

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

QUESTIONS

No. 76

Wednesday, April 17 2002

Questions appear according to the date on which notice was delivered.
When a question has been answered it is removed from the postponed list.

POSTPONED QUESTIONS

Notice Given *Wednesday, March 20 2002*

- 507. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
- 510. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
- 514. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
- 521. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

Notice Given *Thursday, March 21 2002*

- 523. Hon Alan Cadby to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Education
- 525. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
- 526. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
- 527. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
- 529. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Postponed Questions

530. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development

Notice Given ***Tuesday, March 26 2002***

531. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
532. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
533. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development

Notice Given ***Wednesday, March 27 2002***

535. Hon Norman Moore to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
537. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for Energy
538. Hon George Cash to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
539. Hon Norman Moore to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Tourism
541. Hon Jim Scott to the Leader of the House representing the Premier
542. Hon Jim Scott to the Leader of the House representing the Premier

Notice Given ***Tuesday, April 9 2002***

543. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
544. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
545. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
546. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
547. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
548. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
549. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
550. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Energy
551. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Postponed Questions

552. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
553. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
554. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
555. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
556. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
557. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
558. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
559. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
560. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
561. Hon Robyn McSweeney to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Health
563. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
564. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
565. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
566. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
567. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
568. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Education
569. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure

Notice Given ***Wednesday, April 10 2002***

570. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
571. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development
572. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Postponed Questions

573. Hon Christine Sharp to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
574. Hon Christine Sharp to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

Notice Given ***Thursday, April 11 2002***

575. Hon Dee Margetts to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for Energy
576. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
577. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Health
578. Hon Jim Scott to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
579. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
580. Hon John Fischer to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

Notice Given ***Tuesday, April 16 2002***

581. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
582. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
583. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Consumer and Employment Protection

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

QUESTIONS ASKED TODAY

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

584. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development

I refer to question on notice No. 421 of Tuesday, February 26 2002 and the answers provided -

- (1) Is it correct that all staff within the Department of Mineral and Petroleum Resources, including staff in the Minister's office, have an obligation to provide accurate, thorough, honest, unbiased information and advice to the Minister?
- (2) If not, what are the staff within the Department and Minister's office obligations?
- (3) Has the Department of Mineral and Petroleum Resources provided incorrect and misleading information to the Minister and Parliament in advising that Mr Hounslow was interviewed on March 6 2002 concerning his complaint of February 15 2002?
- (4) If yes, will the Minister apologise to the Parliament and ask the Department to apologise to Mr Hounslow?
- (5) Will the Minister ensure that the Department of Mineral and Petroleum Resources does not provide him with further incorrect and misleading information and advice on any issue?
- (6) If not, why not?
- (7) Has the Department provided incorrect and misleading information in stating the 'mine having shut down ...', given the mine has not shut down when KCGM have still, as of Wednesday, March 20 2002, been conducting underground blasting at the Mt Charlotte/Cassidy Mine and KCGM has previously advised members of the public in May 2001 that they expect the final closure to be completed by June 2002?
- (8) If not, why not?
- (9) Will the Minister provide the specific date on which the mine shut down and the Department was notified of the suspension of mining operations in accordance with Regulation 3.12 and 3.15 of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Regulations 1995*?
- (10) If yes to (7), will the Minister apologise to the Parliament and ask the Department to apologise to Mr Hounslow?
- (11) Can the Minister explain how the Mt Charlotte/Cassidy Mine is shut down given that KCGM has previously advised members of the public that they have approximately 30 percent of the Mt Charlotte workforce out of a total of 79 people originally employed still working on the mine?
- (12) If not, why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Wednesday, April 17 2002*

585. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development

I refer to a file note which I understand is signed by Jay Ranasooriya, Geotechnical Engineer dated February 4 1997 concerning Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines (KCGM) tailings storage facilities 1996 Annual Operational Audit, and a letter dated July 1 1996 signed by H Jones, Assistant Director Research and Technical Services addressed to Mr P W Rowe, Registered Manager, Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines reference HJ.FK 2009/96 -

- (1) Is it correct that the letter dated July 1 1996 in part states 'There is a remarkable similarity between this sequence of events as indicated in your letter and the sequence of events which resulted in the Harmony tailings disaster in South Africa approximately two years ago. The matter is currently before the courts in South Africa with the technical press reporting that both the operating company and the contractors are being prosecuted following the failure of the tailings structure. The Department requires an immediate change of operating practices at Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines so that the Fimiston II tailing storage facility is operated with the minimum operating freeboard of 0.5m as stated in the Notice of Intent dated October 1994.'?
- (2) If yes, why did the Department request an immediate change of operating practices in relation to the minimum operating freeboard?
- (3) If no to (1), will the Minister state what was specifically stated in the letter?
- (4) Is it correct that the letter dated July 1 1996 in part states 'I note that Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines has an unenviable record of management of their tailings structures and under these circumstances believe a detailed risk management analysis is essential.'?
- (5) If yes, can the Minister explain why KCGM has an unenviable record of management in relation to their tailings structures?
- (6) Will the Minister table a copy of the letter?
- (7) If no to (4), can the Minister state what was stated in the letter?
- (8) Is it correct that part of the file note dated February 4 1997 states 'While the results of the surveys show that the existing freeboard measurements are only partially satisfactory, KCGM has stated with respect to the freeboard that - 'it is intended that all future surveys will show compliance.'?'
- (9) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the file note?
- (10) If yes to (8), can the Minister state why the Department is concerned with compliance with minimum operational freeboard measurements on the tailings structures?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

586. Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development

I refer to the Annual Operational Audit Report 2000 of the Fimiston I and Fimiston II Tailings Storage Facilities, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that in the above report that in part it indicates that in June/July 1999 the operational freeboard of paddock C in TSF II was reduced to 100mm for a period of approximately four weeks?
- (2) If not, will the Minister state what was specifically stated in the report?
- (3) If yes to (1), why does the Department keep allowing KCGM to operate their tailings dams without the minimum required operating freeboard given this has occurred previously in 1996 and 1997?

587. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

I refer to the Gidgi Roaster and tailings dam licence operated by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd (KCGM) and all previous prosecutions undertaken by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the past 15 years -

- (1) Is it correct that the DEP sent a letter in September 2001 to KCGM with a copy of its licence conditions attached stating in part 'Under section 58 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, it is an offence to contravene a licence condition. This offence carries a penalty of up to \$125,000 with a daily penalty of up to \$25,000. The Department considers that a breach of this section, or any other section, of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* to be extremely serious'?
- (2) If yes, can the Minister explain why the Department considers that a breach of this section, or any other section of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* to be extremely serious?
- (3) If no to (1), will the Minister table a copy of the letter sent in September 2001 to KCGM?
- (4) Is it correct that condition number W10(b) on the current licence states 'The Licensee shall provide a copy of the results of the above sampling programme to the Department of Environmental Protection's Regional Office in Kalgoorlie. The reports shall be submitted to the DEP within six weeks of the end of each sampling period'?
- (5) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the Licence Conditions?
- (6) Can the Minister provide the specific date on which the fourth quarter 2001 Quarterly Report for the Gidgi Tailings storage facility monitoring report in accordance with licence conditions was received by the DEP Regional Office in Kalgoorlie?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) Has KCGM breached its current or previous licence conditions in not providing a copy of the monitoring results for the fourth quarter 2001 relating to the condition outlined in question (4) above within six weeks of the end of each sampling period?
- (9) If not, why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

- (10) If yes to (8), will the Department prosecute KCGM for breaching its licence conditions to clearly demonstrate that the Department considers a breach of section 58 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* or any other section to be extremely serious?

588. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

I refer to all previous prosecutions undertaken by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the past 15 years relating to the Mt Percy Tailings Storage Facility licence operated by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd (KCGM) and a letter dated February 20 2001 titled 'Quarterly Tailings Storage Facilities (TSF) Monitoring Reports, October - December 2000, Mt Percy TSF, Fimiston TSF, Gidgi TSF' addressed to Mr John Shipp, Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines -

- (1) Is it correct that the DEP sent a letter dated February 20 2001 to KCGM stating in part 'A review of the data provided demonstrates that monitoring has been conducted as per License Condition W7(a). However, I draw your attention to License condition W8 which outlines the annual reporting requirement. By the September 30 a report was required to be submitted which covered the monitoring results over the past year. No such report appears to have been received by the DEP'?
- (2) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the letter?
- (3) If yes to (1), why did the Department write KCGM pointing this out and why is it important?
- (4) Is it correct that KCGM responded in writing to the DEP concerning the Mt Percy Tailings Storage Facility with a letter dated March 13 2001 which in part states 'This monitoring report has not yet been produced ... KCGM has engaged groundwater consultant Peter Clifton and Associates to produce this report. It will be available by the end of April 2001 and will include all raw data and its interpretation up to the end of December 2000'?
- (5) Can the Minister state the specific text of licence condition W8 referred to in question (1) above?
- (6) If not, why not?
- (7) Has KCGM breached its licence condition W8 referred to question (1) above or any other licence condition?
- (8) If not, why not?
- (9) If yes to (7), will the DEP prosecute KCGM for breaching its licence conditions to clearly demonstrate that the Department considers a breach of Section 58 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* or any other section to be extremely serious?

589. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

I refer to all previous prosecutions undertaken by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the past 15 years relating to the Gidgi Tailings Storage Facility licence operated by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd (KCGM) and a letter dated February 20 2001 titled 'Quarterly

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

Tailings Storage Facilities (TSF) Monitoring Reports, October - December 2000, Mt Percy TSF, Fimiston TSF, Gidgi TSF' addressed to Mr John Shipp, Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines -

- (1) Is it correct that the DEP sent a letter dated February 20 2001 to KCGM stating in part under the heading Gidgi TSFs, 'The monitoring data submitted for the Gidgi TSF's was reviewed to confirm compliance with Condition W(10)(a) of your current license. The license requires the TDS to be monitored in PB R1 to PB R6, the Gidgi trench and the Gidgi decant in October of each year. This data does not appear to be provided.'?
- (2) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the letter?
- (3) If yes to (1), why did the Department write to KCGM pointing this out and why is it important for the Department to have monitoring data submitted in time to the Department in accordance with licence conditions?
- (4) Is it correct that KCGM responded in writing to the DEP concerning the Gidgi Tailings Storage Facility with a letter dated March 13 2001 which in part states 'This monitoring was performed within the scheduled timeframes, however, it was an oversight on our behalf as the results were not included in the quarterly report'?
- (5) Has KCGM breached licence condition W10(a) referred to in question (1) above or any other licence condition?
- (6) If not, why not?
- (7) If yes to (5), will the Department prosecute KCGM for breaching the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*?
- (8) Can the Minister explain how the monitoring of TDS as part of condition W10(a) can have been an oversight for not being included in the quarterly report given the following, KCGM is large company with a great deal of resources at its disposal or readily available to ensure such oversights do not occur, KCGM has previously been prosecuted by the Department of Environmental Protection for breaching sulphur dioxide limits at its Oroya, Paringa and Croesus Roasters, KCGM has been previously been prosecuted for causing pollution resulting from a spill of hypersaline water from it Fimiston II tailings dam destroying vegetation in its path and prosecution proceedings were implemented against KCGM for an alleged discharge of sulphur dioxide in excess of the allowable limit?
- (9) If not, why not?

590. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

I refer to all previous prosecutions undertaken by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the past 15 years relating to the Fimiston I and II tailings Storage Facility licence operated by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd (KCGM) and a letter dated February 20 2001 titled 'Quarterly Tailings Storage Facilities (TSF) Monitoring Reports, October - December 2000, Mt Percy TSF, Fimiston TSF, Gidgi TSF' addressed to Mr John Shipp, Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines -

- (1) Is it correct that the DEP sent a letter dated February 20 2001 to KCGM stating in part under the heading Fimiston TSF's 'The monitoring data submitted for the Fimiston TSF's was

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Wednesday, April 17 2002*

reviewed to confirm compliance with Condition W10 of your current license. It would appear that the following monitoring was not conducted as required -

- (a) pH and C to be monitored monthly (License Attachment 1- Row 1).
 - (b) Bores do not appear to have been monitored in November 2000. No Data provided for Neve's Dam.
 - (c) TDS, CN - free, CN - WAD and CN - Total to be monitored annually in October (License Attachment 1- Row 3).
 - (d) Required bores do not appear to have been monitored for these parameters pH, EC TDS, CN - Free, CN - WAD and CN -Total to be monitored in November (License Attachment 1- Row 9 and 10).
 - (e) Required bores do not appear to have been monitored for these parameters.
- (2) Can you please confirm whether monitoring was conducted as required?
 - (3) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the letter?
 - (4) If yes to (2), why did the Department write to KCGM pointing this out and why is it important for the Department to have monitoring data submitted in time to the Department and carried out in accordance with licence conditions?
 - (5) Is it correct that KCGM responded in writing to the DEP concerning the Fimiston Tailings Storage Facility with a letter dated March 13 2001 which in part states 'The schedule that was used for the sampling during this quarter had not been updated to reflect the latest licence condition. The schedule has now been updated. To rectify this the outstanding samples are being collected and analysed right now'?
 - (6) If not, will the Minister state what was specifically stated in the letter?
 - (7) Is it correct that both of the years, 2000 and 2001, licences have a condition on them which states 'The licensee shall ensure that any person who performs tasks on the premises is informed of all the conditions in this licence that relate to the task which that person is performing.'?
 - (8) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the years 2000 and 2001 licences?

591. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

I refer to all previous prosecutions undertaken by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the past 15 years relating to the Fimiston I and II tailings Storage Facility licences operated by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd (KCGM) and a letter dated February 20 2001 titled 'Quarterly Tailings Storage Facilities (TSF) Monitoring Reports, October - December 2000, Mt Percy TSF, Fimiston TSF, Gidgi TSF' addressed to Mr John Shipp, Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines -

- (1) Has KCGM breached licence condition number W10 on the Licence?
- (2) If not, why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

- (3) If yes to (1), will the Department prosecute KCGM for breaching licence conditions to demonstrate that the Department considers that a breach of this section, or any other section, of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* to be extremely serious?
- (4) Has KCGM breached condition number G2(c) of the September 2000 Licence or any condition on the licence for not ensuring that any person performing tasks on the premises is informed of all the conditions in the licence that relate to the tasks which that person is performing?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) If yes to (4), will the Department prosecute KCGM for breaching licence conditions?
- (7) Can the Minister explain how the written explanation from KCGM stating in part 'The Schedule that was used for sampling during this quarter had not been updated to reflect the latest condition' was simply accepted by the DEP given there is a licence condition which states 'The Licensee shall ensure that any person who performs tasks on the premises is informed of all the conditions in this licence that relate to the tasks which that person is performing'?
- (8) If not, why not?
- (9) Does the Minister and the Department agree that KCGM has a great deal of resources at its disposal or readily available to ensure that they comply with all licence conditions on all of their operations?
- (10) If not, why not?

592. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

I refer to the Fimiston I and II and tailings dam licences file number L137/88 operated by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd (KCGM) and all previous prosecutions undertaken by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the past 15 years -

- (1) Is it correct that the DEP sent two letters in September 2001 and September 2000 to KCGM with a copy of its licence conditions attached stating in part 'Under section 58 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, it is an offence to contravene a licence condition. This offence carries a penalty of up to \$125 000 with a daily penalty of up to \$25 000. The Department considers that a breach of this section, or any other section, of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* to be extremely serious.?'
- (2) If yes, can the Minister explain why the Department considers that a breach of this section, or any other section of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* to be extremely serious?
- (3) If no to (1), will the Minister table copies of both the letters sent in September 2001 and September 2000 to KCGM?
- (4) Is it correct that both the 2000 and 2001 licences have a condition on them which states 'The Licensee shall provide a copy of the results of the above sampling programme to the Department of Environmental Protection's Regional Office in Kalgoorlie. The reports shall be submitted to the DEP within six weeks of the end of each sampling period'?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

- (5) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the Licence Conditions?
- (6) Can the Minister provide the specific date on which the fourth quarter 2001 Quarterly Report for the Fimiston I and Fimiston II Tailings storage facility monitoring report in accordance with licence conditions was received by the DEP Regional Office in Kalgoorlie?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) Has KCGM breached its current or previous licence conditions in not providing a copy of the monitoring results for the fourth quarter 2001 Fimiston I and Fimiston II Tailings dams relating to the condition outlined in question (4) above within six weeks of the end of each sampling period?
- (9) If not, why not?
- (10) If yes to (8), will the Department prosecute KCGM for breaching its licence conditions given that KCGM were clearly previously alerted to comply with licence conditions by way of letters dated February 20 2001 and January 9 2001 and demonstrate that the Department considers a breach of section 58 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* or any other section to be extremely serious?

593. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

I refer to the Fimiston I and II and tailings dam licences file number L137/88 operated by Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines Pty Ltd (KCGM) and all previous prosecutions undertaken by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in the past 15 years -

- (1) Is it correct that both the 2000 and 2001 licences have a condition on it which states 'The Licensee shall provide a copy of the results of the above sampling programme to the Department of Environmental Protection's Regional Office in Kalgoorlie. The reports shall be submitted to the DEP within 6 weeks of the end of each sampling period'?
- (2) If not, will the Minister table a copy of the Licence conditions?
- (3) Can the Minister provide the specific date on which the second quarter 2001 Quarterly Report for the Fimiston I and Fimiston II Tailings storage facility monitoring report in accordance with licence conditions was received by the DEP Regional Office in Kalgoorlie?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) Can the Minister provide the specific date on which the third quarter 2001 Quarterly Report for the Fimiston I and Fimiston II Tailings storage facility monitoring report in accordance with licence conditions was received by the DEP Regional Office in Kalgoorlie?
- (6) Has KCGM breached its current or previous licence conditions in not providing a copy of the monitoring results for the third quarter 2001 Fimiston I and Fimiston II Tailings dams relating to the condition outlined in question (1) above within six weeks of the end of each sampling period?
- (7) If not, why not?
- (8) If yes to (6), will the Department prosecute KCGM for breaching its licence conditions?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Wednesday, April 17 2002*

594. Hon Dee Margetts to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Health

With regard to the funding for health facilities in Katanning -

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the business plan put forward by the Central Great Southern Health Service for the redevelopment of outpatient, accident and emergency/theatre facilities for Katanning Health Services?
- (2) What priority is the Government currently giving to health facilities at Katanning?
- (3) What funding assistance can the Central Great Southern Health Service expect from the Government to assist in this project and when?

595. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works

As the size of the Jervoise Bay Marine Complex has been considerably reduced from the original plan -

- (1) By how much has this reduced the cost of the project from the original budget estimates?
- (2) If the cost has not been reduced, why not?
- (3) How will the reduced size of the complex effect the returns to the Government?
- (4) Will the Minister table the cost-benefit analysis carried out on the reduced sized project?
- (5) If no analysis has been done, why not?

596. Hon Dee Margetts to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

With regard to a factory in Spring Road (along Jana Road), Thornlie operated by a company called Technical Services Limited in the early 1960s that reportedly emitted foul smelling fumes particularly at night -

- (1) Can the Minister confirm whether the factory produced Agent Orange, 245T, 2, 4D or any other herbicide?
- (2) If yes, when did the factory cease operating on that site and was the company then assisted financially by the State Government to relocate to Kwinana under the name of Kwinana Chemical Company?
- (3) What methods were implemented to remove any contamination from the Thornlie site and its surrounds?
- (4) Were any studies carried out in the area following the closure of the factory to determine the impacts of the emissions on surrounding soil, groundwater and the nearby Canning River?
- (5) Has any recent testing been carried out in the area to determine whether there are any long-term impacts of emissions particularly in relation to groundwater contamination?
- (6) If so, are there any indications that there is still evidence of contamination at, or surrounding, the site?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

597. Hon Peter Foss to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services
- (1) Is the Minister or the West Australian Police Service considering the closure of either the Wembley or Subiaco Police Stations?
 - (2) If so, why?
 - (3) Is the Minister or the West Australian Police Service considering the implementation of a 24 hour per day Police Station in the general Wembley/Subiaco region?
 - (4) If so, where will this be located?
 - (5) How will it be staffed and funded?
598. Hon Peter Foss to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services
- (1) Has the Police Service made a decision to replace its current standard issue police firearms with the Sigma pistol?
 - (2) Has the Government made a decision to replace the Police Service's standard issue police firearms with the Sigma pistol?
 - (3) If so -
 - (a) when was the Government's decision made;
 - (b) what is the total estimated cost of this initiative;
 - (c) has funding for the replacement been agreed to;
 - (d) what amounts and in what budget years; and
 - (e) what was the policy reason behind the decision?
 - (4) What is the total number of standard firearms currently issued to the Police Force?
 - (5) In particular, what make and type of firearms are they?
 - (6) How many are there of each type?
 - (7) What is it proposed should be done with those firearms which are to be replaced?
 - (8) Have any Sigma pistols been acquired?
 - (9) If so, when, how many and at what cost?
 - (10) Has any time or money been expended in training in the use of the Sigma pistol, whether of officers who will use the standard firearm or persons who will train officers to use them?
 - (11) If so, what amount of time and money has been spent?
 - (12) Has the Minister or the Police Force at any time subsequent to the decision to adopt the Sigma, considered adopting or decided to adopt as standard issue firearm, a firearm other than the Sigma?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given *Wednesday, April 17 2002*

- (13) If so -
- (a) when was that consideration given, or if a decision has been made, when was the decision made and by whom;
 - (b) what is the firearm adopted or being considered;
 - (c) what were the reasons for that decision or consideration;
 - (d) has the Government agreed to this;
 - (e) what is the unit cost of this new firearm compared to the Sigma; and
 - (f) what will happen to those Sigma pistols already purchased?
- (14) If a firearm other than the Sigma has been considered or adopted -
- (a) is it proposed that both firearms be used within the Police Force or that one be phased out and when;
 - (b) what costs will be thrown away be reason of this decision;
 - (c) will further training be required in the use of this new firearm; and
 - (d) what time or money has been expended, and will need to be expended in order to introduce this new firearm?
- (15) On how many occasions in each of the three last calendar years have officers, other than those within the TRG, discharged firearms in the course of their duties, other than in practice?
- (16) On how many occasions in each of the last three calendar years has an officer attempted to discharge a standard firearm in the course of their operational duties resulting in the failure of that firearm to discharge due to a malfunction?

L B MARQUET

Clerk of the Legislative Council