

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

QUESTIONS

No. 97

Tuesday, 29 June 2010

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, 19 May 2010***

2423. Hon Alison Xamon to the Minister for Environment

2424. Hon Alison Xamon to the Minister for Environment

Notice Given ***Wednesday, 26 May 2010***

2468. Hon Lynn MacLaren to the Minister for Energy representing the Minister for Local Government

Notice Given ***Thursday, 27 May 2010***

2469. Hon Alison Xamon to the Leader of the House representing the Premier

2471. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

2472. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

2473. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

2474. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment

2475. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

Notice Given ***Tuesday, 15 June 2010***

2477. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Environment

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Postponed Questions

- 2478. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Child Protection representing the Minister for Agriculture and Food
- 2479. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Environment
- 2480. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Training and Workforce Development
- 2481. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Training and Workforce Development
- 2482. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Training and Workforce Development
- 2483. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Training and Workforce Development
- 2484. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Training and Workforce Development
- 2485. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Training and Workforce Development
- 2486. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Energy representing the Minister for Police
- 2487. Hon Lynn MacLaren to the Minister for Environment
- 2488. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
- 2489. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
- 2490. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
- 2491. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
- 2492. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
- 2493. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
- 2494. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
- 2495. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Transport
- 2496. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Transport
- 2497. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Transport
- 2498. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Transport
- 2499. Hon Alison Xamon to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Commerce
- 2500. Hon Alison Xamon to the Minister for Transport
- 2501. Hon Alison Xamon to the Minister for Child Protection representing the Minister for Planning
- 2502. Hon Alison Xamon to the Minister for Child Protection representing the Minister for Planning
- 2503. Hon Alison Xamon to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Regional Development
- 2504. Hon Alison Xamon to the Minister for Transport
- 2505. Hon Alison Xamon to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Water
- 2506. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Energy representing the Minister for Police

Notice Given**Thursday, 17 June 2010**

- 2507. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Energy representing the Minister for Education

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Postponed Questions

2508. Hon Ken Travers to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Water
2509. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Energy representing the Minister for Emergency Services
2510. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Youth
2511. Hon Giz Watson to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Attorney General
2512. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
2513. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
2514. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
2515. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum
2516. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

Notice Given ***Tuesday, 22 June 2010***

2517. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Fisheries

Notice Given ***Wednesday, 23 June 2010***

2518. Hon Jon Ford to the Minister for Fisheries
2519. Hon Adele Farina to the Minister for Environment representing the Minister for Tourism

Notice Given ***Thursday, 24 June 2010***

2520. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Environment representing the Minister for Tourism
2521. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Training and Workforce Development
2522. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich to the Minister for Environment representing the Minister for Tourism

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

QUESTIONS ASKED TODAY

Notice given **Tuesday, 29 June 2010**

2523. Hon Nick Goiran to the Minister for Energy representing the Minister for Police

In reference to the claim of police permission under the previous containment policy made by Ms Mary-Anne Kenworthy in the article, 'Madam says she'll fight closure of brothel,' *The West Australian*, 21 June 2010, I ask -

- (1) Does any documentation exist, which supports Ms Kenworthy's claim, that permission to operate the brothel formerly known as Langtrees, and now operating under the name MacKenzie's, was granted by the Western Australian Police?
- (2) If yes to (1), will you table such documentation in Parliament?
- (3) If no to (2), why not?

2524. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Environment

- (1) Do the following species and subspecies, use Helms forest block in the Shire of Nannup as habitat, -
 - (a) carnaby's black cockatoo;
 - (b) baudin's black cockatoo; and
 - (c) red tailed black cockatoo?
- (2) Has the Department of Environment and Conservation, provided funding or other assistance to, the black cockatoo rehabilitation centre at Jalbarragup, near the Helms forest block?
- (3) If yes to (2), -
 - (a) in what years was the funding or other assistance provided;
 - (b) for each of those years, if funding was provided, how much; and
 - (c) for each of those years, if other assistance was provided, what was the nature and extent of the assistance?
- (4) To the best of the Department's knowledge, what further funding or other assistance has been directed to the conservation of black cockatoos, that use the Helms Forest Block as habitat?
- (5) If funding has declined or ceased, why is this?
- (6) Will you ensure adequate funding is provided to allow the rehabilitation centre to continue its work?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) Are you aware that the cockatoos released by the black cockatoo rehabilitation centre use Helms block for habitat?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (9) What logging does the Department understand to be planned for Helms forest block, up to and including 2013?
- (10) What will the impact of this logging be on, -
 - (a) carnaby's black cockatoos?
 - (b) baudin's black cockatoos which are in danger of extinction?
 - (c) red tailed black cockatoos?
 - (d) the release and survival of the black cockatoos from the rehabilitation centre?
- (11) What evidence is this assessment based on?
- (12) Do you acknowledge the vital role Helms block plays, in receiving rehabilitated cockatoos?
- (13) Are you aware that Helms block is the only block, within the range of the rehabilitation centre, that has not been extensively logged?
- (14) Where do you propose rehabilitated cockatoos be released, if the habitat in Helms is removed?

2525. Hon Jon Ford to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the Norseman Gold operations and the Bullen mine, and ask -

- (1) Have any complaints/concerns been received, both on the company's internal reporting system and by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP), concerning the primary ventilation system and the secondary ventilation system, at the Bullen mine in the last five years?
- (2) If yes to (1), -
 - (a) on what dates were the complaints/concerns received;
 - (b) what was the specific nature of each; and
 - (c) what action, was taken by the DMP, in response to these complaints or concerns?
- (3) How many inspections and on what dates, were any DMP inspections concerning the primary ventilation system and the secondary ventilation system at the Bullen mine, been conducted in the last five years?
- (4) Has any action been taken by the DMP, in relation to any problems found concerning the primary ventilation system and the secondary ventilation system, at the Bullen mine?
- (5) If yes to (4), what actions have been taken?

2526. Hon Jon Ford to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the Norseman Gold company and the Harlequin, Bullen and Okay operations, and ask -

- (1) How many inspections and what actions, have taken place, by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectors at the abovementioned operations in the past three years, and on what date each inspection took place?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (2) In particular, what inspections and actions have been taken by the DMP inspectorate, to ensure that the escape ways and the return airways, have been installed adequately and maintained to keep up with both the development and the production at these operations?
- (3) Are there any active levels of the above mentioned mines operating without escape ways and return airways?

2527. Hon Lynn MacLaren to the Minister for Child Protection representing the Minister for Agriculture and Food

I refer to the current negotiations involving Australia and the United States, over the Trans Pacific Free Trade Agreement (TPPFTA). The United States biotech industry group's submission on TPPFTA calls for no genetically engineered (GE) labelling, and for countries like Australia to discontinue any local safety testing on GE products, and ask -

- (1) What influence will the Trans pacific Free Trade Agreement have on GE food labelling in Western Australia?
- (2) Will the Minister support the continuation of local safety testing on GE products in Western Australia?

2528. Hon Lynn MacLaren to the Minister for Child Protection representing the Minister for Agriculture and Food

In reference to the interdepartmental committee on GM food labelling, I ask -

- (1) In the public consultation telephone survey of 400 people from 8 to 10 June 2010, what questions were asked?
- (2) Does the Minister believe that this is an accurate reflection of public opinion?
- (3) How many submissions to the committee on GM food labelling, from prominent national and state food industry stakeholders, have been received to date?
- (4) Will the Minister table the original letter sent to national and state food industry stakeholders, as well as all submissions (and answers) received to date?
- (5) When is the deadline for submissions?
- (6) Will the Minister clarify what the report of the committee on GM food labelling will do?
- (7) Will improving compliance to assist consumer choice, as a function of the final report, include notification of the potential for GE contamination from stockfeed to dairy, egg, meat or poultry products?
- (8) Will the committee on GM food labelling consider the Trans Pacific Free Trade Agreement (TPPFTA) in their final report?

2529. Hon Lynn MacLaren to the Minister for Disability Services

- (1) Has the Government indicated that the needs of family members of older carers will be a major focus in 2010/11?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (2) Have specific strategies been detailed and funds been allocated to this group to meet these needs?
- (3) Can the Minister please advise how the Government will meet the specific needs of people with a disability, who are being supported by older carers?
- (4) Is the Minister aware that a lack of appropriate, accessible and affordable housing is a barrier to a number of eligible people with disabilities, accessing their accommodation support packages?
- (5) What strategies have been identified to improve access to appropriate, affordable housing for people with disabilities?

2530. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Energy representing the Minister for Emergency Services

With reference to emergency services for the Burrup Peninsula, I ask -

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that a comprehensive emergency plan is in place for all industry on the Burrup Peninsula, and for the population of the townships of Karratha and Dampier?
- (2) If yes to (1), will the Minister table this plan?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that all the recommendations made by, 'The Burrup Peninsula Emergency Services Review Steering Committee', as per Ministerial Media Statement (Michelle Roberts, 24/5/2004) were followed, and are in place?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?

2531. Hon Robin Chapple to the Leader of the House representing the Premier

I refer to the Premier's answer to question on notice No. 2274 on 20 April 2010, and the media article, 'Impact of Native Title split unclear', *ABC News* 8 April 2010, and ask -

- (1) Is the Premier aware that the Goolarabooloo Jabbir Jabbir, had a joint Native Title claim over the James Price Point area since 1994?
- (2) If yes to (1), is the Premier aware that the Heads of Agreement for development of the Browse LNG Precinct, was signed by the Kimberley Land Council under authorisation by the Goolarabooloo Jabirr Jabirr Native Title claimants, and that this authorization is now being challenged in the Federal Court?
- (3) Is the Premier aware that the Goolarabooloo Jabirr Jabirr Native Title claim has now split?
- (4) If yes to (3), is the Premier aware that the Goolarabooloo people and Jabirr Jabirr people, will now have separate claims at James Price Point?
- (5) Is the Premier aware of a third Native Title claim for the James Price Point area by the Ngurmbarl people?
- (6) If no to (5), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (7) Is the Premier aware that the Goolarabaloo people have been reported as saying, that their views have been ignored by the Kimberley Land Council (KLC), which has represented traditional owners in negotiations with Woodside for more than a year?
- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Who does the Premier believe the traditional owners are for James Price Point?
- (10) Is the Government satisfied that the KLC have been representing the views of the correct traditional owners for James Price Point?
- (11) If no to (10), why not?
- (12) With which traditional owners is the Government negotiating an Indigenous Land use Agreement (ILUA), with at James Price Point?
- (13) When is the ILUA expected to be finalised?
- (14) Will the Premier order the compulsory acquisition of the land at James Price Point, if an ILUA cannot be agreed upon by an agreed date?

2532. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment

I refer to the Environmental Protection (Unauthorised Discharges) Regulations 2004, and ask -

- (1) Area these regulations still operable give that the Australian Standards (AS 3543-1989) that the regulations refer to have been withdrawn?
- (2) How many licences or regulations are affected by the withdrawal of the relevant Australian Standards?
- (3) Will the Minister list all licences or regulations affected by the withdrawal by the relevant Australian Standards?
- (4) Does the withdrawal of the relevant Australian Standards in the *Environmental Protection (Unauthorised Discharges) Regulations 2004*, mean that non compliance with these regulations is not legally enforceable?

2533. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories, dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled, '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that the arsenic contained in arsenic trioxide, -
 - (a) can be up to 500 times stronger than arsenic itself;
 - (b) is very toxic;
 - (c) is a known carcinogenic;
 - (d) is dangerous to the environment; and

cq381.097.29Jun2010 (A236297)

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (e) enters easily into human beings through ingestion, inhalation and absorption?
- (2) If no to (1), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (3) Is it correct that arsenic is in fact contained in the ore body in the Kanowna Belle Mine, and that arsenic trioxide is one of the hazardous by products of the processing of the ore, from this mine at the Kanowna Belle Mill, and that it is disposed of underground in the very upper levels of this mine?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) Is it correct that the procedure for disposing of arsenic trioxide underground in the Kanowna Belle mine is as follows, -
 - (a) the arsenic trioxide is mixed with soil do dilute it;
 - (b) the mixture of arsenic trioxide and soil is also mixed with water a setting agent like concrete and placed into a bulker bag;
 - (c) this mixture is then allowed to dry completely and set thoroughly to encapsulate the arsenic trioxide in a 'brick';
 - (d) each and every one of the arsenic trioxide bricks, when it has dried and set thoroughly is drilled to the centre to ensure that it had both dried and set like concrete; and
 - (e) each brick was disposed of in a suitable area of the mine where it was to be encapsulated again in shotcrete?
- (6) If no to (5), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (7) Is it correct that the procedure referred to in (5), was to ensure that the arsenic could not in any way, be released into the mine where the employees still work continually, so that the occupational health of the employees working in the mine was assured?
- (8) If no to (7), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (9) Can the Minister state exactly how long in weeks, months and years, that arsenic trioxide has been disposed of underground, in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine?
- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister state exactly, -
 - (a) how many bulker bags containing arsenic trioxide;
 - (b) exactly how many tonnes of soil and arsenic trioxide mixture; and
 - (c) exactly how much arsenic trioxide itself in tones and kilogram's, are/is disposed of underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) Is it correct that the arsenic trioxide that was disposed of underground in the Kanowna Belle Mine, was meant to be encapsulated as a brick, dry and set like concrete to ensure that, -
 - (a) the soil which the arsenic trioxide was mixed through and the arsenic trioxide itself could not dry out, and the arsenic then dispersed into the air as a powder, and

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

therefore through the ventilation of the entire mine, causing all employees in that mine to inhale arsenic;

- (b) should any water flow into the soil which the arsenic trioxide was mixed through, and then continue down through the mine, that that water would not be contaminated with arsenic and be absorbed through the skin of employees working in the mine that came in contact with the contaminated water; and
- (c) the environment was not polluted?

(14) If no to (13), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?

2534. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that the safe level for the amount of arsenic in drinking water is 0.007grams per litre, making the results of the analysis results referred to on page two of the tests referred to above, almost 286 times the allowable limit for arsenic in drinking water?
- (2) If no to (1), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (3) Is it correct that the safe level for the amount of arsenic in the marine or environment is 0.05 grams per litre, making the analysis results referred to on page two of the tests referred to above 40 times the allowable limit, for arsenic in the marine or environment?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) With regards to (1) and (3), can the Minister state specifically the factual known and potential effects, to a person's health upon ingesting water in which the level of arsenic was two grams per litre, -
 - (a) in small amounts; and
 - (b) in large amounts?
- (6) If no to (5), not?
- (7) With regards to (1) and (3), can the Minister state specifically the factual known and potential effects to a person's health, upon absorbing through the skin or eyes water in which the level of arsenic was two grams per litre, -
 - (a) in small amounts; and
 - (b) in large amounts?
- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Given that the samples provided for analysis were taken from a bulker bag that contained arsenic trioxide, and was disposed of underground in the upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine, can the Minister explain how the results on page two of the analysis results referred to

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

above, specifically state that the arsenic was contained in mud/soil instead of a consolidated substance?

- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister explain why the results from the samples from the water, referred to in page two of the document referred to above, that was right alongside and under and around the bulker bags containing arsenic trioxide that are disposed of underground in the Kanowna Belle Mine, contained any level of arsenic whatsoever, let alone very high levels of arsenic?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) Given that it has been reported and documented that there was water flowing through the roof of the Kanowna Belle Mine, and onto the soil containing arsenic trioxide in the bulker bags that were disposed of underground in the upper levels of the mine, and causing the arsenic to leach out in very high volumes into the water, before that water proceeded to course down through the mine, can the Minister state how the management of this mine and the Department of Environment and Conservation, allowed this to happen, and for how long in years and months this was allowed to happen?
- (14) If no to (13), not?

2535. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that because the arsenic trioxide that was stored underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine was contained in soil/mud, and not consolidated as a brick as it was supposed to be, that when it was dry the arsenic would have entered the air as a powder, and therefore the ventilation system for the whole mine, and would be inhaled by all employees working in the mine?
- (2) If no to (2), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (3) Is it correct that because the arsenic trioxide that was stored underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle Mine, was contained in soil/mud and not consolidated as it was supposed to be, that when it became wet from water running through it from above and then down through the mine, it would have carried arsenic throughout the mine wherever it went, and would be absorbed through the skin of every employee who came in contact with that water?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) Is it correct that all of the water from underground in Kanowna Belle is recycled, and therefore reused through the drills, through the wash down procedures, as well as through any other procedure employed on a daily basis that required the use of water throughout this mine?
- (6) If no to (5), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (7) Is it correct that the bulker bags containing the arsenic trioxide that was disposed of underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle Mine, were also meant to be encapsulated in shotcrete?
- (8) If no to (7), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (9) If yes to (7), can the Minister state specifically, -
 - (a) how much shotcrete was expected to be used to encapsulate the bulker bags;
 - (b) on how many sides the shotcrete was to be applied to the bulker bags;
 - (c) how many bulker bags were allowed to be disposed of before they were encapsulated in shotcrete; and
 - (d) for how long each bulker bag was allowed to be disposed of before it was encapsulated in shotcrete?
- (10) Is it correct that shotcrete is porous and that both air and water can permeate through it quite easily?
- (11) If no to (10), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?

2536. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Can the Minister state the specific date on which arsenic trioxide was first disposed of in bulker bags in the upper levels of the Kanowna Belle Mine?
- (2) If no to (1), why not?
- (3) Can the Minister state exactly how many levels there are in the Kanowna Belle Mine, below the levels in which the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), was disposed of?
- (4) If no to (3), why not?
- (5) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place at the Kanowna Belle Mine, since the date that the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), was first disposed of underground in the mine?
- (6) If no to (5), why not?
- (7) Can the Minister state and quote the relevant sections of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, contaminated sites legislation, and any other legislation covered by the Department of Environment and Conversation (DEC) which apply to, -
 - (a) the handling of arsenic trioxide at the Kanowna Belle Mill and Mine;
 - (b) the encapsulating of arsenic trioxide at the Kanowna Belle Mill and Mine; and
 - (c) the disposal of arsenic trioxide at the Kanowna Belle Mill and Mine?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Can the Minister state specifically all conditions imposed on the management of the Kanowna Belle mine by the DEC in relation to them allowing the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), to be disposed of underground in the mine, the conditions which were to ensure the occupational health of the employees in the mine?
- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister state specifically all policies and procedures put in place by the management at the Kanowna Belle mine by relation to them disposing of the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), underground in the mine, the policies and procedures which were to ensure the occupational health of the employees in the mine?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) Can the Minister state, since the time that the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), was disposed of underground in the Kanowna Belle mine until today, -
 - (a) how many thorough physical inspections have taken place by a DEC inspector;
 - (b) on what date each inspection took place;
 - (c) what was the result of each inspection;
 - (d) how many breaches of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, contaminated sites legislation and any other legislation covered by the DEC were identified, and the maximum penalty for each breach;
 - (e) how many breaches of the conditions referred to in (9) were identified, and the maximum penalty for each breach;
 - (f) how many breaches of the policies and procedures referred to in (11) were identified, and the maximum penalty for each breach; and
 - (g) whether any responsible persons at Barrick Kanowna were prosecuted, or will be prosecuted, for an breaches referred to in (d), (e) and (f)?
- (14) If no to (13), why not?
- (15) In regards to (13), has any responsible person at Barrick Kanowna been prosecuted, or will they be prosecuted for any of these breaches referred to?
- (16) If no to (15), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

2537. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf', and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that around 40 percent of arsenic, in a case of arsenic poisoning, is retained in the bones, muscles, skin, hair and nails, and does in fact take months to eliminate from the human body?
- (2) If no to (1), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (3) Is it correct that arsenic poisoning, in addition to death, can result in the following long term health problems in adults and in children that they bear, -
 - (a) cardiovascular problems;
 - (b) liver problems;
 - (c) kidney problems;
 - (d) coagulation of the blood;
 - (e) high incidents of miscarriage;
 - (f) low birth weight; and
 - (g) congenital defects?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) In relation to above, is it correct that on 8 June 2010 a representative of an employee representative body contacted the management of Barrick Kanowna and informed them of the fact that these samples had been obtained and these test results had been received indicating that there were very high levels of arsenic in the ground water in the mine?
- (6) If no to (5), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (7) Is it correct that during the conversation referred to in (5), the representative informed the management of the company that numerous complaints had been received indicating arsenic poisoning, expressed strong concern for the occupational health of the employees in the mine, and asked that independent individual testing of all employees in the mine would be conducted to verify and ensure their occupational health?
- (8) If no to (7), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (9) Is it correct that to release all the details requested in the letter referred to above, would help the management of Kanowna Belle, identify the person or persons who took the samples?
- (10) If no to (9), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (11) Will the Minister urgently require the Department of Environment and Conservation to conduct a thorough investigation into this matter, including a thorough independent individual testing of all employees, to ensure both the short term and the long term health of all

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

employees working, and of all employees who have worked, in this mine since the arsenic trioxide has first been disposed of in the upper levels of this underground mine?

(12) If no to (11), why not?

2538. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photographs available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-01 Kanowna Belle UG Toilet.pdf' of an underground toilet facility taken on 1 February 2010, on the surface at the Kanowna Belle mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above, does the Resources Safety Division of the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP), consider the toilet facility, as depicted in the photographs, to be clean and hygienic and in good working order?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) With regards to the toilet facility depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), can the Minister state specifically where the hand wash facilities and soap and sanitary bin are located?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) With regards to the toilet facility depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), can the Minister state in what manner a female was expected to maintain her decency, when she removed her overalls, if she were to use this toilet facility?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) With regards to the toilet facility depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), can the Minister state in what manner a female was expected to deal with times of menstruation, and in fact what she or any other employee at the lower levels in the mine were expected to do, if they needed to use a toilet for any reason in the Kanowna Belle Mine, given that this toilet facility is obviously unusable?
- (9) If no to (8), why not?
- (10) In light of (1), (4), (6) and (8), can the Minister state specifically what is the risk to workers occupational health, given that this toilet facility referred to above is reported to have been in this condition, for up to 30 months?
- (11) If no to (10), why not?
- (12) Can the Minister state how many inspections have been carried out by the DMP inspectorate in the previous 30 months at the Kanowna Belle Mine?
- (13) If no to (12), why not?
- (14) Were any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this toilet facility

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today**Notice given****Tuesday, 29 June 2010**

depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), and depicted in the photographs in the last 30 months?

- (15) If yes to (14), -
- (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (16) With reference to (14), -
- (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (17) In light of (4), (6), (8), (10), (15) and (16), does the Minister believe that the situation referred to in question (1) above does in fact represent a blatant disregard by all responsible persons at the Kanowna Belle Mine, for the occupational health of all employees working in that mine?
- (18) If no to (17), why not?
- (19) In light of (1), (4), (6), (8) (10), (15), (16) and (17), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached, including Regulations 7.12 and 7.13, which specific sections have been breached and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (20) If yes to (19), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (21) If no to (20), why not?

2539. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photographs available for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-01 Kanowna Belle UG Toilet.pdf' of an underground toilet facility taken on 1 February 2010, on the surface at the Kanowna Belle mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that on 1 February 2010, the toilet facility depicted in the photographs referred to above was from the 440 level of the Kanowna Belle Mine, and that before it was transported to the surface, it was the only toilet facility that was available to service the area of the mine below the 860 level, where the other toilet facilities are located?
- (2) If no to (1), what then is specifically correct concerning this matter?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (3) Is it correct that the senior management of the Kanowna Belle Mine, refused a representative from an employee representative body the right to go and inspect the condition of the toilet facility at the 440 level depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), and the toilet facilities at the 860 level of the mine, even though that representative had received several complaints concerning the condition of the toilets, and had the right to carry out an inspection, and an investigation concerning this matter?
- (4) If no to (3), what then is specifically correct concerning this matter?
- (5) Is it correct that when the senior management of the Kanowna Belle Mine later conceded and allowed the representative referred to in (3), the right to go and inspect the condition of the toilet facilities depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), and that this same management refused to allow the representative to inspect the toilet facility at its usual location, at the 440 level of the mine, but rather ordered that it be brought to the surface for inspection?
- (6) If no to (5), what then is specifically correct concerning this matter?
- (7) Is it correct that it was reported by numerous employees in the Kanowna Belle Mine, that when the toilet facility depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), was at its usual location at the 440 level of the mine, it was not only unusable but also unapproachable because of not only the overwhelming stench coming from the toilet facility, but also because of a large swarm of bugs and insects that frequented the area of the toilet facility?
- (8) If no to (7), what then is specifically correct concerning this matter?
- (9) Is it correct that when the employee representative referred to in (5), went to inspect the condition of the toilet facility depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), on the surface, that the underground foreman who escorted him refused to go anywhere near the toilet facility because the stench was overwhelming and sickening?
- (10) If no to (9), what is specifically correct concerning this matter?

2540. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at, <http://robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled 2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf and 2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that the arsenic contained in arsenic trioxide, -
 - (a) can be up to 500 times stronger than arsenic itself;
 - (b) is very toxic;
 - (c) is a known carcinogen;
 - (d) is dangerous to the environment; and
 - (e) enters easily into human beings through ingestion, inhalation and absorption?
- (2) If no to (1), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (3) Is it correct that arsenic is in fact contained in the ore body in the Kanowna Belle Mine, and that arsenic trioxide is one of the hazardous by products of the processing of the ore from this mine at the Kanowna Belle Mill, and that it is disposed of underground in the very upper levels of this mine?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) Is it correct that the procedure for disposing of arsenic trioxide underground in the Kanowna Belle Mine is as follows, -
 - (a) the arsenic trioxide is mixed with soil to dilute it;
 - (b) the mixture of arsenic trioxide and soil is also mixed with water and a setting agent like concrete and placed into a bulker bag;
 - (c) this mixture is then allowed to dry completely and set thoroughly to encapsulate the arsenic trioxide in a brick;
 - (d) each and every one of the arsenic trioxide bricks, when it has dried and set thoroughly is drilled to the centre to ensure that it had both dried and set like concrete; and
 - (e) each brick was disposed of in a suitable area of the mine where it was to be encapsulated again in shotcrete?
- (6) If no to (5), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (7) Is it correct that the procedure referred to in (5), was to ensure that the arsenic could not, in any way, be released into the mine where the employees still work continually so that the occupational health of the employees working in the mine was assured?
- (8) If no to (7), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (9) Can the Minister state exactly how long in weeks, months and years that arsenic trioxide has been disposed of underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine?
- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister state exactly, -
 - (a) how many bulker bags containing arsenic trioxide;
 - (b) exactly how many tonnes of soil and arsenic trioxide mixture; and
 - (c) exactly how much arsenic trioxide itself in tonnes and kilograms, are/is disposed of underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle Mine?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) Is it correct that the arsenic trioxide that was disposed of underground in the Kanowna Belle Mine was meant to be encapsulated as a brick, dry and set like concrete to ensure that, -
 - (a) the soil which the arsenic trioxide was mixed through and the arsenic trioxide itself could not dry out and the arsenic then disperse into the air as a powder, and therefore through the ventilation of the entire mine, causing all employees in that mine to inhale arsenic;

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (b) should any water flow into the soil which the arsenic trioxide was mixed through, and then continue down through the mine, that that water would not be contaminated with arsenic and be absorbed through the skin of employees working in the mine that came in contact with the contaminated water; and
 - (c) the environment was not polluted?
- (14) If no to (13), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?

2541. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled 2010-05-20 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf and 2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that the safe level for the amount of arsenic in drinking water is 0.007grams per litre, making the results of the analysis results referred to on page two of the tests referred to above almost 286 times the allowable limit, for arsenic in drinking water?
- (2) If no to (1), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (3) Is it correct that the safe level for the amount of arsenic in the marine or environment is 0.05 grams per litre, making the analysis results referred to on page two of the tests referred to above 40 times the allowable limit for arsenic in the marine or environment?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) With regards to (1) and (3), can the Minister state specifically the factual known and potential effects to a person's health upon ingesting water in which the level of arsenic was two grams per litre, -
 - (a) in small amounts; and
 - (b) in large amounts?
- (6) If no to (5), not?
- (7) With regards to (1) and (3), can the Minister state specifically the known and potential effects to a person's health upon absorbing through the skin or eyes water in which the level of arsenic was two grams per litre, -
 - (a) in small amounts; and
 - (b) in large amounts?
- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Given that the samples provided for analysis were taken from a bulker bag that contained arsenic trioxide and was disposed of underground in the upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine, can the Minister explain why the results on page two of the analysis results referred to above specifically state that the arsenic was contained in mud/soil instead of a consolidated substance?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given Tuesday, 29 June 2010

- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister explain why the results from the samples from the water, referred to in page two of the document referred to above, that was right alongside and under and around the bulker bags containing arsenic trioxide that are disposed of underground in the Kanowna Belle Mine, contained any level of arsenic whatsoever, let alone very high levels of arsenic?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) Given that it has been reported and documented that there was water flowing through the roof of the Kanowna Belle Mine and onto the soil containing arsenic trioxide in the bulker bags that were disposed of underground in the upper levels of the mine, and causing the arsenic to leach out in very high volumes into the water before that water proceeded to course down through the mine, can the Minister explain and define how the management of this mine and the Department of Mines and Petroleum inspectorate allowed this to happen, and for how long in years and months this was allowed to happen?
- (14) If no to (13), why not?

2542. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that because the arsenic trioxide that was stored underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine the arsenic was contained in soil/mud and not consolidated as a brick as it was supposed to be, that when it was dry the arsenic would have entered the air as a powder, and therefore the ventilation system for the whole mine, and would be inhaled by all employees working in the mine?
- (2) If no to (2), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (3) Is it correct that, because the arsenic trioxide that was stored underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine was contained in soil/mud, and not consolidated as it was supposed to be, that when it became wet from water running through it from above and then down through the mine it would have carried arsenic throughout the mine wherever it went and would be absorbed through the skin of every employee who came in contact with that water?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) Is it correct that all of the water from underground in Kanowna Belle is recycled and therefore reused through the drills, through the wash down procedures, as well as through any other procedure employed on a daily basis that required the use of water throughout this mine?
- (6) If no to (5), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (7) Is it correct that the bulker bags containing the arsenic trioxide that was disposed of underground in the very upper levels of the Kanowna Belle mine were also meant to be encapsulated in shotcrete?
- (8) If no to (7), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (9) If yes to (7), can the Minister state specifically, -
 - (a) how much shotcrete was expected to be used to encapsulate the bulker bags;
 - (b) on how many sides the shotcrete was to be applied to the bulker bags;
 - (c) how many bulker bags were allowed to be disposed of before they were encapsulated in shotcrete; and
 - (d) for how long each bulker bag was allowed to be disposed of before it was encapsulated in shotcrete?
- (10) Is it correct that shotcrete is porous and that both air and water can permeate through it quite easily?
- (11) If no to (10), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?

2543. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf', and ask -

- (1) Can the Minister state the specific date on which arsenic trioxide was first disposed of in bulker bags in the upper levels of the Kanowna Belle Mine?
- (2) If no to (1), why not?
- (3) Can the Minister state exactly how many levels there are in the Kanowna Belle Mine below the levels, in which the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), was disposed of?
- (4) If no to (3), why not?
- (5) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place at the Kanowna Belle Mine since the date that the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), was first disposed of underground in the mine?
- (6) If no to (5), why not?
- (7) Can the Minister state and quote the relevant sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* which apply to, -
 - (a) the handling of arsenic trioxide at the Kanowna Belle Mill and Mine;
 - (b) the encapsulating of arsenic trioxide at the Kanowna Belle Mill and Mine; and
 - (c) the disposal of arsenic trioxide at the Kanowna Belle Mill and Mine?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Can the Minister state specifically all conditions imposed on the management of the Kanowna Belle Mine by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectorate in relation to them allowing the arsenic trioxide referred to (1), to be disposed of underground in the mine, the conditions which were to ensure the occupational health of the employees in the mine?
- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister state specifically all policies and procedures put in place by the management at the Kanowna Belle mine by relation to them disposing of the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), underground in the mine, the policies and procedures which were to ensure the occupational health of the employees in the mine?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) Can the Minister state, since the time that the arsenic trioxide referred to in (1), was disposed of underground in the Kanowna Belle Mine until today, -
 - (a) how many thorough physical inspections have taken place by a DMP inspector;
 - (b) on what date each inspection took place;
 - (c) what was the result of each inspection;
 - (d) how many breaches of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* were identified, and the maximum penalty for each breach;
 - (e) how many breaches of the conditions referred to in (9), were identified, and the maximum penalty for each breach;
 - (f) how many breaches of the policies and procedures referred to in (11), were identified, and the maximum penalty for each breach; and
 - (g) whether any responsible persons at Barrick Kanowna were prosecuted, or will be prosecuted, for an breaches referred to in (d), (e) and (f)?
- (14) If no to (13), why not?
- (15) In regards to in (13), has any responsible person at Barrick Kanowna been prosecuted, or will they be prosecuted for any of these breaches referred to?
- (16) If no to (15), why not?

2544. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the Barrick Kanowna Belle operations, analysis results of tests conducted on soil/mud and water samples for arsenic conducted by MPL Laboratories dated 5 May 2010, and a letter from Evan Spencer, General Mine Manager for Barrick Kanowna dated 9 June 2010, which are available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-05-05 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Trioxide Results.pdf' and '2010-06-09 Kanowna Belle Arsenic Letter Evan Spencer.pdf, and ask -

- (1) Is it correct that around 40 percent of arsenic, in a case of arsenic poisoning, is retained in the bones, muscles, skin, hair and nails and does in fact take months to eliminate from the human body?

cqb381.097.29Jun2010 (A236297)

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (2) If no to (1), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (3) Is it correct that arsenic poisoning, in addition to death, can result in the following long term health problems in adults and in children, that they bear, -
 - (a) cardiovascular problems;
 - (b) liver problems;
 - (c) kidney problems;
 - (d) coagulation of the blood;
 - (e) high incidents of miscarriage;
 - (f) low birth weight; and
 - (g) congenital defects?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) Is it correct that on 8 June 2010, a representative of an employee representative body contacted the management of Barrick Kanowna, and informed them of the fact that these samples had been obtained and these test results had been received indicating that there were very high levels of arsenic in the ground water in the mine?
- (6) If no to (5), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (7) Is it correct that during the conversation referred to in (5), the representative informed the management of the company that numerous complaints had been received indicating arsenic poisoning, expressed strong concern for the occupational health of the employees in the mine, and asked that independent individual testing of all employees in the mine would be conducted to verify and ensure their occupational health?
- (8) If no to (7), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (9) Is it correct that to release all the details requested in the letter referred to above would help the management of Kanowna Belle identify the person or persons who took the samples?
- (10) If no to (9), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (11) Will the Minister urgently require the Department of Mines and Petroleum inspectorate to conduct a thorough investigation into this matter, including a thorough independent individual testing of all employees, to ensure both the short term and the long term health of all employees working, and of all employees who have worked, in this mine since the arsenic trioxide has been disposed of in the upper levels of this underground mine?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

2545. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photograph posted for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-03-20 KCGM Close Blast.pdf' taken on 20 March 2010 at the KCGM operations commonly known as 'the superpit' in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold and Newmont, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above, and given that a batter in this operations is around 33 metres in length, and therefore the distance between the shotfirers ute and the nearest edge of the mass blast is calculated at approximately 150 metres, does the Resources Safety Division of DMP consider this distance for this blast regarded as a safe exclusion zone for the shotfirers depicted in the photographs referred to on the left hand side in front of the light vehicle?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) Given that some of the holes fired in the shot depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), are obviously charged more than the rest of the shot, therefore increasing the amount of flyrock and the distance that the flyrock travels, does the Resources Safety Division of DMP consider this distance of approximately 150 metres between the shotfirers and the edge of the blast to be safe?
- (5) If yes to (4), why?
- (6) If no to (4), why not?
- (7) Given that the management of KCGM has released reports claiming that they can control flyrock to within a distance as close as 50 metres from a blast, is the Resources Safety Division of DMP convinced that this distance of 50 meters is safe, and will any of the staff at the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectorate encourage and support any operators being expected by management in any mine in Western Australia to be within such an exclusion zone of a blast?
- (8) If yes to (7), why?
- (9) If no to (7), why not?
- (10) Can the Minister state what is the prescribed distance, if any, for the exclusion zone from a blast in any open pit in Western Australia in relation to the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995*?
- (11) Within the last 60 months have any complaints/concerns have been received and/or recorded, either on the company's internal reporting system or with the DMP inspectorate, concerning shotfirers and/or operators anywhere having near misses from flyrock produced by blasts at KCGM?
- (12) If yes to (11), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern about including the distance in metres of the exclusion zone from the blast;

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue;
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve;
 - (f) how many complaints/concerns were received by the DMP inspectorate;
 - (g) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (h) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (i) when was each issue resolved?
- (13) In light of (1), (4), (10), (12) and (13), -
- (a) have any sections of the Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995 been breached;
 - (b) which sections have been breached; and
 - (c) what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (14) Will the resident manager, or any other responsible persons at KGGM, be prosecuted for any breaches referred to in (13)?
- (15) If no to (14), why not?

2546. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photograph posted for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-06 Raleigh Change Room Air Conditioner.pdf' of an 'iced up' air conditioner taken on 6 February 2010, when the outdoor temperature was 30 degrees Celsius, in the change rooms of the Raleigh mine owned by Barrick Gold and located near Kalgoorlie Boulder, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photograph referred to above, does the Resources Safety Division of DMP consider the air conditioner/heater depicted in the photograph taken at the Raleigh Mine to be in a clean and hygienic condition, and in a good and effective working order?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) Can the Minister state the purpose, in relation to the occupational health of the employees, of having an air conditioner/heater in the change rooms at any Western Australian mining operations?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) With regards to the air conditioner/heater depicted in the photograph (1), will the Minister state the known factual risk and hazard to the workers occupational health, given the deteriorated and unclean state of the air conditioner/heater, including but not limited to dust and heat and cold and bacteria and disease, and what specifically each risk and hazard is?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (8) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectorate at the Raleigh mine site in the last 30 months?
- (9) If no to (8), why not?
- (10) Has any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the company's internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning the air conditioner depicted in the photograph referred to in (1), in the last 30 months?
- (11) If yes to (10), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (12) With reference to (10), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by the DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (13) In light of (1), (4), (6), (11) and (12), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached including Regulation 7.19, which specific sections have been breached and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (14) If yes to (13), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (15) If no to (14), why not?

2547. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photographs posted for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-06-29 Raleigh Womens Change Rooms.pdf', '2010-06-29 Raleigh New Mens Change Rooms.pdf', and '2010-06-29 Raleigh Old Mens Change Rooms.pdf' of all three change rooms taken at the Raleigh mine located near Kalgoorlie and owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above, can the Minister state specifically where the boot cleaners are for the entry of all three change rooms at the Raleigh Mine site?
- (2) If no to (1), why not?
- (3) Is it correct that, at the time that these photographs referred to in (1), were taken there were in fact no boot cleaning facilities available for all three change rooms as depicted in the

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

photographs, which resulted in the mess on the floor within the change rooms as depicted in the photographs?

- (4) If no to (3), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (5) With regards to (1), can the Minister state what is the known factual and potential risk to workers occupational health, given the number of employees using each change room as depicted in the photographs and that there have been no boot cleaning facilities available at all three change rooms at the Raleigh Mine for quite some time?
- (6) If no to (5), why not?
- (7) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectorate at the Raleigh mine site in the last 30 months?
- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Has any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this lack of boot cleaning facilities and the mess that resulted at all three change rooms as referred to in (1), and depicted in the photographs in the last 30 months?
- (10) If yes to (9), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (11) With reference to (9), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by the DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (12) In light of (1), (3), (5), (10) and (11), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached including Regulation 7.19, which specific sections have been breached and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (13) If yes to (12), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (14) If no to (13), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

2548. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to photographs available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-06 Normet Charge Vehicle Raleigh.pdf' of a Normet charge vehicle taken on 6 February 2010, in the main explosives magazine at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above which clearly depict a Normet diesel operated charge vehicle, still loaded with Ammonium Nitrate Fuel Oil (ANFO), with a fire extinguisher not maintained in a fit and proper working order parked and secured in the main explosives magazine of the Raleigh Mine, can the Minister state why this charge vehicle was parked and secured where it was?
- (2) If no to (1), why not?
- (3) Does rule number 10 on the sign on the gate underground to this main explosives magazine in the Raleigh Mine as at 6 February 2010 say, no vehicles or machinery are to be stored in the main explosives magazine?
- (4) If no to (3), what specifically did rule 10 state on the gate underground to this main explosives magazine in the Raleigh Mine as at 6 February 2010, concerning this matter?
- (5) Can the Minister state the importance of, and quote the full text of the relevant sections from the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1995 and Regulations 1994* for, not parking and securing a diesel operated vehicle or machine of any kind, especially a charge vehicle in the condition depicted in the photographs referred to in question (1) above, in a main explosives magazine?
- (6) If no to (5), why not?
- (7) In light of (1), (3) and (5), can the Minister state what is the known risk and potential to workers occupational health and safety, including but not limited to serious injury and death, of leaving any vehicle or machine parked in a main explosives magazine and especially a Normet charge vehicle still loaded with ANFO, and with a fire extinguisher that is not maintained in a fit and proper working condition?
- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Can the Minister state for how long in months and years, that the management of Barrick Kanowna and Raleigh Mine have permitted and instructed that the Normet charge vehicle be parked and secured in the main explosives magazine in that mine?
- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectorate at the Raleigh mine site in the last 30 months?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) 13 Have any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this Normet Charge Vehicle depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), being parked and secured in the main explosives magazine in the last 30 months?
- (14) If yes to (13), -

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (15) With reference to (13), -
- (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (16) In light of (1), (3), (5), (7), (9) (14) and (15), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached, which specific sections have been breached, and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (17) If yes to (16), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (18) If no to (16), why not?

2549. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to photographs available for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-06 Normet Charge Vehicle Raleigh.pdf' of a Normet charge vehicle taken on 6 February 2010 in the main explosives magazine at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above which clearly depict a Normet Charge Vehicle that was parked and secured in the Main Explosives Magazine of the Raleigh mine with an earth strap that was not connected at one end, a charge vessel that is still loaded with ANFO and a fire extinguisher that is clearly not maintained in a proper and functioning manner, can the Minister state the number of levels below the surface that the main explosives magazine of this mine was located as at 6 February 2010?
- (2) If no to (1), why not?
- (3) Can the Minister state the number of levels that are below the main explosives magazine in the Raleigh Mine?
- (4) If no to (3), why not?
- (5) Can the Minister state the maximum number of employees that work, including management staff and technical staff, at one time below the main explosives magazine in the Raleigh Mine?
- (6) If no to (5), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (7) Can the Minister state the number of metres of pillar between the main explosives magazine and the main decline at the Raleigh Mine?
- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Can the Minister state all the different types, and the maximum amount, of explosives stored in the main explosives magazine at the Raleigh Mine?
- (10) If no to (9), why not?
- (11) Can the Minister state all the different types, and the maximum amount, of smoke and gases that are produced when explosives similar in amount and type to that which is referred to in (9)?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?
- (13) Is it correct that, after an explosion during routine firing in the upper levels of the Raleigh mine, all gases and smoke usually move from the top levels of the mine down through the mine before being exhausted through the return air of the mine out to the surface?
- (14) If no to (13), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (15) Is it correct that an explosion created by a similar amount of explosives as referred to in (9) would cause a substantial rock fall in any underground mine?
- (16) If no to (15), what specifically is correct concerning this matter?
- (17) Can the Minister explain and define what happened in the well known incident which occurred at the Telfer mine within the last 10 years, when the main explosives magazine caught fire and exploded, including a detailed description of how the fire began and of the damage that was reported to have occurred?
- (18) If no to (17), why not?
- (19) In light of (1), (3), (5), (7), (9), (11), (13), (15) and (17), does the Resources Safety Division of DMP regard the situation referred to in (1), as extremely serious and posing a very high risk and hazard to the occupational health and safety and lives of all employees in the Raleigh Mine, and showing a blatant disregard by all responsible persons at the Raleigh Mine for the occupational health and safety and lives of all employees in that mine?
- (20) If yes to (19), why?
- (21) If no to (19), why not?
- (22) Have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached in relation to the situation referred to in (1), which specific sections have been breached, and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (23) If yes to (22), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (24) If no to (23), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

2550. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to photographs available for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-06 Normet Charge Vehicle Raleigh.pdf' of a Normet charge vehicle taken on 6 February 2010 in the main explosives magazine at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above which clearly depict the following on the Normet Charge Vehicle at the Raleigh Mine, -
 - (a) a step made from a piece of hydraulic hose;
 - (b) gates on the basket that do not open and close properly or fasten securely;
 - (c) lights that are not clean or clear;
 - (d) a coupling coming undone and completely unsecured that when in use would be under extreme pressure;
 - (e) a charge hose split and held together partially with electrical tape;
 - (f) an earth strap not properly secured at both ends;
 - (g) a pressure vessel still loaded with Ammonium Nitrate Fuel Oil (ANFO); and
 - (h) a fire extinguisher that is not maintained in a fit and proper working order, -
 - (i) can the Minister state why this Normet charge vehicle was allowed to be in this condition by the management of Barrick Kanowna and of the Raleigh Mine?
- (2) If no to (1), why not?
- (3) Can the Minister state the importance of, and quote the full text of the relevant sections from the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1995 and Regulations 1994*, for the following in all underground mines in Western Australia, -
 - (a) having a step made from the correct material and in the correct dimensions as opposed to having a step made from a piece of hydraulic hose;
 - (b) having gates on the basket that open and close properly and fasten securely;
 - (c) having lights that are clean and clear so as to allow good vision when charging and especially when hooking the signal tube to the detonating cord;
 - (d) having a coupling properly done up and completely secured with a second mechanism so that, when in use under extreme pressure, it cannot come undone;
 - (e) having a charge hose that is in one piece and free from defects;
 - (f) having an earth strap properly secured at both ends to all charge vehicles and/or charge vessels;
 - (g) emptying a pressure vessel completely of ANFO when it is no longer in use and has been parked and stored; and

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (h) having the correct number of fire extinguishers that are maintained in a fit and proper working condition on all vehicles and machines in an underground mine?
- (4) If no to (3), why not?
- (5) Can the Minister state for how long in months and years that the management of Barrick Kanowna and Raleigh Mine, have permitted and instructed that the Normet charge vehicle be operated in the condition as depicted in the photographs referred to in (1)?
- (6) If no to (5), why not?
- (7) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectorate at the Raleigh mine site in the last 30 months?
- (8) If no to (7), why not?
- (9) Has any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this Normet Charge Vehicle as depicted in the photographs referred to in (1) in the last 30 months?
- (10) If yes to (9), how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company, on what date was each complaint/concern received, what specifically was each complaint/concern, what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue and how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (11) With reference to (9), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (12) In light of (1), (3), (5), (9), (10) and (11), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached, which specific sections have been breached and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (13) If yes to (12), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (14) If no to (13), why not?

2551. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photograph posted for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-05 Raleigh Shower Cubicle.pdf' of a shower cubicle taken on 5 February 2010 at the Raleigh Mine located near Kalgoorlie and owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photograph referred to above, does the Resources Safety Division consider the shower cubicle in the change rooms as depicted in the photograph referred to above and taken at the Raleigh operations clean, hygienic and in good working order?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) Can the Minister state what types of containers and drums and other rubbish are in the shower cubicle as depicted in the photograph referred to in (1), and what their contents are or were?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) With regards to (1), can the Minister state what is the known factual and potential risk to workers occupational health and safety, including but not limited to poisoning and sickness and disease given the state and condition of the shower cubicle depicted in the photograph referred to in (1)?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the DMP inspectorate at the Raleigh Mine site in the last 30 months?
- (9) If no to (8), why not?
- (10) Has any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this shower cubicle depicted in the photograph referred to in (1) and depicted in the photograph in the last 30 months?
- (11) If yes to (10), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (12) With reference to (10), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by the DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (13) In light of (1), (4), (6), (11) and (12), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached including Regulation 7.19, which specific sections have been breached and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (14) If yes to (13), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (15) If no to (14), why not?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today**Notice given****Tuesday, 29 June 2010**

2552. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photographs posted for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled '2010-02-06 Raleigh Shower Drain.pdf' of a shower drain taken on 6 February 2010 in the change rooms at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above, does the Resources Safety Division of the DMP consider the shower drain depicted in the photographs taken at Raleigh Mine and referred to above to be clean, hygienic and in good working order?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) With regards to (1), can the Minister state what is the known factual and potential risk to the workers occupational health and safety given the state and condition of the shower drain as depicted in the photograph referred to in (1)?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the DMP inspectorate at the Raleigh Mine site in the last 30 months?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) Has any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this shower drain depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), and depicted in the photographs in the last 30 months?
- (9) If yes to (8), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (10) With reference to (8), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by the DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (11) In light of (1), (4), (9), and (10), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995*, been breached including Regulation 7.19, which specific sections have been breached, and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (12) If yes to (11), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (13) If no to (12), why not?

2553. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photograph posted for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460>, entitled '2010-02-05 HV Cable in Drain Raleigh.pdf' showing a 75mm High Voltage cable carrying 10 000 Volts lying in the water drain with a metal stool base lying across it, taken on 5 February 2010 at the underground crib room at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and '2010-02-01 Raleigh Crib Room Seepage.pdf' showing water seepage into the same crib room, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photograph referred to above, is the 75mm High Voltage cable carrying 10000 Volts that is laying in the water drain, with the base of a stool standing on it as depicted in these photographs an acceptable practice in any underground crib room or mine in Western Australia?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) With regards to (1), can the Minister state what is the risk to workers occupational safety as a result of the 75mm High Voltage cable carrying 10000 Volts that is laying in the water drain and having the bottom of a stool standing on it this underground crib room given the potential for the underground crib room to become wet as a result of water shown seeping through the roof, or if the crib room was hosed out and into this drain to clean the floor?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the DMP inspectorate at the Raleigh Mine site in the last 30 months?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) Were any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this 75mm High Voltage cable carrying 10000 Volts that is laying in the water drain in the underground crib room depicted in the photograph referred to in (1), in the last 30 months?
- (9) If yes to (8), how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company, on what date was each complaint/concern received, what specifically was each complaint/concern, what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue, and how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (10) If yes to (8), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by the DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (11) In light of (1), (4), (9), and (10), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached, which specific sections have been breached, and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (12) If yes to (11), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (13) If no to (12), why not?

2554. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photographs available for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460>, entitled '2010-02-05 Crib Room Ventilation Raleigh.pdf' showing handwash facilities taken on 5 February 2010 at the underground crib room at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above, does the Minister consider the piece of pipe around 200mm round sticking out of the wall and this small fan, as depicted in the photographs referred to above, to be adequate as the only form of ventilation in this underground crib room?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) With regards to (1), can the Minister state what is the risk to workers' occupational health when an underground crib room is overheated, and is unusable for a majority of operators for rest and recuperation during crib breaks?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) inspectorate at the Raleigh Mine site in the last 30 months?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) Were any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this lack of ventilation in the underground crib room depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), in the last 30 months?
- (9) If yes to (8), -
- (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (10) If yes to (9), -

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (11) In light of (1), (4), (9), and (10) , have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached including Regulation 7.17, which specific sections have been breached, and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (12) If yes to (11), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (13) If no to (12), why not?

2555. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photograph posted for viewing at <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460>, entitled '2010-02-01 Raleigh Crib Room Seepage.pdf' of handwash facilities taken on 1 February 2010 at the underground crib room at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above, does the Resources Safety Division of the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP), consider the water seeping out of the roof and onto the floor, the table and chairs, the lights the ice machine as depicted in the photographs to be acceptable practice in any underground crib room in Western Australia?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) With regards to (1), can the Minister state what is the risk to workers occupational health and safety given the underground crib room was quite wet at times and that as a result the majority of operators would not use it to rest and recuperate during their crib?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the DMP inspectorate at the Raleigh Mine site in the last 30 months?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) Were any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this water seeping through the roof in the underground crib room depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), in the last 30 months?
- (9) If yes to (8), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue; and
- (e) how long did each issue take to resolve?
- (10) If yes to (8), -
 - (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by the DMP inspectorate;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (d) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (11) In light of (1), (4), (9), and (10), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached, including Regulation 7.17 which specific sections have been breached, and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (12) If yes to (11), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (13) If no to (12), why not?

2556. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum

I refer to the photograph posted for viewing at, <http://www.robinchapple.org.au/node/460> entitled, '2010-06-28 Raleigh Handwash Facilities.pdf' showing handwash facilities taken at the underground crib room at the Raleigh Mine in the Kalgoorlie region owned by Barrick Gold, and ask -

- (1) With regards to the photographs referred to above, does the Resources Safety Division of the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) consider the handwash facilities depicted in the photographs taken at Raleigh Mine and referred to above to be clean, hygienic and safe to be around?
- (2) If yes to (1), why?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) With regards to (1) can the Minister state what the risk to workers occupational health and safety is given the state and condition of the handwash facilities as depicted in the photographs referred to?
- (5) If no to (4), why not?
- (6) Can the Minister state how many inspections have taken place by the DMP inspectorate at the Raleigh Mine site in the last 30 months?
- (7) If no to (6), why not?
- (8) Were any complaints/concerns recorded, both on the internal reporting system including in the Safety Toolbox Meeting Minutes Book and/or with the DMP, concerning this hand wash facilities depicted in the photographs referred to in (1), in the last 30 months?
- (9) If yes to (8), -

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today*Notice given**Tuesday, 29 June 2010*

- (a) how many complaints/concerns were received by management of the company;
 - (b) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (c) what specifically was each complaint/concern;
 - (d) what was done by the management of the company to resolve each issue;
 - (e) how long did each issue take to resolve;
 - (f) how many complaints/concerns were received by DMP inspectorate;
 - (g) on what date was each complaint/concern received;
 - (h) what specifically was done by the DMP inspectorate to address each issue that was raised; and
 - (i) on what date was each issue resolved?
- (10) In light of (1), (4), and (9), have any sections of the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994 and Regulations 1995* been breached including Regulation 7.17, which specific sections have been breached, and what is the maximum penalty for each breach?
- (11) If yes to (10), will any responsible persons from Barrick Kanowna, including the resident manager, be prosecuted for these breaches?
- (12) If no to (11), why not?

2557. Hon Ken Travers to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Health

In relation to patient transfers from the Joondalup Health Campus (JHC) to other hospitals, I ask -

- (1) In 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, how many patients were transferred?
- (2) Of these, what was the primary reason for the patient transfer?
- (3) Which hospitals were patients transferred to?
- (4) How many patients were transferred because JHC was unable to provide the appropriate level or type of care?
- (5) For 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 financial years, what was the cost of patient transfers?

2558. Hon Ken Travers to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Commerce

- (1) What checks does the Department of Commerce carry out on hire campervans?
- (2) Does the Department of Commerce have a checklist for inspections to follow?
- (3) If yes to (2), will they table it?
- (4) What are the qualifications of the inspectors carrying out inspections on hire campervans?
- (5) How often are checks conducted, and how many have occurred this financial year 2009-2010?
- (6) Are hire companies ever given notice as to when checks will be conducted?
- (7) If yes to (6), why?

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Questions Asked Today

Notice given

Tuesday, 29 June 2010

- (8) For each location where campervans have been inspected, -
- (a) what was the name of the hire company that owned the vehicle;
 - (b) how many vehicles were inspected;
 - (c) how many were found to be un-roadworthy; and
 - (d) was the company given any notice that the check would occur prior to the inspector arriving at the premises?

MALCOLM PEACOCK

Clerk of the Legislative Council