

ARTHUR GREER, TRIAL EVIDENCE

798. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the minister representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

I preface the question by indicating that when I submitted the notice of the question, it was directed to the Attorney General. I was subsequently advised that it was to be sent to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. As a consequence, the Minister for Police may not be able to answer the question in the terms in which I put it.

I refer to question 413 asked by me on Wednesday, 27 November 2002 regarding forensic evidence in the trial of Arthur Greer.

- (1) Was a fingerprint found on masking tape attached to a sheet of clear plastic located in the area where the lower remains identified as those of Sharon Mason were found?
- (2) Was evidence given on the trial of Arthur Greer on 3 August 1993 by Mr Sheridan that fingerprints on the masking tape were compared with a fingerprint of Arthur Greer, and that it was not identical?
- (3) Was the fingerprint on the masking tape compared with fingerprints of other persons of interest in the investigation; if not, why not?
- (4) Under what circumstances might the Attorney General authorise the release of fingerprint photographs for forensic comparison with fingerprints of other persons who might be implicated in the death of Sharon Mason?
- (5) Should I put this question on notice?

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The member approached me yesterday and he has seen my answer. That is why he added part (5) to the four parts submitted. He would not be surprised by the response that the Minister for Police and Emergency Services has kindly provided to me to give to the honourable member. I showed him it yesterday - it is now a matter to go on the record.

The Western Australian Police Service advises that the information requested is not available in the time required. I therefore ask the honourable member to put the question on notice.

The fifth part of the question was very appropriate.

PORT GREGORY, WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

799. Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE to the Minister for Government Enterprises:

Given the urgent requirement for water which is delaying the development and growth of the town of Port Gregory, not to mention the tourism potential, when will the Government fund a water supply scheme that will adequately meet current and future needs?

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

The Water Corporation advises that the Port Gregory water supply is owned and operated by the Shire of Northampton under licence from the Office of Water Regulation. The Water Corporation could only consider providing a water supply to Port Gregory on the basis of a capital contribution from the community and approval of a community service obligation. At the request of the shire, the corporation has undertaken studies to determine costs associated with the upgrading of the water supply to corporation standards. The study also investigated supply options, such as a supply from a new water source or by desalination. The corporation has recommended the desalination option to the shire and provided an estimate of the cost. It is now up to the shire, in consultation with the community, to pursue options for funding the upgrading of Port Gregory's water supply.

REGIONAL HERBARIUM PROJECT, NATURAL HERITAGE TRUST FUNDING

800. Hon DEE MARGETTS to the minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage:

With regard to the Geraldton Regional Herbarium I ask -

- (1) Is the minister aware that with the cessation of Natural Heritage Trust funding to the regional herbarium project, the Department of Conservation and Land Management herbarium has withdrawn from all regional herbaria its service of validation and vouchering of specimens?
- (2) Is the minister aware of the number of regional herbaria that have used this service?

- (3) Have any estimates been made of the potential loss of the many voluntary hours that members of the community have contributed already in collecting these samples and the value for money that the single regional herbarium officer has provided for this State?
- (4) Given that this service could not be duplicated by Government, would the minister agree that it is rather unreasonable to expect volunteers, having already voluntarily collected specimens, to then have to raise funds to have them identified?
- (5) Is the minister able to ensure that the service of identification by a qualified botanist and the bar coding of specimens for regional herbaria is resumed with minimal delay?

Hon TOM STEPHENS replied:

- (1) The CALM herbarium has not withdrawn its services of validation and vouchering of specimens.
- (2) The seed money received from the Natural Heritage Trust to establish a self-sustaining network of regional herbaria resulted in 74 regional herbaria that can access validation and vouchering services as well as flora information systems.
- (3) There has been no loss of any voluntary hours because specimens collected by volunteers through the regional herbaria project and lodged in the herbaria are a permanent record with their details available through access to information systems.
- (4) No, the Natural Heritage Trust grant provided seed money to establish local herbaria. A major part of the project was to train participating regional land care, catchment and kindred conservation groups that have access to external funding to factor the cost of identification into their grant applications to the Commonwealth Government and any other funding bodies.
- (5) The service is continuing. CALM has provided funds for an experienced identification botanist and the databasing of specimens to service the regional herbaria project.

INDIGENOUS SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE, PROTECTION

801. Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Indigenous Affairs:

- (1) Does the minister agree with the notion that under Western Australian law, indigenous sites of significance are protected whether they are registered or not?
- (2) If yes, for what reason does the minister agree with this statement?
- (3) If no, for what reason does the minister disagree with this statement?

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question. The minister has provided the following answer.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is the generally accepted interpretation of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972.
- (3) Not applicable.

GROUND WATER SOURCE OPTIONS, DEVELOPMENT

802. Hon NORMAN MOORE to the Minister for Government Enterprises:

Earlier this afternoon I asked the minister a question with respect to sources of water in addition to the south Yarragadee option. The question asked whether these sources would be developed ahead of the south Yarragadee proposal. The answer provided was a little confusing.

Can the minister tell me whether it is the intention of Water Corporation to develop the other options; that is, the Eglinton, Yanchep and Karnup-Dandalup ground water source options, the Wellington Dam option, the enhanced surface water catchment management option and the desalination option, ahead of the south Yarragadee option?

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS replied:

The south west Yarragadee option is being examined. Whether the option is exercised is yet to be determined. The honourable member may be aware that the Water Corporation is causing some \$6.1 million to be expended to determine the sustainability of the south west Yarragadee option to get an understanding of what can be used, whether it be for the south west, the metropolitan area or flowing through to the agricultural region and the Goldfields as the case may be. That option is being examined.

With regard to whether a particular option will be exercised in a particular order, that is a matter to be determined when all the options are on the table. The options that I provided in the list that I read out, which the Leader of the Opposition