



WESTERN AUSTRALIA

# **Parliamentary Debates**

**(HANSARD)**

THIRTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT  
FIRST SESSION  
1998

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 26 May 1998

# Legislative Council

Tuesday, 26 May 1998

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon George Cash) took the Chair at 3.30 pm, and read prayers.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AMENDMENT BILL

*Assent*

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

## WESTERN AUSTRALIA POLICE SERVICE - CHILD ABUSE UNIT

*Urgency Motion*

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon George Cash): I today received the following letter addressed to me at Parliament House dated 26 May 1998 -

Dear Mr President

At today's sitting it is my intention to move an Urgency Motion under SO 72 that the House at its rising adjourn until 9.00 am on Friday, 29 May for the purpose of discussing the needs of the Police Child Abuse Unit for sufficient funds, personnel, resources and equipment to enable them to respond to, investigate and prosecute child abuse wherever it occurs in Western Australia.

Yours sincerely

TOM STEPHENS MLC  
Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council

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

[At least four members rose in their places.]

**HON TOM STEPHENS** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [3.36 pm]: I move -

That the House at its rising adjourn until 9.00 am on Friday, 29 May.

Few sections of our community are more precious to us all than the children of Western Australia. It is therefore distressing that only last week and during the weekend we saw media reports of serious resourcing and morale problems in the child abuse unit of the Western Australia Police Service. These problems were graphically illustrated and described in the lengthy Police Service document entitled "Responses to the Recommendations Made and Issues Raised on Child Abuse Investigation by Wood Royal Commission into New South Wales Police Service (The Paedophile Inquiry) and Implications to the Western Australian Police Service". That report illustrates chapter and verse the sorry tale of neglect by the Government of Western Australia of the needs of children in Western Australia facing situations of child abuse.

Members will recall that only last week a senior police officer described this document, presumably with the support - certainly the silence - of the Government, as nothing more than a self-serving document. He effectively denied that the unit had a problem; as far as the Police Service, and presumably the Government, is concerned, all is well in the child abuse unit of the Police Service. We now know that nothing could be further from the truth.

Hon E.J. Charlton: How do you know that?

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Because we do.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This document, which is available to the Australian Labor Party, is meticulous in its analysis of the problems in the unit. The Government knows from that report that it has an obligation to respond to its recommendations and to the problems outlined in the report. The Government has an obligation to the weakest and most vulnerable sector of our community; namely, our children.

The report reveals the pressure placed on the small team of dedicated police officers who face the task of investigating hundreds of allegations of serious sexual abuse of children in this State. The report reveals the contemptuous response of the Government to the child abuse unit's problems.

I now present the official picture of child abuse in this State: In 1996-97, 162 arrests were effected by the unit, resulting in 981 charges being referred. In 1996, 1 240 charges were laid, and 1 472 charges were laid in 1995. Those charges included incest, indecent assault, sexual penetration, aggravated sexual penetration, indecent dealing, and aggravated indecent assault.

Those figures alone are gravely disturbing. As we know from the Wood royal commission's findings and numerous other studies, those figures represent only a portion of the incidence of abuse, particularly of children outside their immediate family. We have no reason to think that the situation in Western Australia is any different from that which prevails in other Australian States. Indeed, we have cause for greater concern because of our remote towns and communities, where the chances of detection and investigation and the ability to report abuse are fewer than those in the metropolitan area. Last night on the electronic media we heard people in Kalgoorlie express their concerns in an effort to attract the attention of this child abuse unit. Anyone who has taken the trouble to try to contact the unit - as I have today for no reason other than to see how easy it is to gain access - will know that one is answered by a machine, allowing no immediate access to the unit.

This document deals with the inadequacy and failure of the Police Service to respond to the needs of families with children outside Perth. The document, entitled "Extract: - from the Response Compiled by the Child Abuse Unit State Crime Squad", states -

... there are a large number of issues raised in the Wood Royal Commission that are relevant and pertinent to the current situation in Western Australia. Two of these major points are human and fiscal resources. These key issues require careful and timely attention by senior management.

Unfortunately that response has not been forthcoming. Instead, the child abuse protection unit has six seconded interviewing officers with a maximum of nine months' experience. They were due to be returned to their normal duties last month.

Hon Peter Foss interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The Attorney General will have a chance to explain himself and his Government's lack of response to the needs of the Western Australian community. Page 7 of the report states -

It is anticipated that these officers will be replaced by officers inexperienced in the field of interviewing children.

All members know that dealing with the needs of children requires special skills and training. Health and other professionals receive extensive training before they are considered suitable to deal with children. This response illustrates what this lack of training means in practice. The document further points out that detectives transferred to this unit receive one day of orientation from a supervisor and have also completed their detective training skills. From that point they receive only on-the-job training through supervision from other experienced officers.

The people of Western Australia have every right to be concerned and alarmed about attempts by this Government and its Police Service to suppress this document. It is hard to imagine anything more difficult and depressing than eliciting information from a child who has allegedly been sexually abused. Commissioner Wood stated -

... *whether a person is an adult or child, complaints of this kind (child sexual abuse) are in need of sensitive and experienced handling.*

However, the Government and the Police Service expect police officers to handle these tasks with little or no training or background education. That is surely indicative of the priority this Government places on dealing with child abuse in this State. The response further notes the possible disastrous impact this lack of training could have on the conduct of investigations and prosecutions. It states -

It is becoming more apparent -

Hon Peter Foss interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I will provide it in a moment.

Hon Peter Foss: I did not want to interrupt, but I would like the member to identify what he is reading. I am allowed to ask.

The PRESIDENT: The member has identified the name of the document. If better clarification is possible, I ask him to provide it.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I am quoting page 7, paragraph 4, which states -

It is becoming more apparent with ongoing court trials that the evidence of the Interviewing Officer and the manner in which they obtain disclosures from the children, is a primary area that defence counsels are now testing in evidence. It is imperative that the experience of the Interviewing Officers within this Unit be addressed immediately.

If this situation is not addressed, it is likely that there will be fewer successful prosecutions and that child victims themselves will be placed under further scrutiny and duress during trials because of our failure to provide an experienced and professional service.

This document details this Government's neglect. Quote after quote, page after page demonstrates the inaction of the Police Service, presumably at the behest of the State Government, despite the needs of our community. The response goes on to describe the impact this lack of trained or permanent staff has on the operations of the unit. At page 8 it continues -

Due to the excessive and increasing workload of the Child Abuse Unit, in comparison to the staffing levels the introduction of a Priority System was required. Complaints of a high priority, where a child is in danger of being reoffended against, are given immediate attention. Complaints of a lesser priority are attended to as staff resources permit. Currently there are in excess of 109 outstanding complaints awaiting allocation to an inquiry officer.

The response notes that as of 30 December 1997, of those files still waiting for an investigator to be assigned, six complainants no longer wished to proceed, primarily due to the time that had elapsed since their initial report. The response also notes that some complainants have waited many years to report these offences. When they finally build up the courage to come forward they can wait several months before an interview takes place. The negative effect on those complainants is apparent to the staff of the unit and victim support groups. The situation is totally unacceptable.

I hope that members on both sides agree that children and those who have the care of them and who have the responsibility to muster the courage to come forward to report abuse should not be left in limbo. They need a proactive response by the Police Service and this unit in particular. Ultimately these people must resign themselves to the fact that regrettably at this stage nothing is likely to happen with their complaints. Apparently, at least insofar as the response of this Government and the Police Service is concerned, no-one cares. The lack of sufficient and experienced staff has reduced the unit's role to one of reaction to complaints, with little or no time for effective targeting or strategic analysis.

The response notes that the unit's database includes over 1 200 convicted or suspected paedophiles. That figure does not include intra-familial offenders and it is not comprehensive.

Hon Peter Foss: Is the member now reading from the same document or are they his notes?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: These are my speech notes. I will return to the document. Page 9 states -

It is envisaged that this figure could escalate dramatically if sufficient resources permitted investigative staff to respond to information from the analyst and perhaps identify and prosecute offenders prior to them committing offences against children.

Investigations into paedophilia and child pornography are being "written off" because the information supplied has become stale before the matter can be properly investigated. International experts are quoted as noting that Australia is second only to Germany in its receipt of computer based child pornography. All these details indicate that we in Western Australia -

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: One would think that even the Attorney General would display some concern for the situation outlined in the report. At the very least, he and his colleagues should ensure that resources are made available to this unit so that it is able -

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will slow down. I am trying to attract the attention of Hon Ljiljana Ravlich and the Attorney General. They will cease interjecting.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This response document details the difficulties facing this community because of the inaction of the Police Service. We know that this unit does not have the resources that would enable it to respond

to the problems facing the children of Western Australia. This Government should not sit by smugly as it has, nor should it be a party to the suppression of a document that the Police Service has apparently wanted to see disappear. This Government should change its response to this issue. It should ensure that it restores the community's confidence in the capacity of the Police Service to meet the needs of children in our society. An important part of the document states -

This Unit and the staff attached to it are committed and dedicated to the investigation of child sexual abuse. However, without timely and careful attention to the critical issues in this paper, child sexual offenders will continue to evade prosecution and the time frame for investigating complaints will escalate.

I seek leave of the House to table the document so it can be available to the members of this Chamber and to the people of this State.

Leave granted. [See paper No 1629.]

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It contains a litany of the sins of this Government in respect of its response to this issue. I implore the Government to get on with the task of resourcing this unit, to take command of the situation and to get involved in resolving the issues, because for as long as it ignores the needs of the children of Western Australia, as it has done to this point, it neglects the interests of a most important section of our community and the most vulnerable - children who deserve better than they are getting from the Government.

**HON PETER FOSS** (East Metropolitan - Attorney General) [3.51 pm]: As usual, the Leader of the Opposition has given an entirely fact free speech. I will provide a few facts. Members might have noticed some wonderful statements have been made by Hon Tom Stephens. Most sounded like they came out of the report, but they actually came from his notes. The Wood Royal Commission into the New South Wales Police Service made some findings about paedophilia. When the matter was reviewed in Western Australia, it was found that most of what was required to happen in New South Wales was already in place in Western Australia. That is an important point the Leader of the Opposition should have brought out.

I will tell members the resources of this unit: One detective senior sergeant in charge; three detective sergeants; seven detectives; eight female interviewing officers; one unsworn analyst; and two unsworn receptionist-typists. The number of staff has gone from 19 to 20, of late. The budget for this year for all other expenses is \$72 600, and it looks like the unit will underspend it. This is one of the few units which is not required to supply people to other units when there is an extra demand. Most others units are subject to that requirement.

The unit has established a priority system. There are 243 complaints held for investigation, but 25 per cent of those are historical; that is, adults alleging they were abused as children. These are the ones that the Leader of the Opposition is making a fuss about, saying they should be dealt with urgently. They have waited for between 20 and 40 years. The people to whom Hon Tom Stephens referred are not small children.

Hon Kim Chance: One is too many.

Hon PETER FOSS: I will advise the priority for these cases. Priority one cases, where the child is in immediate danger, must be responded to immediately, and are. Priority two cases, where there is potential danger, are responded to within the applicable time frame. Priority three cases are responded to when resources become available, and priority four cases are those in which the complaint is historical. Those opposite must understand the unit is dealing not only with current responses in a timely manner, but also things which it is following up of its own accord. The Leader of the Opposition is wrong in saying the unit is not following up matters of its own accord. The unit is doing that, and in a sensible way.

Let us look at where these comments came from. At the time the Wood royal commission report was passed to the police, unfortunately the officer in charge was not there and it was handed to the third detective. As usual - this happens throughout the whole of Government - when those who are not at managerial level are asked for a solution to a problem, they will always respond that it requires more people. If we listened to everyone at that level, rather than those in management, we would have a Public Service which would outnumber the rest of the people in Western Australia, I suspect. The fact is that this is a very good unit. Those in it are hardworking, but they are dealing with the work in accordance with the appropriate priorities.

The Leader of the Opposition has seized on this. In the parts of the report he quoted he could not even provide any major criticism. All the criticism came from him. This document was provided by a person who is not even at management level. Why did those opposite not ask the janitor about this matter? Would they like to ask any person further down the line? Why do they not deal with the people with managerial responsibility?

Hon Tom Stephens: You're a disgrace.

Hon PETER FOSS: No, the Leader of the Opposition is.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Attorney General to resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition was heard in relative silence and that is the way in which the Attorney General will be heard. I am sure Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich heard what I said earlier.

Hon PETER FOSS: The first thing we must understand about this unit is that it is adequately resourced and it is doing its job. If Hon Tom Stephens wants to know the situation, why does he not talk to the people who can show him the accurate situation? He has distorted this matter by not pointing out to members that one-quarter of the complaints are historical cases. He has not pointed out that there is a priority system. He almost treats it as though the priority system is a criticism. Does he really think all these cases should be responded to immediately? Obviously the priority must be to deal with cases where there is an immediate threat. What size police force does he expect to have so that all cases are handled instantly - historical, urgent or otherwise? The Leader of the Opposition must be sensible in how he thinks this should be arranged. I have indicated that the unit has the resources and the people.

I will now comment on the people who are supposed to be inexperienced. One of the techniques used by the unit is to cycle people through it and then have them go back out to the districts. Not only are there resources in the child care unit, but due to this very sensible approach of taking people from the districts and putting them through the child care unit and back into the districts, we have people in the districts who have experience. That is made out to be a criticism. The Leader of the Opposition said that the only training they get is on-the-job training. Frankly, a lot of people in this world think that is probably the best training people can get. One of the biggest problems is that in far too many cases, organisations have gone crazy in requiring staff members to have academic degrees, rather than having people who know how to do the job. That should not be a criticism, but a commendation of a very sensible process of cycling people through the unit and back out to the districts.

This unit regularly does call upon those in the regions to assist it, in both the country and metropolitan areas. Where was any mention made of that? Where was any mention of a commendation for the fact that these people are being used in all areas? Would the Leader of the Opposition prefer that these staff members attended some academic course, rather than their obtaining practical experience in this unit for 12 months? I happen to think that is a sensible way of doing this. Perhaps the detective or the Leader of the Opposition does not think this is a good idea. Frankly, I think it is a very good one. As I mentioned before, the unit is doing proactive work. Perhaps we should do more; however, it is quite a misstatement to say that no proactive work is being done.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Have you read the report?

Hon PETER FOSS: No; but I have been briefed on it.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Look at page 223.

Hon PETER FOSS: Those opposite should take into account who wrote it. The most extraordinary thing about all this -

Hon Kim Chance: Shoot the messenger.

Hon PETER FOSS: The most extraordinary thing about this -

Hon Kim Chance: It is an official report.

Hon PETER FOSS: - is that the report was commissioned. Unfortunately, the senior officer did not do it and the person who did was not management. How on earth a person who is not management can write a report is beyond me. Would those opposite ask a junior person in their organisation, who is not in management, to write a management report? No; they would not.

Hon Kim Chance: I would not release it without reading it first. I imagine that is what happened with this.

Hon PETER FOSS: Other work in this area is being done by the vice squad. Some things which those opposite might think fit within the child abuse unit are being dealt with by another unit. The resources to which I have already referred are not the sole resources available to this area. The budget is significant, and it has not been spent this year. In one year there was a small drop related to some administrative on-costs; however, in this year funding has increased to \$72 600 on top of the \$62 000 last year. The unit does not look as though it will require all that money. It has adequate resources and staff members. It is one of a few units that do not have the problem of being required to give away any resources to meet any flexibility requirements. It is inviolate, and it retains its numbers within the unit. On top of that, the unit can call in other people.

Those opposite think this is a wonderful opportunity to get stuck into us. They think they have the answer. The

reality is that the unit is dealing with everything that is required to be dealt with. It has the people it requires. It has the resources it requires. It is immune from being plundered by other areas to meet flexibility requirements and it is carrying out its responsibilities. The Opposition should be saying thank heavens when it reads the review of the Wood royal commission report. It will find the situation here is unlike that in New South Wales. Most of the things recommended by the Wood royal commission that need to be done are already happening, and were already happening, in Western Australia. Even Hon Tom Stephens, after he had all that time to prepare, could not pick from it any good quotes which indicated any concerns.

Hon Tom Stephens: You are deaf and blind!

Hon PETER FOSS: I heard the member's hyperbole; I heard a lot of that.

Hon Tom Stephens: As well as being stupid!

The PRESIDENT: There is no need for those comments. The Leader of the Opposition was heard in relative silence.

Hon PETER FOSS: The fact remains that the Opposition really needs to look at the results achieved by this unit, which have been highly commendable. Every time we try to obtain some money to put into these things, the Opposition carps in this place about the Government's ability to raise money to do these things. The Opposition has supported taking \$1.5m out of the Government's Justice budget, and it continually complains about the gold royalties.

**HON LJILJANNA RAVLICH** (East Metropolitan) [4.01 pm]: I say in response to the Attorney General's remarks that there are none so blind as those who do not want to see. Quite clearly the Attorney General does not see the problem because he does not want to see the problem. According to him, there is no problem. This is the same Minister who also told us that there was no problem with our prison system, and we now have a record number of deaths in custody, overcrowding, and a whole range of other problems within our state prison system. This Minister does not want to admit there is a problem.

There is an enormous problem in the Police Service's child abuse unit and I will put it into context by referring to some Australian Bureau of Statistics 1996 recorded crime data for Australia; I want to pick up on the Western Australian statistics. This is specifically in relation to victims of sexual assault. In 1996, a total of 362 males were victims of sexual assault; 231 of those were less than 14 years old and 80 per cent were 19 years and younger. The total number for females was 1 395, of which 584 were below 14 years of age. Quite clearly we have an enormous problem in this State. In 1996 in Western Australia 1 757 persons were victims of sexual abuse, of which 815 were under the age of 14. That signals to me that a huge problem exists and I know that the child abuse unit does not deal only with sexual abuse.

I take no comfort from the fact that the Attorney General has now advised me that the budget for this area is in the vicinity of \$72 000; the bottom line is \$72 000! If that was spread among the number of children who are aged 14 and less and victims of sexual assault, it calculates to a figure in the vicinity of \$77 per person. That is totally unacceptable. This unit is adequately resourced, according to the Attorney General.

I will get to the guts of this. I refer to a survey which was commissioned by Inspector Lockhart and conducted for the childhood abuse unit to compare results with the 1994 survey. The first questionnaire looks at sources of stress and the degree of stress experienced by people working within that unit; it compares 1994 with 1995. Lack of recognition: In 1994, 46 per cent of respondents rated it very high. In 1995, this increased to 50 per cent. The next stressor experienced is the amount of work: In 1994, 46 per cent of respondents said that it was a main stressor. In 1995, it increased to 75 per cent. Conflicting demands: The stress from this increased from 46 per cent in 1994 to 75 per cent in 1995.

I will quickly move to some of the strategies proposed for reducing stress in the CAU. One of the questions related to whether the CAU was seriously understaffed, and I quote -

Q. The CAU is seriously under-staffed -

**Comment:** *Why? Because senior management don't regard what we do as important and they allocate resources to the "glamour boy" squads, ie. Drug Squad, Armed Robbery Squad, Fraud Squad etc.*

In 1994, 100 per cent of respondents agreed to or strongly agreed to this as a stressor, and in 1995 the figure was 75 per cent.

In response to the question of whether ongoing training was needed, 100 per cent of respondents strongly agreed. In response to the question whether further training in the form of a child abuse specialist course would assist in improving confidence/competence of staff, 100 per cent of these people wanted more training. In response to the question that senior management did not promote the interests of the CAU, 62.5 per cent strongly agreed. On the

question of whether initial training is not adequate to start working in the field, 75 per cent of respondents agreed and the comment was -

*We don't receive ANY training for this area. We are the only police service in Australia to fail in this regard.*

Questionnaire 5 asks: "What other type of support do you believe would be useful?" The respondents said -

Increased resources to alleviate problems associated with the heavy workload.

Proper and adequate offices.

More staff.

More office meetings.

Support from management. In particular, praise for jobs well done and more resources.

In answer to the question: "What problems do you foresee in implementing these?" the respondents said -

Senior management appear to be unaware of the nature and volume of the work carried out by this unit, or are simply not interested and believe it to be of low priority.

They don't care. The management are only concerned in cost cutting and not providing a service.

Another comment was -

Speaking personally I feel that it is not the work that is stressful, rather than the amount of it. If more staff was allocated to CAU, I feel it would alleviate stress immensely and you would be more capable of concentrating on one thing at a time rather than trying to do three things at once.

This is very damning. One of the responses was in response to the Attorney's comments that everything is flying nicely -

Our senior management does not care one iota about offences against the person unless you have been murdered. Our complainants spend their whole life sentence with guilt and shame. We charge people every day with offences that attract 20 year penalties - more than any other squad, yet the bosses do not give a shit. Just cut their budget, that's their motto.

That just about sums it up. Something is very amiss here. We have the Attorney General saying everything is okay, but the problem is it is not okay. Internally, people know that it is not okay. Andrew Patterson, who is a senior detective in the paedophile investigations team of the child abuse unit, on 16 April 1996 wrote to Acting Detective Senior Sergeant Coyne saying that legislation introduced in Victoria to create an offence of loitering by sexual offenders was essentially required in this State.

Given the recidivist nature of many paedophile offenders, this type of legislation allows Police to act against these persons, in certain situations . . .

No action was taken by our Minister. Two years ago a claim was made that a legislative framework should be put into place, yet no response has come from the Minister. This Minister has been very quiet indeed on this issue. The Minister was alerted by the Sexual Assault Resource Centre in a letter on 16 December 1997, from its manager, Helen Liedel, who pointed out her concerns by saying -

It also appears that the most specialised police officers are being so tightly squeezed that they are referring out more and more child abuse complaints to suburban offices where there are simply not the same facilities for clients or the same level of expertise.

In relation to being well resourced, an application was made by Detective Sergeant Prins of the child abuse unit on 8 October 1997 for funding to the value of \$4 655 in order to set up a computer system to enable the tracking of paedophilia in this State. In his memo, Acting Detective Superintendent Shervill of the personal crime division said -

U.S. Customs statistics reveal that Australia is surpassed by only Germany, as the country requesting the most child pornography via the 'Internet.'

As there is a direct link between child pornography and paedophilia, it is imperative that this unit and the Western Australian Police Service keep pace with the technology utilised by criminals.

On the front of his memo, it says -



I agree with the concept of proactive policy of the Internet. However, due to budget constraints we are unable to proceed with this initiative at this time.

It is absolutely pathetic that this officer cannot have a computer to the value of \$4 655 in order to track down people who deal in paedophilia. The Government knows there is a problem in the child abuse unit. It has failed to act. It has not responded in the budget. It has kept this a secret. The Government has buried itself and this problem, as it does with most other matters.

**HON E.J. CHARLTON** (Agricultural - Minister for Transport) [4.12 pm]: The Opposition has been totally hypocritical in the way it has approached this subject. There has not been one ounce of genuine promotion of the issue that it has attempted to substantiate today. This is nothing more than an exercise in political grandstanding and it should be seen for what it is. This motion is about trying to bring the Labor Party back together with some common outlook on issues after weeks of dissension amongst its ranks. If members had seen the looks on the faces of members of the Opposition and the way their leader approached this subject, they would agree it is nothing more than a grandstanding performance designed to show a little unity within the Labor Party.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich will come to order.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: There is a second component that should be seen for what it is. Every time the Government attempts to strengthen the laws of this State, the same group of people say we are being too tough on those who break the law. Members opposite say they represent the caring group of people in our society who want to take a soft shoe approach to initiatives to strengthen the law and make penalties tougher for those who cause problems in our society. On every occasion, these same people have undermined the Police Service. These are the people who at every opportunity bag the Police Force for whatever it does to uphold the law. Members of the Police Service in this State are now frightened to look sideways at anyone because they are constantly criticised. This is the same group of people -

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich was heard in silence and she should kindly afford that courtesy to other members.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: The Opposition in this State - this weakened, dissenting group of people in the Labor Party - cannot get its act together. They are the same people who go out into the community and bag the Police Force when it tries to uphold the laws that this Parliament puts in place. It is the responsibility of the Government of the day to employ a Police Force which will ensure that the laws of this State are upheld.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: And you are not supporting them.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: When the Police Service tries to uphold the law, what happens? Let us look at a few prime examples. When members of the WA Police Service go to the waterfront to uphold the law, who denies them that opportunity? The Labor Party and the Trades and Labor Council.

*Point of Order*

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: This does not address the motion that is before us.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister has digressed from the motion before the Chair and I ask him to return to it.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: The motion attacks and criticises the Government for not establishing a Police Service capable of dealing with the issues which have been raised.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Now you are telling the truth.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I point out that it seems convenient today for the Labor Party to say that the Police Service is not properly resourced to deal with those issues.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: It is not.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Then on every other occasion it has done so and I am giving a few examples -

Hon Ken Travers: You have wasted money.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: It is time we saw the Labor Party for what it is. If we are to take it seriously on this issue

and if it wants to take action to enhance this section of the Police Service, we must ask what it intends to do. Where does it stand as far as the rest of the Police Service is concerned? It attacked and criticised the tactical response group and said it should not have done various things because it was dealing with innocent individuals. The secretary of the TLC - that socialist misfit from way back -

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Get a life! How dare you?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: - came out and criticised the Police Service for the action it took to try to deal with issues that this society is forced to endure on a daily basis.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich will try to control herself.

Hon John Halden: When are you resigning?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: The Opposition has not acknowledged the officers in this unit of the Police Service who - as the Attorney General has quite properly demonstrated - are dedicated to their jobs; who are trained and experienced in dealing with the complaints which are made sometimes 30 years after the issue first arose. Members of the Opposition have grabbed hold of this issue - a trend they have been following recently - because they are battling to find issues on which they agree.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon Bob Thomas: We will support gas buses.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Therefore, the community ought to see this tactic for what it is; nothing more than an opportunity out of the blue that the Labor Party -

Hon John Halden interjected.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: You're desperate.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Hon John Halden does not like it because he is sitting there on the back bench being dictated to by his leader, in whom he has no confidence or faith.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich must come to order. If she cannot come to order in this House, she is going to have to leave the Chamber until she can get control of herself. Members, this is a serious motion and I ask you to hear the Minister for Transport in silence.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I put it to the Opposition that it is time it was serious about raising this issue. If it were genuine about this issue -

Hon Tom Stephens: We are genuine.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: - it would make a number of recommendations; it would categorise the issues that need serious, systematic and immediate response; and it would acknowledge the differences and make positive suggestions as to how to deal with them. However, members of the Opposition are a rabble; they have no direction and do not know where they are going; and occasionally they come up with an issue that they agree on but most of the time they cannot agree on anything.

**HON N.D. GRIFFITHS** (East Metropolitan) [4.20 pm]: The Minister for Transport delivered a very interesting speech. Unfortunately, it did not relate to the facts and resembled the response by Hon Peter Foss. Hon Peter Foss cast doubt on the report -

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Peter Foss was speaking as the Attorney General!

Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS: Of course, Mr President. One of the interesting points about the speech by the Attorney General was that it cast doubts at the report; yet, in referring to his briefing notes, he referred in part to the contents of the report. He said that the report was compiled by someone lower down the ranks. The Attorney General is so obsessed with the hierarchy that he forgets the facts. Hon Peter Foss sought some quotes from the report, and I am happy to oblige. At the bottom of page 9 the report states -

With the obvious bounding growth of Child Pornography upon the Internet and otherwise, a number of essential items of technology are required to effectively and efficiently combat this type of crime. Adequate

technical staff, equipment, storage space and procedural guidelines are urgently needed to address this deficiency and to ensure that offenders are identified, charged and in turn credible evidence is presented in court.

The Government can take up that suggestion right now. If and when the Government takes up that suggestion - after six months' delay - it will have our support.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Can the member identify that report?

Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS: It is the same document referred to by the Leader of the Opposition in his opening remarks and relates to a response to the Wood Royal Commission into the New South Wales Police Service, the paedophile inquiry. Page 10 of the report relates to limited security to protect the large amount of highly confidential and sensitive material that is currently stored in hard copy and upon computer systems. Perhaps they should put a police guard outside the storage systems! Reference is also made to the office having a combined total of nine computers shared between 17 sworn and three unsworn staff. It states that all three unsworn officers have access to their own computers, which leaves the remaining six computers to be shared among all sworn officers. The observation is made that three of the computers are outdated and need to be upgraded or replaced. Why does the Government not do something about that? The paragraph concludes -

Urgent attention is required for further computers to be allocated to the Unit.

And further -

Currently there is no formal, certified or accredited training course for police officers in this State who investigate child abuse.

I noted the Attorney General's comment that we will have better on-the-job training. The document states -

Western Australia is one of only three States not to have a training officer in this area of investigation.

It also comments on the Government's sense of priority. At page 11 it reads -

Currently there is a Ministerial complaint being answered by this Unit, initiated by the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, concerning the period of time for some complainants waiting to be interviewed. These type of complaints could be avoided if the Unit were to be adequately resourced.

The document is full of condemnation of the performance by the Government in this very crucial area. Once again, the Government has failed to protect the weak and the innocent in our community. At page 19 the report reads -

By the end of 1995, after the Paedophile Investigations Team had been operative for approximately eighteen months there were over 750 convicted or suspected paedophiles recorded upon the database. This figure has skyrocketed to well over 1200 at this current time and this figure does **not** include intrafamilial offenders.

The situation is urgent and the Government must act on it now.

The Attorney General boasted about the Government's performance relating to proactive policing. The report says otherwise, at page 23 -

The Child Abuse Unit is currently unable to conduct any proactive work due to the consuming demands of complaint based investigations. At present there are approximately 226 outstanding complaints, which equates to an average individual workload of over 30 files per investigator. This figure increases dramatically when officers are called upon for other duties or are on leave.

The Attorney General referred to the vice squad. This is an offensive matter. Much has offended me recently, but this is particularly offensive. Under the heading "Child Prostitution" at page 25 the report states -

Child Prostitution is another area that is not currently investigated. Proactive policing of child prostitution would identify paedophiles who are paying juveniles for sexual gratification.

Over the page -

If this Unit had the appropriate amount of resources to investigate child prostitution, it would have the potential for a large amount of intelligence and analytical data to be gathered and ultimately acted upon.

I urge the Government to do something about that. We were invited to make positive suggestions. One positive suggestion is that the Government should get off its backside and do something about this very crucial area of activity. I am delving into an area of resources. The report makes a number of suggestions for consideration of

legislative change. It is about time that the Government told us what it is doing about considering those proposals for legislative change.

**HON KEN TRAVERS** (North Metropolitan) [4.26 pm]: I have had only a brief time to look at the report since its tabling. It was extraordinary that the Attorney General saw fit to shoot the messenger, by referring to the document as one basically written by someone at a low level down the management chain. I think he suggested that we should also speak to the janitor. The report was compiled by Acting Detective Senior Sergeant Branchi of the child abuse unit of the State Crime Squad. At page 15 the report indicates that he is in charge, but has been seconded indefinitely from another operation. It lists the problems due to the lack of training of staff. The report contains a memorandum dated 16 July 1996 from a detective senior sergeant to the detective superintendent complaining about the lack of qualified staff and high rate of transfers. The report has not been written by a low level officer. It is written by the officer in charge of the child abuse unit of the Police Department.

The report highlights scandalous situations in the child abuse area. However, the Attorney General shot the messenger, and said that the officer in charge, the person who wrote the report, is at a level just up from the janitor. What an extraordinary response from this Government to these very serious allegations.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I could not believe the detail in the report. It includes memorandums from senior officers to superior officers in the department, complaining that staff do not have the necessary level of expertise or experience in interviewing. The Attorney General says that the department has a great policy where everyone is rotated throughout the ranks and learns on the job. However, someone must be on the job to teach other officers. The report highlighted the fact that no-one was available to train officers correctly in procedures. On-the-job training is great, as long as someone is available to teach the officers who require that training. For example, a two year old could not instruct an adult on how to drive a car.

This does not involve ordinary investigation work, which is the sort of stuff one would learn in the Police Academy. Nothing is more important than the way we deal with young children. We must gain their confidence and their trust so that we are in a position to get the information and facts in order to get to the people who deserve to be got - the paedophiles and the people who are abusing our children in this State. We must make sure those people are found out.

I accept that we must have priorities, but I would have thought that a crime like child abuse was one. The Attorney General never answered whether at the end of the day every allegation of child abuse has been fired up and in what time frame, or whether allegations are still sitting on the books of the child abuse unit waiting to be investigated.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to standing orders.

## SORRY DAY

### *Suspension of Standing Orders*

**HON TOM STEPHENS** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [4.32 pm]: I move -

That so much of standing orders be suspended as will enable me to move a motion to mark Sorry Day.

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [4.33 pm]: The Government is prepared to support this motion and to make available one hour between now and 6.00 pm to debate this matter. I do not expect that it will be resolved by 6.00 pm. I understand that a number of members wish to speak to it. However, I have agreed with the Leader of the Opposition to make this time available on the understanding that the debate will be adjourned at 6.00 pm.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

### *Motion*

**HON TOM STEPHENS** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [4.34 pm]: I move -

That this House apologises to the indigenous people of Western Australia for the past policies under which they were removed from their families and expresses deep regret at the hurt and distress that has caused.

Members will know that a similar motion was moved in the other place only 12 months ago on the occasion that marked the tabling of the report into the stolen generation which was known as "Bringing Them Home". We in this place took the opportunity to mark the event by expressing our regret on that occasion. Twelve months down the

track, one of the recommendations contained in the report is that there should be, annually in the view of the report, a national day on which people will express their sorrow and their regret for those events of our recent past and in some cases stretching right back to the early days of settlement.

This is not an occasion for the expression of personal guilt. It is not in most cases the expression of regret for the activities of any of us of the current generation in regard to the practices of the recent past; nonetheless, we know that the community of Australia, and in particular Western Australia, participated in policies that brought about the separation of so many individual Aboriginal people from their families and communities. Children were separated from their parents, parents separated from their children. No doubt many of us, if not all of us, know indigenous people of Western Australia who were so affected. We know that the policy of the past justifies an expression of regret. It is not merely an expression of regret on the part of individuals. Individuals make up institutions. In our case we make up the institution that is the Legislative Council of Western Australia.

As individuals we are members of political parties. For some of us those political parties have been in Government over the years in which those policies were administered. For those of us who are part of those institutions, it is appropriate for us to rise and express our regret for the fact that those institutions - the Labor Party in my own case - were part of administering policies that delivered much hardship and damage to the indigenous community of Western Australia. Not only Governments but also churches, of which some of us are part as well, were involved. Those churches with their current leadership have acknowledged the problems and hurt that their administering of those policies caused indigenous people of this State.

For as long as I have had an association with the Aboriginal community across Australia, I have become aware of this phenomenon of earlier generations determining that they thought it appropriate for Aboriginal children to be taken away from their families. They thought it would do them good, but we know that it did them no good. In so many cases the truth is that the policies were being implemented not for the good of the children but to serve other purposes in our community. That is documented in the report that was tabled 12 months ago.

I appreciate that there are available in our community scientific studies, and certainly objective studies, of the social and personal outcomes of that forced separation of Aboriginal children from their families. It produced the most shocking statistics in that community, with reduced employment being a particular characteristic, with Aboriginal people being poorly trained in so many cases, and with those who were trained for domestic help being reduced to having to serve in families as domestic servants. Indeed, some of the institutions to which Aboriginal people were taken were associated with churning out trainees who could work as domestic servants. There were reduced opportunities in so many cases for educational advancement. We have seen that so many Aboriginal people are left without the incomes of the wider community which might otherwise have been available to them if policies had been designed towards positively accelerating and advancing their interests rather than producing results that have hampered them.

We know, in any honest and accurate reflection on this history between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians, that there is in the Aboriginal community now a consequent despair and many social problems with which the indigenous community is having to wrestle. There was a consistent thread of dispossession, the destruction of cultural heritage and the deliberate fracture of indigenous families. In that same context many of us, especially those of us who have represented the remote parts of this State and no doubt some who represent the metropolitan area, will know of the dedicated and good efforts of those officers administering government policies who believed that they were doing the right thing. In many cases they went out of their way to make sure that they did the right thing to the Aboriginal community in this State, no matter what the intent or effect of the policies they were administering. So many officers from the start of the Public Service of Western Australia championed the interests, rights and protection of Aboriginal people and did it well, but others did not.

The churches of Western Australia have within their ranks people of whom the entire community can be proud and to whom the Aboriginal people can be grateful for the protection that they provided to the Aboriginal people. I am thinking of the Anglican community and people like the Reverend James Gribble. I am thinking also of people in the Uniting Church and their predecessors in the church community. So many people worked in a dedicated fashion in protecting and supporting Aboriginal interests. In the Catholic community people like Bishop Salvado and other leaders, both clerical and lay, and the nuns, brothers and priests, did so much to advance Aboriginal interests. At the same time, they administered a policy that wreaked havoc on the Aboriginal people. It is no wonder there has been this recommendation that today there be an opportunity for expressing sorrow about the facts of the past and for uniting, driven not by guilt but by a determination to see a society in the future in which we can come together as a family of different peoples united in the recognition of what joins us together.

At the same time there should be open and honest reflection of the damage done in the past. There will be an opportunity for others in this House to join in expressing their support for this motion.

**HON CHRISTINE SHARP** (South West) [4.41 pm]: I second the motion. When it comes to contact between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians, no-one who reflects on their mutual history can fail to be moved. This Sorry Day is an occasion on which people of all races in this country can reflect on the tragic history of race relations in Australia and, from that base, celebrate the beginning of a new understanding. It is a day of hope on which we can join hearts across the races and nationalities for a new beginning in this State. Saying sorry is the first step in this reconciliation. By saying sorry, we can release the past and acknowledge the future. A great historian, George Santayana, once said that those who cannot remember the past are doomed to repeat it.

When I discussed this motion with Hon Tom Stephens earlier today and indicated that I would be very privileged to second it, I asked that one word be changed in the motion because it is a repeat of the motion debated in the Legislative Assembly on the first Sorry Day last year. I asked that the word "has" be inserted before the word "caused", to change the tense so that part of the motion would read "expresses deep regret at the hurt and distress that has been caused." Using the present perfect tense makes it clear that people understand we are talking about a situation that has not been completed and that the past is still part of the present.

We have attempted to bury the past by not acknowledging this history; by pretending that policies have worked when we know from the health, prison and education statistics that white Australians are better off than indigenous Australians in almost any area where government intervenes. A superficial examination of statistics brings home the gulf between the two Australias. Last week the Attorney General provided this Parliament with terrible statistics indicating that 48 per cent of the female prison population and 33 per cent of the male prison population in Western Australia are Aboriginal. Nationally, the overall unemployment rate is 23 per cent for Aboriginal people, compared with 8 per cent for non-Aboriginal people. Life expectancy for both Aboriginal men and women is between 15 and 20 years less than for other Western Australians. In almost all areas indigenous people are disadvantaged.

However, most grievous of all is that we have ignored the Aboriginal people in our State. They have become invisible people and are not seen by white Australians as part of the mainstream of the wider society. We may have given them access to our cities but we have not given them access to our homes, and many Aboriginal people live in Homeswest ghettos. In country areas they are marginalised, except on the sporting field, and in pastoral areas they are often located on outstations and segregated settlements so interracial contact is minimal. In the south west where I live the Nyoongah population has been so decimated over time that it has been impossible to easily find an individual Nyoongah to whom to say sorry.

Hon E.J. Charlton: I will introduce you to some.

Hon CHRISTINE SHARP: Aboriginal people who have integrated with the mainstream of society are often invisible and they become so accepted by white Australians that their Aboriginal identity disappears from our white vision. They are just another bloke in the workplace. Our stereotype of Aboriginal people still persists. We rarely talk about indigenous success, but talk only about the failures. Government policies have not worked, and the plight of Aboriginal people is still one of a conquered race unable to share in the fruits of our success.

Today gives us a chance to reflect, to seek peace in our own hearts and collectively say "I am sorry". Sorry Day is not a day for Aboriginal people to celebrate but it is a day on which all those in society can expurgate their souls. Our collective guilt has led us to collectively punish Aboriginal people. Because we failed them, we seize on every opportunity to blame them and make them seem the victims of their fate rather than the victims of our fate. We not only blame, but also enter into acts of denial. People who ask why they should apologise because they have done nothing to Aborigines, miss the point. The point is that our history collectively, and not just individual acts, brought us to this day. Until we come to grips with our history, we cannot move forward. The past is still affecting Aboriginal people today. Noel Pearson said in 1993, following the Mabo decision, that after social justice and land acquisition, the third step must be emotional reconciliation and this will be very hard for indigenous Australians because they bear deep emotional scars.

The life story of one stolen child, Avis Gale, as reported in *The Aboriginal Independent*, particularly touched me. She was taken from her mother at the age of one week and was raised in a church owned orphanage, where she was sexually abused, unloved and beaten. As a teenager she was nicknamed Wild Dog, because of her behaviour. Eventually she went to prison, where she was introduced to drugs. From this low point she began a journey out of hell. She eventually became the manager of a hostel for Aboriginal children, linked herself with a reconciliation group and raised funds for a memorial on the site of the orphanage in which she grew up. When the Uniting Church moved to apologise unconditionally for its part in the forced removal of children, she was among those invited to receive the apology. The church's apology moved her deeply. She said it freaked her out because she realised that she, too, had apologies to make. She said that one day they must meet their maker but so must she.

Mr Gatjil Djerrkura, the Chairman of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, said at the launch of National Sorry Day that truth does not require people to wallow in guilt, but it does require them to listen and to

acknowledge. One year ago Sir Ronald Wilson, who chaired the inquiry into the stolen generation, visited this Parliament and a few members attended his presentation and morning tea. The story he told of the process of the inquiry into the stolen generation touched me enormously, and I thought then that this story should get into the home of every white Australian and, particularly, that every Australian mother should consider and listen to it. No mother could fail to be moved by the plight of so many thousands of Aboriginal mothers who lost their children, or the plight of the motherless children. Sir Ronald Wilson has said that apology means understanding and a willingness to enter into the suffering. It implies a commitment to do more.

Today, by accepting at the entrance to this Parliament more than 150 sorry books with their thousands of signatures received around Western Australia so far, we entered into a commitment to do more. Those messages should signal a clean break from the past. The past will not go away but we can now begin to leave guilt behind and begin the healing process.

As a State we should build on the goodwill and events of today towards a positive view of reconciliation. We need to ensure that the spirit of reconciliation which follows is built into our values through our education system. We should ensure that as adults we continue to examine our view of people of other ethnic groups. We should not begrudge programs aimed at ensuring the return of land to Aboriginal people and of improving their health, education and housing.

As any psychologist will affirm, time does not heal emotional scars. The healing of Aboriginal pain will come about only through collective acknowledgment. For my part, I am proud to have the opportunity to second this motion and convey in this Parliament my deep regret to all indigenous people of Western Australia.

**HON HELEN HODGSON** (North Metropolitan) [4.50 pm]: It is a year since the report entitled "Bringing Them Home" was handed down in Federal Parliament. During the past year I had the opportunity to speak with many people affected by the policies that resulted in so many of these people being taken from their families and brought up in an alien environment. Those children experienced a trauma that few of us seated here can understand. I did not understand it myself. Like many of us here today I am the product of a middle-class, white, urban upbringing. I have had little to do with Aboriginal people in my life. I realised how little I had had to do with them only when I talked to people about what took place in Aboriginal history.

I had a very moving experience about April last year shortly before I took my seat in this place when I was invited to attend a reconciliation weekend at Wandering. It was organised by the Uniting Church in Australia, which, as we all know, was involved in running some of the homes for these children. The weekend event was advertised through the church system and the community. A mixture of people attended this weekend, among them Nyoongah and Wadjella people. The purpose was to sit, talk and listen to find out a little about each other. To my shame, I was not aware until then that in my lifetime, people of my age were taken from their families and brought up in an alien environment. They were taken to schools, not through their or their family's choice, and they were alienated and separated from their culture. I am aware that many children of white background for various reasons attend schools and are taken away from their homes. However, in most cases they are allowed to retain their ties, communicate with their family and go home on holidays, whereas for many of the stolen children that was not the case. The removal was total and attempts were made to break their cultural ties.

The impact of this on some of these people can be seen in not only the "Bringing Them Home" report but also many other areas of our society. If members examine the statistics on family violence and the impact of indigenous people on our prison system, as Hon Christine Sharp indicated, it is obvious that the Aboriginal population is grossly over-represented. Some of the stories in the "Bringing Them Home" report reveal the reason for that. It talks of children who believed they were unloved and unwanted and who were told they were of little worth in our society. That was bound to have an impact on their self-esteem and lifestyle. We are told of children who did not receive parenting, so they did not learn how to be parents. This time last year the Government of this State acknowledged and apologised to the stolen generation. I am glad this Government had the courage to do so. Its example has not been followed by some Houses of Parliament in this country. As a result of that, many Aboriginal people feel they cannot rely on our political leaders to acknowledge Australia's shame. In this State we have come part of the way towards that and this follow up motion on the first anniversary of Sorry Day is a way of showing our ongoing commitment.

We must take all these steps towards reconciliation. That is what saying sorry is all about. We may not have had any personal responsibility for these actions, but some of us in this place were old enough to vote when Governments were implementing these policies. Some of us indirectly had a say in the way these policies were developed. That does not apply to all of us and it does not mean we personally endorsed those policies or want to see them return.

Saying sorry is an important step that will allow people on both sides to acknowledge that wrongs were done and that we must acknowledge them in order to move forward. In this context at page 277 of the "Bringing Them Home" report in a segment of confidential evidence a woman who was removed from her mother at 12 months in 1967 say -

And an apology is important because I've never been apologised to. My mother's never been apologised to, not once, and I would like to be apologised to.

The report reveals the stories of people who are hurting badly and an apology is a way of acknowledging their hurt and of moving forward and saying that we know wrongs were done; now we must work together to redress those wrongs. An apology will not rectify the errors of the past. Much intolerance still exists around us. It will not take away the hurt or reunite families torn apart or restore the identity of people who have become alienated from their past. It is not simply to assuage the guilt of the non-Aboriginal community. We should not be standing here in sackcloth and ashes saying, "Now that I have admitted my fault, I am cleared of all blame and responsibility", because we have a responsibility to move forward and learn from the mistakes of the past.

An apology is always a personal thing. I fully understand those members of the community who do not feel it is incumbent on them to make a personal apology. I do not agree with them and I am quite willing to make my personal apology to members of the Aboriginal population. However, everybody must come to that point in their own time. For some people in our community that time is not here. They cannot yet see the wrongs that have been done and the hurts that must heal.

Today in the presentation ceremony on the steps of Parliament House I was pleased to hear a commitment from the Minister for Family and Children's Services that an allocation of \$1m has been set aside in that department's budget to fund some of the issues raised in the "Bringing Them Home" report. I am keen to see the detail of how that allocation will be used. It is vitally important that we remember that the best way to deal with the issue of the stolen generation and the problems caused by it is by starting from a framework of self-determination, as acknowledged in the report. Therefore, we cannot go to them with paternalistic handouts saying, "Here is some money to do this and that." We must involve the community to find the best ways to use the money to help resolve some of the situations with which they are faced. I trust that in the detail of the proposals we will see involvement of the community in choosing the best ways to meet the objectives and recommendations of the report.

I am conscious that many people in this place would like to have their feelings noted in the record so with those few words I say that I am sorry.

**HON TOM HELM** (Mining and Pastoral) [4.59 pm]: I join my comrades on this side of the House and support the motion moved by Hon Tom Stephens. It prompts me to make the observation that earlier today we had an interesting debate on child abuse.

#### [Questions without notice taken.]

Hon TOM HELM: I advised the House before questions without notice that I was proud to join members who support this motion. I remind the House of debate on the motion moved by Hon Tom Stephens regarding aspects of child abuse in this State. The "Bringing Them Home" report outlines what took place in Australia when children of indigenous people were taken away from their families. The pain felt by the removed children, and the abuse they suffered, is well documented. For the single reason of that policy, we owe an apology to the indigenous people of our nation.

Interestingly, I was reminded by this motion about the report handed down in this Parliament in 1992 by the Select Committee into the Achievements of the Indigenous Peoples of Australia chaired by Hon Muriel Patterson. I was proud to serve on that select committee with Hon Muriel Patterson and Hon Derrick Tomlinson. The three of us said at the time of its release that members would be advised to read the broad ranging report which outlined the achievement of indigenous people not only in Western Australia, but also in other States we visited. It reflects, in depth in some instances, upon the effects of children being taken away from their families.

I skim through the report now, but I recollect that we met with only one person who felt benefit arose from being removed from her family as a child and educated and raised in a mission environment. She felt it delivered some advantage to her. However, many Aboriginal people said that although some benefit accrued from the education they received from the mission, the downside was a lost identity. It was necessary for these people to reclaim their Aboriginality, as attempts made by many institutions in our nation to assimilate them were traumatic. All Australians suffer as a result of Aboriginal children being taken away from their parents.

I was talking to one of the doormen at the main entrance at lunchtime when presentations were made and sorry books were available to sign, and I was surprised by how I was affected by a song written and sung by Archie Roach called "Took the Children Away". I do not usually go for blues-soul singers in many respects, and Archie Roach does not affect me in many ways. However, the way that song is sung, especially when one is aware of Archie Roach's past, affects me each time I hear it. Having spent my 18 years in Australia in the north west, I have seen the daily effects of a policy visited on Aboriginal people. It can never be forgotten.



Hon Christine Sharp said that many non-indigenous people of Australia, not the majority, think of Aboriginal people in two ways: First, that they are invisible, do not really count and are not part of mainstream Australia, despite the fact that 40 000 years has demonstrated that they are Australia's backbone. Second, they are seen, using Senator Ross Lightfoot's description, as the "lowest colour on the civilisation spectrum". He has since apologised for that statement, although he said it more than once, so the apology must be taken with a pinch of salt. He reflects the view of a sizeable minority when he says that. Some people have adopted the attitude that Aboriginal people do not count, that they are not there or, if they are, that they make no contribution to the community. We must understand that, if that diminishes any individual, it diminishes us all.

Members should reflect on where Aborigines are today in relation to where they were when their nation was invaded. The policies put in place were a manifestation of terra nullius and the fact that Aborigines were treated as part of the flora and fauna. Governments that were supposed to represent us all took those children away from their parents, whether or not they wanted to go. They were taken by force and with the full sanction of the law.

I am sorry that we must say sorry. However, we must express our regret because collectively we have not done enough about correcting the wrongs. We have not done enough to educate our young children.

Hon Greg Smith: What about the English children taken from their families?

Hon TOM HELM: I am sorry for them too, but we are discussing a different issue. They were sent to a foreign land but this land was taken from the Aborigines, who were then displaced. Select committees have inquired into that matter and funds have been made available to assist those people. The English are trying to reunite those children with their families in England. That prompted the member's interjection, but it is not seen in the same light.

The Aboriginal deaths in custody inquiry resulted in about 300 recommendations. However, Federal and State Governments have failed to address those recommendations. Aboriginal people still do not have the same longevity as non-Aboriginal people. We still have the same situation that existed when the report was tabled. I am not saying that more money must be spent, although money should be spent more appropriately. However, there appears to be no willingness on our part to take a positive step and to give indigenous people what they are asking for; that is, the right to determine their own future, although, no doubt, the granting of that right will lead to some mistakes. We should have a Prime Minister of whom we can be proud and who represents our nation. However, Mr Howard cannot take the first step towards recognising the needs of indigenous people in any sense. They have tried everything. The High Court has brought down the Mabo ruling. That frightened the life out of him and he has run a mile. The Wik decision has led to all sorts of hand wringing and hair tearing. The indigenous people of this nation could not get anywhere with those decisions.

The easiest thing to do is to say, "We recognise what went on. We are sorry about it and let's get on with it." We cannot get on with anything unless we demonstrate that we are prepared to use whatever resources we can to correct those mistakes. We can say that it is too politically or economically difficult or whatever to do anything, as the Prime Minister has done, but we must admit that it happened. We must understand and express our regret about the true history of our nation. Every nation has something of which to be ashamed and this is our shame.

Until everyone understands the need to express those regrets, we will never get anywhere. We will be sailing around in circles without admitting that we must acknowledge these mistakes and that we must take some fundamental steps. The most fundamental step is to recognise those mistakes and to express our regret. There is no good in our saying that the missions did not meet the aspirations of Aboriginal people, because they were not intended to do so. The whole thrust of their removal was to encourage Aborigines to shed their sense of Aboriginality and to become like middle class, urban, white Australians.

Those things must be understood. The Aborigines Act was in place until 1964. However, children were still being removed in 1972. I am not sure how that happened, but that is the information we have.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: It was done under the Native Welfare Act. It replaced the Aborigines Act.

Hon TOM HELM: We must say sorry because, for the most part, Federal and State Governments are afraid to say that those things happened. They understand that if they do so they will be required to do something. After every inquiry and High Court decision, at every step of the way, Governments have resisted being part of this whole notion. I am glad we are having this Sorry Day and we should all support it. I support the motion.

**HON GREG SMITH** (Mining and Pastoral) [5.48 pm]: I cannot support this motion. This Sorry Day business and the guilt peddling that is going on worries me. I spent five and a half years growing up in America. When I came back to Australia it struck me that the Americans seem to have a great national pride whereas we seem determined to be ashamed of being Australian and to feel guilty about our past. My great-great-grandparents came to Australia when it was almost an unsettled country. They landed in Adelaide.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Members will get their opportunities in due course.

Hon GREG SMITH: They heard that gold had been discovered in Darwin, so they loaded a wagon with flour and water and went there. There was no gold so they went to the Mallee and developed a scrub block. With nothing more than bare hands and horses, they cleared it and made it a productive farm. Some of my relatives went overseas and fought and died to keep Australia a free country. No-one will make me look back on their achievements with shame or sorrow. I am not prepared to do that. If people in the crowd who gathered at the front of Parliament House were serious about helping Aboriginal people, they would be better off going to Fitzroy Crossing, Halls Creek or Derby and being involved with the Aboriginal people; teaching them about nutrition and getting their kids to go to school.

Hon Tom Helm: That's a disgrace. That is an insult.

Hon GREG SMITH: I will tell the House a short story. I once sheared at Meeline station, where there was a small Aboriginal child, aged between five years and seven years. He used to run around the woolshed. He puffed up like a toad and no-one knew what was wrong with him. He was taken to the doctor, who found that the boy's liver had broken down. No-one could work out why. We found out that his mother did not look after him as a child. To keep him quiet, his brothers and sisters would fill up his baby's bottle with coca-cola. From the day he was weaned he grew up drinking coca-cola. We must ask ourselves whether this boy should have been taken away from his mother and father. We are probably guilty of not looking after him properly by allowing him to remain in that situation.

We also hear about the preservation of culture. Hon Christine Sharp said that she had never met an Aborigine and could not find one where she lives.

Hon Christine Sharp: I said I could not find one today in the south west.

Hon GREG SMITH: Some people have a vision that Aborigines live in a harmonious environment, at one with the land, and would have lived happily ever after. We could not get further from the truth. Australia is an arid, dry, barren land. They lived a life that none of us would dream of. I have not met one Aborigine who wants to go back to the desert, drink from waterholes and live on bungarras. I will tell members a story to give some idea of their culture, which I believe is probably one of their worst enemies.

I once worked with an Aboriginal bloke from Mullewa, named Willy. He wanted to get away from his family, to try to break free from his relatives. He asked the contractor to put \$100 away for him every pay. When he had enough put away he wanted to go to Alice Springs. That went on for about three or four months. Eventually his family found out. He was a helluva good bloke, a good worker. He was at the shed working when a car load of big blokes turned up and Willy ran. He said, "I got to get out of here; my 'lations have found out that I have all this money and they will kill me if I don't give it to them." Part of their culture is to share everything; it matters little whether it is a big kangaroo that was killed which will go to waste if it is not eaten or a lot of money. However, sharing money is not the same as sharing a kangaroo. Willy jumped in the car with them, got his cheque, and went into town. He told me that he and all his friends had a big party and when all his money was gone, all his friends had also gone. Consequently he stopped working. He questioned why he should have a job.

The Aboriginal culture is fine, but there is no way known a primitive culture can coexist harmoniously with a modern society. It simply cannot work.

Hon Tom Helm: Agreed.

Hon GREG SMITH: At least we agree on something.

Hon Tom Helm: Not very much, comrade.

The PRESIDENT: Order! One problem in the House is that some members think they should be heard in silence. When they have finished speaking, they think that gives them a right to interject on everyone else. Hon Greg Smith has the call.

Hon GREG SMITH: The problem with those opposite -

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member should not worry about there being any problem. I ask that he continue his comments.

Hon GREG SMITH: Part of the reconciliation process is that Aborigines must accept us and vice versa. I do not have a problem doing that; I have worked with them, drunk with them and played football with them. However, perhaps we should have a national "Thank You Day" as well as a national Sorry Day. We have all said we are sorry

and that we regret something. Why can we not have a thank you day on which Aboriginal people say thank you to everybody for making Australia the country it is; thank you for sending our men away, for those who died, to keep Australia a free country so that it was not settled by the Japanese, for keeping it a country where we can make native title claims over huge tracts of land. Part of reconciliation is accepting the good with the bad.

Hon N.F. Moore: Quite right.

Hon GREG SMITH: The least Aboriginal people can do - the best day on which to do this is Anzac Day, I think - is to say thank you to the Europeans for settling Australia. If Europeans did not settle Australia, it would have been another race. Do those opposite think we would be better off if Australia had been settled by Asians, or perhaps the French or the Germans?

Hon J.A. Cowdell: They are European.

Hon GREG SMITH: They should be part of the reconciliation process. I refuse to feel guilt or shame or sorrow for the past doings of any of my forebears.

**HON DERRICK TOMLINSON** (East Metropolitan) [5.56 pm]: I support the motion. When I was a child, if I did anything which offended my parents, they would punish me. Sometimes that punishment would be mum taking down what she called the stick and hitting me around the legs, and I would cry.

Hon E.J. Charlton: She obviously didn't do it often enough.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Yes, and I regret she did not. When I cried, invariably I would say that I was sorry. My mother would respond by asking me what I was sorry for and telling me that if I did not know what I was sorry for, I could not be sorry.

I sat and listened to my colleague Hon Greg Smith and I am concerned that we do not know what we are sorry for. For that reason, I am reminded of the debate held by the National Reconciliation Council at the time the Sorry Day was proposed. It was about the term "sorry". The council did not want to use the term because sorry so often denotes an apology. Those people did not want a day of apology. It was not appropriate to apologise. They wanted a day of acknowledgment that mistakes were made, and that there were horrendous consequences of these mistakes. However, for the Aboriginal people on that council, the only appropriate word was "sorry", with all the connotations of sorry being an acknowledgment of what had gone before, the consequences of what had gone before and the consequences that are with us now and will continue. For example, section 8 of the Aborigines Act 1905 states -

The Chief Protector shall be the legal guardian of every aboriginal and half-caste child until such child attains the age of sixteen years.

Section 60 of that Act states -

The Government may make regulations for . . .

- (c.) Providing for the care, custody, and education of the children of aborigines and half-castes:
- (d.) Enabling any aboriginal or half-caste child to be sent to and detained in an aboriginal institution, industrial school, or orphanage:

When we read the justification of such policies, this is what we hear. These are the ambulatory moral vacuums that were responsible for this Act. The member for Pilbara, a Mr Isdell, said that there was a great deal of maudlin sentiment about taking away a child from a native mother.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Muriel Patterson.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

### TREASURER'S ADVANCE AUTHORIZATION BILL

*Receipt*

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

*Second Reading*

**HON MAX EVANS** (North Metropolitan - Minister for Finance) [7.33 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill authorises the Treasurer to make certain payments and advances for

authorised purposes chargeable to the consolidated fund or the Treasurer's Advance Account within the monetary limit available for the financial year commencing 1 July 1998. The monetary limit specified within clause 4 of the Bill represents an authorisation for the Treasurer to withdraw up to \$300m for the financing of payments and advances in the 1998-99 financial year. The \$300m limit provides for an increase of \$100m on the previous financial year. The last increase in the Treasurer's Advance occurred in 1989-90, when the advance was increased from \$200m to \$250m. In 1991-92 it was reduced to \$200m. Since then, expenditure in the consolidated fund has increased from \$5 168m to an estimated \$7 144m.

The purposes for which payments and advances may be made from the Treasurer's Advance are set out within clause 5 of the Bill and remain unchanged from those authorised in previous years. Where payments are made in respect of a new item or for supplementation of an existing item of expenditure in the consolidated fund, those payments will be charged against the fund and submitted for parliamentary appropriation in the next financial year.

Members will be aware that a number of activities, such as rental of government offices, are initially financed by way of a Treasurer's Advance which is subsequently recouped from the department or statutory authority on whose behalf the service was performed or rental paid. Advances provided for other purposes are repayable by the recipient. In addition, the Bill seeks supplementation of \$350m against the monetary limit authorised for the 1997-98 financial year.

The main factor giving rise to the need to increase the limit by \$350m is the transfer of \$244m from the consolidated fund to the state development fund trust account. These funds will be used to progress a number of new capital projects in addition to those to be funded within the normal allocations of the capital works program. Details of these projects have been provided in the budget papers. The funds will be transferred to the state development fund this financial year, with the required cash flows over the forward estimates being provided as required to match the expenditure of the relevant projects.

Additional funding from the Treasurer's Advance is also required to meet additional expenditures in -

Health - \$45m;  
Ministry of Justice - \$25m;  
Police Department - \$15m.

Treasurer's Advance funding of \$37m is required to continue the operations of the Department of Contract and Management Services. The department carries out some of the functions of the former Department of State Services. Until appropriate legislative amendments are made, it is necessary to fund its operations from the Treasurer's Advance.

In addition, \$36m is required to fund the low interest loan scheme. In November 1996 Cabinet approved a change of funding arrangements such that loans will be funded by borrowings with only subsidies being charged to the consolidated fund. This arrangement requires amendments to the Education Act, to provide the Minister for Education with the power to borrow moneys. Until these amendments are dealt with by the Parliament, the scheme is being funded from the Treasurer's Advance. If the legislative amendments are in place before 30 June 1998, arrangements will be made to repay the Treasurer's Advance, otherwise the moneys should be repaid next financial year. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Bob Thomas.

## **LIQUOR LICENSING AMENDMENT BILL (No 2)**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon Norm Kelly, and read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**HON NORM KELLY** (East Metropolitan) [7.36 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Liquor Licensing Act. Its intent is to introduce into the Act a requirement to limit the number of licences that can be held by any individual, company or associated groups of individuals or companies. These amendments were not put forward in the recently passed Liquor Licensing Amendment Bill to facilitate the speedy passage of that Bill, which had received strong, widespread support throughout the liquor industry and wider community.

However, during debate on that Bill other members and I noted that there was a failure to address one of the most serious concerns that confront the industry today. That concern, which has become stronger in recent years, is the

growing dominance of Coles Myer Ltd in the liquor store sector of the market. This has occurred through its Liquorland, Vintage Cellars and Charlie Carters chains.

Historically, the tertiary sector of the liquor industry in Western Australia has been characterised by a healthy diversity of wholly owned groups, marketing groups of independents, and independents. However, this traditional spread has become more concentrated over the past few years.

As at 19 May 1998 there were 433 liquor store licences in Western Australia. Of these, 72 were controlled by Coles Myer Ltd. That represents 16.6 per cent of the total number of liquor store licences. More importantly, the market share that Coles Myer controls is approximately 32 per cent. That is based on the most recent figures available from the Office of Racing, Gaming and Liquor.

At the beginning of 1994 Coles Myer owned 50 liquor store licences. Therefore, the 1998 figure represents an increase in licences of 44 per cent in the past four years. This policy of acquisition is heading towards a domination of the Western Australian market which could be disastrous for the future vitality of this industry sector. The trend towards an oligopoly will devastate an industry sector that is largely made up of independent, small businesses.

However, this legislation should not be seen as an attack on Coles Myer. It is a limitation on any individual or company that seeks to control a market share that can result in anti-competitive behaviour. At the moment, although Coles Myer is the dominant player in the liquor store market, Woolworths (WA) Pty Ltd also has substantial holdings, owning five of the top 10 stores in the State, based on turnover,

With the passing of the recent Liquor Licensing Amendment Bill there is a distinct advantage for existing licence holders to preclude others from entering the market in their catchment area. This can lead to localised monopolies. For example, in the Innaloo state electorate, five of the six liquor store licences are currently owned by the one organisation. The development of state, regional or local monopolies or oligopolies involves the steady destruction of competitors and therefore competition. This can lead to higher prices for the consumer and a limited range of product.

As public policy requires that liquor be a controlled and regulated product, due to the massive social and health impacts of alcohol, the liquor industry necessarily becomes a restrictive market. Therefore, it is incumbent on the Government to ensure that although competition is restricted, it also remains as competitive as possible and open to new operators.

There is legitimate concern that major corporations could dominate the Western Australian market through their increased purchasing power and other corporate policies that could squeeze out independent operators. It is not only independent liquor stores which can be affected by further market penetration by the major liquor store chains, as hotels and taverns, often owned by small, family-owned and operated businesses, are also vulnerable to domination. Many of these hotels and taverns rely on takeaway sales to support the other services they offer patrons on-site.

If the only competitor to a liquor chain store in a local market is a hotel or tavern, the hotel is generally unlikely to be able to compete on price because cash flow and profit are needed to subsidise its on-premises consumption operation, which requires a much higher level of capital investment and working capital than a liquor store.

A trend is evident for independent liquor store owners to form buying groups to compete against the buying power of national companies. However, these groups are unable to match the ability of national companies to manipulate tax systems, such as stamp duties, which can vary from State to State.

It is important that a protected but fair and competitive market is maintained for the sale of liquor in this State. If the financial viability of a store is threatened due to the unfair practices of a dominant competitor, a temptation can be to resort to promotional practices that are not conducive to the responsible sale and consumption of liquor in our society. These practices can have a negative social consequence and expense for the wider community.

Concern arises among competition authorities when market share exceeds 20 to 30 per cent, as this size of market share gives potential to restrict open and fair competition in an open market. In a restricted market, such as liquor, an even greater potential exists for exploitation. Ideally, a restriction on the number of licences held by one operator would be based on the percentage of turnover that the operator controls. However, there is no realistic way of doing that. Therefore, a limit on the number of licences, in this case 15 per cent, is seen as the most effective way of ensuring that an operator in the industry does not attain a market share that could be used in anti-competitive ways.

As a result of the likelihood of the Coles Myer group being above the 15 per cent limit when this legislation is enacted, a transitional clause has been included to allow for a five year period for any such group to comply with the new requirements. It is the understanding of the Australian Democrats that this legislation is in line with state and federal legislation in regard to trade practices. In particular, legal advice has shown that the provisions of part IV of the Trade Practices Act do not create any legal impediment to the enactment of a limit on licences.

Likewise, this legislation is not in breach of the competition principles agreement which states that "the benefits of the restriction to the community as a whole outweigh the costs." Furthermore, as Malcolm McCusker QC has stated -

... its purpose, objectively viewed, is to ensure that competition is preserved and promoted, by preventing one licence holder from dominating the industry. To limit the number of licences that may be held by any single person or corporation, far from being restrictive of competition, will prevent monopolisation of the industry, and promote "workable competition" - the underlying object of the CPA and Part IV of the TPA.

The introduction of a cap on licences is fully supported by the Liquor Industry Council, which is the peak group representing the liquor industry in Western Australia. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Ray Halligan.

## ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

### *Consideration of Tabled Papers*

Resumed from 30 April.

**HON LJILJANNA RAVLICH** (East Metropolitan) [7.45 pm]: It is not often that one is presented with a smorgasbord of choice in this place. However, in drawing together information for my speech on the Budget I wondered to which subject I would speak. It was not the case that too little, but too much, was available for comment. For example, I could have commented on striking nurses, about whom I have already spoken at length in another debate; on the problem on our wharves; and on the day of action held by construction workers last Wednesday because of dissatisfaction with working conditions and the threat to their rates of pay. I could have spoken about the tens of thousands of Australians who have lost their jobs, many of whom are former state public sector workers. Many people in Western Australia have also lost jobs in the name of profit and delivering dividends to employers and companies.

I could have spoken about deaths in custody, which is a growing problem in this State, and the fact that the Government spends \$99 a prisoner on psychiatric services, which may contribute to this problem. I could have spoken about insufficient preventive work being carried out in the area by the Government. I could have spoken at length about crime rates and the increases -

Hon Max Evans: We are waiting with bated breath.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: - in crime against property and people. I could have spoken about schools being closed to achieve greater profits, or about mine deaths. However, I will spend some time -

Hon Ken Travers: Keep the Minister in suspense a little longer.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: - addressing the question of health, and the increased allocation in the Treasurer's Advance of \$25m for the Ministry of Justice and \$15m for the Police Service. Clearly a need exists in our public health system because enormous dissatisfaction is evident.

I alluded earlier in my remarks to the problem of striking nurses, who are currently being forced to sign a workplace agreement. That action will mean that they no longer will be covered by the federal award; that trade-offs will result in lost conditions to achieve pay increases; and that shift penalties will be removed and nurses will be required to work a 10 day shift. We have an enormous problem in our health system.

It is good that the Government is taking some remedial action, but it is uncertain whether this extra allocation of \$45m to Health is to be directed into capital or will form part of an agreement to see around 22 000 patients on the hospital waiting list receive some health care. I understand that this figure, reported on page 8 of *The West Australian* of 26 May, excluded country patients. Therefore, we have an enormous problem in our health system.

It saddens me that the Treasurer commented some time ago that the Health budget was determined on the basis of relying on some positive alternative outcome in negotiations with the Commonwealth Government. That is an enormous oversight and one which indicates a total lack of respect and regard for Western Australians. For members opposite to adopt such a cavalier attitude, to tell Western Australians that they will not budget for them no matter how dire the problem because they are expecting someone else to pick up the tab, is totally unacceptable. It is the Premier's first and foremost responsibility to look after the people of Western Australia. The State Government should have provided money to address the health crisis. If it could then have been recouped from the Federal Government through the commonwealth agreement or whatever other arrangement, so be it. Instead we have a very sad situation, with 22 000 people on hospital waiting lists.

There are many other problems in this Budget. I do not see anything about youth unemployment and today we heard

evidence about the funding crisis affecting the police child abuse unit. It was very difficult to make a choice about what specific issues I would address tonight.

This Budget represents lost opportunities. We know that Western Australia is very fortunate in that it has a very strong resource base. It is full of natural resources and therefore it has a strong natural endowment. The State's economy has grown strongly during the 1990s and we are therefore fortunate that we have not felt the full impact of the Asian crisis. Its impact is yet to be determined and in the medium term we appear to be riding it out very well. However, growth forecasts have been slightly reduced. Given our strong resource base and the fact that we are benefiting from a strong economy at the moment, revenue growth is projected to be strong. Our strong economic growth has helped fuel this Government's record revenue growth. The Government's current budgetary position is probably more a result of its being in the right place at the right time than of any direct economic planning on its part.

Along with that strong economic growth, this Government has continued to increase taxes and charges, and that has contributed to record revenues. In its budget submission, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry stated that this Government has enjoyed growth, and that that growth is the result of some positive economic indicators coming together. The 1998-99 financial assistance grant was increased by \$83m and that increase would have contributed to an increase in the budget surplus.

This Government has been on a drive to reduce debt and to privatise, the latter being totally driven by ideology rather than good economic sense. Perhaps it has overplayed its hand in its debt reduction and privatisation strategies. We see emerging problems in Health, Justice, the Police Service, Main Roads and so on. Everywhere we look there is evidence that things are not going as well as they should be.

The Opposition supports the concept of debt reduction in principle and recognises the need to contain the State's debt. However, this Government continues to provide a very false impression that debt has been reduced by better financial management. In reality, this State's debt has been reduced solely by asset sales. Many people in the community are asking where the social dividends are. We should not be digging into our pockets to find money to pay for the increases in service charges included in this Budget.

The Budget contains not one shred of information about how the Government will reduce debt apart from embarking on major privatisation campaigns. It has already indicated that it will reduce debt by privatising Western Power, AlintaGas and Westrail, and it has already sold off or privatised State Print, Health Care Linen, 6PR, the State Government Insurance Office - and the list goes on. Given the Government's reluctance to reveal the full privatisation story in the Budget, who knows what other assets it is planning to sell? This Budget is not a debt reduction strategy: It is a privatisation strategy driven not by proper cost-benefit and social analyses but by the Government's ideological beliefs. No benefits accrue from contracting out and privatisation and there is no social dividend for Western Australians.

The impact of this Budget on families is drastic. Many people in our community find it very hard to pay their rent and have sufficient resources left to feed and clothe their family. If there is anything left over, they might be able to afford a holiday, but many sail so close to the wind that that is out of the question. This Government is increasing taxes and charges and directly impacting on the State's families specifically after it promised that not only would taxes and charges not rise but there would be a social dividend. I keep asking where the social dividend is. Clearly it is nowhere to be seen.

I refer members to the direct impact on households of the past two state Budgets. This Budget included an increase in motor vehicle registrations of \$55; third party insurance increased by \$12.55; stamp duty on motor vehicle licences increased by \$9.20; public transport increased by \$26; water, sewerage and drainage services increased by \$21; and stamp duty on household insurance increased by \$11.50. It is predicted that the total impact of the 1998-99 Budget is an increase of \$136. That is on top of an increase in the 1997-98 Budget of \$236. The total impact of the two Budgets is \$372. This is a substantial increase, particularly in view of the fact that this Government promised there would be no increases in taxes and charges and that Western Australians, as a result of putting up with the Government's privatisation and contracting out agenda, would receive a social dividend. There is certainly no social dividend.

This year's Budget shows the Government is out of touch with the Western Australian public. It has seriously neglected government services and evidence shows that the key areas that should have been funded have received inadequate allocations. Maybe this Government is so arrogant that it thinks it can do what it likes and it will provide a bit of a sweetener a year or two out from the election, and this is the way it will deal with these issues. Perhaps it thinks in its first and second years in office it should hit the public hard and come in a little later and soften the blow and Western Australians will forget. I can assure the Government that Western Australians will not forget. They will have been hit too hard in this case.

Everywhere we look we see evidence that the public health system is in crisis. In my view this Government has no commitment to the public health system. The Premier insists on squabbling with his coalition partners in Canberra, using people as political pawns. Earlier I explained that I do not think it is adequate for the State Government to overlook the state health care requirements and bank on the fact that the Federal Government will come good with the money. In adopting that strategy, this Premier has let the people of Western Australia down badly.

We have a Premier who wants to play the heavy hand and exercise some muscle. I can tell members opposite that the one thing about the Premier that seems particularly strange to me is that he says he can go to the Federal Government and deliver the goods on behalf of Western Australians. That is evidenced by the fact that we have seen nothing from the Federal Government in terms of assisting this State with our health care crisis. I am interested to know, in terms of the additional funding from the Treasurer's Advance, what this \$45m will be allocated to. Very little detail is provided in the second reading speech on the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill, in particular, as to what it will be allocated to. I understand the Budget provides less than half the amount necessary to stop the state health care system sliding further into crisis. That is irresponsible, not just in my view but also in the view of all Western Australians. The Minister for Health has no idea. He has no strategy about how to deal with the health care crisis. It is pathetic.

An article in the *Sunday Times* on 24 March 1998 under the heading "Prince running out of those glib replies" just about sums up his situation. It states -

Health Minister, Kevin Prince flees his mounting problems each weekend.

"If I did not live in Albany I simply could not do the job," he said.

"I recharge my batteries every weekend for the next onslaught by meeting people, having a drink at the pub with them, seeing my family," he said.

Basically, he is saying that he must run away to the country so that he does not have to face this crisis. I have news for him: It does not matter where he runs to, the bottom line is that he will be caught. There is just as much of a health care crisis in Albany - Hon Bob Thomas can attest to that - as there is in the metropolitan area. In fact, I suspect the health care crisis in regional areas is probably even worse than that in the metropolitan area. We know country people are not particularly well-served in rural areas.

Hon Bob Thomas: They do not have private hospitals.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That is right. Health care is a major concern. This Government has no idea what it will do, nor does the Minister for Health. The health system is out of control and there is an enormous backlog. I do not know where this \$45m will go, but I think it will take much more than that to scratch the surface of this problem.

I now turn to law and order. This is one of the greatest concerns faced by our community. The level of home invasion, property theft, assaults against property and assaults against the person, is increasing. Once again, the Government is at a loss to know what to do in this area. The total recurrent Police budget is down by 0.7 per cent in real terms and 2.3 per cent in real per capita terms. For the second year in a row the operational budgets have been cut. The Government has given up finding real, long term solutions to crime in Western Australia. I find all of this a little hard to take. This is a government which, during the last two election campaigns, ran very strongly on the law and order issue. This Government said that it would stop the revolving door syndrome.

Hon Bob Thomas: Crime rates are going up.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Crime rates are going through the roof. They have increased so much that there is nowhere to house the offenders who have been caught and convicted of committing crimes. This is yet another part of the problem: If there is nowhere to put them, they are left out on the streets. The fact is that this Government knows it has nowhere to put these people and it focuses most of its effort on catching people who are speeding, rather than catching those who are involved in criminal activities against ordinary Western Australians.

The Minister for Transport made a point earlier in the House today about the presence of the police at the Fremantle wharf during the dispute between the Maritime Union of Australia and Patrick's. Given the amount of police presence on the wharves, any crook could have gone anywhere in the Perth metropolitan area and helped himself to whatever he wanted.

Hon E.J. Charlton: That is exactly what they will do.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Quite frankly, it shows a total disregard and contempt for Western Australians, that the Minister for Transport could put virtually the whole of the Western Australia Police Force at the Fremantle



wharves - he paid those police officers who were involved in overtime and goodness knows what else - while risking the safety and welfare of ordinary Western Australians. I will guarantee that if people tried to find a policeman on that night, they would not have been able to because all the police were being drilled on an oval somewhere in East Fremantle. It is absolutely pathetic.

We had a debate in the House earlier today about the level of funding for the Police Department. This Government would have us believe that there is so much funding floating around in government agencies, the Police Force and the Ministry of Justice, that there cannot be any problems whatsoever.

That is not the story that is emerging from government departments. The urgency motion raised today indicates that there are severe problems in funding particular areas and the police child abuse unit is a good case in point. We have enormous problems with this year's Budget. It is not clear where the remainder of the \$300m will be allocated. We know that \$45m will go to the Health Department, \$25m will go to the Ministry of Justice, and \$15m will go to the Police Department. In addition to these areas, I have enormous concerns about the possible closure of schools and the fact that some of the money from the sale of these schools will go back into the Government's coffers. Two-thirds of the money will be redirected into feeder schools, but one-third will no doubt find its way into the consolidated fund. Another concern relates to Transport, and this Government has done a disastrous job in this area. It uses an outdated and discredited road building program as a solution to metropolitan transport needs.

Hon Greg Smith: At least we build roads.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: This is no longer acceptable. It is obvious that no serious planning or environmental consequences are being considered by the Government as it moves along with its Transform WA program. I found the Minister for the Environment's media statement of 21 May 1998 on the use of wood heaters quite humorous. It states -

Environment Minister Cheryl Edwardes today welcomed the select committee's report on Perth Air Quality and said it paved the way for a more coordinated Government and community approach to managing and improving Perth's air quality.

It continues -

The Government has also already announced the issuing of haze alerts, the release of draft firewood regulations to ensure only dry wood is sold, the requirement of wood heaters to comply with Australian Standards and the necessity for the Department of Conservation and Land Management (CALM) to consult with the Bureau of Meteorology before conducting controlled burns.

One must ask: If the Government is trying to solve the problem of Perth haze, why does it then want to build \$1.3b-worth of roads in Western Australia? To the lay person, and certainly to me, things just do not stack up.

I do not know how much of this appropriation will be allocated to Transport because that is not quite clear. We have a problem with the Transform WA strategy and with the general transport area. Rail options were ignored by this Government and, prior to supporting a budget allocation of \$1.3b for the building of roads in Western Australia, we heard allegation of a lack of consultation by the Government and a failure to speak to stakeholders. It has ignored the rail option and spent a lot of money on advertising. The Government has spent over \$100 000 on leaflets, \$40 000 on other advertising, and another \$100 000 for television commercials. It has neglected to speak to the key players. Even the Mayor of Fremantle, Richard Utting, has said, "This is not on. We have not been consulted." A number of local mayors are vehemently opposed to the Government's proposal.

Part of these funding increases, or the direct hit on Western Australian taxpayers, comes as a direct result of the Government's support for the Transform WA proposal. Car registrations will increase by \$50 to \$100, third party insurance will increase, and bus and train fares will increase. It seems to be a very poorly thought out strategy and people have grave concerns about it from a number of perspectives, one of which is this \$1.3b initiative. Given the record of Main Roads, it is likely to cost Western Australian taxpayers a helluva lot more over the long term. There is evidence to suggest that if Main Roads does one thing, and does it well, it is ensuring that costs blow out on virtually any construction project it undertakes.

The Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations report on contracting road construction and maintenance operations found cost blow-outs on six projects of up to 77 per cent. There is ample evidence that this \$1.3b project will blow out quite substantially. The other day my colleague, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, raised in Parliament the blow-out figure for the Northbridge tunnel, which had an original price tag in the 1995-96 Budget of \$335m.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The only blow-out has been in Alannah MacTiernan's imagination.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: A rise was revealed in the latest budget papers. The new price tag is \$407m - an increase of \$72m. There is evidence that these increases are likely to be and will be funded by Western Australian taxpayers. I have difficulty, as we all do, receiving real answers from this Government. I am disappointed because I thought that when I became a member of Parliament and asked a bureaucrat or a Minister a question, I would get a response, but it does not seem to be the case. If one wants information about what is happening in the area of Health, Justice, or the Police Department one will not always receive an answer. If one asks questions about transport and Transform WA, it is particularly hard to obtain answers.

I attended a meeting of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations where Ross Drabble, the Commissioner for Main Roads, was in attendance. I put to him, "How do you determine that a road project will be viable? Do you do a cost-benefit analysis and how do you come up with your projected savings of 20 per cent?" Ross Drabble said, "We cannot come out with a figure like that. We know it will be around that ballpark figure because that is the sort of figure one gets around the State Public Service." Every government agency seems to be achieving savings in the order of 20 per cent on the contracting out of its functions. However, those savings are not reflected in these budget papers. They show the budget surplus, which is equal to the asset sales, but there is no more than that.

One has to ask, where is this across the board 20 per cent saving in the Public Service; and if it is there, and if it is real, then where is it in the budget papers? I have grave concerns about the long term implications of the Transform WA proposal. I have those concerns because I do not believe that the contracting out of work is necessarily the way to go in this case. The "Best Roads Redefinition Project" report goes to great lengths to warn the Government that the private sector does not have sufficient expertise in some of the functions which will be required. For example, the report by Deloitte and Touche Consulting Group into the outsourcing of Main Roads provider activity states that experience in other Western Australian government agencies has demonstrated that efficiencies of up to 20 per cent can be achieved through outsourcing, therefore, the goal for Main Roads should be 100 per cent outsourcing of provider functions. It goes on to describe the risk profile. However, it begs the question of who will do the work, and, given that the Government has been such a disaster in this area, it states -

In the case of technical services, there are some areas in which the industry is mature and well able to deliver a quality product, eg, in road design -

Then it has that scratched out and continues -

- and non timber bridge design, but in other areas such as materials, pavements, and surfacing, the industry does not have the same level of maturity.

There are real risks. What will we do to address some of those risks? I have very grave concerns about the contracting out of Main Roads functions because this report indicates "do not do it". I have grave concerns about 2 000 Main Roads workers losing their jobs. I have grave concerns that the Minister makes very bold statements in the media that for every dollar the average Western Australian spends on higher registration fees, a saving of \$7 is made in the form of less travelling time, fewer accidents and decreased pollution. We have asked him to table those documents, but we cannot get hold of them. We want to know how he has done his sums to see if they stack up. Obviously it is very difficult to check those figures because we cannot get that level of information.

I return to the comment I made when I first came to this place. I thought a member could get an answer to a question. I have put a series of questions on the Supplementary Notice Paper. In fact, I make no secret that, over two weeks, I submitted about 200 questions which related to the major contracts that the Government had entered into. I asked a set of questions in relation to each of those contracts, many of which involved Main Roads. I needed some feedback in a number of areas because I wanted to assure Western Australian taxpayers that, if the Government was going down this line, it would do so in a cost-effective manner, checking on the due diligence of the companies and the like.

I asked a series of questions in relation to government contracts as follows: Was a business case conducted, which is a requirement under the Government's own policy; did it include a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis; if so, what did it show; if not, why not; what were the identified inherent risks; what other options were considered; was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contracts were awarded; if yes, did it include a check on the contractor's financial background; who carried out the financial background check; was the contractor a company; when was the company formed and what was its share capitalisation; who was the director of the company and were any of the directors Ministers or senior public servants? I cannot even get answers to those questions. I would have thought that, in relation to any government contracts, this would be a fair set of questions to put to the Minister, but the Minister wiped off about 15 of my questions today, failed to respond to those on the Supplementary Notice Paper and said in relation to question 1599 -

The Hon Member has asked a number of questions regarding Main Roads contracts. The Member has already asked for identical information with respect to other contracts and I am not prepared to continue to commit scarce resources to collate the data required.

This would have to be the joke of all time. He is not prepared to commit the resources. We do not own the resources, the Western Australian public does and it has a right to know. The Minister further replied -

However, if the Hon Member would like specific information about a particular contract, I would be pleased to assist.

All those I have earmarked with yellow sticky labels relate to today only; those were the ones which were not asked today. The answer states -

Refer to response for Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

I am bruised personally and professionally because, despite the amount of time I spent putting these questions to the Minister, his lack of response shows a total disregard for me professionally, for the institution of Parliament, and for Western Australian taxpayers generally. I will not cop it and I will not take it lying down. I have had a gutful of doing the hard yards and of this Government and its Ministers refusing to provide the information sought. This is not the last of it and I advise the Minister responsible that he will hear from me time and time again with regard to his failure to respond to questions that I ask in this place. It is no surprise that he will be leaving at the end of the year because he is displaying a very cavalier manner to his duties, given the fact that he is refusing to provide me with the details that I and the Western Australian taxpayers need, so that we can all get on with the business of getting on.

I say that this Budget is a budget of betrayal of Western Australians. Western Australians are hurting under Court Government policies. Members should make no mistake about it. I could have spoken at length on any number of topics because there are so many disaster areas in this State. Everywhere one looks, one sees grave problems and people have concerns. The Government has demonstrated in this Budget that it has given up trying to deliver proper solutions to the crises being experienced in our public hospitals, schools, prisons, and the Justice Department. This Government is a non-government. It has shown a total disregard for Western Australian taxpayers. It does not care to build a cohesive and socially equitable society in Western Australia, and, furthermore, it does not believe that it needs to account to Western Australian taxpayers with regard to how it uses their money.

Quite clearly, this Government has breached the confidence of Western Australian taxpayers. Not only has it not delivered the social dividend, but also Western Australians are facing increased taxes and charges. This Government has failed to explain why its policies of privatisation, economic rationalisation, and contracting out are not delivering the much promised social dividend which is being denied to Western Australia.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Muriel Patterson.

## **HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION REPEAL BILL**

### *Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon N.D. Griffiths) in the Chair; Hon N.F. Moore (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

#### **Clause 1: Short title -**

Hon BOB THOMAS: The Opposition will oppose this clause. The reason is that we did not agree with the Bill and voted against it at the second reading stage.

Hon N.F. Moore: On this occasion.

Hon BOB THOMAS: We voted against this Bill, which has been dealt with only once, and that was in August last year.

Hon N.F. Moore: If you can convince yourself of that, you can convince yourself of anything.

Hon BOB THOMAS: The Leader of the House may want to go through the history of other Bills that have been presented to this place, but the Opposition voted against this Bill at the second reading stage, and it went to a committee because the vote was 13:13, and the President decided that he would allow the debate to continue. We have not changed our minds.

The reason we believe this Bill should be rejected is that it proposes to abolish the Hairdressers Registration Board but does nothing to implement the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies, which recommended in its thirty-seventh report, which was presented to this House by Hon Barry House in November 1995,

that the board be abolished and replaced with some other form of regulatory body. The report states at page 6, under the heading "Conclusion", that -

Whatever form of regulation is finally adopted, it should be directed towards licensing both hairdressers and the working environment. The procedure should be administrative; the grant of a licence as of right if the criteria for registration are met, and revocation for wilful, persistent or gross breach of the licence conditions.

Therefore, although the Standing Committee on Government Agencies recommended that the Hairdressers Registration Board be replaced with another form of regulation, all this Bill does is allow for the repeal of the board, and it then refers to the legal aspects of winding up the board and its property, and to how to deal with any legal proceedings against the board in the future. This Bill does not provide for the Government to replace the board with some other form of regulation or licensing of the industry.

This matter was also referred to the Standing Committee on Public Administration, which was chaired by Hon Kim Chance and reported to this House in December 1997. The report of that committee states at paragraph 4.3 that -

There are strong arguments to support the notion that total deregulation of the industry is undesirable because of the possible detriment to standards of skill and care, although the Committee finds that if any form of registration within the industry is maintained, it should be directed towards licensing the working environment, and should be administrative in nature.

That committee also recommended that if the Hairdressers Registration Board were abolished, it be replaced with some other form of regulation or licensing arrangement. The Government has made no attempt to introduce any form of regulation or licensing. All it has sought to do is abolish the board.

In the past few months, negotiations about this issue have taken place between the Government and the minor parties, and at no stage has any form of legislative regulation been proposed. Basically, the Government is still proposing to abolish the Hairdressers Registration Board and to replace it with some informal, non-legislative arrangement. We will not accept that, and we intend to defeat this legislation. We have not made that decision lightly. We understand that if this Bill is defeated, it will be the first Bill that has been defeated in the Legislative Council.

Hon N.F. Moore: You have had seven years to look at it, and you have changed your mind three times. At least you are flexible; I will give you that.

Hon BOB THOMAS: In 95 per cent of cases, government legislation has been passed with the accord of all parties in this place. On very few occasions has the Opposition voted against a Bill. If the Greens (WA) and the Democrats vote with us, this will be the first time that we have voted against a piece of government legislation. It is unusual.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Stop apologising!

Hon BOB THOMAS: I am not apologising. I am saying that it is very important that we reject this legislation. That is not a common occurrence. The *Hansards* show that on 95 per cent of any votes taken in this place, the Greens, the Democrats, the Labor Party, the National Party and the Liberal Party have voted together.

Hon E.J. Charlton: We might as well not be here!

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon N.D. Griffiths): Order, Minister for Transport! Hon Bob Thomas does not need protection from the interjections, but I think the Hansard reporter does.

Hon BOB THOMAS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman.

A number of other factors need to be addressed when we consider this clause. The Government has said that there is no need to regulate and license this industry because other legislative protections are in place - consumer protection through the Ministry of Fair Trading, health inspections provided by local government authorities, and protection under section 21 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act - that make redundant some of the protections that are provided by the Hairdressers Registration Board. I defy any member of this place to tell me how section 21 provides protection for the customers of hairdressers. Section 21 is headed "Duties of employers and self-employed persons" and states -

- (1) An employer or a self-employed person shall -
  - (a) take reasonable care to ensure his own safety and health at work; and
  - (b) so far as is practicable, ensure that the safety or health of a person not being his employee is not adversely affected wholly or in part as a result of the work in which he or any of his employees is engaged.

That is for the protection of third parties who may come into contact with the employer's operations. It is not a form of consumer protection against faulty workmanship, and so on. I do not agree with the Government's argument that other legislative protections are available. We are not satisfied that the Government has met our request to find some form of legislative alternative to the Hairdressers Registration Board. As a result, we do not support the clause.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is somewhat disappointing to hear Hon Bob Thomas speak on behalf of the Labor Party, indicating on this occasion that the ALP will vote against the Bill. I will remind the Chamber of the history of the legislation. When I was Minister for Employment and Training I brought a Green Bill to this place, seeking the abolition of the Hairdressers Registration Board. Prior to my doing that, at least two Ministers for Labour Relations or Training under the previous Labor Government attempted to get rid of the board. A number of inquiries resolved to do that. I referred the Green Bill to the Standing Committee on Government Agencies. I thought that was what Legislative Council committees were for. That committee was set up to look at statutory authorities, therefore that committee should look at the Hairdressers Registration Board. In its report, that committee agreed that the board should be abolished, but it felt there was a need for a committee of sorts to ensure that things did not go astray. I agreed to that; I told this Chamber that I would agree. In fact, I gave an undertaking to set up a committee once the Act had been proclaimed. As a result, this place unanimously supported that view. Perhaps Hon Jim Scott did not vote for it, but certainly the Labor Party supported it. I remember reading the speeches by Hon Tom Stephens, Hon John Halden and Hon Kim Chance. I could not have put it better than they, because they were effusive in their support of the abolition of the board.

The Bill passed this place and went to the other place. Regrettably it was not dealt with prior to prorogation before the last election. The Bill was introduced once again in the other place and passed, and returned to this place. For reasons which still escape me, in this place the Labor Party did a complete about-turn - those members being great supporters of a process to totally oppose the Bill. I can only assume that Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich has had such an influence on them -

Hon Tom Stephens: She is a very persuasive, intelligent colleague.

Hon E.J. Charlton: That is not what you said last week.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Members opposite have returned to being their old, conservative selves. They simply cannot accept that the times are a-changing. They want to control everything. It is the socialist way to control everything. The board must control everything. We are getting away from that philosophy in this country -

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: You don't control everything. Everything has gone haywire.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon N.D. Griffiths): Order! The Leader of the House does not control everything at the moment; I do, under the standing orders. Members should listen to the Leader of the House in silence for at least a couple of minutes.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Members opposite have returned to their old attitudes on this issue. That has come from their speeches which I read with great interest, because people have changed their minds completely, although I do not recall Hon Tom Stephens speaking on the second Bill; nor did I hear Hon John Halden speak on the second Bill. They would have felt a little hypocritical - perhaps that is too strong a word - because they changed their point of view.

Hon Tom Stephens: I support the Labor Party.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Of course the member does. He cannot think for himself. If he does not support the mob he will be kicked out, or he will have to resign. If that is the way he wants to behave, that is another reason that I do not belong to that party.

We dealt with the second Bill on its arrival from the other place, and the vote was tied. For some reason a member was not present and the vote was tied, and the President cast his vote to allow the passage of the Bill through the second reading stage. Then I had what I thought was a bright idea. I would give the committee system a chance to have another go. The committee had already made a recommendation to abolish the board, but there were some new members and the committee had to have something to do. This Chamber agreed to that move. The Public Administration Committee has now made an extraordinary recommendation to abolish this board and set up two others. That is, it wants to get rid of one statutory authority and create two more. This is the most extraordinary thing I have ever heard.

We are trying to do something about the overburdened influence of government ownership, to deregulate these things, which most other parts of the world have deregulated, and to get rid of unnecessary agencies and fees. We are trying to get rid of the Hairdressers Registration Board, probably the last of that sort in existence; but the report says to get rid of that one and to create two more.

Hon Peter Foss: Perhaps it should be a tourist attraction.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is almost heritage. The legislation is so old, antiquated and out of date, it is virtually heritage. Perhaps it could be a tourist attraction. Some members have the view that hairdressers must be controlled, because they are likely to cause enormous damage to the heads on which they work. For some reason, members think that hairdressers are a special breed of people who must have special controls on what they do. Ironically, the last time someone was badly hurt by a hairdresser, it involved a 10 year registered hairdresser. The person had been registered by the board, had gone through the training process, had paid her fees to the board, and then carried out a procedure on someone's hair which caused the person some damage. The board has nothing to do with that sort of matter. The Hairdressers Registration Board only collects fees from hairdressers, and a board member may occasionally wander around a salon to see if the hairdresser has paid the fee to maintain registration. It also checks on whether hairdressers from overseas need to be registered in this State, and then registers them. That used to be done with interstate hairdressers, but that is not required now due to the mutual recognition legislation. The only job for the board now is to collect fees from Western Australians, and to check the registration of overseas hairdressers. That is it. However, the Labor Party Opposition - we have not heard from the other parties, but I have a sneaking suspicion we will - tells us that we must maintain the Hairdressers Registration Board to do those two things.

Hon Kim Chance: That is wrong.

Hon Tom Stephens: That is conjecture. It is misleading.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is not. I will come to that in a moment.

Today we debated an urgency motion. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about how important it is to protect children in our society. He made an impassioned speech - as did other members - about how important it is to protect children in our society. The vast majority of children are not subjected to the abuse about which we spoke today. Children go to school. Looking after those children in our schools are schoolteachers, not one of whom is registered. We do not think it is necessary to register schoolteachers in Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That is exactly right. I will tell members all about that. The member has hit the nail on the head.

To be a schoolteacher in Western Australia people must be qualified. They must go through the process but they do not have to be registered. They do not have to go to some board and say, "Here is my qualification and my money. Will you register me and let me teach in government or private schools?" People do not have to do that with the vast majority of occupations in Western Australia. Members opposite are saying that hairdressers are a special breed who will cause all this damage to society if we do not register them. They can say to me that we must have a Hairdressers Registration Board in Western Australia but they will not say, nor did they when they were in government, "Bring in a registration system for teachers." Are they suggesting that somehow or other teachers are less important and can do less damage than hairdressers? Is it not absolutely amazing that here we have a party which, on the one hand, is prepared to accept that schoolteachers need to be qualified - and I agree they must be qualified - but do not need to be registered; whereas, on the other hand, hairdressers must be qualified and registered? What is the difference, for goodness sake?

Hon Bob Thomas: That is a very poor analogy.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is a very good analogy. Let us go further and demonstrate the total stupidity of members opposite on this question. The only hairdressers in Western Australia who need to be registered are those who work in the metropolitan area or Kalgoorlie; whereas those who work in Narrogin, Esperance, Albany, Port Hedland or Wyndham do not have to be registered at all.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am making this speech. The member can make one afterwards. We are told by this parliamentary committee that somehow or other hairdressers are a special breed of people who need to be registered. However, if Hon Tom Helm walks into a hairdresser's in Port Hedland, he can cut his hair. His hair looks all right to me, but his hairdresser may not be registered. Hon Tom Helm would expect that the hairdresser would be qualified because he would not want somebody cutting his hair who was not qualified, but he would not ask, "Are you registered before you touch my curly locks?"

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: I do.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I know the member does because she needs somebody with extra qualifications.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon N.D. Griffiths): Order! I am sure that members' interjections are germane to the debate and no doubt Hansard would like to take them down but too many members are interjecting on the Leader of the House at the same time and I cannot quite hear what he is saying.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am happy to repeat it all.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sure the Leader of the House is, but would he please continue what he is saying?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I will because it is absolutely germane to this question. This is "Blue Hills" times 10. I have never in my life had to put up with such a long-running saga as the Hairdressers Registration Board, although I must say that the building and construction industry training fund got almost to the same stage.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: I was involved in that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The member has made my point. Since Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich arrived the Labor Party has recessed to its arch conservatism with its head in the sand. We now have problems with two Bills that this Chamber passed prior to her arrival. I am delighted that she is here because it demonstrates clearly to me, as it will to the public of Western Australia when they hear its policies at the next election, that the Labor Party is back to what it used to be prior to 1983, when the public could not stand it. I am happy about her being here, but I am not happy about her voting against this legislation because the legislation is a step in the right direction.

The Hairdressers Registration Board is unnecessary for two reasons: First, it is no longer a requirement in most occupations for people to be registered, but it is still a requirement for them to be qualified. Qualifications are provided by training institutions or apprenticeship systems or through universities, depending where people get their qualifications. A person comes out with a piece of paper which says, "Joe Blow is qualified to be a doctor", or dentist, or whatever it is. He can hang up his shingle and start operating with that qualification. Why is it not possible for a hairdresser to go through a training process in Western Australia and come out with a certificate which says that she is a qualified hairdresser and can go and cut hair? Members opposite are saying that hairdressers must take their qualifications to some board and say, "Here are my qualifications and here is my money." The only difference between the two scenarios is that they must pay their money the second time around and get nothing at all for it. The board may have been necessary when it was set up back in the dim dark days of 1948, when it was formed by a very enlightened piece of legislation, but it is not necessary in 1998. In those days we did not have all the legislation that we have now to look after people's interests from a safety and health point of view. Other legislation has surpassed the Hairdressers Registration Board legislation and makes it unnecessary and superfluous.

I return to my argument that the future role of the Hairdressers Registration Board will be minimal. Recently the Hairdressers Registration Board has been replaced by a number of new members. It has determined a new policy for registering people. Those who have completed a full term of indenture of 48 months and been awarded a certificate will automatically be provided with registration provided they pay the appropriate fee. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich has spent all day telling us about providing fees. This is her chance to save some people money.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: This is an exception.

Hon N.F. MOORE: An exception!

Hon Bob Thomas: They want to pay for it.

Hon N.F. MOORE: When they know what they will get for their money, they will turn on the Opposition in droves.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! If members are to interject, they will do so one at a time.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That is the first part of the new policy. The second part is that if people complete a reduced term of indenture of between 30 and 48 months, they will not automatically be given registration even though they have the qualifications; they will have to do another examination set by the board to see if they can be registered. They will then pay their fees again. However, if a person is very smart and does the course of training in less than 30 months, the board will not provide that person with registration or an opportunity to undertake the board's examination. What we have now is this new board saying that the only people who will be registered automatically are those who have done four years' training and have satisfied the requirements of that training. If their training is between 30 and 48 months, even though people have passed an examination through the TAFE process, the board will examine them again. What an insult that is. If they learn to be hairdressers in less than 30 months and are smart operators, the board will not register them or consider them for the board's examination. The board is saying to them, "Go back to TAFE for another year." That is the policy of the board.

As a result, the Minister sought legal advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office on the meaning of the Hairdressers

Registration Board legislation and where it should go from here. The Crown Solicitor's advice is that the only area of responsibility for the Hairdressers Registration Board in the future will be in collecting fees for registration and assessing the registration of overseas persons who wish to be hairdressers in Western Australia. People trained in Western Australia under the Industrial Training Act and regulations who achieve the qualifications necessary to be hairdressers should be automatically registered. That is the Crown Solicitor's view.

Hon Kim Chance: I think it is true of an exclusive responsibility but there are areas in the Hairdressers Registration Board of joint responsibility.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The member may be a lot smarter than the Crown Solicitor but I am telling him what the Crown Solicitor has told us. He is saying that people who train to become hairdressers in Western Australia should be automatically registered by virtue of the completion of their training under the Industrial Training Act. Hairdressers from other States who come to Western Australia will be automatically registered by virtue of mutual recognition policies in Australia at present. The only people left are those from overseas who want to practise in this State, and the board will need to register them and check their qualifications. There is a potential for members opposite to keep the Hairdressers Registration Board, by rejecting this legislation, on the basis that it may do only two things; that is, collect money - I do not know how much it is a year -

Hon Kim Chance: It used to be \$70.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is probably more than that now because everything goes up. The board will also register hairdressers from overseas. According to the Crown Solicitor's advice, all other hairdressers should be automatically registered, as has been the case in the past. It is a most extraordinary "Blue Hills" scenario. This Parliament has gone through the assessment of this legislation for three or so years; two parliamentary committees have recommended that it be got rid of and one that it be replaced; Crown Solicitor's advice is that it will not have much to do in the future; and there is legislation all over the place that looks after the interests of hairdressers and anybody else in the workplace.

Several members interjected.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The WorkSafe legislation is Labor Party legislation, and its members should not blame me if they do not like it.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: You cut the funding.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It has nothing to do with funding. When was the last time a complaint was made about a hairdresser who did something wrong with somebody's hair? I suggest it happens on very few occasions, bearing in mind the number of haircuts done each day. Rarely are complaints made about the standard of safety in a hairdressing salon.

Hon Bob Thomas: That is because it is regulated.

Hon N.F. MOORE: No it is not. It is because the hairdressers are qualified to do the job. The member forgets the difference between being qualified and being registered.

Hon Bob Thomas: A person must be qualified in order to be registered.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I know. Therefore, why be registered?

Hon Bob Thomas: Under your scenario they do not have to be qualified.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am not saying that at all. The Government is not saying that people should not have to be qualified. It is saying that a hairdresser in Western Australia must be qualified, just as anybody who wants to be a teacher, lawyer, dentist or mechanic must be qualified, but they do not have to be registered.

Hon Cheryl Davenport: You do not have to be qualified to be a mechanic in Western Australia, and I will discuss that with the Leader of the House another time.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I look forward to hearing that at great length. Would the member take her car to an unqualified mechanic?

Hon Cheryl Davenport: No, I would not.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Of course not and that is why people do not go to an unqualified hairdresser to have their hair cut. There is nothing to stop anybody cutting other people's hair. My wife cuts my son's hair, and she is neither qualified nor registered. Anybody can do it if the other person agrees. However, I am referring to people who willingly pay money to have their hair cut and they want to make sure the hairdresser is qualified to do it. That is



all that is necessary. It should not be necessary for a person to be qualified and to be registered by paying money to the registration board, which must employ a couple of people to make sure hairdressers are registered and which does nothing else.

It is clear to me, and it was clear to the first committee, that what I am saying is absolutely right. The existing arrangement is unnecessary and the amendment sought is appropriate and proper. For some reason, which I still cannot understand, some members opposite have changed their minds completely from being effusive supporters of to totally opposing the legislation. They think it is satisfactory for unregistered teachers to teach their children, but not for unregistered hairdressers to cut their hair. They have their priorities totally wrong.

Hon Tom Stephens: Do you want us to regulate schoolteachers?

Hon N.F. MOORE: No, because I do not think it is necessary. Some people do, and I heard someone say that today. People can be good teachers, but it is not dependent on whether they are registered but on whether they are qualified. That is all that counts.

Hon Kim Chance: Some good teachers are not qualified.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I know, and they are allowed to teach people. There is nothing to stop people from doing that if they are not qualified, provided they do not take money from people and do not claim to be qualified. Once people pay for a service, they are entitled to know that the provider of that service is qualified. Registration is a furphy. It is unnecessary, and WA is the only State that retains it. Even in WA it applies to only parts of the State. However, there are no more complaints in those parts than there are in the city.

This matter should be quickly resolved. Far too much time has been wasted on it tonight. It is a simple question of whether to accept that a qualification is enough, or whether qualification and registration are necessary in one industry but not in many others which are vastly more significant and more important in the ultimate effect they can have on people. I am disappointed that the Labor Party has taken this position but I am sure its members will be persuaded by my argument to change their minds again.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not often quote the late Sir Winston Churchill, but on this occasion I remind members that he said he would rather be right than consistent. I believe Churchill lived by that and, although I am happy to concede that he made a few mistakes, he tried not to repeat them. He generally acknowledged those mistakes and I admired him for that.

I conceded last year during the second reading debate that I felt some sense of embarrassment about the position I was taking. It was my position and I was not simply representing the position of the ALP, but I had been a member of both the Standing Committee on Government Agencies and the Standing Committee on Public Administration. It is true, as the Minister said, that both committees recommended abolition as the upfront position. However, it is quite wrong to go no further than an assessment of that position of pro-abolition and try to represent that as the full view of either or both of those committees. Both committees went a long way further than simply recommending abolition. Even the more abolitionist of the two reports, which was the thirty-seventh report -

Hon Peter Foss: How about the vote of the House? That was fairly abolitionist.

Hon KIM CHANCE: It was probably youthful enthusiasm. There were significant differences between the two reports but not as significant as the differences between the thirty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies and the Bill. Listening to Hon Norman Moore, one could almost get the impression that the Bill reflected the tenor of the thirty-seventh report.

Hon N.F. Moore: I indicated that I had made commitments in addition to the concerns, and that is why you supported it so enthusiastically.

Hon KIM CHANCE: No doubt.

Those differences were quite serious. There is a consistency between the thirty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies and the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Public Administration. The Bill before us is essentially the same as the one introduced in 1996; it deregulates the industry. That is not the fundamental position - notwithstanding its pro-abolitionist approach - expressed by the Government Agencies Committee. It specifically disavows the comments made by the committee on page 4 of its report to the effect that the majority of individual witnesses held the clear opinion that total deregulation was an undesirable option, not least because of the deleterious effect they saw deregulation could have on standards of skill and care. That is not the argument of a deregulator.

In his second reading speech Hon Norman Moore indicated that the Wholesale, Retail and Personal Services Industry

Training Council would provide the industry with its voice in training standards and assessments. It was the committee's view, at page 5 of that first of the two reports, that a specific hairdressers' industry training council should be formed. The Bill referred to the establishment of a, presumably, voluntary code of ethics. It said that hairdressers' associations were best placed to make representations to government. The committee did not have that view. It did not refer to a code of ethics but to the possibility of a statutory successor to the Hairdressers Review Board, at pages 6 and 7 of the report.

On page 7 the committee recommended the establishment of an advisory body appointed by the Minister to represent the industry's views. The Bill did not do that, nor did the second reading speech refer to it. Most significantly - this has been said by others but it must be stated clearly for the record - the committee report concluded on page 6 that both hairdressers and their establishments, the salons, should be licensed. The Bill made no such provision for that. I will not have time to go into the Public Administration Committee's report and the reason for the differences.

However, I want to address the furphy the Minister has run past us about the difference between qualification and/or proof of qualification and registration and/or licences. We do not need to register teachers. With my limited knowledge of the education system I cannot perceive such a need. Nobody has ever said they need registration. However, we all agree that we need to know that a person in charge of teaching children or adults should be competent and preferably qualified.

Hon N.F. Moore: How do you determine the difference? Are you saying a registration board determines competence?

Hon KIM CHANCE: No. Teachers' qualifications are assessed and vouched for in a sense on a daily basis by both the school and the Education Department, or private school principals if that is the environment in which they are teaching.

Hon N.F. Moore: So are hairdressers.

Hon KIM CHANCE: They are monitored by parents interested in the student group. There is a continual vouching for that person's capacity to teach.

Hon N.F. Moore: So are hairdressers; that is why you go back to them next time.

Hon KIM CHANCE: It is a very different scenario.

Hon N.F. Moore: This is the longest red herring I have heard in my life.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Probably an owner/employer and two or three other persons work in a hairdressing salon. It is not the same situation as in a school. In the assessment of an individual's performance I liken the role of the hairdresser to that of a motor vehicle dealer or salesperson. Is it not funny that they need to be registered? One cannot sell a motor vehicle without a motor vehicle dealer's licence. One cannot sell a motor vehicle on behalf of someone else in a commercial establishment unless one has a salesman's licence. There are licensing authorities for people to take part in a trade like that. Why do we license motor vehicle dealers and salesmen and not teachers? The reason is exactly what I put before members: A supervisory body is constantly watching teachers' performances.

Hon N.F. Moore: Rubbish; you know that's not true.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Hon Norman Moore is a former school principal. He well knows that if he had a non-performing teacher at his school he would know about it within a couple of days.

Hon N.F. Moore: I wouldn't be able to do anything about it.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Congratulations to the Government for trying to fix it up with its School Education Bill. A principal is well aware of a problem that occurs in his school by a member of his staff. No similar provision exists for a hairdresser other than the fact that the employer may say, "I do not want those standards to be maintained; that person is not qualified."

Hon N.F. Moore: Because people are no longer getting their hair cut there.

Hon KIM CHANCE: What happens if the employer makes no such determination or starts cutting corners or puts his hairdresser on a workplace agreement and pays her \$5 an hour? What happens if we lower our standards the way the Court Government wants us to lower our standards?

Hon PETER FOSS: Mr Chairman -

Hon Tom Stephens: Are you trying to filibuster this Government's Bill?

Hon PETER FOSS: Members may remember the very funny show called "The Frost Report". In one skit a newsreader solemnly said, "The Government has decided to place toll booths at either end of Oxford Street in order to pay for the cost of placing toll booths at either end of Oxford Street." That is what the Hairdressers Registration Board is about. It collects money to pay for the board so that it can exist and collect money. That is all it does. It is even sillier; it is like us having a toll booth at either end of Hay Street to collect money from Western Australians. Anyone else would be allowed to walk down there without paying.

The silly thing about this is that we are even discussing it and that members opposite will take a constitutional view of defeating government legislation. In 150 years of control of this Chamber, the coalition occasionally knocked back some of the Labor Government's legislation but only when it disagreed with it on basic principle, where there were some major points of disagreement between us as parties. However, we generally took the view that, this being the House of Review, it was our job to allow the Government to get on with things. We could hardly complain about the performance of a Government if we interfered with it.

What is this big issue on which members opposite have decided to take a stand? Hon Bob Thomas said, "We have not taken this decision lightly." How can we do anything but take it lightly?

Hon Kim Chance: It is one of the major employing industries in Western Australia.

Hon PETER FOSS: What does this have to do with that?

Hon Kim Chance: Everything.

Hon PETER FOSS: The only reason members opposite want to keep the Hairdressers Registration Board is for the sake of protectionism; it is nothing to do with standards. Funnily enough, the people who are already registered and who happen to be on the board are the ones who want to retain it. That is what protectionism is always about.

Hon Kim Chance: That is not true.

Hon PETER FOSS: An engineer can build the biggest bridge in the world without having to be registered. A tax accountant does not have to be registered.

Hon Helen Hodgson: One must be a registered tax agent; you picked the wrong profession that time.

Hon PETER FOSS: However, a tax accountant does not have to be registered. The fascinating thing about all this is, it is keeping up quality and safety in hairdressing! Members opposite should read section 4(1) of the Hairdressers Registration Act; it states -

Nothing in this Act shall extend or apply to, or in any manner affect, the practice of his profession by or any rights or privileges of any medical practitioner or *bona fide* nurse or masseur.

Here we have it. This Act does not apply to a bona fide nurse, medical practitioner or masseur. A hairdresser can carry on cutting people's hair while massaging them. He or she does not even have to be registered as a masseur. We do not need a registration board. People can do a course in massage and in the course of that massage people's necks and so on and the Hairdressers Registration Board cannot do anything about it.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: What a load of cobblers this is. This is straight out protectionism. One can be an engineer or an accountant and not need to be registered. One can do all those amazing things and not need to be registered, yet the members opposite believe that hairdressers should be registered. We know it has nothing to do with qualifications because if one is a hairdresser from the eastern States, why worry? One has a six month term of practice where one does not have to do a thing. We know that this is all a load of nonsense, and yet, for some reason or other, the Labor Party has to say that this is a major point.

Do members opposite realise that the limitations on a hairdresser are greater than those on a nurse? One can nurse as much as one likes and not be paid but as a hairdresser one cannot do anything. The main thing that nurses are not allowed to do is call themselves registered nurses. Some nurses call themselves enrolled nurses and nursing aides and all those other things. We have fewer protections for nurses. However, if one clearly wants to be protected what one needs is to have a Hairdressers Registration Act.

I can remember a very good speech given by Mr Paul Nichols at the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Legislative Assembly. He had said to the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation that its legislation was totally unnecessary because all he had to do was appoint people as chicken meat inspectors under the Chicken Meat Industry Act and they would have far greater powers than those conferred on ASIO officers under the ASIO Act. That is what this is all about. This is the registration equivalent of the Chicken Meat Industry Act. It gives amazing powers to

people who do absolutely nothing except put up toll booths at either end of Oxford Street in order to pay for the cost of those toll booths.

Here is the Opposition making this ponderous decision: "As an Opposition, we will defeat this legislation." They should go ahead and defeat the legislation. What a load of clowns members opposite will look. They will use their power to stop this Government passing a teensy weensy bit of deregulation. They will exercise their muscles on this highly important thing. Do members opposite realise how silly they look?

Hon Kim Chance: Ask the industry how silly you look!

The CHAIRMAN (Hon J.A. Cowdell): Order!

Hon PETER FOSS: Do members opposite realise how silly they will look?

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon PETER FOSS: The Opposition is flexing its muscle and saying that it ought to get in there and do something really important. The Opposition is going to knock down the Hairdressers Registration Repeal Bill. Wonderful! As an Opposition it really has an idea of what its role is. It has learnt how smart it is to get in there and guide the State. The important thing for the Opposition about this legislation is that it sees itself as guiding this State along its way from the opposition benches. It says it should not be allowing the Government to make these changes. They say this is a point of principle. This is the Hairdressers Registration Board. This is about foreign people coming here and getting registered. They are the only ones that this Bill is going to have any effect on, as members have heard from the above. The Opposition is doing a wonderful job.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Better than you did on prisons.

Hon PETER FOSS: This is a historic occasion.

Hon Kim Chance: Just belittle everyone who is not a lawyer.

Hon PETER FOSS: The Labor Opposition, for the first time in its 150 year history, is about to step in and save the State from an absolutely dreadful performance by the Government. It should go ahead and do it. Members opposite will have a great time. Look at them; they voted for it once before. If it is that important, they have voted for it once already. Now it is a point of principle. They are saying "We think this is an important point of principle and as the House of Review we will stop those terrible people in Government abolishing the Hairdressers Registration Board."

Hon Kim Chance: The Minister is dead right, he should have stuck with the law.

Hon PETER FOSS: This is the funniest thing - I do not know why: The Opposition should go ahead and defeat it, because the justification for the Opposition's position is absolute arrant nonsense.

Hon Bob Thomas: Read your own *Hansard*.

Hon PETER FOSS: It is one of the funniest things that I have seen in this Chamber. The Opposition is solemn about exercising its power at this important time. This is the upper House at work. One of the things the Opposition should learn is that if we make mistakes, we make mistakes.

Hon Bob Thomas: You make plenty of them.

Hon PETER FOSS: We should be allowed to make mistakes. One of the good things about being in Opposition is one can allow Governments to make mistakes and then point them out afterwards and say, "They did it."

Hon Kim Chance: That is not our philosophy, as it happens.

Hon PETER FOSS: The Opposition should do that occasionally.

Hon Kim Chance: We are trying to help the Government out.

Hon PETER FOSS: The Opposition is helping us out, is it?

Hon Kim Chance: We are trying to prevent the Government from making silly mistakes.

Hon PETER FOSS: The Opposition is maintaining a structure in this State which it does not realise is opposed by the national competition policy. I suspect the Opposition believes it is a piddling thing. I doubt that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission will punish us by denying our draw down of money because we did not deal with this stupid anticompetitive measure. However, does the Opposition realise that it is potentially interfering with

the right of this State to draw down large amounts of money under the national competition policy? No. It should not worry about that. I suspect that the Opposition thinks it is doing something important. "Let us get in there and really show them how." Frankly, I think the only word to describe the Opposition is "pathetic".

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: Mr Chairman, I often wonder about the Attorney General. I have said in this place before that he has missed his calling. He should have been in the acting game.

I have come to this Bill latterly. As a member of the Standing Committee on Public Administration I had an input into its fifth report, in which we recommended the abolition of the Hairdressers Registration Board, as did the thirty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies. We agreed that the board should be abolished. However, what the Government has not done is to propose something to replace it.

Hon N.F. Moore: We do not want to replace it. We do not think it needs replacing.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: This is one of the reasons for some of the recommendations within the report of the Public Administration Committee. During deliberations and research on that report, I read a submission from the Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Employers Association of South Australia. In 1995 they wrote to Hon Trevor Griffin, Attorney General for South Australia. The Hairdressers Registration Board in South Australia was abolished in 1988. After seven years of abolition and total deregulation of the industry there, the employers' association put forward to the South Australian Government a recommendation for the need yet again for regulation. They came up with a co-regulation model for the hairdressing industry. That rang many bells for me because over the last five to six years I have been part of a West Australian government committee that has looked very closely at a co-regulation model in relation to the motor vehicle industry.

A month ago that committee - chaired by the member for Geraldton in the other place and with me as deputy chair and a range of other people - recommended to this Government to follow the path of a co-regulation model. The Minister for Fair Trading accepted that report and indicated to us that the ministry will follow those recommendations. I have been told that the recommendations put before the Government by the Public Administration Committee is a 1980s model of regulation and no longer appropriate.

The Motor Trade Association, the peak body for the motor vehicle industry in this State, is a great supporter of co-regulation. A similar model has existed in New South Wales since 1978. Attempts by Governments of both political persuasions in that State to abolish that model have been resisted on all occasions and as recently as in the current term of the Carr Government. It is a model that works and the industry is happy with it.

I see the potential for such a model in the hairdressing industry. That model could deal with many of the issues that have been raised by people who appeared before the committee. For example, the co-regulation model has a dispute resolution mechanism which could be used in the hairdressing industry in the same way as it is used in the motor vehicle repair industry in New South Wales. It could be used to protect workers within the industry. It could be used for a range of issues, not only for safety in the workplace but also for incorrect charges and so forth.

Hon N.F. Moore: Government departments do that.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: Yes. However, from my investigations into occupational health and safety in the hairdressing industry, no salons are visited for routine occupational health and safety checks.

Hon N.F. Moore: Do you want a big team of inspectors wandering around salons?

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: A small team would suffice.

Hon N.F. Moore: If people do not like what is happening they go somewhere else or complain about it.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: There is no harm in having a team of inspectors.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is the same old control story; the Labor Party wants to control everybody.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: The inspection process would look after the interests of consumers and hairdressers, and licensing of premises. That would be a useful way to ensure conditions within the salons are appropriate. I do not see any problem with that. South Australian employers are keen to see regulation reintroduced.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is one group in South Australia; it does not receive universal support at all. Just because one person says it is a good idea does not mean everyone thinks it is a good idea.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: No, but obviously problems exist. I am referring to an employers' association.

Hon N.F. Moore: Employers are just as bad with respect to closed shop arrangements as are employees. They are protecting their own interests.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: There is a need to do more than just abolish the registration board and have open slather in the industry. If Hon Norman Moore had produced an amended form of legislation -

Hon N.F. Moore: You want us to set up another registration board in place of the one we are going to abolish.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: No. The Government can modify the existing board. A number of recommendations were put forward following consultation with the industry.

Hon N.F. Moore: You will wear this when everyone finds out what you are doing.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: I am happy to wear it. We have a responsibility, particularly with our committee work, to look at the whole situation.

Hon N.F. Moore: You should take some notice of what the committee suggests. You voted for it last time.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: We did take notice of the committee. Hon Norman Moore returned the legislation to the committee and the committee did an excellent job in putting forward alternative points of views that the Government could investigate. In his wisdom Hon Norman Moore chose not to go down that path; all he wants to do is abolish the board and leave the notion of any sort of regulation for the protection of consumers and workers to one side.

Hon N.F. Moore: I want to leave it to other Acts of Parliament.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: The difficulty is that the other Acts of Parliament are not being applied in this industry.

Hon N.F. Moore: Are you going to bring in legislation for every occupation?

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: No. I have had some experience over a number of years with the motor vehicle industry, in which I spent my early working days.

Hon N.F. Moore: You have not made speeches about it.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: I have made speeches about that industry in this place.

Hon N.F. Moore: I have heard Hon Cheryl Davenport ask another member why he did not bring an issue into this place.

Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT: I was not involved in this industry. I became involved in putting this forward because in the South Australian situation the employers' association said that the deregistered model was not working. I have experience of this model in another industry. The motor vehicle mechanics in this State and motor vehicle dealer outlets that carry out servicing in this State all support a co-regulation model. An interesting point is that the motor vehicle industry has pulled away from the government industry training council and has set up its own council without funding.

The recommendation of the thirty-seventh report of the Public Administration Standing Committee is that there should be a separate hairdressing ITC. There are probably as many motor mechanics in Western Australia as hairdressers. These are fairly significant industries that recognise that they need more than a simple registration process; that they need a model that will look at a range of aspects. I had hoped the Government would look again at this issue and come back with something that we could all support.

Hon GIZ WATSON: I do not support this clause. I did not have any particular interest in hairdressers at all. I have come to this debate with an open mind and have put a lot of time and energy into studying the pros and cons of the legislation and the different reports. As much as members on the other side have been trying to belittle this Bill, it is significant. I hope that we can arrive at a solution which will improve the industry, which is what the industry is asking for. The report of the Public Administration Standing Committee made some good recommendations and I would like to see those enacted. I have not seen any response from the Government to address the primary concerns that a body is needed to regulate this industry.

This Bill reminds me of Hon Eric Charlton's decision to buy diesel buses rather than gas buses. In order to justify his position of continuing to support the fossil fuel industry he used the example of antiquated petrol driven buses which had been converted to gas to show that gas fuel buses were inferior. We are presented with the argument that the Hairdressers Registration Board is antiquated. However, we are suggesting that it can be revamped. Similarly, with its push for competition policy the Government has attempted to orchestrate the demise of the Hairdressers Registration Board for 10 years. Over that time the chair and deputy chair of the board, who were Department of Training employees, were instructed by two successive Governments to work towards closing down the board.

I want to talk briefly about what has happened since February this year with the new, government appointed board, which has a new registrar and an independent chair. That board was appointed to look at winding up the organisation. Although the new crew acknowledged the superfluous nature of the board, its research of 100 salons found that the industry was desperately in need of a cohesive functioning body to re-establish professionalism in the industry. A survey was carried out by the board. In response to the question "Do you feel that there is a need for a Board which represents the Hairdressing Industry?" an overwhelming 76 per cent said yes. In answer to the question, "Do you think this Board should have a role in ensuring that only trained and competent hairdressers work in the industry?" 87 per cent said yes. In answer to the question, "Do you think that industry standards are slipping?" 63 per cent said yes. Clearly there is a need for some sort of regulatory body and that has been identified by the industry. Our role as members is to do our best not only by the consumer but also by the industry.

Over the three months that the board has been operating it has responded to the upper House committee's fifth report, supporting most of its recommendations. It has set up an accreditation subcommittee to implement the national hairdressing training package developed in WA after winning a national tender; it has trained 12 new workplace assessors; it has reinstituted salon inspections after a hiatus of several years; it has investigated over 50 complaints from clients, employees and employers; it has approached WorkSafe to begin consultation on a code of practice to be developed by hairdressers highlighting the occupational health and safety needs of the industry and to include a complaints mechanism for clients and employees; it has worked with the Health Department of WA on implementation of the code of practice for scheme penetration procedures and begun negotiations for small business training courses; and it has investigated cases where training providers have awarded spurious qualifications. Many members will be aware of the salon owner in the south metropolitan area who was awarded credentials, even though she had failed the standard hairdressing test.

The board has also negotiated with a major bank to provide EFTPOS services to salons at a low rate. That is quite an impressive turnaround in the last three months for a moribund board.

Hon Kim Chance: The board has achieved much.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is all they have left.

Hon Kim Chance: Listen to Hon Giz Watson's comments.

Hon GIZ WATSON: That is what it has done. The industry has an expressed need which the board has addressed over the last few months, which indicates that it can fulfil a broader role.

Hon N.F. Moore: I think you will find that what it has done in the last few months with the new policy was ultra vires, frankly.

Hon Kim Chance: Rubbish.

Hon GIZ WATSON: For the next few months, the board has proposed to continue to consult with industry on a code of practice; to develop WorkSafe's implementation with the industry throughout Western Australia; to assess ongoing needs for training, especially postgraduate courses; and to gather together mobile and home-based hairdressers to form an association to enforce health standards. All this good work would be lost if we were to now disband the board and let WorkSafe look after the occupational health and safety needs of the industry. WorkSafe does not consider hairdressing to be a high risk, high fatality industry.

Hon N.F. Moore: Well, it is not. Are you saying that it is a high risk, high fatality industry?

Hon GIZ WATSON: I consider it to have significant risks, such as dealing with sharp objects.

Hon N.F. Moore: People in Coolgardie deal with sharp objects, and the same things are cut in Coolgardie as here in Perth.

Hon GIZ WATSON: I suggest that they need regulations then. The contact WorkSafe has had with salons relates to manufacturers' products and safety data sheets. WorkSafe is not resourced to handle customer complaints. On the other hand, the board established by the industry with special expertise in hairdressing has a particular interest in monitoring what takes place in salons and all aspects of salon performance.

Concerning customer complaints, the Ministry of Fair Trading and the Small Claims Tribunal cannot cope with their current volume of work. They cannot mediate, and have no expertise in hairdressing. Clients find it difficult or confusing to negotiate with the bureaucracy, and do not know where to go, whereas the Hairdressers Registration Board is a one-stop shop for all complaints, which can relate to overcharging, alleged sexual harassment, poor standards of service, extensive damage to hair and even serious complaints of scalp burns or burns to the skin or eyes.

The board has already negotiated small business training courses to make sure small operators know how to run their

businesses. To date, this sort of training has been sadly lacking, a situation which led to the demise of many salons. Hairdressers need business and health-safety training and updates on latest advances.

It needs to be appreciated that this is not an industry full of large and powerful players. Hairdressing salons are small autonomous businesses with an average of 3.5 employees each.

Hon N.F. Moore: What are you quoting from?

Hon GIZ WATSON: It is information from the board itself.

Hon N.F. Moore: What information is that?

Hon GIZ WATSON: Which part are you asking about - the 3.5 employees each?

Hon N.F. Moore: The whole document.

Hon GIZ WATSON: It is something I prepared earlier.

Hon N.F. Moore: Are you reading your speech?

Hon GIZ WATSON: I am referring extensively to my notes.

Hon N.F. Moore: I thought you were quoting some document. If it is your speech you're reading, that's fine.

Hon GIZ WATSON: Earlier I was referring to a document; in fact, the summary of what the hairdressers board has done in the last three months came from its own information.

Hon N.F. Moore: Sometimes people quote from documents to give more substance to their argument. That is why I was asking about the document.

Hon GIZ WATSON: I wanted to reiterate more points but it would mostly be revisiting earlier comments on this matter.

The Greens (WA) do not believe that the advisory body proposed to replace the Hairdressers Registration Board will accomplish the necessary regulations. The Minister is well aware that the role of the advisory committee will be to advise the Minister for Training, and I am sure that the Minister knows that training is only a small part of the board's role. It is critical that the reformulated Hairdressers Registration Board have a more powerful legislative framework. I believe that we should be looking at amending the existing Hairdressers Registration Act to bring it into the twenty-first century, which will shortly be with us.

Hon B.M. SCOTT: The Public Administration Committee, formerly the Government Agencies Committee, released the 1995 report that recommended to Parliament that the Hairdressers Registration Board be abolished. We have talked about the reasons for that move, which I support. A second report was released in 1997 which again recommended that the board be abolished. Clearly, agreement was evident among all people who considered this matter twice.

To recap, we do not register all other professions so it is unnecessary to register hairdressers. The 1946 constituted Hairdressers Registration Board covers only part of the industry; therefore, it is a nonsense to continue in place a board which excludes everybody six miles from the Kalgoorlie Post Office and parts of the south west and north west divisions. It does not cover all hairdressers, so to talk about its continuance is a nonsense.

The reasons argued for its retention were to protect the training of staff and the safety of customers. The 1997 report was delivered with sincerity, after we went away with instructions by Parliament to produce recommendations which reflected the terms of reference. We had to produce something to replace the board, which we all agreed should be abolished. We produced recommendations.

It was recommended that a separate industry training council be established. I do not see that as a large regulatory body as many industries have separate ITCs. We also recommended that an independent authority operate to advise the Minister. Members should look in detail at the Minister's response to the 1997 report, as this indicates why we recommended abolishing the board in the first instance.

The two concerns were that appropriate training mechanisms were not put in place, and that the Minister needed to be continually advised on the requirements of the hairdressing industry. The Minister said she agreed with nearly all the recommendations in the 1997 report, which concurred with the 1995 report. She strongly supported most of the recommendations. She said that the committee was established in 1997 to put in place a code of practice.

In examining this issue around the State, a common denominator among people in the industry emerged; namely, that a code of practice was needed. The Minister guaranteed the provision of such a code in her response. She said it



would be sufficient to have a code of practice and rejected the recommendation of a separate ITC. She has an advisory body in place and the code of practice would also cover better education for the safe handling and use of chemicals in the industry. We must look very closely at the issues raised in the second report. The response from the Minister is that they are covered by other legislation. That is comforting to me as a member of that committee. The Minister has stated -

Rec 5.10 then refers to the proceeds of this funding revenue being utilised for routine inspection of premises and "maintenance of health, safety and hygiene standards".

*The Occupational Safety and Health Act details responsibilities and obligations relating to health and safety in the workplace of both employers and employees.*

Current Acts cover the concerns raised by this Parliament in the first instance. They were investigated and recommendations were made, but we have the Minister's assurance that they are covered by other Acts.

I had the opportunity to visit South Australia late last year and I took time out to visit some hairdressing salons and speak to the people in charge. I also visited a private training institution. It is important that members recognise that training has changed markedly over the years. We now have in this industry and in other skills based industries a recognition of prior learning. If we do not abolish the Hairdressers Registration Board, we will force every hairdresser, whether a novice or an experienced hairdresser, to undergo four years of training as an apprentice. That is grossly unfair when we have national recognition of prior learning.

I contest some of the statements made by Hon Giz Watson. They were precisely the same as those made by the board, which has a vested interest. I have a brochure which the board produced in May 1998, entitled "Did you know?", and which states that the board is currently looking for expressions of interest from 12 qualified hairdressers to be board assessors. Hon Giz Watson says that they have been trained. This brochure was published in May. I am known to have been involved in this issue for four or five years and the only person who has approached me has been a young hairdresser who applied to become an assessor on 24 April, and the applications closed on 28 April. That was the Tuesday after the Anzac Day long weekend. She was told that the assessors had already been appointed.

I still question the board's behaviour. It does not cover all hairdressers in the State, it does not ensure the safe use of chemicals and it has never put in place inspection of sites. We should abolish the board and take the word of the Minister that the advisory body will hear the industry's concerns. The South Australian industry is working very well.

The Minister has made these points very clear in her response. I urge members to consider it because, while we put up a sincere alternative to what we felt the Parliament was requesting, she has put up very concrete and rational reasons why there cannot be a separate ITC or an independent authority or advisory body. That would cross national legislation and it would not be accepted.

The Minister has agreed with recommendation 5.13 in the second report of 1997 and that improved industry standards should be developed, including an industry code of practice to be created and implemented with full industry consultation. That is rational and reasonable. However, it is unreasonable and unfair to hundreds of young Western Australians, particularly women, who are being condemned to undertaking four years of training when we have recognition of prior learning and this board is not allowing those women to have their skills recognised.

Hon HELEN HODGSON: I have been involved in discussion on this piece of legislation since it was referred to the Standing Committee on Public Administration. My involvement has been relatively short, as I suspect will be my comments tonight.

Progress reported.

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

**HON N.F. MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [9.55 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

*"Sunday Times" Workplace - Adjournment Debate*

**HON TOM HELM** (Mining and Pastoral) [9.56 pm]: It is important that I advise the House of something that was recently brought to my attention by my union. If I were to leave it too long the thrust would be lost. A notice went out to the Australian Manufacturing Workers Union from the assistant secretary of the printing division, Gary Bucknall. The notice draws the attention of members working at the *Sunday Times* to the similarities between the battle on the waterfront involving the MUA and Patrick Stevedores (Operations) Pty Ltd and their situation. The notice states -

I find interesting that management of the Sunday Times takes an interest in the material that I forward to members of the Union, and if they are unable to draw an analogy from the waterfront dispute then maybe the following may assist not only you as members but management to understand what they have done not only to the reputation of the Sunday Times but also to you as Unionists.

#### **PATRICK**

- \* Re-organises it's company structure establishing a number of subsidiary Companies.
- \* States that it requires "waterfront reform", as it turns out "waterfront reform" is the use of non unionised workforce.
- \* Individual workplace agreements are put in place that remove conditions of employment that have been negotiated by the MUA over many years.
- \* 1998 Patrick terminates it's entire workforce after negotiations break down over an enterprise agreement.
- \* Patrick use security guards and dogs to remove its' workforce.
- \* Patrick use police including mounted Police, tactical response group and helicopters in an effort to break the MUA and Community picket line.

The notice then describes the similarities between what has happened with the MUA and Patrick and the *Sunday Times*. It states -

- \* In 1994 Enterprise Agreement negotiations fail a stoppage of work occurs, a picket line is established, the Sunday Times uses Police, Mounted Police, Tactical Response Group and Helicopter to break the picket line.
- \* 1996 again negotiations break down over an enterprise agreement, proposed stoppage of work fails. Sunday Times engages "New Breed" security firm. The FOC is removed from the premises on the Saturday night by Security Guards after undertakings were even given by the Union Secretary and the FOC that there would be no further industrial action.
- \* 1998 Sunday Times notifies that News Ltd. had made a decision to establish Perth Print a subsidiary of News Ltd.
- \* Advises that it will no longer require its production workforce after March 1999 as a result of that decision.
- \* Claims Union membership is not an issue and states "It is true there is no longer a closed shop at our workplace. We encourage freedom of choice and that is exactly what we mean, freedom to belong or not to belong to a union". In other words the Sunday Times wants a passive non unionised workforce.
- \* Sunday Times/Perth Print offer it's employees and prospective Perth Print employees Individual Contracts which remove or reduce Award and Enterprise Agreement conditions that have been negotiated over many years by the P.K.I.U. and now the A.M.W.U.

It is not difficult and it does not require a fertile mind to make the analogy that there are great similarities between the waterfront dispute and what is occurring at the Sunday Times.

Minister Reith is on the public record as saying that he has had many meetings with a number of Employers regarding his Workplace Relations Act and how it can be used to improve productivity, the question is whether News Ltd. has attended such meetings as the words and actions that they have embarked upon have the hollow sounds of Howard/Reith and Corrigan

The assistant state secretary asks the union members to be the judge. The document states -

You be the judge!!!

Finally if the Sunday Times was really interested in seeking change in the way you currently work or if there were work practices that they say are "Rorts" why did they not seek to meet and discuss those issues with the Union and the Chapel.

It is my understanding that there was general agreement that prior to the new plant being operable that there would be changes to work practices, manning levels and ships agreed to by all members?

I bring that to the attention of the House because I am sure none of us wants to see events unfold at the premises of the *Sunday Times* similar to those that occurred on the waterfront at Fremantle. I am also sure that the Maritime Union of Australia will eventually have the victory it deserves in the courts, a battlefield not of its making. Let us hope that we do not see those security guards in black balaclavas with their dogs at the premises of Perth Print or the *Sunday Times*. I use the contents of these documents as a warning. I place on the public record my hope that we have learnt the lesson that was provided by the MUA in the waterfront dispute. All workers in Australia will become more disciplined and will fight on the battlegrounds that are presented to them - and will win.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 10.02 pm*

---

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Answers to questions are as supplied by the relevant Minister's office.

**GOVERNMENT VEHICLES LEASED OR OWNED**

1504. Hon NORM KELLY to the Minister for Transport:

For all agencies under the control of your Ministry, can the Minister advise -

- (1) How many vehicles are leased or owned by those agencies?
- (2) Of these, how many are -
  - (a) passenger vehicles; and
  - (b) commercial vehicles?
- (3) Of the total number of vehicles, how many are -
  - (a) petrol or diesel powered;
  - (b) LPG powered; or
  - (c) powered by other means?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Albany Port Authority

- (1) 7.
- (2) (a) 3.  
(b) 4.
- (3) (a) Petrol - 6.  
Diesel - 1.  
(b)-(c) Nil.

Geraldton Port Authority

- (1) 23.
- (2) (a) 4.  
(b) 8.
- (3) (a) 23.  
(b)-(c) Nil.

Dampier Port Authority

- (1) 6 vehicles (owned).
- (2) (a) 4 passenger vehicles.  
(b) 2 commercial vehicles.
- (3) All 6 are petrol/diesel powered.

Esperance Port Authority

- (1) 11.
- (2) (a) 4.  
(b) 7.
- (3) (a) 11.  
(b)-(c) Nil.

Bunbury Port Authority

- (1) 18.
- (2) (a) 4.  
(b) 14 (includes 1 forklift, tractor and front end loader).

- (3) (a) 17.  
 (b) 1 (forklift).  
 (c) Nil.

#### Port Hedland Port Authority

- (1) 7.  
 (2) (a) 3.  
 (b) 4.  
 (3) (a) 7.  
 (b)-(c) Nil.

#### Fremantle Port Authority

- (1) 61.  
 (2) (a) 18.  
 (b) 43.  
 (3) (a) 61.  
 (b)-(c) Nil.

#### Westrail

- (1) 377.  
 (2) (a) 91.  
 (b) 286\*.  
 (3) (a) 377.  
 (b)-(c) Nil.

\* Includes 23 road coaches.

#### Eastern Goldfields Transport Board

- (1) 18 Omnibuses.  
 1 Sedan.  
 1 Utility.  
 (2) (a) 19.  
 (b) 1.  
 (3) (a) 20.  
 (b)-(c) Nil.

#### MetroBus

- (1) 435.  
 (2) (a) 416.  
 (b) 19.  
 (3) (a) 389.  
 (b) 2.  
 (c) 44 CNG.

#### Main Roads Western Australia

- (1) 719.  
 (2) (a) 325.  
 (b) 394.  
 (3) (a) 719.  
 (b)-(c) Nil.

#### Department of Transport

- (1) Total 1 017 (877 owned, 140 leased)  
 (2) (a) 983.  
 (b) 34.

- (3) (a) 971.
- (b) None.
- (c) 46 buses powered by compressed natural gas.

#### TOWN & COUNTRY DEMOLITION & SALVAGE'S CONTRACT

1556. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Town and Country Demolition worth approximately \$45 600 for the provision of demolition of Block C, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1)-(5) This contract involved the demolition of buildings within Block C for the construction of the Graham Farmer Freeway. A separate business case and comprehensive cost benefit analysis was not considered necessary.
- (6) Quotes were sought from an established list of demolition experts, with Town and Country Demolition assessed as offering the best value for money.

#### RAPTOR DEMOLITION'S CONTRACT

1559. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Raptor Demolition worth approximately \$105 800 for the provision of demolition of Block D, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1)-(5) This contract involved the demolition of buildings within Block D for the construction of the Graham Farmer Freeway. A separate business case and comprehensive cost benefit analysis was not considered necessary.
- (6) Quotes were sought from an established list of demolition experts, with Raptor Demolition assessed as offering the best value for money.

#### QUALITY & TECHNICAL SERVICES' CONTRACT

1560. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Quality and Technical Services worth approximately \$176 840 for the provision of service quality systems management, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

The member is referring to Contract 488/96, which was let by the Commissioner of Main Roads, not the Department of Transport.

- (1)-(5) A separate business case and comprehensive cost benefit analysis was not considered necessary.
- (6) This contract for the provision of quality systems management for the Graham Farmer Freeway was advertised in the newspaper with Quality and Technical Services assessed as offering the best value for money.

#### N & M CLEANING'S CONTRACT

1561. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 2535 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm N & M Cleaning for the provision of washing and steam cleaning of MetroBus operated buses, can the Minister advise -

- (1) What was the value of the contract?
- (2) Was a business case conducted?
- (3) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (4) If so, what did it show?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (7) What other options were considered?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) Malaga Depot - \$204 100

Contract was awarded on 1 July 1997 for a 12 month period until 30 June 1998.

- (2)-(3) Yes.
- (4) That the system of using "mixed function personnel" (bus drivers at their hourly rate) to conduct the cleaning was costing MetroBus \$1 205 500 per annum. The total cost for tendering out the system (including the contract with N&M Cleaners) would cost \$654 994.00. MetroBus would generate savings of \$550 506.00 per annum.
- (5) Not applicable.
- (6) The inherent risks identified were maintenance of quality and current standards.
- (7) Two options in addition to, the contracting out of the service, were considered:
  - (a) Maintaining the existing "mixed function personnel" system.
  - (b) Employing dedicated staff to provide the cleaning function. This option would have been cheaper than the "mixed function personnel" system, but meant that MetroBus would be responsible for additional staff with all the Human Resources issues and costs of absenteeism, sick leave, payrolls, workers compensation, administration, etc.

EVANS & PECK MANAGEMENT'S CONTRACT

1566. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Evans and Peck Management worth approximately \$176 420 for the provision of service and contract management support, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

I refer the member to my response to Question on Notice, Legislative Council 1546 of 1998.

EVANS & PECK MANAGEMENT'S CONTRACT

1567. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Evans and Peck Management worth approximately \$201 000 for the provision of project contract management services for contracts 19/95 and 404/95, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

The member is referring to Contract 253/96, which was let by the Commissioner of Main Roads, not the Department of Transport.

- (1) This contract was advertised with Evans and Peck Management offering the best value for money and being assessed as the most suitable to undertake the work.
- (2)-(6) This information is not known nor was it considered by Main Roads necessary at the time to inquire.

WESTERN STEVEDORES' PERFORMANCE BOND

1576. Hon J.A. COWDELL to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has Western Stevedores provided a performance bond to guarantee its provision of management services on the Dampier Public Wharf?
- (2) If so, how has that bond been secured?
- (3) Has any third party provided a guarantee or surety on the bond?
- (4) What is the sum secured by the bond?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) Under the Operating Agreement and Lease signed with Western Stevedores they are required to provide a bond for their performance.
- (2) Bond is to be in the form of an unconditional and irrevocable bank guarantee or cash in lieu.



- (3) Not known.
- (4) This is commercially confidential.

#### VIC PARK SALVAGE'S CONTRACT

1599. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Vic Park Salvage worth approximately \$48 900 for the provision of demolition of four buildings in Fitzgerald Street, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

The honourable member has asked a number of questions regarding Main Roads contracts. The member has already asked for identical information in respect of other contracts and I am not prepared to continue to commit scarce resources to collate the details required. However, if the member would like specific information about a particular contract, I would be pleased to assist.

#### LINKPIN CONSTRUCTION'S CONTRACT

1600. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Linkpin Construction worth approximately \$53 074 for the provision of renovation of Blocks B and C, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?

(12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

CONNELL WAGNER (WA) PTY LTD'S CONTRACT

1601. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Connell Wagner (WA) Pty Ltd worth approximately \$129 100 for the provision of consultancy services Loftus Street duplication, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

PB & KA BRAJKOVICH'S CONTRACT

1602. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm PB & KA Brajkovich worth approximately \$90 000 and \$37 000 for the provision of demolition of Block J and demolition of building in Newcastle Street, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

#### TRANSFIELD THEISS JOINT VENTURE'S CONTRACT

1609. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Transfield Theiss Joint Venture worth approximately \$59.3m for the design and construction East Parade to Great Eastern Highway, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

#### MOLTONI CORPORATION'S CONTRACT

1610. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Moltoni Corporation worth approximately \$141 600 for the provision of demolition Block A and part Block B, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

**BGC'S ROAD MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS**

1611. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question without notice 903 in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm BGC worth approximately \$5.63m for the provision of road maintenance contracts to September 1997, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

**HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PTY LTD'S CONTRACT**

1612. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 31 in relation to the Transport Department's contracts with the firm Highway Construction Pty Ltd worth approximately \$12.5m (contract 671/95) for road construction on Burkett Road and approximately \$8.4m (contract 582/95) for the provision of road construction on sections of Great Eastern Highway, can the Minister advise in each case -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

#### HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PTY LTD'S CONTRACT

1613. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1693 of 1996 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Highway Construction Pty Ltd worth approximately \$9.5m plus \$4.5m in variations for the provision of construction Reid Highway (contract 118/92), can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

#### EVANS AND PECK MANAGEMENT'S CONTRACT

1614. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Evans and Peck Management worth approximately \$339 025 for the provision of management service for contract, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?
- (7) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (8) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (9) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (10) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (11) Who are the directors of the company?
- (12) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

BORAL LTD'S CONTRACT

1616. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 31 in relation to the Transport Department's following contracts with the firm Boral Ltd worth approximately \$10.4m (contract 118/95) maintenance contract in the Pilbara and MidWest regions, \$1.7m (contract 414/95) for road construction in the National Park Section of Port Gregory to Kalbarri Road, and \$449 500 (contract 520/95) for the construction of surcharge embankment for eastern approach to Burswood Bridge, can the Minister advise in each of these cases -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

EVANS AND PECK MANAGEMENT'S CONTRACT

1622. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Evans and Peck Management worth approximately \$176 420 for the provision of service and contract management support, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

EVANS AND PECK MANAGEMENT'S CONTRACT

1623. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Evans and Peck Management worth approximately \$201 000 for the provision of project contract management services for contracts 19/95 and 404/95, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a business case conducted?
- (2) Did it include a comprehensive cost benefit analysis?
- (3) If so, what did it show?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What were the identified inherent risks?
- (6) What other options were considered?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

## WOODWARD CLYDE PTY LTD'S CONTRACT

1630. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Woodward Clyde Pty Ltd worth approximately \$47 250 for the provision of geotechnics consultants services, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

## TOWN AND COUNTRY DEMOLITION'S CONTRACT

1631. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Town and Country Demolition worth approximately \$45 600 for the provision of demolition of Block C, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

## MOLTONI CORPORATION'S CONTRACT

1632. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Moltoni Corporation worth approximately \$46 880 for the provision of demolition of Lone Star Hotel, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

MOLTONI CORPORATION'S CONTRACT

1633. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Moltoni Corporation worth approximately \$73 880 for the provision of demolition of Western Power Building, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

RAPTOR DEMOLITION'S CONTRACT

1634. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Raptor Demolition worth approximately \$105 800 for the provision of demolition of Block D, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.

QUALITY AND TECHNICAL SERVICES' CONTRACT

1635. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Minister for Transport:

Further to the answer given to question on notice 1808 asked in the Legislative Assembly in relation to the Transport Department's contract with the firm Quality and Technical Services worth approximately \$176 840 for the provision of service quality systems management, can the Minister advise -

- (1) Was a due diligence check carried out on the contractor before the above contract was awarded?
- (2) If yes, did it include a check of the contractors financial background?
- (3) Who carried out the financial background check?
- (4) If the contractor is a company, when was the company formed and what is its share capitalisation?
- (5) Who are the directors of the company?
- (6) Are any of the company directors Ministers or senior public servants?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

Refer to response to Parliamentary Question, Legislative Council 1599.



## ALLANOOKA BORE FIELD CATCHMENT AREA

1650. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the Water and Rivers Commission carried out a Water Allocation plan for the catchment area around the Allanooka bore field?
- (2) If no, when will one be carried out?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes. A review of the allocation plan for this area is currently being undertaken, to be completed in the 1998/99 financial year.
- (2) Not applicable.

## ALLANOOKA BORE FIELD WATER LICENCES

1651. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

Does the Water and Rivers Commission have a policy of not issuing water licences in the area around Allanooka bore field?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

No.

## SEWERAGE CONTRACTS, GERALDTON

1652. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) In the last three years have any contractors carrying out sewerage work for the Water Corporation in the Geraldton region not met the standards required in their contract?
- (2) If yes, for each occasion what penalties have been imposed?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

- (1) All contracts in the Infill Sewerage Program have met the standards required.
- (2) Nil.

## SEWERAGE CONTRACT VARIATIONS

1654. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) How many variations to infill sewerage contracts have been requested in the last three years?
- (2) How many have been approved, and to whom?
- (3) What is the value of variations approved in each case?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

- (1) Almost all contracts have some form of variation.
- (2) I am not prepared to request the Water Corporation to commit the high level of resources necessary to research and compile this commercially confidential information.
- (3) Any information relating to variations in contracts between the Water Corporation and its contractors is commercially confidential.

## SEWERAGE PROJECTS, MID WEST REGION

1655. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) In each of the last three years how much has been spent on in fill sewerage projects in the Mid West region by the Water Corporation?
- (2) How much is planned to be spent in the next three years?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

- |     |         |               |
|-----|---------|---------------|
| (1) | 1994/95 | \$2.8 million |
|     | 1995/96 | \$6.9 million |
|     | 1996/97 | \$6.5 million |
| (2) | 1997/98 | \$5.5 million |
|     | 1998/99 | \$9.5 million |
|     | 1999/00 | \$7.4 million |

#### WATER RATES INCREASE

1659. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Did the Minister for Water Resources receive advice from the Office of Water Regulation prior to announcing the recent water rates and charges?
- (2) If yes, will the Minister table that advice?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. The advice was verbal.

#### WATER EXPLORATION LICENCES ON MINING LEASES

1660. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Does the Water and Rivers Commission issue water exploration licences in areas covered by mining leases?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon MAX EVANS replied:

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

#### MINISTER'S ITINERARY FOR USA AND CANADA

1672. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will the Minister table the itinerary for his visits to USA and Canada from July 8 to August 2, 1997?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) A copy of the itinerary is tabled for the information of the member. [See paper No 1630.]
- (2) Not applicable.

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### AMSWA ATTITUDE MONITORING STUDIES

**1562. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:**

- (1) Will the Leader of the House table all those documents described as "(AMSWA) Attitude Monitoring" studies prepared for the Office of the Premier by West Coast Field Services, or any other organisation, as well as all written or electronic documents, notes and reports made or prepared by any person in the Premier's office in which the contents of any verbal briefings by West Coast Field Services or AMR Quantum Research relating to these studies are recorded or analysed?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If yes, when?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(3) The Government tables in Parliament written reports on each wave of the Attitude Monitoring Study - Western Australia conducted under the contract between the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet and West Coast Field Services. There are no other records relating to the Attitude Monitoring Study - Western Australia provided to the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet as they are classified under the contract as proprietary and the property of AMR: Quantum Harris.

"BRINGING THEM HOME" REPORT

**1563. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:**

Which recommendations of the "Bringing Them Home" report into the stolen generation has the State Government implemented over the past 12 months?

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question. Of the 54 recommendations contained in the "Bringing Them Home" report less than 20 require implementation by State Governments. The remainder fall within the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, churches and/or non-government agencies. Of those which relate directly to state government policies, recommendations 3, 4, 5, 9, 13 and 23 have been fully or partially implemented in the past 12 months.

SEX OFFENDERS, LOITERING OFFENCE

**1564. Hon N.D. GRIFFITHS to the Attorney General:**

- (1) Has a version of an offence to do with loitering by sex offenders been submitted to Cabinet for consideration for inclusion in the Criminal Code?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If not, why not?

**Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

I am not sure that I am the right person to be asked that question.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: You are. You are responsible for the Criminal Code.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Nick Griffiths can ask the question. I will decide whether it is in order or not.

Hon PETER FOSS: Mr President, I think the offence of loitering is covered by the Police Act, not the Criminal Code. I do not think that I am the right person to be asked that question. The member may want to put the question on notice. However, I do not know that we would answer it as I do not think it is appropriate for us to give details of what occurs in Cabinet.

SPECIES AND ECOSYSTEMS - RESPONSE TO DISTURBANCES

**1565. Hon NORM KELLY to the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment:**

In the answer to question on notice 1532, tabled on 19 May, the Minister stated that independent reports on the response of species and ecosystems to disturbance are publicly available. The Minister repeated this statement in a media release yesterday.

- (1) Is the Minister aware that these reports are still not publicly available in Western Australia?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that, contrary to the comprehensive regional assessment report, copies of these reports are not available on the Internet?
- (3) Given that these documents are important in assessing options for a final regional forest agreement, will the Minister extend the current public consultation period to allow for due consideration to be given to these reports?
- (4) Will the Minister table these reports?

**Hon MAX EVANS replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) These reports have been available on request from the Department of Conservation and Land Management or from the commonwealth government agencies involved in the RFA process since 11 May and have been made available to those stakeholders who have requested them.
- (2) Only the major RFA reports have been published on the Internet.
- (3) No, as the documents are available.
- (4) CALM will forward the member a copy of the reports today.

FREMANTLE EASTERN BYPASS TRAFFIC STUDY REPORT

**1566. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for Transport:**

I refer to the contract awarded to Halpern Glick and Maunsell for the production of the report "Fremantle Eastern Bypass - Traffic Study".

- (1) When and where were the tender details advertised?
- (2) How many companies or organisations lodged tenders?
- (3) What was the cost of the winning tender?
- (4) What was the cost of the unsuccessful tenders?
- (5) When was the contract awarded and the final report completed?
- (6) Was the Minister aware that Halpern Glick and Maunsell had a contract to carry out planning work for part of the proposed Fremantle-Rockingham controlled access highway, a road that is proposed to link into the proposed Fremantle eastern bypass?

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(2) This work was undertaken as a variation to an existing contract.
- (3) \$17 920.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) The variation was awarded in May 1997 and the final report completed in August 1997.
- (6) Contracts up to and including \$500 000 are awarded by the Commissioner of Main Roads. Similarly, the variation was approved by Main Roads.

POLICE CHILD ABUSE UNIT

**1567. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:**

- (1) How many cases of child abuse have been reported to the police child abuse unit in the past 12 months?
- (2) How many cases of child pornography have been reported to the police child abuse unit over the past 12 months?
- (3) How many cases of child prostitution have been reported to the police child abuse unit over the past 12 months?
- (4) How many child abuse officers are employed in the police child abuse unit?
- (5) What are the qualifications of the child abuse officers?

**Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question. Can I ask for a little time because I have the question and an answer attached -

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: You had an answer this morning.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon PETER FOSS: I have the question and I have an answer attached to it but it is quite clear that the answer has nothing to do with the question.

Hon Tom Stephens: Nor are funds attached to the unit.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon PETER FOSS: I am sure it has nothing to do with the child abuse unit but I will check the papers and find the right one.

#### KIMBERLEY STOLEN GENERATION STEERING COMMITTEE

**1568. Hon HELEN HODGSON to the Minister representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:**

- (1) Has the Western Australian Aboriginal Affairs Department been negotiating with the Kimberley Stolen Generation Steering Committee regarding the facilitation of a workshop that would lead to the establishment of a link-up centre situated in the Kimberley?
- (2) Has the Aboriginal Affairs Department made a decision on whether to fund this workshop?
- (3) If no, when will a decision be made?
- (4) If yes, what amount of funding will be provided?

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Funding of link-up centres is a responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. The State Government is negotiating with the Commonwealth Government in relation to the allocation of funding in Western Australia.
- (4) Not applicable.

#### MT CHARLOTTE REWARD MINE

**1569. Hon GIZ WATSON to the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment:**

In respect of answers to question on notice 1523 of 5 April 1998 and with reference to the proposed mining of the Mt Charlotte Reward ore body in Kalgoorlie, can the Minister advise -

- (1) At the Williamstown residents' meeting on Friday, 18 February 1998, did a member of the public ask the Department of Environmental Protection officer if the letter of objection to this proposed mine had been submitted?
- (2) What was the response of the DEP officer in attendance?
- (3) Was this letter of objection forwarded to the Perth DEP?
- (4) If yes to (3), and given that it was clear that a substantial number of Williamstown residents wished to object to this mine, why did neither the Perth DEP office nor the Kalgoorlie DEP office advise the authors of the letter of objection that they needed to reodge their letter during the period of appeal?

**Hon MAX EVANS replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(4) I refer the member to sections 7, 8 and 9 of question on notice 1523.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the next question without notice, the Attorney General has indicated he is now in a position to reply to the earlier question from Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich.

#### POLICE CHILD ABUSE UNIT

**1570. Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:**

- (1) How many cases of child abuse have been reported to the police child abuse unit in the past 12 months?

- (2) How many cases of child pornography have been reported to the police child abuse unit over the past 12 months?
- (3) How many cases of child prostitution have been reported to the police child abuse unit over the past 12 months?
- (4) How many child abuse officers are employed in the police child abuse unit?
- (5) What are the qualifications of the child abuse officers?

**Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

Part of the problem arises from the fact that many members of the Opposition have asked almost the identical question, at least in some part.

- (1) 1997 calendar year - 752 cases reported; 1998 calendar year (as at 26 May 1998) - 268 cases reported.
- (2) Thirty-one cases reported.
- (3) One matter relating to an alleged child prostitution ring - matter not substantiated.

I should explain that prostitution is normally dealt with by the vice squad. It is only in cases where the child is of tender years that the matter would be referred to the child abuse centre.

- (4) Authorised staff for the unit totals 20 - I think I read this to the House earlier -

One detective senior sergeant who has been seconded to the Shoalwater taskforce and will resume with the unit on 27 May 1998.

Three detective sergeants.

Seven investigators.

Six interviewing officers

One crime analyst - this position had been vacant since April 1998 when the analyst left to join the Victoria Police; it will be filled shortly.

Two typist/receptionists.

In addition, other personnel in the districts are involved in investigating allegations of child abuse.

- (5) Experience of current squad members is as follows -

All investigative staff currently with the unit have a minimum of 13 years' police experience including six years' experience in the area of criminal investigation.

All detective staff have successfully completed at least two four-week detective training courses of which child abuse and sexual assault are a component.

All detective staff have had extensive experience in the investigation of criminal offences, including offences of child sexual abuse, prior to attending the child abuse unit.

Five of the six interviewing officers successfully completed a four day sexual assault investigators course.

One officer within the unit has a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology - Behavioural Science.

Five officers within the unit participated in the 1997 Australasian conference of child sexual assault investigators.

**POLICE CHILD ABUSE UNIT**

**1571. Hon CHERYL DAVENPORT to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:**

- (1) What is the average time period for a reported case of child sexual abuse to be investigated by the police child abuse unit?
- (2) How many cases arising from Operation Paradox in 1996 are still not completed?
- (3) How many cases of child sexual abuse are still waiting to be assigned?

- (4) How many cases are still waiting to be investigated?
- (5) How many reported cases have not been investigated each financial year from 1993-94 up to and including the present financial year due to their not meeting certain criteria, and what are those criteria?

**Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Unable to be determined. All investigations received by the child abuse unit are assessed and prioritised upon arrival. Time frames for each investigation depend upon the priorities that have been given.
- (2) Five complaints remaining. Four complaints are at write-off stage - no result. One complaint is continuing where the alleged offender is in prison.
- (3) A total of 93 cases have not yet been assigned and fall into the following categories -

Priority 1 - nil  
 Priority 2 - nil  
 Priority 3 - 35  
 Priority 4 - 58.

Priority 1 - responded to immediately. This relates to -

A child in immediate danger of being further abused by the alleged perpetrator.

Other children are in immediate danger of being further abused by the alleged perpetrator.

The alleged offender is a person in authority such as a police officer, school teacher or child carer.

A child receiving medical treatment or has died as a result of confirmed or suspected "non-accidental injuries".

Priority 2 - responded to within the applicable time frame. This relates to -

A child being removed from potential danger within a time frame such as an upcoming access visit.

An alleged perpetrator intending to flee from the State to avoid interview or apprehension.

Priority 3 relates to -

A child in no danger of being subjected to further abuse in the short or long term.

No extenuating circumstances being present giving rise to concerns for a child's safety or wellbeing.

Priority 4 relates to -

An historic complaint made by an adult.

No children in danger of abuse or continued abuse are included in the third and fourth priorities. No child who is either being abused or likely to continue to be abused is included in the cases that have not been commenced.

- (4) Ninety-three cases are still awaiting investigation; these are cases that are not yet assigned. They are all priority 3 or 4.
- (5) Unable to be determined. There are no existing criteria that prohibit an investigation from taking place. All matters are dealt with on a priority basis.

**LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS FROM BUNBURY**

**1572. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Transport:**

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that live sheep were exported through the Port of Bunbury last week?
- (2) If yes, when was he made aware of that situation?
- (3) Does he support a continuance of these exports through the Port of Bunbury?
- (4) If not, what action will be taken to stop these exports?

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:**

(1)-(2) I was advised after the event.

(3)-(4) Yes, I support that happening because Bunbury is a port. Like other ports it is there to provide a service to people who want to import and export products, which they can legally do provided they meet all the relevant conditions associated with that product. I look forward to all ports doing it even more efficiently than they currently are.

Hon Tom Stephens: Can we export the Minister for Transport?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

**LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS FROM BUNBURY**

**1573. Hon J.A. COWDELL to the Minister for Transport:**

My question relates to the renewed export of live sheep through the Port of Bunbury.

- (1) Have any members of State or Federal Parliament contacted the Minister's office expressing concerns about these exports?
- (2) If yes, who contacted him?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that the Bunbury City Council voted to ban the live sheep trade through Bunbury?

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:**

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The Bunbury City Council does not run the Bunbury port.

**BLACKWOOD VALLEY PROPERTIES**

**1574. Hon CHRISTINE SHARP to the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment:**

Some notice of this question has been given. It concerns the selling of properties in the Blackwood Valley.

- (1) Can the Minister for the Environment advise whether the Department of Conservation and Land Management has plans to sell Ferndale Homestead and Southampton House?
  - (a) If so, will conservation plans be prepared and when are these plans expected to be completed?
  - (b) What are the conditions of the heritage agreement set by CALM on the disposal of the properties to private owners?
  - (c) What price is being put on these properties?
  - (d) What will happen to the funds raised by the sales?
- (2) The Department of Conservation and Land Management is currently offering Folly plantation near Nannup for sale. It is next to the water supply for Nannup. Can the Minister advise what steps are being taken to protect the water supply of Nannup?
- (3) Can the Minister advise if the Department of Conservation and Land Management plans to sell the block which contains the water supply itself in its future land sales program?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will call the Minister for Finance but I am unsure whether the question comprised a number of separate and distinct questions.

**Hon MAX EVANS replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Both Ferndale Homestead and Southampton House are being considered for sale in future stages of CALM's property disposal program.
  - (a) Conservation programs are being prepared for Ferndale Homestead and Southampton House. Completion is expected in the next three to four months.



- (b) The conditions of the heritage agreements relating to Ferndale Homestead and Southampton House will be set when the conservation plans are completed.
  - (c) A sale price for Ferndale Homestead and Southampton House will not be established until the heritage procedures are complete and a firm decision has been made for sale.
  - (d) If sold, funds raised by the sales will be applied to debt retirement and to assist in financing an afforestation program under the State's salinity action plan.
- (2)-(3) Action is being taken to create a separate lot for the land containing the Nannup town water supply. CALM has reached agreement with the Water Corporation on the process for the transfer of this lot to the corporation. The balance of the existing lot is not required to protect the water supply and is being considered for sale.

#### POLICE CHILD ABUSE UNIT

##### **1575. Hon BOB THOMAS to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:**

- (1) What was the budget for the police child abuse unit for the 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97 financial years and what is it for the 1997-98 and 1998-99 financial years?
- (2) What was the budget allocation in relation to dealing with graffiti for these years?
- (3) How many calls has the police child abuse unit received in relation to child prostitution so far this year?
- (4) How many of these calls have led to the unit investigating complaints?
- (5) How many complaints have been investigated as a result of these calls to the unit?

##### **Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

I had a little trouble finding this question. I knew I had seen it but it is actually in Hon John Halden's name.

Hon Tom Stephens: Yes, it is.

Hon PETER FOSS: The answer is -

- (1) For the years 1993-94 to 1995-96 the operating costs of the child abuse unit were included as part of the overall budget for the crime operations portfolio. Since 1996-97 an allocation has been made to the unit for such expenses as overtime and specialised equipment. These allocations are -

1996-97	\$68 000
1997-98	\$72 606
1998-99	\$74 600 (estimated)

These allocations are in addition to the routine operating costs such as salaries, accommodation and vehicle expenses. In addition, other personnel in the districts are also involved in investigating child abuse allegations.

- (2) The information sought is not kept by the Police Service. There is no budget allocation specifically for graffiti offences.
- (3) None. Matters pertaining to child prostitution are usually dealt with by the police vice squad; for example, 17 and 18 year olds. Where children of tender years are involved, the matter would be referred to the child abuse unit. I think I mentioned in answer to another question that one was so referred.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) None.

#### POLICE OFFICER WITH MESOTHELIOMA

##### **1576. Hon TOM HELM to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:**

- (1) Has the Minister been made aware that a former police officer who lived and worked in Wittenoom in the 1950s has recently been diagnosed with mesothelioma?
- (2) What opportunities exist for the expeditious handling of a compensation claim from the former officer in order to ensure that the best medical, nursing and palliative care is available to him for the anticipated remaining short period of his life?

- (3) Will the Minister ensure that steps are taken to assist this police officer and his family?

**Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(3) The Commissioner of Police has been advised by the former officer's solicitors that he lived and worked in Wittenoom in the 1950s and has recently been diagnosed as having developed mesothelioma. I am aware that the former officer's solicitors have given notice of an intention to commence common law proceedings against CSR Ltd and Midalco Pty Ltd. Facilities exist in the courts for the expeditious handling of common law claims.

I realise that does not answer the member's question. I am not sure that the Minister for Police can answer that question. It is more likely to be somebody else, because the member wanted to know about medical, nursing and palliative care, which I do not think would be handled by the Minister for Police. I could refer that back to the Minister.

Hon Tom Helm: He could take an interest.

Hon PETER FOSS: Any claim for compensation by the former officer against the State will be handled expeditiously.

#### CITY BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Land Valuation*

**1577. Hon E.R.J. DERMER to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Education:**

I refer to the Minister's advice on 28 April 1998 that the sizeable difference between the valuations for City Beach Senior High School land and buildings by Chesterton International and the Valuer General's Office are the result of complications the Valuer General's Office envisions with the possible clearing of remnant bushland at the site, which was not factored into Chesterton International's valuation.

- (1) Does the Minister attribute the sizeable difference between the valuations to complications with the possible clearing of remnant bushland at the site?
- (2) Has the Minister established whether the valuation conducted by the Valuer General's Office or that conducted by Chesterton International more accurately indicates the actual value of the site?
- (3) If yes, which of these valuations does more accurately indicate the actual value of the site?
- (4) Have further valuations been commissioned for the purpose of verifying the most accurate valuation for the site?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) The Valuer General's Office stated that the valuation for highest and best use is \$7.8m. The Valuer General's Office also stated that this value takes into consideration the potential restrictions imposed by the Environmental Protection Authority as it lies within the boundaries of Bold Park Regional Reserve. A value free of this restriction has been assessed at \$15.75m. The value \$15.75m is similar to the Chesterton International valuation of \$15.3m.
- (2)-(3) As the valuation of \$7.8m reflects the potential risks associated with the disposal of the land, it is both prudent and proper to use this valuation for planning purposes.
- (4) No.

#### ROTTNEST ISLAND AUTHORITY

##### *Motor Vehicles*

**1578. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Tourism:**

I refer to the Minister's answer to question on notice 1502, and in particular to the number of vehicles leased or owned by the Rottneest Island Authority.

- (1) Has the number of vehicles increased since employees of the authority were moved off the island and, if so, by how many and at what increased cost?
- (2) Was this increase taken into account in determining the potential cost savings when the decision was made to move employees off the island and, if not, why not?
- (3) Why does the authority have such a high proportion of vehicles compared with the number of its employees?
- (4) Will the Minister identify which positions have vehicles and the vehicle that each position has, and what is the criteria for allocating vehicles?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) The figures cited in the answer to question 1502 include fire service vehicles, vehicles leased to contractors and those vehicles that were based in the Fremantle office. The Fremantle office vehicles have decreased from four to two in the 1997-98 financial year.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Under the Rottnest Island Authority Act the authority is responsible for the control and management of the entire island. This includes tourist services, including luggage handling; asset maintenance; waste and rubbish management systems; power and water utilities; emergency repairs; environmental management; heritage management; ranger services; freight deliveries; and bus and coach operations.  
  
In the development of a facilities management contract on the island, the number of vehicles leased or owned by the authority will decrease by at least 19 by the end of the 1997-98 financial year.
- (4) Staff on after hours maintenance call-out on Rottnest Island are allocated use of vehicles on an as needed basis. This includes the emergency plumber, electrician, carpenter mechanic, airport manager and rangers. Other staff within the authority with vehicles are the chief executive officer and the director management and policy who garages a pool vehicle from the Fremantle office. I am happy to provide more detailed information if it is required.

SECONDARY EDUCATION, YEARS 11 AND 12

*Student Leaving Rate*

**1579. Hon RAY HALLIGAN to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Education:**

- (1) Will the Minister indicate what percentage of school students currently leave secondary school prior to years 11 and 12?
- (2) Is the Government examining ways in which more students can be encouraged to stay within the education system?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

I am advised by the Education Department that -

- (1) In government schools in years 10 to 11 the figure in 1997 was 14.9 per cent and for years 11 to 12 it was 26.2 per cent. In non-government schools in years 10 to 11 the figure is 10 per cent and in years 11 to 12 it is 12.4 per cent.
- (2) Yes. The Government is looking at a range of options to encourage greater retention in post-compulsory years of education, including the use of technology, flexible delivery and allowing some students to study tertiary level units in year 12. However, several major initiatives will ensure that student study programs in years 11 and 12 are relevant to students' post-school options. Included in these initiatives are the successful vocational education and training in schools programs and the review of post-compulsory education recently announced by the Minister for Education, Mr Barnett.

Projections for VET in 1998 indicate that 4 700 students in 85 high schools will participate in vocational training. This represents a sizeable improvement on previous years and the expansion of this program is expected to encourage even more students to stay on in school.

In addition the Curriculum Council will be conducting a review of post-compulsory education and making recommendations for future directions in post-compulsory schooling. The review will involve considerable community consultation and will ensure that post-compulsory education in Western Australia is well placed to meet the needs of students, the training and education sector, and employers into the next century.

#### DOMBAKUP BLOCK, LOGGING

**1580. Hon NORM KELLY to the Minister representing Minister for the Environment:**

- (1) What is the total area of Dombakup block?
- (2) How much of Dombakup has been clear felled in the past 25 years?
- (3) How much of Dombakup is reserved from logging as formal conservation reserve and informal conservation reserve?
- (4) Is Dombakup coupe 24 scheduled for logging this year and, if so, when is logging scheduled to commence?
- (5) Have any assessments of the natural, social and cultural heritage values of Dombakup 24 been undertaken and, if so, by whom?

**Hon MAX EVANS replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) 8 960 ha.
- (2) 2 800 ha.
- (3) A proposal in the forest management plan 1994-2003 is for a formal conservation reserve of 60 ha, and 2 720 ha of informal conservation reserves along streams and travel routes and within diverse ecotype zones.
- (4) Yes. Sometime during 1998 it is anticipated that a net area of 70 ha will be logged dependent on sawlog market and weather conditions.
- (5) Yes. Rare flora inspection by Rod Annear, a Department of Conservation and Land Management officer, on 17 January 1998; review of numerous other recorded sensitive sites from CALM's geographic information system and local records by various CALM officers on 19 December 1997; Australian Heritage Commission assessment of the national estate values in the southern forest region; forest management plan 1994-2003 approved by the Government following wide liaison by CALM officers with about 20 neighbours by mail and meetings in Northcliffe during March, April and May 1998; landscape management by landscape architect, John Cleary; and currently an assessment of a cultural site is being undertaken.

#### POLICE CHILD ABUSE UNIT

##### *Qualifications and Training*

**1581. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police:**

- (1) Do the police working in the police child abuse unit have any special qualifications; within the areas of child abuse or child sexual abuse?
- (2) If so, what are those qualifications and what is the status of those qualifications; for example, are they degrees or diplomas?
- (3) What other training are they given prior to their involvement in or being given cases, over what period is this training and is it regularly updated?
- (4) If no training is provided prior to this time, why not?

**Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

- (1)-(2) These answers have already been given.
- (3)-(4) All police officers attend information seminars regarding child abuse in the Police Academy. Detective staff receive additional training while in detective training school. At the unit, each interviewing officer undergoes a period of specialised on-the-job training. During their first two weeks with the unit, interviewing officers work exclusively with an experienced interviewer. Interviewers' performances are constantly monitored and corrective measures are put in place where required.

## ALBANY LIBRARY FUNDING

**1582. Hon MURIEL PATTERSON to the Minister for the Arts:**

- (1) How much funding has been allocated to the Albany Town Council Library over the last three years?
- (2) Has any increase been made in the funding directed to the purchase of additional books or other forms of information services in that time?

**Hon PETER FOSS replied:**

- (1) Under the arrangement for public circulating libraries in Western Australia, the State, in a partnership between the State and local government, provides circulating book stock and local government provides the building, staff and permanent collections. Accordingly, the Government of Western Australia, through the Library Board of Western Australia, does not provide funding to local authorities, including Albany.

Many people do not realise how fortunate we are with our library system in Western Australia, which is probably the envy of all other States. The State spends huge amounts of money on books and can buy them in bulk at a good price. Also, everybody in the State has access to the books, which are circulated around the State. In other States, money is provided directly to the libraries, which purchase their own stock. That system does not have the same buying power of our system and does not make material available throughout different areas. People in the smallest towns of Western Australia have access to the same books as everyone else.

- (2) The State has consistently increased funding for book stock and has participated in other information service initiatives. Members may recall that we called tenders for Internet services, and all regional libraries now have access to the Internet.

## FREMANTLE PORT AUTHORITY

*Meetings with Police and Security Firm***1583. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Minister for Transport:**

Further to the Minister's answer to question without notice 1536 regarding the meeting between the Fremantle Port Authority and the Western Australia Police Service -

- (1) Who were the FPA staff who attended?
- (2) Was the Minister advised at any point that discussion had taken place with the police; if so, when was the Minister so advised?
- (3) What information was the Minister provided with?

**Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:**

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Kerry Sanderson, Steve Wade and Eric Atkinson.
- (2) Prior to the meeting occurring, the chief executive officer advised my office that in view of the general speculation in the Press regarding possible disruptions on the waterfront, discussions would be initiated with the police to ensure they were aware of a possible need for police assistance.
- (3) General information as set out above was provided prior to the meeting. Exact details, and the time and place of the meeting, were not provided.

## ABORIGINAL AND ISLANDER EDUCATION WORKERS

**1584. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Education:**

- (1) Does the Minister recognise that Aboriginal and Islander education workers fulfil a vital role in education in many schools throughout the State, and that many are providing education support of the highest standard?
- (2) When will the Minister be taking steps to ensure pay structures and promotional opportunities exist for AIEWs to ensure they receive appropriate remuneration commensurate with their contribution to the education system?

- (3) If the Minister does not plan to take any such steps, why not?

**Hon N.F. MOORE replied:**

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Minister has recently agreed to launch the Education Department's Aboriginal employment and careers action plan, which recognises the importance of Aboriginal and Islander education workers, and contains as key strategies the development of appropriate training, remuneration and career pathways for AIEWs.
- (3) Not applicable.
-