



WESTERN AUSTRALIA

# **Parliamentary Debates**

**(HANSARD)**

THIRTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT  
FIRST SESSION  
1997

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13 May 1997

## *Legislative Assembly*

Tuesday, 13 May 1997

---

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Strickland) took the Chair at 2.00 pm, and read prayers.

### **PETITION - PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARE CONCESSIONS**

**DR GALLOP** (Victoria Park - Leader of the Opposition) [2.04 pm]: I present the following petition -

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

We the undersigned petitioners call on the State Government to reverse their increases in public transport fares, in particular the changes to concession fares and time constraints on transfers in that they will impact most severely on pensioners, the unemployed and other low income earners.

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 405 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

[See petition No 28.]

### **PETITION - GUILDERTON REGIONAL PARK**

**DR CONSTABLE** (Churchlands) [2.05 pm]: I present the following petition -

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

We, the undersigned, respectfully request that the Government establish a Regional Park immediately to the south of Guilderton in order to protect the mouth and lower reaches of the Moore River and the significant dunes and coastal heathland south of the mouth of the Moore River.

We request that the Government take urgent action to acquire this land before it is further rezoned or developed.

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 109 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 29.]

### **PETITION - TEMPORARY TEACHERS**

**MS McHALE** (Thornlie) [2.06 pm]: I present the following petition -

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

We, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia wish to register our strongest possible protest over the treatment of Temporary Teachers by the Education Department of Western Australia. Temporary Teachers have no job security and have no career structure. We believe this situation reflects badly on our State's commitment to education - especially that of children in country areas.

We hereby request that the Minister for Education urgently reviews the conditions of Temporary Teachers and the way in which Permanent Teacher status is granted.

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 10 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 30.]

**PETITION - ILLEGAL SUBSTANCES**

**MR JOHNSON** (Hillarys) [2.07 pm]: I present the following petition -

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

We, the undersigned petitioners ask that Parliament request the Government to introduce or amend legislation:

- (1) compelling lessees to disclose to lessors their intention to sell or display water pipes (commonly referred to as bongs) and other implements used for the smoking of illegal substances;
- (2) prohibiting the display or sale of literature dealing with the cultivation, manufacture or use of illegal substances;
- (3) ensuring that the merchandise or advertising of such shops is not visible to members of the public from the outside of such premises;
- (4) restricting entry to such premises to persons aged over eighteen years of age;
- (5) making it an offence for anyone to purchase or provide such equipment for or on behalf of any person under the age of eighteen;
- (6) making it an offence for any person under the age of eighteen to be in possession of such equipment.

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 736 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 31.]

**PETITION - HOSPITAL CHARGES**

**MR BROWN** (Bassendean) [2.08 pm]: I present the following petition -

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

We, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia call on the State Government to abolish the charges imposed on the parents of sick children who wish to stay with their child overnight at the Princess Margaret Hospital. We believe the charge imposed to be an unreasonable imposition on parents of young children, many of whom are on limited incomes and stressed by the medical condition of their child.

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 14 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 32.]

**STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRY***Gascoyne-Murchison Rangeland Strategy*

**MR HOUSE** (Stirling - Minister for Primary Industry) [2.14 pm]: A significant study into the Gascoyne and Murchison rangelands covering 10 local government authorities and more than 240 pastoral properties has recently been completed. The report has resulted in a landmark initiative, supported by the Government, which addresses the special commercial, environmental and social challenges which face those regions. Since the late 1980s, the local pastoral industry has suffered a severe economic downturn associated with the collapse of the reserve price scheme for wool in 1989, serious drought conditions in 1992-93, and depressed beef prices in 1995-96. It is against this backdrop that a rangeland development strategy for the Gascoyne-Murchison area was initiated by the Government, with a broad expectation that restructuring would occur to provide for sustainable pastoral use. The strategy involved the appointment of a steering group, principally comprising residents of the region, which successfully undertook extensive consultation with individuals, the community, industry and local business interests.

To achieve lasting structural adjustment, and to ensure an ongoing vibrant rural community, the report required a range of activities to be supported by both the State and Commonwealth Governments. These activities would necessitate the allocation of about \$43m of new state and commonwealth funding over the next five years. The primary commitments by the State Government include:

The acceptance of a structural adjustment package which will allow more flexible lease arrangements, will assist those leaving the industry voluntarily and will enhance the productivity of remaining leases;

support is provided for a "Rangecare" program, assistance for total grazing infrastructure, the development of new grazing technologies, an artesian bore capping program and for research and development on climate forecasting;

the development of aquaculture and horticulture is supported, as are the use of rural adjustment scheme implementation grants for non-pastoral ventures and the re-establishment of a diversification officer;

the Government also supports the establishment of a conservation reserve system which will, in conjunction with pastoralists, manage pastoral rangelands; and

support is provided for the equitable provision of services such as power, education and telecommunications.

In line with the Federal Government, the State Government has not supported those recommendations which relate to the proposal for financing the reduction of hard core debt. The relaxing of sandalwood licensing and the provision of mining royalties for specific pastoral purposes were also not supported.

The decision to vigorously pursue the majority of the report's outcome will of necessity include continued negotiation with the Federal Government on the provision of matching funds. The steering group chairman, Mr Ian Laurance, has agreed to lead the implementation group to pursue both the report outcomes and the funding negotiations. I take the opportunity to thank Mr Laurance, the steering group and the Gascoyne-Murchison community for the considerable effort that has contributed to the positive outcome.

I seek leave to table the document.

[See paper No 390.]

#### **STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRY**

##### *Natural Resource Management and the Viability of Agriculture WA*

**MR HOUSE** (Stirling - Minister for Primary Industry) [2.18 pm]: I announced in December 1995 a review into natural resource management and the interaction with agricultural activities in Western Australia. This included wide ranging consultation by a review task force, which last week presented a draft report. It is now clear that the draft report has been complemented by the actions over the last four years by Agriculture Western Australia and the whole of government regarding agricultural resource management issues and the changes implemented in that time. Importantly, Agriculture Western Australia has significantly refocused its activities to respond to client needs in this regard. More than \$40m is now directed at sustainable agricultural outcomes, ensuring that Agriculture Western Australia remains the State's lead agency in agricultural land management.

The introduction of regional and industry partnership groups and the strengthening of existing groups like the Agriculture Protection Board will also guarantee continued participation by farmers and rural communities in land conservation. This is in support of the fundamental principle that individual landholders remain responsible for managing their own land. Examples of sound land management practices already adopted include -

The general direction of agriculture is now one which fully recognises sustainable farming practices;

changes to the Rural Adjustment and Finance Corporation now ensure it promotes and supports sustainable farm management;

four agencies have signed a land clearing memorandum of understanding to implement a clear and accountable process for landholders, with similar work commenced on land drainage;

the remnant vegetation protection scheme, the state revegetation scheme and the regional enterprise scheme assist landholders to manage and protect remnant vegetation on their property;

the Government recently announced an adjustment package specifically designed to provide relief to landholders affected by tighter land clearing requirements;

a sustainable rural development committee is coordinating support to regional partnership groups and ensuring that sustainable agricultural resource management is achieved; and

the State Salinity Council and related action plan is a significant whole of government approach offering practical support to landholders and rural communities and a primary conduit for natural heritage trust funding.

As members will be aware, a large number of other natural resource management activities are also being undertaken in relation to agriculture. Examples of these include regional catchment plans such as the Blackwood and the Avon; the Gascoyne Murchison rangeland strategy; farm forestry development; the review of the chemical spraying regulations; minimum tillage and the south coast regional initiative.

Natural resource management remains a priority for this Government. The relationship between natural resource management and the viability of agriculture is also a priority. As Minister for Primary Industry, I am committed to a sustainable agricultural industry in this State and to the fundamental principle of individual landholders remaining responsible for managing their own land. The review process is now concluded and I thank the task force members for their efforts. I seek leave to table the document.

[See paper No. 391.]

### STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR HOUSING

#### *Homeswest Maintenance Program - Remote Aboriginal Communities*

**DR HAMES** (Yokine - Minister for Housing) [2.22 pm]: Mr Speaker, I wish to provide the House with some details of my recent trip to remote Aboriginal communities and to speak about several programs which are turning in outstanding performances. Over four days I visited 16 communities in the Gascoyne and Kimberley regions. Homeswest has, for some time now, been conducting a maintenance program in remote communities to upgrade housing and other facilities. The program also trains Aboriginal residents in a number of skills with the aim of handing over the management and maintenance program to the communities. The feedback we received from residents was that the program is making a big impact because it involves communities in the work and the decision making process.

Known as the management support program, this strategy has been expanded to include 20 communities throughout the State. During the trip we visited five of those communities including Bayulu, Mungullah, Tjalka Warra, Mallingbarr and Jiggalong. Under the program, a supervisor teaches Aboriginal people to maintain their communities for themselves. Each community then employs residents - up to six people - to carry out repairs, collect rent, allocate tenants to houses and pay insurances and other bills. At the end of the teaching program, communities should have the skills they need to run them without the need for expensive and extensive maintenance. The program's success has resulted in Homeswest's placing a further eight communities in the program with the expectation that more will become involved in the future. Nearly 15 000 Aboriginal people live in more than 200 remote communities in Western Australia. There are about 1 400 houses, 800 being provided through Homeswest.

Communities we visited also included those which won places in Homeswest's inaugural Clean Communities are Healthy Communities competition. The competition carried prize money of \$20 000 to be used on facilities, equipment and cultural events. The winner was Ngullagunda on the Gibb River, with Barrel Well near Geraldton running a close second. Seventeen communities entered the competition and Homeswest would like to make it an annual event.

Remote Aboriginal communities continue to be plagued with the problems which have been documented in this House before. However, my overall feeling at the end of the trip was that, armed with tools such as the management support programs and with more involvement by the communities, Aboriginal people in those areas will slowly, but surely, move forward in their quest for self-determination.

[Questions without notice taken.]

### ACTS AMENDMENT (MARINE RESERVES) BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Resumed from 15 April.

**DR EDWARDS** (Maylands) [2.59 pm]: The Opposition will support this Bill. However, I will take the opportunity to make a number of comments, and I will expand on those comments in Committee. The first item I will raise is my concern about the time taken and the processes used to get this Bill into Parliament. I will talk also about my concerns with the content of the legislation.

Prior to the 1993 election the Liberal Party promised to introduce comprehensive marine parks legislation. The Premier took the opportunity at the Liberal Party conference in July 1994 to release a strategy for conserving the marine environment. He announced the creation of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority and outlined a three tiered approach to preserving the marine environment. He also announced a total prohibition on petroleum drilling and the production of petroleum and gas in Ningaloo Marine Park. Everyone welcomed and applauded that announcement.

In July 1994 the delegates at the Liberal Party conference were told that the legislation would be in Parliament by late 1994. This Bill has taken a considerable time to reach this place. By August of that same year the then Minister for the Environment said the legislation would not be introduced until early 1995. Later in 1994 a document called "New Horizons in Marine Management" was released, which built on the statements made in July by the Minister for the Environment and the Premier and outlined again the Government's policy in this area. We were told then that the legislation would come very soon. At a briefing late in 1995 I was told that the legislation was prepared and would come into the House in the next month. I must admit that I laughed politely at the officer who gave me that information because there was no way that at that stage of 1995 we would have been able to deal with that legislation, given the other legislation banked up. In 1996 I had yet another briefing. I was told throughout 1996 that the legislation would hit Parliament any minute.

Although I welcome the fact that the legislation is before the House in 1997, I am curious why it had to be introduced in the upper House and why there was such a rush to get it through that House. It is unusual for an environment Bill to be put through the upper House first, given that the Minister for the Environment is here in the lower House. I hope the Minister will comment on that in her response. I do not accept the argument that the upper House needed this piece of work. It could have dealt with other legislation that was more appropriate.

The advance draft of this final legislation was sent to interest groups. It is of concern to me that those interest groups were particularly those involved in the exploitation, rather than the conservation, of the marine environment. It is a big oversight on the part of the Government not to send the draft legislation to conservation groups. Will the Minister confirm that there were 14 drafts of the legislation?

I turn to my concerns about the content of the legislation. In 1970 the Conservation Through Reserves Committee recommended proposals for several marine parks. There has been a long history of trying to establish marine parks and marine reserves in this State. In 1994 when the Conservation and Land Management Act was passed, statutory provision was made for the first time for marine parks. Subsequently, marine parks at Ningaloo and Marmion were declared in 1987. Special legislation was enacted and the Rottnest Island reserve was created as a marine park shortly afterwards. In 1990 there was a rash of creations of new marine parks at Shoalwater Islands, Rowley Shoals, Swan Estuary, Shark Bay, and the Hamelin Pool nature reserve.

In 1986 the previous Government was concerned that not enough work had been done about the marine environment. In that year it established a working group of scientists, academics and planning officers from government to look at the whole system of marine reserves. The report of that study is known as the Wilson report because it was chaired by Barry Wilson. The brief of that committee was to review the coast of Western Australia as a whole to identify areas that had values for conservation, scientific purposes or recreation that made those areas worthy for reservation and, in doing so, improve the representativeness of the State's marine reserves system. Based on a consideration of geographical regions and also on the distinctive coastal types, the Wilson report developed a four tiered system for the environmental management of Western Australia's coastal waters. I will outline those four tiers and point out how they are related to the tiers in this legislation.

The first tier in the Wilson report referred to the entire area of the State's territorial waters. The committee felt a tier was needed at that level because not enough care was given to what it called "the common". The committee's report said that more consideration should be given to the environmental management of the whole coast. That comment is as pertinent today as it was in 1986. The second tier it identified contained ecosystem types and reserved whole ecosystem types for management in order to protect the whole system. It cited the Ningaloo Reef area as an example. The committee said that a large area that contains a whole ecosystem must be protected to ensure that there is internal ecological integrity within that system. It also signalled that a large area was a significant area that needed more stringent protection when looking at the activity that occurred in it. This tier in the Wilson report fits most closely with marine parks as proposed in this legislation, although the emphasis is somewhat different. The first part of the Wilson report indicates that the second tier is much more concerned with conservation and exploitation. However, from reading this legislation it seems that marine parks are as much concerned about exploitation in the broader sense of the word as they are about conservation.

The third tier in the Wilson report is to create special zones for recreation, conservation and resource exploration. This correlates with the zones in this legislation. The fourth tier is marine reserves. This corresponds most closely with the marine reserves in the legislation. Marine reserves are areas protecting the high conservation value within

them. The emphasis in marine reserves is on the pristine conditions. By definition, certain activities will be precluded in those areas.

During the final half of last year I was lucky enough to have a student on a parliamentary internship who did some work on marine parks and marine legislation. I will refer to some of her work to explain what she saw as the differences between the marine system proposed in the Wilson report and that proposed in New Horizons - the latter having been taken up by the Government. The student's name was Melanie Kennaugh. I commend her for the good work she did and I commend the parliamentary internship scheme to other members of Parliament who might not yet have had the opportunity to have an intern. According to Kennaugh, the representative marine system in the Wilson report was a system of networks. The Wilson report referred to the marine environment - the commons - as the whole system. However, the committee suggested that people making decisions should be mindful about applying a basic level of protection to the whole system. Kennaugh represented that as a circle with smaller circles contained inside. Under the Wilson committee model, the representative ecosystems are inside, and overlapping inside that are special zones. There are some similarities in the proposal in the New Horizons document and the provisions in this legislation; however, there is a significant difference in that there is an unmanaged common. In the model under the Wilson report the circles are subsets of each other, whereas the model under New Horizons and in this legislation contains discrete areas not necessarily managed in an integrated way. Therefore, a holistic sense of management is lacking. The Wilson report is made up of two parts. The first describes the model I have outlined, and the second works through Western Australia's coastlines. It makes 70 recommendations about different areas about which more information or on which more research is needed, or where there is sufficient information and the areas should be reserved. The second part of the Wilson report does not take up the model contained in the first part of the report and, in a sense, it slips into the more conventional model.

I will now go through the reasons for the creation of marine reserves. First, I comment on the biological facts as they relate to marine systems. Much is not known about the marine system and the extent of knowledge is limited. What is known and the way in which marine systems are managed reflects what is known about the land. There is a tendency to apply to the ocean the system that works on the land. Last year I had a meeting with members of the Australian Institute of Marine Sciences, and I was told that many people are working in the marine environment but they do not necessarily share their knowledge with all parties. I hope the Government and the new branch within CALM will take measures to ensure all the information gathered becomes known to the public. Obviously, I recognise that there will be some commercial sensitivity, but when information is not commercially sensitive it would be good if scientists made it available so that other people did not reinvent the wheel.

The second point is that the marine environment is interconnected in a way that no other environment is. Obviously, that is because water is the primary feature of the marine environment and is the basic facet that links all the different parts. The impact of that is profound because what happens in one part of an ecosystem can affect other parts of that system, and what happens in one ecosystem can have an influence through the flow of water on another ecosystem. A couple of years ago when so many pilchards were dying, a possibility being floated was that a herpes virus had been introduced that was able to move over huge parts of the ocean influencing areas far distant from the place where the first deaths were recorded. What happens in one part of the system will affect another part, and what happens in one ecosystem may well affect another even though it is some distance away. As a consequence, marine protection areas may need to be very large to make sure, firstly, that the significant ecosystem is protected and, secondly, to make sure that adverse effects from exploitation activities in one area do not flow to another area that is supposed to be protected. Management plans must cover large areas and land management practices should not be applied to the sea. However, land management of itself is also extremely important because up to 70 per cent of pollution on the coastal strip arises from land management practices. An example of that is nutrients introduced through estuaries into the ocean. We must be mindful of what is happening on the land and also make sure the model over the oceans is the best one available, although it may not necessarily be the best model of land management.

It is generally accepted that marine areas should be preserved for two major reasons: Firstly, their representative features of existing ecosystems, of which Ningaloo is an example; and, secondly, to protect special features that require protection, of which an obvious example is the stromatolites at Hamelin Pool. I refer to comments by Dr Ballantine, a New Zealand scientist who visited Australia at the end of last year. He said that concentrating on special features may create a trap for the mind. He said we must be careful not to be seduced by the excitement of the special feature. He drew an analogy with people acquiring new cars. He said that often they are excited about the new gadgets on the car, but the important feature of the car is the engine which enables the car to take people from one place to another. He expanded on that using the strange analogy of legs and livers. He said people do not become excited about fantastic gadgets for legs and livers because they have a basic function that people cannot and do not want to change. Therefore, reserving areas because of their representative features is just as important as reserving areas for their special features. I hope that when the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority becomes active it will pay as much attention to representative features as it does to special features.

The second point on the subject of future management, is that in the marine environment effective management of small parts can benefit larger parts because of their interconnection. For example, in the Philippines certain small zones became no take areas for fishing. Those areas became sanctuaries for the fish, and ultimately the fishing take improved over a whole region. Oceans have a particular dynamic, about which more needs to be known and taken into consideration in their management. The approach to the management of the marine environment in the past has tended to be reactive. People have been keen on preventing damage to areas in which certain activity is taking place, and action has been taken to antagonise the least number of people interested in using the area. The two focuses have been to ban certain activities because an area is deemed to be precious, or to talk about sustainably managing uses for the other people involved. The problem with that reactive approach is that one cannot always anticipate what the new threats will be, and it is possible that damage being done may not be detected. It is important to adopt a proactive approach with a precautionary principle as its base. That assumes that any unnatural activity will have a detrimental effect and if people do not know, they must be cautious about their approach.

I now comment on what happens in other States of Australia and compare that with the proposals in this legislation. New South Wales is one of the most densely populated States in Australia and, therefore, it has potential for the greatest impact from the many users in the marine environment. It has numerous legislation but the legislation that has the most impact appears to be that dealing with fish habitat, whose primary aim is the protection of fish. It seems from reading on the subject that protection of the marine habitat is secondary to fish protection. However, on further research it appears that although the legislation provides for that, the policy appears to be different. At the policy level there appears to be a healthy respect for protecting endangered species. However, that process is sub-optimal and people must be clear about what they are doing. It is also clear from New South Wales that there has been a shift in focus from the need to preserve the marine environment for the maximum number of users towards considering biodiversity and what is going on. In the past it was felt that the marine environment should be preserved so that the maximum number of uses could be derived from it. Although that is not necessarily a problem per se, it reflects the reality of marine management that many people want to use the system. In incorporating multiple use in marine parks it is important to be very clear that the primary management aim of biodiversity remains. The values in the system must not be compromised.

It has often been said that Queensland has the most effective marine park legislation in Australia. In that State 90 areas have a level of comprehensive marine protection. However, in Queensland 50 pieces of legislation impact on the marine environment. Despite recent changes, it is not yet clear how that has been resolved. It appears that in Queensland marine protection has arisen as a result of other legislation almost as an after thought. That is not the best way to manage the system. That is why we welcome this legislation that sets out aims and describes the system that will manage the marine environment.

The Opposition has two concerns about the legislation, the first of which is the power afforded the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Fisheries. Both Ministers must concur at the beginning and end of the establishment of marine parks and reserves. That contrasts greatly with the fact that the Minister for Mines must notify the Minister for the Environment only about exploration leases issued over marine areas.

Our second concern is about what will actually happen in a marine park. Clearly a marine park does not have the same status as a terrestrial national park. In fact, a terrestrial national park equates more with a marine reserve. This is not well realised by the public. Down the track when the public see multiple uses occurring in marine parks we will have problems. Having said that, I am not about to give the Minister for the Environment any wise advice. Despite giving it much thought I am not sure how that situation could be best resolved. One way would be to call it something else, but the Opposition would then argue that the Minister was being intellectually dishonest. I will be interested to see the process unfold. People have strong ideas about the concept of national parks. They are clear about activities that should or should not be permitted in them. They will assume that marine parks have the same status and will react once they see some of the activities permissible in them under this legislation.

I will give some examples of marine management in the State and highlight the need for this legislation. On 22 February this year the Minister for the Environment released a management plan for the Shark Bay area. It was accompanied by a media release that highlighted some of the values of Shark Bay. The Minister stated that it was impossible to overstate the importance of the final Shark Bay marine reserves management plan. She also described how the Shark Bay world heritage area has the world's largest seagrass bank, supports one of the world's largest dugong populations and is an area where loggerhead turtles nest.

As I said, Hamelin Pool is also in that area and is one of two locations in the world containing living stromatolites. The Minister said later in her press release that, as with all good management plans, this one was not developed in isolation. Following that launch on 5 March it was revealed that last November, during the election period, exploration licences were let to three companies north of Hamelin Pool, overlapping part of the world heritage area.



It is of great concern that a management plan was released one week, the federal Minister for the Environment made a strong statement about protecting the oceans the next week and this exploration licence was issued a week later.

I referred to the Minister's comments about consultation because it appeared that the Commonwealth did not know about the exploration licence that would cover part of the world heritage area. The Federal Government played a critical role in obtaining world heritage status for Shark Bay and has a right of veto over activities in the area. Therefore it should have been notified.

Shark Bay is one of only 11 international world heritage areas which meet all four of the requirements for a natural value system. As a result, it is an extremely important area. We should therefore hold further discussions about activities that are permissible in world heritage areas and tease out the attitudes of both the community and the Government.

Similarly, during the spring of last year it became apparent that two exploration wells were proposed for near Exmouth; one on the beach of the Ningaloo Marine Park and the other about 1 kilometre inland just north east of Exmouth. The well in state waters was called Melanie 1. The Environmental Protection Authority decided that proposal did not need a formal environmental assessment.

Mrs Edwardes: Melanie 1 is not in state waters; it is in the car park which is commonwealth land.

Dr EDWARDS: I am talking about Melanie 1 which is 1 kilometre from the coast. The White Opal well is on the edge of the beach on commonwealth land. In October last year the State had received no environmental input about the exploration proposed in that area.

I raise these two points in relation to the Wilson report referred to as "The Commons". The reaction of the EPA, particularly to the Melanie 1 proposal, and the Government's attitude to the White Opal drill, persuade me that we cannot leave management of the marine environment outside this legislation and hope it will be well managed. That is why I have some support for the model referred to in the Wilson report which refers to a system of management over the whole area.

I would not support a defined system, but I support the sentiment in the report that the Environmental Protection Authority, the Department of Conservation and Land Management and other departments with an interest in the area should take greater notice of the likely environmental impact of activities in the area. I applaud the decision by the new Minister for the Environment to upgrade the level of assessment after hearing appeals on the Melanie 1 proposal. The area is extremely important.

Although the Melanie 1 drilling well is 1 kilometre from the coast, it is important to that environment. At the end of last year a report called the Karst report into management of the karst environment in that area found its way into the public arena. It pointed out that Exmouth is an extremely sensitive region and is closely connected with the waters on either side of it because of its system of limestone caves and karst environment.

Recently a letter was sent by the Conservation Council of Western Australia to the federal Minister for Administrative Services about the White Opal exploration well pointing out that a rare, deep groundwater species called *remipides lasionectes exleyi* is currently being assessed for inclusion on the federal endangered species list and that it was already registered in the IUCN Red Book and was very rare and highly sensitive to disturbance.

That highlights one of my initial points that we are unaware of many aspects of the area and when consideration is given outside of marine parks and reserves the precautionary principle should be used more than occurs now to ensure we are not ridding our environment of things we do not even know about, such as this deep groundwater species.

I will refer to what other people have said about this legislation. The Opposition received a submission from the Conservation Council of Western Australia (Inc) and has had discussions with it. It also held a meeting with the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association. It became apparent to the Opposition that there was common ground among the people who have commented on this legislation. I was sent a copy of APEA's submission in response to the Wilson report. One of the issues APEA highlighted was the need to protect marine areas and to have well defined conservation, scientific and public recreation venues. Its submission supports what has taken place. In a similar vein, the Conservation Council supports this legislation but, like APEA, has concerns about particular aspects of it.

I refer to an announcement made by the Federal and State Governments last week that eight new petroleum exploration permits were about to be issued. Again, this highlights my hope that when the environmental and other assessments are done they will be considered as part of the whole and their impact on the environment will be taken seriously.

The statement by the Minister for Mines in the other place puzzled me. He said that the state and commonwealth waters of the Ningaloo Marine Park included an extensive area of deeper offshore waters which protected the areas

of highest conservation value and sensitivity. If the Minister for the Environment has the relevant information, I hope she will be able to explain whether that statement is as reassuring as it sounds.

Having heard the statement by the Commonwealth and State Governments last week and having been given a lot of reassurance from the gas and oil industries that their practices are very safe and the potential environmental impacts are very low, I am puzzled by the reports in the media last week about the loss of thousands of litres of either petroleum products or water from Thevenard Island. It raises serious questions. It appears it is not oil because oil has not been detected from the tests. However, if it is water, it raises the question of the standard of monitoring which is taking place if so much can be lost without the company knowing where it has gone. I am sure the shareholders will not be very impressed because 14 000 litres, or whatever, is worth a lot of money.

Mrs Edwardes: Although the report will take some time, the DEP has been involved all the time. It may be nothing more than the fact that the oil has gone into another tank and the calculations have mucked up. There is no proof that any oil has leaked out of the container. It appears to be an internal problem.

Dr EDWARDS: I accept the Minister's comments and from what I have read testing of the ground water and soils has not identified any oil products. However, it brings home to me a statement that was made by Senator Robert Hill when he released the Federal Government's ocean policy a few weeks ago. He said -

Numerous reports have identified ad-hoc decision making along our coasts as being one of the major causes of environmental degradation.

In spite of the policies which indicate that the marine areas will be managed holistically, there are glitches in the system. While I accept that the Minister said that the loss of 14 000 litres, or whatever, of oil may not be serious, the issue is that on the ocean, where this activity is taking place, quite a lot happens that we are not told about. A number of years ago I visited the Department of Conservation and Land Management at Karratha and at that stage the CALM officers could visit the islands only if they could hitch a ride with the company. I know the department's resources have improved, but there must be a tight system of management so that people who do not live in those areas can be reassured that the best possible practice is in place.

A recent survey by the Australian Bureau of Statistics revealed that concern about ocean pollution is second to air pollution in this country. It is interesting that in Western Australia concern about environmental problems increased, which was counter to the national trend. While 31 per cent were concerned about air pollution and 23 per cent were concerned about ocean pollution, only 6 per cent were concerned about uranium mining and 7 per cent were concerned about land degradation and salinity. People have an awareness of the ocean. In Western Australia, with a coastline of 12 500 kilometres, people feel connected to the coast even if they live inland.

The Opposition welcomes this legislation. It is sorry it has taken so long to get into this place. The Opposition is puzzled about why it is being rushed through the Parliament prior to the change of members in the upper House and why it was debated in the upper House before it was introduced in to this place. The Opposition is disappointed about some aspects of the legislation, particularly the power which will be given to the Ministers for Mines and Fisheries. Ultimately, the Opposition will suspend its judgment because the true test of the legislation will be what happens when the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority is operating. The Opposition hopes that the authority will have suitable independence and resources to do its job properly and adequately protect the ocean for all Western Australians.

**MR McGINTY** (Fremantle) [3.36 pm]: I support the observations made by the member for Maylands in addressing the Labor Party's position on this Bill. It is unfortunate that this House is debating this Bill, which deals with the very important question of marine reserves, at a time when the Government's record in this field is less than exemplary. The highest recognition that environment and heritage bodies throughout the world can bestow on any area is World Heritage listing. I am concerned at the way in which this Government has treated the only World Heritage listed area in Western Australia; that is, Shark Bay.

Shark Bay was given World Heritage listing in 1990 and at that time it was seen as truly the jewel in this State's environment and heritage areas. It remains the only area in Western Australia which has been granted World Heritage listing and it is remarkable that it satisfies all four natural heritage criteria which can lead to the granting of World Heritage listing. It is one of only 11 places in the world that has received that level of recognition and, as such, an enormous obligation is placed on the Western Australian Government to move to ensure the highest possible level of protection for Shark Bay. Of course, that has not occurred. In March this year we saw a series of headlines in the Press ranging from, "Shark Bay bid shocks expert", "Sea life needs more room", "Shark Bay wins reprieve", "Shark Bay exploration not on: Hill", "Premier defends action", and "Federal fears for Shark Bay". Throughout March, most people who have over the years come to know and appreciate the great environmental values of the Shark Bay World Heritage listed area were shocked to find that this Government had granted oil exploration permits

over part of that area. If that is the Government's view on how the new marine parks authority will operate - that is, a significant diminution of the environmental value placed on the State's marine national parks and World Heritage listed areas - the Opposition does not hold out great hope that the framework which is being established by this legislation will achieve the standards of excellence in environmental protection that the people of this State have every right to expect, especially in an area which has received the highest possible recognition by the world authority on environment and heritage; that is, a World Heritage listing.

It is interesting to compare this Government's action in respect of Shark Bay with the action it took at Ningaloo. I have been to both areas. I have enjoyed the marine environment values of both areas, and I place enormous store on the retention of the environment and heritage values at both Ningaloo Reef and Shark Bay. The Government has adopted a remarkable double standard: It has said that oil exploration will not be allowed in Ningaloo Marine Park - it has national park status, but somewhat less than the World Heritage listed status of Shark Bay - but will be allowed in the World Heritage listed areas of Shark Bay. That is inconsistent. It is no doubt a sign that the Government lacks the necessary principal commitment to protecting those jewels in our marine environment, but is prepared to act politically if lobby groups place enough pressure on it to act in a particular way.

There is a hierarchy in the conservation areas in our marine environment. The highest recognition is given to Shark Bay, where oil exploration is now allowed; the second highest to marine nature reserves; and the third highest to marine national parks. Yet the Government's policy of total exclusion of oil exploration in a marine national park, which is only third in the hierarchy of recognition, has been extended to conservation areas. In the most important, most pristine and most internationally recognised area, this Government is prepared to allow oil exploration to continue. That is a remarkable state of affairs.

Some people might say that this matter was debated in March and it is now a dead issue. It is not. As long as those exploration licences persist and as long as the threat of drilling, whether it be trial drilling or other work taking place in the bay, remains those in the community who are environmentally minded will continue to complain about it. The Government says that the approval for exploration does not carry with it the approval for exploitation of the significant resource if it is found. We all know that is a nonsense, that this Government will authorise oil extraction from the Shark Bay World Heritage area if a viable resource is found there. Otherwise, why would it give someone the right to explore? The exploration licence is a precursor of an indication that the resources which might be found will be exploited. We cannot allow our World Heritage listed area at Shark Bay to be subject to the threats which oil exploitation in that area would propose to the sea grass, the dugongs, to the snapper fishery - to all the other great environment values that the Shark Bay area possesses.

The exploration permit should never have been granted in respect of this World Heritage listed area. It was, and not only for the World Heritage listed area but also for part of the marine national park, particularly that which runs up the coast between Shark Bay and Carnarvon where there are some very important mangrove and other areas which have been included for strong scientific reasons. This area, which is not only World Heritage listed but also state environmentally listed as a marine national park, is subject to the petroleum exploration permit that was granted during the last state election campaign.

Shark Bay is a unique area. The introduction to the management plan for the Shark Bay marine reserves which the Government released recently recognised that Shark Bay was granted World Heritage listing because it satisfied all four natural heritage criteria: Firstly, the area contains outstanding examples representing the major stages of earth's evolutionary history; secondly, it contains outstanding examples representing significant ongoing geological processes, biological evolution and human interaction with the natural environment; thirdly, it contains certain unique, rare or superlative natural phenomena, formations or features of exceptional natural beauty; and, fourthly, it contains the most important and significant habitats where threatened species of plants and animals of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science and conservation still survive.

Let us look at those four bases upon which World Heritage listing was granted to this area in 1991, having been nominated in 1990. I am almost speechless in trying to express the sense of disappointment I feel when I see the Government granting an exploration licence and then, inevitably, if a viable resource is found, the exploitation licence to develop that resource. It is an extremely important area. The decision to pursue World Heritage listing by the previous Labor Government was the correct one. It encountered some local hostility at the time, but it is crucially important that leadership be shown by the Government of the day in pursuing the environmental protection of these regions. It is a great shame that the decision was made to grant the petroleum exploration permit over part of this World Heritage listed area.

If that is the approach the Government takes to the new authority created by this legislation, which is designed to regulate activities within these important conservation areas affecting our marine environment, I do not hold out great hope that these very sensitive areas will be properly protected. I say that against a background of not one new national park being created in Western Australia in the first four years of this Government. This is the first

Government in my memory that has not created a single national park during its tenure in office. We must add to that the threat that is now posed to the jewel in the crown - the Shark Bay World Heritage listed area. We cannot gain any sense of confidence that this Government will do the right thing by our fragile marine environment and effect the protection that it desperately needs and deserves.

As the shadow Minister for the Environment has already said, the Labor Party will strongly support the establishment of a regulatory body with statutory functions to protect and enhance our marine environment; however, we are concerned about a particular component of the proposal. For many years Western Australia has operated on the basis that environmental protection legislation is paramount. In other words, when we have looked at the mining industry, the petroleum industry and other exploitative industries - I use that in a purely descriptive sense - we have always considered our environmental protection legislation to be paramount. It is a statement from the Parliament about the importance of the environment. On this occasion we are dealing exclusively with the marine environment. The legislation subjects the interests of the environment to competing interests. The Bill states at page 11 -

... in the event of any other conflict or inconsistency between the purpose referred to in subsection (1) and a provision of, or an activity authorized by, the *Fish Resources Management Act 1996* that relates to aquaculture or to commercial or recreational fishing, the latter prevails.

It then states further on -

... in the event of any other conflict or inconsistency between the purpose referred to in subsection (1) and a provision of, or an activity authorized by, the *Pearling Act 1990* that relates to pearling activity, the latter prevails.

Throughout this legislation, which establishes a regulatory framework for the creation and regulation of marine national parks, marine reserves and the like, we see that those areas, and the provisions of the Acts that give power to regulate those areas in the interests of the environment, are at all times subject to competing interests. That is the reverse of the way these things have traditionally been regulated. We have always spoken about the primacy of environmental protection, and this legislation takes an unfortunate step back when it spells out that environmental considerations will be secondary. If one needed a clearer statement of violation of that principle, one need only look at the provisions of the legislation relating to the declaration of a marine park. Three Ministers may well have an interest in the declaration of that marine park. They include the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Fisheries, and the Minister for Mines in that sense would be the Minister responsible for the operation of the Petroleum Act.

A marine park cannot be declared unless it has the approval of both the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Fisheries. The Opposition appreciates that because of the way these things are done, a declaration of a terrestrial national park or a marine national park would normally be the subject of cabinet deliberations and a cabinet decision. But written into this legislation is a right of veto of the commercial Minister over the environment Minister in such a way as would prevent the creation of a marine park where it was thought to be environmentally defensible, justifiable or necessary to do so. In other words, a marine park cannot be created for environmental reasons only. But that is why these parks or reserve areas are created; that is, to protect their environmental value.

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

Page 9 of the Bill refers to marine nature reserves, which is the highest recognition given to areas set aside for conservation reserves and which is akin to terrestrial nature reserves; that is, specifically to look after the environmental interests of an area because of its uniqueness and peculiarity. It states at proposed section 13A of the Conservation and Land Management Act:

- (1) The reservation of a marine nature reserve shall be for -
  - (a) conservation and restoration of the natural environment;
  - (b) the protection, care and study of indigenous flora and fauna; and
  - (c) the preservation of any feature of archeological, historic or scientific interest.

Although this legislation provides that aquaculture, commercial fishing, recreation fishing and pearling activity shall not be carried out in a marine nature reserve, interestingly, it provides for certain oil exploration to take place in an area which is regarded as the most important environmentally sensitive area along our coastline, warranting the highest level of environmental classification and protection. I ask members to consider what I have been saying about Shark Bay. The decision of the Government to allow oil exploration in that area is a precursor for oil exploitation - that is, the extraction of oil from the World Heritage listed area - and this legislation provides for that to occur in all of the most environmentally sensitive parts of the State.

Proposed new subsection 13A(3) at page 10 of the Bill states -

Despite section 4(1) but subject to section 13E, exploratory drilling for, or production of, petroleum under the *Petroleum Act 1967* or the *Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act 1982* shall not be carried out in a marine nature reserve.

What is important is what that section accepts, in the sense of it being subject to section 13E, not what it does not say. It clearly envisages low intrusive levels of such things as seismic exploration in the search for oil in marine nature reserves. I would be far happier if exploration activity were not permitted in a marine nature reserve, because exploration activity is only ever done for the one purpose of exploiting that resource. Reserves are created to protect threatened species. What exists in marine nature reserves is precious. They are important areas not only for us but also for future generations, and seismic testing for oil is incompatible with such areas and would lead to significant ongoing problems.

I am also concerned that the watering down of environmental standards will affect marine environments elsewhere. The categorisation of areas to protect marine reserves makes sense. A graduated system is akin to what is available in the terrestrial environment, which includes state forests, national parks and, most importantly, nature reserves. That same rough format is being set up in the case of the marine environment, but instead the legislation will allow more commercial exploitation than would be expected in terrestrial conservation areas.

My concern about this Bill is based on two things: First, the bona fides of the Government and its failure to create a single national park during its first term in office, and, second, what has been done to Shark Bay. If one is serious about protecting the marine environment, one must start by protecting the valuable jewels in the crown. No-one is saying Ningaloo is not an important area, but it has not been recognised by the scientific, environment and heritage communities as warranting the same high level of classification as Shark Bay, yet we are allowing oil exploration in the Shark Bay World Heritage listed area and excluding it from Ningaloo. I simply ask the question: Why? If the Government's policy in these matters were to be a political knee jerk policy rather than a logical policy, let it say so. Let it say, "We will protect Ningaloo because that is what the public wants, but we will not protect Shark Bay, although according to the scientific, heritage and environment communities, it warrants a higher level of protection!"

For those reasons - the Government's failure to create new national parks, and its inconsistent or illogical action with regard to Ningaloo and Shark Bay by granting oil exploration permits in one area but not the other, although arguably the lesser of the two - we cannot have an enormous degree of confidence that this legislation will establish a framework to regulate our marine reserves for the benefit of future Western Australians. It will take a change of government before the protection that should be afforded to our Western Australian marine reserves is afforded to them.

In my view - others might disagree - these areas are too precious to jeopardise. They should be given strong legislative protection, and this legislation fails in a number of important respects to grant that protection. Nonetheless, the Labor Party will support this legislation, because it does at least establish a regulatory framework, although in many respects we wish it would do more for the environment than it will do.

**MR GRILL** (Eyre) [4.00 pm]: As the member for Maylands indicated, the Opposition supports the Acts Amendment (Marine Reserves) Bill, although obviously with some criticisms. I am a little less critical of the legislation than are some of my colleagues, as I will explain later.

The Minister's second reading speech states that the strategy behind this legislation emerged from the document entitled "New Horizons in Marine Management". That was a glossy put out by the Government in November 1994 to outline its policy with regard to marine parks. That glossy made a number of fairly high-flying statements about what the Government would and would not do, and it all sounded very good. That document appeared to draw some of its inspiration from a document which had been released some time earlier and had been commissioned by the previous Government. That document was entitled "A Representative Marine Reserves System for Western Australia", and was the report of a committee headed by Barry Wilson, who was at that time second in charge of the Department of Conservation and Land Management. That report was very extensive. The Government has taken up some elements of that report and rejected or not adopted other elements.

The second reading speech states that the first object of this legislation is to provide clear access guidelines to commercial interests in marine conservation areas. Those interests include people who are interested in petroleum exploration and undersea mining, and commercial and recreational fisheries. The second objective is to remove uncertainty for those commercial interests. Those two heads of interest seem to merge to some degree; I am not sure of the difference between the two. The third objective is to minimise the potential for conflict between conservation interests on the one hand, and resource development and mining interests on the other hand.

All of the speakers on this side have made the point, and I suspect other members will make the point, that the Government has been rather slow in bringing forward this legislation. I suspect that, despite some of the high flying language of the new horizons document, the Government has had considerable difficulties in framing this legislation, in accommodating the different interest groups, and in gaining approval from selected and important interest groups.

The interest groups to which I have spoken, which have been mainly on the resource development side, because they approached me as the Opposition spokesman for resources development, believe that this Bill is probably worth supporting, but only tentatively. They have a number of misgivings about it, and they would like to see how it operates before giving it their full support. In reality, some of those resource development interests would rather that this Bill did not go ahead, but they have been press-ganged, by one means or another, into formal support of the legislation, and we have been informed that they certainly do not want to see this Bill defeated.

It is generally agreed that this legislation will provide clearer access guidelines and greater certainly for commercial interests with regard to their activities within marine conservation areas, and it is hoped that this will minimise the potential conflict between conservation and resource management and development. However, the real debate is about where the balance should be struck. The two previous opposition speakers have indicated that they believe this legislation strikes the balance too much in favour of the commercial fishermen and petroleum interests. I do not know whether that is true, but that view certainly exists; it has been expressed in the second reading debate, and it has also been expressed by the Conservation Council of Western Australia. I suspect that only time will tell. I do not know whether this legislation will be durable, because it certainly is a compromise between competing interests, and those sorts of compromises work only where there is goodwill on all sides and fair-handedness in the management of the legislation and the regulations. If there is not fair-handedness in the management of the legislation and the regulations, it probably will not be durable and will be superseded fairly quickly.

This Bill sets up a new vesting authority - the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority. One of the roles of that authority will be to develop policy in respect of marine conservation areas, and the Minister needs to explain how much of that role it will have. It will also have a role in the management and oversight of the areas which will be created and come within its jurisdiction. It will certainly have a role in advising the Minister but the Minister need not accept that advice. Certain restrictions are placed on the Minister, although they are not great. It will have a role in creating new marine conservation areas, therefore it will have a wide role to play, but I am not sure to what extent it will have authority.

Concomitant with the creation of the new vesting authority, a Marine Parks and Reserves Scientific Advisory Committee will be established. Everyone welcomes the creation of that body which will advise the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority which will, in turn, advise the Minister on a range of matters set out in the legislation.

Perhaps the Minister for the Environment can answer my concerns when she responds to the second reading debate, but if not then, in Committee. Where will the interface occur between the Department of Conservation and Land Management and the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority? The Minister's second reading speech indicates that the new authority will play a role in policy development. I presume that the Minister and CALM will also have a role in policy development. It will be very difficult to justify where the interface will be. What budget allocation will be made for the new authority? Of course, finance will need to be made available for the Marine Parks and Reserves Scientific Advisory Committee, but what other support will be offered to the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority? What hands on role will it play in the management of those areas? Will that function be carried out primarily by CALM or will the new authority have primacy? I would like to know more about that interface and how it will operate within a budget. Will the major part of the budget be allocated to CALM or to the new authority?

The Bill also creates a new class of conservation and marine conservation area. It will set in place a system of checks and balances for the creation of new marine reserves and their management. The system of marine conservation areas - to use the generic term - will be a hierarchy with marine nature reserves at the top, marine parks in the middle, and marine management areas at the bottom. At the apex of the hierarchy the marine nature reserves will be completely exempt from oil exploration, at least for the first 200 metres - but only in respect of new activity, as I understand it. Any rights and obligations for any petroleum exploration or production that have already been undertaken in a marine nature reserve will continue. Of course, the 200 metre limit will allow directional drilling if petroleum exploration takes place under a marine nature reserve.

Marine parks and marine management areas will have multiple use. A further subset of the hierarchy has been set up: In marine parks and marine management areas there will be sanctuary areas, recreation areas, special purpose areas and general use areas. If a sanctuary area is created within a marine park its status will be similar to a marine nature reserve: There will be no mining or drilling except under 200 metres and there will not be any commercial activities, including fishing. However, in respect of at least the special purpose and general use areas, those activities will be allowed. Which Minister is responsible for this Bill?

Mr House: It has a lot to do with the industry for which I am responsible; so both Ministers have a lot to do with it.

Mr GRILL: I understand that there was a suggestion that this should be a concurrent debate.

Mr House: I suggested that there should be, but the leader of opposition business did not accept that, I understand because you wanted to be lead speaker on the other Bill. We are happy with that.

Mr GRILL: I am not sure whether that was the reason. That might have been the attitude -

Mr House interjected.

Mr GRILL: I note a framework of permissible and non-permissible activities within the hierarchy of marine conservation reserves or areas. It is not an uncomplicated framework nor is it an uncomplicated hierarchy. I have tried to summarise them quickly, and I hope that I have it right.

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

Mr GRILL: The contentious area of the legislation is the role of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority. For instance, the second reading speech indicates that the role of the authority would be very much curtailed, such as in the area of fish management policy. The speech states -

The Marine Parks and Reserves Authority will not extend to the development of policies which review or otherwise seek to affect fisheries management.

The legislation indicates a number of areas where the activities of the authority and of the Minister for the Environment would be very much curtailed or vetoed in some cases by the Ministers for Mines and Fisheries. In a number of cases in the legislation a veto could be exercised by both Ministers. I presume the assumption is that those Ministers and ministries would act as gladiators on behalf of the commercial interests that are represented under their authority. That might work well, but it might not. As I said earlier, time alone will tell. An example of that is the notice of intent to create a new marine reserve. The Ministers for Fisheries and Mines must concur before that process can get off the ground. If they do not concur with the issuing of a notice of intent to create a marine nature reserve, it cannot proceed. That is an example of the checks and balances that have been built into management. It appears that not one Minister, not one department, not one commercial interest, and not one conservation interest will have primacy of authority under this legislation.

The Bill provides a range of checks and balances. Only time will tell how well they work. Other areas on which the Bill will impact are fisheries, aquaculture and pearling. The Minister for Fisheries has the power of veto where any of those existing activities will be affected. Where he concurs that those activities may be affected a notice of intent will proceed and a reserve will be created, but only on the basis that compensation will be paid. That will create an interesting situation. As we well know, compensation does not apply terrestrially. It should apply on farming properties throughout Western Australia. Where a farmer has conserved an area of bush or forest which the Government feels should not be bulldozed or destroyed he should be compensated. It is a recompense provided for in this Bill obviously for commercial fishing activity. In that sense the legislation breaks new ground.

As the Bill clearly provides, it is interesting that the Environmental Protection Act will not be precluded by any of this legislation. I doubt that anyone will be critical of that; certainly neither the conservation nor the resource development interests to whom I have spoken, will be.

Built into the legislation is security for existing petroleum rights even where the highest category of marine reserve is created. If rights exist where a marine nature reserve is created those rights will remain. This legislation contains a range of checks and balances and situations where Ministers can veto actions of other Ministers. That will apply not only to the Minister for Mines or the Minister for Fisheries in being able to veto activity by the Minister for the Environment, but also to the Minister for Mines who would require the concurrence of both those Ministers before he were able to create a new exploration tenement within a marine nature reserve. Where a tenement is sought for mining production in a marine nature reserve or a marine park it will be necessary for both Houses of Parliament to concur, therefore the checks and balances extend to Parliament in relation to these marine reserves.

The conservation, fisheries, mining, petroleum, recreation and tourism interests are affected by this legislation. Not mentioned in the Bill or the second reading speech is the Aboriginal interests. However, they will be protected because Aboriginal people have special rights to fish and hunt animals under not only the federal Native Title Act but also other legislation.

Fisheries interests can be broken into commercial and recreational interests which are often in conflict. As the Minister for Primary Industry well knows bitter wrangling often occurs between them over certain stocks of fish.

The Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association, which had some trepidation about this legislation, approached the Opposition. I referred earlier to some of its misgivings. Nonetheless, it is prepared to accept the Bill as it stands. It goes on to say, however, that within this legislation and the regulations is the potential for a Government to preclude petroleum exploration from the whole hierarchy of marine reserves, depending on how the regulations are used and how the management plans or policies are implemented. The Minister might wish to comment on that later. That allegation by APPEA was made in writing - not exactly in those words but that was the essence of its meaning. The Government could reply by saying that there are many competing interests and the various checks and balances within the Bill will prevent that situation from arising.

The representatives of the petroleum industry have provided us with some notes on their activities. They say they have a fine record of contributing towards the state and national coffers and of conservation activities. They point out that, for instance, the petroleum industry has become Australia's and Western Australia's most valuable resource. They refer to national production of \$8b per annum of petroleum resources and in excess of \$4b of production in Western Australia alone. They indicate that the Carnarvon basin off the North West Shelf is the largest petroleum producing basin in Australia containing approximately 58 per cent of the nation's demonstrated oil resources and 74 per cent of its demonstrated gas reserves. They also indicate that the oil and gas industry pays the largest share of mineral royalties - approximately 35 per cent of mineral royalties in this State or about \$160m based on 1995-96 figures. The representatives of APPEA claim their industry is contributing large amounts of money to the state and federal coffers. They also point to the contributions their industry makes to the balance of payments and state -

Currently the net balance of trade benefit exceeds \$4 billion per annum.

Having said that they go on to point out that their industry makes a very small contribution towards the pollution by means of petroleum spillage to the seas around our coast. They state -

Globally, the exploration and production industry is responsible for less than 2% of all oil entering the marine environment.

They then point to other polluters and claim that municipal and industrial run-off comprises 30 per cent, atmospheric fallout accounts for 9 per cent - which was a surprise to me, but I have no reason to doubt their figures - and natural seepage accounts for 8 per cent. They point to seepage that goes on naturally in Joseph Bonaparte Gulf and other places. They indicate that tanker operations account for 22 per cent and tanker accidents about 13 per cent.

They also boast that Australia's petroleum exploration has spilt only approximately 800 barrels of oil over 30 years' operation. I do not know whether that figure is correct; it is a 1994 figure apparently arrived at after scientific research. That seems a very small amount and I imagine the conservation movement will dispute it. The fact that the industry can say that with some degree of credibility indicates what a small contribution the petroleum exploration industry is making to the pollution of this State's coastline. The industry also points out, and I think there is some truth in this, that it has co-existed with the marine environment, including some of its more sensitive parts, in Western Australia for something like 30 years without causing significant pollution. The industry points to the water surrounding the Monte Bello Islands, the Lowendale Group and Barrow Island. It is something of which it can be quite proud.

The Opposition supports the legislation. It feels it can be improved in some areas. It is a matter of testing the water and seeing how it works over the forthcoming years. I wish the Government luck with the legislation. It is a very delicate balancing act and I hope it comes off.

**MR PENDAL** (South Perth) [4.31 pm]: Like other members I welcome the Bill before the House and I congratulate the Government for introducing it. It has been a long time in coming and for this Government it had its genesis in the coalition's environment policy which was announced in January 1993. I will make a couple of references to that before I move to my remarks. I refer members to item 12 in that policy document which, under the heading "Marine Parks", reads -

A system of Marine Reserves will give recognition and protection to significant and important marine ecosystems around W.A. Marine Parks are managed to provide multi-use activities consistent with the conservation of the area.

These activities may include commercial and recreational fishing and tourism as well as passive recreation activities, scientific study and hydro-carbon development.

The policy went on to say a number of things and ended with a series of dot points. It said -

Accordingly, our Government will -



- Seek views on the prospects for creating a new Marine Parks Authority to administer all marine parks and marine nature reserves.  
The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority will be used as the model for the West Australian scheme;
- Give appropriate representation to user groups and conservationists; and
- Produce management plans to provide for zoning to achieve multiple-use while ensuring that the conservation values of the areas are protected.

As a broad statement of intent, the then Opposition had it right.

Mr Grill interjected.

Mr PENDAL: I am far too modest to say that. The policy was right and the Bill, although it has taken three or four years to get here, also gets it right. Even the Government's critics say that the Government, in trying to protect offshore environmental assets in a similar way to the way it protects onshore environmental assets, has probably got it 70 or 80 per cent right. When the Government's toughest critics are saying that, I suppose the Government has every reason to feel satisfied.

Mr House: At the time you were the opposition spokesman and you were instrumental in, and the catalyst for, developing that policy which was of great benefit to the coalition parties in the 1993 election. You can take some credit for it.

Mr PENDAL: I am happy to hear the Minister say that. When he started his interjection I got a bit defensive and I thought about the story of Greek gods bearing gifts.

Several members interjected.

Mr PENDAL: There is no truth that overtures are being made by the National Party. I am very happy where I am.

Mr House: You did not look happy in question time today.

Mr PENDAL: I did not look unhappy! Other people were doing the hard work. I was as happy as Larry and I advise the House that we ain't seen nothing yet. The Minister for Lands is certainly not doing what the Minister for Primary Industry is doing - that is, attending to House duties. I think the other Minister is outside preparing for an onslaught and he will not know what has hit him when it finally does. That has nothing to do with the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I agree and the member should direct his remarks to the Bill before the House.

Mr PENDAL: In a debate like this we should go back to square one. For example, the Government has a Bill before the House which, as I explained, its harshest critics believe it has probably got 70 to 80 per cent right. Perhaps that is still the wrong way to look at a bit of legislation that aims to protect a resource which, if it degenerates, will never be restored to this State.

I put to members that the emphasis in this Bill, as is the case in a lot of other legislation that goes through the House, is on how the State exploits its natural resources, which are always spoken about in terms of minerals and metals, wheat, wool and other things of that kind. Very rarely are the State's assets talked about in terms of what it has ecologically, whether it is onshore or offshore. The reason I say that is that members do not often enough put their mind to the problem of how much the State accommodates gas, oil and mining, and exploration for all those things, which are resources which might last for 30 or 40 years. Long after those resources are pulled out of the ground or sucked out of the centre of the earth this State will still be battling with how it correctly husbands the resources such as the environment. I do not think this or any other Bill introduced by this or past Governments reflects that long term concern. Members get bogged down in a fair bit of detail, and I suggest they will get bogged down in the Committee stage of this debate, when they talk about the rights of explorers and the people, whether they be miners or oil and gas producers. However, we are building into the equation a huge amount of protection for them which will disappear at the end of 30 or 40 years because the resource will have gone. An onshore resource will be gone quicker than an oil or gas resource but, for all of that, it will not last anywhere near as long as the resource on which members should be focusing all their intention. That is the reason the Government has done the wrong thing by giving so much attention in this Bill to the supremacy of the Mining Act over the Conservation and Land Management Act. If I am wrong, I am sure someone will correct me.

Notwithstanding the very valuable resources of oil, gas, minerals and metals that are looked after in another Statute, we should be legislating in this Statute to give marine reserves maximum protection, and then we will draw back in order to give some comfort to the miners and the oil and gas producers.

Mr Riebeling: And the fishing industry.

Mr PENDAL: Yes, and the fishing industry; I would put the fishing industry in the category of the producers - the miners. Like most people in this House, I know that all of those producers are very important to the State. However, it seems that when we are starting afresh with a Bill as important as this - the Minister deserves great credit for bringing it in so early in her period as Minister - it is a pity that we must begin by compromising our offshore environmental assets by a very protective set of circumstances for those producers. That is not even getting into the complexity of the processes that are outlined in this Bill. It is to some of those things that I will address myself. However, before I leave the point, I remind members that only five or six years ago this Parliament grappled with what we should do with the coal reserves at Mt Lesueur. At the time that seemed to be crucial to the very existence of Western Australia. The Parliament had to make a decision about whether to allow Mt Lesueur to be developed, and it decided not to allow development. I do not know what is its current status; but nothing has happened. It is interesting that the sun still comes up in the morning and goes down at night and we still have access to energy and electricity, notwithstanding that at the time we were being pressured into believing that, unless we did something about reserves like Mt Lesueur, the State would head back to cave-dwelling days! That is what I mean when I say that the mining and production imperative, as important as it is, should not be allowed to dominate our thinking as much as it has in the Bill that is currently before the House.

What is lacking in the Bill are those provisions that exist under the Conservation and Land Management Act about what eventually comes back to Parliament for decision. I am willing to admit I am a bit confused, because a number of references in the Bill might otherwise lead one to believe that Parliament's role in this has been preserved. For the benefit of members, I will go over what we do about the protection of on-land or terrestrial national parks and nature reserves. I am not sure, having explained that, that we are doing the same with our offshore assets. Anyone who wants to explore in an on-land nature reserve or a national park must get the permission of the Minister for Mines and the Minister for the Environment. Someone, however, who wants to mine in a nature reserve or a national park must get both Houses of Parliament to agree to that mining, or oil or gas production. That seems to be eminently fair; it is fair to the producers or the explorers and it is fair to the conservationists. Most importantly, it is fair to the overall bulk of the Western Australian people, because even if the Parliament gets it wrong, in the end the Parliament still made the decision; that is, the Parliament allows it in the full knowledge that it will attract public odium for allowing it if it is the wrong decision. I am not sure, however, that that will happen under this Bill so far as offshore parks are concerned.

When the Minister responds, I want her to carefully explain to me the comparison that I am now trying to make between on and offshore exploitation of mineral or oil or gas reserves. For example, I understand that it is possible to make a comparison between an on-shore nature reserve, which is at the top of the pile ecologically, and a marine reserve with which we are dealing in this Bill. I am told that only one marine reserve is in mind or in place; that is, Hamelin Pool. From then on, apparently the comparisons become a little more difficult. For example, one cannot compare the marine parks to which we are referring in this Bill with national parks on-shore. If I am wrong about that I hope the Minister will explain that to me, because the amendment that I will move, unless I am satisfied about that, may attract a fair bit of debate in the Committee stage. I intend to move a catch-all clause as an amendment that will demand that no production licences for oil, gas or mineral extracts will be issued for any of our offshore areas, unless they come to Parliament for not only debate but also approval. Just as no-one seeks to do that with C class reserves, roadside verges or other lesser conservation reserves onshore, I am not seeking to do it for all of the conservation estate offshore.

Mr Grill: To which part are you referring?

Mr PENDAL: I want a very clear definition about those areas offshore, which must come to the Parliament for approval before an oil or gas production licence is issued. It may be clear to the member for Eyre which of those will come to Parliament, but it is not to me. For example, proposed section 24A(4) of the Bill states -

No mining lease or general purpose lease shall be granted in respect of any marine nature reserve or marine park unless both Houses of Parliament by resolution consent to the grant, and then only on such terms . . .

On the surface that appears to answer my concerns. However, I am not sure that it does; therefore I will seek from the Minister an assurance, even if it means my moving my amendment in order to discuss it.

Mr Grill: You will not move an amendment as long as you get a proper assurance from the Minister?

Mr PENDAL: It will depend on the form in which I get the assurance. Being an experienced member, the member knows that we are often given assurances in the second reading speech that are not worth a lot. If it means that I must move my amendment, even though it will probably be defeated, I will do so, even if it achieves nothing more than

a succinct explanation from the Government about which offshore areas will be subjected to parliamentary scrutiny in the event that someone seeks to extract oil or gas. I repeat that it may well be clear to other members but it is not clear to me. For that reason I probably will move my amendment.

Mr House: Which clause did you say it was?

Mr PENDAL: It is proposed section 24A(4) on page 51. It may well give the assurances that I am looking for but I am not sure that it does. For all that, we are making a giant leap forward in the Parliament this month by dealing with a Bill that has been absent from the legislative landscape for all of our history; that is, a Bill to protect our offshore assets. I repeat a point I made earlier: I hope those assets will be here in 1 000 years from now, still attracting tourists, scientists and students from around the world and still being enjoyed by the people of Western Australia, long after all the gas, oil, minerals and metals have been extracted and perhaps forgotten about by most Western Australians. I support the Bill.

**MR RIEBELING** (Burrup) [4.52 pm]: We on this side of the House support this legislation. As far as my electorate is concerned, it is hoped that the clauses of this new Bill may contain a solution to some of the problems being experienced, especially in the Dampier Archipelago, of which the Minister for Fisheries is well aware. The problems have been generated by the activities of the fishing, pearling, aquaculture and professional crayfishing industries. I hope that the series of reserves and marine parks proposed in this legislation will enable the departments to come up with a workable solution to the problems created by the expansion of various commercial fishing activities within my electorate. However, in saying that is the hope, I reiterate to the House and to the Minister my area's concern about what has occurred in the past couple of years with the expansion of the pearling, fishing and trawling industries and the commercial taking of crayfish, which I understand will be able to be allowed or disallowed in the new types of reserves and parks that are likely to be set up.

The Bill attempts to set up a structure that can be worked with the community so that the multiple use of facilities is possible under various classifications of marine parks, nature reserves, recreational areas and the like. However, one of the big problems with which we are faced in my area has been that the general community rightly or wrongly believes insufficient consultation has taken place with them about what is occurring in an area so vital for the recreational needs of probably the most productive area in the State. Even though we have no gold, everything else comes out of my electorate.

One of the great problems, especially with the expansion of pearling and aquaculture leases that occurred 18 months to two years ago, was that virtually no consultation occurred. I am worried about the vesting authorities that are to be set up under this legislation. Local people are suspicious of Fisheries Department bias towards the development of the fishing industry, which is understandable as it is in the business of managing fisheries, because local people and the professional fishing bodies are competing for the same ground and quite often for the same resource. With trawling it is exactly the same resource; with pearling and aquaculture, competition is for the space the operations occupy. I see no assurance in this legislation that the make-up of the vesting authority will change that perception. The suspicions of local people may be greater. If we look at who will be part of the process, we see there will be seven members appointed for their knowledge, experience and interest rather than their representation of organisations or interest groups. I note that the Minister for Fisheries has the ability to nominate two members to the authority. Nowhere in this legislation do I see the genuine community input to the process which everyone in my area hoped for. Like the member for Eyre and the member for South Perth, I hope that those fears can be quickly dispelled by whatever is put in place.

Mr House: Many of the points the member has made are valid. One of my points about this legislation is not the process of the legislation per se but the process that will be developed as a consequence of the legislation. As the Minister for Fisheries and also someone who represents a coastal area with a lot of recreational and professional fishermen, I agree that the integrity of the process is really important. If it is not right, what you have alluded to will be a fact; that is, that uncertainty and unhappiness will continue to bubble. We must be very careful to get it absolutely right.

Mr RIEBELING: I am pleased that the Minister has interjected in that manner. As the Minister will know, when the legislation comes into effect the initial reaction from recreational fishers in my area will be that they have been sold out to some extent. The challenge is whether, in the process of putting in place a park system, we can come to an acceptable solution.

Mr House: Frankly, the process will do that. Once the process is right, it will offer an opportunity to solve some of the very real problems in the Dampier Archipelago. Although that area has been at the forefront, it is only the first of a whole range of areas round the State where we will have that sort of problem. We must get it right so that it will be an example for all of the other areas.

Mr RIEBELING: That is right. For many years people have had virtually open and free use of the Dampier Archipelago for recreational purposes. Over the last two or three years the pearling and aquaculture interests in the area have undergone a major expansion. They probably produce Australia's best pearls because, as I understand from the pearling industry, the length of time that pearls take to develop enhances their lustre. Those pearls are a much sought after and very valuable resource. That would have been all very well if they had not been developed in the main recreational fishing area for the towns of Wickham, Roebourne, Karratha, Dampier and, to a lesser degree, some of the inland towns. The visual impact of a pearling lease is dramatic with virtually thousands of buoys in an area that once had no obstacles at all. The Minister has alluded to the consultation process. I am sure that the Minister will agree that 18 months to two years ago the process of establishing new leases was poor. There was no consultation. On one of Dampier Pearling Co Pty Ltd's largest leases information was sought basically from the Hampton Harbour Boat and Sailing Club and a couple of departmental advisers. However, there was virtually no input from the local community. This legislation is a genuine attempt to arrive at a solution; however, it provides no ability for direct community input to decision making. Will the Minister explain how the community will have an input to these decisions?

Another of the problems in my area relates to the Fisheries Department. The department is primarily concerned with the commercial harvesting of the ocean, and people who act on behalf of the Fisheries Department have a bias towards proving activity that will benefit the Fisheries Department; that is after all their role. The local people are concerned that if the only people advising the Minister are those who are interested in commercial exploitation of a resource, it is likely that the Minister will accede to their requests. Even if a process of consultation is set up, if that is the only advice the Minister receives about what should take place within a recreational area, a marine park, a marine nature reserve or other categories of reserves, the people of Western Australia on whose behalf the Government is governing may not be completely happy with the process. The general population is mainly interested in recreational fishing, and they have developed a lack of trust or appreciation for the process by which the Fisheries Department and other departments operate. In the fish trawling industry even the Fisheries Department now admits that the commercial activity of the trawlers operating out of Point Samson has reduced quite dramatically the size of the fish, although not the take that is currently going through Point Samson. The trawler operators are still pulling the same tonnage out of the waters off Point Samson, but the size of the fish has been reduced dramatically. The Fisheries Department says that means there are more fish, but they are smaller. Perhaps we must get used to that, but it is difficult to explain to amateur fishermen that the big fish they were used to catching are no longer available because the commercial activity in a managed fishery has been such that all the big fish are gone and they will now have to put up with catching smaller fish in that zone.

That fishery is lucrative and professional fishermen involved in that industry are keen to make as much money out of it as possible. It is doubtful whether all of them have an interest in a long term industry at that location. I have spoken to one skipper, who unfortunately was in a state of relatively advanced intoxication, who said that he was looking forward to the day he could get his hands on the Kimberley fishery, so he could get stuck into decent size fish again. I asked him about the fishery he was currently exploiting and he said that it had had its day. He did not use those words, but much more colourful language that would not be allowed in this place. An element within the fishing industry is there for a good time rather than for a long time. They want to make as much money as is humanly possible and then move on. There are exceptionally large amounts of money to be made in certain fisheries. I do not blame the Fisheries Department for that. The industry as well as the Fisheries Department should take some responsibility for the longevity of fishing areas.

Mr House: Have you talked to WAFIC about those views?

Mr RIEBELING: I asked a series of questions in this House about a year to 14 months ago about the size of the catch, the species and the like. The advice was that the size of the fish had reduced and certain species had disappeared. However, there were more juvenile fish, which meant that the food chain was healthy. I do not know if that is right, but all the biggies have gone, which is disappointing to amateur fishermen. Amateur fishermen used to go to Bear Rock, which is accessible by 18-foot boats, and catch large fish. They now have to go 15 to 20 km out to sea to catch any sort of decent size fish. The more transient-type fish such as mackerel and sailfish still come in and make that area one of the world's great sport fishing grounds.

The general community is suspicious about the motives of the department and its activities; that includes pearling and aquaculture. I urge the Minister to put in place a process whereby the people of Western Australia will have an input into what happens to their recreational areas and that the Minister listen not only to the commercial interests in the area but also the recreational fishermen. One of the problems is that departments have access to experts who will spend a solid month preparing a report for a Minister. That is put out for public comment. A group of amateurs will sit down at a meeting and bash out 500 or 600 words on why the experts are wrong. The Minister compares that with a nice presentation from the commercial interests and says that the locals do not know what they are talking about. The Minister must consider the whole argument and that is usually heavily weighted in favour of what the

bureaucrats want. That is a trap in a field which, as the Minister for Fisheries said, will get worse before it gets better. With the expansion of the pearling industry in the north, pearls are being processed in areas in which it was considered even 10 years ago they would never be produced. The impact of commercial fishing or harvesting of our natural resources will impact on more and more people. Recreational lobby groups are becoming stronger and better organised. If the Government gets this legislation right this time and people see the process working, the management of fisheries for years to come will be much easier. If the process that is put in place does not work, all hell will break loose. I voice those concerns.

**MR MASTERS** (Vasse) [5.11 pm]: In many debates about the environment and development in which conflicts can arise it is not uncommon for the emotional aspects of a debate to bring out the doom and gloom issues and, therefore, scare people away from taking steps differently from what has been done in the past. However, I commend the Wilson report, and the Government for commissioning that report, because it is a ground breaking document in Western Australia. Barry Wilson, who chaired the working group, has had enormous experience in marine environments. His report four years ago makes sound and desirable recommendations for reserved areas in the marine environment along the coastline of Western Australia. In my electorate of Vasse, the west coast of the Leeuwin-Naturaliste National Park is one area that was recommended by the Wilson committee as a marine park. However, the community, through bodies such as the Geographe Bay Advisory Committee, is saying to the Government that it wants that marine park to extend around the tip of Cape Naturaliste and into Geographe Bay. How far that marine park extends into Geographe Bay - whether it goes all the way eastwards, almost to the outskirts of Bunbury - is yet to be resolved. However, the community believes there is a marine environment in Geographe Bay that is worth preserving.

It is important to note that just because a reservation is sought for an area, it should not automatically mean that all developments are banned. There are many ways in which we can combine the best of both worlds - eat our cake and have it too. The thinking in Geographe Bay is that a major portion of the bay should become a marine park, but that only in fairly small and isolated areas should the zoning be constrained in such a way that most impacting developments are removed. In other words, in 90 or 95 per cent of the proposed Geographe Bay marine park most normal activities that are occurring today will continue. It is tempting for people in the environmental movement and others to say that a marine park is like a nature reserve - it should not be touched and needs special management and so on. I will read to members part of an article that was printed in the *New Scientist* magazine on 15 February 1996, entitled "Where fish may safely graze". The important paragraphs read as follows -

In the Philippines, the Caribbean, Florida, New Zealand and East Africa, groups of researchers have shown that closing a small area to fishing can lead to increased catches in the remaining fishery. At Shimoni in southern Kenya, the number of fish caught fell dramatically during the late 1980s, but they slowly rose again after fishing bans were enforced in a nearby coral-reef marine reserve. The same number of fishermen concentrated into a smaller sector caught more than when the entire area was fished. How did this happen?

One reason is that fish reproduction and fishing interact. Large, old fish are usually hardest hit by fishing because they are vulnerable to most fishing gear. Because the number of eggs is exponentially related to length of a fish, large fish should produce the most juveniles. A 61-centimetre snapper can produce 212 times the eggs of one 42 centimetres long.

Importantly, many marine fish and invertebrates reproduce via free-living larvae which drift with the current for several weeks. So by protecting areas where individual fish grow to maximum size, it is possible to reseed an overfished stock. Similarly, adult fish in stocks that are recovering can move into fishing grounds.

Unlike land-based conservation, the inherent "leakiness" of marine reserves can be an advantage. Historically, many marine reserves were designed as conservation areas. Kenya's marine parks, for example, protect biodiversity and attract tourists as well as making fisheries management easier . . .

Some countries are catching on to the value of protected areas.

As mentioned by a previous speaker -

For the past decade, Bill Ballantine, a New Zealand marine scientist, has argued that 10 per cent of his country's coastline should be protected. In 1990, the US National Marine Fisheries Service recommended that 20 per cent of the southeastern seaboard of the US be designated as "no-take" areas to protect spawning stocks. At first such proposals always meet stiff opposition.

Around the world the sea is seen as public property belonging to everyone, and in many countries it is the last resort in times of poverty. But it is the open access nature of the sea that fuels over-exploitation. In this tragedy of the commons, there is no incentive for one person to catch less when the benefits of restraint will go to less scrupulous fishers.

Conversely, experience shows that when the benefits of reserves are demonstrated, they can become partially self-policing. The fishermen at Shimoni attribute their increasing catch to the recovering fish populations in their park, and they will often report fellow fishermen found poaching. When a new protected area was proposed further up the coast, in Diani, the idea was vehemently opposed by local fishermen. However, fishermen from Shimoni volunteered to help persuade them that a reserve was greatly in their neighbours' interests.

That is a message we must understand in this debate about marine reserves. Just because significantly large areas of marine reserves will, it is hoped, be created along Western Australia's 17 000 kilometre coastline over the next 10 to 20 years, it does not mean all those areas must be protected from every possible impacting development that human beings might wish to impose on them.

Mr Board: None of those larger fish has ever been in danger from my fishing activities.

Mr MASTERS: Last summer and the summer before, a two metre, 300 pound groper came down from the northern waters and lived under the Busselton jetty for weeks, and people actively tried to catch that fish.

Mr Riebeling: What about bait fish?

Mr MASTERS: I am not sure what the member for Burrup means by "bait fish".

Mr Riebeling: The small ones you put on the hook to catch a fish.

Mr MASTERS: The principle remains the same. As the *New Scientist* article indicates, if the areas are chosen wisely and are designated as no-fish areas and are open only to, for example, oar-propelled boats and perhaps scuba divers - certainly no fishing and no spear fishing - benefits will be derived from those relatively small sanctuary no-go areas that will extend many kilometres along the coastline in both directions. In other words, a reserve per se is not a justification for imposing a prohibition on development. There are jewels in the crown that must be protected. I am sure most members of this House have their own ideas about where those jewels are: Ningaloo Reef is a case in point. The current government policy on mining on land-based nature reserves and national parks, inherited from the previous Australian Labor Party Government, allows various forms of development - mining, in particular, but also tourism and other developments - to occur under strict protective conditions. I have no problem with accepting that the policy should be applied in the marine environment. Once this Bill comes into operation and marine reserves and parks are created, the truly unique, special, rare, or other key or bejewelled parts of the marine environment must be protected. However, it is important not to get caught up in the doom and gloom and ban all development once any form of reserve is created. We can eat our cake and have it too, but we must be smart and understand what we are doing.

**MRS EDWARDES** (Kingsley - Minister for the Environment) [5.21 pm]: I thank members opposite for their support and comments on the marine reserves Bill. I will work through each of the points raised because it is important that a direct response is made to the concerns members have raised. Although strong support was expressed, one of the underlying themes was that the implementation of the process set out in the Bill will be critical to ensuring confidence and certainty for all the users in those areas. The Government will make sure it goes slowly and softly in the implementation of this legislation. I have always been of the view that although a Bill contains the words, in practice caution must be exercised. A great deal of concern has been expressed on this subject.

The member for Burrup suggested that many people should be involved in the consultation process and not just those who respond to a government document that is extensive and well produced. He said the views of other people should be considered from wherever and in whatever form they are received. I will make sure his views and the views of other members are passed to the marine reserves authority which will be responsible for implementing this legislation. It will be independent of the Government and will have strong community support.

The member for Maylands and other members spoke about the time taken to introduce this legislation. I, too, wish it had been in place much earlier. It indicates that when preparing legislation that deals with a large number of stakeholders, extensive consultation is required. It is most important that the views of as many people as possible be brought together. A query was raised about whether a balanced approach had been adopted. The Government has attempted to accommodate all the concerns raised so that some of the more important areas along the coastline can be protected, while ensuring that the views of those people already using it and whose livelihoods may depend upon it are taken into account. That has taken some time. Fourteen drafts of the Bill were prepared, and that reflects the wide range of issues and interaction involved with the conservation movement and the fishing, pearling, petroleum and mining industries.

Reference was made to the Wilson report. Its brief was primarily to identify areas for reservation, and not necessarily to develop policy. In the not too distant future the Government will respond to the Wilson report and identify the

priority areas. As soon as this legislation is passed, I hope that expressions of interest can be called for and the authority will be set up as soon as possible.

The multiple use of marine parks is not an easy issue with which to deal, and one reason for including the category of a marine management area is to allow for management over a wide area with conservation purposes in mind, while still permitting multiple use that does not impact on the conservation values for that area. It is an important issue. It allows for multiple use but on the basis that it will not impact on the conservation value of an area. As the member for Vasse pointed out, it is important to provide these sanctuary zones, which are clearly government policy, because that is clearly where some real benefits can be gained. However, even greater benefit can be gained from marine management areas by providing a whole management response to those areas. Reference was made to the lessons to be learnt from other States. I assure members that the Government has looked at marine reserve management practices around Australia and it will continue to do so. It hopes to put in place a practice that accords with world best practice.

Concern was expressed about the requirement for the concurrence of the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines, although the Minister for Mines is required to only notify the Minister for the Environment about petroleum management. One of the benefits of this legislation is that it will provide the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines with an opportunity to adopt a whole of government approach, including the Minister for the Environment. That is not only appropriate, but is fundamental to the management and expansion of the marine conservation reserves system. If those Ministers responsible for stakeholders in a wider range of uses, other than conservation purposes, are not involved, the system will not succeed and achieve all the aims identified in the Wilson report. Experience elsewhere indicates that all areas must be involved to ensure they have a greater understanding about what the Government is attempting in the management and conservation of these important areas. A whole of government approach has been the basis of the legislation.

The Shark Bay management plan, released in February and approved by the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority and all relevant Ministers, was completed in 1996 and printed and approved prior to the issue of the exploration permit referred to by the member for Maylands. I reiterate that exploration permits do not permit mining. When a company has received that permit, any activity in which it seeks to become involved is subject to full environmental assessment. The permit is a licence only for the company to go to the next step.

I hope that the karst report will be ready to be released together with the responses of the Environmental Protection Authority and the Department of Environmental Protection in the not too distant future. I understand it is progressing with the authors of that report at the moment.

The member for Fremantle raised World Heritage listing and the Government's commitment to request that the Federal Government nominate Purnululu. I have already written to the Federal Minister for the Environment in that regard, and we have already discussed listing the massif. As late as last week, the Federal Minister and I agreed to the next step in progressing this nomination. I will keep the House informed of that progress.

I am sure members will understand that we have a long way to go with the Shark Bay heritage area. These matters are not easy. As I said regarding the marine reserves legislation, it is important to involve the community and various stakeholders to ensure that World Heritage listings are supported. The Shark Bay World Heritage listing is testimony to the work carried out by the state and federal Ministers - a couple were involved - to ensure that the community became committed to the World Heritage listing. If the community were not on side, undoubtedly Shark Bay would not be listed for World Heritage.

I assure the member for Fremantle that environmental protection legislation remains paramount; notwithstanding anything in the Bill, all activity will be subject to the Environmental Protection Act. The members for Maylands and Fremantle referred to the Minister for Mines notifying the Minister for the Environment only in respect of mining tenements. That requirement does not exist under current practices and processes. We will establish protocols between my office and the department and the Minister for Mines and his department before the legislation comes into operation; also, we are alerting the Federal Minister for the Environment in that regard. It is important with the legislation - in fact, regardless of the legislation - that we work together on this matter.

Once the legislation passes, it will become statutory for the Minister for Mines to notify the Minister for the Environment, yet it will not take away from the fact that such notification will not be an approval by the Minister for the Environment - it will be only a permit which must go to the next stage with any activity being subject to full environmental assessment.

The member for Eyre raised the question of greater certainty and reduced conflict. That will be the success of the legislation. However, that success will only be achieved through good management. I support the member's

comments. I assure the House that the Government is very conscious of that aspect and will continue to work with that in mind.

The interface between the Department of Conservation and Land Management and the authority was also raised. CALM will have overall responsibility for on-the-ground management, and the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority will be the vesting body and will deal with policy and advisory aspects. Also, it will oversee CALM's management. The member will be familiar with the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority. The CALM officers' voting rights on the NPNCA will not apply in this legislation, although it will allow CALM, Fisheries, Mines or whichever officers are appropriate for the agenda, to attend. Nevertheless, they will not be able to vote or to become a member of that authority.

The member for Eyre also referred to checks and balances. We have worked through the fears raised by the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association. As we work through the process slowly and surely towards implementation, APEA's fears will subside. I visited Burrup yesterday with members of APEA. Obviously, it recognises that its industry must ensure that sanctuary zones and no-go areas are respected. Although APEA may not always be happy about some of those future areas, at least it accepts that sanctuary and no-go zones will be created in some areas. Its program of activity could conflict with conservation purposes, but it is mature enough to recognise that possibility.

Again, the establishment of the various levels of operation, as required under this legislation, will take some time. Even establishing one reserve will not happen overnight.

Mr Grill: Thank you for those comments. In respect of the relations between the new authority and CALM, will the authority have its own budget, and will it include the new scientific committee?

Mrs EDWARDES: The scientific committee will comprise people already operating in the system and, basically, the legislation will pull them together. The NPNCA already operates marine reserves, so that aspect of the present authority will be moved across to the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority. As such, it will all be dealt with out of the CALM budget. It is a separation and formalising of what already happens within CALM.

Another question related to the development of policy for other areas. I assure the House that the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority to be established under the CALM Act will be accountable to me. It will not - it would be inappropriate to do so - take a lead role in the development of fisheries policy or management. Some concern was expressed about that taking place, but such activity will not be within its responsibility. Clearly, that will remain the province of the Minister for Fisheries, a point highlighted in the second reading speech.

I responded earlier to some issues raised by the member for South Perth. It must be satisfying for the member to see this body come into being as he played a part in the history of its creation. I have come in only at the end of the process; the member was involved in the beginning.

The Bill puts in place a long term framework relating to the reserves category and outlines conservation objectives. It also has a lot in it regarding resource utilisation, to which the member for South Perth referred. The relationships and the rules must be clearly spelt out and understood. If we are to be successful in establishing any reserves or conservation areas, we must be sure there is a whole of government approach, that a reserve is a national park and is managed accordingly.

The member for South Perth referred to clause 41(1) of the Bill. For the first time this Bill gives the Parliament a role in marine nature reserves and marine parks regarding mining.

Mr Pental: I am pleased to hear that remark. Proposed section 24A(4) is about having to come to Parliament if it is a mining lease for a marine nature reserve or marine park. That does not seem to sit with what is on page 10. Proposed section 13A(3) seems to ban exploratory drilling or the production of petroleum in marine nature reserves.

Mrs EDWARDES: It is subject to proposed section 13E.

Mr Pental: I will come to that condition later. I just do not understand that part, which is the prohibition of exploratory drilling for petroleum production from marine nature reserves, yet page 51 - I realise this is to do with the Mining Act - talks about marine nature reserves or marine parks.

Mrs EDWARDES: I think the member has highlighted the difference. Proposed section 13E(3) refers to the Petroleum Act and the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, not the Mining Act. There is a prohibition subject to proposed section 13E concerning marine nature reserves. That is the issue. The proposed subsection on page 10 deals with petroleum; that on page 51 deals with mining. It is different.



I have addressed most of the fisheries issues raised by the member for Burrup. We will be working very hard to ensure genuine community input. Where that has not been evident in some of the authorities and committees, I am pushing particularly hard to ensure there is a greater level of community interest and involvement. I again thank members opposite for their support for, and also their contributions to, what will be a major piece of legislation for Western Australia and is well recognised around Australia as setting ground rules.

The member for South Perth referred to the Great Barrier Reef Act. It is different from this Bill because it is commonwealth legislation. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### **APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED FUND) BILL (No 1)**

#### *Second Reading - Cognate Debate*

Resumed from 9 May.

**MR GRAHAM** (Pilbara) [5.45 pm]: This state Budget is based on duplicity and deception. On budget day it was described by the Leader of the Opposition as being a budget of betrayal for three reasons: First, the unwarranted increases in taxes and charges; second, the increase in the state debt; and, third, the State Government had just won an election based on the delivery of what was to become known as the social dividend to the community of Western Australia. That social dividend was not delivered in this Budget; instead, there is a further reduction in the level of services provided by government. I happen to agree with the Leader of the Opposition on each of those points. The Budget is much more than that. As I said, it is quite duplicitous in its nature and it is also deceptive in the picture it paints for Western Australia.

With the federal Budget being brought down tonight, it is interesting to look at what has happened in the other States and Territories since our state Budget was delivered. The basis of our Treasurer's Budget is that the Federal Government has screwed the State so hard there is no alternative but to raise taxes in Western Australia. I will deal with that in some detail later. Let us look at what happened in the Northern Territory. An article in *The West Australian* on 1 May reported -

Taxes and charges stay the same but there is more spending in key social sectors and a modest debt reduction strategy in the Northern Territory's Budget delivered yesterday.

On 7 May *The West Australian* reported on the New South Wales Budget. It said -

A \$400 million tax grab from the rich will help pay for a big-spending New South Wales Budget as the Labor Government tries to reclaim its electoral heartland.

In the third Carr Government Budget, delivered yesterday, luxury homes, cars and hotel rooms all will be hit.

It is worth while bearing in mind - without running any political argument about the merits of the New South Wales Government or otherwise - that in its Budget it is paying for the year 2000 Olympics at a cost of \$2.1b.

Members will remember the famous statement by the Premier in the 1993 election campaign - this was not Victoria and he was not Jeff Kennett. He was dead right. The Kennett Government, in bringing down its Budget, delivered no new taxes or tax increases for the sixth year running and a \$211m reduction in state tax. In addition, its state debt will fall and an additional \$122m will be spent mainly in health, education and transport. The Kennett Government was able to deliver low taxes to its community, as was every other State Government except Western Australia. What did we do? An article on 5 May headed "WA leads, but 'poor lose'" accurately describes what happened in our state Budget. It refers to the state of the States report and says -

... WA beat all States in industry assistance, private capital investment, full-time employment growth, gross State product and real State income growth.

But it ranked last in education and environmental protection, fifth in public transport and recycling and third in welfare services.

I do not pretend that is a scientific examination of what has happened around the country since the Budget came down, but it is a realistic assessment of what the Budget does.

I draw members' attention to those articles because those Premiers, who delivered their Budgets, were at the same Premiers' Conferences as our Premier and were in the same position and copped the same treatment from the Federal

Government as our Premier, but not one of them saw the need to increase taxes and charges on the citizens of his State in his Budget or to blame the Federal Government.

Budget Paper No 3, which paints an economic and fiscal overview of the State, contains some interesting things. It contains the proof that the Court-Liberal Government is the biggest taxing Liberal Government and that it has more income coming to it than any other Government in the State's history. In 1996-97 its revenue was \$6.2b, in 1997-98 its revenue has risen to \$7.04b, and in 2000-2001 it expects its revenue to be \$7.647b.

The budget paper also points out that over the life of the Budget and the forward estimates, real wages in Western Australia are estimated to reduce by 1.5 per cent. I will be interested to hear what the Minister for Labour Relations, who often bleats about pay increases being awarded under his system, has to say about that. It is simple: Either he is telling lies or the Budget is telling lies. The two points of view that are being put up are mutually exclusive. He cannot claim that wages are going up at the same time as he endorses budget papers that say wages are going down.

The budget papers show that growth is to rise to 6 per cent in 1997-98 and that over the Court Government's time in office the average growth has been 5 per cent. The Premier in his second reading speech and his public rhetoric claims that the growth in this State is greater than that found anywhere else in Australia. I enjoy, and I will enjoy again today, quoting from the very first report the Premier commissioned in Western Australia. That was the Access Economics report entitled "The Importance of Western Australia to the National Economy". It is interesting to compare the Premier's and this Government's achievements with the achievements of the former Labor Government, because the Access Economics report points out that growth over the decade of the former Labor Government was 11.1 per cent, double what the Premier now claims as being outstanding. That was the average. That information is not in a Labor Party report, it is in a report commissioned by the Court-Liberal Government.

The budget papers estimate that growth for the State in 1996-97 is estimated to be 5 per cent of the gross state product. The 1993 Access Economics report - coming from a base of a Labor Government, because the Liberal Government had just come in and had done nothing - estimated that the State would grow by 9.2 per cent that year. The 1997-98 forecast in the State Budget is 6 per cent of GSP. The Access Economics report in 1993 estimated that it would be 7.6 per cent. In 1998-99 the GSP was anticipated in the Budget to grow by 5.25 per cent. Four years ago Access Economics was estimating that it would grow by 6.6 per cent.

Those figures beg the question: What happened to the growth that was anticipated when this Government took office - not the growth that we said it would be, but what those opposites said it would be? The reality is that growth in the GSP has been about half of that which was anticipated when the Liberal Party took office. The Government will have an interesting time trying to answer why that has been the case.

The economic outcome for Western Australia in the budget papers shows inflation is estimated to increase over the life of this Budget and that housing investment is estimated to fall by 6 per cent over the life of this Budget. When those key indicators are put together one does not come up with the rosy picture of the economy the Premier paints. One also does not come up with a picture of an economy in dire straits - and I am not attempting to paint that picture. The picture I am attempting to paint is that there was a State that was in a sound economic position in 1993. It is still sound and healthy, but the management of the economy now is not as good or as effective as it was under the former Labor Government. The Government's own report points to that.

The labour market figures are also interesting, Mr Acting Speaker. The Minister for Labour Relations is also responsible for those. As you will know, Mr Acting Speaker, during question time the Minister subjects us to dorothea dixers and rhetoric about how everything could not be better, how growth is always great under him and his policies, how he has changed the labour market and how we are much better off than we were in 1993. His consistent view is that he, and the Government of which he is part, have done it better than any Labor Government ever did. The Budget estimates of 1997-98 show an anticipated employment growth of 2.5 per cent but indicate that in 1998 it will fall to 2.25 per cent. Again, I refer to the Access Economics report estimates. Access Economics estimated 4.5 per cent growth in employment in 1997-98 and 3.8 per cent in 1998-99. So, four years ago a Liberal Government, working on the basis of no policy change from the former Labor Government, because there had not been any, was estimating employment growth of roughly double that which we are experiencing now and double that which we are estimating for the coming three years.

What happened in the intervening five years to cause those figures to be downgraded by 50 per cent? The Access Economics report shows that in last decade of the Labor Government the 10-year average of employment growth under a Labor Government was 2.8 per cent. That was not an annual peak; it was the 10-year average of the former Labor Government. That is employment growth that the Minister for Labour Relations consistently describes as appalling. However, his best forward estimate does not get near 2.8 per cent over the life of this Budget.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

Mr GRAHAM: Prior to the dinner suspension, I pointed out that the Minister for Labour Relations is always telling us that everything is absolutely wonderful under his Government, and the Labor Party had it wrong in its last decade in government. I then proceeded to show from the budget papers and the Access Economics papers that the Court Liberal Government has never matched the employment growth of the decade of the last Labor Government and that its best employment growth averages are significantly lower than the 10 year average of that Labor Government.

I pointed out also that growth in the State as measured by gross state product, which is now the measure that this State Government likes to use, has been half of what the Government predicted when it came to office in 1993 and is significantly lower than was experienced under the last 10 years of Labor Government. Those figures come not from my head or some bodgie report, but from a government report.

Over the life of the Budget, net exports will also fall by 1 per cent. Therefore, over the life of the Budget we have not only an unwarranted increase in taxes and charges, an increase in debt and an increase in inflation, but also a decrease in net exports.

Those economic indicators are pretty well on course with where Access Economics suggested the State would be if the Government took no action on the key issues on which action needed to be taken. Access Economics said in 1993 that it was not the best case, and certainly not the worst case, but about the middle of the road. It called it a "no policy change" scenario.

The Treasurer said in his Budget speech that this would be a difficult Budget. I say it is a terrible Budget. Who does he blame? For the first four years that he was Treasurer of this State, he said that it was his predecessor's fault. He ignored all the evidence that has been in every government report now for the past five years; that is, Western Australia's economy is healthy and sound, and it goes into recession quicker than do other States and comes out of it quicker than do other States. That is, and always has been, the history of Western Australia. Who does the Treasurer blame this year? The Treasurer gives four reasons for the difficult Budget. The first one is that demand for services is increasing because of our robust economic growth. I have outlined how the budget figures discount that argument, because growth is slowing in Western Australia. In some sectors, such as the housing sector, growth is slowing to the point where it is a problem in our economy. The Treasurer cannot be believed on that point.

The second point is that the State's revenues to fund these services are not growing. This is the biggest taxing Government in the history of Western Australia. No other Government in the history of this State has received the level of revenue that this Government has received. The third point is that the revenue shortfall has been seriously compounded by significant cutbacks in commonwealth government grants. I will return to that point later. The fourth reason is that total state revenues are falling by 1.7 per cent in real terms. That is not true. This State's revenue base is growing significantly.

Two things can be said of the Treasurer's rhetoric about the Federal Government. Firstly - members have heard me say this before, and they will hear me say it again before I go - everything the Treasurer says about Canberra not producing the wealth but taking the taxes and not sharing them with States like Western Australia is exactly what those of us in the regions say about the Treasurer in Perth. In the simple case of mining royalties, iron ore and petroleum royalties in this Budget will return \$401m to the State Government. Not one cent of that money is generated in Perth; it is all generated in the regions, most of it in the Pilbara. However, only a minuscule fraction of that revenue will find its way back to the regions. When I did the sums in 1991, the figures were about \$250m going into the State's coffers and \$30m flowing out. I suspect not too much has changed since then and the percentages are about the same. With regard to services, the regions are significantly worse off than they were five years ago.

Secondly, the Treasurer said that we will be in diabolical trouble if Canberra does not change its policy. Budget Paper No 3 states that commonwealth funding is forecast to continue to decline in real terms in 1997-98. It is quite clear that the Government expected commonwealth government funding to decline in 1997-98. However, it states two pages later that commonwealth grants are expected to grow marginally over the next few years. How can one justify those two statements about the same source of money? They are mutually exclusive: Either commonwealth grants will fall, or commonwealth grants will increase.

Although I have read the budget paper, I am not sure what happens next. Page 186 of Budget Paper No 3 states that for 1997-98, total commonwealth payments to the consolidated fund are expected to show negligible growth, and actually decline in real terms.

It states that higher nominal growth is forecast for commonwealth grants over the forward estimates period. Therefore, the budget papers confirm not that, as the Treasurer says, we will be in diabolical trouble because of falling federal funds, but that we will receive an increase in federal funds over the life of this Budget.

I am concerned about what the Budget says the Government will be doing over future years. Budget Paper No 3 states that outlays will decline by 0.9 per cent in 1997-98. Three pages on, it is stated that outlays will grow by 1.4 per cent in 1997-98. It is not unreasonable to ask the Treasurer to explain the discrepancy in those figures. In a \$10b Budget it would represent a significant amount of money. It appears to be the same situation as five years ago when the Treasurer delivered a Budget that did not balance. He forgot about \$25m, and we lost an Under-Treasurer in the process.

I can point to a number of examples in the budget papers where one can compare the numbers with the rhetoric, but they do not match up. Also, discrepancies occur between the Treasurer's budget speech and the figures provided in the Budget. During the five years of the Court Liberal Government this is the fifth different system of delivering the Budget, therefore it is virtually impossible for any serious commentator on the Budgets to compare one year's operations of the Government with another year.

The delivery of the Budget is usually followed by government propaganda sheets in the electorates. My electorate has been ignored for a couple of years, I am sorry to say, because I would copy those sheets and send them to various constituents. Now, the Government has started delivering its propaganda again, such as the blurb entitled, "State Budget 1997-98, Pilbara Region, Securing Our Future". It is a typical government publication, and it looks like good news. It refers to responsible financial management, regional development and industry. It contains good news relating to \$52.86m worth of projects and goodies for the Pilbara. I thought it was good news and, as the local member, I was happy to see \$52.86m worth of development about to be delivered in my electorate. However, on closer inspection I note that of the \$52.86m an amount of \$50.8m was contained in last year's Budget or has already been announced for some purpose. Rippon Hills Road has received funding from two successive Budgets, as have the Karijini National Park east-west link, and the South Hedland enhancement scheme. According to the blurb put out by the Government, BHP's contribution to that scheme is regarded as government money being spent in the Pilbara. Therefore, of the \$52.86m announced in the good news blurb, \$50.8m has already been allocated, and the work should have been finished. The roads in the Karijini National Park were promised three years ago, and they should have been finished. I should be driving down them, having a good time.

I turn now to some matters not included in the Budget. First, I will talk about the Port Hedland Regional Hospital. Last year, the Budget allocated \$1m for a new roof at the hospital. One cannot complain about that, unless and until one realises that the hospital was built in 1976 by the Sir Charles Court Government after Cyclone Joan demolished the permanent hospital. I have always paid Sir Charles Court credit for that. The day after the cyclone he directed the Health Department to rebuild the hospital. There was no argument about it, and the hospital was rebuilt. However, 21 years ago a temporary hospital was built in Port Hedland as a result of the demolition of the permanent hospital, and I suspect that even the new Court Liberal Government with its elastic view of the English language would consider that it is drawing a long bow to call a hospital temporary when it has been standing for 21 years. This Government claims that it has a great record of building hospitals. Therefore, I look forward to hearing the Minister for Health explain why there is no allocation in the Budget for a new hospital in Port Hedland. Perhaps he can tell us when there will be some money in the Budget for a new hospital, because there is no provision for it in the forward estimates.

I turn now to the provision of electricity in the north west. Despite the rhetoric by the Minister for Energy regarding energy reform - he has done a good job of reforming gas for commercial purposes in the north west - the cost of electricity to businesses in the north west has increased significantly. To Aboriginal communities and remote communities the cost has reached levels which, if even mentioned in Perth, would cause riots in the streets. Mr Speaker, can you imagine what would happen in your electorate if the Minister for Energy said that because of a disagreement between the State and Federal Governments your electors would have to pay somewhere between 78¢ and \$1 a unit for electricity for domestic purposes? That would be unacceptable anywhere in the metropolitan area. It has not been a problem in the past because the previous Labor Government honoured its commitments under what was called the universal tariff policy. We had an agreement between the State and Federal Governments about who should pay, when, where and how.

I turn now to some correspondence from a constituent, Sister Pat Sealey, from Turkey Creek. She runs an Aboriginal centre there, and puts it better than I ever could. She writes -

I believe something needs to be done about the inequity to remote Aboriginal communities which are required to generate their own power and do not receive adequate diesel rebate. I find it incredible that the Argyll Diamond Mine, which makes \$1 million/day pays 8 cents/unit for power. Warmun community is 30 kms. away. I am a pensioner, all the staff at Mirrilingki are unpaid volunteers. We conduct alcohol awareness and treatment programs (as yet unfunded by the government). My last power bill was \$2,187.46 for 96 days (24-10-'96 to 28-1-'97 ie \$159.50/week. From Dec. 12th, '96 - Jan. 20th, '97, there was no-one here except for one young man minding the place, and for the rest of the time, because of the wet, there were

not very many groups (only 2 staff). The power bill before that was \$1,966.27 for 71 days ie \$193.86/week. I am getting up at midnight to send weather reports to the Bureau to help pay the power bill. This money formerly went into the purchase of resources for the centre. Although I find it difficult I am prepared to pay 12.29 c/unit for power which is the Kununurra rate, but 30c/unit is far too much and unjust as power is an essential service. I am asking that, either remote Aboriginal communities be subsidised for their power use, eg by being put on the Western Power grid, or they receive the full diesel rebate.

That Aboriginal community is on a national highway. In my electorate other Aboriginal communities, stretching from the Northern Territory border to the western and central desert around Halls Creek, have the same problem.

Mr Cowan: You know who changed the diesel excise policy don't you?

Mr GRAHAM: The argument is not about the diesel excise policy.

Mr Cowan: I understood that letter asked for a return of the diesel rebate.

Mr GRAHAM: I am happy to debate with the Deputy Premier if he will move to extend my time.

Mr Cowan: You are not even prepared to answer interjections.

Mr GRAHAM: I am. The Deputy Premier must have had a good dinner, the cranky old sod! I am happy to debate with him if he gives me the time to do it, at which time we will address those issues.

Mr Cowan: Answer the interjection.

Mr GRAHAM: The Deputy Premier should shut up and I will answer it. That argument has always been around. When I started speaking on this I acknowledged that the State had always picked up its share of the costs. It no longer does. It says it is the responsibility of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. The Deputy Premier's Government is having a federal/state argument about who should pay. However, caught in the middle are some of the poorest people in this State.

Mr Cowan: The State never paid the federal diesel excise; don't talk nonsense.

Mr GRAHAM: The Deputy Premier should not be silly.

Mr Cowan: I suggest you stick to your other day job. You did a very good job as a union official, but you are not a very good economic analyst.

Mr GRAHAM: I am tempted to argue, but I will control myself. The Deputy Premier had a difficult dinner and he is taking it out on me. I understand that. Did the federal Budget upset him again?

Mr Cowan: Yes.

Mr GRAHAM: In the past the State always played its role - whether it paid the diesel excise is not the point - in ensuring Aboriginal communities in remote areas paid reasonable prices for electricity. The State no longer pays because ATSIC and the State are arguing about who should pay. In any event, the State Government has an obligation to ensure its citizens are not severely disadvantaged. As the Deputy Premier will know, he dismantled the uniform tariff policy. I debated that with him during the election when he said he would reinstall it, but he has not done that. I might not be a good economic analyst but I have a memory; it was not all destroyed.

The people in the Aboriginal communities are least able to pay those electricity bills. The Government should not put them in that position; it should do something. As the Minister for Energy suggests, some time in the future when something has been done about the dam near Argyle, electricity will be generated and a main will be installed. That will resolve the situation for one community. However, not all the communities are in the same position.

All I am saying to the Government is that it should get off its bot, negotiate with the Federal Government and enter into an arrangement.

Mr Cowan: Don't hold us responsible for the Federal Government paying.

Mr GRAHAM: If the Government cannot do that, I am more than happy to negotiate on its behalf. The Deputy Premier said I was a good negotiator in my old days as a union man; I am happy to do it again if the Government cannot do it.

Mr Cowan: You don't have to wait for our invitation to do that.

Mr GRAHAM: I turn now to another area which is a little complicated because it concerns facilities at Port Hedland Senior High School. Strangely enough I will not take all my time complaining about the Government's not spending

money. I will point out where the Government has spent a lot of money but has not done anything it said it would do. When Peter Dowding was Premier I used to say that every school age child had a right to kick a football or play sport on a school oval and that the State had an obligation to ensure that the condition of school ovals allowed children to do that. It does not matter to me whether they go to school in Merredin, Port Hedland, Kununurra or Esperance. It is a fundamental right of children to play their school sports on good ovals.

Dowding agreed with me once and it cost his Government \$2.5m to reticulate all the school ovals at Port Hedland in the 1989 Budget. We then discovered that the local council had dismantled the effluent distribution system, so very large tanks and a reticulation system were left standing because water could not be piped to them. It has been an ongoing problem since then.

I had intended to raise this as a grievance on Thursday but that time is taken up by others, so I will use my last six minutes to give that speech for the Minister's benefit to see what his response will be.

Last year the State Government spent between \$70 000 and \$100 000 on Port Hedland Senior High School oval to bring it to a condition where children could play sport on it. Some political points must be made along the way; one is that, as members will remember, the Government did away with gardeners and cleaners and contracted out their work because it would "lead to significant reductions in school budgets because it would be cheaper to employ contractors". That was absolutely wrong. If ever an example proved that, it is Port Hedland Senior High School.

The oval was stripped and relaid with top soil and the reticulation was brought up to speed. However, somewhere in the process people forgot about spraying the oval for weeds. The first growth to provide a green cover on the lawn was the khaki burr and the caltrop weed. Yesterday morning I and the school based decision making group were standing knee-deep in weeds on an oval that is useless for any practical purpose other than grazing the sheep of the leader of the National Party. Even they would get burrs in their feet and feel a bit crook if they stood on it or ate it!

Mr Cowan: They are very discerning animals.

Mr GRAHAM: Only because they voted for the Deputy Premier.

Mr Cowan: That proves how discerning they are!

Mr GRAHAM: Despite the Government's spending \$70 000 to \$100 000, the children still do not have a school oval on which to play. I do not throw that up as a line of political rhetoric -

Mr Cunningham: You never do that.

Mr GRAHAM: I was happy to make some political points. However, some matters need reinforcing; for example, the Education Department and the school should not argue about whether something is wrong. Last year the department made \$4 000 available so that the children could go somewhere else to play their sport. It cannot be a problem with the water because that has been resolved. There may be some problems with the local council. The school is responsible for mowing the lawn and owns a small sit-on mower, which has been in service for five of the past seven weeks. Seven hectares of grassed area need mowing in a certain amount of time, the total of which I cannot recall.

Mr Cowan: Seven hectares at the school?

Mr GRAHAM: One would be hard pressed to walk it -

Mr Cowan: The entire school would not be as big as that.

Mr GRAHAM: I am told that the school occupies 9 ha and it has 7 ha of grassed areas. Negotiations are currently taking place between Pundulmurra Aboriginal College and the school to see whether there can be joint service on the ovals. Pundulmurra college withdrew from the negotiations because it was not prepared to pay money for those sorts of substandard ovals. My comments apply to not only Hedland High School, but also other schools in Port Hedland. Yesterday afternoon I went past one of the other schools and the gardener was mowing the football oval with a hand mower. The problem, simply put, is that the section responsible for school ovals within the Education Department has probably spent more on air fares in the past 10 years flying to Hedland to look at the problem than it has in addressing the problem. Every time it has entered into some arrangement to fix the problem along come the school holidays at the end of the year. It goes like this: New principals come to the schools and because the ovals are in such a disgraceful condition they decide to have them fixed. They kick the department and the department agrees to do something about it. It spends a bucket of money and at the end of the school year when everyone goes on holidays one can imagine what happens to an oval in a Pilbara summer. New principals commence at the schools at the beginning of the school year and the procedure is repeated. To fix it the Minister must put some people in charge, make them responsible and give them a reasonable budget. On my guestimate, the department has spent

between \$3.5m and \$4m in the past 10 years on school ovals in Hedland and there is still not one on which the children can play football. It is time they were fixed.

**MS ANWYL** (Kalgoorlie) [8.02 pm]: I will comment on the effect of the Budget on this State, particularly my electorate. The Government made great play in the last election campaign about a social dividend which would be delivered to this State and its taxpayers in this Budget. What has eventuated is a failure by the Government to increase the allocation to Health and Education, except on a minimal level. Essentially, the slight increases which can be discerned in the Budget will only keep abreast of population changes and perhaps not even that. The Government has failed to address major infrastructure needs in the poorer schools, many of which are in the rural area. The House has just heard from the member for Pilbara about the lack of adequate playing fields and buildings at schools in Port Hedland. Later I will refer to the Government's lack of addressing the needs of what are the largest primary schools and high school in the State and I refer to the schools in Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

The failure of this Government to address Health and Education in a meaningful way in this Budget represents a broken promise with respect to the so-called social dividend which simply will not be delivered by this Budget. It is not the only broken promise. I will not spend a great deal of time, as I usually do, referring to the gold royalty. It is clear that it is a totally cynical exercise by this Government in misleading voters in the regional areas, particularly the goldfields and the area covered by the electorate of Ningaloo where the bulk of the mining activity occurs. The Leader of the National Party was very clearly on the record - I have had the opportunity to listen to the tape - saying at a media conference he attended one week out of the last election that he and his party would not be part of a Government which introduced a gold royalty. It did not take very long for a gold royalty to come before the Parliament. No real detail has been provided in what I suggest is a very serious lack of attention to detail. The budget papers simply anoint an amount of \$19m that will be raised during the first six months of the imposition of the gold royalty which will take effect on 1 January next year. There is a complete lack of detail on the precise way it will be implemented. It is irresponsible government to announce a royalty without providing any detail of how the producers, some of which are extremely marginal, can be protected.

I am already being regaled with countless tales from people in my electorate, including manufacturers of mining equipment and explosives and service providers - caterers and others - and the smaller tradesmen and contractors who perform maintenance work in various mining operations about less work coming their way. I have also heard from major companies like a company which provides explosives to organisations throughout South East Asia and which has its base in Kalgoorlie that there has been a major downward trend in the amount of work coming its way. I have also heard from a couple of painters who generally have regular work on a contract basis. They told me that they had work lined up, but since the announcement of a gold royalty the contracts had been cancelled.

It appears the Government will continue with the imposition of a gold royalty in the face of a wealth of evidence from a variety of sources, including what I suggest are impeccable academic sources, on the negative economic impact that it will have on the community. I mention this in detail because as the member for Kalgoorlie I do not have to leave my office to notice the effect that the collection of this royalty, which is yet to be announced in detail, will have. The Government does not have the decency to announce to the industry and to the community at large exactly how the tax will be collected. I have heard from a lot of people who are concerned about the effects of the gold royalty and these people are not the major producers. I know there is a degree of cynicism in the gold industry's ability to cry wolf, particularly in regard to the imposition of the federal tax which was introduced some time ago. They are not the people who are contacting me. The gold industry had been softened up by a tag team effort between the Premier and the Minister for Resources Development who continually say in this place that there will be an ongoing dialogue and that ongoing consultation is occurring with the industry. My investigations have led me to believe that that was an absolute falsehood. The reality is that in a year the industry has lost its concerted will to band together to get the message across to this Government about the negative impact of this tax.

I could spend the whole night talking about the Government's broken promises as they relate to the goldfields. I have a copy of the 1993 coalition policies for the nineties document on the goldfields. I had the joy of fighting two election campaigns last year. During those campaigns I was continually reminded of the number of broken promises in my electorate. I have a document which details 44 broken promises in the short time since the election. I do not have enough time to talk about each of those. However, I will refer to some of the more serious ones. I have said a number of times in this place that the cause of the cynicism in the electorate towards politicians is the cavalier fashion with which politicians present scenarios prior to an election and completely renege on them subsequently. I have a Liberal-National Parties' policy document which details the effect the election of those parties would have on this State.

**Mr Riebeling:** It is a photocopy of the policy document for the 1993 election.

**Ms ANWYL:** Another thing I find particularly concerning about the way the public looks at issues and reflects on politicians at the moment - this is particularly in the context of the industrial relations debate, but I will give other

examples - is the complete lack of regard by this Government for a mandate. If a Government intends to introduce changes after an election, it is pretty clear to me that it should campaign on those changes at the time of the election. There are a number of examples in my electorate of that not occurring. The best and probably most recent of those is the changes to the *Prospector* train service between Kalgoorlie and Perth. We only found out that this Government intends sacking the passenger staff on the *Prospector* service through an answer by Hon Eric Charlton to a question in the other place. The rationale for doing that is yet another consultant's report which revealed some lack of passenger satisfaction with the *Prospector* service. It is no wonder that passengers are dissatisfied; the *Prospector* train service began being dismantled with the Right Track program which involved closing the Midland Workshops. That led to more than 1 400 jobs being shed from Westrail so that maintenance on the *Prospector* has decreased and the cost of doing any type of maintenance to the track and the railcars has steadily increased. It is no wonder that passengers announced they were dissatisfied with services when frequently last year the service was cancelled altogether and buses were used at the last minute to convey passengers.

I will return to the industrial relations issue later. However, again there is no doubt that the community is angry with this Government ramming through such draconian legislation without allowing the newly elected upper House to consider it.

Mr Prince interjected.

Ms ANWYL: The public is angry, Minister for Health.

Mr Prince: I do not think it is.

Ms ANWYL: I think it is. If the Minister took the trouble to do a random check, even in Albany, he would find there is a lot of dissatisfaction with the legislation being rammed throughout the upper House when the Government has no mandate.

Mr Minson: It is not being rammed through. What do you think the upper House should do?

Ms ANWYL: It should debate legislation in the fashion this place has operated for the past 100 years.

Mr Minson: One of your members up there spoke absolute rubbish for six and a half hours. That is a misuse of that place.

Ms ANWYL: I listen to the Minister for Labour Relations spout nonsense in this place every day.

Mr Minson: He does not take seven and a half hours to do it.

Ms ANWYL: The legislation is being rammed through. The member cannot tell me that the conventions are not being flouted.

Mr Minson: No other Parliament would put up with it.

Ms ANWYL: That is happening and the public is angry about it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kalgoorlie has the call and she is trying to present her budget speech. I cannot allow other members to hijack her time.

Ms ANWYL: One of the most glaring problems with this Government is a complete lack of regard for a mandate. Therefore, legislation which has been introduced was not voted on by the public of Western Australia at the last election.

Another issue that I will pursue is the Government's total preoccupation with contracting out what were government services. There are a number of examples of that in my electorate. I referred to the *Prospector* train service about which we have had consultant's report after consultant's report. I have been told by a variety of Westrail workers that working for Westrail these days is like working for a bunch of accountants, because not much regard is paid to passenger satisfaction. I do not have much doubt that eventually country services will be totally privatised. There is a lot of evidence for that - I referred a short time ago to the contracting out of passenger services on the *Prospector*.

It is difficult to justify the money that has been spent on consultants' reports, given the lack of attention to very basic things, such as track maintenance and so forth. The report relating to passenger dissatisfaction is yet to be released. However, Westrail staff have been coming to my office for a long time and have referred me to all sorts of waste that is occurring because of the lack of management skills in Westrail. Staff have been on temporary travel allowances for periods of up to six months, which costs the taxpayer a large amount of money, and neither the relevant Minister nor the chief executive officer had the will to sort that out. Apparently, \$260 000 was spent in 18 months to pay staff



travel and living away from home allowances because no roster was done. The Minister, in his characteristic fashion, has blamed the union for this lack of attention to sorting out the roster system. However, it is my understanding that the problem was caused by a complete lack of management skills in making appropriate arrangements for staff. The dissatisfaction among staff increased to the level where many dedicated staff left the service. The Minister has claimed that staff members are not doing their job, when they have battled under the most adverse conditions. There have been 29 cancellations of the train service in not much more than six months. Lack of maintenance includes doors falling off trains; for example, a door fell on a female member of staff. Those sorts of things have been achieved by the Right Track program and the preoccupation with contracting out.

Another example, which I have raised in my electorate during two election campaigns, is the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital's apparent obsession with the contracting out of laundry and catering services. Finally, well after 12 months since the contract was first mooted, the laundry privatisation contract has been ruled out. The catering services are yet to be decided by the health service board. Some of the laundry staff have worked in the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital laundry for up to 30 years and some are second and third generation employees at the hospital. I was pleased to hear that those people will keep their jobs. However, I was disturbed to read the letter from the health service board suggesting that the staff would be constantly subjected to benchmarking and if their performance did not come up to scratch, the whole process would be renewed. This Government appears to have a complete lack of compassion about the effect of ongoing job insecurity on workers. As I have said, some of those people have worked in the hospital laundry service for 30 years. They are faced with ongoing uncertainty, despite the fact that presumably their performance has worked out okay or the board would have gone on to privatisation. Of course, we do not have access to the benchmarking figures and so we can never form a proper opinion. Why is it that those loyal and dedicated staff still have the threat of losing their job hanging over their head?

I am critical of the contracting out process because it is wasteful. The Government's rhetoric says that it is all about saving taxpayers' dollars, increasing efficiency and so forth. As I have said, because we do not have access to the benchmark figures we will never know - certainly I will never know. I am glad the Minister is present. I put a question on notice to him about the cost of the privatisation exploration process in the Kalgoorlie hospital laundry. Let us remember that we are not talking about a hell of a lot of staff; we are not talking about hundreds and hundreds of people being assessed. However, according to the answer I received today, the cost to date has been \$50 000. That is the cost of investigating the privatisation of essentially a handful of jobs. Let us remember that the people who work in the laundry, who are mainly women, do not receive a lot of wages per annum. We are probably talking about two full-time wages in terms of the total cost of investigating this privatisation process. What is even more disturbing is that the cost does not include the involvement of management, the staff who were involved on the consultative committee which met regularly, the advice from the legal department of the Health Department - we all know that lawyers are not cheap -

Mr Marlborough: Are you talking of their morals?

Ms ANWYL: I am talking about fees. It does not include the cost of obtaining advice from the Crown Solicitor's office or the State Supply Policy Council. The dollar value of the consultancy is difficult to quantify, according to the answer I have.

Mr Prince interjected.

Ms ANWYL: I do not believe it has changed the laundry's working at all. A major restructuring of the laundry and catering occurred prior to this whole process being undertaken. How can I possibly form an opinion on the value of the benchmarking process if none of the documents is to be made available?

Mr Prince interjected.

Ms ANWYL: Quite frankly, I do not spend a lot of time in the laundry of the hospital. It is difficult for me to comment. I suggest that the process has cost anything upwards of \$100 000, and for what effect?

Mr Prince: If the laundry is working at its maximum efficiency, it has obviously been a worthwhile exercise.

Ms ANWYL: We spend \$100 000 to work out that all of those people are doing a good job! No wonder we have cuts in vital services in this State, if we have to spend \$100 000 to work out that fewer than 30 people are doing a good job in a hospital. The concept is preposterous. I suggest that this amount of money is very typical of the large amount of dollars being spent across a huge number of industries in this State. Whose pockets are those dollars going into? I suggest the moneys are going into the pockets of the beneficiaries of this Government's policies; that is, people who are aligned in one way or another with the coalition parties. The Government is not receiving one iota of value from this expenditure. The non-government services are deteriorating because of this Government's obsession with contracting out.

I do not think I received a very coherent response from the Minister for Family and Children's Services, but I raised in the media an example in the field of domestic violence where \$250 000 was earmarked on 1 July last year for Aboriginal domestic violence. Not one dollar of that has been spent. Here we are almost into the next financial year. I should not say that not one dollar has been spent because it may be that \$100 000 has been spent on consultants' fees - I do not know. That money has not been delivered to the place where it should have been delivered, bearing in mind that statistics indicate that Aboriginal women suffer domestic violence some 53 times the rate for non-Aboriginal women. I know the Minister will say that that \$250 000 will be spent. However, my point is that if it were not for the contracting out obsession, that money would have reached its destination a long time ago. In my electorate a number of Aboriginal communities have tendered for the money. It might be that they could be providing services which would be addressing the issue now.

I have given three examples of where the obsession with contracting out is effectively causing a deleterious effect on the provision of services. The other effect of that obsession is the effect it is having on the relations of the non-government sector with the Government. Right across the social services field agencies are reluctant to speak up openly about the problems they are seeing. We do not have to be Einsteins to know that unemployment is rising, particularly in rural areas, and that youth unemployment is a huge problem. We hear rhetoric day in and day out about the issues of youth suicide, homelessness and so forth being addressed at state and federal levels. All the people working in that sector are concerned at a range of government actions. However, because of the continuous need to contract out and tender successfully for government moneys, there is a real reluctance to speak out publicly about the difficulties that those non-government agencies are facing.

I return to the broken promise theme. I have a document which details some 50-odd promises of the coalition Government which were made in 1993 in respect of my own electorate. I understand that some of the promises relate to the electorate of the member for Eyre, and I am sure he will refer to those. The Eastern Goldfields Senior High School is the second largest school in Western Australia. It had 1 302 students as at February of this year. I suspect that it has now slightly more. A promise made in the coalition policy document in the election campaign in January 1993 was that the coalition would determine the demand for secondary education in the Hannan's area with a view to establishing a district high school or senior high school in the area. Absolutely nothing has occurred, and some four years later the senior high school is bursting at the seams. I have spoken to the Minister for Education about this issue. He has been reasonably receptive to the concept that something must happen at the high school, and a committee has been set up. However, I was disturbed when in answer to a question on notice on 28 April about overcrowding at the high school the Minister replied there was no overcrowding and only five temporary classrooms were required in addition to the permanent facilities. The reality is that at the end of last year and the beginning of this year the parents and citizens' association spent a great deal of time making representations to the Education Department, because the school principal was requesting several new classrooms. We are not talking about new brick and mortar classrooms, but temporary classrooms. One of the existing transportable classrooms was moved to a local primary school because of a fire. That was later replaced, but no new transportables were made available, notwithstanding representations made by the parents and citizens' association. It was clear from a number of parents to whom I spoke that the academic performance and behaviour of their children was being affected because they did not have the type or size of classrooms that were needed for subjects, particularly science, where it is vital that children can observe practical experiments.

The Minister for Education says that he does not think the Eastern Goldfields Senior High School is overcrowded, notwithstanding it has an enrolment of 1 300 children, it is the second largest school in the State and a promise was made in 1993 that another high school would be built in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. The reality is that it is overcrowded, and a number of families have left the goldfields because of the perception that their children will not have a decent secondary education in the town. I know that the member for Pilbara, the member for Eyre and, I suspect, the member for Kimberley would endorse my comment that the lack of sufficient quality education facilities for our children is affecting the development of the region. The reality in regional development is that until this education problem is fixed there will be no stable population growth with families remaining long term.

I do not criticise the quality of education available at the high school. It has an excellent level of staffing and the range of subjects offered by a professional group of teachers is exceptional. However I know that senior staff have become so frustrated with this continual overcrowding that they have given up and moved to the metropolitan area. Of course, people leave for other reasons; however, I know that in some cases staff have left because of a frustration with the Government's repeated rhetoric that it will fix these issues, and its failure to do anything about them.

The problem does not stop at the Eastern Goldfields Senior High School; the South Kalgoorlie Primary School is one of the largest primary schools in the State, if not the largest, with 120 preprimary students at that school alone. The facilities include a number of old fashioned Bristol transportables which have now become permanent fixtures at the school. It is disturbing to see that this Budget makes no real provision for that infrastructure. I have previously placed on record that I would like to see a seniors' college developed in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. I support the notion

that a separate college for years 11 and 12 be built next to the high school for maximum sharing of resources. I also support the notion that such a facility would enable a number of people to return to school and do their so-called year 13 of adult education. It seems there is a large need for that type of facility which cannot be entirely met by the excellent bridging courses and general studies course which are available on the Kalgoorlie campus of Curtin University. The bureaucratic process must be speeded up. I acknowledge that a committee has been set up to look at these issues; however, it must be spurred along.

One of the most fundamental problems in Kalgoorlie-Boulder is street drinking. During the election campaign the coalition promised that it would take action to control street drinking. The member for Eyre and I have been involved with an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission appointed and run committee on this issue. However, when the committee presented some legislation in draft form to the former Minister for Aboriginal Affairs there was a complete lack of cooperation. Although I acknowledge some attempt has been made to improve Aboriginal police liaison in Kalgoorlie-Boulder by the appointment of more police aides, a range of issues are still to be addressed on homeless Aboriginal people in my city. It was only one weekend ago that an Aboriginal woman died of exposure. That is a regular event. Temperatures in Kalgoorlie-Boulder are low. We had a maximum of 10 degrees on Saturday, and another Aboriginal woman is dead. Each winter a number of people die. Little attention has been paid to what I acknowledge are extremely complex issues surrounding the reasons that people come to be living on the street. A committee that both the member for Eyre and I have attended for a long time came up with a number of constructive proposals, but sufficient resources have not been available to get those proposals under way. I make a plea to the Minister, who is in this place, to look at the legislation which was presented to his predecessor, and which the committee has now refined, to attempt to address this problem before more deaths occur, because undoubtedly they will.

One of the primary matters that I have been involved with since becoming the member for Kalgoorlie and since I moved to Kalgoorlie seven years ago is youth services - in some ways it is the lack of youth services in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. We are seeing an increase in the number of youths who are sniffing petrol and other deleterious substances. This Government recently, and without much publicity, amended the laws to remove the power of Aboriginal communities to impose sentences of imprisonment - or detention for those under 18 - with respect to youths who are petrol sniffers. That has been removed, but it seems there has been no real effort to improve the services available to deal with those issues. I have had a number of representations from not only people who deal with the communities and see first-hand the effects of increased petrol sniffing, but also people in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. Many of these youths end up causing all sorts of problems in Kalgoorlie-Boulder as a result of crime. I was disappointed, but not surprised, to find out recently about a notorious juvenile who had been handballed between government agencies, including Family and Children's Services and the Ministry of Justice. He is a young adolescent now, but he has been involved in the criminal justice system from an early age. I was recently advised that that child is now in Graylands Hospital and is likely to be there permanently because not only does he have severe brain damage, but also he has attempted to kill himself a number of times. I give that illustration because we are seeing the beginning of what will result in an epidemic across the area in which I live.

The lack of attention to finding meaningful solutions to these sorts of issues does not do this Government any credit. Unless steps are taken to overcome the devastating impact of petrol sniffing, we will not see any improvements. From a purely economic point of view, numbers of other people like the boy I have just described will cost the taxpayer vast sums of money each year through their detention in prisons or juvenile facilities or, in his case, in Graylands.

I mentioned the lack of a mandate of this Government for the industrial relations legislation. I know those opposite like to think that only a few people have a problem with this contentious legislation. However, it is not only a few; it is a vast number of people throughout the community. That is evidenced by the virtually unprecedented step of the churches calling on the Government to reconsider its divisive legislation; the representations by labour organisations from places well outside Australia; the breach of international obligations in conventions and treaties - there is no doubt that at least three significant treaties will be breached; and the lack of attention to constitutional law, which is evidenced by the operations of the federally affected awards. I am sorry the Minister for Labour Relations is not present at the moment. When I raised these problems during Committee on the Labour Relations Legislation Amendment Bill, the Minister assured me he had legal advice to the effect that there were no such conflicts. When I asked him to table that advice - knowing the answer would be no - he surprised me and told me he would provide a summary of that legal advice. That was on 8 April. I am still waiting for the advice. I placed a question on notice to the Minister and he responded by saying that no such advice existed. He was either wrong when he told me in Committee that he had advice, or he may have been wrong when he answered the question on notice and said no such advice existed. My suspicion is that no such advice exists.

The Minister finally came clean about his objective. I was pleased to see that on 29 April, after returning from his Asian trip during a time of unprecedented turmoil in this State, he was candid for a change. In *The West Australian* he is reported as saying -

There are 1.2 billion people in China producing very high-quality products with wage rates one-tenth of those in Australia . . .

One major thrust of this legislation is to destroy the wages and conditions of workers in this State. We know that workplace agreements are being registered for less than the minimum wage. We know that many workers have no choice about signing a workplace agreement but must do so if they wish to take a job in these difficult economic times. It is implied in all the Minister's comments that he embraces his system, and has developed a hardening of attitude, because he wants to see the wages and conditions of workers in this State match those of China, or at least become more competitive. To read more competitive, one can assume only that we are talking about a reduction. Many members opposite fail to understand that even those who do not belong to trade unions are alarmed by the Minister's candid wish to destroy the wages and conditions of workers in this State.

**MR GRILL** (Eyre) [8.46 pm]: I want to talk about a decision made by the Court Government in this Budget; that is, the landmark decision to tax gold. No other Government for at least 50 years has been prepared to take that step. I am not certain whether there has been a gold tax up until the present time. It was my understanding until recently that a gold royalty or tax had never been applied by a State Government in Western Australia. However, it was drawn to my attention a few weeks ago that there may have been a gold tax in the early 1940s. I have seen a reference to a gold tax in an edition of the *Kalgoorlie Miner* going back to 1947 or 1948. However, I believe there has never been a royalty placed on gold in the past, although there may have been a tax. The decision by the Government to impose a gold royalty is a landmark decision.

The decision represents a major change of posture, because for a long time the conservative parties have masqueraded as special friends of that part of the mining industry that has considerable roots in this State; that is, the goldmining industry. I have it on good authority in no uncertain terms from a person in the industry, whom I cannot name - a person who is also within the ranks of the Liberal Party - that the major contributor to the last two election campaign war chests for the coalition partners was the goldmining industry.

The decision by this Government, not yet implemented, to tax gold was made in the most dubious of circumstances. I have outlined those circumstances on numerous occasions in this House, as have the member for Kalgoorlie and the Leader of the Opposition. I will not labour that point, but I repeat a statement I have made on previous occasions; that is, the circumstances in which the Government announced that it would proceed with a gold tax were treacherous to the electors of Eyre, Kalgoorlie, Ningaloo and others generally in Western Australia. The gold industry in this State affects a wide spectrum of people, many of whom live in the Perth metropolitan area.

At a recent meeting of the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies in Kalgoorlie, attended by the Minister for Mines, Hon Norman Moore, the Government was called on to implement a study into the effect of a tax on the industry. That fairly innocuous request was carried by the 200 people at the meeting in the presence of the Minister for Mines, who said he would take it to the Government for consideration. He did not say a study would be carried out but that it would be presented to the Government for consideration. Nothing has been heard from the Government since then. However, it appears the Government has set its face against any independent inquiry into the implications of such a tax. I ask you, Mr Speaker, why the Government will not be party to such an independent study. What has it to fear? If this royalty is a good thing for Western Australia, why fear an independent inquiry? If it is a good thing for the mining industry generally, why fear an independent inquiry? If it will not be deleterious to the goldmining industry, why fear an inquiry? Why has this Government so steadfastly set its face against such an inquiry? Is it because it is afraid of the truth that would be revealed by such an inquiry? That is a suspicion some people have, including me and most residents of Kalgoorlie. They believe the Government will not go down that track because it would be embarrassed by the result. That is probably correct.

It is not as though this tax will raise much money initially. In the current Budget it is estimated a gold royalty will raise \$19m if it is applied at the rate of 1.25 per cent, rising in due course to 2.5 per cent. A paper is in circulation in some areas that presents a justification for the gold tax. I do not have a copy of it as yet, but it has been referred to in the mining journals of this State. It came from Treasury, and the Chamber of Mines and Energy is privy to it. I have made a request for a copy of the document under the Freedom of Information Act. I understand from reports in the mining journals of Western Australia that the paper is not a dinky-di analysis of the effects of a gold royalty on the Western Australian goldmining industry. It is a polemical paper full of political arguments about the best time to introduce such a tax. It is about the most opportunistic time to introduce a tax, who needs to be convinced, persuaded or cajoled, who needs their arms twisted, who needs to be stymied in one form or another, and which people must be gagged in relation to the implementation of such a royalty. Is that the sort of paper Treasury should issue? I do not think so. Is that the sort of paper Treasury officials normally write? Not in my experience. Why in

these circumstances was this polemical exercise carried out by Treasury? Was it because certain Ministers intended to go down that track, and they put the officials up to writing such a paper? I suspect that is the case, and one of those Ministers is hightailing it from the Chamber at present for fear of being embarrassed.

Mr Cowan: Hope springs eternal in the breast of the member for Eyre!

Mr GRILL: He was rushing out until I said those words. The Government, through more than one of its Ministers but particularly the Premier, has made a commitment that small and marginal miners will be looked after and not be put out of business or deleteriously affected by such a tax. It was a solemn commitment, although several fuzzy commitments were made prior to the election.

Mr Shave: Everyone made fuzzy commitments prior to the election.

Mr GRILL: I certainly was not making any promises.

Mr Shave: Your skipper was making a lot of promises.

Mr GRILL: He is conservative in that respect and it is most unlikely. Certainly the Opposition did not make blatant promises which could be termed indiscretions or, dare I use the word, lies. Fuzzy commitments were made prior to the election, but I refer to the clear commitment by the Premier to the industry, on one occasion at the gold conference in Kalgoorlie, eyeball to eyeball, that small and marginal miners would not be detrimentally affected by the royalty.

It has been suggested that small miners should be protected and that those who produce small amounts of gold - up to 1 000 ounces - should be exempt from the tax. If the Government intends to proceed with that proposal, it will not protect very many small miners. It will protect a number of prospectors at the bottom end of the ladder but it will not protect many in the small mining company fraternity. There does not seem to be a serious commitment to protect the marginal operation, and I have heard no serious proposal from the Government that will protect marginal miners. In fact, I do not think the Government knows how many marginal goldmining operations there are in Western Australia. That is one of the reasons a study should be carried out. If any Ministers listening at the moment are prepared to enlighten the House on the number of marginal goldmining operations in Western Australia, I would be happy to hear from them. A few weeks ago I quoted from a paper published once a week by Bell Securities. Often within that weekly paper is the cost of goldmining production on a mine by mine, and sometimes a company by company, basis across Australia.

I quoted several weeks ago from a copy of *Bell's Weekly Gold Review* which was some weeks old, and it was alarming to note just how many goldmining operations in this State were operating with greater costs than returns. Any member who knows anything about the goldmining industry will appreciate that one can mine gold profitably with costs greater than returns because of what one might receive on the futures market for the sale of gold. However, one cannot do that forever. It is done by virtue of the futures market. Many Western Australian goldmining companies have become extremely expert in using that market to hedge their position and to keep mines alive, but it cannot go on forever.

I put it to the Government, or any Minister who might be listening and who might like to chance his arm: How many of these marginal mining operations will be affected by the gold tax? I suggest that the Government does not know the answer as no answer is offered by the government benches at this time. Members opposite do not know how many, or in what way, companies will be affected. If they know, they are not letting on. The only information offered has come from the Chamber of Minerals and Energy and the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies, both of which bodies have carried out some work in the area. I will refer to that work shortly.

The truth is that this Government is implementing this gold royalty not knowing how many mines and companies will be affected, or the effect of this tax on new operators. Plans have been made for mines to come into production at some future date, yet the Government has no idea about the effect it will have on goldmining companies extending their operations to new areas, be it new chutes, reefs or situations. Members opposite have no idea how the tax will affect those companies making the transition from open cut to the much more expensive underground operations, or exploration.

I remind members opposite that the goldmining companies, and the exploration and producing companies, have a very wide ranging effect on the economy of this State. The goldmining industry is our biggest exporter. Petroleum, including gas, is probably the bigger industry, but gold is our biggest export industry. It is bigger than any other mineral, yet this Government is prepared to apply a new tax on that industry without studying its possible ramifications on different people.

I posed questions about the effect of the royalty on exploration. The exploration budget in this State all up is between \$300m or \$400m, 70 per cent of which is generated by the goldmining industry. As members opposite with some

knowledge of the industry know, when a new tax is imposed or a downturn in the goldmining or any other mining industry occurs, the first casualty is exploration money. I think the Minister will agree.

Mr Shave: Absolutely.

Mr GRILL: The suggestion coming from the goldmining industry is that the axe will fall first in this area. The goldmining companies of Western Australian - I have congratulated them for this in the past - are now looking offshore in the maturing of a fledgling industry.

Mr Shave: It would have happened anyway.

Mr GRILL: It is happening now which is a good thing. It is a maturing industry as companies are spreading their wings and heading overseas taking Australian expertise and talent with them. We are the best miners in the world. We have not always been able to say that, but in the last decade Western Australians, without fear or favour, have become the best miners in the world. We are the most efficient and productive. Africa comes close, but the South Africans are out-competed by Australians, principally Western Australians. However, this is the industry which the Government has decided to tax without knowing the effects -

Mr Board: You said a while ago it was a royalty.

Mr GRILL: I use the words interchangeably.

Mr Board: It is a royalty when it is on a finite resource.

Mr Shave: When is a royalty not a royalty? Is gold a finite resource?

Mr GRILL: It depends: Many people have the misguided view that we live in a world with finite resources; that is, that resources are running out. I have a different view; namely, that we live in a world of expanding resources. The history of the goldmining industry is that resources have expanded. For instance, 100 years ago Norseman existed on a two-year reserve, but it has operated for 100 years.

Mr Shave: You know that the resources have always been there. You are saying that access to the resource has improved through technology. Resources do not expand - they are always there.

Mr GRILL: All the Malthusians have made doomsday prophesies for 300 years, but they have comprehensively been proved wrong. They have never taken into account the advancement of technology. What is not a resource today may well be a resource tomorrow. The answer is that resources are not finite. Ultimately, we will have a very cheap source of energy in the world, and the skies are the limit once we have that energy source. We will be mining the oceans of the earth for most of the minerals we need. Therefore, one can say that minerals are not finite at all.

Mr Shave: I think you're right. The gold reserves on the earth's floor, those under water, would be five per cent established.

Mr GRILL: If that. I remember a speech made by Premier John Tonkin in the eastern goldfields back in about 1973. The goldmining industry had been through a very hard time, and he went up to Kalgoorlie to offer some aid to the industry. It was at a time when some mines were closing. He made a stirring speech about the prospects of the goldmining industry in general; it was the first time I had heard the words, "We have only just found stuff that pokes up out of the ground, and many more times that amount of minerals are underneath the surface." The prospects for the eastern goldfields, he thought at that time, were limitless. He had a far reaching vision for the goldfields. He taught at Boulder for some time and had an understanding of the goldfields which many city people unfortunately lack. He had a view about finite resources. He thought it was an almost inexhaustible resource provided we had the vision and the capacity to carry on with the job and explore.

Mr Board: You are arguing about marginal operations. If this were a tax, I might agree; but it is a royalty. Therefore, it requires basically a law. You cannot argue it on a marginal basis if it is a royalty.

Mr GRILL: There is a very simplistic argument which the member is now parroting.

Mr Board: You are saying because there may not be a competitive operation, there should not be a royalty.

Mr GRILL: At the end of the day we are talking about jobs, about wealth creation. If the member is thinking about an ad valorem royalty - that is what is being proposed by the Government - no-one will argue that it will not cost jobs; that the mines will not need higher cut off grades to accommodate that tax; or that the level of production will go down to some degree. All of those things will happen.

I will argue - I have done so in this place before - that there is a uniqueness about gold. It cannot be compared necessarily with an iron ore deposit. It is a very different product. It is physically different; harder to find; harder to mine in most cases; and flukier in terms of its construction.

At the end of the day, this tax must cost jobs. This Government is going ahead with a tax without any proper estimate of the jobs it might cost. If the Treasury paper had done some sort of analysis on what the loss of production might be, or how the head grade might have to be increased, or which mines would go out of operation, or which new deposits would not be mined, or how many jobs might be lost, that document would have some credibility. The truth is that it did not make any of those analyses. In implementing this tax, the Government is flying blind.

I know the argument will be that it is not a very big tax, especially at the initial level of 2.5 per cent overall; however, we can say with certainty that this tax will cost jobs. This goldmining industry has served this State very well. Some analyses have been undertaken on what this tax might do. The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies conducted a study of nine mines in the eastern goldfields. It came up with a finding that, firstly, 44 per cent of those mines would need to raise their cut-off grade to remain profitable under a gold royalty. That is a pretty dramatic effect. The increase in cut-off grade ranges from 0.05 to 0.12 grams per tonne. Our goldmining industry operates on the basis of a cut-off grade of about 2.1 grams; therefore, those small figures make a big difference. The efficiency of the goldmining industry in this State causes part of its problem. It is able to mine very low grades of gold efficiently, but the margin on which some of the mines operate is very small. When we start to tinker with that margin, as this gold royalty will, there will be loss of production and loss of jobs.

The second finding in the analysis was that the total quantity of gold produced in the same sample of mines surveyed would fall by 184 000 ounces, ranging in impact from zero to 50 000 ounces. The total value of lost production is an estimated \$86m. This is a clear waste of community resources. This survey is saying that 184 000 ounces of gold would remain in the ground and \$86m would not be a receipt either by the mining company or the people of Western Australia - it will be lost immediately the royalty is brought in.

Thirdly, the survey found that future employment would be reduced in one-third of the mines. The work force of one mine would be cut by more than 22 per cent. Fourthly, mine life would be reduced in 44 per cent of the mines and by up to six years in one particular mine, with another mine threatened with closure. The average value of lost gold production across the mines would be \$9.5m per mine. That is just for those nine mines that were surveyed.

Fifthly, all mines stated that they would reduce their future investment in Western Australia, ranging from \$2m to \$20m. That investment would be, partly, in exploration, equipment and new jobs. Sixthly, expanding the results across the industry, the survey found the consequences of a royalty would be an average reduction in mine life of one year; lost production of just under \$500m; and reduced future investment of \$200m. They are the big numbers; that is the bottom line.

Is that the situation we should countenance? Are the employment and wealth creation situations in this State so good that we can afford to wave goodbye to that sort of money and destroy those jobs? I know most people will concede we cannot afford that; yet this Government is contemplating just that.

The Chamber of Minerals and Industry of Western Australia contracted the University of Western Australia economics department to conduct its analysis. It looked at the economic effects of a gold royalty at 2.5 per cent. This is what it found: Under the heading "Government Benefits" it found that royalty revenue raised by the Government would be plus \$75m. That would increase the Government's bottom line in a full year of taxation by \$50m. There would be offsets of about \$25m against that royalty revenue of \$75m. It then goes on to deduct from that the economic loss. It looks at the Australia-wide picture to begin with. It states that Australia-wide gross domestic product would be reduced by \$370m. That figure does not quite equate with that produced by AMEC; that is, just under \$500m. The University of Western Australia came out with a figure of \$370m. The models may have been different. Nonetheless somewhere between \$370m on one model and nearly \$500m on another model will be lost in a full year as a result of this tax. The university analysis found that Australian exports would go down by \$100m; State income would go down by \$250m and WA gold output would go down by \$88m. The effect on Western Australian employment would be 1 500 jobs.

Mr Barnett: It was carried out by an economist employed by the University of Western Australia.

Mr GRILL: A group of economists were employed. As I understand it, the analysis was conducted by Professor Clements, a person whom the Minister, on occasions, has been more than happy to join on the rostrum and to praise his expertise. He is a conservative economist, nonetheless, but a person of some repute and someone we cannot lightly dismiss.

Can we afford the loss of that number of jobs in the current situation? The Government consistently points to its employment performance as being better than that of other States. I am pleased to say that is true. This State has

done better than other States, but not a lot better. The seasonally adjusted revised unemployment figures for February show that Western Australia has an unemployment rate of 7.6 per cent. The national average in February was 8.8 per cent. Western Australia is about 1 per cent below the national average. I am not particularly happy with that figure, and I know the Government is not happy with it either, because it has confessed as much. Is the Government happy to add another 1 500 jobless to that figure when the gold tax is introduced? I thought the Government would not want to do that.

The Government's proposed gold royalty is not a tax on profits. The truth is it has nothing to do with profits. A gold royalty is an ad valorem tax; it is payable whether the mine makes a profit or not. People should understand that. Even most people in Kalgoorlie are under the false impression that a gold royalty is a tax on profits or an income tax or company tax. An income tax or company tax on gold is nowhere near as pernicious as a royalty. A royalty is a tax on everything produced regardless of profit and for that reason it is a dangerous tax.

An income tax will not necessarily reduce the number of jobs. It will not necessarily have the same effect on head grades. It will not necessarily ensure that some of the product is left in the ground. But a royalty will, unless it is somehow made into a profit-based royalty. It will be difficult for the State to do that. I encourage the Government not to proceed with the tax, because of its deleterious effect, but if it insists on going down that track, it should ensure that it is a profit-based royalty.

Mr Barnett: There are mixed views in the industry about that.

Mr GRILL: I know there are elements in the industry who think that way. They are usually those at the big end of town who are making huge profits. They do not want to pay that sort of tax. But for the overall benefit of the State, for the goldfields in particular, a profit-based royalty is the sort of tax the Government should introduce. I am not advocating that the Government introduce any royalty, but if it intends to go down that track, it should not listen to those people making the big profits. It should be listening to those people who advocate what is best for the State. Unless the Government has some information that contradicts all of that, it should not introduce a tax at all.

If the Minister has figures that contradict AMEC's nine-mine analysis, or information that contradicts the research of the University of Western Australia, he should produce it. If not, a study should be done. There are already rumours spreading that the Minister has engaged someone to look at the effect of the gold tax.

Mr Barnett: I haven't.

Mr GRILL: Is there any basis for those rumours?

Mr Barnett: I am not sure what Treasury has done, but I have not.

Mr GRILL: A number of commentators say that gold is just like any other ore, that it is no different from base metals such as copper, lead or nickel, or any other commodity and that it should not be treated any differently from any other commodity. That suggestion is put forward by people who have no knowledge of the mining industry, or of the goldmining industry in particular. Gold has never held that position and hopefully never will. Gold has always been a unique mineral.

Western Australia was built on gold. Virtually no-one lived in this State until gold was discovered. In fact, it was not until gold was found in Western Australia that the colony had any claim to greatness. The great majority of people who lived in this State lived in the goldfields, and they, rather disparagingly, referred to the Government in Perth as the "Government on the coast".

Back in 1850 the struggling colony turned in desperation to importing convicts. We were bringing people in chains to this State when the rest of Australia was eschewing that notion. That is how desperate we were in the 1850s. The convicts built some very fine buildings but they did not build Western Australia. The truth is the goldmining industry and the people who came here to mine gold built the State. That is when my relatives came to Western Australia.

Gold is still important to the global economy. It may not be pre-eminent at present but it is still extremely important. Although some European Governments are selling off gold so that countries in the European Community can compete with the monetary requirement of the new EC currency, that will pass. In many countries gold remains the basis of wealth. Gold in the global economy is not simply another base metal, it is very important. Western Australia would not have a stock exchange of any note if it were not for the goldmining industry. If Western Australian stocks have any claim at all to fame it is the gold and mining stocks. We would not have a merchant bank, the expertise in the futures market, GoldCorp or a gold Mint in this State if it were not for the goldmining industry. All of those add values and jobs to Western Australia.

The Government is grievously mistaken in this Budget to proceed down the track of implementing the gold royalty. It is a bad step. It will cost us wealth and jobs. Ultimately it will cost this Government the right to govern. That



might sound like a long shot. However, I have always maintained in forums within our party that no party can win government in this State if it does not have the support of the major resource industries. When we came to government in 1983 we had the support of those industries. Subsequently, the coalition has had the support of those industries. Those industries are starting to turn against the Government. They were treacherously treated with this gold tax, and they will not forget it. At the next election the resource industries of this State will vote the Government out and they will not be supporting the Government with funds as they have in the past, and they may well support our party. There will be consequences from this gold tax and not all of them will be good for the Government.

**MR MARSHALL** (Dawesville - Parliamentary Secretary) [9.31 pm]: As the former member for the Murray electorate and the first member for Dawesville I remind the House how important are good and proper budgetary allocations to growing areas, and what they mean to the progress of a region.

The explosive population growth in the Peel region has seen more action and projects completed in the past three years than at any time in the history of the area. Although many people like to dwell on the negatives I will refer to the infrastructure that has been completed. Sometimes we take infrastructure for granted. We lobby for it, and when we get it we absorb it and then take it for granted. I will also advise members what this infrastructure has meant to the area in other ways. I will first refresh members' memories. Budget allocations have been favouring the south west and the Mandurah areas because population demands infrastructure. "Demands" is a simple word.

Let me refresh members' memory about the population growth in my electorate. In 1993 the population was 56 843; in 1994, 58 916; in 1995, 61 782; and in 1996, 64 200 people. That is an increase of 15 per cent, which has determined that the area is the fastest growing area in Western Australia. To give members an idea why I said we are inclined to take things for granted I have aerial photographs in my sports room of the canals of Mandurah. Five years ago the first canals were built in Mandurah. There was a lot of opposition from the environmentalists, who believed the wetlands should not be destroyed; from negative people who said there should not be canals in Mandurah; and from other people who thought it was the wild dream of some engineers and real estate developers who would ruin the city. The first aerial photograph showed that 20 per cent of the waterside development had houses on it. Five years later only a handful of blocks, six at the most, are left. Magnificent houses have been constructed, and the block value has increased from \$80 000 to \$250 000. The same has happened at Port Mandurah. The same photograph shows that only one-eighth of the blocks were sold and houses developed. Now, all of stage 1 has been sold and the price of the blocks increased from \$100 000 to \$350 000. Could members have imagined five years ago buying a block in sleepy hollow Mandurah that is now worth \$350 000? That is the price one pays for some of the better blocks in the metropolitan area.

Mr Pandal: The population increase is because your family moved down there.

Mr MARSHALL: Only two of us moved there. I was lucky, through my entry into politics, to move there. As I have told the member for South Perth many times, I am such an adventurous person that I had the same wife, house and business for 37 years. Then I got into politics. I changed my job and my house. I celebrated my thirty-seventh wedding anniversary the other day and I am proud of that, although I have got my wife on her toes.

It is very exciting to be part of the population boom. Stage 2 of Port Mandurah was developed over the past six months. It was interesting watching that engineering feat. While the dredging was in progress and the trenches constructed, there were complaints from constituents about dust; however, once they pulled out the bungs and we had a trench full of glistening water, the value of blocks increased. I was told that on the first day two blocks were sold for \$400 000 each. That is what is happening in the electorate of Dawesville.

The Dawesville Channel is old hat now. I also have five or six aerial photographs in my office of the progress of Dawesville Channel; it opened in 1994. We are inclined to forget when the Peel Harvey inlet was stagnating through lack of oxygen that an engineering feat was needed to save the environment of the waterways - incidentally, the Peel and Harvey Inlets are three times the size of the Swan. The Dawesville Channel was built for environmental reasons: To increase the tidal range, improve the water clarity, increase the water salinity and improve the flushing of the nutrients. That has been tremendous, but what else has happened?

There has been a tremendous increase in land subdivisions because of the Dawesville Channel. The Wannanup development around the channel is second to none; it will be the Gold Coast of Western Australia. Many of the blocks on the east side of the channel, known as Eastport, have been sold already. Southport is destined for a golf course and a five star hotel with magnificent views. Northport will have 380 urban blocks, a shopping centre and lots of amenities on an area that was bushland in 1994. Recently 2 km south of the Dawesville Channel the Florida estate was opened with another 280 lots; and 3 km north the Cox Bay development was opened with a 380 lots. These developments mean people and employment as houses are constructed on those blocks; and more infrastructure and demands for extra budgetary concerns from any Government that is in power. It was all created by one budgetary item - a \$45m item for the Dawesville Channel.

We should not forget the \$8.15m Port Bouvard Bridge, which is a magnificent engineering feat. Those developments have attracted tourists, and tourists demand services. In the past three years two restaurants - the Dancing Dolphin and the Jolly Frog - have opened on the northern side of the channel. Only 2 km down the road is the Dawesville shopping centre. Such has been the increase in the population that a new 12 shop commercial complex has been developed, 8 of which have already been leased.

If people had been told four years ago that another 250 houses would be built in the area, that a golf course would be built close to the Dawesville Channel, and that another shopping centre would be created, they would not have believed it. However, as a result of the Dawesville Channel that has all happened. The Dawesville Channel has also provided another area for recreational fishing. The different fish stocks coming through the channel from the Indian Ocean has meant that hundreds of thousands of people have been able to relax and enjoy their recreational fishing. Four more boat ramps have had to be provided, to allow more people to go out into the ocean for crayfishing. They are getting into the big fish, too!

It sounds as though everything is rosy, but with the good we also have some deficits. When we tamper with nature, it often creates other problems. A major problem is that the northward drift of the sand has been diverted as a result of the building of the Dawesville Channel groynes. The engineers decided that a bypass system would move the sand from the south side of the groynes. It was decided to pump the sand, which was collecting on the south side of the groyne, through the channel so that it would flow northwards. The theory was that the system would work well. However, it did not. Recent storms washed away the beaches at Falcon, Florida, and Rakoa Road and they have had to be restored manually by trucking in sand. Again, the engineers got to work. They realised that the pipes needed to be taken further out into the ocean to pump away the sand. As a result, the problem has been solved.

Another problem in the area has been the increased tidal flow up the Serpentine and Murray Rivers. The water moves out just as fast as it comes in, leaving many pools of water in which mosquitoes breed. This has resulted in a small increase in the number of cases of Barmah Forest virus and Ross River virus. Through poor journalistic reporting many people think that the Ross River virus originated in Mandurah. That is incorrect. Five per cent of the cases have occurred in the north west, 15 per cent in Mandurah and 75 per cent in the south west around Margaret River and Busselton. Great importance is placed on improving those percentages, and addressing the mosquito breeding problem. The situation is being addressed by regular helicopter spraying of various types of insecticides. The problem is being overcome, but it is a very costly exercise. The Government pays something like \$150 000 each year to address the problem created by population growth which makes its own demands. We need improved and decisive budgeting. I am pleased to say that, as the local member, every time I approach the Government for more money from the Health budget to attack the Ross River fever problem, it has been very sympathetic and has wisely allocated extra funding.

In 1994 the North Dandalup Dam was opened to provide extra water storage. That was an excellent Opposition initiative. However, I doubt that the Water Corporation realised that it was developing a tourist attraction. Perhaps it did. The corporation provided beautiful, grassed barbecue areas. The view to the east from the dam overlooks the forests around Dwellingup, and the area enjoys ocean views, even though it is 25 kilometres from the ocean. It is a magnificent place to visit. The infrastructure at the dam which cost around \$40m also provides a picnic place. The corporation did not realise that it was creating a triangle of tourism. Dwellingup, which is just up the hill from the dam, has become a tourist town. The tourist day trippers from Perth saw the potential to link Pinjarra and its heritage into a one day, triangular visit. The day trippers can now visit the North Dandalup Dam, which has a view second to none, and then travel to Dwellingup, which over the past three or four years has developed a fire museum. Members will recall the drastic, four day fires which destroyed Dwellingup in 1961.

Mr Marlborough: My sister-in-law lost all her property in that fire. She went away for a while and when she returned her house had gone.

Mr MARSHALL: It was the worst bushfire ever in Western Australia, and was captured on Channel 7 footage which now is shown in the museum at Dwellingup. That footage and other relics have been put together in the museum to remind us of our history, and it is very well attended by tourists. Additionally, the Department of Conservation and Land Management provided \$1.5m for a forest heritage centre. This was an initiative of Syd Shea, who was born and bred in East Fremantle. He was a very good tennis player in his heyday. The idea had three components: First, to allow students to undertake a Diploma of Arts in wood design; second, to show visitors the forest ecology; and third, to sell the wood exhibits produced by people undertaking the courses. Further, it was realised that the Marrinup prisoner of war camp was the only one set up in Western Australia. Between 1943 and 1946 more than 1 000 Germans and Italians were imprisoned in the camp. As a result of heritage listing, funds were provided in the form of a grant to restore the POW camp. That has also become a tourist attraction. Therefore, in the past three or four years Dwellingup has become more than just a place for the well informed to visit; it has been opened up to the entire State. Everyone knew about the Hotham Valley Railway, the Nanga Bush Camp and the Lane Poole Reserve, but

as a result of the other attractions Dwellingup has become a real tourist destination. People can also go to Pinjarra and visit the Blythewood and Edenvale heritage areas and see how the whole area was developed in the past. Therefore, the original infrastructure to store water has helped to create tourism and employment. It has also led to urban development in Dwellingup and has increased the price of the blocks of land. People did not realise they would become investors, and now possess valuable land.

Population demands infrastructure and infrastructure demands budgetary allocations by Governments. This leads me to talk about the Murray Play Centre. Because of the population boom there was a need in Barragup for a new play centre, but there was no money in the budget. The Murray Shire allocated some land for the centre, and I was told by the Minister at the time that if I went to Margaret River I would see a play centre that had been set up without any capital because a transportable house had been donated and renovated. I took three mothers down by car to see what could be done. We had relied on getting money from the Government for 12 months, but that was to no avail. We looked at the transportable and we were filled with confidence that we could make that happen at Barragup. Where could we get a transportable? When we returned to Mandurah we realised that at Hamilton Hill and in a few other areas, Homeswest houses were being demolished. We rang Homeswest and asked where we could get a Homeswest house for free, and we were asked how many did we want. Within a short time we had a Homeswest house. We had the land, and we had the house.

Mr Marlborough: You had the initiative!

Mr MARSHALL: Does the member for Peel know that it costs \$12 000 to transport a house? My community group which had been selling five tickets for a \$1 in a chicken raffle had collected only \$1 000. I appealed to the Government again. This time, the Minister, bless him, was able to provide some money from the budget to transport the Homeswest house to the land donated by the Murray Shire. The play centre was in its embryonic stage! Then the community rallied. We had only to put something in place and the community finished it off. Alcoa of Australia Ltd paved the car park. The local carpenter, plumber and painter contributed and nine months later what had started from nothing became the Murray Play Centre, of which everyone is very proud.

I mention that because many of my colleagues on both sides of the House know what they need in their electorate. They are fighters and have vision, but they need the support of Ministers who can see what is needed in communities and are willing to provide funds from the Budget to make things happen.

The Dwellingup Primary School needed a library. How could we get a library to Dwellingup? A Government Employees Housing Authority house was at the end of the playground. I asked GEHA how much it wanted for it. As a result of the Opposition's planning the house was not even on GEHA's books! It did not know the house existed. I put my foot in it and let GEHA know one was there. I do not know how it had not been vandalised over the past 15 years. The Government Employees Housing Authority wanted \$12 000 for it.

I said, "My little old parents and citizens' group has only \$2 000; let's make it \$5 000." However, GEHA said it wanted to rent it out because it needed the money. The playground had only one access and the P & C suddenly decided it needed to close the road. How could GEHA rent a house that had no access to it? Finally a deal was struck and we were able to get the GEHA house converted into a library, thanks to the imagination of visionary Ministers who know what facilities like that mean to a community.

For some time it concerned me that people from Pinjarra could not travel to Mandurah on public transport even though school buses travelled that distance each day. They left Mandurah full and returned empty. The reverse happened at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. What could we do? We took school buses away from education and put them under transport so they can now be used as normal buses. That was a revolutionary idea. All country people are able to use country school buses when they are empty. People from Pinjarra can now catch the empty bus at 9 o'clock, do their shopping at Mandurah and go home at 2.30 pm when the bus goes back to Pinjarra to pick up the children.

Mr Marlborough: Is that so?

Mr MARSHALL: Things happen that people like the member for Peel do not know about. We need Ministers with vision.

Talking about revolutionary ideas, the Labor Government tried to work out how to do it. It acknowledged the growth of Mandurah but not the fact that many people who moved to Mandurah continued to work in the metropolitan area. It took three or four years to work out a strategy. However, thanks to the Minister for Transport four rapid transit buses leave between 7.00 and 8.00 am each day filled with people going to work in the metropolitan area. That was very much needed for the fastest growing area in Western Australia.

It is obvious that much is happening in that area. I refer to some of the events that have taken place in the past four years. I do not know how many other members live in electorates that are exciting and growing as fast as the ones

down my way. Two of the four primary schools built in 1995 were built at Halls Head and Riverside. Both of those schools were assessed to accommodate 300 pupils each. Halls Head opened with 300 students. Riverside opened with 680 students, and requiring transportables, proving that Mandurah is no longer the retirement village that people remember.

The population blend is of very young preprimary school students, primary school students, young parents, high school students and retirees. Mandurah is truly a city with every age range. In the light of its growth, the demand for tertiary education was obvious. It is no good having just good primary schools and excellent senior high schools such as the Coodanup High School and Mandurah Senior High School. Tertiary education arrived last year. In 1996 the TAFE Murdoch centre was developed. I am proud to say that this year its student numbers have reached capacity.

The \$1.2m sports centre at Pinjarra was a dream that came true. As members all know, indoor sporting complexes are very important in this modern age of sport. That development at Pinjarra is going strong.

The Yalgorup National Park was created in 1995, showing again that the area has not catered for only one section of the community. It caters for bird watchers, bush walkers and artists who want to capture the natural environment. The Yalgorup National Park, developed by Syd Shea, Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Conservation and Land Management, connected five areas of bushland. I believe it covers an area of 75 kilometres of national park. It encompasses the famous stromatolites that were being damaged by people walking all over them. Fortunately we received budget funds to build a boardwalk to protect them.

On 14 June the \$16m cultural centre at Mandurah will be opened. This magnificent pavilion will seat 800 people in the main auditorium and 200 people in the smaller area. People will be able to arrive at the cultural centre by boat. I do not believe another cultural centre exists like it, except perhaps in Venice. At Mandurah on 14 June people will be able to cruise up to the cultural centre, ask the person at the quay to park their boat and attend the main show of the evening. Six years ago, who would have thought that would happen at Mandurah?

In five years I hope Mandurah will boast one of the best marinas in Western Australia. It started with plans for 250 pens and they have increased to 400 - and wisely so because the population will create that demand. That will create employment in a number of areas, primarily tourism.

Last weekend after I had left Parliament I was staggered to see eight launches ranging in length from 38 metres to 48 metres berthed at the culture centre. I discovered they belonged to a group from a Perth yacht club who had decided to cruise down to Mandurah and visit the magnificent Italian restaurant opposite; it was booked out. Members can see the result of budgetary allocations, and what vision does for employment and tourism in a new city.

At long last plans have already begun on the 130 bed hospital for Mandurah. It will have 100 public beds, 30 private beds, an intensive care unit, chemotherapy facilities, obstetrics, radiology, retail shops and a coffee lounge. This is the hospital for Mandurah that everyone has been dreaming about for the past 14 years. Eight years ago the then Government said that the region would have only a 30-bed hospital. It did not have the vision to anticipate that the area would increase in population and there would be a need for better hospital care. The population boom has caught out a lot of people. The City of Mandurah and the Peel Development Commission are frantically working to keep abreast of this boom. The Government put together a Peel regional strategy which was undertaken over two years. The strategy was a vision for the next 20 to 40 years and the people concerned were determined to identify the major priorities.

Mr Marlborough: Who did the strategy?

Mr MARSHALL: The Government of the day. It was not a plan, but a strategy to ascertain the direction in which the region was heading over the next 40 years. I chaired the committee that was established to undertake that strategy. It determined that a priority was to look at the main corridors of growth from Rockingham to Mandurah and from Mandurah to Pinjarra. The intention was to not allow to continue the urban sprawl which is evident around Rockingham and Safety Bay, but to keep the character of the Peel region. In other words, the farmlands, the public open space and the ocean views were to be retained instead of having a concrete jungle from Rockingham to Mandurah. The two corridors were included in an inner structure plan on which a group of planners worked for 12 months. They presented their report last year and the proposals in it are from people with vision.

In the past a lot of money was put into areas north of the river. However, it is now evident that anybody who lives south of the river in the Applecross and Fremantle areas does not retire to areas north of the river, but to areas such as Mandurah or Dawesville. Perhaps 1 per cent of the people who live south of the river retire to areas north of the river, but there is always an exception to the rule.

Incidentally, the inner structure plan picked up on an innovation of the Labor Government; that is, the setting aside of land for a Peel regional park. It had completed 65 per cent of the work. Planners completed the remaining 35 per

cent, presenting a Peel regional park that will protect land surrounding the waterways of the Peel region. This move will play a very important part in the history and progress of the area.

An increase in population brings with it an increase in unemployment and crime. There is always a negative side.

Mr Carpenter: What is the positive side?

Mr MARSHALL: The positive side is everything that has happened in the Peel region. I thought the member for Willagee was listening. The things which are happening in my electorate will never happen in his electorate. I was born and bred in the area the member for Willagee represents and he will never experience in his electorate the excitement I have experienced in my electorate in the last four years.

Unemployment in my electorate is of great concern. As yet there is not sufficient industry in the region to provide employment. The inner structure plan provides for industrial areas where economic growth can take place. Tourism will provide most of the employment in the area and the technical and further education college has a hospitality course as one of its main courses. This morning I attended the Coodanup Senior High School, which opened an aquaculture section. It has an area in which it trains youngsters to repair outboard motors, make boats and work with aluminium. Hopefully, that will provide them with employment in the future. The school also provides horticulture and poultry courses. It is providing hands-on education for youngsters to obtain experience for future employment.

The level of crime in my electorate is probably the same as in other electorates. Many of the houses in my electorate are unattended holiday homes and they are frequently broken into. For that reason, the police numbers in Mandurah have doubled over the last three years from 40 to 80 officers. I was told tonight that an additional Aboriginal aide will be appointed next week which will increase the number of Aboriginal aides in the Mandurah area to three, which is very important. I stress that the police in the area cannot combat crime on their own and they need help from Neighbourhood Watch and community policing.

The Peel region is a wonderful and vibrant place to live. All the action I have spoken about has occurred in the past four years. In addition new restaurants and businesses have opened their doors. Only last week I opened a \$2m family restaurant called the "Buffet House". Given the number of young people with children in the area a family restaurant is in great demand. The region has its own football club, Peel Thunder, which made history by being the first football team from a country town to be included in the Westar Rules competition. At the moment it is making history because it has not won a game. With the vision of the executive of the Western Australian Football Commission that team will improve next season. The inclusion of Peel Thunder in Westar Rules has resulted in an increase in tourism to the area. Approximately 7 000 people attended the first game and over half of those people were visitors. I am told that the restaurants were filled to capacity on that day.

The sporting clubs in the Peel region have improved. Mandurah is the only country city in Western Australia which does not have an astroturf playing field, but money has been allocated to have one put down this year. It will not be long before the locals will have the chance to compete at an international level and to make their bid for Olympic stardom. The tennis clubs have additional courts and the bowling club has a \$450 000 new clubhouse. Budget allocations are catering for all the elements of sport and recreation because of the demand created by the increase in population.

My electorate is a little treasure, but my electors must appreciate what they have and look after it. People spend a great deal of time lobbying intensively to improve sporting and other facilities, but one year after they have obtained the required infrastructure they take it for granted, and that is not right.

I will refer to some of this year's Budget allocations to the Peel area. The Peel Health Service will receive \$26m to complete the hospital which the region was promised. Main Roads Western Australia has been allocated \$2m to improve the road from Leslie Street to Dawesville. That is where the main population growth is and the people in the area need road improvements. An amount of \$2.4m will be allocated through the Water Corporation to upgrade the Halls Head waste water plant. Again, that sort of infrastructure and sewerage is required in areas where population is increasing. Transport is very important to the area and \$385 000 has been allocated to sand bypassing work at the Mandurah and Dawesville entrances to the estuary. These entrances were being blocked; boats inside the estuary were unable to get out and boats from Rottnest and Fremantle could not get in. The allocation has been made to dredge the entrances and that will keep them open for the boating population all year round, which will increase the number of tourists to the area. The Peel Development Commission has been allocated \$2m to complete projects such as the ocean marina and the tourist industry has been allocated \$72 000, which I do not think is sufficient. An increase in employment will be achieved through tourism and more money must be spent on promoting the area.

The population boom in the region demands extra and improved infrastructure. I believe, like all members, it is up to every local member to let Ministers know what progress is going on in their areas. If Ministers are presented with

a fair, factual and feasible proposition, I am sure they have enough vision to see whether the requests can be accommodated.

**MR MASTERS** (Vasse) [10.11 pm]: I support the Budget and the Bill that will allow it to proceed through this House. However, I cannot miss this opportunity to refer to the presentation just made by the previous speaker, who is leaving the Chamber, and remind him that the second fastest growing area in Australia is the Shire of Busselton, which includes Dunsborough. That is the theme of my speech tonight.

The Budget which was presented by the Premier last month has been very kind to the Vasse electorate. I will go briefly through some of the benefits that the electorate has gained from the Budget and highlight some of the issues that I hope will receive funding in future Budgets, including the next one in 12 months. First and foremost it is important to remember that Busselton has an agricultural base. It was founded in about 1840 after a cow walked north from Augusta to the tuart forest in Busselton. The farming property that was established after that was called "Cattle Chosen" and that signified the beginning of agriculture in that part of the world.

A publication put out in August last year by Agriculture Western Australia contains a number of facts and figures relating to Busselton and its contribution to agriculture in this State. It states that agriculture production in Busselton in 1993-94 totalled in the region of \$50m to \$75m. I estimate that figure has gone up by 50 per cent today because of the rapid pace of agricultural developments that have occurred since then. Busselton is the sixth highest cattle and sheep meat yielding shire in Western Australia with total production valued at just over \$10.6m; the third highest milk yielding shire with annual production totalling \$18.3m in 1993-94; the top producer of crops and pastures with production of hay totalling \$7.5m three years ago; and the eighth highest horticultural producing area in the State with production totalling \$12.7m. More significantly, Busselton is the seventh highest vegetable producing area in the State, with production totalling \$7.3m. It is also the top producer of grapes used in winemaking or distillation with production totalling \$2.5m. That figure relates to the grapes, not the wine produced from those grapes. The Busselton area is the eighth highest producer of cut flowers, nurseries and turf, with production totalling \$2.7m. Busselton comes in at fourth with cut flowers production totalling \$2.4m and production of cultivated turf coming in at ninth. Even though Harvey, Gingin and other areas are important irrigation areas, Busselton produces \$1.1m worth of horticultural products with a total land area of 664 hectares, which ranks it fourth in total state production.

The commitment that the Government has made to agriculture in Western Australia can be exemplified by the amount of money allocated to the construction of a new agricultural research station on Agriculture Western Australia's land at the Vasse Research Station. The amount allocated in the first year totals only a few hundred thousand dollars. However, in the end, it will involve a commitment of over \$1m to a research station that will undertake work in a wide range of expanding agricultural products for which Busselton, Capel and Augusta-Margaret River - that high rainfall part of Western Australia - is already making a name for itself and will continue to do so over coming years. That commitment is very much appreciated and I look forward to a further commitment of funds in future years.

I thank the Government for the extension of the natural gas pipeline from Boyanup to Capel. It is currently on its way to Busselton. That gas pipeline has allowed the two mineral sand companies, RGC Mineral Sands Limited, and my former employer, Westralian Sands Ltd, to convert from coal or fuel oil to natural gas, which is cheaper and more efficient, as well as environmentally beneficial. Benefits such as that will make a significant contribution to the overall increase in economic competitiveness of businesses such as the mineral industry in south west WA. Capel householders have asked me why it is not possible to connect them to the natural gas pipeline. I am investigating that. However, I understand that the market for domestic consumers in Capel is too small to justify an extension now. Nonetheless, I will look into it.

Among other economic contributions to Busselton over the next 12 months is a sum of \$2.5m for an upgraded waste water treatment plant to service the Busselton townsite, with a similar amount of money to service the Dunsborough townsite. I will return to this topic shortly.

I also commend Main Roads WA for a number of initiatives. In the period leading up to the last election, I was approached by people from the Gelorup area who were concerned about Main Roads' preferred position for what is called the Gelorup bypass, which is part of the Bunbury bypass road, which will eventually take heavy haulage traffic away from the Gelorup and outer Bunbury areas through the marginal farming land to the south east, east and north east of Bunbury. The residents were concerned that the consultant's studies had not examined all possible routes. The member for Mitchell and I told the Minister for Transport that a number of people would be seriously disadvantaged by this proposal should it proceed. To his credit, the Minister for Transport accepted the arguments that we put forward. The arguments were essentially technically based. Firstly, the road reserve going through the Gelorup corridor is 70 metres wide instead of the current Main Roads' preferred width of 100 metres. On top of that, the consultant considering other alternatives had deliberately avoided considering any areas that might even slightly impinge on wetlands in the area immediately to the south east of Gelorup. I pointed out to the Minister that that was a little unrealistic because wetlands, like any other ecological system, should be assessed for their actual

environmental values and not for their theoretical environmental values. My experience with the wetlands in that area indicates that it would be possible to put a major road close to or even through the middle of some of those very poor wetlands. Some of the wetlands have been cleared for agriculture and, in one case, cleared for purposes that no-one understands. Therefore, some of the wetlands unfairly constrained the consultant examining the possible options for the location of the Gelorup bypass. I am happy to say that the current consultant, ERM Mitchell McCotter Pty Ltd, has commenced this community consultation.

The consultants have spoken to a wide range of people in the area such as farmers, Gelorup residents and, I understand, the shire. I commend Main Roads and the Minister for having been willing to listen to our objections on technical grounds to the Main Roads preferred option. It has therefore been willing to commit money to look at what hopefully will be viable alternatives.

As I am talking about bypasses, I must commend Main Roads for another study it is conducting in its search for a potential bypass to replace Caves Road where it runs between Vasse and Dunsborough. The existing Caves Road carries 5 000 or 6 000 vehicles a day. Main Roads has quite rightly pointed out that within 15 years the number will increase significantly and the road will not be able to cope with the traffic flow. On top of that planning must be done for any selected alternative. Planning now means that the traumas and difficulties associated with finding a preferred route in five to 15 years' time will be overcome. However, it means some potential pain right now, especially for people living close to or right on the edge of any of the five preferred possible routes put forward by the consultants. I have explained my concern about this study to Main Roads WA. My concern is that one could argue that this is almost a ballot to find the number of people who are opposed to or in favour of a particular route. Since Caves Road has the largest number of people living along its route, that may therefore create a large number of protest votes from people who do not wish to have a four lane highway extending down what is for them something of a back road, the character of which they wish to retain. All of the four alternative routes go through farming land of one form or another. Of course, because the landholdings are larger, the population density is lower. The result may be that only a small number of affected landowners and farmers will put in their protest vote to Main Roads WA via its consultants, saying that they do not want the road to go through their farms. At the end of the day it may mean that an extension of Caves Road might attract 100 or 200 protest votes compared with perhaps 20 to 40 votes from the farmers in the areas affected by the four alternative routes. This would be unfair. We must take account of the full range of economic, social and environmental issues which the various routes might affect. To decide on a major transport route on the basis of the number of voices which are raised in protest, is not a very good example of democracy at work. Nonetheless, my concerns have been raised with Main Roads. I am confident that consultants will take those issues on board and try to achieve what I hope will be a well-balanced and considered set of options before making a recommendation or providing data to the community about the preferred route.

A final transport issue I wish to raise relates to the Busselton bypass. For two or three years now, there has been a lot of media attention about the bypass and the need for it to go ahead. The bypass has been talked about in the Busselton area for about 30 years, but it is now time that Main Roads committed itself to going ahead with the bypass sooner rather than later. I understand that the bypass is scheduled for commencement in 1999 or 2000 and for completion in 2001. However, with the growth in population in the Capel-Busselton-Dunsborough area and in the traffic that must bypass Busselton to go to some of those areas, as well as Margaret River and places further south, it is entirely appropriate that we seek to have construction of the bypass commenced sooner rather than later. I will be seeing the Minister for Transport over the next couple of days and asking him to give me advice on what mechanisms we can put in place to find ways to speed up the process.

Another issue, which unfortunately has not been mentioned in the budget papers but which I believe must be raised and dealt with in next year's Budget, is coastal management. Residents of the Bunbury area will be well aware of very significant coastal erosion at what is called the Back Beach area of Bunbury. Major erosion has also occurred in the Shire of Busselton and to a lesser extent in the Shire of Capel at Forrest Beach where winter storms last year caused sufficient erosion for the shire to remove a toilet block. Had members seen the toilet block, they might have said it was a blessing in disguise. Nonetheless, it means that the ratepayers of Capel were forced to spend money to remove a structure and then spend more money to rebuild it further inland where it is safe. More serious erosion problems occurred in the Shire of Busselton where in a number of places the cycleway from Busselton west towards Siesta Park was washed into the ocean and quite considerable damage done. I understand that the total cost of repair after last winter's series of storms was about \$160 000. I am not aware of what proportion of that money the Shire of Busselton must spend or whether the Department of Transport will make a contribution through its marine and harbours section. Nevertheless, the figure of \$160 000 is quite significant.

What is more significant, unfortunately, is that the Shire of Busselton and the Shire of Capel have not yet responded positively to the request that I put to them some months ago for a strategic coastal study. One of the problems of coastal management in Western Australia and throughout the world is that we tend to have short memories. For example, a winter or summer cyclonic storm may damage a coastal area. For the next two or three years nothing goes

wrong, as a result of which we forget that there was a problem. The problem then repeats itself, because natural forces tend to be repetitive, and once again another \$160 000 or \$200 000 must be spent on coastal repair. As I have said some months ago, I put a proposition to the two shires to conduct a two stage strategic study to look at coastal processes in Geographe Bay. Knowledge of the coastal processes would then enable the shires to understand how serious were some of the various issues affecting the coast, and to address them.

To demonstrate how unfortunate some of the short term planning has been in the Shire of Busselton, I point out that, because of the severe coastal erosion that occurred in Siesta Park last year, two of the religious youth camps, which were leasing land from the Department of Land Administration, were seriously threatened by having their playing ovals or buildings washed into Geographe Bay at the height of the storms. At a cost of about \$13 000 to each of those religious groups, a rock wall was constructed using gravel riprap. It has worked very well and stopped the erosion. However, the problem with a sea wall of that nature is that the erosive energy is then moved up or down the beach with the result that in future years we can expect other youth or religious camps to the west or east of the two that have a rock wall in place to suffer exaggerated coastal erosion as a result of the temporary and somewhat short term, inefficient coastal management that has been achieved by building the rock wall. I hope that the two shires will respond positively to the initiatives I put to them. I understand that the Department of Transport might be prepared to make funding available on a three for one basis. Considering that coastal management on a soft coastline like Geographe Bay will be a recurring problem for the Busselton and Capel shires it is most appropriate that we undertake a study of coastal processes.

Another issue of great importance at the moment relates to policing. In the period leading up to the election campaign I set out a questionnaire to Capel residents who indicated strongly that they wanted an increased police presence in Capel. I have met with Superintendent John Watson who is in charge of the Bunbury police district. He has advised, and I concur with his conclusions, that the townsite of Capel is too small to justify a permanent police presence. However, Senior Constable Peter McCarthy attends Capel for anywhere between two to four hours every Friday. At my suggestion Peter is doorknocking various businesses around Capel, introducing himself so that people get to know who he is, and also so that he can find out from them what the policing issues are in the Capel townsite. He received an extremely positive response on the first occasion that he doorknocked some of the Capel businesses. It was the first time in many cases that a policeman had been seen in a friendly manner rather than responding to a problem in that Capel business area.

Two more issues relate to policing in Busselton and the south west in general. The Busselton issue relates to the lack of an upgraded or new courthouse complex in Busselton. I understand that the member for Burrup recognised this problem recently in a media release. For a number of years Busselton has been poorly served by an under-designed, small and totally unsuitable courthouse police complex. I raised this issue with the Minister, and unfortunately I was told that no money was available in this Budget. That will not reduce my efforts or the efforts of local people to approve the budget allocation for next year, so we can proceed with this urgent task.

The other issue which I said covers the whole of the south west relates to motorbike gangs. I do not wish to talk in any detail about this, because I understand that the police will take a number of actions over the next three to six months which will significantly impact upon the presence and therefore the effect of some of these bikie gangs and the way in which they engage in antisocial behaviour in the south west. I will put on record, firstly, the assistance from the Police Department in recognising the problem and its preparedness to act on it; and, secondly, my commitment to the residents of the Vasse area, Capel and Busselton, that this issue is so important that the Parliament as a whole almost certainly will be speaking with one voice to ensure that the intimidation and the general antisocial as well as unlawful behaviour of bikie gangs in the south west will not be tolerated. I do not know what we should do with them. I guess they are human beings like the rest of us and must be somewhere. My hope is they might like to go to Mt Walton, where there is a noxious waste facility, where they will probably not be able to hurt too many people. It is important that the members of those gangs realise that the Government and the police are concerned and will act.

One of the other issues raised by Capel residents in the questionnaire which I mentioned earlier related to the need to provide enhanced pharmacy and medical facilities in Capel. Once again the problem with those requests is that a pharmacy requires a certain population to be economically viable and Capel is too small. The Capel townsite does not have enough people to allow a doctor to service the area full time. However, I am pleased to commend the Government for making the money available for the new Bunbury collocation hospital. Construction of the hospital is under way in the southern part of Bunbury city. The site is 3 or 4 km closer to Capel than the existing two hospitals, St John of God Hospital and Bunbury Regional. Capel residents will gain significant benefits from the new collocation hospital in Bunbury when it is up and running next year.

I will finish on three issues. One relates to the funding that has been made available to the Water Corporation to allow the Dunsborough waste water treatment plant to be upgraded. That plant has been causing significant pollution



of groundwater in the area of Toby Inlet. The nutrients from the plant almost certainly will discharge into Geographe Bay, causing problems of excess nutrients. It is hard to tell whether that has caused the death of seagrass over recent years, because the research work has not been done. Nonetheless, I commend the Water Corporation and the Government for funding the relocation of the Dunsborough plant. The new plant will be similar to the Albany plant and will be a no-discharge plant. All waste water will be of secondary quality and will be pumped to and disposed of in its entirety on a tree plantation.

The Busselton waste water treatment plant is a significantly different kettle of fish. Busselton is a reasonably large town of about 12 000 people. The Water Corporation is extending the sewerage system to more and more of the town. As well during the tourist season the population increases three times. The end result is that in summer the Busselton waste water treatment plant - even after it has been expanded to the size that the Water Corporation has planned - will not be able to cope with the amount of waste water that goes into the system. Two broad options are available to the Water Corporation to solve this problem. The first is to go down the same route as Dunsborough and Albany; that is, to buy sufficient land for a tree plantation and pump the secondary treated water onto the tree plantation for nutrient removal and so on. The difficulty with that option is that very little suitable land is available close to the existing Busselton waste water treatment plant. The land that is suitable from a hydrological point of view is not all that suitable from a nutrient retention point of view. Based upon data given to me by the Water Corporation 600 hectares of land may be required to be purchased to construct the plant and then operate the tree plantation disposal system. The cost would be about \$3m or \$4m. At the end of day the money does not come out of government or members' pockets, it comes from the ratepayers of the Shire of Busselton. I understand that the \$4m cost is equivalent to \$100 per ratepayer per annum. That a significant sum. Busselton ratepayers have spoken at various public consultation sessions and said they would be happy to spend an extra amount like that. However, that is on top of the \$100 that is needed to upgrade the waste water treatment plant. In other words, it is \$100 for the waste water treatment plant and then \$100 for the tree plantation.

One innovative suggestion from the Water Corporation is as follows: If the community of Busselton is prepared to accept a small amount of treated waste water flowing into Geographe Bay over the summer months, with the total nitrogen and phosphorus being in the order of 15 and 3 tonnes respectively, the Water Corporation might be able to make available \$100 000 to \$200 000 for each of the next five or 10 years to be spent on reducing nutrients from agricultural and other sources in the catchment. Each year Geographe Bay receives about 600 tonnes of nitrogen and 50 or 60 tonnes of phosphorus, the bulk of both coming from farming areas. If we are talking about how to make the taxpayers' dollar achieve the most for the smallest amount of expenditure, the alternatives are to spend an extra \$3m or \$4m removing 15 or 17 tonnes of nutrients from the Busselton waste water treatment plant, or to spend one-tenth of that amount a year for a few years and achieve potentially five or 10 times the amount of nutrient reduction by assisting farmers to reduce nutrient levels from their farms. The proposal is being discussed actively between the Water Corporation and the Environmental Protection Authority. The EPA or the Department of Environmental Protection ultimately must give approval for the licensing of waste water treatment plants. This is an innovative idea. I commend it to the Water Corporation and the EPA and to members of this House in the hope that we can be as efficient as possible in the spending of government and taxpayer money.

Unpaid drainage rates by a small number of farmers in the Busselton-Capel area over recent years has been an ongoing difficulty. I am pleased to advise that the issue has been resolved to the reasonable satisfaction of the Government and affected landowners. I thank the Minister for Water Resources for his intervention and interest in that issue. I trust that the drainage action movement will accept the offer that has been made in the spirit of conciliation and, it is hoped, put this issue to bed once and for all.

The final issue I will mention relates to a matter I wanted to raise last week in my grievance, but on advice I did not. It relates to the fact that three people were involved in an illegal business exporting fossils out of Australia. Members will appreciate that my background is as a geologist. That means I like rocks. That might seem a little strange to some people; nonetheless, that is the way I am. The people who were convicted - David Edward Vaughan, Edward Dudley Madden, and one other whose name I have not been able to find - were illegally exporting fossils of extreme scientific importance to not just Australia, but the whole world. The fossils helped to piece together some of the geological history of Australia. By understanding the geological history of this country we are able to better understand mineral deposits, geography and geomorphology, and a range of other important issues.

Last week I wanted to stand up in this place and encourage the judge who was about to sentence David Edward Vaughan to throw the book at him. I was advised not to do so because the sentencing had not been done. However, I am pleased that in the intervening week a Perth District Court judge brought down his sentence. David Vaughan received a three year suspended gaol term and a \$50 000 fine. His accomplice, Edward Dudley Madden, received a 12 month suspended gaol sentence and was fined \$1 000. I express my regret at the lack of severity in those sentences. One fossil specimen was collected in South Australia - from a national park, no less. It would have been cut out using a diamond saw. It was offered for sale in Japan for \$30 000. Obviously the sale was not successfully

negotiated. Nonetheless, it gives an indication of the high prices that are being paid for parts of Australia's heritage and, in particular, Western Australia's heritage.

In the bed of the Gascoyne River, north of Gascoyne Junction, the same people used a diamond saw to cut out 270 million year old fossil crinoids. They were a local tourist attraction. To any geologist worth his or her salt, they were a must see tourist attraction in that part of the world. As of about two years ago, neatly cut holes could be found in the bed of the Gascoyne River where those fossils had been removed. I believe the fines and suspended gaol sentences that were imposed are very light. I hope to discourage people from involvement in the illegal fossil business by calling for far stiffer penalties in the future.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Ms McHale.

*House adjourned at 10.47 pm*

---

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### EDUCATION - SCHOLARSHIPS

#### *Criteria*

10. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister for Education:

In relation to the article on page 8 of *The West Australian*, dated 30 January 1997, entitled "Sell-offs to go on: Barnett" -

- (a) how many scholarships will be awarded;
- (b) what criteria must be satisfied to qualify for a scholarship, including TEE score; and
- (c) as a condition of the scholarship will scholarship teachers be required to teach at Governments schools and, if so, for what period of time?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (a) Up to 30 scholarships each year will be offered to high achieving students and Aboriginal students completing year 12 to undertake undergraduate studies in teacher education.
- (b) Criteria are presently being established. This information will be made public in due course.
- (c) The conditions of the scholarship are also yet to be determined.

### PARKS AND RESERVES - NATIONAL PARKS

#### *Dieback - Research*

80. Mr PENDAL to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) I refer to the coalition's 1993 pledge for the creation of a Dieback Research Institute and its commitment to seek to combat this disease and ask if the institute has been formed?
- (2) If so, what is its budget, who is its head, and what staff does it employ?
- (3) In reference to dieback in national parks, can the Minister state whether infested areas have -
  - (a) increased;
  - (b) reduced; or
  - (c) remained the same in the past five years?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

(1)-(2) No, for the following reasons -

- (a) A joint proposal for the establishment of a cooperative research centre on dieback prepared by CALM and CSIRO with other academic and industry involvement was submitted in 1994. It did not proceed beyond the Commonwealth's independent scientific review process.
- (b) The report of the WA Dieback Review Panel advised against the establishment of a single Dieback Institute. It recommended instead the development of more effective interaction among the large number of scientists already working on the problem in various State and interstate institutions. The panel suggested that this issue should be further addressed by a recommended ministerial peak advisory body, Dieback Consultative Council, a proposal which is currently under consideration within the Department of Conservation and Land Management.
- (3) Spread of the organism which causes dieback continues to increase by two distinct processes. The natural (autonomous) colonisation by the exotic pathogen type *Phytophthora cinnamomi* can be expected to increase as there is as yet no known method of slowing this progress which is both practical and affordable at the scale required. The artificial (vectored) spread has been significantly slowed by observance of practices for hygienic access. However, new centres of infection will continue to establish due to uncontrollable movement of infested soil by native animals.

## GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING - EXPENDITURE

81. Dr CONSTABLE to the Premier:

- (1) With reference to the table on page 73 of the *Business Review Weekly*, dated 24 February 1996, can the Premier confirm that the Western Australian Government spent \$30m on advertising in 1996?
- (2) If no to (1) above, what is the correct amount spent on Government advertising in 1996?
- (3) For each year from 1992 to 1995, inclusive -
  - (a) how much did the Western Australian Government spend, in total, on advertising in each year; and
  - (b) how much was spent by each Government department?

Mr COURT replied:

- (1)-(2) If the member's question is referring to the table on page 73 of the *Business Review Weekly*, dated 24 February 1997, the member should note that the figure used is 'sourced from several media-buying companies'. There are two areas of Government advertising - campaign and non-campaign - and under the Master Media contract system other than non-consolidated fund organisations such as the WA Municipal Association, public benevolent institutions, Perth City Council, universities, government corporations (AlintaGas, Western Power, Water Corporation, GoldCorp) and self-funded government bodies like the Lotteries Commission and TAB are included in the total government expenditure figure.

This system distorts the real picture of government expenditure. The total campaign media expenditure for the calendar year 1996 was \$23 594 262 and for non-campaign \$10 121 394.

- (3)
  - (a) Calendar year breakdowns of expenditure are not normally provided to government and special arrangements with the Master Media Agency and non-campaign agencies were made to answer (1) and (2) of the member's question.
  - (b) Providing a breakdown of departmental expenditure would reveal material which is either commercial in confidence (such as AlintaGas, Western Power, Water Corporation and GoldCorp) or would not be appropriate for the Government to release (public benevolent institutions, universities, local government and Perth City Council). If the member has a question about a specific department, the Government will endeavour to provide the answer.

## EDUCATION - PRIORITY SCHOOLS PROGRAM

*Staff*

90. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it the case that central and district office staff are no longer specifically allocated to administer the priority schools program?
- (2) If yes, why?
- (3) If no, how many central and district office staff service this program?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1) While central office staff are still specifically allocated to administer the priority schools program, district office staff are not.
- (2) In the spirit of devolution, and to offset a cut in commonwealth funding, the centrally funded district based personnel ceased at the end of 1996. Priority schools now receive an allocation through their school grant which they may use to employ a school development officer, through the district office, to facilitate the implementation of their PSP.  
  
To date, five SDOs have been employed by schools in five districts - Esperance, Goldfields, Hedland, Kimberley and Cockburn.
- (3) The PSP is supported by one consultant and one administrative assistant in central office as it has been in the past.

ENVIRONMENT - ASSESSMENT PROCESS

*Bentley Kehoe Report*

308. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for the Environment:

Will the Minister table the Bentley Kehoe report on the review of the environmental assessment process?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

Yes, the report was tabled on 7 May, 1997.

MINING - MARINE

*Memorandums of Understanding*

313. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Will the Minister table a copy of the Memoranda of Understanding for Marine Mineral Exploration and Terrestrial and Marine Petroleum Exploration and Production?
- (2) If no, will the Minister table the draft memoranda?
- (3) When will these MOUs be endorsed and at what stage of development is each memorandum?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(3) The Memoranda of Understanding are being negotiated at present. They will be available once they have been agreed by the signing parties.

STATE SETTLEMENT PLAN - STRATEGIES

*Minister for Labour Relations*

379. Ms WARNOCK to the Minister for Labour Relations; Planning; Heritage:

- (1) What are the objectives of the Minister's departments' state settlement plan?
- (2) What -
  - (a) internal; and
  - (b) external,access strategies have been developed and implemented?
- (3) What -
  - (a) financial; and
  - (b) human,resources have been allocated to implement the state settlement plan?
- (4) What consultation process has been undertaken by the Minister's department?
- (5) Who from the -
  - (a) community;
  - (b) business sector; and
  - (c) academic sector,has been consulted?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1)-(5) Not relevant to the portfolios of Labour Relations, Planning or Heritage.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY - SALE

412. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Resources Development; Energy; Education:

- (1) How many State Government assets of the value of \$200 000 or more have been sold by each of the departments or agencies under the Minister's control in each of the last four financial years?

(2) What is the total value of the assets sold?

(3) What have the monies realised from the asset sales been used for?

Mr BARNETT replied:

Department of Resources Development

(1) Nil.

(2)-(3) Not applicable.

Office of Energy

(1) Nil.

(2)-(3) Not applicable.

Western Power

(1)	SECWA	July 1992-June 1993	0
		July 1993-June 1994	0
		July 1994-Dec 1994	1

	Western Power	Jan 1995-June 1995	0
		July 1995-June 1996	1

		Total	2
--	--	-------	---

(2)	SECWA	\$2 000 000
	Western Power	\$ 450 000
		<u>\$2 450 000</u>

(3) The money realised from the sale of all assets is redirected into the business.

AlintaGas

(1) AlintaGas was established on 1 January 1995, and since that time only one asset to the value, or over \$200 000 has been sold; the land and buildings located at 2 Hines Road, O'Connor, which had previously been used as a depot.

(2) The property was sold for \$747 749.07.

(3) Sale proceeds were used to retire debt.

Education Department of WA

(1) Seven.

(2) \$8 495 000.

(3) Improvement, upgrading and replacement of facilities at many schools.

Department of Education Services

(1) Nil.

(2)-(3) Not applicable.

Secondary Education Authority

(1) The Secondary Education Authority has not sold any individual assets over \$200 000 in the last four financial years.

(2) The total value of assets sold in the last four financial years is \$224 000.

(3) The monies raised have been used to offset shortfalls in revenue collection.

Department of the Curriculum Council

(1) Nil.

(2)-(3) Not applicable.

## DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

*Appointment*

440. Mr MASTERS to the Premier:

For what time period has the executive director of the Department of Conservation and Land Management recently been reappointed?

Mr COURT replied:

For a five year period, which commenced on 8 October 1996.

## SCHOOLS - BUSSELTON AREA

*Dental Therapy Centre - Location*

472. Mr MASTERS to the Minister for Education:

- (1) While the Busselton community strongly supports the building of a new primary school in East Busselton, could the Minister provide an explanation as to why the dental therapy centre was removed from the proposed new primary school to the Busselton Senior High School, in spite of reported support from all Busselton school principals that it should be located at the new East Busselton Primary School?
- (2) In addition, what is the maximum number of students that will be able to attend the new East Busselton Primary School and how will this number compare with all other public schools in the Busselton Shire?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1) Decisions regarding the location of dental therapy centres are taken by the School Dental Services Branch of the Health Department of Western Australia. I understand that the Busselton Senior High School site is the preferred location for the replacement dental therapy centre because it is central to the service area which extends from East Busselton to Vasse.
- (2) The East Busselton Primary School will be provided with 14 permanent primary classrooms and two permanent pre-primary units, with the capacity for 434 and 54 students respectively. Future growth which takes numbers above these thresholds will be catered for by way of temporary accommodation. Student numbers at other government schools in the Shire of Busselton as at semester one, 1997 were -

Dunsborough Primary School	42 pre-primary and 269 primary students.
Vasse Primary School	42 pre-primary and 319 primary students.
West Busselton Primary School	50 pre-primary and 417 primary students.

## EDUCATION - ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

*Provision*

535. Ms WARNOCK to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many -
  - (a) basic classes;
  - (b) advanced classes;
  - (c) job-oriented classes;
  - (d) professional language-oriented classes,

in English as a second language were provided for persons of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds as distinct from those of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin, in -

- (i) 1994;
- (ii) 1995;
- (iii) 1996; and
- (iv) 1997?

- (2) How much of the funds allocated for these programs came from -
  - (a) Commonwealth funds; and
  - (b) State funds?
- (3) Who provided these ESL classes?
- (4) Were they qualified and trained ESL teachers?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1) The English as a second language program in government schools in Western Australia is dynamic and diverse in nature. Decisions regarding the deployment of ESL services are made at school level by school administration in consultation with staff and other professionals in order that resources are allocated on the basis of student needs. In a devolved education system, decisions are best made closest to the students. Broad guidelines are provided by the system for the structure, management and accountability of ESL programs in schools. No central records are kept regarding the types of ESL classes offered within individual ESL programs over the years 1994-97. Decisions regarding program provision are made at school level in recognition of the needs of students accessing particular ESL programs. ESL programs are staffed on formula and in recognition of the particular needs of ESL students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.
- (2)
  - (a) Commonwealth Funds
 

1994	\$6 480 552
1995	\$6 472 035
1996	\$6 487 000
1997	\$6 034 000
  - (b) State Funds
 

1994	\$ 74 235
1995	\$ 94 235
1996	\$100 585
1997	\$193 177
- (3)-(4) Classes were provided by qualified and trained ESL teachers.

#### LAND - SOUTH-EAST CORRIDOR

##### *Needs*

543. Ms MacTIERNAN to the Premier:

- (1) When was the task force to examine the needs of the south east corridor established?
- (2) Who is on the task force?
- (3) Has it met yet?
- (4) When is it due to report?

Mr COURT replied:

- (1)-(4) There is no task force, as such. A small group of departmental officers have been working on this for some months now. A report will be published later this year.

#### TELECOMMUNICATIONS - TELSTRA

##### *Charges - Timed Local Calls*

578. Mr CARPENTER to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that passage of the Telstra Bills through the Federal Parliament will allow timed local calls for "data calls"?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that this may result in Internet service providers being charged for receiving modem calls from their customers?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that such charges are likely to be passed on to customers?
- (4) Will these changes affect the education area?
- (5) If so, what is the anticipated impact of the changes?
- (6) Does the Minister support Telstra establishing a fee structure based on timed local calls for "data calls"?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1) Yes.



- (2)-(5) It is reported in the media that Telstra has given a public commitment not to charge customers of Internet Service Providers on a timed basis for their Internet service calls.
- (6) The Minister is opposed to any change in tariff structures which would increase the cost of Internet service provision to schools.

## SCHOOLS - GOVERNMENT

*Middle to High Income Earners - Use*

580. Mr CARPENTER to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of comments made by the member for Alfred Cove relating to education in Government schools for the children of middle to high income earners?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the member for Alfred Cove described people with incomes equivalent to, or higher than that of, members of Parliament as "bludgers" if they sent their children to government schools?
- (3) Does the Government have a policy consistent with the member's view?
- (4) If no to (3), has the Minister conveyed the government's policy to the member?
- (5) If not, why not?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1)-(2) Yes. The Minister is aware of the comments made by the member for Alfred Cove.
- (3) The member's comments are not consistent with the view of the Government which is supportive of the government school system and parents' right of choice.
- (4) No.
- (5) The member for Alfred Cove is aware of the government's policy in respect of government schooling and parental choice.

## GOVERNMENT VEHICLES - LEASING

*Cost and Number*

609. Mr BROWN to the Premier; Treasurer; Minister for Public Sector Management; Federal Affairs:

- (1) How many vehicles does each department and agency under the Premier's control lease?
- (2) What is the monthly amount each department and agency pays for leasing the vehicles?
- (3) What was the amount each department and agency paid for leasing the vehicles in February 1997?

Mr COURT replied:

- (1) The number of vehicles varies from month to month due to the turnover of vehicles. Leasing costs fluctuate accordingly. The figures listed below cover the period 15/2/97 to 14/3/97, except where indicated.

Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet	
- department/agency vehicles	
(includes VIP, ministerial and other office holders' vehicles)	118
Members of Parliament Leased Vehicle Scheme	
(as at 15/3/97)	56
Treasury Department	15
Public Sector Standards Commission	6
Government House	3
Royal Commission into the City of Wanneroo	3
Anti-Corruption Commission	2
Salaries and Allowances Tribunal	1

- (2)-(3) Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet

- department/agency vehicles	\$13 870.16
Members of Parliament Leased Vehicle Scheme	
(as at 15/3/97)	\$12 097.35
Treasury Department	\$ 1 860.78
Public Sector Standards Commission	\$ 621.88

Government House	\$ 277.18
Royal Commission into the City of Wanneroo	\$ 244.27
Anti-Corruption Commission	\$ 355.07
Salaries and Allowances Tribunal	\$ 98.54

## GOVERNMENT VEHICLES - LEASING

*Cost and Number*

620. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for Finance:

- (1) How many vehicles does each department and agency under the Minister's control lease?
- (2) What is the monthly amount each department and agency pays for leasing the vehicles?
- (3) What was the amount each department and agency paid for leasing the vehicles in February 1997?

Mr COURT replied:

The Minister for Finance has provided the following reply -

State Revenue Department

- (1) Seven.
- (2)-(3) \$699.02.

Valuer General's Office

- (1) Forty-one.
- (2) Average - \$15 833.
- (3) \$13 407.11.

State Government Insurance Commission

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

Government Employees Superannuation Board

- (1) Six.
- (2) \$1 616.05.
- (3) Nil. In February 1997 the vehicles were owned by GESB. Leasing did not occur until March 1997. It should be noted that when the coalition came into government there were no accurate records of Government vehicles. The new arrangements introduced by the Government have resulted in better asset management and accountability. By way of example, in the case of one fleet of some 1 100 vehicles the relevant department was able to locate only 700 vehicles for transfer to the fleet manager. A search for "missing" vehicles located not only the "missing" 400 but an additional 150 that the department did not know it owned. This matter has since been resolved.

## GOVERNMENT VEHICLES - LEASING

*Cost and Number*

622. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) How many vehicles does each department and agency under the Minister's control lease?
- (2) What is the monthly amount each department and agency pays for leasing the vehicles?
- (3) What was the amount each department and agency paid for leasing the vehicles in February 1997?

Mr COWAN replied:

The Minister for Racing and Gaming has provided the following reply -

Office of Racing, Gaming and Liquor

- (1) Twelve.
- (2)-(3) \$1 966.90.

Burswood Park Board

- (1) Four.
- (2) \$452.93 (4 vehicles)
- (3) \$214.91 (2 vehicles)

Totalisator Agency Board

- (1) Twenty-three.
- (2) \$6 000 approx.
- (3) \$6 014.83.

Lotteries Commission

- (1) Twenty.
- (2) \$2 789.90.
- (3) \$2 661.94. It should be noted that when the coalition came into government there were no accurate records of Government vehicles. The new arrangements introduced by the Government have resulted in better asset management and accountability. By way of example, in the case of one fleet of some 1 100 vehicles the relevant department was able to locate only 700 vehicles for transfer to the fleet manager. A search for "missing" vehicles located not only the "missing" 400 but an additional 150 that the department did not know it owned. This matter has since been resolved.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TASKFORCE - MEMBERS

*Costs and Operations*

646. Mr KOBELKE to the Minister for Labour Relations:

- (1) From what date did the Taskforce for the Building and Construction Industry become operational?
- (2) What are the names of the people employed in the Taskforce for the Building and Construction Industry?
- (3) What are the designated duties for each member of the task force?
- (4) Is each member of the task force employed on a full time basis and where not, which members are employed on a part time basis and what are the arrangements?
- (5) Are any members of the task force designated as industrial inspectors or special constables and if so, which members are these?
- (6) Are all wages and other costs for the task force funded through the Department of Productivity and Labour Relations?
- (7) If not, then what other agencies or sources of funding are used to meet the costs of the task force?
- (8) Who is the senior officer or officer in charge of the Taskforce for the Building and Construction Industry?
- (9) To whom is this officer in charge directly responsible?
- (10) Which officer, or officers, give instructions to the task force in order to set its direction and mode of operation?
- (11) How many briefings or specific reports has the Minister received in the current calendar year from the task force, or on the functioning and matters relating to the work of the task force?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1) The task force was established in November 1993.

- |         |  |   |
|---------|--|---|
| (2)-(3) | Executive Officer<br>Manager Industry Liaison and Compliance<br>Industrial Inspector | Level 7, Acting Level 8<br>Level 8<br>Level 3, Acting Level 5 |
|---------|--|---|
- (4) Each member is employed on a full time basis.
- (5) Apart from the Industrial Inspector listed in (2)-(3), the Manager Industry Liaison and Compliance is both an Inspector and a Special Constable.
- (6) No.
- (7) Contract and Management Services and the Department of Productivity and Labour Relations.
- (8) The Executive Officer.
- (9) The task force Executive Officer reports to the Chief Executive Officer of CAMS, and also to the Minister for Labour Relations on matters concerning the Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry.
- (10) Task force direction is set by the Executive Officer, and the mode of operation is determined by the Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry and relevant legislation.
- (11) The Minister has received numerous briefings from the task force Executive Officer in the current calendar year.

#### INDUSTRIAL ESTATES - OAKAJEE

##### *Environmental Review*

669. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Why did the Environmental Protection Authority suspend its assessment of the 1994 LandCorp Public Environmental Review of the Oakajee site?
- (2) Has the EPA now received information on the hydrogeology of this area?
- (3) Who has provided this information?
- (4) Will the Minister table this report?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) Will the EPA recommence this assessment?
- (7) If so, when?
- (8) If not, why not?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) The then Minister for the Environment requested the Environmental Protection Authority to assess the concept more fully with regard to groundwater and regional planning, particularly the development of a port at Oakajee. As a result of this request, the EPA suspended the assessment to allow additional information with regard to these aspects to be provided to the EPA.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) LandCorp.
- (4)-(5) The report was released publicly with the EPA's advice on the Oakajee Industrial Estate Concept, provided under Section 16(e) of the Environmental Protection Act, on 9 April 1997.
- (6)-(8) The EPA has completed its environmental advice on the Oakajee Industrial Estate and the report of its advice was released on 9 April 1997.

#### HOSPITALS - SIR CHARLES GAIRDNER

##### *Cardiac Services Unit - Statistics*

684. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister for Health:

- (1) When was the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital cardiac services unit established?

- (2) What was the cost of running the unit in each of the following years -
- (a) 1992;
  - (b) 1993;
  - (c) 1994;
  - (d) 1995; and
  - (e) 1996?
- (3) What is the number of patients treated in each of the last five years for -
- (a) coronary artery bypass grafting procedures; and
  - (b) heart valve procedures?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) The Cardiothoracic Surgery Unit opened in March 1993.
- (2) The cost of running the cardiothoracic unit at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital - includes cardiac and thoracic surgery -

Year	Expenses	Notes
1992-93	Not available	opened March 1993
1993-94	\$4 055 717.00	
1994-95	\$2 962 234.09	
1995-96	\$2 155 934.65	
1996-97	\$1 399 270.72	to end March 1997

- (3) The number of patients treated from 1993 to 1997 for coronary artery by-pass grafting procedures, heart valves and combined CABG and heart valves at SCGH -

Year	CABG's	Heart Valves	CABG & Heart Valves
1993	234	17	7
1994	273	20	13
1995	306	22	20
1996	280	15	14
1997	58 (YTD)	4 (YTD)	3 (YTD)
Total	1151	78	57

#### MINISTRY FOR PLANNING - LAND PURCHASE

##### *Reimbursement*

695. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Will the Ministry for Planning be seeking to recover from Main Roads WA the money spent to purchase Lot 38 Taylor Road and Lot 112 Thomas Road?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.

#### PORT KENNEDY SCIENTIFIC PARK - TINGAY REPORT

699. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a report on the Rockingham Lakes at Port Kennedy Scientific Park known as the Tingay report?
- (2) Is the Minister aware the report was requested by the Minister for the Environment as a result of the assessment of the south west corridor major amendment?
- (3) When was the report supposed to have been completed according to the Ministerial conditions set by the Minister for the Environment?
- (4) Has the report been completed and submitted to the Minister for the Environment?
- (5) If not, why not?

(6) Why was this report not completed in accordance with the requirements of the law?

(7) When will the report be available?

Mr KIERATH replied:

(1)-(2) Yes.

(3) 31 December 1995.

(4) No, however a draft report has been forwarded to the Department of Environmental Protection and is awaiting comment from CALM before it is advertised for public comment.

(5) After the report is advertised for public comment, it will be submitted to the Minister for the Environment.

(6) The law has not been breached in relation to this matter. Due to the complexity of issues and the need for consultation with stakeholders, the preparation of the report took longer than anticipated. In any case, the intent of the Minister for the Environment's condition is being fulfilled by the progression of the Tingay report.

(7) When it is advertised for public comment following comment from CALM.

#### SCHOOLS - COMPUTERS

##### *Ratio to Students*

706. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

(1) What is the average number of students per computer in government primary schools?

(2) What is the average number of students per computer in government secondary schools?

(3) What is the average number of students per computer in non-government primary schools?

(4) What is the average number of students per computer in non-government secondary schools?

(5) What is the highest ratio of students per computer in any government primary school?

(6) Which school is it?

(7) What is the lowest ratio of students per computer in any government secondary school?

(8) Which school is it?

(9) What is the lowest ratio of students per computer in any non-government primary school?

(10) Which school is it?

Mr BARNETT replied:

(1)-(10) The information requested is not available. The Education Department does not maintain a record of the number of computers in government schools. The Government has no centralised data base of such information in non-government schools. Similarly, information on the largest system of non-government schools, the Catholic system, is not held by the Catholic Education Office. In terms of government schools, it is important to recognise that funds are provided from a range of state and commonwealth funded programs administered by the Education Department.

Individual schools make decisions on how best to use these funds based upon the objectives of the program and the needs of the student body. Resources, and the decisions on how best to use them, are increasingly being devolved to schools. The Department does not keep records on what specific equipment schools acquire from their funds. The Education Department currently makes specific provision for the following minimum ratio of computers per student - one computer per 40 students in every secondary school; and one computer per 100 students in every primary school (schools with student numbers less than 100 receive one computer per 50 students).

The Government will provide additional funding for technology in schools over the next four years to progressively increase these minimum ratios so that by 2000 the minimum ratios will be as follows - one computer per 50 primary students; and one computer per 20 secondary students. However, as previously stated, funds are provided by the Education Department to government schools (through the School Grant)

to purchase resources based largely on a per capita formula. Schools will use these funds, and locally raised revenue, to purchase computers. During the past two calendar years (1995, 1996) government schools leased \$6m worth of computers, through the department's leasing scheme. The actual ratio of computers to students in most schools is therefore considerably higher than that specifically provided for in the base funding.

The Government's aim is to see government schools in Western Australia having, on average, on computer for every five students by 2000/2001, through increased funding for technology, increases in the school grant and expansion of the program to access surplus computers for schools.

## SCHOOLS - GOVERNMENT

### *Funding from Non-government Sources*

712. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What was the average proportion of a government school's budget that came from non-government sources in 1994 for -
  - (a) primary schools;
  - (b) secondary schools?
- (2) What was the average proportion of a government school's budget that came from non-government sources in 1995 for -
  - (a) primary schools;
  - (b) secondary schools?
- (3) What was the average proportion of a government school's budget that came from non-government sources in 1996 for -
  - (a) primary schools;
  - (b) secondary schools?
- (4) What was the average proportion of a government school's budget that came from non-government sources in 1997 for -
  - (a) primary schools;
  - (b) secondary schools?
- (5) Which government school had the highest proportion of its funding from non-government sources in 1996 for -
  - (a) primary schools;
  - (b) secondary schools?
- (6) Which government school had the lowest proportion of its funding from non-government sources in 1996 for -
  - (a) primary schools;
  - (b) secondary schools?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1)
 

(a)	21 per cent
(b)	52 per cent
- (2)
 

(a)	19 per cent
(b)	50 per cent
- (3)
 

(a)	17 per cent
(b)	48 per cent
- (4) (a)-(b) Data will not be available until 1998.
- (5)
 

(a)	Sutherland Dianella Primary School	64 per cent
(b)	Canning College	89 per cent
- (6)
 

(a)	Oombulgurri Remote Community School	1 per cent
(b)	Cocos Island District High School	3 per cent

## SCHOOLS - ENROLMENT LIMITS

719. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Government impose any maximum enrolment limits on schools?
- (2) If yes, what are those limits?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1)-(2) Limits are only set when site and accommodation constraints necessitate them.

## INGLEWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL - AIRCONDITIONING

*Funding*

720. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

Will the Government reconsider its decision not to grant funding to Inglewood Primary School to assist in its efforts to raise \$44 000 for airconditioning?

Mr BARNETT replied:

The policy of the Education Department in respect of the provision of air-cooling in schools is based on data provided by the Bureau of Meteorology. These data which provide a means of assessing climate with regard to the stress it imposes on people have been used to delineate a priority zone for the provision of air-cooling. The zone comprises the Kimberley, Pilbara and eastern goldfields together with the northern regions of the Geraldton education districts. In the remaining part of the State the days on which extremely high temperatures are experienced tend to occur over a limited portion of the school year. The provision of air-cooling to cater for this period cannot be justified in terms of other competing demands upon the available financial resources.

However, notwithstanding the above, some schools have elected to use their minor works funds to implement a program to air-cool a limited number of classrooms each year. In response to parent concerns about children working on very hot days in schools without air-cooling, the Director General has requested a review of this policy. All schools will be advised of the outcome of the review in due course. Any reconsideration of the Government's decision with regard to Inglewood Primary School will be predicated on this outcome.

## SCHOOLS - AIRCONDITIONING

*Government Funding*

721. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

How much money is provided in the 1997-98 budget for airconditioning for schools?

Mr BARNETT replied:

An amount of \$300 000 has been allocated in the 1997-98 capital works program to complete the installation of air-cooling in demountable and transportable classrooms in schools throughout the State. An amount of \$200 000 has been allocated in the 1997-98 capital works program to enable two classrooms to be equipped with air-cooling at each education support school. This project is intended to reduce the considerable discomfort and stress which some students in these schools suffer due to their various medical conditions on those days when high temperatures are experienced.

## SCHOOLS - DEMOUNTABLE CLASSROOMS

*Number and Airconditioning*

722. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many demountable classrooms are currently in use at government schools?
- (2) How many of these demountable classrooms are airconditioned?

Mr BARNETT replied:

- (1) 1 470 demountable and transportable classrooms are in use in government schools throughout the state.
- (2) 1 402 classrooms are equipped with air-cooling. It is anticipated that the remaining 68 classrooms will be provided with air-cooling by the end of this year.



FORESTS AND FORESTRY - DIEBACK REVIEW PANEL

*Report*

744. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) How many submissions were received in response to the report of the Dieback Review Panel?
- (2) When will a final report be released?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) Ten.
- (2) The WA Dieback Review Panel report was released in October 1996. The call for public submissions closed in February 1997. An analysis of the public submissions is being prepared by the Department of Conservation and Land Management.

PEST CONTROL OPERATORS - GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION

*Remediation*

750. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) With respect to ground water contamination discovered near a pesticide operator's residence in Dianella in early 1993, what information was gathered, and by whom, to determine the nature and extent of the contamination?
- (2) Which Government department(s) reviewed or commented on the consultant's report commissioned by the pest control agent?
- (3) What were the Government departments' recommendations for remediation and ongoing management?
- (4) What further studies and investigations were undertaken?
- (5) What was the cost of these?
- (6) What was the cost of remediation?

Dr HAMES replied:

- (1) Soil sampling and ground water sampling from existing private bores was jointly carried out by the Health Department and the former Geological Survey Division of the Department of Minerals and Energy in February to April 1993 to determine the extent and severity of pesticide contamination near the pesticide operator's residence. Further investigations were carried out by consultants acting for the pest control operator to continue monitoring pesticide levels in nearby bores and to determine the best strategy to manage the contaminated ground water.
- (2) The Environmental Protection Authority was the lead agency in dealing with the contamination problem. The EPA directed the pest control operator to determine the extent of the contamination and evaluate options to manage the contamination including cleanup. The EPA had primary responsibility for reviewing the consultant's report. Comments on technical aspects of the report were also provided by the former Geological Survey, the former Water Authority of WA and the Health Department, and were coordinated in a response to the pest control operator by the EPA.
- (3) The EPA accepted the consultant's ground water remediation program on the condition that surrounding private bores were sampled and tested on a monthly basis for at least one year subsequent to achieving acceptable pesticide concentrations in ground water from the pumping bore.
- (4) At the request of the EPA the former Geological Survey drilled an investigation borehole adjacent to the pest control operator's residence in August 1993 to determine the vertical extent of pesticide contamination. All other investigations were carried out by consultants acting for the pest control operator.
- (5) The total cost of drilling and sampling the borehole drilled by the former Geological Survey was \$1 900. The costs of additional investigations carried out by consultants acting for the pest control operator are not known.
- (6) The remediation program was commissioned by the pest control operator and the costs are not known.

## WATER AND RIVERS COMMISSION - GWALIA CONSOLIDATED LIMITED

*Greenbushes Mine Water Quality*

753. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for Water Resources:

What action has been taken by the Water and Rivers Commission to follow up comments made in July 1996 by the Radiation Health section of the Health Department that water from bore 4 at Gwalia Consolidated Ltd Greenbushes mine, did not comply with drinking water standards?

Dr HAMES replied:

The bore concerned is not in a capture zone for drinking water supply. The bore is used to monitor the ground water around the mine and the water quality is only a potential pollution issue in terms of the environment. The Department of Environmental Protection has responsibility for administration of the pollution control provisions of the Environmental Protection Act. The Water and Rivers Commission has made the Department of Environmental Protection aware of the comments from the Health Department regarding the water quality of bore 4.

## OFFICE OF MULTICULTURAL INTERESTS - DIRECTOR

*Appointment*

781. Ms WARNOCK to the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs:

- (1) What is the present level allocated to the position of Director, Office of Multicultural Interests?
- (2) What was the level allocated to the position prior to the restructuring out review?
- (3) What was the level of the two acting Directors of OMI?
- (4) When will the Minister appoint a permanent Director for OMI?

Mr BOARD replied:

- (1) The position of Director, Office of Multicultural Interests is classified at level 9.
- (2) Level 9.
- (3) Special 4 and special 3.
- (4) The options are being considered.

## DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION UNIT - IMPLEMENTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Operation*

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

- (1) How often does the domestic violence prevention unit implementation committee meet?
- (2) What are the names and professional qualifications and/or employers of all members of the committee?
- (3) Are minutes of the committee meetings available to the public?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) Does the implementation committee report to the regional committees on a regular basis?
- (6) If so, how often and by what method?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) By what method does it report?

Mrs PARKER replied:

- (1) The Family and Domestic Violence Implementation Advisory Committee meets on a monthly basis.
- (2) The employers are -

Police Service  
Homeswest  
Domestic Violence Council

Family and Children's Services  
Aboriginal Affairs Department  
Health Department

Centrecare  
Women's Refuge Group  
Relationships Australia  
Ministry of Justice  
Education Department

Legal Aid  
Sexual Assault Referral Centre  
Edith Cowan University  
Aboriginal Community Member  
Women's Policy Development Office

- (3) No.
- (4) The Implementation Advisory Committee is an advisory mechanism to the Justice Coordinating Council.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) The members of the Implementation Advisory Committee are expected to report to their regional committee members. The Domestic Violence Prevention Unit also issues a public newsletter.
- (7) Not applicable.
- (8) The Implementation Advisory Committee has the responsibility to provide advice on the implementation of the Family and Domestic Violence Action Plan 1995 to the Justice Coordinating Council through the Domestic Violence Prevention Unit.

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING - TELEVISION

##### *AFL Match - Cost*

838. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Labour Relations:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that during the Channel 7 coverage of the Australian Football League match between the West Coast Eagles and Geelong on Saturday, 5 April 1997 there were numerous advertisements paid for by the Government of Western Australia related to workplace agreements, occupational health and safety and the Drive Safe Campaign?
- (2) How many advertisements were shown during the period of the television coverage including within 10 minutes of the commencement and 10 minutes of the conclusion of the match?
- (3) What was the total cost to taxpayers of the television commercials?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There was one advertisement about workplace agreements. One advertisement for the ThinkSafe-WorkSafe campaign was shown at 1.30 pm and one advertisement for the ThinkSafe-DriveSafe campaign was shown at 1.32 pm during the television coverage. One bonus spot - no charge - was also shown at 2.15 pm. Neither of these advertisements was shown within 10 minutes of the commencement or within 10 minutes of the conclusion. The television coverage ran from 12.00 pm to 3.00 pm.
- (3) The cost of the workplace agreement advertisement was \$1 850. The total cost of the ThinkSafe-WorkSafe and ThinkSafe-DriveSafe campaign was \$3 034.

#### HEALTH - DENTAL

##### *Commonwealth Dental Health Program - Eligibility Criteria*

946. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Health:

- (1) On what date did the Federal Government stop providing funds for the dental health program?
- (2) Prior to the Federal Government making its decision to cease funding the dental health program, did the State Government narrow the eligibility criteria under which individuals and families could obtain treatment under the State program and/or through the Perth Dental Hospital?
- (3) Is it true the Government and/or Perth Dental Hospital advised clients and/or potential clients that the treatment eligibility criteria had been narrowed by the State Government prior to the Federal Government announcing its decision to cut funding to the program?
- (4) What was the precise way in which the criteria were narrowed?

(5) In public statements has the Minister made it clear that the State Government narrowed the criteria under which dental services would be provided prior to the Federal Government deciding to cut its dental health program?

(6) If not, why not?

Mr PRINCE replied:

(1) 31 December 1996.

(2) In November 1995 approval was given to streamline the assessing process for the state dental program from one of variable subsidy - 20 per cent-80 per cent - to one where all eligible patients received an 80 per cent subsidy - see parliamentary question 947(4). At the same time persons receiving maximum additional family allowance supplement were excluded but would still have been able to access basic dental care under the commonwealth dental health program and their children were covered by the School Dental Service. The change did not relate to the CDHP. The reasons for changing the eligibility criteria were -

(i) There are many people on the orthodontic waiting list and it was necessary to ensure that the available resources were directed to those most in need.

(ii) The previous maximum FAS recipients would be best off of all eligible persons and the subsidy of 20 per cent while significant was not great in terms of overall cost of orthodontic care. Having the additional persons seeking care meant that everyone waited much longer for treatment.

(iii) Progressive changes by the Department of Social Security, in that FAS was included with all other payments related to children as family payment, has meant that it is now virtually impossible for the hospital to determine who would have been eligible under the old maximum FAS category.

(iv) A lot of orthodontic care can be delayed without any health detriment to a patient.

(v) It has been possible to provide additional subsidy - 80 per cent - to other more needy eligible patients who were receiving lesser subsidy.

(3) Yes.

(4) After 31 January 1996 persons in receipt of maximum family allowance supplement and entitled to a 20 per cent subsidy became ineligible.

(5) No.

(6) Perth Dental Hospital and the associated public clinics ensured all patients in this category who were undergoing or about to undergo treatment had that treatment completed and those who were on the waiting list were advised of the change and given the opportunity to forward individual cases for consideration.

#### HEALTH - DENTAL

##### *State Dental Health Program - Eligibility Criteria*

947. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Health:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the dental services' basic eligibility criteria' as currently used by the staff at the Perth Dental Hospital?

(2) Is the Minister aware of any review of the criteria that has been carried out in the last four years?

(3) When was the review carried out?

(4) What were the recommendations of the review?

(5) Did any of the reviews of the revision of dental health services examine who the service should be made available to based on a needs analysis of which groups are at most risk?

(6) Are the criteria currently used based on a risk assessment and/or income assessment?

(7) Is it possible that some of those who are at most risk in relation to dental health care are outside the dental services basic eligibility criteria?

(8) Will the Minister examine the possibility of further reviewing the eligibility criteria or establishing a board of review to examine specific cases that do not fall within the eligibility criteria but where the need is great?

(9) If not, why not?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1)-(2) Yes.
- (3) In 1993-94 and in November/December 1995.
- (4) The 1993-94 review recommended that the state dental program maintain the current eligibility criteria and program in parallel with the commonwealth dental health program. The 1995 review recommended that persons in receipt of maximum family allowance supplement and in receipt of a subsidy of 20 per cent be no longer eligible. All other eligible persons not already in receipt of a subsidy of 80 per cent should receive a subsidy at that level.
- (5) No.
- (6) Income assessment.
- (7) Yes, it is possible, but available information identifies that oral health outcomes are directly related to income status and that persons in the lowest income groups have the worst oral health. These are people currently targeted under the state dental program.
- (8) No.
- (9) The current eligibility criteria ensure that the available resources are targeted to the most needy. However, needs and eligibility criteria are monitored.

#### POLLUTION - SWAN RIVER

##### *Tests - Industrial Waste*

948. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Have any tests been carried out on the water quality on the Swan River since the beginning of April 1997?
- (2) Is the Minister aware the river around the Bassendean Bridge and further down stream has turned black?
- (3) Is the discolouration of the river brought about by the release of materials from mineral sands plants?
- (4) What tests have been carried out to determine the degree to which the river is being polluted by mineral sands plants?
- (5) What is the nature of the tests being carried out?
- (6) What action does the Government propose to take to ensure the river is not constantly polluted by industrial waste emanating from mineral sands or other production processes?

Dr HAMES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. There has been algal bloom activity in the Bassendean area during April and this causes a dark brown colour occasionally.
- (3) No. I understand there is no discharge from any mineral sands plant in the catchment to the river.
- (4) None.
- (5) Not applicable.
- (6) An industrial water quality study is currently under way. Major industry is also licensed by the Department of Environmental Protection.

#### LABOUR RELATIONS LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL - ADVERTISING

##### *Cost*

974. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Labour Relations:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of an advertisement that appeared on page 38 of *The West Australian* on Saturday, 19 April 1997 concerning secret ballots?
- (2) Were the advertisements paid for by Western Australian taxpayers through the Government of Western Australia?

- (3) What was the total cost of the advertisement?
- (4) Did the advertisement say both employers and employees will benefit from the unfair dismissal changes, with the emphasis on re-employment rather than compensation?
- (5) How will employees benefit from this change?
- (6) How much does the Government plan to spend advertising its interpretation of the changes being brought about by the Labour Relations Legislation Amendment Bill 1997?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1)-(2) Yes.
- (3) The total cost was \$8 794.52 consisting of \$6 580.89 for the advertising space and a one-off charge of \$2 213.63 for production.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Employees will have increased opportunities to be re-employed or reinstated.
- (6) Full costings have not been finalised.

#### DRUGS - PROGRAMS

##### *Substance Abusers*

981. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Youth:

- (1) What funds does the Government make available to provide programs to treat young substance abusers?
- (2) What agencies or individuals receive funding to provide such programs?
- (3) How much was made available for such programs in -
  - (a) 1995-96 financial year;
  - (b) 1996-97 financial year?
- (4) What funds will be made available for this purpose in the 1997-98 financial year?
- (5) Will the Government fund a number of comprehensive programs to treat young substance abusers in the 1997-98 financial year?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mr BOARD replied:

Responsibility for the drug task force falls within the jurisdiction of the Minister for Family and Children's Services. Please refer to question 982.

#### DRUGS - PROGRAMS

##### *Substance Abusers*

982. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) What funds does the Government make available to provide programs to treat young substance abusers?
- (2) What agencies or individuals receive funding to provide such programs?
- (3) How much was made available for such programs in -
  - (a) 1995-96 financial year;
  - (b) 1996-97 financial year?
- (4) What funds will be made available for this purpose in the 1997-98 financial year?
- (5) Will the Government fund a number of comprehensive programs to treat young substance abusers in the 1997-98 financial year?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mrs PARKER replied:

- (1)-(6) The Central Drug Coordination Office has funded the following programs specifically for young substance abusers -

The Yirra program provided by the Perth City Mission has been funded to extend its residential service and to provide outpatient and family services for a cost of \$156 000. These funds have been provided in 1995-96, 1996-97 and will be provided in 1997-98. The program is, and previously has been, funded for a similar amount by the Health Department.

The youth accommodation agencies, Swan Emergency Accommodation and Wanneroo Emergency Accommodation, have been funded to provide drug treatment services and the Palmerston Association has been funded to provide drug treatment services to a further four youth accommodation agencies. The total cost of these services in 1996-97 has been \$101 000 and the full year cost for 1997-98 will be \$118 000.

Palmerston and Perth City Mission are each funded to provide individualised drug treatment services to young offenders in detention prior to and then following their release, for a cost of \$60 000. These funds were provided in 1996-97 and will be provided in 1997-98. These services are in addition to programs funded by the Ministry of Justice to provide group treatment at juvenile detention centres.

The Central Drug Coordination Office is facilitating a project with Family and Children's Services which involves using workplace based learning strategies to enhance the extent and quality of interventions to address the alcohol and drug problems of Family and Children's Services clients. This will largely benefit young substance abusers. The project has cost \$22 000 in 1996-97 and will cost \$50 000 in 1997-98.

These programs are new initiatives arising from the report of the Taskforce on Drug Abuse. They are in addition to the dedicated youth drug treatment programs provided by Palmerston, Holyoake, Perth City Mission prior to the expansion described, and the Noongar Alcohol and Substance Abuse Service funded by the Health Department. They are also in addition to the work of youth agencies funded by Family and Children's Services.

## DRUGS - PROGRAMS

### *Solvent Abusers*

984. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) Has the Government carried out any -
  - (a) research;
  - (b) comprehensive research,
 on young solvent abusers to determine the types of measures and programs that need to be put in place to stop this type of abuse?
- (2) Has the Government produced a research paper or papers or other documentation on the types of programs that should be provided?
- (3) Has the Government conducted any research on the types of programs conducted in other States and territories on the substance abuse and ways of preventing/stopping substance abuse?
- (4) Will that information be made publicly available?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) Has the Government carried out any research to determine if any other States and territories have implemented a workable and/or effective model to treat substance abusers?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) If so, will that information be made available to youth and other agencies who come into contact with substance abusers?

(9) If so, when?

Mrs PARKER replied:

- (1)-(9) The report of the Task Force on Drug Abuse investigated the issue of solvent abuse and the measures that can be taken to deal with the problem. It drew heavily on the previous work of the Western Australian Committee on Solvent Abuse and a report on the issue prepared for the United Kingdom Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs. This United Kingdom report was prepared by a consultant who has visited Western Australia and advised our authorities and his report is regarded as outlining best practice for urban populations. The Central Drug Coordination Office and other agencies monitor this problem and the developments in other States.

Solvent abuse is of continuing concern, however, it is unfortunate that there is not a single effective model to deal with this issue. Various approaches have been tried and no State is having any more success than Western Australia. It is a problem that must be dealt with by communities and families as well as by providing treatment for individuals who are affected.

Family and Children's Services have developed a policy and protocols to deal with the issue and youth agencies deal with solvent abusers and their families regularly. There is currently a working party, convened by the Police Service, developing a coordinated approach to this and other problems in the inner city area.

Local drug action groups around the State are being encouraged to work with local retailers to curtail supply of solvents to young people. In the Central Desert communities there is a coordinated approach between the government agencies and the communities. The Government will continue to address this difficult problem as well as seeking new solutions.

## DRUGS - PROGRAMS

### *Solvent Abusers*

985. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Youth:

- (1) Has the Government carried out any -
- (a) research;
  - (b) comprehensive research,
- on young solvent abusers to determine the types of measures and programs that need to be put in place to stop this type of abuse?
- (2) Has the Government produced a research paper or papers or other documentation on the types of programs that should be provided?
- (3) Has the Government conducted any research on the types of programs conducted in other States and territories on the substance abuse and ways of preventing/stopping substance abuse?
- (4) Will that information be made publicly available?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) Has the Government carried out any research to determine if any other States and territories have implemented a workable and/or effective model to treat substance abusers?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) If so, will that information be made available to youth and other agencies who come into contact with substance abusers?
- (9) If so, when?

Mr BOARD replied:

- (1)-(9) Responsibility for the drug task force falls within the jurisdiction of the Minister for Family and Children's Services. Please refer to question 984.



LABOUR RELATIONS LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL - ADVERTISING

*Cost*

1013. Mr KOBELKE to the Minister for Labour Relations:

- (1) What is the anticipated cost of the advertising campaign being run in support of the Government's Labour Relations Legislation Amendment Bill 1997?
- (2) What is the cost of the television advertising?
- (3) What is the cost of all newspaper advertising?
- (4) Has there been any opinion polling for other research undertaken and, if so, what is the cost of it?
- (5) What is the cost for advertising consultants or other professional costs involved in mounting this advertising campaign?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1) The anticipated cost of phase one of the campaign is approximately \$134 000.
- (2) Approximately \$86 000 - including production costs.
- (3) Approximately \$48 000 - including production costs.
- (4) No.
- (5) Approximately \$21 866 is the anticipated production cost of phase one of this campaign.

WORKSAFE WESTERN AUSTRALIA - REPORTS

*Demolition Industry*

1023. Ms MacTIERNAN to the Minister for Labour Relations:

On 2 October 1996, in a letter to the Trades and Labor Council, the Minister said that he instructed the WorkSafe WA Commissioner to provide him with quarterly reports on the new Occupational Safety and Health regulations in the demolition industry -

- (a) how many reports has the Minister received;
- (b) when was each report received;
- (c) will the Minister table these reports?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (a)-(c) My letter to the Trades and Labor Council of 2 October 1996 referred to new requirements for demolition work contained in the Occupational Safety and Health Regulations 1996. Significantly these new requirements require compliance with the relevant Australian standard and any variation from the Australian standard to be referred to WorkSafe Western Australia for approval. Also, supervisors of demolition work are to be appropriately qualified and experienced. Since October 1996 WorkSafe Western Australia has strenuously enforced these new provisions and supplied considerable information concerning the requirements of the new regulations to the demolition industry.

A copy of a report prepared by the construction team of WorkSafe Western Australia on the new demolition regulations is hereby tabled with this question.

[See paper No 389.]

GAMBLING - VIDEO LOTTERY MACHINES

*Permits*

1030. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) How many permits have been issued to date for video lottery machines?
- (2) Have any permits been issued to any group or person other than a charity or sporting group and, if so, to whom?

- (3) In what respect are video lottery machines distinguishable from poker machines?
- (4) In respect of the revenue generated from the use of video lottery machines -
  - (a) what percentage goes to the permit holder;
  - (b) what percentage goes to the venue owner;
  - (c) what percentage goes to the Government; and
  - (d) what percentage goes to the ticket holder?
- (5) What is the total amount of revenue generated from video lottery machines since they were introduced, breaking down the revenue in accordance with question (4) above?

Mr COWAN replied:

The Minister for Racing and Gaming has provided the following response -

- (1) 706.
- (2) No.
- (3) Poker machines - that is, one-armed bandits - are spinning reel slot machines and provide for linked jackpots and payout in cash into a hopper. They provide for multi-line betting and have ancillary and hold features. Poker machines also provide for wins to be converted to credits. Video lottery terminals do not provide any of the above features. They are an electronic representation of break open bingo tickets.
- (4) Revenue breakdown -
 

Prizes	70 per cent	
Government	6 per cent	
Charity/Club	10 per cent	
Remaining 14 per cent shared between supplier and venue.		
- (5) Breakdown of revenue to April 1997 -
 

Total turnover	\$8 844 331	
Prize payout	\$6 112 830	Note 1
Government	\$551 359	Note 2
Charity/Club	\$903 837	Note 3

Note 1: The prize payout is lower than 70 per cent because current - incomplete - series have not paid out a full 70 per cent and this is reflected in the above figures.

Note 2: The government share is greater than 6 per cent because when machines malfunction any moneys remaining in the machine, after disbursement to the various parties, are forwarded to and accounted for as moneys due to the Government.

Note 3: The return to the Charity/Club is greater than 10 per cent because clubs, in addition to the 10 per cent required by legislation, also receive a proportion of the 14 per cent for the use of club premises.

#### ENVIRONMENT - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

##### *Karst Report*

1032. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Will the karst report to the Department of Environmental Protection be made publicly available, and, if so, when?
- (2) If no to (1) above, why not?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(2) The karst report of the Cape Range area will be publicly available as soon as a version is received from the authors which avoids the potential for defamation and which takes account of comments from peer review of the report. It is anticipated that this will be before 30 June 1997.

## PARKS AND RESERVES - REGIONAL

*Rockingham Lakes - Management Plan*

1050. Mr McGOWAN to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Has the Government completed the proposed Rockingham Lakes Regional Park Management Plan?
- (2) If yes, when will it be released?
- (3) When will the Government declare the Rockingham Lakes Regional Park?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Planning Commission has received a report proposing a management framework for the proposed Rockingham Lakes Regional Park and associated Port Kennedy Scientific Park.
- (2) Comment is currently being sought from stakeholders prior to the WAPC considering the report which will then be printed and released for public comment expected to be in June/July.
- (3) Land consolidation negotiations are continuing for the purchase of privately owned land with the intention of formally creating the regional park in the 1998-99 financial year.

## DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - PREVENTION UNIT

*Implementation Advisory Committee*

1063. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

I refer to the Domestic Violence Prevention Unit and ask -

- (a) who are the members of the implementation committee;
- (b) how often does the implementation committee meet;
- (c) what is the projected length of tenure of the said committee members;
- (d) how long is it intended the implementation committee will continue to exist;
- (e) did the implementation committee approve the training manual recently provided to parties expressing an interest in tendering for the domestic violence training packages;
- (f) does the manual include any component on legal issues or the criminal justice issues associated with domestic violence;
- (g) what notice was given to potential tenderers with respect to the briefing session held on 24 April 1997;
- (h) when do tenders close, and
- (i) what is the budget for the provision of training to the 16 regions?

Mrs PARKER replied:

- (a) The following are members of the implementation advisory committee -  
Carole Kagi, Director, Domestic Violence Prevention Unit  
Ron Carey - proxy Julie Hansen/Rebecca West, Police Service  
Joy Johnston - proxy Allison White, Homeswest  
Jennifer Gardiner, Domestic Violence Council of WA  
Robin Shine, Centrecare  
Angie Hartwig, Women's Refuge Group  
Jill Flannigan, Relationships Australia  
Ian Vaughan, Ministry of Justice  
Peta Mabbs, Ministry of Justice, Courts Division  
John Fussell, Education Department  
Jocelyn Jones, Aboriginal Community  
Sue Renshaw, Family and Children's Services  
Jenny Collard - proxy Carole Wright, Aboriginal Affairs Department  
Peta Wootten, Health Department  
Nawdy Roussetty, Legal Aid  
Helen Leidel, Manager, Sexual Assault Referral Centre  
Irene Froyland - proxy Mel Ainsworth, Edith Cowan University  
or their representatives.
- (b) Usually monthly.
- (c) Agency representatives were appointed until June 1997.
- (d) Extension of the term is currently being considered.
- (e)-(f) Yes.
- (g) The tender was advertised on 12 April 1997 with a briefing session to be held 12 days following this date on 24 April 1997.
- (h) 1 May 1997.

- (i) The budget for the provision of training in the 16 regions will be determined once the tender bids have been evaluated.

#### HOTEL TRADING HOURS - EXTENSION

##### *Increase in Physical Assaults*

1066. Ms WARNOCK to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that police statistics show that rates of physical assault have more than doubled in and around Perth hotels that were granted extended trading hours?
- (2) How many hotels or taverns have had their extended trading permits revoked as a result of problems with violence and/or irresponsible practice since 1989?

Mr COWAN replied:

The Minister for Racing and Gaming has provided the following response -

- (1) The Minister is aware a recent study by the National Centre for Research into the Prevention of Drug Abuse has suggested that in a sample of 20 hotels with extended trading permits between 1991-92 and 1994-95 there appears to be an increase in assaults in and around these licensed premises. However, the report is not yet available and the premises used in the research have not been identified and the actual number of assaults has not been clarified.
- (2) Since 1992 the licensing authority has, for various reasons, including the unsuitability of the premises, refused applications by hotels or taverns for ongoing extended trading permits. If a permit is granted and the licensing authority becomes aware of problems relating to the management of the premises or disturbance to residents, the permit is revoked or modified. A review of individual licensee files reveals four hotels have had their permits cancelled and at least six have had their permits modified.

#### LIQUOR LICENSING DIVISION - OFFICE OF RACING, GAMING AND LIQUOR

##### *Monitoring Service on Licensed Premises*

1067. Ms WARNOCK to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) How many inspectors are employed by the Liquor Licensing Division of the Office of Racing, Gaming and Liquor?
- (2) If none, who is responsible for monitoring standards of service on licensed premises?
- (3) How many prosecutions have there been for serving alcohol to -
  - (a) intoxicated; or
  - (b) under-age customers,
 each year for the past five years?

Mr COWAN replied:

The Minister for Racing and Gaming has provided the following response -

- (1) Three premises inspectors and five financial inspectors.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The Office of Racing, Gaming and Liquor does not maintain a data base on prosecutions for serving alcohol to intoxicated or under-age persons as prosecutions are the responsibility of the Police Service. The office only places a record of conviction on individual licensee files.

#### LIQUOR LICENSEES, POLICE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT - ACCORDS

1068. Ms WARNOCK to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Is there any evidence that the "accords" between liquor licensees, police and local government have reduced alcohol related harm and reduced the incidence of serving under-age or drunk customers?

Mr COWAN replied:

The Minister for Racing and Gaming has provided the following response -

It is too early to fully estimate the impact of accords. However, the Minister is confident that the accords are encouraging the industry and community to adopt responsible attitudes to the sale and consumption of liquor.

#### FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES - INDUSTRIAL INFORMATION AND ADVISORY SERVICE

##### *Tenders*

1070. Mr KOBELKE to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

- (1) When were tenders called for a contract to provide a statewide industrial information and advisory service to the community service sector?
- (2) How many tenders were received?
- (3) What is the amount of money being provided annually, and for the total life of the contract, to the successful tenderer?
- (4) Who was the successful tenderer?
- (5) Will the Minister table the full details of the contract?

Mrs PARKER replied:

- (1) 21 December 1996 and 4 January 1997.
- (2) Three.
- (3)

\$267 925	Year 1, 1 April 1997 - 31 March 1998
\$275 962	Year 2, 1 April 1998 - 31 March 1999
\$71 059	Year 3, 1 April 1999 - 30 June 1999
Total price \$614 946 with provision for variation.	
- (4) Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia.
- (5) No.

#### YOUTH - SOUTH WEST FORUM

1074. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Youth:

I refer to the south west youth forum and ask -

- (a) how many youth attended;
- (b) what other country forums are to be held and when;
- (c) what regions have youth councils and what is the date of inception of each;
- (d) what are the names and postal addresses of each of the members of youth councils; and
- (e) when will metropolitan forums be held and where?

Mr BOARD replied:

- (a) It is assumed that the question refers to the youth consultation which was recently conducted in Bunbury and attended by students from Bunbury and some nearby regional centres. Approximately 28 young people participated in this consultation.
- (b) See schedule over page.
- (c) Youth councils have not yet been established in the regions. It is envisaged that these will commence later this year.
- (d) Not applicable.
- (e) See schedule over page.

Proposed Dates and Districts/Regions 1997  
For Youth Consultations

Metropolitan		Country	
Alexander	19 May	Mandurah	7 May
Armadale	14 May	Kununurra	27 May
		Halls Creek	28 May
		Fitzroy Crossing	29 May
Bayswater	11 June	Geraldton	24 June
		Carnarvon	25 June
Melville	2 July	Northam	30 July
		Merredin	31 July
Thornlie	13 August	Karratha	27 August
		Port Hedland	28 August
		Broome	29 August
Perth	10 September	Manjimup	17 September
Whitfords	24 September	Bunbury	18 September
Scarborough	22 October	Esperance	16 October
Willetton	29 October		
Swanbourne	11 November	Narrogin	4 November

Note: Additional meetings in the country regions will involve consultations with Aboriginal youth, community service providers and tertiary students. Additional consultations in the metropolitan area will engage community service providers and tertiary youth. These consultations are yet to be determined.

### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - PREVENTION UNIT

#### *Funding*

1075. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Family and Children's Services:

I refer to the 1997-98 budget of the various government agencies directed to attend domestic violence prevention regional committees and ask -

- (a) what funds have been allocated to domestic violence prevention;
- (b) which have domestic violence protocols; and
- (c) what funds have been allocated to tackle domestic violence issues generally?

Mrs PARKER replied:

- (a) The Domestic Violence Prevention Unit has grants of up to \$1.4m available. Funds are allocated by relevant government departments.
- (b) None.
- (c) Funds are to be made available in the budgets of relevant government departments.

### HOSPITALS - KALGOORLIE REGIONAL

#### *Catering - Privatisation*

1076. Ms ANWYL to the Minister for Health:

- (1) With respect to the recent decision of the Kalgoorlie Health Service Board not to privatise laundry at Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital, when will a decision be made with respect to catering?
- (2) What legal issues are still being considered?
- (3) What have the total costs of the privatisation process and inquiries been to date?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) The Kalgoorlie-Boulder Health Service Board has held no discussion on the issue of contracting out of catering services and no time frame has yet been set to progress this.

- (2) The legal issues under consideration are related to the sales tax implications of private contracts for laundry and linen services. Advice has been sought from the Crown Solicitor's Office.
- (3) Costs: The total estimated cost is \$50 000. Not included are: Additional costs were incurred with the involvement of senior management in the tender preparation and with a core group of staff on the CTC Consultative Committee which met regularly to direct the process.

In addition, the process has involved seeking advice from Health Department of WA staff in Legal Administration Branch and Health Supply Council, from the Crown Solicitor's Office and State Supply Council. The dollar value of this consultancy is difficult to quantify.

The above expenditure has progressed the tendering process to the stage of the first tender document almost ready to take to the open market. It does not include the cost of calling for tenders and evaluating the responses, or the resource intensive activities relating to management of staff affected by the privatisation process.

## HEALTH - MEAT

### *Australian Standard - Amendments*

1107. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Health:

- (1) During late 1996, were amendments made to the Australian Standard for the Hygienic Production of Meat for Human Consumption which included an amendment to the post-mortem inspection of cattle and buffalo which deleted the requirement to incise the bronchial and mediastinal lymph nodes when inspecting the viscera?
- (2) Can the Minister advise which committee was responsible for making this decision and who represented Western Australia at the meeting when the decision was made?
- (3) Did the representative(s) from Western Australia oppose this motion and if they did, is their opposition recorded in the minutes of the meeting?
- (4) Was any submission made to the Director of Health or to the Minister for Health expressing concern regarding the amendment referred to in question (1) above, to the amendments being circulated to local government in December 1996?
- (5) Did the Northam Shire Council, in a letter to the Director of Environmental Health dated 29 January 1997, express concern regarding the amendment in question (1) above and point out this could jeopardise the current tuberculosis eradication program being undertaken by Agriculture Western Australia?
- (6) Did representatives of Agriculture Western Australia contact the Health Department and support the concerns of the Northam Shire Council?
- (7) Were further amendments made to the standard in February 1997 which once more make it mandatory for the incision of the bronchial and mediastinal lymph nodes when inspecting the viscera of cattle and buffalo?
- (8) Can the Minister explain the significance or why there is a necessity to incise the bronchial and mediastinal lymph nodes in the lungs of cattle or buffalo?
- (9) Can the Minister advise as to what date he received a request from the Health Department to designate company employed personnel from Watsonia's abattoir as health surveyors, or inspectors, for the purpose of undertaking meat inspection at that abattoir?
- (10) As at what date were the company employed personnel referred to in question (1) above designated as inspectors for the purpose of undertaking meat inspection in accordance with the Health (Meat Inspection and Branding) Regulations 1950?
- (11) Is it correct the Health Department had permitted company employed inspectors to undertake inspection duties at Watsonia abattoir prior to the Minister being requested to designate these persons as health surveyors or inspectors?
- (12) If the answer to question (11) above is yes, can the Minister advise who authorised this to occur and under which provision of the Health Act 1911 and the Health (Meat Inspection and Branding) Regulations 1950 can this occur?

- (13) Is it correct at least one company inspector employed by Watsonia abattoirs was working as a meat inspector on the chain as early as 4 February 1997 and undertaking the responsibilities of an inspector appointed for the purpose of inspecting meat in accordance with Regulation 1AA of the Health (Meat Inspection and Branding) Regulations 1950, which provides the interpretation of what an "Inspector" means in accordance with those regulations?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Agricultural and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand Steering Group 2 - Meat Safety.
- Mr Brian Devine, Principal Environmental Health Officer Health Department of Western Australia and Mr Michael Donnelly Chief Executive Officer Western Australian Meat Industry Authority represented Western Australia at the meeting.
- (3) Yes, these issues were raised by the Western Australian representatives but the minutes of the meeting did not record their statements.
- (4) No.
- (5)-(7) Yes.
- (8) Incision of these nodes will assist in the detection of disease that may have affected the lungs.
- (9) 28 March 1997.
- (10) 1 April 1997.
- (11) Yes.
- (12) Company employed meat inspectors were permitted to undertake meat inspection duties at a time when two Health Department meat inspectors were still employed at the abattoir. The company employed inspectors were fully qualified officers and their performance was monitored continuously by the on-site Health Department officers.
- (13) Yes, but inspectors from the Health Department were also on site.

#### HEALTH - MEAT INSPECTIONS

##### *Australian Standard - Terms*

1128. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister for Health:

What are the terms of the Australian Standard for the Hygienic Production of Meat for Human Consumption?

Mr PRINCE replied:

The Australian Standard for the Hygienic Production of Meat for Human Consumption is a document developed for and endorsed by the Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand for introduction into the meat industry on a national basis. The standard is intended to apply production and hygiene control of meat establishments processing animals for human consumption and boning rooms and further processing establishments producing chilled or frozen meat and meat products.

#### HEALTH - PRIVATE MEAT INSPECTORS

##### *Use*

1129. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have any meat production companies in Western Australia used private meat inspectors at any time?
- (2) If yes to question (1) -
- (a) which company or companies;
- (b) when did the company or companies use private meat inspectors; and



- (c) under what legal authority were the private meat inspectors permitted?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) Yes, but the Health Department requires a government inspector in addition to company employed meat inspectors.
- (2)
  - (a) Watsons Foods, Spearwood.
  - (b) 6 January 1997.
  - (c) Under Health Legislation Administration Act with effect from 1 April 1997. Prior to this date company employed meat inspectors were monitored by on-site Health Department officers.

#### HEALTH - MEAT INSPECTIONS

##### *Environmental Health Officers - Duties*

1130. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Under the system of meat inspection proposed by the adoption of the Australian Standard for the Hygienic Production of Meat for Human Consumption -
  - (a) will at least one environmental health officer be stationed at meat production companies in Western Australia; and
  - (b) what penalties, if any, will be imposed for non-compliance with the Australian Standard?
- (2) If yes to question (1)(a), what are the proposed powers and duties of the EHO, and how will the EHO interact with private meat inspectors permitted under the Australian Standard?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1)
  - (a) Under the Australian Standard for the Hygienic Production of Meat for Human Consumption, abattoir operators have an option to employ their own meat inspectors under a quality assurance arrangement. The Health Department requires a regulatory meat inspector to be present while animals are being processed for human consumption.
  - (b) Existing sanctions and penalties as prescribed under the Health Act 1911 and subsidiary regulation.
- (2) The powers of an environmental health officer are prescribed in the Health Act and the duties will be the same as currently exist. The officer will have overriding authority on any issue.

#### HEALTH - MEAT INSPECTIONS

##### *Australian Standard - Amendments*

1136. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it correct that during late 1996 amendments were made to the Australian Standard for the Hygienic Production of Meat for Human Consumption which included an amendment to the post-mortem inspection of cattle and buffalo which deleted the requirement to incise the bronchial and mediastinal lymph nodes when inspecting the viscera?
- (2) Can the Minister advise which committee was responsible for making this decision and who represented Western Australia at the meeting when the decision was made?
- (3) Did the representative(s) from Western Australia oppose this amendment and if they did, is their opposition recorded in the minutes of the meeting?
- (4) Was any submission made to the Director of Health or to the Minister expressing concern regarding the amendment referred to in question (1) above, prior to the amendments being circulated to local government in December 1996?
- (5) Is it correct the Northam Shire Council, in a letter to the Director of Environmental Health dated 29 January 1997, expressed concern regarding the amendment in question (1) above and pointed out this could jeopardise the current tuberculosis eradication program being undertaken by Agriculture Western Australia?

- (6) Did representatives of Agriculture Western Australia contact the Health Department and support the concerns of the Northam Shire Council regarding the amendment referred to in question (1) above?
- (7) Is it correct further amendments were made to the Australian Standard for the Hygienic Production of Meat for Human Consumption in February 1997 which once more makes it mandatory for the incision of the bronchial and mediastinal lymph nodes when inspecting the viscera of cattle and buffalo?
- (8) Can the Minister explain the significance or why there is a necessity to incise the bronchial and mediastinal lymph nodes in the lungs of cattle or buffalo?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Agricultural and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand Steering Group 2 - Meat Safety.
- (3) Yes, the changes were opposed and the minutes of the meeting did not record this objection to the changes.
- (4) No.
- (5)-(7) Yes.
- (8) Incision of these nodes will assist the detection of diseases that may have affected the lungs.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### JOONDALUP CINEMA COMPLEX - CONTRACT

##### *Government Commitment*

#### **296. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Lands:**

- (1) Is it the Minister's claim that the previous Labor Government signed a legally binding contract that requires the current Government to contribute \$15m to a cinema complex in Joondalup?
- (2) If so, why did the Minister not mention it when he answered a question in this House on 7 May 1997?
- (3) If so, what is the specific wording in that contract that the Minister claims binds the Government to contribute these funds to a cinema development, and will he table the contract?
- (4) If there is no legally binding contract, what is the Minister's justification for providing \$15m towards a new cinema complex in Joondalup?
- (5) If the cinema complex is commercially viable, why has it not been left exclusively to the private sector?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call upon the Minister to respond, I remind members that every question does not need to contain an extremely large number of parts. We can have more questions, with fewer parts.

**Mr SHAVE replied:**

- (1)-(5) I am more than happy to table the original Joondalup agreement entered into by the Labor Party in 1988. A master plan was put in place -

Mr Pandal: The new socialist!

Mr SHAVE: My friend, the member for South Perth! I just tell the Leader of the Opposition that he must be very careful not to get led down the garden path by the member for South Perth, because it could become very embarrassing to him later. As a political adviser, the member for South Perth is not good, but as a branch stacker he is fantastic. We used to call him the woodcutter when he was in the Liberal Party.

Mr Pandal: Just tell us the truth. Are you a socialist?

Mr SHAVE: One thing I do not need is for the member for South Perth, who has never been involved in business, to advise me about business. With regard to the Joondalup development proposal, a master plan was put in place in 1990, part of which involved a cinema complex. It was supported by the then Labor Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member. The coalition Government has a responsibility to follow through on commitments in joint venture agreements which were made under the previous Labor Government.

Mr Pandal: You have privatised State Print. Why don't you get off your backside and privatise this cinema.

Mr SHAVE: I told the Leader of the Opposition that he must be careful about listening to the member for South Perth; he is illiterate when it comes to business. An inference has been drawn that the coalition Government, through its subsidiary LandCorp, is running a cinema complex in Joondalup. That is not so. LandCorp and Armstrong Jones Management Limited made a commitment to offer certain facilities in that area. The cinema complex forms part of those facilities. There is no intention for the Government to run that cinema complex.

Mr Thomas: There is a rumour around that you are going to be selling tickets.

Mr SHAVE: I will have the member stamp them, just to make sure I am honest.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to draw his answer to a conclusion.

Mr SHAVE: The cinema complex will not be built unless Greater Union Organisation Pty Ltd enters into a long term lease agreement which is commercially viable and which is satisfactory to the taxpayers of Western Australia.

[See paper No. 392.]

#### JOONDALUP CINEMA COMPLEX - CONTRACT

##### *Government Commitment*

#### **297. Dr GALLOP to the Minister for Lands:**

Is the Minister for Lands saying that there is a legally binding contract that commits this Government to spend \$15m on that cinema complex?

Mr Pandal: That is what he said on television last night. Tell the truth.

#### **Mr SHAVE replied:**

Again, the member for South Perth is not telling the truth. Last night on television I did not say that there was a commitment by the Government to spend \$15m on a cinema complex. I said that the Government had entered into a joint venture arrangement with Armstrong Jones and gave certain commitments that it would honour with regard to the development of the Joondalup area. The Government will honour those commitments.

#### JOONDALUP CINEMA COMPLEX - MASTER PLAN

##### *Labor Government Support*

#### **298. Mr BAKER to the Minister for Lands:**

- (1) Did the former Labor Government support a master plan in 1990 which incorporated the construction of a cinema complex as an integral part of the shopping centre development at Joondalup?
- (2) Was the Leader of the Opposition a Cabinet Minister in the Labor Government in 1990 when the master plan was agreed to?
- (3) Has the Leader of the Opposition at any time advised LandCorp of any of his concerns or those of his colleagues about the development of the Joondalup regional centre?

#### **Mr SHAVE replied:**

I thank the member for the question.

- (1) Yes. That has always been the Government's intention. My understanding of the situation is that the former Labor Government also proposed to sell it. However, it would be irresponsible to sell it at the wrong time. The Government will not sell its half share because that development is subject to rent reviews every three years. For the information of the member for South Perth who is business illiterate, it would be inappropriate for a business person to sell his interest in a shopping centre development just before a rent

review, because the rent goes up following a rent review and when the rent goes up the capital value of the shopping centre also goes up. The worst thing that the Government could do would be to sell its holding in the Joondalup shopping centre at present.

Mr Pandal interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for South Perth has been interjecting incessantly. I have called him to order. If he continues, I will have to toughen up on him.

Mr SHAVE: I seem to be hitting a few soft nerves in here today. The member for South Perth has been soft ever since he left the Liberal Party. The reality is that the majority of rent reviews on the Joondalup shopping centre will take place in July and August. If the board of LandCorp determined to sell its equity, that would be the time to sell. I have also been told by the chief executive of LandCorp that if I asked him to sell our interest in that shopping centre today, he would advise the Government that that would be irresponsible until the rent increases had been properly evaluated and we could obtain the maximum price for it.

(2)-(4) Yes.

(5) Yes. He had a press conference yesterday at 12 o'clock and voiced his concerns about this matter. At 12.30 pm I pointed out to the Press that he was one of those who initiated this proposal. He is reported in *The West Australian* today as saying -

Since 1990 a lot of water has gone under the bridge - entrepreneurial government -

Mr Kierath: Of which he was a part.

Mr SHAVE: Of which he was a part and which lost a lot of money -

- is no longer seen as appropriate . . . The WA public now wants government to concentrate its efforts on core services.

It sounds like he is becoming a Liberal. He continued -

If the theatre concept is such a good one, the private sector should have been invited in to run it.

Spot on - that is exactly what it is doing. If the member for South Perth had rung my office, he would have found that out.

## NATIVE TITLE - PASTORAL LEASES

### *Compensation*

#### **299. Dr GALLOP to the Premier:**

Does the Prime Minister's 10 point plan to deal with the Wik issue have the potential to make the richest man in the world, the richest man in Australia, and the richest woman in Australia even richer?

#### **Mr COURT replied:**

I presume the Leader of the Opposition is referring to Packer.

Dr Gallop: Holmes a Court and the Sultan of Brunei - new supporters you have.

Mr COURT: I would love to ask what is the Opposition's position on native title, but I do not think we would get an answer.

Dr Gallop: There hasn't been a bigger rip-off since 1066.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COURT: The proposal being put forward will mean that a person who has a pastoral lease will be able to carry out a range of agricultural activities - something that the Leader of the Opposition's party has always supported and my party supports. It will also mean that those leases will become perpetual leases, again something that my party supports. I am not too sure about the policy of the Leader of the Opposition's party.

Dr Gallop: At whose expense?

Mr COURT: Hang on. It will institute a process so that, in certain circumstances, if parts of a pastoral lease are to be freeholded they can be freeholded. The process will go something like this: The Government may compulsorily

acquire a pastoral lease, as it has done with Waterbank station at Broome, and then if some of that area is to be freeholded, compensation will have to be paid for any native title rights that were also taken back with that pastoral lease; so compensation would be determined. Under the arrangements being negotiated with the Federal Government that compensation would be on a 75:25 -

Dr Gallop: Taxpayers.

Mr COURT: Yes.

Dr Gallop: What about making the people who are getting the benefit pay?

Mr COURT: Let me finish. If the value of that land improves, that improvement will be taken into account and the land will then be put back out to the market. So the benefit will flow to all Western Australians. If there is an increase in the value of that land, and that land is then put back out to the market, the money will come back to the taxpayers. I do not want to upset the Leader of the Opposition's story -

Dr Gallop: We know about the pastoral market, my friend, Mr Premier!

Mr COURT: Do you?

Dr Gallop: All the people who have backed your party over the years, they have paid nothing to the State.

Mr Shave: Who bought all Holmes a Court's land?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COURT: If we want to have a debate about pastoral leases we can look back on the good old Exim Corporation days when the then Government bought a whole swag of pastoral leases and paid out a nice old dollar for them.

Dr Gallop: You won't deal with the issue that is on the table.

Mr COURT: The Leader of the Opposition has asked me the question. I have just given him the answer, but I will run through it again. A pastoral lease will be compulsorily acquired. It will then be owned by the taxpayers of Western Australia. The compensation will be determined and paid out. If the value of the property improves that will be taken into account in the arrangements with the Federal Government. We have yet to see detail of those compensation arrangements, but that is how the Prime Minister has said it will work.

Dr Gallop: So the answer to the question is yes.

Mr COURT: No. I said the Government owns it, not the people the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned.

Dr Gallop: I am asking will they have the potential to become richer. Answer: Yes.

Mr COURT: Any person who wanted to go out and buy that land and have a dash at developing it would have the opportunity to either make or lose money. I cannot determine whether the people who buy the property will be winners or losers, but I am interested in the Leader of the Opposition's attitude.

#### SPECIAL BROADCASTING SERVICES - BOARD

##### *Western Australian Representative*

#### **300. Mr MASTERS to the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs**

- (1) Is the Minister aware that there is no Western Australian representative on the board of the Special Broadcasting Service, otherwise known as SBS?
- (2) Will the Minister see what can be done to rectify this unfair position where the board of a federal government instrumentality is not only dominated by, but is exclusive to, appointees from the Eastern States?

#### **Mr BOARD replied:**

- (1)-(2) It is of great concern to me - as it was to former Ministers for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs - that Western Australia does not have a member on the board of SBS, and has not had one since 1995, when Dr Eric Tan voluntarily stood down from that position. Unfortunately the board is dominated by Eastern States members. That shows in some of their decisions. The policy of the Federal Government is that SBS services be available to all Australians. Unfortunately, none of the proposed five new regional areas to receive SBS services is in Western Australia. Western Australia is the only State in which some 350 000 people do not

receive these services. I have written to Senator Alston, the Minister for Communications and the Arts, asking him to address this issue. As there is currently a vacancy, we are hoping to rectify the situation.

#### SPORT AND RECREATION - WORLD MINING AND ENERGY GAMES

##### *Funding - Premier's Involvement*

#### **301. Mr BROWN to the Premier:**

I refer to the Western Australian Tourism Commission's \$125 000 handout to Mining and Energy Games Pty Ltd -

- (1) What involvement did the Premier as Minister for Tourism have in approving or scrutinising this grant?
- (2) Was a feasibility study conducted before the money was handed over and, if not, why not?
- (3) Was the Premier aware that Mining and Energy Games Director Brian Tolhurst was also one of his tourism commissioners?
- (4) Will the Premier guarantee that Mr Tolhurst did not take any part in the commission's decision to grant his company \$125 000?
- (5) Does the Premier accept personal responsibility for this fiasco?

#### **Mr COURT replied:**

- (1)-(5) I am sorry that I cannot give a detailed answer to this question. I am not aware of the detail. I saw the article in the newspaper which referred to the matter being decided by the Tourism Commission with the support of a number of different government departments. I will find out the detail and give an answer.

#### LANDCORP - CINEMA COMPLEX

##### *City of Mandurah*

#### **302. Mr MARSHALL to the Minister for Lands:**

Will the Minister advise the House whether LandCorp proposes to build a cinema complex as part of its support for and development of the city of Mandurah and the Peel region?

#### **Mr SHAVE replied:**

I thank the member for this question. I put on record that the member works very hard for his electorate and people in the area appreciate what he does. I was intrigued by an article I read in *The West Australian* which referred to the Labor Party moving on from the 1990s. The article by Dr Gallop suggested that the Government should not get involved in issues relating to private sector developments. Because of his enthusiasm and the off-chance that he might be prepared to change sides and come to us, I did a little bit of homework and checked a few comments. I would like to quote from "Northern Suburbs - A Better Place to Live", which is authorised by Mr Mark Nolan. It refers to the Labor Party commitment and what Dr Gallop would do for the taxpayers of Western Australia. It was issued prior to the last state election.

Mr Kierath: The one we have just had?

Mr SHAVE: Yes. We have moved on from 1990 and we are now in 1997. The election, of course, was in 1996. The article in the *Wanneroo Times* of 19 November 1996 is headed -

Gallop vows \$100 million for rail and road.

That is commendable. The release continues -

Central to Our Northern Suburbs - A Better Place To Live policy launched yesterday, is the ALP's commitment to provide \$20 million in matching funds to the City of Wanneroo to build civic, recreational and cultural facilities.

There we have it. The Leader of the Opposition is saying on the one hand, "We will put some money in", but on the other hand, "You should not do it." In answer to the member, no, we are not building a cinema complex in Mandurah but we will do what we can. I looked through the notes put out on the Mandurah and Peel region, which say, "A Labor Government will support the City of Mandurah as necessary" -

Several members interjected.

Mr SHAVE: It does not say "will facilitate" but "will support the City of Mandurah as necessary - ". Assuming the Leader of the Opposition is a man of his word and the private sector will not put up the \$10m or \$20m, the ALP is committed to doing it.

The notes continue: "- to ensure that local cinemas are constructed as part of the total cultural centre complex and that the new cultural centre is promoted and finally utilised." Is that not the height of hypocrisy?

#### GOVERNMENT VEHICLES - USE

##### *Liberal Party Campaign Material*

### **303. Mr RIEBELING to the Minister for Health:**

I refer to the use of a Western Australian Government vehicle to transport Liberal Party campaign material in the electorate of Burrup during the 1996 state election and ask -

- (1) Does the Minister condone the practice of government employees being involved in election campaigning and using government vehicles to distribute campaign material?
- (2) If not, what action has the Minister taken following this incident?
- (3) Who was responsible for placing the campaign material, which included posters and boxes of pamphlets, in the vehicles?
- (4) Why was the vehicle being used to transport this political material?

#### **Mr PRINCE replied:**

I thank the member for the question and for some notice of it. It follows on from question on notice 651 of 9 April that was answered on 20 April. The answer is as follows -

- (1) This is an interesting question. Government employees are not precluded from participating in any legal activity in their own time. The member for Burrup was a government employee. Did he have a government car when he was a clerk of courts?

Mr Riebeling: No; I should have, but I did not have.

Mr PRINCE: The member for Thornlie was a government employee, and she undoubtedly had a government car.

Mr Riebeling: Answer the question!

Mr PRINCE: The question is: When people are travelling in a government vehicle, particularly in the north west, where they may have an extended trip and may stay away overnight, should they carry in their vehicle only things which are related to their employment? Should they not carry personal belongings, and could not those personal belongings include things in which that person was interested - 25 posters and a couple of shoe boxes of material? That person was travelling in the course of her employment. Of course the vehicle should not be used for the purpose of campaigning - which was not the case in the member's electorate when his party was in government - but to carry personal belongings is not a problem at any time and in any place.

Mr Riebeling: What have you done about it?

Mr PRINCE: To continue -

- (2) Under the Public Sector Management Act, this is a matter between the commissioner and the employee. The matter has been investigated by the management of the West Pilbara Health Service. The investigation determined that the material concerned was part of the employee's personal luggage. As a consequence, no further action is warranted.

Several members interjected.

Mr PRINCE: Wait for this - be warned! The commissioner is currently developing a policy to provide guidance to employees with regard to participation in political activities. That will affect a lot of people, most of whom will, I suggest, be on the member's side. Members opposite will need to be careful. I have had nothing to do with this. When the commissioner has developed his policy, I will be more than happy to give it to members opposite so that they can look at it.

- (3) The materials were placed in the car by campaign volunteers.

- (4) The employee was travelling between Karratha and Tom Price on business, and the materials were carried as part of personal luggage. It was not campaigning. The person involved had an accident and, fortunately, neither she nor her two passengers, who were trainee nurses, were injured seriously. The employee was not a candidate. The member for Burrup should be careful, when he raises this sort of issue in a political way, not to be guilty of hypocrisy.

#### POLICE - REGIONALISATION PROGRAM

##### *Effectiveness*

#### **304. Mrs ROBERTS to the Minister for Police:**

I draw the Minister's attention to the reported claims of Inspector Graeme Gordon of the Bunbury regional office that regionalisation means that each region must supply its own budget, and that if officers are called in from another region, their wages and expenses must be met by the region needing their help.

- (1) Does the Delta program have the Minister's full confidence?
- (2) Is regionalisation working effectively to deal with crises such as the bikie gang rape of a mother of three?
- (3) Do the police lack the resources to cope effectively with crime in our suburbs?

#### **Mr DAY replied:**

- (1) The Delta program has my full confidence. It is my view, and it is widely shared within the Police Service, the public generally, and certainly the Government, that the Delta program has resulted in the Western Australia Police Service being more flexible, responsive and accessible to the public.
- (2) Yes, the regionalisation program is working. The comments of the officer that the regionalisation program and the budgeting process in particular had prevented action being taken were based on a one-off discussion with a relieving district officer from Perth who gave him a wrong perception of what occurs. In other words, although the officer believed his comments were correct, they were not correct. The correct information has now been provided.

Mrs Roberts: Was it provided at a retraining camp?

Mr DAY: Not at all.

- (3) Yes, the Police Service is being provided with adequate resources. The Police Service has never been better off than it is at the moment in financial and human resources terms and in the facilities that are provided - whether buildings or other facilities. For example, this year's Budget allocated \$3m for an asset purchase and replacement program - that is, to replace outdated equipment - \$1m to further the information technology plan; \$500 000 to further the emergency services call taking and dispatch system; and an allocation for four new police stations. The Government has been extremely supportive of the Police Service over the past four years. An extra 800 officers have been added to the system. Of those 800 officers, 88 have been added to the southern region, which includes the Bunbury district, which has been the area of concern over the past few days. The Police Service has never been better off. I agree that more work must be done and the Government is doing it.

#### POLICE - SERVICE

##### *Resources*

#### **305. Mrs ROBERTS to the Minister for Police:**

How can the Minister claim that the Police Service has the resources to do the job and it has never been better off when police are no longer responding to 90 per cent of home burglary alarms, there is a growing sense of insecurity in the community as evidenced by recent surveys, local councils are filling the vacuum in patrolling our streets and serious crimes are on the increase?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will allow the supplementary question. However, I ask the member for Midland to read the statement that was issued.

#### **Mr DAY replied:**

About 94 per cent of home alarms have been false alarms and the police, in consultation and conjunction with industry representatives, have determined a new strategy and policy to better target the use of their resources so they can respond to positive alarms more quickly and effectively. The change in policy on responses to false alarms has



nothing to do with responses to serial rapists. It is precisely so the police can have the resources to respond more quickly to those serious offences that they are not responding to false alarms.

Mrs Roberts: Six per cent of alarms they responded to were real situations.

Mr DAY: I acknowledge the increasing degree of concern and fear in the community over crime. However, the Police Service cannot be blamed for that. It can be blamed on the occurrence of some serious offences, which are not new. The Police Service is doing all that it can, and it has my full confidence to deal with these very serious offences.

# KING EDWARD MEMORIAL HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

## *Special Care Nursery - Incubators*

### **306. Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN to the Minister for Health:**

I refer the Minister to claims made by the member for Fremantle recently.

- (1) How many incubators are there at King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women?
- (2) Is there a shortage of incubators at the hospital?

### **Mr PRINCE replied:**

- (1)-(2) As has been the custom for years, on the weekend King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women launched its Mothers' Day appeal for funds. KEMH has sought funds for a variety of reasons over the years and for assistance and equipment from time to time. The attempt to raise some money by KEMH was the subject of an attempt by the member for Fremantle to torpedo that charitable exercise, by saying that the Government should be supplying the equipment and that there was some sort of crisis in the special care nursery at the hospital.

At any one time up to 70 sick or premature babies are being cared for in the special nursery at KEMH. If it is not the largest neonatal intensive care unit in the southern hemisphere, it is one of the largest. In physical size it is exceeded in this State only by the Royal Perth Hospital intensive care unit. Every one of the intensive care cots with associated equipment - there is a rack of it, and members should go to look at it, to see what I mean - is worth up to \$140 000. Currently the nursery has some 35 incubators, and there is no shortage. However, the hospital obviously wants to keep up with the latest equipment, as far as possible. All the equipment is good and serviceable, and over three or four years the hospital has been replacing and updating it. As part of the hospital's normal Mothers' Day appeal, it wanted to appeal for something tangible which would appeal to the people, because there is a healthy relationship in a charitable sense between people donating to a hospital - be it KEMH, Princess Margaret Hospital for Children, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, or however small - for people to have a direct connection.

Mr Johnson: Hear, hear!

Mr PRINCE: The member for Hillarys is referring to Radio Lollipop which is a first class organisation.

The member for Fremantle has tried to make some cheap political points and say that there is some problem here because there is not enough money to keep the incubators going!

Several members interjected.

Mr PRINCE: It is a disgraceful exercise by the member for Fremantle.

In 1993 the Tiny Tots Quest raised \$24 000 for KEMH. In 1994 Telethon contributed \$600 000 to the special care nursery at KEMH. More recently that nursery has received \$250 000 from the Variety Club as a result of its efforts. The first ever major letter drop campaign was held in conjunction with Channel 9 from July to October 1994, which was the first Mothers' Day appeal. I congratulate the media organisations and everyone else who has anything to do with raising money for hospitals in this State, in this case KEMH. The fact is that the first ever members of Parliament women's project for funds, raised money for equipment for the newly renovated ward 5 gynaecology and oncology patients. That ward opened in December 1995.

It is the height of political opportunism for the member for Fremantle to try to score points from this exercise. The only charity that he knows about is the one that contributes to the Australian Labor Party, and nothing else!