a speech given earlier tonight by my friend the opposition leader of House business. I am the first Speaker to use that term on a regular basis and I have tripped myself up most of the time. One day I was sitting on the opposition front bench in the seat of the member for Morley and I was busy preparing a speech on a Bill that was to come up later that day. I vaguely heard the Speaker, one of the select former Speakers of this House, say, "The question is that the Bill be now read a second time." There was a long pause. Only the Leader of the Opposition and I were sitting on the front bench. He told me to get up and speak. "What! What!" said I. He said, "Speak now; get the call." Mr Speaker, being considerate, started to put the question again because he knew there was some difficulty. I asked my leader what was the Bill. "I don't know", he said, "but get up and speak and I will get someone who should be here." So I did. I said, "Mr Speaker", very slowly, and I said, "I am pleased to be able to speak on this important matter today." I said that slowly too. Then I tried to send a message to my brain that I should think rapidly and come up with some brilliant comment, but as usual the brain was dead. So I tried another tack and said in my most statesmanlike way, "No legislation comes before this House that has not been thoroughly examined by a wide cross-section of the Administration and the bureaucracy." I continued on in that vain in a totally vacuous way. Eventually - it seemed like hours but it was only minutes - the person due to speak for the Opposition arrived in the Chamber, at which time I promptly sat down. I still do not know what that Bill was or what it was about and was rather offended when some of my colleagues told me that it was probably the best speech I ever made in this House.

I must give members a little chronicle of the posts I have fortunately held in my time here. I came here as I said in 1974 and I was a backbencher until 1975, when there were some dramatic changes in the party with which the Deputy Premier had a close association. As a result of that problem, I was Government Whip between 1975 until 1977. I then became the Deputy Speaker for five years from 1977 to 1982 and in 1982 and 1983 I was Minister for Education. I was very pleased to hold that position. I then became a shadow Minister - I was not pleased to hold that position - for the 10 years from 1983 to 1993. I was the only person in the shadow ministry to be a shadow Minister for the whole time. That indicates how much change occurred. I had many shadow portfolios. It is interesting to note how, when one becomes a shadow Minister, one becomes an expert on that subject. For a while, I was the shadow Minister for Prisons. I knew nothing about prisons, like all good men. However, it was a good portfolio for getting publicity because every time somebody broke out of gaol, the newspaper would get in touch with me and I would have my photograph in the paper with me saying, "It is a great pity that the Government is not more careful in looking after prisoners." After I vacated that position my successor said exactly the same thing.

I was a member of the Public Accounts Committee as it was called then and I was later its chairman. I found that experience very valuable. I was the opposition leader of House business for about two years. I have been privileged to be the Speaker since 1993. Anyone who examines those posts will note that I have been closely associated with the operations of this House in a wide variety of positions.

Mr Omodei: Shadow Minister for Local Government.

The SPEAKER: I was. The parliamentary process is dear to me. I have had the opportunity of seeing other Parliaments in operation and I cannot say that we have the best form of the Westminster system. However, adding to what was said earlier, the Deputy Speaker and others have put forward some excellent amendments and alterations to our procedures. There should be more. The long speeches of greater than an hour that are given by some people are a bit like those given in the Legislative Council when I first came here; members of that House could speak infinitely on any subject, and many tried to do that. So that I do not speak in a nougat way I will make a soft criticism of the operations of this House. I refer in particular to the quality of the speeches that are made in this House by all members, including me. If this Parliament is to grow in stature not only are changes in procedures required, but also,

as Mrs Malaprop would have said, the speeches must become better and better. I am not suggesting we do not have excellent speech makers in this House, because we do. However, all members could make their speeches better. On some nights I hear members say that the debate on a Bill is droning on and speeches are being made without a great deal of substance. As I am the oldest member in this Chamber, members can bear with me with that little bit of advice. It will not matter to me whether members' speeches get better or worse, because I will be in bed.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We may broadcast them.

The SPEAKER: In my time in this place the best orator was Hon William Leonard Grayden. On Wednesdays he would do the heavy work, defending the Government. One evening the motion before the House was on childhood education. I was part of the Liberal Party's education committee long before I came into this place. That committee did a lot of work on early childhood education and it recommended that the Government move into what we call today preprimary education. It was at a time when neither party was in support of such a change. The education officials repeatedly said that it would cost more money which would come out of the Education vote.

Returning to Hon William Grayden, as he and I walked down the corridor from the dining room the bells were ringing and he told me he had to speak on the Opposition's motion. He knew of my interest in that subject and he asked me for a couple of points. I told him it would be no trouble to give him some. At the time I was sitting where the member for Roe sits and Bill Grayden sat where the Minister for Labour Relations sits. When we sat down he asked me to suggest a point from which he could start. I did that and he asked me to jot down a couple of points and to pass them to him. He started with the point I suggested and I wrote down five dot points. At an early stage in his contribution one of the opposition members interjected on him and he turned on the member and gave one of his terrific retorts. There was a great uproar and I used that opportunity to pass him the five dot points. He said, "What's this? I don't want that." I said, "But you asked for it", and he replied, "I have more than enough information now."

I recommend to members that when they have the opportunity they read his speeches, particularly the one about the monkey's brain. It was a fantastic speech. I tried on one occasion to be a public speaker but failed. However, when Bill Grayden reached the point in his speech where he was cutting off the top of the head of the monkey before he dipped in the imaginary spoon to take out some of the brains and eat them, which was a practice in China, I looked at all the members in the House and every member had his eyes fixed on William Leonard Grayden. I suggest to members that they look it up and read it.

I also commend Sir Charles Court who was my leader for a long time, both before and after I came into Parliament. He was very organised, thorough and in control of every speech he made. An example of his thoroughness is that when I was government Whip Sir Charles Court would look around the Chamber to see whose seat was empty. The member who was sitting next to me at the time would notice what he was doing and would warn me that Sir Charles Court would soon be around to see me. Sir Charles Court would walk to where I was sitting and would ask where certain members were. I would say that I was not sure, but I had it written down and I would tell him where that member was. He would then ask where other members were and I would say that they had ducked out for a minute. His reply was that there was no place for that and that all members were supposed to be in the Chamber. He said a member's first duty was to his seat in this House. Times have changed, have they not? That is a bit of trivia, but overall Sir Charles Court was a consummate batsman. He would open the innings and he was like the two Waugh brothers together. We could always tell what would happen. I am sure the father of the House well remembers that if Sir Charles came back to this House in one of his old suits we knew we would be in the Chamber for a long time. He was even cautious in that way.

I refer briefly to Hon John Tonkin who was an amazing member of this House. I knew him outside this place in regard to Meath Care (Inc) where he spent 49 years on the committee. His knowledge of parliamentary matters was fantastic and he knew the standing orders inside out. Before he retired he used to sit in the seat which was occupied until recently by the member for Pilbara. Something would happen and he would take a point of order and, without opening the standing orders, he would say, "I think Standing Order 106 on page 78 says" - and he would summarise the standing order - and then he would open the standing orders and read the relevant one. Thank God, in the brief time I have been the Speaker, none of the members knew the standing orders!

Sir David Brand was in this place for a short time after I came here, but he was not the Premier at the time. I always regarded him as an outstanding member of Parliament. Many older members on the coalition side held Sir David in high regard.

I have made many good friends, both before I became, and during the time I have been, a member - among members on my right, my left and in the other place. I thank them all for their friendship, especially, the Deputy Premier and the former Speaker who came into this place at the same time I did in 1974.

I thank all the staff who have been helpful and friendly to me for so many years. Vic Moate is one of my favourites because I taught him at Perth Modern School. Members cannot blame me for any of his faults. Since I became the Speaker I have had outstanding support from the Clerk, Peter McHugh. Without his advice I would not have been able to do the job as I have. I thank him and I also thank the Deputy Clerk, Doug Carpenter. I also thank John Mandy, who got me into a lot of trouble over the lights. To start with I tried to blame somebody else, but I was the butt of so much criticism that I feel I should say it was my idea. I am sure that one day someone will give John and me credit for these lights.

Mrs Roberts: I heard it was John Mandy's fault.

The SPEAKER: No, that is not right. In 100 years' time this Chamber will be noted for these lights in a highly favourable way. As for someone who cannot pronounce the name of her electorate properly, I am not sure I should take her special advice.

Since I have been a member of Parliament one lady has been my electorate secretary and I refer to Bett Lyon. She is an amazing electorate secretary and person. If I were to return to Parliament, I would not have a male electorate secretary because a secretary like Bett is brilliant.

I have been an active member of the Liberal Party for nearly 40 years. It has been a very important part of my life. I began as an ordinary member and after I criticised the organisation of the branch I was told the job was not too hard and I should nominate for branch president. I did exactly that and I was successful. I later became the divisional president. I then went onto our state executive, which is a small body, unlike that of those on my left. I spent 28 years successively on the Liberal Party's state council. I can tell members that is a very long time to listen to politics at that level; one needs some resilience.

At the 1971 state election I stood against a sitting Labor member of Parliament, a bloke I regarded as a good fellow; the late Stanley Lapham. He held the seat for about three terms and was a good member of Parliament. Nineteen seventy-one was not a good year for a new Liberal candidate to stand for a seat in the metropolitan area, because that was when John Tonkin was elected with a big swing against the Liberal Party in the metropolitan area of about 12 per cent. In the year that John Tonkin won and Labor became the Government, I received a big swing, which I put down to the people who helped me organise my campaign, and to my time in local government. That successful loss - if it can be called that - encouraged me to stand again in 1974 when Sir Charles Court became the Premier.

I am proud that although about 12 Liberal lay members, as we would call them, opposed me for preselection as the Liberal candidate for Karrinyup in 1971, in all the preselections that followed I was fortunate never to have an opponent. I recommend that all members try that. It is quite helpful, and it also benefits one's health. I want to say deliberately that I am proud of my long membership of the Liberal Party, which I intend to continue to maintain.

My family and friends have been and still are a vital and integral part of my life. They have supported me strongly through all of what is at times a difficult job of being in politics. I thank my wife, Edith, my three beautiful daughters, and now their three not so beautiful husbands, my sons-in-law. I would not recommend anyone start a fight with any of them. Two of them are 6'6" and one is 6'3" and he has more fight in him than the other two together. I am very proud of them and my four sisters - I have no brothers. I have four grandchildren, one of whom will be about 11'6" and he will also help me in my declining years.

My campaign supporters have been of great assistance to me and without their help I would not have been able to succeed politically.

Before I came to Parliament in 1974 I spent from 1969 to 1975 as a councillor of the City of Stirling. That was an important period of my life. I believe that was a great apprenticeship for this place. Contrary to others saying that they thought I entered local government so I could come in here, that is not true. I have largely represented the same area with small alterations over the 30 years I have been in either local government or the State Parliament. Electors in North Beach, Trigg, Waterman, Sorrento, Hillarys, Gwelup, Karrinyup, Carine, Duncraig etc have given me tremendous support. For a long time now I have been privileged to have won every box in my electorate, and that is also a handy thing to manage.

As I have traditionally acknowledged the many dedicated people we employ in this Parliament and who make us able to do our job, I will do that again, although this is slightly repetitious. I thank Mr Vince Pacecca for his help throughout the year. He has done an excellent job and I found it enjoyable working with him. I also want to thank the staff of the Joint House Committee, the gardeners who keep our gardens and grounds so attractive, the cleaning staff, the security staff, the catering staff, and the people in the kitchen who, often, are not seen to need to be especially commended. The staff on the switchboard, as I have already mentioned, are out of sight; however, their efficiency and friendly service does not go unnoticed. The finance and personnel staff headed by Mr Ken Foster work tirelessly all year in their various duties, particularly in paying us, and I thank them sincerely for their efforts.

I thank Mr Neil Burrell and his reporting staff, who are a dedicated team who work very long hours to keep our records up to date, and do it accurately and with panache. I thank them for their help during this time. I thank Mr Bruce Bott, our relatively new Librarian, and his fellow librarians and assistants. I hope, Mr Premier, that when the new building is built that it has a new library and that library moves on and has the technology and support that is necessary for a Parliament. I thank those librarians for their service.

I do not think I particularly acknowledged my secretary in this place, Jan Graham, and Vince La Galia, who is an outstanding steward. Some members may not know that he once ran a brilliant restaurant. He is certainly over qualified for the job. I thank Sheila Mills and David Klemm of the Parliamentary Information Office for the work that they do. To the Deputy Speaker, whom I have already mentioned, and the six Deputy Chairmen I say a special thanks for their work in the Speaker's panel. It is a task that is not rewarded - other than for the Deputy Speaker - and it seems that they should be rewarded.

I turn the last page on my time in Parliament. I will never turn away from politics; I will always be closely interested in politics. I hope that all members will be kind to me when I return to this place and give me any necessary support as I proceed into my further dotage.

I was a lecturer in politics before I came to this place. One thing that does strike me is that it is amazing how little the community at large knows about politics. The media and people in the public make all sorts of statements about members of Parliament. They talk about our lack of quality, which I reject. I was a lecturer at the Nedlands College of Advanced Education in history and politics. If one looks at the list of positions and where people are ranked in the community, lecturers rank very highly. I was elected on the Saturday and on the Sunday morning when I woke up as a member of Parliament I knew I was down with the journalists and used car salesmen at the bottom of the list, and I had not done anything but have a sleep. It would be great if an education program could teach the people of our community more about the true role of politicians and the Parliament.

[Applause.]

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe - Leader of the House) [1.49 am]: Mr Speaker, as I adjourn the House I thank you for your comments tonight. All members are united in their respect for you and for the other retiring members of this House. In my comments earlier I failed to acknowledge the contribution of a very important group of people. In those fleeting moments when I appear to now what I am doing as Leader of the House, that is due to Nick Hagley and Tania Mirco and the other members of the parliamentary services section. I particularly thank them. Behind the scenes they make sure that this Parliament operates in a sequence that allows us to proceed. It is with a sense of relief, pleasure, and of anticipation for the next few weeks that I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: As I put the motion I will do what the Leader of the House has done; that is, catch up with the ones that went through. I thank the Leader of the House and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for their kind remarks. I also thank the Premier, Deputy Premier, the Ministers and all the members on both sides. Thank you very much.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 1.49 am (Thursday)

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**PORT KENNEDY DEVELOPMENT - MEDIA CONSULTANT, COST**

1805. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) What was the total cost of the media consultant associated with the ministerial launch of the Port Kennedy development?
- (2) Who is responsible for payment of this account?
- (3) Who will pay for the Port Kennedy management plan and what proportion of the cost will each contributor be responsible for?
- (4) Why are the board and the Government involved in paying for the management plan?
- (5) What is the expected cost of the management plan?
- (6) Has Port Kennedy Resorts or the Minister made a decision on the option on stage 2?
- (7) What is the decision?
- (8) If not, when is a decision expected?
- (9) What changes to the Port Kennedy Development Agreement Act are being contemplated by the Government?
- (10) Is the Minister considering disbanding the Port Kennedy Management Board?
- (11) What "coercive measures" would the board consider appropriate to control vehicle access to the beaches?
- (12) What are the locations of the dual use paths which Mr Sheehan declared were "under construction" in the minutes of the twenty-fifth Port Kennedy Management Board meeting?
- (13) Will the Minister table a copy of the statement of expenditure from the board for the month of November 1995?
- (14) If not, why not?
- (15) Will the Minister table a copy of the cash flow statement to 2003?
- (16) If not, why not?
- (17) Will the Minister table details of the board's expenditure to date?
- (18) If not, why not?
- (19) What are the employment costs for Ranger Stafford?
- (20) What are the qualifications of Ranger Stafford?
- (21) Was the position taken by Mr Thompson advertised?
- (22) If not, why not?
- (23) What relevant qualifications does Mr Thompson hold with respect to his position?
- (24) Which items of expenditure, as detailed in the budget, for Mr Stafford's services are covered by the developer?
- (25) Has the developer contributed the right amount for these items of expenditure?
- (26) If not, why not?
- (27) Will the Minister table a copy of expenditure for October 1995 and a copy of the draft budget?
- (28) If not, why not?
- (29) Will the Minister table a copy of the request, from the Department of Training, for the board to accept the transfer of the LEAP programs?
- (30) If not, why not?

- (31) Does the revised concept plan breach Ministry for Planning guidelines for the proximity of a development to the beach?
- (32) Does the section of the beach closest to the development boundary, in the revised concept plan, have an accreting or eroding shoreline?
- (34) Has the Environmental Protection Authority provided a favourable response to the proposed modification to the existing boundary?
- (35) Will the Minister table a copy of the response from the EPA regarding the modification to the existing boundary?
- (36) If not, why not?
- (37) Did the unexploded ordnances team provide a \$10 000 bond?
- (38) If not, why not?
- (39) Did the developers pay a penalty to the City of Rockingham for damaging vegetation due to slashing in the wrong areas by the UXO team?
- (40) If not, why not?
- (41) What modifications have been made to the original concept plan for the recreation centre?
- (42) Will the Minister table a copy of the correspondence dated 17 June 1995, from Mr Rick Palmer to the board?
- (43) If not, why not?
- (44) Will the Minister table a copy of the correspondence dated 1 June 1995, from the Director of Land Operations Division at the Department of Land Administration to the Commissioner for Soil Conservation, regarding the Port Kennedy Local Conservation District Committee compound?
- (45) If not, why not?
- (46) What issues in relation to the future location of the LCDC compound have been or will be addressed?

Mr LEWIS replied:

- (1) \$2 633.
- (2) The Western Australian Planning Commission as the responsible accounting authority paid this account.
- (3) A document was prepared in August 1994 entitled "Port Kennedy Conservation Management Plan". This was prepared by Bowman Bishaw Gorham on behalf and at the cost of Port Kennedy Resorts Pty Ltd.
- (4) See answer to (3).
- (5) Unknown.
- (6) No.
- (7) Not applicable.
- (8) After the Minister for Planning has fully considered the matter in accordance with the provisions of the Port Kennedy Development Agreement Act 1992.
- (9) None.
- (10) No.
- (11) No coercive measures are planned; however, some dune management and log fences will be put in place.
- (12) Following the alignment of Port Kennedy Drive from the eastern boundary of the stage 1 area to the car park near the beach.
- (13) Yes. [See paper No 785.]
- (14) Not applicable.
- (15) No.

- (16) Insufficient detail provided to enable question to be answered.
- (17) Yes. [See paper No 785.]
- (18) Not applicable.
- (19) Approximately \$35 000 per annum including overtime. The Ministry for Planning will charge 40 per cent of Mr Stafford's salary to the Port Kennedy account held by the Western Australian Planning Commission from October 1995 to August 1996.
- (20) Experienced regional field management officer.
- (21) No.
- (22) Mr Thompson was not offered a position. Mr Thompson carried out contract maintenance work at Port Kennedy.
- (23) Experienced maintenance contractor.
- (24) Mr Stafford was paid from the developers' \$500 000 contribution which is held in the Port Kennedy account of the Western Australian Planning Commission.
- (25)-(26) See answer to question (24).
- (27) No.
- (28) The question is not clear as to which expenditure is being requested.
- (29) A copy of the letter of 6 October 1996 from the Western Australian Department of Training to the Chairman of the Port Kennedy Management Board in relation to the management of funds for the Port Kennedy LEAP projects is hereby tabled. [See paper No 785.]
- (30) Not applicable.
- (31) There are several concept plans for the development. It is unclear which one is being referred to or which guidelines.
- (32) Parts of the shoreline at Port Kennedy accrete or erode. Depending on which plans the member is referring to, it may be an accreting or eroding shoreline.
- (33) Question (33) is missing.
- (34) In response to the developer's proposal to advance the development line some 40 metres towards the beach, the Environmental Protection Authority has advised the Minister for the Environment that the changes will not have additional impact on the existing environment and will have no impact on the conservation area.
- (35) Yes. A copy of the letter of 22 December 1995 from the Minister for the Environment to Port Kennedy Resorts Pty Ltd is tabled. [See paper No 785.]
- (36) Not applicable.
- (37) No.
- (38) As a government body, the UXO team was not required by Port Kennedy Resorts Pty Ltd to lodge a \$10 000 bond.
- (39) No.
- (40) No penalty was payable to the City of Rockingham.
- (41) The original concept plan for the Port Kennedy regional recreation centre dates from 1978. Modifications have been made to the original concept plan since 1978. The modifications were encompassed within the Port Kennedy Development Agreement Act 1992.
- (42) Yes. A copy of the letter of 17 June 1995 from Mr Rick Palmer to the board is tabled. [See paper No 785.]
- (43) Not applicable.
- (44) No.

- (45) No record can be located on Port Kennedy Management Board files of the letter which is referred to.
- (46) Matters such as the location, area, physical appearance and terms of a possible lease will be addressed with the LCDC and City of Rockingham.

WESTERN POWER - MUJA/KALGOORLIE ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION LINE, ANNUAL PROFIT OR LOSS

1847. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Energy:

- (1) What annual profit or loss does the Muja/Kalgoorlie electricity transmission line currently return to Western Power?
- (2) What will be the size of the annual financial loss on Western Power's electricity transmission line once the gas to the goldfields pipeline is operational?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

- (1) Western Power does not report a separate profit and loss on individual assets such as the Muja/goldfields transmission line.
- (2) Western Power's revenues from the eastern goldfields are expected to decrease by approximately \$70m per annum as a direct result of the gas pipeline to Kalgoorlie.

WESTERN POWER - WARMUN COMMUNITY, EAST KIMBERLEY, NO SERVICES

2049. Mr THOMAS to the Minister for Energy:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Warmun Community in the East Kimberley does not receive a service from Western Power?
- (2) Is the Minister also aware that the Ngalangangpum School, which has hitherto received a subsidy from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, must now pay 30¢ per unit, as the subsidy has been removed, and this is causing the school financial hardship?
- (3) Will the Minister have Western Power investigate the feasibility of linking Warmun with the East Kimberley grid currently serving Kununurra and Wyndham, possibly by cooperating with Argyle Diamond Mines and/or Pacific Hydro, for access to their transmission lines etc on public land?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

- (1)-(2) Yes.
- (3) The capital cost of the connection of the Warmun Community to the Ord hydro power scheme is, under current arrangements, a funding responsibility of the Commonwealth. I am advised that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission has included this project as a proposal for consideration in the national Aboriginal health strategy community housing and infrastructure program and will be assessing the viability and priority of this project in the near future. I understand that Ord Hydro Pty Ltd has taken a positive approach to the supply of power to the Warmun Community on commercial terms and the State would wish to facilitate an outcome which shows the promise of real benefits. The Office of Energy has been taking an active interest in these considerations and I expect further advice on this matter in due course.

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

2112. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Resources Development; Energy; Education:

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

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

Department of Resources Development

- (1) (a) Nil.
- (b) Seven people between 21 and 25 years of age.
- (2) (a) Two people under 21 years of age; four people between 21 and 25 years of age.
- (b) Two people under 21 years of age; four people between 21 and 25 years of age.

Western Power

- (1) (a) 37 employees under 21 years of age.
- (b) 60 employees 21 to 25 years of age.
- (2) (a) 68 employees under 21 years of age; 65 employees 21 to 25 years of age.
- (b) 84 employees under 21 years of age; 106 employees 21 to 25 years of age.

Office of Energy

- (1) (a) Nil.
- (b) Five.
- (2) (a) Not applicable. The Office of Energy was not in existence before 1 January 1995.
- (b) Three.

AlintaGas

- (1) (a) Five employees recruited under 21 years of age.
- (b) Eight employees recruited between 21 and 25.
- (2) (a) One employee recruited under 21 years of age; nil employees between 21 and 25 years of age.
- (b) Seven employees recruited under 21 years of age; 13 employees recruited between 21 and 25 years of age.

Education Department of Western Australia

- (1) (a) 275.
- (b) 1 390.
- (2) (a) Under 21 years of age, 247; between 21 and 25, 1 340.
- (b) Under 21 years of age, 271; between 21 and 25, 1 419.

Note: The figures above were extracted from the Education Department's mainframe payroll system. They include all employees being appointed to the department for the first time; all employees previously employed and now reappointed; employees who have an employment status of temporary, permanent on probation, permanent teacher area, or permanent. Relief employees are excluded. These figures include both teaching and non-teaching employees.

Department of Education Services

- (1) (a) Nil.
- (b) Two.
- (2) (a) Under 21 years of age - one; between 21 and 25 - nil.
- (b) Under 21 years of age - one; between 21 and 25 - nil.

Secondary Education Authority

- (1) Nil.
- (2) (a) Under 21 years of age - nil; between 21 and 25 - two.

- (b) Under 21 years of age - nil; between 21 and 25 - one.

CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT, NOT PUT OUT TO TENDER

2184. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Resources Development; Energy; Education:

- (1) In the departments and agencies under the Minister's control, how many let contracts in the 1995-96 financial year without such contracts being put out to tender?
- (2) What was the nature of each contract?
- (3) What was the contract price of each contract?
- (4) Who was allocated the contract?
- (5) How did the department or agency select the company/person to carry out the contract?
- (6) Has each department or agency advertised for expressions of interest from contractors and individuals who may wish to carry out small contract work from time to time?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) Does each department/agency have a list of companies or individuals that may be used for particular work?
- (9) How do the companies or individuals get on the 'list' if the work is not advertised from time to time?
- (10) To what extent are such small contracts allocated to 'mates', 'colleagues' and 'confidantes'?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

- (1)-(10) The letting of all contracts, unless otherwise exempted by the State Supply Commission, is subject to the policies and guidelines of the State Supply Commission. A copy of the relevant State Supply Commission policy statement 1.3 and policy guidelines is attached. Government agencies routinely contract external providers to undertake a range of services in support of the delivery of their programs. Given the large number of contracts in place at any time the details sought are not readily available. I am not prepared to direct the considerable resources to obtain this information. However, if the member has a specific query I will have the matter investigated. [See paper No 791.]

CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT, NOT PUT OUT TO TENDER

2193. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Health; Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) In the departments and agencies under the Minister's control, how many let contracts in the 1995-96 financial year without such contracts being put out to tender?
- (2) What was the nature of each contract?
- (3) What was the contract price of each contract?
- (4) Who was allocated the contract?
- (5) How did the department or agency select the company/person to carry out the contract?
- (6) Has each department or agency advertised for expressions of interest from contractors and individuals who may wish to carry out small contract work from time to time?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) Does each department/agency have a list of companies or individuals that may be used for particular work?
- (9) How do the companies or individuals get on the 'list' if the work is not advertised from time to time?
- (10) To what extent are such small contracts allocated to 'mates', 'colleagues' and 'confidantes'?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1)-(10) The letting of all contracts, unless otherwise exempted by the State Supply Commission, is subject to the policies and guidelines of the State Supply Commission. A copy of the relevant State Supply Commission policy statement 1.3 and policy guidelines is attached. Government agencies routinely contract external providers to undertake a range of services in support of the delivery of their programs. Given the large

number of contracts in place at any time the details sought are not readily available. I am not prepared to direct the considerable resources to obtain this information. However, if the member has a specific query I will have the matter investigated. [See paper No 786.]

CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT, TENDER DOCUMENTS MADE AVAILABLE TO INQUIRERS

2215. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Health; Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Does each department and agency under the Minister's control make available tender documents to each company and individual expressing an interest in putting in a tender for specified advertised contracts?
- (2) Are the tender documents made available in a timely manner?
- (3) Have there been any occasions when tender documents have not been made available to people making the relevant inquiries?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1)-(3) Relevant agencies are expected to make every effort to disseminate documentation to interested parties in a timely fashion. I am not aware of any problems in this regard; however, if the member has a specific issue he wishes to address, he should put it to me in writing and I will have it investigated.

CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT, TENDER DOCUMENTS MADE AVAILABLE TO INQUIRERS

2216. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for Finance:

- (1) Does each department and agency under the Minister's control make available tender documents to each company and individual expressing an interest in putting in a tender for specified advertised contracts?
- (2) Are the tender documents made available in a timely manner?
- (3) Have there been any occasions when tender documents have not been made available to people making the relevant inquiries?

Mr COURT replied:

The Minister for Finance has provided the following reply -

- (1)-(3) Relevant agencies are expected to make every effort to disseminate documentation to interested parties in a timely fashion. I am not aware of any problems in this regard, however, if the member has a specific issue he wishes to address, he should put it to me in writing and I will have it investigated.

CONTRACTS - GOVERNMENT, TENDER DOCUMENTS MADE AVAILABLE TO INQUIRERS

2217. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Does each department and agency under the Minister's control make available tender documents to each company and individual expressing an interest in putting in a tender for specified advertised contracts?
- (2) Are the tender documents made available in a timely manner?
- (3) Have there been any occasions when tender documents have not been made available to people making the relevant inquiries?

Mr COWAN replied:

The Minister for Racing and Gaming has provided the following reply -

- (1)-(3) Relevant agencies are expected to make every effort to disseminate documentation to interested parties in a timely fashion. I am not aware of any problems in this regard, however, if the member has a specific issue he wishes to address, he should put it to me in writing and I will have it investigated.

PORT HEDLAND - HOUSING ESTATES DEVELOPMENT

2317. Mr GRAHAM to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) What action has the Minister taken to encourage people to develop housing estates in the Town of Port Hedland?
- (2) On what date/s was/were the actions taken?

- (3) With whom were the actions taken?
- (4) What was the effect of the actions taken?
- (5) How many housing estates have been developed as a result of the actions taken?
- (6) On what date will the housing estates be opened?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

- (1) The Department of Land Administration is responsible for the development of housing estates at Port Hedland and Homeswest is responsible for the development of housing estates at South Hedland. Recent advice indicates that the land release programs from these agencies will meet forecast private and industry demand.
- (2)-(6) Not applicable.

PORT HEDLAND - TOWNSITE DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE

2318. Mr GRAHAM to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Has the Government established a townsite development task force to address matters relating to the development of the Town of Port Hedland?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If so -
 - (a) on what date was the task force established;
 - (b) who are the members of the task force;
 - (c) which organisations does each member of the task force represent;
 - (d) by what process will the public be able to have input into the deliberations of the task force?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) The task force was established on 19 August 1996.
- (b)-(c) The membership of the task force is as follows: Homeswest; Ministry for Planning; Department of Resources Development; Department of Land Administration; Pilbara Development Commission; Department of Environmental Protection; and, as appropriate, Water Corporation and Western Power.
- (d) The public will be consulted by public forum for input into the task force.

BOARDS AND COMMITTEES - WOMEN APPOINTMENTS; MEN APPOINTMENTS

2402. Dr WATSON to the Minister representing the Minister for Finance:

- (1) How many women are on boards and committees in the Minister's administration?
- (2) How many men are on boards and committees in the Minister's administration?
- (3) How many women have been appointed since October 1995?
- (4) How many women members whose terms had expired by October 1995 were not reappointed?

Mr COURT replied:

The Minister for Finance has provided the following reply -

State Government Insurance Commission:

- (1) Nil.
- (2) SGIC Board of Commissioners Seven
SGIC Executive Committee 10

(3) Nil.

(4) Not applicable.

State Revenue Department:

(1) One.

(2) Two.

(3)-(4) Nil.

Government Employees Superannuation Board:

(1) Two.

(2) Five.

(3)-(4) Nil.

Valuer General's Office:

(1)-(2) None.

(3)-(4) Not applicable.

BOARDS AND COMMITTEES - WOMEN APPOINTMENTS; MEN APPOINTMENTS

2403. Dr WATSON to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

(1) How many women are on boards and committees in the Minister's administration?

(2) How many men are on boards and committees in the Minister's administration?

(3) How many women have been appointed since October 1995?

(4) How many women members whose terms had expired by October 1995 were not reappointed?

Mr COWAN replied:

The Minister for Racing and Gaming has provided the following reply -

Office of Racing, Gaming and Liquor:

	Members	Deputies
(1) Betting Control Board	-	1
Gaming Commission of WA	1	-
Racecourse Development Trust	-	1
Racing Penalties Appeal Tribunal	1	-
Totalisator Agency Board	1	-
(2) Betting Control Board	7	5
Burswood Park Board	6	-
Gaming Commission of WA	3	2
Racecourse Development Trust	7	4
Racing Penalties Appeal Tribunal	7	-
Totalisator Agency Board	6	-
WA Greyhound Racing Association	5	-
(3) Gaming Commission of WA	1	
Totalisator Agency Board	1	
(4) Gaming Commission	1	-
Totalisator Agency Board	1	-
Racecourse Development Trust	-	1

Lotteries Commission:

(1) 20.

(2) 25.

(3) Four.

(4) Nil.

WESTERN POWER - BACKUP POWER FOR COMPANIES PURCHASING POWER FROM PRIVATE GENERATORS USING GOLDFIELDS GAS PIPELINE GAS; FEE

2443. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Energy:

- (1) On what basis has Western Power agreed to provide backup power to companies purchasing power from private sector generators using gas from the Pilbara-Goldfields gas pipeline?
- (2) Does Western Power receive a fee for providing this facility?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

- (1) Western Power has agreed to an interim arrangement with the private generation companies, Normandy Power Pty Ltd and Western Mining Corporation, for standby and access on behalf of the companies they are supplying. None of the companies purchasing from these private generators has requested access and standby from Western Power. The interim arrangement agreed between Western Power and the private generators involves the purchase and sale of standby power. The agreements expire after a short term where it has been agreed that the private generators will transfer directly over to the terms and conditions of the "open access regime" which is being developed by the Government in consultation with the public.
- (2) Yes, Western Power receives a fee for access and standby.
- (3) Not applicable.

GOLDFIELDS GAS PIPELINE - COST REDUCTION FOR COMPANIES

2445. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Energy:

For companies in Kalgoorlie previously purchasing power from Western Power, what is the cost reduction available as a result of the Pilbara-goldfields gas pipeline development?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

The costs of power to companies not purchasing power from Western Power are based on commercial arrangements between the companies and their suppliers.

WESTRAIL - PENSIONERS' FREE TRIP, RESTRICTION

2474. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Seniors:

- (1) With reference to the Legislative Council Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs and Statute Revision report in relation to a petition objecting to the Government's decision to restrict use by pensioners of their free Westrail entitlement during holiday periods, on what basis did the Minister argue that a return to unrestricted free travel vouchers cannot be justified?
- (2) What kind of social impact will such a decision have on seniors and their families?
- (3) What kind of information has been sent to those categories of people previously eligible for concessional travel, including holidays?
- (4) What travel concessions are available for pensioners and under what circumstances?
- (5) Will the Government implement all of the recommendations of the report?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(3) I refer the member to my letter to the standing committee dated 20 June 1996. [See paper No 787.]
- (4) A wide range of travel concessions is available for pensioners in Western Australia, far too many to read out in this forum. In 1995, however, the Office of Seniors Interests conducted an audit of state government concessions for 1993-94. Appendix 2 of this audit lists all the concessions available by each state agency, including Westrail and Transperth. Copies of the report are available upon request from the Office of Seniors Interests.
- (5) The report's recommendations fall within the portfolio responsibilities of several Ministers.

- (6) Not applicable.

DISABILITY SERVICES COMMISSION - CARERS TASK FORCE

2475. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Disability Services:

- (1) Who are the members of the carers task force?
- (2) How many are from rural Western Australia?
- (3) Is the Disability Services Commission providing respite for those members who are carers while attending to their task force duties?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) Will carers of old people with stroke, dementias etc be catered for?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) Members of the carers task force are -

Dr Warren Loudon	Chairperson/carers
Penny Keep	Carer
Geoff Patching	Carer
Jean Yeates	Carer
Linda Furnish	Carer
Dr Heather Brown	Disability Services Commission
Norma Josephs	Disability Services Commission
Wendy Randall	Disability Services Commission
Dr Penny Flett	Homes of Peace
Margaret Walsh	Council of Funded Agencies
Richard Robinson	Home and Community Care
Angie Paskevicius	Executive Officer, Disability Services Commission

- (2) Three are from rural Western Australia.
- (3) Carers will receive payment for their contribution to the carers task force. This will be in accordance with Public Sector Management guidelines. If respite is required, this will be funded from the carers task force budget.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) The task force will be identifying, inter alia, practical ways to help carers meet their own personal and emotional needs. These strategies will be relevant to all carers and will be made available to the Health Department of Western Australia to further inform the services it provides for carers of older people with disabilities resulting from stroke or dementia.
- (6) Not applicable.

DISABLED - COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT, CHANGES; CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUNDING

2477. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Disability Services:

- (1) How does the Minister intend to protect commitments made to Western Australians with a disability when the Commonwealth changes the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreements?
- (2) How will the construction program for people with disabilities be funded?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) The State has an interim agreement with the Commonwealth Government that maintains the current level of resourcing for the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for the years 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1998-99. Negotiations regarding any longer term agreement are, I understand, not yet finalised.
- (2) This question should be directed to the Minister for Housing.

CONCESSIONS - FOR WIDOWS NOT YET ELIGIBLE FOR SENIOR'S CARD

2482. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Women's Interests:

What state government concessions are provided for widows not yet eligible for a senior's card?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

Veterans Affairs war widows pensioners are entitled to the following concessions, according to appendix 2 of the audit of state government concessions, compiled by the Office of Seniors Interests in 1995 -

Transperth - concession fares on the Transperth system
 Eastern Goldfields Transport Board - travel concession of 80¢ per trip as at 1995
 Kalgoorlie College - concession on state government implemented tuition fees
 State Energy Commission, now Western Power - account establishment fee rebate and supply charge rebate.

LEGISLATION - PASSED UNDER TIME MANAGEMENT SESSIONAL ORDER

2487. Dr CONSTABLE to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Further to question on notice 2252 of 1996 concerning unproclaimed legislation, which pieces of legislation identified in the answer to the question were passed through this House under the time management sessional order?
- (2) Since February 1993, which Acts of Parliament have passed through this House under the time management sessional order?

Mr C.J. BARNETT replied:

- (1) The following Acts identified in the reply to question on notice 2252 had all or some of their stages progressed through the Legislative Assembly under the time management sessional order -

Electricity Corporation Act 1994
 Hospitals Amendment Act 1994
 Bank of Western Australia Act 1995
 Prisons Amendment Act 1995
 Caravan Parks and Camping Grounds Act 1995
 Unleaded Petrol Repeal Act 1995
 Agricultural Legislation Amendment and Repeal Act 1995
 Sentencing Act 1995
 Sentence Administration Act 1995
 Sentencing (Consequential Provisions) Act 1995
 Industrial Relations Legislation Amendment and Repeal Act 1995
 Coroners Act 1996
 Education Amendment Act 1996
 Security and Related Activities (Control) Act 1996
 Listening Devices Amendment Act 1996

- (2) From 1993 to 31 October 1996, the following Bills had all or some of their stages progressed through the Legislative Assembly under a time management sessional order -

Industrial Relations Amendment Bill 1993
 Workplace Agreements Bill 1993
 Minimum Conditions of Employment Bill 1993
 Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Amendment Bill 1993
 Young Offenders Bill 1994
 Collie Coal (Western Collieries) Agreement Amendment Bill 1994
 Acts Amendment (Health Services Integration) Bill 1994
 Fish Resources Management Bill 1994
 Fisheries Adjustment Schemes Amendment Bill 1994
 Fishing Industry Promotion Training and Management Levy Bill 1994
 Pearling Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1994
 Pearling Industry Promotion Training and Management Levy Bill 1994
 Local Government (Superannuation) Legislation Amendment Bill 1994
 East Perth Cemeteries Repeal Bill 1994
 Financial Institutions Duty Amendment Bill 1994
 Fire Brigades Amendment Bill 1994
 Mines Safety and Inspection Bill 1994
 Mining Amendment Bill 1994
 Pawnbrokers and Second-hand Dealers Bill 1994
 Electricity Corporation Bill 1994
 Gas Corporation Bill 1994
 Land Tax Assessment Amendment Bill 1994

Acts Amendment (Perth Passenger Transport) Bill 1994
 Acts Amendment (Local Government and Valuation of Land) Bill 1994
 Local Government Amendment (Elections) Bill 1994
 Energy Coordination Bill 1994
 Energy Corporations (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Bill 1994
 Western Australian Tourism Commission Amendment Bill 1994
 Statutes (Repeals and Minor Amendments) Bill 1994
 Reserves (No. 1720) Bill 1994
 Reserves Bill (No. 2) 1994
 Ord River Hydro Energy Project Agreement Bill 1994
 Medical Amendment Bill 1994
 Justices Amendment Bill 1994
 Child Support (Adoption of Laws) Amendment Bill 1994
 Agriculture and Veterinary Chemicals (Western Australia) Bill 1994
 Agriculture and Veterinary Chemicals (Taxing) Bill 1994
 Dairy Industry Amendment Bill 1994
 Criminal Law Amendment Bill 1994
 Victims of Crime Amendment Bill 1994
 Fines, Penalties and Infringement Notices Enforcement Bill 1994
 Acts Amendment (Fines, Penalties and Infringement Notices Enforcement) Bill 1994
 Firearms Amendment Bill 1994
 Stamp Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1994
 Financial Agreement Amendment Bill 1994
 Freedom of Information Amendment Bill 1994
 Lotteries Commission Amendment Bill 1994
 Hale School Amendment Bill 1994
 Marine and Harbours Amendment Bill 1994
 North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 1994
 Health Services (Quality Improvement) Bill 1994
 Hospitals Amendment Bill 1994
 Marketing of Potatoes (Amendment) Bill 1995
 Bank of Western Australia Bill 1995
 Alumina Refinery (Worsley) Agreement Amendment Bill 1995
 Forrest Place and City Station Development Amendment Bill 1995
 Lands, Parks and Reserves Amendment Bill 1995
 Security and Related Activities (Control) Bill 1995
 Swan Valley Planning Bill 1995
 Financial Transactions Reports Bill 1995
 National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Bill 1995
 Pay-roll Tax Assessment Amendment Bill 1995
 Land Tax Assessment Amendment Bill 1995
 Supply Bill 1995
 Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill 1995
 Aboriginal Heritage Amendment Bill 1995
 Local Government Amendment Bill 1995
 Stamp Amendment (Marketable Securities Duty) Bill 1995
 Agricultural Practices (Disputes) Bill 1995
 Road Traffic Amendment Bill 1995
 Caravan Parks and Camping Grounds Bill 1995
 Sentencing Bill 1995
 Sentence Administration Bill 1995
 Sentencing (Consequential Provisions) Bill 1995
 Prisons Amendment Bill 1995
 Agricultural Legislation Amendment Bill 1995
 Corporations (Western Australia) Bill 1995
 Collie Hardwood Plantation Agreement Bill 1995
 North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 1995
 Legal Practitioners Amendment Bill 1995
 Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 1) 1995
 Hire-Purchase Amendment Bill 1995
 State Supply Commission Amendment Bill 1995
 Acts Amendment and Repeal (Native Title) Bill 1995
 Land Tax Amendment Bill 1995
 Land Tax Assessment Amendment Bill 1995
 Stamp Amendment Bill 1995
 Skeleton Weed and Resistant Grain Insects (Eradication Funds) Amendment Bill 1995
 Financial Institutions (Western Australia) Amendment Bill 1995
 Misuse of Drugs Amendment Bill 1995
 Police Amendment Bill 1995
 Health Services (Conciliation and Review) Bill 1995
 Local Government Bill 1995
 Coal Industry Superannuation Amendment Bill 1995
 Bunbury Treefarm Project Agreement Bill 1995
 Freedom of Information Amendment Bill 1995
 Coroners Bill 1995

Government Employees Superannuation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1995
 Planning Legislation Amendment Bill 1995
 Hospitals and Health Services Amendment Bill 1995
 Water Corporation Bill 1995
 Water Services Coordination Bill 1995
 Water Agencies Restructure (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Bill 1995
 Industrial Relations Legislation Amendment and Repeal Bill 1995
 Fines, Penalties and Infringement Notices Enforcement Amendment Bill 1995
 Education Amendment Bill 1995
 Unleaded Petrol Repeal Bill 1995
 Iron Ore Direct Reduced Iron (BHP) Agreement Bill 1995
 Iron Ore Beneficiation (BHP) Agreement Bill 1995
 Censorship Bill 1995
 Local Government (Consequential Amendments) Bill 1996
 Biological Control Amendment Bill 1996
 Main Roads Amendment Bill 1996
 Revenue Laws Amendment (Assessment) Bill 1996
 Revenue Laws Amendment (Taxation) Bill 1996
 Consumer Credit (Western Australia) Bill 1996
 Fruit Growing Industry (Trust Fund) Repeal Bill 1996
 University of Notre Dame Amendment Bill 1996
 Land Drainage (Validation) Bill 1996
 Health Amendment Bill 1996
 Criminal Law Amendment Bill 1996
 Listening Devices Amendment Bill 1996
 Telecommunications (Interception) Western Australia Bill 1996
 Vocational Education and Training Bill 1996
 Curtin University of Technology Amendment Bill 1996
 Competition Policy Reform (Western Australia) Bill 1996
 Competition Policy Reform (Taxing) Bill 1996
 Westpac Banking Corporation (Challenge Bank) Bill 1996
 Road Traffic Amendment (Measuring Equipment) Bill 1996
 Chattel Securities Amendment Bill 1996
 Medical Amendment Bill 1996
 Reserves Bill 1996
 Revenue Laws Amendment (Assessment) Bill (No. 2) 1996
 Statutory Corporations (Liability of Directors) Bill 1996
 Criminal Code Amendment Bill 1996
 Home Building Contracts Amendment Bill 1996
 Financial Legislation Amendment Bill 1996
 State Enterprises (Commonwealth Tax Equivalents) Bill 1996
 Acts Amendment (Assemblies and Noise) Bill 1996
 East Perth Redevelopment Amendment Bill 1996
 Acts Amendment (ICWA) Bill 1996
 Stamp Amendment Bill 1996
 Railway Discontinuance Bill 1996
 Government Railways Amendment Bill 1996
 Skeleton Weed and Resistant Grain Insects (Eradication Funds) Amendment Bill 1996
 Criminal Code Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1996
 Electricity Amendment Bill 1996
 Mining Amendment Bill 1996
 Reserve (No. 18039) Bill 1996.

DISABILITY SERVICES COMMISSION - 462 GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY, HERITAGE VALUES PROTECTION

2488. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Disability Services:

Further to the answer to question on notice 2385 of 1996 how can the Minister be certain that the heritage values of the building at 462 Great Eastern Highway will be protected if it is to be sold?

Mr MINSON replied:

I expect the member is referring to question on notice 2386 of 1996. When the property is placed on the market a heritage agreement approved by the Heritage Council will be attached to the offer and acceptance that will bind any prospective purchaser to the conditions set down in the agreement.

HOSPITAL CLINICS - WAITING TIMES

2507. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the extraordinary amount of time people have to wait at hospital clinics before being attended to?

- (2) Is the Minister aware that frail nursing home residents are kept waiting an extraordinary amount of time in hospital clinics?
- (3) What initiatives does the Government plan to take to reduce the waiting times?
- (4) When will these initiatives be implemented?
- (5) To what extent will the waiting times be reduced by these initiatives?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) There is no question that patients do have to wait in outpatient clinics and that the waiting time is sometimes too long for patient comfort. A patient satisfaction survey in the outpatients department in one teaching hospital recently showed that the average waiting time was 47 minutes. This is probably similar to the waiting time at a general practitioner's surgery or specialist rooms, but often an outpatient clinic visit will require additional diagnostic or therapeutic interventions, which may prolong the time at the clinic.
- (2) The Health Department is not aware of a particular problem for frail aged residents from nursing homes waiting at outpatient clinics. The special needs of these patients have been recognised at one teaching hospital where they are given priority for medical review by the nursing staff. The ambulance officers who provide the transport to the clinic are asked to wait so that the patient can be returned to the nursing home as soon as possible. Inevitably, there are some time delays due to other emergencies arising.
- (3) Hospitals are being encouraged to record the waiting time for each patient attending an outpatient clinic. No specific initiatives are planned by the Health Department as waiting times for patients attending a clinic are seen as a management issue for the hospitals themselves.
- (4)-(5) Not applicable.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT - ABORIGINAL HEALTH WORKERS' EMPLOYMENT

2512. Mr McGINTY to the Minister for Health:

With reference to Aboriginal health workers employed by the Health Department -

- (a) How many are employed in each region;
- (b) of those in (a), at what level are they classified;
- (c) how many vacant positions are there designated as Aboriginal health worker positions, in what regions and at what classification levels;
- (d) what was the level of vacant positions in (c) at this time in 1994;
- (e) has the Health Department conducted a review into the career structure of Aboriginal health workers and what is the current status of the review;
- (f) what was the budget for the conduct of the review;
- (g) what was the timeline for the completion of the review;
- (h) when will the review and its findings be made available to Aboriginal health workers and their representatives;
- (i) has the Health Department had a request to enter into enterprise bargaining negotiations on behalf of Aboriginal health workers; and
- (j) has the Health Department responded to the request in (i)?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----|
| (a) | Kimberley | 18 |
| | Central Wheatbelt | 4 |
| | Goldfields | 12 |
| | Mid West | 9.5 |
| | South West | 3 |
| | Pilbara | 13 |
| | Great Southern | 8 |
| | East Metropolitan | 3.6 |

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------|--|--|
| | South Metropolitan | 5 | | |
| | North Metropolitan | 3 | | |
| | Total | 79.1 | | |
- (b) Level 4 1
 Level 3 13
 Level 2 65.1
 Total 79.1
- (c)
- | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Level 4 | Level 3 | Level 2 |
| Kimberley | 0 | 0 | 2.5 |
| Central Wheatbelt | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Goldfields | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Mid West | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| South West | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pilbara | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Great Southern | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| East Metropolitan | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Metropolitan | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Metropolitan | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 1 | 9.5 |
- (d) There were no vacancies at this time in 1994.
- (e) Yes. Copies of the report will be distributed to health workers for their comments. When a substantial level of comment has been received these will be provided to the working party for consideration and subsequent public release of the report.
- (f) \$17 500.
- (g) It was completed as planned by 31 May 1996.
- (h) Copies of the report will be distributed over the coming weeks.
- (i) The union has not approached the Health Department of WA directly on behalf of Aboriginal health workers. The award which covers these staff has recently become a federal interim award.
- (j) There have been general discussions and "in principle" agreement reached for all Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union members.

PRISONS - DEATHS IN CUSTODY

2515. Dr WATSON to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) In each year since 1990 how many prisoners have died in custody and in which gaols?
- (2) How many of these were -
- (a) suicides;
- (b) natural causes;
- (c) other?

Mr MINSON replied:

(1)	Year	Gaol	No of Deaths
	1990	Fremantle	2
		C.W. Campbell Remand Centre	1
			<u>3</u>
	1991	Fremantle	2
		Canning Vale Prison	1
		C.W. Campbell Remand Centre	2
		Casuarina	2
		Greenough	1
			<u>8</u>
	1992	C.W. Campbell Remand Centre	2
		Hospital	1
		Albany	1
			<u>4</u>

1993	Pardelup	1
	Casuarina	1
	Canning Vale Prison	1
		<u>3</u>
1994	Canning Vale Prison	1
	Greenough	1
	Casuarina	1
	C.W. Campbell Remand Centre	<u>3</u>
1995	Hospital	2
	Casuarina	1
	Broome	1
	C.W. Campbell Remand Centre	<u>1</u>
1996	Casuarina	3
	C.W. Campbell Remand Centre	1
	Broome	1
		<u>5</u>
(2) 1990	(a)	1
	(b)	1
	(c)	<u>1</u>
1991	(a)	1
	(b)	3
	(c)	<u>4</u>
1992	(a)	2
	(b)	-
	(c)	<u>2</u>
1993	(a)	2
	(b)	1
	(c)	<u>-</u>
1994	(a)	3
	(b)	1
	(c)	<u>2</u>
1995	(a)	-
	(b)	4
	(c)	<u>1</u>
1996	(a)	-
	(b)	-
	(c)	<u>5</u>

Please note that "other" includes open and accidental death coronial findings and deaths that are still subject to the coronial inquiry process.

PRISONS - NEXT OF KIN OF PRISONERS, NOMINATION POLICY

2516. Dr WATSON to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What is the policy for nominating next of kin of a prisoner?
- (2) Under what circumstances would next of kin be contacted by the prison authorities?
- (3) Under what circumstances would a parent of a young prisoner be contacted - if not notified as next of kin?
- (4) What are the procedures for notifying a prisoner's next of kin if the prisoner should die in custody?
- (5) Is the Minister confident such procedures are always followed?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) Prisoners nominate whom they wish to be designated as their next of kin.
- (2) In any situation within the discretion of the superintendent or nominee.
- (3) Following discussion with the next of kin or at the discretion of the superintendent.
- (4) Notification of the next of kin shall be carried out by the police.
- (5) Yes.

PRISONS - PRISONERS WITH A PSYCHIATRIC ILLNESS, TREATMENT

2517. Dr WATSON to the Minister assisting the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What provisions are made for the diagnosis, assessment, new and/or ongoing treatment and rehabilitation of prisoners with a psychiatric illness who are not at the forensic unit?
- (2) How many specialist psychiatrists consult at each prison?

Mr MINSON replied:

- (1) All new prisoners undergo initial medical/nursing screening including assessment for psychiatric illness or self-harming behaviour. This screening process includes a specialised at risk of self-harm proforma completed by both a qualified nursing officer and the reception officer. This system has been operational at the Canning Vale Remand Centre and is being developed at all other institutions. A psychiatric illness may be identified at this stage.

The regular nursing and medical clinics conducted also identify prisoners who develop psychiatric illness during imprisonment. Newly identified psychiatrically ill prisoners and those who develop illness are referred to the visiting forensic psychiatrists from the Frankland Forensic Unit or the visiting consultant psychiatrists at the regional prisons. Further diagnosis, treatment and management is arranged by the Forensic Psychiatric Service and by the visiting psychiatrists as they are needed in liaison with the health services staff.

- (2) This varies prison by prison. For example, Casuarina Prison has more than one specialist psychiatrist attending, dependent upon the availability of clinical staff from the Statewide Forensic Psychiatric Service and clinical needs. Most metropolitan and some regional prisons have regular sessional attendances. All other prisons receive occasional sessional services. Where services are needed but cannot be provided or are considered, clinically, not appropriate to be provided in situ the prisoner/patient may be transferred to Casuarina Prison infirmary - adult male prisoners - or Bandyup Women's Centre - adult female prisoners - for assessment regarding further treatment and management.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT - RITALIN AT HOSPITAL PHARMACIES, BUDGET

Osborne Park, Armadale, Fremantle Hospitals

2518. Dr WATSON to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Further to question on notice 2333 of 1996, why does Osborne Park Hospital not have a budget for Ritalin?
- (2) Are children served by this hospital not diagnosed with conditions requiring this medication?
- (3) Why is there a discrepancy in the Ritalin budgets for Armadale and Fremantle Hospitals?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) Some public hospitals in Perth provide Ritalin to patients presenting authorised prescriptions, even when those presenting are not patients of the hospital. Osborne Park Hospital does not supply Ritalin or other medications to non-hospital patients due to a decision made by the Health Service Medical Advisory Committee. Any decision to increase access to free Ritalin medication through public hospitals has been deferred while an expert technical working party reporting to a Cabinet subcommittee on ADHD has been closely examining the use of and access to stimulant medication. The draft technical working party report was released last week for a period of public consultation until 31 December 1996. Until this consultation

process is complete and a final report submitted to government, the current level of access to Ritalin will be adhered to.

- (2) The assessment and diagnosis of children who are deemed to require stimulant medication does not take place at or under the auspices of Osborne Park Hospital. Ritalin is prescribed by paediatricians in private practice. Patients can get free access to the stimulant medication through some but not all public hospitals.
- (3) Both Armadale/Kelmscott and Fremantle Hospitals supply Ritalin to patients presenting with authorised prescriptions. In the case of Fremantle, the costs are covered from within the hospital base budget. In the case of Armadale/Kelmscott the department does adjust the hospital budget for Ritalin supply based on an assessment of volume of supply and the hospital's capacity to meet the costs.

HOSPITALS - FREMANTLE

Heart Surgery Unit Plans

2519. Mr PENDAL to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are there plans/proposals to establish a heart surgery unit at Fremantle Hospital?
- (2) Have funds been allocated for such a unit?
- (3) If so, when is it expected that the heart unit will commence operating?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1)-(2) Yes.
- (3) July 1997.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES - CODE OF FAIR PRACTICE, AND AUDITED ACCOUNTS INFORMATION; AMENDMENT

2529. Mr PENDAL to the Minister for Fair Trading:

I refer to the code of fair practice for retirement villages which requires villages to provide a copy of the previous year's audited accounts and ask -

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the code does not require a breakup of the accounts on a village-by-village basis where a village is part of a series of villages controlled by one organisation?
- (2) Does the Minister acknowledge that this effectively undermines a resident's capacity to be fully informed about his or her particular village?
- (3) Will the Minister take steps to have the code amended to achieve this objective?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) Yes. However, part 5 section 5.1 of the code also states that the administering body -

. . . must create appropriate structures and procedures to provide residents with access to management information and allow input into the future planning and budgeting of a retirement village.

This requirement would suggest that the information provided should be appropriate to residents' needs.

- (2) The residents' need for detailed management information must be balanced against additional costs which would be passed on to all residents if financial information were to be broken down in great detail. However, I am concerned that villages may not all be providing the type and level of information required under the code. Failure to provide such information can lead to concern among residents and a lack of accountability by management.
- (3) The code was reviewed in conjunction with the review of the Retirement Villages Act and a report tabled in 1995. The Ministry of Fair Trading is currently reviewing the recommendations made about the provision of financial information to residents. This issue is being discussed with the retirement village industry and resident organisations to arrive at agreed standards of financial reporting to residents. If necessary the code will be amended accordingly.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HOSPITALS - MANDURAH

Services Agreement; Funding Arrangement

682. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Government signed the services agreement with Health Solutions (WA) Pty Ltd to provide hospital services in Mandurah?
- (2) If not, will the caretaker government conventions prevent the Government from signing the agreement this year?
- (3) How does the Government justify paying \$500 000 commission for BZW Investment Management Australia Ltd for arranging finance for the hospital construction when the funding is being raised through State Treasury?
- (4) Has the Minister yet informed his ministerial colleague the member for Mandurah that the State Government's Bankcard will be used to pay for the private hospital and the cost will be added to state debt?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I thought the caretaker provisions would say that it is not signed if the Government is in caretaker mode.

Dr Gallop: Why isn't it signed?

Mr PRINCE: The documentation is being resolved between groups of lawyers on behalf of the various parties. As I have said before with regard to the Joondalup and Bunbury hospitals, it is not a matter in which any Minister should interfere or involve himself. It should be worked out by those people so that no suggestion of untoward influence can be made now or at any future time. The result will still be a first class, 110-bed hospital, with 20 private beds, which is what should have been built in 1988 and which is what the Government will deliver to the people in the area.

- (3)-(4) BZW Investment Management Australia Ltd has received fees for more than \$500 000. The breakdown of those fees has been provided to the member. I think the total fees are \$1.031m, and they relate to a number of different things.

Mr McGinty: The question was about the half a million dollars.

Mr PRINCE: Yes, I am just explaining that the fees are a total much bigger than that, and are broken down into a number of different aspects. The half a million dollars has been negotiated between Treasury and BZW. As I understand, the bonds have been issued through the Western Australian Treasury Corporation on the bond market through a dealer. BZW is a dealer. With regard to the arrangements that have been made between Treasury and BZW, that is for them to answer.

Dr Gallop: You're the Minister. You tell us whether it is justified.

Mr PRINCE: I have been informed of the amount of the cost and that that is not an unreasonable cost. The money that has therefore been raised is producing an asset for the people in the Peel region and, specifically, the people of the Mandurah area.

NATIONAL PARKS - CONSERVATION RESERVES WITHOUT MINING OR EXPLORATION PERMITS

683. Mr BOARD to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Are there any national parks or conservation reserves in Western Australia that do not have some form of mining or exploration permit on their grounds?
- (2) If yes, which national parks or conservation reserves are they?
- (3) Are any reserves that are free of mining or exploration permits set aside for recreation?
- (4) If yes, which reserves?

Mr MINSON replied:

(1)-(4)

The member will have noticed that Hon Jim Scott in another place asked this question, which created a certain amount of interest among sections of the media. There are 75 national parks and 1 075 conservation and nature reserves without mining tenements of any sort over them, either exploration licences or mining leases. I am a little disappointed at the attitude of the member in the other place and the mischief he seeks to create. As the exploration licences and mining leases are granted in graticular blocks, occasionally they encroach in part on a nature reserve. However, the conditions almost always dictate that the companies may not enter and mine on or explore the encroachment area.

There are so many recreation reserves that it would take months of checking and manual cross-checking to produce a list. However, I table for the benefit of members a list of all national parks and nature reserves with no tenement of any sort.

[See paper No 784.]

DIEBACK - CONTROL PROGRAM

684. Dr GALLOP to the Premier:

Given the precedent set in recent days, will the Premier announce a \$3b, 30-year plan to tackle dieback in Western Australia, as this disease is as devastating as the salinity problem? In fact, dieback infestation is regarded as being much worse than ever imagined and is now seen to be a biological disaster of global significance.

Mr COURT replied:

This is an issue of great concern. It is one of the environmental issues that must be addressed. I do not know whether the member is trying to be smart or otherwise.

Dr Gallop: You are trying to use taxpayers' money to fool the people, but they will not be fooled.

Mr COURT: The salinity strategy the Government launched this week has had nearly universal support; however, some members opposite want to be critical. The Government has taken a major step to address that problem. There is a major problem in relation to dieback and it is an issue from which the Government will not walk away. The member is being facetious in asking whether the Government has a \$3b program to announce this week. The answer is no.

DIEBACK - REVIEW REPORT

685. Dr GALLOP to the Premier:

I ask a supplementary question.

- (1) Is the Premier aware of a report by his Government, entitled "Review of Dieback in Western Australia", which makes a number of serious criticisms of the Government's failure to control dieback?
- (2) Is the Premier aware that these include the Department of Environmental Protection acting contrary to the Department of Conservation and Land Management advice that CALM allowed its position of dieback coordinator to lapse; that only 6 per cent of CALM's spending on dieback research is allocated to field operations; and that an overreliance on external funding from commonwealth and industry sources is having a major and disproportionate influence on priorities?
- (3) If the Premier is aware of that report, what will he do about it?

Mr COURT replied:

(1)-(3)

I am not aware of the detail of the report.

Dr Gallop: You should become aware of it. This is a major scandal.

Mr COURT: Has the Leader of the Opposition read the report?

Dr Gallop: I have looked at the report.

Mr COURT: The member has looked at it, but he has not read it.

Dr Gallop: I've had a very busy day, calling you to account.

Mr COURT: I have not read the report either, but I am prepared to ensure that any constructive criticism is acted on.

WATER CORPORATION - PRESTON VALLEY IRRIGATION SCHEME

686. Dr TURNBULL to the Minister for Water Resources:

The Preston Valley Irrigation Scheme Advisory Committee has been negotiating with the Water Corporation for 18 months regarding a proposal for the scheme to be managed by a cooperative of the water users - the irrigators. Can the Minister explain his recommendations to the irrigators' representatives on the viability of the proposal and the need to increase the supply of water by installing deep bores?

Mr NICHOLLS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The member has been very vigorous in her representation of the group. I am pleased to say that meetings with growers' representatives have been very fruitful. The growers in the Preston Valley irrigation area wish to take over the scheme, but one issue is the purchase of the dam which provides the water and the need for additional water sources for growers which possibly cannot be supplied from the current allocation. The options are, first, to put down deep bores into the Yarragadee aquifer and, second, to build a new dam. The ground water option was investigated, and the capacity would be around 1 200 megalitres a year, whereas a new dam would provide about 1 500 ML capacity a year. The cost of putting down the bores would be around \$500 000, and approximately \$73 000 a year to run. A new dam would cost around \$2.5m as a capital cost and about \$10 000 a year to run.

At the conclusion of the meeting with me the growers understood that the Water Corporation would undertake a feasibility study of the bore field as well as the dam option. My preference is to put down bores, to provide water to the growers so that a cash flow could be worked out for the scheme prior to any transfer to the cooperative. In that way, not only could a business plan be substantiated but also the risk to the growers and to the State would be limited, based on the cash flow to be arrived at.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT - PLANNING APPEALS, SUPREME COURT DECISION

687. Mr KOBELKE to the Minister for Planning:

I refer to the Supreme Court ruling today that the Minister was wrong in refusing to release, under the Freedom of Information Act, documents revealing why the Minister upheld or dismissed a planning appeal.

- (1) Does the Minister accept the Supreme Court's decision in the Taweel case and will he immediately release the documents in accordance with the decision of the Information Commissioner?
- (2) Will the Minister now comply with all decisions of the Information Commissioner and grant access to town planning appeal documents sought under the Freedom of Information Act?
- (3) Will the Minister now stop wasting taxpayers' money and the legal resources of the Government to prevent ordinary citizens affected by the 600 appeal decisions the Minister makes each year from understanding the reasons for his many inexplicable and questionable decisions?

Mr LEWIS replied:

- (1)-(3) His Honour, Judge Parker, in his finding described the clause which the former Labor Government put in place as rather elusive. That meant that he had difficulty bringing down his decision.

Mr Kobelke: Will you accept that decision?

Mr LEWIS: Be patient, please! It is proper for the Government to test a question of law in the appropriate place, which of course is the Supreme Court. That was done, and I do not apologise for that, because I am the Minister responsible for planning legislation. The member for Nollamara takes great delight in jumping up and down like a jack in the box in this place highlighting two or three decisions that I may make.

Several members interjected.

Mr LEWIS: Members, this is my last day! Give me a chance.

Dr Gallop interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! While interjections persist we cannot proceed. Today is a day on which I thought it would be very important for us to have some cooperation so that more questions could be asked, because it might be a while before the next questions are asked.

Mr LEWIS: Planning appeals arose from the 1928 legislation. They are administrative appeals. I believe that the judge probably realised that the freedom of information legislation was out of sync with the provisions which prevailed in relation to planning appeals -

Mr McGinty interjected.

Mr LEWIS: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should stop being so rude.

Mr McGinty: Why don't you abuse the judge!

Mr LEWIS: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was sacked as leader because he was so rude and negative!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to proceed.

Mr LEWIS: In the course of my handling 750 appeals each year, the member for Nollamara takes great delight in highlighting a couple of appeals about which some people may be aggrieved.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to begin to conclude.

Mr LEWIS: We must consider these matters in their entirety.

Mr Kobelke: Do you accept the decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr LEWIS: I will examine the judgment of Justice Parker and make a determination. As a Government, we must take -

Mrs Roberts: This is outrageous.

Mr LEWIS: Why is it outrageous? I have not read the judgment. What does the member want me to do? I understand that the judgment was rather disparaging of the Information Commissioner.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Mr LEWIS: As the Minister responsible, I will take cognisance of the Supreme Court, and I will abide by the determination of the umpire.

ELECTORATE SECRETARY - HAND INJURIES CAUSED BY PICTURE IN ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

688. Dr HAMES to the Minister for Health:

The electorate secretary of a member of this House unfortunately suffered a serious injury yesterday in this Chamber. The injury was caused when a picture of considerable weight fell on his left hand. Can the Minister advise the extent of those injuries and the state of the electorate secretary's health?

Mr PRINCE replied:

This matter has been the subject of debate around the House and among the Press. The gentleman suffered a compound fracture to the ring finger of the left hand, and a dislocation and break to the knuckle. He left the Chamber very quickly, and was attended to by the member for Dianella who happens to have medical qualifications and a provider number. The gentleman concerned was then taken to Royal Perth Hospital and admitted. He was operated on last evening by a consultant surgeon. He will be discharged today and reviewed in one month. The injuries were extremely serious.

Several members interjected.

Mr PRINCE: I will not reveal that.

OAKAJEE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - NATIONAL PARTY POLICY

689. Mr RIPPER to the Leader of the National Party:

- (1) Is it still National Party policy - as it was before the last state election and as now advocated by the Hon Murray Criddle - to oppose the development of the Oakajee industrial estate?
- (2) Is the National Party committed to underwriting \$250m of infrastructure simply to shift the Kingstream steel project from Narngulu south of Geraldton to Oakajee to the north of the town?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COWAN replied:

- (1)-(2) Let me assure one of the interjectors that the Jervois Bay redevelopment is very much on track. He can go and tell his electors. The position at Oakajee is that Kingstream Resources has agreed that it will permit the Government to examine the capacity for the project to be relocated to Oakajee. As the Minister for Resources Development has said on a number of occasions, in order to allow that to happen, a sum of money has been appropriated to conduct the feasibility study associated with the cost of the development infrastructure, which at the moment is estimated at approximately \$250m. That infrastructure takes into account a road and rail link into the Oakajee site and a deep water port development. The development would require the supply of power and water. Until one knows the precise cost of the infrastructure, it is very difficult to assess whether the Government is able to support that level of infrastructure on a single project.

Several members interjected.

Mr COWAN: Although my views about Oakajee as a future industrial site are well known, it would be churlish of me to automatically deny the development to the extent that is being proposed in that area, to the tune of between \$250m to \$300m. I do not have the necessary expertise to determine what the people of the Midwest region would say to me, notwithstanding that they support my personal views on Oakajee. The truth is they would support the development of that site given that they would receive infrastructure to the tune of \$250m to \$300m. That decision requires a lot of detailed survey and quantitative assessment. When that is received by the future Government - and I am sure it will be this Government - then on that basis a physical judgment will be made on Oakajee.

One of the aspects that has to be borne in mind - and again the Minister for Resources Development has made it very clear - is that the State has indicated to Kingstream Resources that it will give it the option of examining Oakajee on the clear understanding that, firstly, there will be no additional costs to the company other than those savings that it would make because of its relocation and, secondly, that no time will be lost.

OAKAJEE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - NATIONAL PARTY POLICY

690. Mr RIPPER to the Leader of the National Party:

As a supplementary, is the Leader of the National Party saying that the National Party is not committed 100 per cent to underwriting the \$250m-worth of infrastructure for Oakajee or is he saying that the National Party policy that was advocated before the last election has been overturned by the Government?

Mr COWAN replied:

It must be very disappointing for people in this Parliament to learn that the member for Belmont has a hearing affliction. I thought I had answered the question, but let me repeat it. There is no question that some 30 years ago the Oakajee site was chosen by bureaucracy as a site suitable to transfer iron ore from Mount Gibson ore deposit to wherever it could be exported. As a consequence of that, when the Mitchell River plateau bauxite deposits were found, it was felt that was the nearest location at which a deep water port could be sited to receive Mitchell River plateau bauxite for refining to alumina. From that time on Oakajee has been bubbling away.

I have indicated, because of the future plan for Geraldton, which shows that already residential development is planned to go within 1.5 km of the southern boundary of the Oakajee site, there will be conflicts of land use and we need to find alternatives. In other words, I have always had the view that we need to find an industrial site other than Oakajee. On this occasion I am prepared to support - just to make it clear to the Opposition - a proposal that will indicate whether it is feasible to adopt Oakajee as an industrial site based on the cost associated with locating Kingstream Resources to that site. That is a decision for the next Government of Western Australia. I am sure it will be this Government that makes this decision.

ROAD FUNDING, FEDERAL - ADDITIONAL FUNDS, NORTHERN SUBURBS

691. Mr JOHNSON to the Premier:

Can the Premier advise the House if he has been successful in securing additional funds from the Federal Government for major roads in Western Australia; in particular, funding for improving transport infrastructure in Perth's northern suburbs?

Mr COURT replied:

The Federal Government agreed to give the State an additional \$54m in its road fund allocations, of which \$14m is allocated in the current financial year. There are four lots of \$10m over the next four years. Of that money, \$25m will be spent on an extension of the Mitchell Freeway to Hodges Drive and \$15m will be spent on the Mount Keith to Wiluna road, which is part of the upgrading that is taking place in the Kalgoorlie to Meekatharra road. We believe that the State should be getting a much better deal when it comes to road funding.

Dr Gallop: Start fighting for it. You are weak.

Mr COURT: Hang on! We have just got \$54m and all the Leader of the Opposition can say is, "Start fighting for it." I am pleased with the fact that we have been able to get that additional funding to enable those works to be undertaken.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - CORPORAL PUNISHMENT, REFERENDUM

692. Mr McGINTY to the Premier:

- (1) Has Cabinet approved a referendum on the re-introduction of capital and/or corporal punishment to be held in conjunction with the forthcoming state election?
- (2) If yes, what is the question to be asked?
- (3) If no, does this mean that the Premier does not believe there is sufficient public support for his views on this matter?

Mr COURT replied:

- (1) No, the submission has not gone to Cabinet.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has asked me for an opinion. That is his judgment.

WORKPLACE SAFETY - TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

693. Mr OSBORNE to the Minister for Labour Relations:

Recently when speaking about workplace accidents, the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council asserted that "in virtually any workplace" there is "no induction training when a worker enters the workplace". What are the legal requirements for employers in this regard?

Mr KIERATH replied:

This Government has been strongly committed to workplace safety. I was very disturbed to hear the Secretary of the TLC imply that there are no safety training requirements under the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Anyone knows that, under the general provisions of part 3 of that Act, there are specific requirements for training. Section 19 says that, as far as possible, an employer must provide a safe workplace and paragraph (b) states that the employer must provide information, instruction and training in safety. The Secretary of the TLC knows that is the case. It does not matter how good one gets in workplace safety, more has to be done to make the workplace safer.

The Act is fairly clear that there are legal requirements for safety training. In any event, if the employee feels not enough is being done, he or she can make a request to his or her employer or raise the issue with a WorkSafe inspector. There are many mechanisms for addressing the issue of training.

Members of Parliament are not classed as employees and so are not covered by the legislation. If there was one place in this Chamber, other than the back of the Speaker's Gallery, that is unsafe to sit, it is the seat of the Leader of the Opposition. Someone told me that seat's new name is "the departure lounge".

LOCAL GOVERNMENT - BOUNDARIES OF DARDANUP, HARVEY, CAPEL, BUNBURY, CHANGES
PROPOSAL**694. Mr D.L. SMITH to the Minister for Local Government:**

- (1) Has the Minister made any proposal to the Local Government Advisory Board which impacts upon the boundaries of the local authorities of Dardanup, Harvey, Capel or Bunbury?
- (2) If so, what is the nature of that proposal?

- (3) Will the Minister table a copy of his proposal by the close of business today?

Mr OMODEI replied:

- (1)-(3) I understand that the member for Mitchell has been overseas and may not have seen some of the announcements made by the Minister for Local Government. The local government structural reform advisory committee came down with a report with 21 recommendations, one of which was to refer to the advisory board the assessment of the boundaries of the Cities of Stirling and Wanneroo. The assessment dealt with efficiency, effectiveness and smaller units. Another recommendation was to refer to the advisory board for assessment the regional councils - or donut councils as they are known - of the City of Geraldton, the Shire of Greenough, the Town of Northam, the Shire of Northam, the Town of Narrogin, the Shire of Narrogin, the Town of Albany and the Shire of Albany and the greater areas of Bunbury and Mandurah. That has been done.

Mr D.L. Smith: By whom?

Mr OMODEI: By me as the Minister for Local Government. I wrote to it and asked it, in accord with the structural reform advisory committee report, to report back to me on the Cities of Wanneroo and Stirling by 30 March and on the donut councils by 30 August 1997. The Minister can then accept or reject that response and make a formal proposal for boundary changes if that is in accord with the Government's wishes. Under the structure, the board has to assess and advise the Minister and the Minister can accept or reject and then put forward a formal proposal for change. There is no formal proposal until I get advice from the advisory board.

Mr D.L. Smith: Can you give me a copy of the letter.

Mr OMODEI: I do not have a copy with me. However, I will give the member a copy of the letter.
