

CITY OF BELMONT INQUIRY

1059. Hon JIM SCOTT to the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development:

- (1)
 - (a) Has the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development noted the discrepancies between the responses recorded in the “Report of the Inquiry into the City of Belmont” tabled by the minister on 10 April, 2003, and the City of Belmont’s consolidated report of inquiry tabled on 11 June, 2003?
 - (b) By what process has the City of Belmont changed the response resolutions adopted on 28 April, 2003 and how was this effected in the requirements of the Local Government Act 1995?
 - (c) Does the “Report of the Inquiry into the City of Belmont” tabled by the minister contain the correct responses or does the minister accept the consolidated report circulated by the City of Belmont in May and tabled on 11 June as the authentic and correct document?
 - (d) Is it correct that the City of Belmont has been vindicated by the inquiry and, if not, what action will the minister take to ensure that the City of Belmont withdraws the consolidated report and deals with the matters concerned?
- (2) Why did the inquiry not deal with the term of reference relating to lot 600 known as the bowling club land?

Hon TOM STEPHENS replied:

I thank the honourable member for his question. I am particularly interested in the question for a range of reasons. It highlights a substantial discrepancy between the public face of the City of Belmont and how it purports to be replying to these serious issues of the inquiry, and its formal private response to the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development. Fortunately, the City of Belmont is taking the formal private response seriously. However, for whatever reasons, it has chosen to present to the public a different response altogether.

I must think about these issues and decide whether the formal response is a sufficient response for me to take into consideration, or whether I should consider the wider response of the City of Belmont to this issue as if it were part of the formal response. It adds an interesting dynamic to my responsibilities as Minister for Local Government and Regional Development in ensuring the good governance of the people of the City of Belmont. However, the formal reply is as follows -

- (1)
 - (a) Yes.
 - (b) On 28 April the council of the City of Belmont resolved on the content of the formal response to the recommendations contained within the inquiry report. I have a copy of this response, which is now being considered. I am unaware of any changes to this resolution.
 - (c) The report I tabled on 10 April, 2003 is the “Report of the Inquiry into the City of Belmont”.
 - (d) The report that I tabled contains a number of findings and recommendations. The City of Belmont has provided its response to these and it is currently being considered.
- (2) The answer to (2) has not been made available, so I will come back to the member with that information.

The issue raised about the terms of reference of the inquiry that were not dealt with in the inquiry will be considered at the end of the inquiry process.

That is the formal reply prepared for me, which I am happy to read out. However, I will add to it. It is not correct to say that the City of Belmont has been vindicated.