

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 2 April 1992

THE SPEAKER (Mr Michael Barnett) took the Chair at 10.00 am, and read prayers.

CONDOLENCE MOTION - BUCHANAN, THE LATE PAMELA

DR LAWRENCE (Glendalough - Premier) [10.05 am]: I move -

That this House records its sincere regret at the death of Pam Buchanan, former member for Pilbara and Ashburton, and tenders its deep sympathy to her husband and family in their bereavement.

I know that when members in this House discovered yesterday that Pam had died after a long illness they were deeply upset and deeply grieved. Pam is a member for whom everyone has had enormous respect, particularly the Labor Party, for whom she has been an active member for many years. Pam joined the Labor Party in 1976 and was elected to Parliament seven years later. During that time she clearly demonstrated to everybody a professional and diligent approach to public life. She was always available to her electors and to the Parliament and her record of achievements in the electorate of Ashburton is second to none, and second to none of any member of this Parliament.

Pam Buchanan is a woman enormously regarded by members in this place because during her time here she stood up for the ordinary people. Many people in the Parliament will remember the debates about the cost of living in the Pilbara in which Pam was vehement in her defence of the needs of the people in the region. She did a lot of detailed work establishing community groups and working with them. I discovered recently that she made her office available to local community groups for the work they were doing. It was a measure of her commitment to the people in the north that she continued in Parliament despite her illness and, I might add, without the knowledge of many people. She was not one to seek sympathy and she was not one to look for others to look after her, although it was her intention always to look after the needs of her electorate which she did in a most extraordinary fashion. As well as representing the area and working with community groups so well she had a steadfast view about the needs of workers in the Pilbara. She always defended the battlers and she worked hard to improve industrial relations and to ensure that the people in the Pilbara and in the rest of the State could work with dignity and under conditions which protected them from ill health and injury. That is one of the great tributes one can pay to her. She was concerned about other people's wellbeing perhaps, as it has turned out, ahead of her own.

As well as being Minister for Works, Services and Regional Development, in which she had a consuming interest, Pam was Minister assisting me as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Pam clearly had a strong empathy for the Aboriginal people and within that community she earned great respect from both inside and outside politics. She was always available to the Aboriginal people; she would take the time to discuss issues with them and she understood the differences between black and white Australia sufficiently to be patient and careful in her dealings with Aboriginal people. I know that they will sadly miss her also.

Pam served in this Parliament as Government Whip and all members on both sides of the House developed a great respect for the calm way in which she served in that position for five years. It is not always easy in the Parliament to discipline unruly mobs, but she did that extremely well. She made sure that members were in their place, on time, she took care of their needs in servicing their electorates and was fair in distributing pairs and generally ensuring members' proper performance in the Parliament. She did that with good temper. I do not think I ever saw her lose her temper. She was concerned to ensure that people were dealt with fairly and reasonably and that is the way she will be remembered. As a woman who put herself last, she put the people of the Pilbara, her family, Aboriginal people and, in the case of members in this place, members' needs ahead of her own. She has always been somebody whom we, as parliamentarians, could regard with a great deal of respect. It was no great difficulty for any of us to do that.

I express our deep regret at Pam's death and I know that members on both sides of the House will share that view.

MR MacKINNON (Jandakot - Leader of the Opposition) [10.09 am]: I formally second the motion. Pam Buchanan was a member of this Parliament from 1983 to 1992. I was interested to learn, when reading her profile, that while being a member of Parliament for only that time she had lived in the Pilbara since 1967. She had therefore seen the growth and development of the region and made a significant contribution to it, not only as a member of Parliament but also as a member and supporter of the Lions Club, the P & C association, the Country Women's Association, and the tourism industry.

When thinking about that electorate and the whole area, I remember Pam's predecessor, Brian Sodeman, a man who I thought was outstanding in his commitment to the electorate and its people. Certainly in Pam's case she was equally committed to the people of her electorate. As the Premier said, Pam had a keen interest in all those issues that affected the electorate, particularly the cost of living. While we on this side of the Chamber tried to take the mickey out of Pam in that regard we could not deny her commitment and interest in issues on behalf of her electorate. She definitely fought that fight to the end.

When we think of Pam one word could sum her up: Unselfish. Her commitment was to others, not to herself. Despite her illness and her problems, personal and otherwise, she remained loyal to the electorate and to the principles of her party. That is something I admire in any individual. I join with the Premier in extending to Pam's husband, George, her family and friends, our condolences.

MR HOUSE (Stirling) [10.12 am]: I join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the National Party, in offering our sympathy to Pam Buchanan's family. Pam came to this Parliament as part of the Labor revival in 1983 and played her part for the Labor Party in winning the seat of Pilbara which had previously been held by the conservative parties.

Pam Buchanan was a quiet and dignified person. She went about her work as a member of Parliament in an unassuming way. Pam Buchanan's speeches in this Parliament showed concern for the people she represented, especially for the average battler - the people she felt she represented the best. Her speeches indicate that she brought to this Parliament their problems; she worked hard and diligently to help them. I had some contact with Pam when she was the Labor Party Whip. I know how difficult it is to keep the members of any party in order from time to time, particularly members of the National Party on a Thursday, but Pam was always very accommodating about our problems and requirements. She was a very easy person with whom to work.

Pam's final months of life were not months that most of us would want to experience. During that time she showed the same quiet dignity she had always shown. On behalf of the National Party and its leader, I extend sympathy to Pam Buchanan's family.

MR DONOVAN (Morley) [10.14 am]: I preface my comments in support of the Premier's motion in a way that perhaps may not be regarded all that well in some quarters. I note the obituary in *The West Australian* today is somewhat more realistic and sensitive than was the story on 26 February on the same matter, at least in respect of the resignation of the late Pam Buchanan. I take the opportunity to urge the Press Gallery to remember that this place is full of all sorts of human beings. Sometimes it does not do members of the Press any good to jump to wrong and hurtful conclusions. The members of the Press Gallery know about whom I am talking. There is no need to say any more.

I take this opportunity to extend to the Buchanan family the condolences of my family, particularly of my two sons, James and David, both of whom were taught at kindergarten by Pam Buchanan - with all the other white and black children at the time in Roebourne. That is a point I would want to stress most this morning. In the battle for improved race relations and decreased juvenile crime in Roebourne - and the member for Pilbara will bear me out here - change and improvement had to come from at least three sources. Certainly it had to come from a greater police effort which has gone into the town and the community and from the tremendous improvement and increase in the level of community involvement by both white and black members of the community. However, both of those things were made possible only by the sorts of positive attitudes, increased tolerance and assertiveness among people that makes that progress possible. The point is that my first experience of Pam Buchanan was of someone with the skills and commitment to early childhood education by which she could actually start crafting the groundwork for the changes in attitudes from

which Roebourne benefits today. It is a tremendous credit to the woman - and the Leader of the Opposition noted her unselfishness - to recall those days when in a quite hostile environment she was able with the patience and tolerance most of us have come to know to proceed quietly with the job of teaching people to do things differently where it counts, in their formative years.

More recently Pam's tolerance to difference and disagreement was sometimes frustrating to those who shared her left wing views but wanted to move faster and harder. However, when I looked back to Roebourne and saw Pam on the grass outside the kindergarten building with the pre-schoolers of Roebourne's Aboriginal and European communities I could not help learning a lesson from that. I guess the old adage "Rome was not built in a day" fits the bill. If I were better able to be as patient as she was, and perhaps as long-sighted about the future, my contribution may have been different also. That was the mark of the woman. She took those skills and commitments into politics and used them in the best way that she could.

Pam Buchanan will be remembered as much for her commitment to early childhood education and community development as she will for her commitment to social justice, and Aboriginal advancement in particular. Pam Buchanan was not always treated by some of those around her with quite the same respect and sensitivity with which she treated them, but nonetheless she will be missed by us all. My thoughts and best wishes go to Pam's husband, George, and their two daughters who I know will miss her, as will the rest of the community she served so well.

MR GRAHAM (Pilbara) [10.18 am]: I support the condolence motion for the late Pam Buchanan. I do this with great difficulty because not only was Pam my predecessor in the seat of Pilbara and my political colleague; she was also a very close friend of myself and my family. The passing of a colleague is very difficult but when it is a matter of friendship and family connection it is even more difficult.

I record publicly on behalf of the people of the Pilbara our admiration and sincere thanks to Pam Buchanan for the service she has given to that area of the State. It is an area in which it has been difficult for women to play a major public role. It is predominantly a masculine, mining area of the State and Pam came into that area as a female candidate. I know how difficult it was for her during the election campaign. I am aware of some of the prejudices that were placed before Pam in her quest to become a member of Parliament. She handled all of those difficulties just as she handled most issues in her lifetime, with a certain calm and dignity which is not often found in people in public life. I appreciated her for that. I also would like to record my deep sympathies to her family, who played a very major role in the life of the Pilbara. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, they were long term residents of the Pilbara; they grew up and developed in that area. I simply record the Pilbara people's appreciation of Pam Buchanan, and I wish her family well.

DR ALEXANDER (Perth) [10.20 am]: I add a few words to this motion, not because I know the Pilbara well but because in the past 12 months I got to know Pam Buchanan perhaps better than I had previously, simply because we were put in a similar political position. Through that contact I certainly came to appreciate the tremendous qualities she had which I think were underestimated by many people particularly, regrettably, her colleagues. She obviously went about her job as Minister in a very unassuming way, and it is unfortunate that politics is one of those occupations which seems to require a higher profile in the public eye than Pam was seen to be able to deliver. However, if one talks to people who know the work she did, as the member for Pilbara said, it is clear that it was a false picture. In the glamour of the Perth media the situation was sometimes portrayed differently, and that went against her when it came to judgment time around the Cabinet table and she was unceremoniously turfed out.

I have talked to people in the Aboriginal community with whom she dealt, and I am aware that she was able to build close links with them, particularly the fringe dwellers, in a way that probably most members of Parliament have not been able to do and perhaps Ministers who operate in different ways may not have been able to achieve. Certainly, Pam had great respect from those people and that is a mark of the compassionate and sincere way in which she approached her job as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. She exhibited that same compassion last year in the debates on the brewery, and it is a great pity that she was not listened to more closely on issues such as that where she had the best interests of her

constituents - whether local in the north or in the metropolitan area - in mind. She was very well regarded by the people with whom she worked in the outside community. It has been a matter of personal regret that I lost contact with Pam in the last few months but it was obvious that she wanted to see out her last days with her family in quiet dignity, and that is a mark of the person she was.

During my brief contact with her in this place, and particularly when she resigned from the Labor Party and we worked briefly together on the back bench as Independents, I came to appreciate her sincerity to a much greater degree. I think that her sincerity and genuine approach to the job will be fully recognised and remembered. It is a great pity that often the true qualities of people are recognised only after they die.

MR THOMPSON (Darling Range) [10.24 am]: I add my condolences to those already expressed, but I also make the point to members of Parliament that they should be a lot more charitable one to the other than they tend at times to be. Some people in this place were prepared to peddle all sorts of rumours about Pam Buchanan and to make judgments, without knowing the facts. I made it my business to keep in touch with Pam during the past few months and I knew of her situation. I thought it most unbecoming that some members of Parliament were prepared to make suggestions about her situation. In defence of the journalist referred to by the member for Morley, may I say that his attitude and perhaps the way he thought were coloured by some of the malicious views being expressed by some members of Parliament. They were not confined to only one side of the House. I was aware that Pam was desperately ill and I encouraged her not to resign 12 months ago. Her inclination was to resign at that time because of her regard for her constituents. However, I said that in my view it was not necessary for her to do that; she should try to beat her illness and make a decision about resigning further down the track. I do not know whether I influenced her, but I am pleased that she left her resignation until the time she did. She was entitled to do so. I hope that Pam Buchanan will serve as a reminder to all members of Parliament that we should be more charitable one to the other.

MR P.J. SMITH (Bunbury) [10.26 am]: I would like to say a few words about Pam Buchanan, without repeating what has been said already. I had a close affinity with Pam because we both entered Parliament in 1983 and we sat together, firstly on the back benches and later, when she became a Minister. She and I, together with Mrs Fay Smith, who was a member of the dining room staff, went to Scarborough Primary School together in the latter years of World War II. We had that link from the past, and I spent a lot of time discussing issues with Pam. She was a very mild person, and she did not posture, shout, or scream like some members. She believed intensely in what she was doing, and would stand and deliver her speeches in her very intense and quiet manner. She stood up for ordinary people. She was the champion of the poor and disadvantaged, particularly Aborigines. As such, I feel she was an excellent choice as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. As one who believes the old Swan Brewery should be kept, she managed to persuade me that the site was of tremendous significance to Aborigines and I moderated my views.

On behalf of the people who have known her over the years and her friends in the Labor Party and in Parliament - many of whom would have liked to say a few words about Pam - I express my deep regret on her passing to her husband George, and her daughters, Jane and Ann.

Question passed, members standing.

PETITION - MUJA STRIKE

Timber Workers' Opposition

MR OMODEI (Warren) [10.29 am]: I have a petition couched in the following terms -

To: The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned timber workers deplore the actions of strikers at Muja and call on the State Government to resolve the dispute immediately, and put in place measures to ensure it does not occur again.

Timber Workers have already suffered as a result of the recent decline in the timber

demand in the building industry and cannot afford a loss of wages as a result of any strike.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 181 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 20.]

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - SEVENTH DAY

Motion, as Amended

Debate resumed from 1 April.

MR LEWIS (Applecross) [10.30 am]: As a shadow Minister I will raise concerns related to the Mounts Bay Road bus port and charges associated with the Western Australian ports for the attention of members.

Many things can be said about the Mounts Bay Road bus port. The overwhelming understanding in the community is that it is a major embarrassment to the Government particularly from the planning and public transport points of view. It stands starkly in Mounts Bay Road as a white elephant and perhaps a monument to the stupidity of this Government. It is also an example of political intervention causing something to be built for all the wrong reasons. It is yet another example of the Leader of the House failing dismally in his ministerial responsibilities when, as Minister for Transport, he was responsible for that project being initiated.

The bus port was predicated as part of the WA Inc deals to enhance property values of what was then the Perth Technical School site, now known as Westralia Square. One must look at the bus station as a \$34.1 million lemon. It stands side by side as a Gemini with the \$36.5 million lemon known as Rous Head at Fremantle, the result of another decision made by the Leader of the House when Minister for Transport. We see two lemons together - a \$70 million waste of taxpayers' money initiated by the Leader of the House when Minister for Transport.

The bus port is derisively known as "the bus joke". I did not make that up. It is called that by many people who look on it with awe, wondering who uses it. The bus station has had an ill fated history and calling it "the bus joke" is not unreasonable. The project opened with much fanfare on 30 November 1991, 21 months after its scheduled completion date. The cost had blown out from \$23 million to \$34.1 million, an extra \$11.1 million or 48 per cent over budget. It turned out to be an industrial relations disaster. The Government acquiesced to the building unions working a 36 hour week on the project and in the central business district that flowed on to all city building sites. Of course, that 36 hour week was denied in this Parliament by the former Minister for Industrial Relations who said that a 36 hour week was never granted on that site. History has shown that was not the case and that that is where the 36 hour week was first instituted.

One of the unfortunate products of "the bus joke" was that litigation is now proceeding with Concrete Constructions (WA), the principal contractor, about the project. The whole project has been a large embarrassment all round. Perhaps the greatest embarrassment was that it was built in the wrong position and does not work. It was said that 2 700 buses and 20 000 people would use the station each day. I understand from the scheduling and timetables available that that number of buses does use the station each day. In reply to a question on notice the other day about how many people use the concourse we were told that 900 people currently use it each day. If one divides that 900 into the 2 700 buses using the station each day, one finds that only one person on every third bus uses the station - that is, \$34.1 million later.

The bus station has placed a physical barrier between the river and the City of Perth, which enjoys a unique situation with the Swan River enhancing it. To take that feeling from the city by placing the bus port where it is has stymied the so-called Perth foreshore plan. If one looks at the submissions for the Perth foreshore competition one sees that few of them

recognised the foreshore plan's existence or took it into account. The bus station was not recognised by most of the planners of Perth's future foreshore because they omitted it from their submissions. That is an incredible situation bearing in mind that it cost \$34 million to put the bus station where it is. The bus port is, in fact, an expensive bus stop. Rather than spend \$34 million, \$10 could have been spent at the local hardware store to buy a 10cm x 10cm x 1.8m length of timber that could be painted orange and put in the same position, for all the good the bus station is doing. A few weeks ago, I walked around the bus station for half an hour, and I was staggered at what I saw. I counted 14 people on the concourse, and only two of the 16 shops were open. One shop was a boot repairer or cobbler, and the other was a florist.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr LEWIS: The bottom line is that the bus station is an absolute disaster in a commercial sense, and it reflects unfavourably on the competence of the Government. The bus station was launched on the basis that it would relieve traffic congestion in the central business district, and particularly on the Terrace. The sad fact is that it has exacerbated the traffic congestion because buses that formerly terminated on the extremities of the CBD are now brought into the city and pass through the bus station. A few days ago, I was in Mill Street, and no less than 27 buses were queued up in the street or trying to leave the bus station. The siting of the bus station has caused chaos in the city. When one thinks about it, why would anyone want to walk 200 or 300 metres in the rain to catch a bus from the bus station when that same bus can be caught as it moves along the Terrace?

The bus station was sited in that area for all the wrong reasons. It is flawed because it is in the wrong position. The logic behind its siting does not work at all. The professional city planners have said that the bus station should have been combined with an inner transport node to the east of the Perth Railway Station and within easy walking distance of the Wellington Street Bus Station so that all public transport would be within the one node. However, the planners were ignored; the political and financial, or WA Inc, imperatives came into play; and it was decided to site the bus station in its present location to enhance the values of the Government's properties across the road. It is a sad and sorry story and it is an indictment of the Leader of the House, who was then Minister for Transport.

Mr Pearce: Actually, I was not, but I supported the decision nonetheless, and it is the right decision because the trouble with your plan is that it has all the buses going through all of the streets of the city. We need to get public transport out of the city. That is what the real planners think. I would be interested to know to which planners you spoke who believe that public transport should run through all of the streets of the city.

Mr LEWIS: The Leader of the House has exacerbated the transport problems in the city. The reason is WA Inc and Westralia Square. The bus station is a major embarrassment to the Government. It does not work, and I do not know how anyone can get it to work. It is a \$34.5 million lemon that was 50 per cent over budget. It was an industrial relations disaster and it brought a 36 hour week to building sites in Perth. No-one uses the facility. It cost \$28.3 for every Western Australian, and \$34 million later we have a huge white elephant. It is a commercial disaster because only two of the 16 shops have been let, and I suggest that those two shops will probably not continue to trade for much longer because they must be going broke at 100 kms an hour. The siting of the bus station has stymied the future planning of that end of the CBD and the idea of bringing the river into the City of Perth. It was stated in an answer to a question that 2 700 buses and 20 000 people a day would use the bus station, but in answer to a question on notice approximately 900 people transfer to other bus services via the concourse each day. The utilisation of the bus station is 20 times less than was expected, and the Minister opposite says it is not a lemon! The dilemma of this Government is what will it do with the bus station. The situation is like the Fitzgerald Street bus bridge. The incompetent Minister for Transport does not have any solutions and does not know how the problem will be resolved or, indeed, what will be done with that huge, expensive white elephant.

Mr Pearce: What do you suggest?

Mr LEWIS: To be very candid with the Leader of the House, it is not my responsibility; it is his Government's responsibility. We said the bus station was being built in the wrong place, as did everyone else. This Government made the decision, and it has to wear it.

I want to refer now to some of the things that are going on at some of the ports around the State. I am disappointed that the so-called Minister for Transport - who should be known as the "Minister for Minders" because her minders make all the decisions - is not here to listen to what I believe is a reasonable debate about two important matters that fall within her portfolio of Transport. However, her day of reckoning is coming. People see her incompetence every day of the week and it is only a matter of time before the Premier will have to shift her. The Premier did not even refer to the Minister for Transport the propositions in the WA Advantage package whereby the Premier, and rightly so, is moving to deregulate transport in this State. I suppose the Minister is a bit of an ornament. She does not do much but sit here as an ornament, in some people's eyes. That is her function at present.

I want to talk about what is going on at the wharf. The State and Federal Governments talk about microeconomic reform and how we must sort out the costs on the wharf. The Government has looked at possibly reducing some of the labour costs and so on, but it has not examined the demarcation of charges and the anachronistic fixation some port authorities have in their charging methodology. It is known around the wharf that when a ship ties up it receives a raft of services it does not even need or want but nonetheless pays for. In our ports that psychology still prevails. Ships are being charged for services that are not required on the basis that they are included in the tying-up package. The port provides what it thinks the ships need rather than the clients specifying what they need. I suggest that huge savings could be made in port charges and great assistance could flow to our industry, particularly niche markets such as export markets for aluminium and boat construction. Members may not know that we have four very competitive boat manufacturers operating in the south west metropolitan region which have developed niche markets in the Middle East and China. They have become very professional and are world leaders in the kinds of vessel they manufacture.

To illustrate how microeconomic reform has not quite filtered through to the management of the various port authorities I will relate a couple of examples. Firstly, however, we must look at the successes of the Port of Fremantle. One wonders why that port was faced with an operating loss this year of \$13 million and a gross loss, including superannuation, of about \$37 million. The bottom line is that tonnages are not being shipped through the Port of Fremantle. Our population is growing by three per cent a year but the tonnages going through the Port of Fremantle are falling. It can be seen from annual reports that in 1980-81, 19.8 million tonnes went through the Port of Fremantle. In 1987-88 the figure was 21.3 million tonnes, so there was growth. However, in 1990-91 the figure had fallen to 16.3 million tonnes. In the 10 years between 1980-81 and 1990-91 the throughput of cargo at the Port of Fremantle decreased by about 2.5 million tonnes and its revenue fell accordingly, as reflected by the \$13 million loss this year.

Why are the port's customers not using the port? The bottom line is that it is too expensive. There are too many rules and fixed charges and no ability to negotiate shipping and stevedoring costs, wharfage, berthage and the like. As an example, I understand that the manufacturer of a 40 metre long ferry weighing 150 metric tonnes was quoted \$45 000 to ship it out of Fremantle. That would have involved the ferry's steaming from Jervoise Bay into the Port of Fremantle and coming alongside the ship so that that ship, using its own lifting gear but not the deck of the wharf or anything else, could lift that ferry onto the ship. In Brisbane the same procedure would have cost \$24 700; and in Sydney, the port which is supposed to be the problem where all these barriers have to be broken down, it would have cost \$26 168. In fact, this ferry ended up being loaded for nothing. The ship steamed out of Fremantle and anchored in Jervoise Bay in waters not controlled by the Fremantle Port Authority, the manufacturer brought the ferry alongside and the ship's crew, using its own lifting gear, loaded the ferry onto the ship. It cost the manufacturer nothing but the labour of those seamen and a few stevedores who secured the vessel.

When the manufacturer was negotiating with the Port of Fremantle and was told the price he said, "That is a bit rich. We are not even using the wharf. Why are you charging us \$45 000 for wharfage?" The authority replied that those were the rules, that was the package, and he must take what the port was offering and could not have what he wanted. The manufacturer thought that he might take the ferry down to Bunbury for loading, but that would have cost about \$24 000 and by the time the ferry had steamed to Bunbury with a special crew he

would have been only about \$10 000 better off as it would have cost about \$36 000. Then someone who was a lateral thinker decided that they did not have to use the wharf anyway and could load the ferry for nothing. When they went back to the Fremantle Port Authority and tried to negotiate, the authority told them to get lost.

Members might think that was an isolated incident, but of course it was not. Another example is where a boat manufacturer had two world class aluminium ferries valued at \$5 million to \$6 million each, representing \$12 million worth of exports. About six weeks ago the Port of Fremantle charged \$87 000 to load those two ferries onto the MV *Lena*. They did not use the wharf at all. The ferries steamed into the harbour and the ship's lifting gear was used to load them, but the authority charged \$87 000. It seems that the Fremantle Port Authority is really going out of its way to help our exports! That figure represented about one per cent of the cost, and one per cent could be the difference between winning and losing a contract. Unfortunately, those people who paid the \$87 000 were not smart enough and did not think enough about it and so ended up paying, whereas the other exporter did not pay because he thought of a way around the problem.

A third example is the port of Bunbury and I am sorry that the member for Bunbury is not here. The motor vessel *Co-op Grantell* loaded alumina on 14 January this year. It was supposed to steam out on 15 January. However, because work needed to be done on the vessel after it was surveyed, the insurance company withdrew the insurance cover and the vessel could not leave. The owners of the vessel contracted people around Bunbury to repair the vessel. An amount of \$160 000 was spent on contractors, goods and services and the like in Bunbury to repair the vessel. The dreadful thing was that the owners of the vessel approached the Bunbury Port Authority and said, "We have finished loading and so we will pay the wharfage charges and other fees that were associated with it" which, for two days, would have totalled \$15 000. Because the vessel needed to be repaired and as the berth was not scheduled to be used for two or three weeks, they asked to leave the vessel there until 30 January - for another 14 days - while it was being repaired. Of course, the money for the repairs would have been spent in Bunbury under that arrangement. However, the port authority would not allow that and because that vessel could not go to sea, the Bunbury Port Authority virtually screwed the owners of the vessel to lie alongside and the total fee charged by the Bunbury Port Authority was \$75 800. An additional \$60 000 was paid as an all up cost for the vessel to use the wharf and for other incidental charges that go with the wharves that occur on the wharves while the vessel was being repaired.

The message I am trying to get across is that, if we are dinkum about exporting and competing, we must look also at the wharves being charged by the port operators, including the Fremantle and Bunbury Port Authorities. I do not have any examples of what is happening at other port authorities. It is absolutely over the top when the port authorities charge these extraordinary charges on the basis that that goes with the package, they know what the owners want or need but they do not care about it or what it will cost! I ask the Parliament and Leader of the House to try to sort out charges on our wharves.

DR CONSTABLE (Floreat) [11.02 am]: I welcome this opportunity to comment on a number of issues of concern in my electorate. Firstly, though, I would like to comment on the program outlined in the Governor's Speech to the Parliament on opening day. While he mentioned a number of issues that I see as "significant challenges" to be faced by this State, I would have liked to see a number of other initiatives included in the program. I did not see any new initiatives for our young jobless people, the 35 per cent of 15 to 19 year olds. We would all like to see some new initiatives in that area. I did not see any initiatives that would ease the problems in our public hospital system with waiting queues growing month by month. I did not see any new initiatives for our schools to lower class sizes and to provide more adequate services for handicapped children. Those are some of the significant challenges that I would have liked to see addressed in this session of Parliament.

Another challenge of significance is planning for an increase in population which this State will experience in the next 30 years. Two important planning issues are being discussed in the electorate of Floreat. The first of those relates to the policy by Federal and State Governments to increase density in inner suburban areas. The prediction is that our population will double in the next 30 years. Although we have to plan carefully, we must ensure also that the decisions that we make now are the right ones for the next 30 to 50 years. The Federal Government has put out a document titled "Building better cities", but I wonder

whether that is the case. The new jargon used by planners is "urban consolidation" and "urban infill". I suggest they may be misnomers. It is "suburban infill" and the whole notion of infill encroaches very much on the lifestyles of the people living in the suburbs close to the city.

The Department of Geography at the University of Western Australia carried out a very interesting study of how people in that area viewed higher density. It found that four out of five households oppose any increase in residential density in their neighbourhoods. Only one household in seven was in favour, and a small group of 8 per cent were noncommittal. This is a real issue occupying the community's attention.

Last night I attended two meetings in my electorate, the first at City Beach, where the Perth City Council had organised a workshop which was attended by 35 people so that they could give their views on planning issues in their area. Probably 90 per cent of the people attending that workshop believe that planning for higher density is the wrong way to go. The second meeting I attended was a general meeting of the Wembley Ward Ratepayers and Residents Association which definitely opposes higher density in those areas. I commend the Perth City Council for consulting the community prior to bringing out its review on planning issues affecting its wards. It is conducting numerous workshops with interested people to gauge the feelings of the community. That consultation process is the way we should be going in this State.

There are many concerns about increased density. They cover environmental issues, its effect on families, noise, traffic, pollution, crime rates and the general effect on the lifestyle of the people. One argument used for increasing density in the suburbs in my electorate is that the infrastructure exists already. We have sewerage, water and power supplies and other services and, therefore, it is cheaper to infill those areas than to develop new areas. Many of us are not convinced that that is the way to go. An example of an argument against infill is sewerage. Large areas of Floreat and City Beach are not sewered. However, there is a suggestion that the density in those suburbs should be doubled. Many areas in those suburbs are on septic tanks and the cost of doubling the problem may be horrific. Where density has been increased in some streets in Wembley, the old sewerage pipes have had to be replaced because they were not adequate to carry the increased waste. Also on the border of my electorate is the Shenton Park treatment plant which causes continuing odour problems in my electorate. I understand that has reached its capacity. Increasing density may cause more problems than it will solve. Water pressure problems have been experienced in some streets in my electorate because the more houses there are, the greater the demand. The people of my electorate are yet to be convinced that the existing infrastructure will be adequate to take an increase in density.

One issue that does worry me about increased density is its imposition on people's lifestyles. The people who live in these suburbs have chosen to live there because of the lifestyle they give them. The thought of having their lifestyles changed with more traffic and more people worries them greatly. It has been suggested that there might also be an increase in crime and vandalism with increased density and overseas studies suggest that that will be the case. Another problem is whether there is enough open space in my electorate to cater for additional residents. Many of the green areas will possibly be lost and the remaining recreational areas may not be sufficient to cater for an enormous increase in population.

It has been drawn to my attention that high density development will lead to a loss of privacy. People find that neighbouring blocks are subdivided and two storey dwellings are built along what was their back fence. They find neighbours encroaching on their privacy. High density development affects one's quality of life, changes one's chosen lifestyle and causes safety and security problems.

Another area of grave concern will be increased traffic and traffic congestion. Not only will the resulting noise and air pollution affect the residents, but also children's safety will be at risk. As soon as the bulldozers come into the suburb to redevelop an area, the trees are cut down, and that has already happened in two or three streets in Wembley. The garden atmosphere is destroyed. If we are to go down this route we must adopt standards similar to those adopted in other parts of the world. I understand that in England trees cannot be cut down for redevelopment without permission. We must look carefully at these things before we go willy-nilly into redevelopment. I suggest to members that this is not really about building a better city; it may be destroying beautiful suburbs.

The second area of grave concern in my electorate stems from the road reserves report, R8, which was released in January 1991. The report proposes the realignment of the western suburbs route to be known as Stephenson Highway. No one wants the Stephenson Highway but the realignment proposal has been brought to people's attention because it will encroach on those houses which will be close to it. The highway is designed to go through the residential areas of Woodlands, Churchlands, Wembley Downs, Floreat, City Beach and further south to Swanbourne and Cottesloe. If this proposal is implemented, it will destroy what is indeed a quiet, secure and pollution free lifestyle for the people in the western suburbs. It is planned that the highway will run through an existing golf course. I cannot understand how anyone could propose the establishment of a four or six lane highway through a golf course! It is to run alongside a major park and recreation area. The highway will carry large volumes of traffic and some sections of it will feed traffic along Cambridge and Grantham Streets and add congestion to other major routes to the city. From my discussions with the Main Roads Department it appears, from its traffic projections, that there is no need for this route for another 20 years. It will give us time to make sure it does not happen and that the area is not destroyed. It will cut off access to schools and to the beaches.

Mr Pearce: Are you talking about the Stephenson Highway proposal?

Dr CONSTABLE: Yes.

Mr Pearce: It will not go ahead.

Dr CONSTABLE: While it is on the plan it will affect the ability of people to sell their properties.

Mr Pearce: A recommendation has been made to take it out of the plan. A committee was set up by the Minister for Transport to look at road reserves generally and it was to recommend that the Stephenson proposal be removed.

Dr CONSTABLE: I am glad that is on the record. It was realigned in the road reserves report which was released last year, but it will still go through the golf course.

Mr Pearce: There is no need for it and it should be scrapped.

Dr CONSTABLE: I reiterate I am glad that is on the record and I will take that message to my electorate. We all agree then that if the proposal goes ahead it will destroy the lifestyle of the people in those suburbs.

Both of these planning issues raise a fundamental question which we must address very soon; that is, the standards for consultation and community involvement in changes proposed for specific areas. Given the debate in this place yesterday about the Fitzgerald Street bus bridge - it has been debated three times since I came to this place last August - it is time that people were consulted on community issues. According to my dictionary "consultation" means to seek advice or information from people; to ask guidance; to refer to for information; to have regard for a person's interest in making plans, and to confer. The example of the Fitzgerald Street bus bridge shows that the process of consultation by the relevant authorities, particularly Westrail, with some of the people most directly affected by it has been scant. Last September I attended a meeting which was called by people whose businesses were affected by this bridge. Some of them had only just found out a week or so prior to the meeting that the bridge was planned. If every household close to the electrified railway can be sent a brochure telling them that the railway is operating and encouraging them to use public transport, there must be a way to send information to people most directly affected by these sorts of changes so that they are informed from the beginning.

Mr Strickland: Perhaps the Minister should consult the Parliament so that we know.

Dr CONSTABLE: Perhaps we can be supplied with copies of brochures. We should be informed about what is happening, but more importantly the people affected by the development should be informed. The wider community should have a chance to comment on major changes. Plans should not be put in place until people have had a chance to have their say and be listened to.

Another example to illustrate my point concerns the road reserves report, R8. On its release a time was announced for community comment. It was some time mid year, but large numbers of people directly affected by the proposed changes to my electorate did not know

about them. Some people would argue that it is their job to find out what is going on, but I suggest that it is the Government which should be informing people directly of such changes. The story does not end there: There was a short period for public comment and I thank the Minister for extending the period to allow those people who were not aware of the proposed changes to have an opportunity to comment on the report. It appears that scant regard is given to people's submissions. Citizens go to the trouble of writing submissions and they are not even acknowledged. One of my constituents sent his submission to the Department of Planning and Urban Development on 14 November 1991 and, four and a half months later, it has not been acknowledged. I have found out since then that other people have not had their submissions acknowledged.

Mr D.L. Smith: I would be more than happy to look into the letters to which you are referring. I can assure you that letters to the Minister's office are responded to.

Dr CONSTABLE: I am referring to submissions on the road reserves report and they may not have been sent to the Minister's office.

Mr D.L. Smith: Submissions would have gone to the road reserves committee.

Dr CONSTABLE: Whoever they were sent to, they have not been acknowledged and that is a gross discourtesy to start with. People are concerned that their submissions have not even been read.

Mr D.L. Smith: I can assure you that all the submissions which are forwarded to the Department of Planning and Urban Development are read and are acknowledged.

Dr CONSTABLE: One of my constituents who was concerned that his submission had not been acknowledged phoned the department and was told that the report was for information only and that the recommendations would not change, no matter what people suggested.

Mr D.L. Smith: What was the name of the officer?

Dr CONSTABLE: I will supply that.

Mr Pearce: If it is a case of a person saying that, that person has no authority.

Dr CONSTABLE: We do not disagree. I am saying that we must get the procedures straight so that they work both for the Government and for the people.

Mr Pearce: Very often people come away from a telephone conversation with a view of what the other person said which would not be the same as the view held by that other person.

Dr CONSTABLE: I would not disagree with that either. That adds weight to my point that procedures should be in place.

Mr Pearce: The Leader of the Opposition has had a few memory lapses at the Royal Commission. Some Opposition statements at the Royal Commission do not correspond to what happened in this House.

Dr CONSTABLE: I am not talking about the Royal Commission. I am talking about the standard of consultation. The time has come to acknowledge the importance of planning and for people to have ownership of the planning process. When we set standards in procedures, in general terms they should be followed so that people are informed and consulted, perhaps in the way that the Perth City Council is acting at the moment with its review of urban density, so that people can be part of workshops; so that they can be listened to and their views taken into account before the final decisions are made.

Mr D.L. Smith: I invite the member to come to the department and view the process. Our planning processes are taken into account more than in any other area of Government.

Dr CONSTABLE: That may be so, but I hear in my electorate and in other parts of Perth that people feel alienated from the process. Clearly it should continue to be looked at so that people do not feel alienated.

Mr D.L. Smith: Unfortunately in the end people feel alienated.

Dr CONSTABLE: When I attend meetings of 150 people, that is the general. These are good and decent citizens who go about their business most of the time and they should be listened to.

Mr D.L. Smith: There is no problem with consultation on the rewrite of the Planning Act.

Dr CONSTABLE: Let us look at it.

Mr D.L. Smith interjected.

Dr CONSTABLE: Perhaps we should all know what it is. It is not widely known by the people who are often most intimately affected by the plans.

I direct my attention now to health services; the cutbacks in those services, as well as the waiting lists for hospitals. A constituent came to see me after she had been involved in an accident while away in Victoria. Her nose was broken, and she returned to Perth a few days later to see her GP who referred her to outpatients at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital for an appointment. She learned that it would take nine months to get an appointment. She accepted that appointment and every week after she rang to take a cancellation. After six months she received an appointment. The ear, nose and throat surgeon examined her and said that she would require an operation to break and reset her nose. He could not tell her when that would be because the list was never ending. That situation led me to look at the waiting lists in this State. I found that the metropolitan health services review, which came out late last year, indicated the figures for waiting lists in teaching hospitals between 1987 and 1991. The overall figure shows an increase from 7 187 people on the list to 10 584; that is an increase of 3 397 or 47 per cent. What is going on in our public hospitals if waiting lists are growing at that rate?

Mr Pearce: Why did that person go to the outpatients and not to a doctor?

Dr CONSTABLE: She went to her GP; she did not have private insurance so she went to outpatients.

I can give a number of examples of different services. I began with the ear, nose and throat figures, which represented an increase of 83 per cent in four years. The waiting list for general surgery has increased 79 per cent in four years. We are not providing the services which have been promised but, worse than that, people can wait on a list for some time. I have another example on good authority of a situation which occurred at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital a few weeks ago. Two elderly people were admitted on a Sunday for eye surgery the following morning. They had been on the waiting list for about two years. However, two emergency cases came in and were operated on first. The two elderly people who had been brought in for surgery, after waiting two years, and whose relatives had taken time off work to look after them and take them home after surgery, were told they could not have the operations that day, and they were sent home. What is going on when we are restricting the number of operations that can occur? This is happening where surgeons could once do three or four cases from the public operating list, but now find they can only do two operations. The time has come to examine the situation and ask for a more efficient hospital service so that patients can receive treatment.

Another topic I wish to comment on briefly is the standards testing in schools. It is important for us to establish standards, to maintain them, and to keep track of them. One aspect of the testing program needs to be aired, and that is the notion that it is some sort of diagnostic procedure. Let us address that aspect: Those tests are designed to be given to children in September of years 3, 7 and 10. It defies anyone's imagination how tests which are meant to be diagnostic can be given to any child in the second semester of year 10. That will not do any good at all because it is far too late to think the procedure would be diagnostic. Diagnostic procedures that find whether children have learning or reading problems should occur early; they should be part of an ongoing process. I have examined these tests carefully and, as one who has diagnosed and been involved in the diagnosis of learning problems for many years, believe they are no more than screening tests. A statement by Mr Robinson in the newspaper said that the tests would provide information with a diagnostic base. That is not so and they should not be mooted as that. Even if we could use them as a proper diagnostic procedure, we do not have enough remedial teachers in schools to follow them up. Therefore it is a false premise. I have asked the Minister for Education questions on notice twice about how many remedial teachers are in our schools. She does not know because the numbers are not kept. Individual schools are given funds for skills development and can decide where they will spend those funds. Perhaps they will be spent on music development - and I think that is a good idea - or in any area. It is likely that schools do not

have adequate remedial teaching facilities, so to say that we can diagnose is a waste of time unless the tests are followed up with adequate procedures afterwards.

Mr Strickland: Nearly a quarter of the students leaving school in year 10 cannot read.

Dr CONSTABLE: So why should we wait until year 10 to use diagnostic procedures? Why wait until year 3? This testing should occur earlier.

I will now relate a story told to me by a person in my electorate. A gentleman telephoned me two or three months ago about his three sons, all of whom had lost their licences as a result of losing 12 demerit points. This gentleman was very angry about a number of things but the first issue was the 12 point system. He said that it is really a four point system. Each son had lost his licence for four speeding offences. I do not condone speeding offences for one minute; however, the offences occurred on a stretch of the West Coast Highway with which I am sure members here are familiar. The speed limit goes from 70 km an hour to 60 km an hour, and the Multanova camera is always in place on that section. There is one in every electorate -

Mr Strickland: They are revenue producers.

Dr CONSTABLE: That is not the point of my story. The gentleman's point was that each of the four offences had resulted in the loss of a licence. He told me his wife has had a licence for 34 years and has not even had a parking fine but one day she was caught on that stretch; she was fined going up the road and was caught again coming back. She lost six points in one day, but I hope that she will have another happy 34 years of driving and will not lose any more. Each of his sons lost his licence for three months, and the next part of the story is very important: They were all apprentices, and each apprenticeship had to be suspended because they could not get to work by public transport from home. They went on the dole for three months and their father was furious that a system existed which allowed that to happen to his boys. He was even more angry because the three boys on the dole, living close to the beach, thought it was a great life. They were being paid to stay at home. There must be a better way of dealing with people who lose their licences for speeding offences. We do not want to go in the direction of giving young people a taste of life on the dole so that they find out how comfortable it can be.

Mr Strickland: If children misbehave and are expelled from school they can go to the beach every day as well.

Dr CONSTABLE: This did not result from a deliberate action on the part of the boys; a series of accidents led them down that path. I would prefer a system to be in place whereby they would be allowed to drive to and from work, and at weekends do community service for a period determined by the court before their licences were returned. The situation I have described is costly to the individual, particularly the view of life it presents to young people, and it is costly for the community when people go on the dole in those circumstances.

MR BRADSHAW (Wellington) [11.32 am]: The first matter I bring to the attention of the House in this Address-in-Reply debate is the iniquitous country sewerage scheme the Government has put in place. The Government has decided that if a rural community wants a reticulated sewerage scheme and requests it from the Water Authority, it must pay 30 per cent of the cost of the scheme. I understand the Government will continue its program of establishing sewerage schemes, but if special requests are made the 30 per cent charge applies. The people who will benefit from the scheme will be required to pay that 30 per cent contribution, unless the local shire council makes alternative arrangements. Generally speaking, shires are not prepared to do so. I refer specifically to the Shire of Dardanup because it is very important for the Dardanup townsite to have a reticulated sewerage system.

I will read some background information presented to a public meeting about this sewerage scheme which indicates why it is so important. The Government has made a wrong decision to charge the local community 30 per cent of the cost, but also some responsibility in this area lies with the Health Department, the Environmental Protection Authority, and the Water Authority. The background information, which is horrendous, reads as follows -

A survey carried out in 1989 indicated that of the 103 properties and lots inspected, nearly 50% were defective in one form or another or had the potential for problems to develop.

Some of the properties with defective systems may have connected to surface water drains to alleviate the problems of on-site disposal.

Members can imagine what that is doing. It continues -

This has led to a potential health problem in the townsite with increased risk of hepatitis and gastro-enteritis particularly among the young inhabitants who may play in the drains.

There is also a very real threat of increased mosquito breeding and activity.

These findings were confirmed by an inspection carried out by Health Department of W.A. in September 1990.

Because of the perceived health risks, very high water table in winter (usually at natural ground level) and type of soil it was felt that the only long term solution to the problems associated with on-site effluent disposal in the townsite was the provision of deep sewerage

That survey was carried out in 1990 by the Health Department. About the same time I was approached by a couple who had built a house in the Dardanup townsite. Two weeks after they moved in, in the middle of winter, they found that their sewerage system did not work. The water table was at ground level and the system, which had been approved by the local authority, did not work. This situation is occurring throughout the townsite and some people are laying pipe work into the drains. That is wrong and it should not be allowed to continue. In 1990 I went to the Environmental Protection Authority and pointed out what was happening. I spoke also to officers in the Health Department but, unfortunately, no action has been taken. The Water Authority is not prepared to do anything unless it receives a contribution of 30 per cent of the cost of the scheme.

It has been estimated that the cost to each householder of contributing to the scheme in the Dardanup townsite will be \$4 000. Most of the properties are new and obviously many have been built by young couples. It is a substantial amount to impose on them, particularly after they have paid for the installation of septic systems which either are not working efficiently or are not working at all, especially during the winter. In addition to the \$4 000 they must pay the Water Authority, they must pay \$2 000 to connect to the sewerage system from their properties. That means that each household will be liable for approximately \$6 000. I can think of other towns in the south west which have reticulated sewerage systems for which the residents were not required to pay; for example, Burekup, parts of Harvey and Bunbury. Not only is the Government's decision iniquitous but also the Government has not taken into account the health risk, or the risk of effluent getting into the Leschenault Inlet. The EPA is closing piggeries in the area because of the risk of effluent escaping from the piggeries, and I am sure it does not want the problems experienced in the Mandurah-Peel region with algae growth to be repeated in the Leschenault Inlet. To date, no action has been taken although it is two years since I brought this to the attention of the Government. It is disgusting and wrong, and the Government should make sure the scheme is installed as soon as possible. It is probably too late to construct the sewerage system before this winter, but the problems I have outlined will continue until a reticulated sewerage system is in place.

Although three quarters of the Harvey townsite has a reticulated sewerage system, one part is not connected to that scheme and the Water Authority has again indicated that if the people want that facility they must pay 30 per cent of the cost. I have a pecuniary interest in the Harvey townsite because I have a building in that area. I would like a reticulated sewerage system to be available for a number of reasons, including the fact that the area has a high water table and, therefore, it will be of benefit to the people living there.

The Minister for Water Resources and the Minister for South-West are now in the Chamber, and I refer them to the earlier background information I gave about the Dardanup townsite. A further problem is Ross River virus which has been virulent over the past few years, and during the summer.

Mr D.L. Smith: I agree with you in relation to Dardanup, and I am doing what I can.

Mr Bridge: Is it a big project?

Mr BRADSHAW: No it will cost about \$1 million. Each householder will have to pay \$4 000 initially and another \$2 000 to be connected. Therefore, each householder must find

\$6 000. Many new houses are being built in the area and the young couples building them cannot afford such a large cost. Under the circumstances, it is wrong that this project was not done a year or two ago when it was brought to the attention of the Environmental Protection Authority, the Health Department and the Water Authority.

Mr Bridge: We should look at that; I do not understand how the contributions referred to total \$6 000.

Mr BRADSHAW: The Water Authority has said that the work will cost \$1.2 million. Working on 30 per cent of that and dividing that by 130 blocks one reaches a figure of around \$4 000, which may vary a bit when final costings are in.

Mr D.L. Smith: We did Burekup as a direct priority over Dardanup. It is not as though the Dardanup Shire was left out.

Mr BRADSHAW: Dardanup needs the project as much as Burekup. That information was released by the shire at a public meeting. A couple of years ago a family asked me to have a look at what was happening at their brand new house where they had been living for two weeks. I inspected it and found that the septic system did not work because the groundwater level was too high. I found that people were diverting their effluent to drains and doing all sorts of things which were quite wrong in this day and age.

Mr Bridge: Why do you not raise the issue with me formally and not just in the House? I will be happy to have a look at the matter.

Mr BRADSHAW: I will write to the Minister. I have written to the Water Authority already.

Another questionable area is what the Government is doing to the police in the south west. I have an article titled "SW police cop it hard with budget" which states -

Police in the South-West are battling the confines of a tight budget with no relief in sight.

Government cost cutting measures included reduced budgets, a long term plan to reorganise staff in outlying towns and the possible sale of Government Employees Housing Authority accommodation used by police.

The Police Department plans to move the traffic police from Boyup Brook and Harvey to Bunbury. That is not the way to go. Police presence should be as widespread as possible. I am sure that if one questioned the superintendent in Bunbury or the Minister for Police they would say those police are able to radiate from Bunbury to other areas to look after them. It is important that police are on the ground in outlying areas rather than in main regional centres because it provides that extra police presence and it is a major benefit to the towns to have those people living in them. It is all very well to say that the police are still in the country in these revised circumstances, but the smaller towns like to have as many people living in them as possible. Traffic police not only work on traffic matters but also at times are called on to perform general duties. I was speaking to a policeman in Harvey recently who told me that he had been on a stake-out of buildings which had been broken into. It had been effective and had resulted in a person being caught. That did not detract from his traffic work.

The police are looking at the possible sale of Government Employees Housing Authority accommodation. That is the wrong way to go. People such as school teachers and police officers are transferred regularly. It is difficult for people who are transferred to a country town for a few years to find any sort of accommodation. In addition they face the trauma of uprooting and moving their families, including their children who must be settled in new schools and so on. It costs people to do that, even though their removal costs are paid. The Government, as a result of budgetary constraints, plans to sell off police accommodation. That is wrong, and will cause great resistance from police who are to be transferred.

The removal of the police from Harvey and Boyup Brook was not done properly. The first thing they knew about the move was when a report appeared in the media. It is disgusting that those people were not informed that they would be moved from their existing station. For them to have to read about it in the media was quite wrong. The department is treating those people as pawns or numbers and forgetting the human side of the situation. Until it gets back to treating people as humans instead of pawns that can be moved willy nilly the

police will have a low morale which will do no good for the credibility of the Police Force in Western Australia.

I turn to the Auditor General's report on the management of guarantees, indemnities and sureties. I have been concerned for the past few years that the Government has been able to give guarantees and put taxpayers' funds at risk without parliamentary approval. There may be some situations where that needs to be done. However, I do not go along with that happening. The situation should be that the Parliament must approve any guarantee that is given. I say this because in the past couple of Budgets the Parliament has had to approve large sums of money - between \$50 million and \$100 million - to pay debts created by the Government's providing guarantees for business activities. I am here again referring to the Western Australian Development Corporation. It is interesting that the report states -

In the years prior to 1987 the payments arising from a default of guarantees, indemnities or sureties were not substantial. During 1987 the government issued substantial sureties when taking action to protect depositors' funds in various financial institutions. The State has incurred expenditure of \$146 million from the Consolidated Revenue Fund from 1987 to 1991 in respect of sureties for Western Australia Teachers Financial Society Ltd and Swan Building Society. It is also incurring substantial outlays to honour the guarantees which it gave under the Northern Mining Corporation (Acquisition) Act.

That Act was to do with the petrochemical purchase with which we have been saddled and for which we now must pay. Business activities of any description should be brought before the Parliament before any guarantee is put in place or before the Government enters into any business activity. It is wrong that the Parliament must approve payments for losses incurred as a result of previous poor and wrong decisions made by this Government.

The Auditor General states on page 3 of the report, under the heading "Key Findings", that -

Parliament has not been fully informed on all matters relating to the issue of, and payments relating to guarantees, indemnities and sureties which were reported in the Treasurer's Annual Statements as \$641 million at June 30, 1991. As a result Parliament cannot exercise the degree of control over this area of the government's operations that it may desire.

We are not talking peanuts; we are talking big bickies. It is quite wrong that the Government can blow hundreds of millions of dollars without the Parliament's approval when the Dardanup townsite cannot get a miserable \$1 million for a sewerage scheme and has to ask the people to pay for it, and when people's health is at risk.

The Auditor General makes the following recommendation at page 8 of his report -

Parliament should determine whether restrictions should be placed on the issuing of sureties in situations where no enabling legislation exists. Consideration of the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982, No 33 enacted by the Parliament of Queensland may be appropriate.

I agree with that recommendation. It is about time that this matter was discussed in the Parliament to find out whether we should look longer and harder at what the Government can do without the Parliament's approval. It is wrong that the Government can give guarantees to businesses and that when those businesses go bad the Parliament has to give approval for those guarantees when it was not given the right to determine whether those guarantees should have been given in the first place.

I turn now to an article in *The West Australian* of 30 March 1992, headed "Business cases too complex for laymen: Bosch". The article states -

Corporate criminals are escaping conviction because of financially illiterate juries, according to former National Companies and Securities Commission head Henry Bosch.

The article states that financially illiterate juries are finding people not guilty because they do not have the expertise or knowledge to understand the intricacies of the business or financial dealings of the people who are on trial. I have believed for a number of years that this problem should be addressed by the Parliament because when juries were first introduced into the legal system, the main crimes that were tried were the theft of a loaf of bread or

someone's goat. The trials were very simple, and it was not difficult, as long as some evidence was presented, to determine whether the accused was guilty. However, over the years, lay people have been required to act as jurors in trials which have become more complex and have involved business enterprises and complex business arrangements. I am not condemning jurors for their lack of knowledge because in a lot of cases I and other members in this Parliament would not be able to understand the intricacies of the arrangements and illegalities that occur in business situations. However, it is amazing how many people have been charged but not convicted of white collar crimes during the last few years. I do not know whether that was because the jury was not able to understand the facts of the case or whether the people accused of the crime were not guilty. Len Brush and Robert Martin, and Robert Roget from Armtech, who was tried in South Australia, were charged but not convicted; and Alistair Norwood and Alf Barbagallo were discharged and found not guilty in the La Rosa case. The jurors in complex financial trials should have a legal or financial background so that they can understand the intricacies of the trial.

The article states also that -

... Queensland Law Society President Ray Rinaudo said it was a disgrace to suggest ordinary Australians were not capable of understanding whether someone had done wrong.

He is living in cloud cuckoo land. He is a bit like Mr Burdekin from the Human Rights Commission who was quite out of order earlier this year when he said that our juvenile justice legislation was imposing on the rights of juveniles. I have more sympathy for the people who are killed, maimed, or have their cars stolen than I do for the juveniles who commit those crimes. Mr Burdekin should get off cloud nine and come down to earth and realise that people in Australia are suffering and that something must be done to stem that suffering. In the case of complex legal trials, I am sure that if we approached ordinary people on the streets and asked them, "Do you feel confident to sit on this jury?" most of them would be quite truthful and say, "I do not think I am really qualified to do so." Perhaps in ordinary, everyday trials we can have lay people as jurors, but we should look at establishing a better system for complex trials.

MR DONOVAN (Morley) [11.56 am]: I am conscious that this will be my last contribution to an Address-in-Reply debate in this place. I am sure many members will be relieved. However, before they express that relief, I remind them that it is early 1992 and there will be many opportunities during the remainder of this year for me to contribute in other debates. I want to address the issue of ethics in Government public policy and the political process generally. That issue was most important to me when I came into this place, and I believe it is appropriate, given my present political circumstances, to make some contribution to the debate on that issue during what is left of my time in this place. I draw members' attention to the introduction to chapter 5 of the "Summary of the Final Report of the Community and Family Commission", which states -

From the extensive consultations conducted by the Commission, there can be little doubt that the majority of people have lost respect and faith in the political process.

Politicians and bureaucrats are seen as self seeking and opportunistic and lacking in principles and ethics. They are perceived as consulting widely prior to an election and then forgetting their promises and the electors for four years.

That is a fairly damning statement by the people of Western Australia about their political representatives, expressed through the consultative work of that commission.

Mr Lewis: Maybe of the Government, because individuals do not really have the ability to do surveys. Governments do that.

Mr DONOVAN: I do not have much time but I will reply to that interjection. It is important that political parties, members of Parliament and aspirants to political office take note of those comments because the people consulted in this lengthy process were not simply directing their remarks to Government. They were quite clearly and adamantly reflecting their remarks to this place and its members as a whole. To illustrate that point I go to the specific recommendations that arose from it. One was that the attention of all members of Parliament be drawn to the widespread lack of respect and disillusionment in the community with this country's Parliament and Government. It is very important that members recognise

that the people in the electorate are not making a formal distinction between the Government and the members of this place; or rather, they are making a distinction between them - they are including both.

It is because of that question of ethics that it seems clear to me that some sort of code of ethics or commitment to ethical conduct in politics and public office is necessary if there is to be any recovery of public confidence in the political process and the institutions of Parliament and Government. That seems to be the basic message from the findings of the Community and Family Commission. I believe such a code of ethics should in fact direct policy formation and promotion; for example, economic policy, about which I will say something in a moment. It should direct action and decision making in the administration of the Government's responsibilities; for example, juvenile justice, about which I will also say something in a moment. Ethics should direct election campaigning, at least to some level, and I will also say something about that, with respect specifically to the 1983 election and the 1992 by-election in Ashburton.

The first thing that comes to my mind when looking at the Governor's Speech, which is the Government's statement to the Parliament about its program for the year, is the economic component of that statement. The first thing that becomes obvious to me in looking at that, after having taken the time to read the Opposition's Fightback WA policy, is that there is no substantive difference between the two documents. There are differences of extent - that is, should we privatise part of the R & I Bank Ltd, as the Government would, or all of it, as the Opposition would? Should we privatise the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service of WA, as the Opposition would, or retain it within the public sector, as the Government would? There are differences in emphasis and in extent but there is no substantive difference between the two. Nor should that surprise anybody in this place or in this State, since political parties, being what they are - in this country at least - are organised not simply around the States but also nationally. Hence the views and agendas of a political party in Western Australia may well be discrete to the State to some extent but they will also take into account, and hopefully complement, the agenda of its national organisation.

I cannot put that lack of difference any better than did Prime Minister Keating in the Australian Parliament a few weeks ago during one of his attacks on the Opposition's general consumption tax, when he said words to the effect that the general consumption tax was not conceived of by the Liberal Party as something which was necessary to Australia but merely as the result of its desperate search to be different from the Labor Government. What a statement for the leading Labor figure in this country to make of his own party - that is, that the Opposition's policy in one area is a desperate attempt for it to be different from Labor. What does that make of the Labor Party nationally and in the States? In my view, and clearly in the view of the many hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of men and women who have left the Labor Party -

Mr Lewis: Hundreds of thousands? There would not be anyone left!

Mr DONOVAN: I am pleased that the Hansard reporters do the recording in this place and not the members. The hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of men and women who have left the Labor Party see that problem with some regret and with some sense of depression for the future. There can be no substantive difference when a party that was social democrat in nature and in platform embraces the values, policies and programs of its conservative opponents. That is important, not because it is just rhetoric but because it touches on the question of ethics.

One of the reasons we have a statement from the Government called the WA Advantage and a statement from the Opposition called Fightback WA that are so indifferent in substance is that neither party is really prepared to tell the people of this State the truth of the matter, which is that, whether we like it or not, in large part the economic development of this State is simply not in our hands and has not been for many years. All we do, in effect, as the Government has committed itself to do in its WA Advantage program, is to respond to the tunes that are piped overseas, and largely interstate, by the corporate boardrooms of the world upon which we have allowed ourselves - perhaps inadvertently, perhaps inevitably - to become dependent. However, we should at the very least be honest with the people of this State and say so, so that when we talk about providing infrastructure, as this document does - and I agree and can see that much of that infrastructure is necessary - we are not talking

about something which is created and initiated here but rather about something which is regarded by the Government, and clearly by the Opposition, as the inevitable response to tunes piped elsewhere. People can cop that truth, although they might not like it. What they cannot cop are political parties that strut the stage of by-elections in this State pretending they are in charge of the economic agenda when nothing could be further from the truth.

Turning from the economic question of the importance of ethics to the social policy dimensions of the importance of ethics, we have a glaring example of the importance of such a statement of principle right now. We in this place have passed highly controversial legislation in relation to juvenile justice and how children are to be treated at law; legislation which has been roundly condemned throughout this country and in certain places overseas. It has been roundly condemned because, firstly, it represents a major departure from our international obligations, to which we are a party; and secondly, it seems to most people who have looked at this issue for as long as or longer than we have that it is a most unsuccessful way to go. The European countries are way ahead of us in this regard and simply do not consider the kind of legislation we passed as having any place in their approach to the question of juvenile offending. They see it as a knee-jerk response which is most unhelpful. Why is that related to the question of ethics? It may surprise members to know that the questions we were addressing in this place in February and earlier, in December and January, were the same questions as were addressed within the Department for Community Services, which had the lion's share of responsibility for this issue in 1986.

Six years ago, the preface to an internal report of the department which was supposed to generate a substantial change in direction and which referred to the question of the review of the juvenile justice system stated that -

As the primary focus of this exercise was the more effective utilisation of existing resources, no additional staff items are proposed at this stage. This has meant that the resourcing of some recommended initiatives is not at optimal level. However it is considered that the proposed redistribution of resources provides a firm basis from which to launch the new directions which the report proposes.

Gobbledegook? On the surface it appears no more than that. However, we should consider some of the issues that were being considered that produced that gobbledegook. The same report states that -

As at 31 March 1986 the total number of juveniles under sentences involving detention was 123, which places Western Australian at approximately twice the national per capita average, i.e. 63 per 100,000 relevant population, compared with 31.2 national average (obtained from figures in Australian Institute of Criminology Report No. 31 on "Persons in Juvenile Corrective Institutions"). By comparison, the report shows South Australia as having a population of 29 under sentence of detention in juvenile institutions, or 51.1 per 100,000. The figures for Queensland, the other State of comparable population and demography, are 90, or 25.2 per 100,000.

The report states further that -

These figures show the current rate of incarceration of juveniles for offending to be alarmingly high, both by comparison with other States and with 1985 (i.e. an increase of 59.7%). Research into admissions to institutions in the first two months of 1986, compared with the same period in 1985 has shown a small reduction of sentenced juveniles from country courts, with a massive increase in the number sentenced from metropolitan courts (i.e. 41%) with an average increase of 10.7% in the length of sentences.

The causes of this extraordinary increase are currently under investigation. It does highlight, however, the extent of system breakdown in Western Australia and the urgency of the need for reform.

Six years ago the department was saying the same things as we are saying now. What happened? There was a shift in the deck chairs, a few higher paid positions, and very little change at the community level. I understand that that is the change that is being considered currently within the department to accommodate the public and this Parliament's demand for more appropriate action in respect of juveniles. Apparently positions are being reallocated

and a few people are being promoted but nothing else is happening at the grassroots level, nothing is being done at the offending level and nothing is being done locally where the children are living. That is the history of the department's response under successive Governments and for the last couple of decades. Surely it is time to recognise that we have failed. Surely it is time to recognise, as did the Community and Family Commission, that it is time to put some of these questions into their proper context. It is time to put some power and resourcing back into local communities and it is time to involve local people in the supervision of programs for the resolution of problems which affect them directly and which only affect the bureaucracy of the Department for Community Services distantly and occasionally when a furore is created in this place or in the public arena.

In support of that - I have mentioned this before and the member for Pilbara has talked about the Port Hedland example - there is an alternative way to go; its performance is on the record, at least - that will achieve results and will do so without a continuing dependency on high cost detention. Although this model has Ron Bowman's name on it, it is based on the fairly thorough research of European, British and New Zealand models and it has a high capacity for adaptation in this State. It is called the "Youth Community Facilitator Model". I support that proposition for two reasons: Firstly, because it represents a constructive move back to the community and away from distant bureaucracy; and, secondly, because it represents a statement about the truth of the situation in relation to youth offenders and how to resolve the problem in this State. That makes it very much an ethical question. However, unless we have the Parliament's support for this kind of move now, it will not happen. In practical terms, we will, under the pressures of election campaigning, settle for the extreme legislation that we have passed and we will do little to prevent further juvenile offending in this State of the type that has led us to that knee-jerk response. In support of that, I table a copy of the paper titled "Youth Community Facilitator Model" so that the Parliament is in no doubt about the existence of economic and workable alternatives that cost very little compared with the huge costs of the present method upon which we have come to depend.

[The paper was tabled for the information of members.]

Mr DONOVAN: Moving away from the social policy area specifically and the example of juvenile justice as an ethical issue and an issue about openness and honesty in this State to the broader question of public policy generally I will present a number of examples, one from overseas and three local, of the critical importance of some sort of code of ethics or statement of principles to be considered for public administration and Government in this State. This is not a question that odd members like me air as an interesting idea. It is a question that has been taken most seriously in many jurisdictions around the world. Ironically, Professor Link of the University of Notre Dame, with whom I have very little in common as members know, is one of those who may make a positive contribution in this regard. He has been involved in the establishment of a code of ethics which is about to be implemented in the State of Indiana in the United States of America.

The first example I draw to members' attention is one that I guess some people will find uncomfortable. Members will recall the critical role played in the lead up to the Gulf war by the United States Congress, which was reluctant to give approval for the United States to enter that conflict. The Administration was desperate to find ways of persuading it to support the President in that move. As members know, the use of lobby groups and public relations companies in the US is common practice. It has now come to light that the lobby firm, Hills Norden, was employed by the Administration to turn around the minds of the members of Congress. Members may recall that one of the critical issues, if not the critical issue that finally turned Congress to supporting the President, was a "videotape" of Kuwaiti babies being taken off incubators by Iraqi soldiers to send the incubators back to Iraq. That conjured up in the minds of the congressmen, as it would have done in the minds of most people who saw that video clip on television, the most horrendous images. Finally, it dissolved the prior resolve of Congress to bow out of a war. It was at that point that Congress decided to go ahead because it could not allow these atrocities to take place and it considered that man a monster. It turned out that that story, on admission by Hills Norden, was fabricated to bring about a result in Congress that otherwise could not be brought about.

Mr Shave: Everyone knows he was a butcher.

Mr DONOVAN: I am not here to argue whether he was a monster or whether he did those things, but my point is that if we have reached a stage where, as administrators and

legislators, we are prepared to accept fabricated stories, purchased at high cost, in order to aid us to make our decisions, some of which will be far reaching, we have reached a stage where it may be too late to develop a code of ethics in public administration.

Mr Strickland: I hope the Minister for Transport is listening to this.

Mr DONOVAN: The member will have no argument from me on that.

Given the time remaining to me I will omit two of the local examples I wanted to use, although the member for Scarborough has cited an example that would have fitted into the whole question. Relating this to what I said earlier about there being no difference between the Liberal and Labor policies, the fact is that there is a difference. At least one can say of the Liberal Party in this country and State that by and large it has remained consistent with its policies. However, one has to say about the Labor Party in Government in this country and this State that it has almost done an about face and run the other way in respect of its policies. That is not only a political problem, but also it is a major problem of ethics. At the last election the people in this State had a view of the Labor Party in Government which view now no longer holds up.

Mr Kierath: They chose Dowding and he has gone.

Mr DONOVAN: That is another point. We are confronting the problem of ethics rather than politics.

I will refer briefly to electioneering as another example and I will not expect any support from the Opposition. I was amazed to pick up my copy of *The West Australian* of Saturday, 28 March and read that Hon Norman Moore was offering a sermon to us on the question of manipulation of Aboriginal votes. I was amazed that he should still be seen by his party, much less by this Parliament, as offering some sort of credible position on the question of Aboriginal votes.

Mr Watt: Are you saying it doesn't happen?

Mr DONOVAN: I am saying that if I were looking for somebody to wave a warning flag at about the way Aboriginal communities and, indeed, any other community may be marshalled or, in his view, manipulated in the Ashburton by-election, I would want to turn to someone who has not made an art form of it. In 1983 Hon Norman Moore organised and supervised a revival crusade to Alice Springs designed, successfully I might add, to exploit the spirituality of the Aboriginal people in the central desert.

Mr Shave: That is nonsense.

Mr DONOVAN: Before the member says that it is nonsense, a phone call to the Commonwealth Electoral Commission in Alice Springs will confirm what I am saying. The Aboriginal people turned up at the Commonwealth Electoral Commission to ask for the ability to vote in the Western Australian election. These people had been assured by Hon Norman Moore's people that they would be able to do that. Members know what the result was! On the question of marshalling and manipulating Aboriginal voters, and in response to Hon Norman Moore's prescription for Liberal observers to be in attendance at Ashburton on Saturday - do members know what his "observers" did in Wiluna in 1983? Hannibal developed this as a method of war - the phalanx approach. The Liberal observers, some 32 of them, formed a phalanx around the Wiluna polling booth making it impossible for the majority of the Wiluna Aboriginal electors to vote.

Several members interjected.

Mr DONOVAN: Taking into account what the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform said about the Liberals' performance in 1977 and after in the Kimberley, if I were looking for someone to give us a direction towards ethical practice in electioneering in this State, Hon Norman Moore is the last person to whom I would turn for that direction.

Several members interjected.

Mr DONOVAN: The Community and Family Commission adds yet another demand for what it describes as dignity, honesty and honour in Government and politics. I agree with it. We have reached a point where unless that issue is taken seriously we will never recover the confidence which is needed to govern effectively in this State.

[The member's time expired.]

MR KIERATH (Riverton) [12.27 pm]: In my contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate I will refer to the Governor's Speech which really is an address from the Premier. I was very disappointed with the Governor's Address to this Parliament because it was full of the tired old clichés and it lacked new initiatives. It was a regurgitating of issues that have been before this Parliament previously and have been brought forward again to do nothing more than political mischief.

The Governor's Speech lacked vision and a sense of direction and it did not concentrate on the real problems facing Western Australia. The biggest problem facing this State is unemployment and there was very little in the Governor's Speech relating to this subject. Far more was said about duck shooting than unemployment and that illustrates that the Government has its priorities around the wrong way. Instead of focusing on unemployment and the lack of jobs the Government focused on what I call red herring issues which were designed to divert the attention not only of the members in this House, but also all Western Australians, from the real issues.

I am glad that the member for Balcatta is trying to interject because my comments will be directed at the Australian Labor Party. Let us look at the state of that party. If we examine the ALP we will find out why it is not addressing the real problems. This Government is more intent on doing what it can to stay in power than addressing the problems.

The Premier's rise to the number one position in this Parliament was achieved after a deal had been done between her group and the left wing of the Labor Party. The coup was arranged to get rid of Peter Dowding while he was out of the State. Only some months prior to that all members of the Labor Party were reported to have signed a letter pledging their support to Premier Dowding. Within six months they put the knife in his back. Out of that, sadly, we had to face another issue; that is, the ability of the Premier to manage the Cabinet reshuffle that followed the deal with the left wing to remove three people and replace them with three members from the left. Sadly, one of those three members is not here today. She resigned from the ALP very disillusioned about the way she had been treated. Jeff Carr, the previous member for Geraldton, was one of the better members in this House because he tried to answer questions. Although we served on opposite sides of the political fence, I had a great deal of time and respect for him because he would attempt to answer questions; he would not play ducks and drakes with questions and attempt to avoid providing information. Two of those members have gone from this place but one remains - the member for Swan Hills, the former Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations. He has not had the courage to go from this place yet. He is sitting around hoping that he will be offered another job.

Mr Catania: He has the courage to remain here.

Mr KIERATH: That is for the moment. I am wondering what job he will be offered prior to the next election. He will be offered something because he has told me that he will keep his options open.

Returning to the broader view, the left wing is in control of the Parliamentary Labor Party. We know all about the scenarios of the left wing. We know that in the union movement the left wing uses its numbers crudely. That is the hallmark of the left wing.

Mr Catania: What is the source of your information?

Mr KIERATH: The union movement. The member should speak to some of his colleagues in the union movement who are not necessarily from the left. He should listen to their stories. I meet many of those people at the Industrial Relations Society meetings and at other conferences. They tell me that they are bunkering down for four years of conservative Government. They are getting ready for the next election, but the scenario they paint is one where we will see no controversial legislation handled in the last 12 months of the Parliament. The second point is that they believe the conservative parties will win the next election - and I do not disagree. They say that the mess will be so great that the conservatives will have to make all the tough decisions which will put many people offside. They say the conservative parties will fix up the problems, but will be a one term wonder, and the Labor Party will be ready to take power again. That information comes directly from the trade union movement. I have a different view. We will address the difficult problems; we will resolve them, but we will not be a one term wonder.

I repeat that the hallmark of the left wing is that it uses its numbers crudely. The left wing

has eliminated three Ministers, one of whom was outstanding and the other two reasonably good. That is my assessment of their abilities. As one left winger said, they went through the pain but without any gain. The left wingers gained the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, who is referred to as the minister for helicopters flying over sacred sites. What a joke! That is the pain they went through, for very little gain.

When Brian Burke was in control, although deals were done with the left wing, it was the right wing that made the decisions. Many of the decisions appeared to be correct at the time, but with the left wing in control even more stupid decisions are made. The left wing uses its number crudely, and that will be its downfall. When the current Premier was the Minister for Education, two sites in my electorate had been agreed on as primary school sites, but those sites were sold off by the Labor Government. That has been a great disappointment. Approaching the last State election the Minister for Education made promises that she could not keep. The people in my electorate describe her as silver-tongued. Watching her performance in this place I believe that to be a fair description. She uses all the correct words but does nothing. Members should recall her promises when she rose to power that she would protect Labor Party members' endorsements. What has happened to Hon Garry Kelly in the other place? As a result of a cheap factional deal he has lost his place on the ticket.

Mr MacKinnon: To whom did he lose his place?

Mr KIERATH: It was to Hon John Halden, and to Hon Cheryl Davenport, who has established an electorate office in my electorate. The Labor Party has a rule whereby it elects people as shadow members in what is regarded as marginal seats. Hon Cheryl Davenport is shadowing me. However, whenever I go to functions I do not see her there. The only time I have seen her at a function was when she was sent on behalf of the Government to open some aged persons' units. I should add that her electorate office has been established next door to a primary school and that school invites her to presentation ceremonies. Hon Doug Wenn was dropped as well; so much for the assurances of the Government to protect ALP members' endorsements! Glib promises are made but not delivered.

Mr Catania: Let's talk about preselection.

Mr KIERATH: Some Government members have done poorly. I simply point out that this is the style of the left to stitch up deals and to sacrifice people. In all honesty, Hon Garry Kelly is a far better member of Parliament than the other two; although I do not have any great love for Hon Garry Kelly.

Mr MacKinnon: He stood against me in my first two elections. He was the best opponent I had. Eric Ripper stood against me but he was as weak as water.

Mr KIERATH: I agree. I ran up against Hon Garry Kelly in 1980. I was unfortunate enough to make the mistake of doorknocking at his house. When the Labor Party loses its intelligence and its pragmatism it sacrifices someone of substance and puts in his place two nondescripts.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before this debate goes any further, I call the member to order. I almost did this when the member for Morley was speaking. I refer members to Standing Order No 132. All imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on members also applies to members of the other place. Since members of the other place are not here to defend themselves, members should take more care.

Mr MacKinnon: We were paying them compliments.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There were also less than complimentary remarks made about other members. I remind members of Standing Order No 132 in case they wish to take the argument further.

Mr KIERATH: I will not take the argument further, but I put those comments in the public arena. When the left wing has been in control of the Australian Labor Party it has made wrong decisions, and deals have been stitched up behind the scenes. I am sure the right wing would have done things differently; especially it would have handled the Cabinet reshuffle differently. I am trying to establish the modus operandi of the State Labor Government: If it cannot find a good argument it makes up stories and tell untruths. I can give numerous

examples, but none is better than the current war against the goods and services tax by the ALP. Some of the stories it is spinning are beyond comprehension. Firstly, the GST is one part of a total package, but this Government tries to take a negative aspect of that one part and claim that it represents the whole package. The ALP does not quote the GST provisions properly, and it ignores other components. Senator Ian Campbell of Western Australia has issued a duplicate \$10 note, to counter the \$4.25 note put out by the Seamen's Union in connection with the GST which the Premier tried to dangle in this House the other day. Senator Campbell's note states that this \$10 note represents the price of the tank of fuel that people will save when the fuel excise duty is removed. That is far more honest than the deceitful campaign the ALP is trying to run.

A further situation I have encountered first hand relates to enterprise bargaining. I receive and read magazines from various trade unions and they all contain a fear and hate campaign against enterprise bargaining. If I had read only one magazine, I would perhaps understand that the planning of the campaign reflected the person behind it. However, having read so many of them, I find they are all remarkably similar. Somebody somewhere must be coordinating the campaign. Different names appear on the articles but they are almost word for word.

Mr Catania: Do you agree with enterprise bargaining?

Mr KIERATH: Yes, and so does the Minister. Was the member for Balcatta in the Chamber when I read the quotes from her? He does not know what his side of politics is doing. The Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations travels around the State preaching fear of a system operating in New Zealand, although the Opposition has given an assurance that it would not duplicate that system. That is not good enough for the Minister. She addresses stop work meetings and preaches about the dangers of the New Zealand system. That is her style - not trying to tell the truth. If Labor members do not have a good argument, they make up a big story and tell untruths. It reminds me of that old saying: If people tell a big lie often enough, others will start to believe them.

Now that I have established the distortions of and untruths told by this Government, I come to the big bribe. For those who do not know, I advise that today is big bribe day. Electors in Ashburton and Wills will receive cheques under Keating's signature for amounts between \$125 and \$250.

Mr Catania: Are you going to accept your cheque?

An Opposition member: Will you get one?

Mr KIERATH: Yes - or at least my wife will get a cheque. I am one of the lucky ones because I have five children. People with five children, who have an annual income of less than \$77 000, will receive \$250. As my salary is not that high, I am eligible for the full rebate. I have not yet decided whether to accept it. From where did Mr Keating get the idea for this scheme? It was from the Premier and her education allowance which was paid to the parents of schoolchildren. Once it had achieved the Government's aims, the Government dropped the payment. Who was a member of the Premier's staff at the time? None other than Stephen Smith.

Dr Lawrence: He was not on my staff.

Mr KIERATH: I remember seeing him running in and out of the Premier's office to talk to the Premier. I acknowledge that I made a slip of the tongue in that he was not a member of the Premier's staff, but he is a member of the ALP. He is now working for Mr Keating. The education allowance proved to be a successful bribe, and Mr Smith has imported it to Canberra. Mr Keating is now using exactly the same trick. It can only be described as a big bribe.

Mr Donovan: It is a bit more sophisticated than a barrel of pork.

Mr KIERATH: I thought it was a barrel of pork. The State Government is in dire financial straits. I am sure that members get that hint from various Government departments. Everywhere one goes there is a lack of money. Policemen have told me stories about their lack of funds and resources. A person in my electorate told me that on one occasion a neighbour had seen some people breaking into his house. The neighbour rang the police three times, and they arrived on the scene one and a half hours later. In the meantime my

constituent had returned home and disturbed the intruder, who left a knife behind. The police arrived after the constituent. I queried this with the local police and was told that at the time they had only one car and two officers available, and they were attending to a marital dispute involving a threat with firearms. I do not argue about their setting priorities, but about the lack of resources. My constituent told me that he was very angry because although no police were available to investigate the breaking into his house, the next day when driving along South Street he went through a speed trap, at which there were 10 policemen. Those policemen should have been dealing with law and order problems, but they were only raising revenue for the Government. That is the type of situation we have come to expect under this Premier and her Government.

Let us consider the Government's record. Two years ago when the Premier came to office approximately 57 000 people in Western Australia were unemployed. Currently, approximately 93 000 people are unemployed. That means 36 000 Western Australians have lost their jobs in that period. What is the Government doing about it? It has introduced Bills dealing with duck shooting and daylight saving, but nothing to address the problem of unemployment. The Premier may smile, but she has presided over the worst unemployment levels in Western Australia since the Depression.

Mr Lewis: Is it worse than during the Depression?

Mr KIERATH: Not in percentage terms.

Mr Catania: What are you going to do about it?

Mr KIERATH: The Opposition has placed in the public arena some packages that will address the problem. What does the Government do about it? It can only try to tear those packages to shreds. The Government has no hope, no vision and no solutions. This subject received less attention in the Governor's Speech than did the duck shooting Bill. That is an indication of how much importance the Government places on it, yet it has the gall to attack the Opposition. The Liberal Party has introduced a package at the Federal and State levels that will address unemployment. For example, the payroll tax exemption alone will create 20 000 jobs in Western Australia. The Liberal Party is promising those people work, and the Government has done nothing for them. Every time a Labor Premier has been in power, the level of unemployment has risen. That is why the mob is screaming. The Premier is the person who told us we should never interject. Now look at her conduct here! The other day the Premier raced into the House when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking and interjected on him during the whole of his speech, yet she holds herself up as a beautiful example of how to behave in the Parliament.

Mr MacKinnon: A paragon of virtue!

Mr KIERATH: Yes, a paragon of virtue. What has happened to the parliamentary standards and recommendations spoken of? The Premier went on about financial interests. How long has the legislation on that matter been sitting on the Notice Paper? I believe it has been there since October 1989. Nothing has been done about that matter because it was never a real issue with this Government, only a political tactic. The Premier has presided over a disgraceful state of affairs and now 36 000 Western Australians have lost their jobs; that is equivalent to the number of voters in two electorates, so we are not talking about just a couple of people. We are talking about real, live human beings who want to work and cannot get a job. The Premier does not have the decency to come into this place and discuss this matter. Time and again we have offered a bipartisan approach to make this topic the top priority of the Parliament. I again challenge the Premier to do that. We are prepared to give it top priority if the Premier will consider the issue and give it her time and attention. I bet the Premier does nothing about this offer today, which has been made before and about which nothing has been done.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Nothing except talk about ducks.

Mr KIERATH: Yes. The real working people are hurting and do not have jobs. One part of my electorate used to be a strong Labor heartland. The people in that area want a job - a way to earn some money so that they can live their lives in peace. As a general rule these people are not interested in politics but want to get on and live their lives. They want politicians to provide them with jobs and do not care about the political arguments we have in this place. The only interest for these people is that politicians find them a job. We are not delivering to

those people. If we do nothing else, we must address the problems associated with a lack of jobs and leave political fighting and red herrings to be dealt with somewhere else.

A strong Labor person came to see me and told me that working people cannot afford Labor Governments any more. He compared what life was like under a Liberal Government and said, "I thought it was bad then, but I had no idea that it could be this bad." One former Labor supporter comes to do voluntary work in my office. This person did not vote for me at the last election. He has voted Labor all his life but has now converted to our cause. Although he does not necessarily believe in our principles he says to me, "You are the ones coming up with a real package, even though it contains things that may hurt me." He also said, "There is some hope I can get a job out of it."

Mr C.J. Barnett: The Premier calls it "Fightback junior" and thinks that is clever, but she will not debate the issue.

Mr KIERATH: That is correct. The person about whom I am speaking does not understand this political bun fight. All he knows is that when someone comes up with something constructive, instead of giving it support and being constructive, members opposite use political jargon to degrade it but do not address the real problem.

Dr Lawrence: You are full of contradictions.

Mr KIERATH: While the Premier has been in office 36 000 people have either lost their jobs or lost real wages. The person to whom I have just referred had to send his wife, who had never worked before, to work. In some Labor areas the people are really hurting but the Premier has no sympathy for them and would rather play politics up in Ashburton. Yesterday I asked the Premier a question about the Construction, Forest, Mining and Energy Workers Union's disaffiliation. The Premier would not acknowledge that there had been some disillusionment in that union and that the AEE and the FEU, which have now combined, disaffiliated two years ago as separate unions.

I turn to what the CFMEWU says about the present State Labor Government. The State President, Bill Ethell, is reported in a newspaper article as saying about branches pressing the executive to leave the ALP that it "was becoming increasingly irrelevant to workers". Mr Ethell is certainly no friend of ours, and certainly from the left wing of the Labour Party. He continues that the union "could not continue to support a party which was costing jobs". Therefore, it is not only the Liberal Party saying that, but also some of the Labor Party's own people. The article continued -

He hoped to persuade the Trades and Labor Council that up to \$2 million it collected for a political action fund should not go to the ALP.

I referred yesterday to a document titled "YOU could soon be at WAR!" which was issued by Clive Brown, secretary of the Trades and Labor Council who hopes to be the next member for Morley. That document asked union officials to set an example and trade union members and workers to donate money to support their political cause. Union workers are upset with people who they think should be helping them and not attacking them.

I turn to a newsletter issued by the Asbestos Diseases Society of Australia Inc, which is not normally a supporter of ours, dated 9 March 1992 which states in part -

... incompetent and dishonest Government bureaucracies ... our own infamous State Government Insurance Commission, has suddenly taken a new stand on the Wittenoom negligence issue ...

He continues later that the SGIC has given valuable assistance to CSR and its insurers to frustrate workers' compensation provisions. The newsletter continues -

Sadly, you may have guessed that both our State and Federal governments have totally abandoned the rights to life of asbestos diseases sufferers and their families.

The society points out that AIDS research is receiving more than \$15 million in funding yet the death of people with asbestos diseases is more than five times greater than people with AIDS. Despite that they cannot get any money from the Premier. The newsletter continues -

In the previous newsletter of October 1991, we informed members that we had been advised by our Premier Dr Carmen Lawrence and the Treasury Department that funding to support our society had ceased.

To date, we have been unable to clarify our Hon. Premier's correspondence. Perhaps some of you may ask your State or Federal politicians "what's the next trick to obstruct asbestos diseases sufferers' rights?".

That newsletter was paid for by the Plumbers and Gasfitters' Union. This Government has lost its way and hurt its working class people most of all.

DR LAWRENCE (Glendalough - Premier) [12.57 pm]: I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage.

[Leave granted for speech to be continued at a later stage of the sitting.]

Debate thus adjourned.

[Continued below.]

Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2 00 pm

[Questions without notice taken.]

BILLS (7)

Messages - Appropriations

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills -

1. Retirement Villages Bill 1991
2. National Rail Corporation Agreement Bill 1991
3. Freedom of Information Bill 1991
4. State Government Insurance Commission Amendment Bill 1991
5. State Government Insurance Office Bill 1991
6. Western Australian Land Authority Bill 1991
7. Western Australian Treasury Corporation Bill 1991

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - SEVENTH DAY

Motion, as Amended

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

DR LAWRENCE (Glendalough - Premier) [2.38 pm]: As we draw to the end of the Address-in-Reply debate, it is very important, despite what some speakers said this morning, as the focus has been principally on the Western Australian economy, that I outline to the House again, since it seems to need repeating, the Government's initiatives in relation to the Western Australian economy into the future. These initiatives are clearly outlined in the Governor's Speech. A great deal of the legislation that we will be enacting this year has direct relevance to the future of the Western Australian economy and stems from the statement that I gave earlier this year in the WA Advantage document. I know it is fashionable for Opposition benches to attempt to take the most negative view of what WA Advantage contains. However, it is of interest if one looks at the Liberal Party's Fightback WA document to see that, in some key areas, there is very little difference between the Government and the Opposition, and for that I commend the Opposition. In some cases, however, the Opposition recommends actions which are already under way and I am not impressed by that because it appears that it does not know what is happening in Western Australia. It makes recommendations to the electors that certain actions should be undertaken that are already under way, and in some cases makes a virtue of projects that are already in the public arena through Government departments and agencies. For example, I have already drawn the House's attention to the fact that the Liberal Party's document makes reference to tourism growth in Western Australia as if that party were solely responsible for it, omitting to say in its document that it represents the Tourism Commission's own projections based on current levels of activity. The Government has sought to look forward to the needs of the State but to restrict its thinking to the economy of Western Australia, to decisions about investment and employment; in contrast, the Opposition's document is a bit

of a mish mash which contains something for many matters - rural, social, and some others which have nothing to do with the economy. More of that in a moment.

The assumptions on which the Liberal Party's document is based, and on which the Government's activities are based, are clear. Firstly, Western Australia has a very bright future. It is a State which will grow both in population and economy. It is a State which if well managed can also diversify its industry base. One of the assumptions on which we are operating, and which we believe is a view shared by at least some members of the Opposition, is that we cannot continue to rely on our traditional industry sources for growth and employment particularly, because although there are spin-offs from those industries, particularly mining and agriculture, they directly employ only about five per cent of the population. So, if we are to accommodate the growing population and have diversity in our economy, to protect us from some of the fortunes of commodity prices we need to diversify the economy. In the past, that diversification has been something to which lip service has been paid by successive Governments, but with very little action realising the benefits, except in the areas of what are called traded services - tourism, education and health services - which are beginning to be very impressive performers in our economy. However, taking our raw materials and value adding to them, whether in agricultural processing or mineral processing, has sadly not been a feature of the Western Australian economy, although again there has been a significant growth in manufactured products. Recent progress has been impressive; but in absolute terms it does not make up a very large proportion of our economy.

The Government's document has attempted to ensure a number of things: First, that we would have approvals given to processes, to proposals, to investments necessary for the future of this State, as quickly as possible, consistent with high standards of environmental protection, planning, Aboriginal heritage protection and occupational health and safety. These issues are very important to us, but we believe that all State Governments and Federal Governments have been tripped up to some degree by their own very complicated legislation, and companies can rightly feel from time to time that they must tread a very complicated minefield before receiving the necessary approvals. That is why we have already established the Strategic State Projects Unit which will ensure that projects of importance to Western Australia are approved more quickly, with a guarantee of legislative action - something missing from the Opposition's proposals - if Government agencies default on time frames. We now have the personnel together. We will be announcing the first projects to be assisted by that unit, and the person to head it up, very shortly.

Additionally, clearly some of the legislation this Parliament has passed over the years is not up to scratch, for modern needs. Amendments to the Aboriginal Heritage Act and a review of the Environmental Protection Act are due. This is very much a matter that I hope will be considered carefully in this Parliament in the next few months. In addition - and again this is in stark contrast to the Liberal Party's package - we have said that it is not good enough to stand back and say that the approvals process is streamlined, that we have good infrastructure in Western Australia; we know we have competitors elsewhere who perhaps can offer that something extra which will mean that they choose Western Australia as a location rather than another part of Australia or another part of the world. Two important elements make Western Australia a particularly attractive place in which to invest. Obviously we have our own natural advantage, if one is talking about tourism. We can talk about the quality of the air and water, the superb scenic beauty, and the access to it. We do not have some of the prohibitions that exist in other parts of the world. We have a stable society where people know that they can visit in safety. However, we have impediments in the cost of transport. One of the reasons that we look very carefully at transport in our package is that we have seen with Compass Airlines a huge boost to tourism in Western Australia which showed risks of being eroded unless we could get an alternative carrier. I am delighted that the Federal Government has responded to our requests and has allowed Qantas the necessary rights across Australia to carry domestic passengers across the country. We have yet to see the effect of that on tourism but I believe it will be very significant. Therefore, building on that advantage is very important. I have given an indication of how it might be done and how it is being done in the tourism arena.

Secondly, Western Australia has natural resources second to none for purposes of the creation of wealth. Our mining and energy sector is growing. It is substantial, and it has an

enormous future. However, building on the advantage is what we are all about, not just sitting back and asking people to come here - as was the case with the State agreements Acts - not just asking people to come and build a steel mill or some sort of processing factory. It requires more direct involvement by the Government in providing an attractive package for industry, as we did with the North West Shelf modules, to provide for payroll tax holidays, for royalties relief, for additional infrastructure spending to attract those new industries that will make our economy much more diverse. We must build on the Advantage WA package in a very conspicuous way, to say to people that if they invest in country and regional areas of Western Australia the bonus of investment assistance will be 50 per cent. In other words, it will be even more attractive for people to invest in Albany, Geraldton or the Pilbara region. In doing that we will treble the amount of money provided under the scheme.

The first instance of assistance under that scheme was recently announced. It is an excellent project in one of the areas we have identified as requiring special focus by Government to achieve improvement in our value added downstream processing. It is a project which involved Pratt and Whitney, and Wyman Gordon, two United States companies of stature; and a local company, Westintech Ltd, which is now building the plant to manufacture super alloys, and providing for the first time - or I should say the second time, because we have the blades program - a foot in the door for the aerospace industry. Given our location in South East Asia, it is an industry that we can legitimately look forward to expanding. We have also identified other areas available to the State for proper investigation and, we hope, the future improvement in the value of products developed here. If we sell iron ore or mineral sands or the low level of processing of minerals, we receive a benefit but nothing like that which occurs if we employ people of skill and intelligence to manufacture products for sale in the South East Asian region. Therefore, our investment attraction program - of which there is no equivalent in the Liberal Party's document - is designed to say to companies that there is an additional element in the Western Australian Government's program which will give a little extra which might tip the balance for the companies making decisions whether to locate here or in some other part of the world.

The third element is that we have recognised the need not just to talk about energy tariff targets - as is the case with the member for Nedlands - but also to show how it might be done. For example, I refer to competition that we believe is necessary in the gas industry. We will be establishing a pipeline authority to allow access to all players at the end of production, and better prices at the end to consumers. I have been delighted by the response to this element, because I have been able to recruit Sir Roderick Carnegie -

Mr Cowan: Are you having trouble selling the package?

Dr LAWRENCE: The Leader of the National Party is being most ungracious. It is customary for the Premier of the day to speak in the Address-in-Reply. I do not recall when it has not happened.

Mr Lewis: The Premier is to respond to the speeches made.

Dr LAWRENCE: I am responding directly to many of the points raised in this place - points on regional development, industry assistance, employment, and on industrial relations. Members should not give me that absolute garbage. I have sat and listened through the Address-in-Reply debate; the issues I am addressing have been frequently raised throughout the debate. I am pointing out to members opposite what the Government proposes to do. I am highlighting distinctions between our proposals and Opposition proposals in relation to those matters important to this State. I do not believe that is an abuse of the Address-in-Reply debate but quite characteristic of what might be done in Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: These little bypasses may be of interest to the member for Cottesloe but the Institute of Public Affairs is also occasionally critical of members opposite for some of the decisions they make. I am happy to cop independent assessments of our package. I do not regard the IPA as particularly centre stage; it is a bit to the right and from time to time I strongly disagree with it as well. I am sure that members opposite do the same.

I turn to a number of matters that I have underlined relating particularly to the speeches of

the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nedlands and the member for Cottesloe. Despite what the Leader of the National Party may say, what we have listened to here over the past couple of weeks has in many cases either been the Opposition attacking the Government, frequently on spurious grounds, or making proposals from the package it has put before the Parliament. I do not dispute the right of the Opposition to do that. However, I will now address some of the issues imperative to Western Australia which were handled extremely poorly by the Fightback WA package and the "Fightback Australia!" package just in case it may be thought I am trying to sell my package over a careful analysis of the Opposition's program.

Although the Fightback packages have a lot in common, particularly their heavy reliance on a GST, it is quite clear that there are a number of fundamental flaws in them that should be drawn to the attention of not just members opposite but also the community at large. One of the matters I find most extraordinary - and I have said this in a number of places - and about which I am frankly amazed more commentators of note have not commented, is the ridiculous position of the Leader of the Opposition on State debt. It is an absolutely nonsensical position!

Mr MacKinnon: Moody's agrees with me.

Dr LAWRENCE: It does not agree with the Leader of the Opposition, I can tell him that. It is quite clear that the Liberals' program of debt reduction exhibits an appalling lack of understanding of budgeting and financial management. One needs only to look at it briefly to see why that is so. The package heroically tells us a number of things; firstly, that it will reduce all State debt by a particular date, I think 2010.

Mr MacKinnon: That is correct.

Dr LAWRENCE: It states that it will reduce State debt to zero by that time. In what country, Government - either State, Federal or Commonwealth - or political system is that a goal that people set themselves? It is not a goal that people set for themselves because it is not a sensible goal to set. The Liberals aim to get rid of some \$10 billion of debt by the year 2010. They claim they will do that by way of a five per cent annual increase in State revenue. That is an interesting point because it is clear that in some respects the Liberal Party's Fightback package endorses some of our projections. The curious thing is that it is not referring to a five per cent increase in the gross State product but a five per cent annual increase in revenue, which is a touch high for a responsible Government to commit itself to. Nonetheless, that is the basis on which the Liberals claim they will be able to get rid of that debt, accompanied by the sale of certain key Government assets to reduce debt.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Wrong! The Fightback package states clearly that the debt reduction program is not dependent on asset sales. We say any asset sales will be used to retire debt.

Dr LAWRENCE: I concede that. At that rate the Liberal Party's view is that it will be able to get rid of the State's debt. At the same time, and in the same package, the Liberals have outlined a capital works program which the State will be required to fund and about which the Liberals say there will be a private sector component of 25 per cent, which I think is rather heroic; nonetheless, that is what is in the document. Therefore, while the Liberal Party is simultaneously reducing State debt to zero it will increase capital works by \$14 billion; so it is not just the current level of State debt of \$10 billion that is involved but also an additional \$14 billion over that period. That, in my view, is frankly nonsense! It is not possible for the Liberal Party to do that and it is not desirable that that be done.

It is impossible for the Liberal Party to do what it claims at the same time as Dr Hewson cuts back grants to the States; that is, implement a \$10 billion debt reduction program accompanied by a \$14 billion capital works program and other items in the package such as tourism and roads in remote areas which are not costed at all. The fact that that is impossible to do, is the first point. Secondly, it is not desirable to do that when building capital works that have a long life because it is appropriate that the people who use those capital works should contribute to their payment over the lifetime of those capital works.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: That is a view shared by Treasury officials both State and Federal. If the

Opposition calls in someone like Ross Bowe or the Federal Under Treasurer and asks that question -

Several members interjected.

Dr LAWRENCE: Members opposite should ask those people for their opinion because that is what they will say. It is obviously important that members opposite listen to the sensible people because they obviously have no sensible people in their ranks. If that is the Opposition's goal two things must be said about State debt: The Opposition will be unable to do what it claims because it will seek to simultaneously increase the amount of money being spent on capital works while decreasing the State's debt. A 10 per cent annual increase in capital works is mentioned in the Liberals' document. To mention such a figure is extraordinary and irresponsible!

Several members interjected.

Dr LAWRENCE: Members opposite interject saying that we have not spent anything on infrastructure. Western Australian investment in infrastructure per capita is the highest in the country. A great amount of debt necessarily applies to Government trading enterprises which, like most businesses, have a mixture of debt and equity and which borrow at different times and pay back at others as businesses do. They are thereby able to operate with large projects taking account of generational effects. Therefore, the Opposition's position on State debt is the biggest load of nonsense I have ever come across! I am amazed that has not been picked up by more people. The Opposition's proposal is inconsistent and does not make economic sense, particularly when one adds to it the very unlikely possibility of the Opposition's getting into Government, which is No 1. I am pleased to say that. When the Leader of the Opposition was challenged on the possibility that Dr Hewson might not be elected Federally - which is looking increasingly likely - and was asked how he would meet his commitment to eliminate payroll tax in Western Australia he acknowledged it would have to be done over eight years. I do not know whether he has checked what proportion of the State's revenue is made up by payroll tax, but he would know it is pretty substantial and to reduce that unilaterally without receiving some part of a GST from the Federal Government would add to his problems.

Mr MacKinnon: It will come from eight years of living within our means.

Dr LAWRENCE: That is absolute fairytale nonsense! In addition to \$14 billion in capital works the Opposition promises the reduction of the State debt to zero during a period in which it will implement a 10 per cent investment in capital works programs per annum and the abolition of payroll tax. Even if Dr Hewson does not come clean, under those circumstances we would not have a single school operating in this State. Consolidated revenue would shrink to zero. In Government the Liberal Party would have no discretion and would have to chop the number of teachers, nurses, and doctors. It would probably have terrific roads and all sorts of facilities but no-one would be using them because they would have no operating funds. That is a clear indication to me that the Opposition has an extremely poor understanding of the nature of finances in this State and the principles that underlie financial management of State and Federal Governments, not just in Australia but around the world.

That brings me again to payroll tax. The Leader of the Opposition is obsessed by payroll tax. It is a tax I would rather see disappear but I have never said that it can be unilaterally removed, because the money must come from somewhere. If the Opposition reduced payroll tax it would have either to cut expenditure very significantly or bring in another tax. One of the taxes the Opposition is proposing is the goods and services tax, but the other taxes it might increase are even worse in their effect than payroll tax. Land tax and stamp duty are much more regressive and damaging to the business community than is payroll tax. Payroll tax applies, as members opposite would know, to only 10 per cent of businesses - the big employers - so what the Opposition is proposing is to put a tax on the smaller businesses which pay land tax, stamp duties and things of that kind. Not only does the Opposition intend to do that, but also it would have us believe that it could do that even if Dr Hewson did not introduce the GST. If Dr Hewson ever gets into power I think I would probably leave the country at that point. Dr Hewson says that in exchange for the State's giving up payroll tax he would give it back in the form of money that comes from the GST, but he gives no real guarantees, if one looks at the rhetoric. It is the same old story in relation to Canberra -

we have to put out our hand and they will tell us how much we will get from year to year. That is something that successive State Governments of all political persuasions have sought to avoid. We have sought to maintain maximum flexibility in our own revenue. In case members opposite have not noticed, we are currently conducting a fight with the Federal Government, as we will with any Federal Government of the future, to try to improve our position rather than go backwards at a million miles an hour. However, the specific immediate effect of the abolition of payroll tax, under whatever circumstances it is done in relation to the GST, is that we would lose \$40 million cold, just like that, absolutely.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Dr LAWRENCE: Western Australia actually has a very low level of payroll tax in comparison with the other States. The member for Cottesloe should check his figures. Our threshold is lower and we do not tax fringe benefits. In fact, one of the things the Federal Government does to us because we have a lower payroll tax base than do the other States, and higher thresholds, is to compensate us for that in the grants it gives us. That is an annual compensation of \$40 million. Under Dr Hewson's proposals that money would immediately be lost. In addition, the formula that is proposed because of those higher thresholds and the fact that we do not collect fringe benefits tax would mean that we would get less than our reasonable share of whatever came out of the GST. If members opposite think about that for a while they will probably be able to figure it out. That is the second effect.

Several members interjected.

Dr LAWRENCE: The third effect -

Several members interjected.

Dr LAWRENCE: Mr Speaker, I must say I am getting a bit fed up with this and I would appreciate some attention to the interjections of members opposite.

The SPEAKER: I am getting a bit fed up as well. I have repeatedly asked that if members wish to interject they do it in a reasonably orderly manner. I have been in an excellent mood today and I would rather go home in an excellent mood. That will not happen if I have to deal with someone under Standing Order Nos 83, 87, or some other Standing Order. I would go home distressed, as would the member concerned, so let us not arrive at that situation.

Dr LAWRENCE: Those two issues are very important ones. On the question of payroll tax I think it should be said that if the Opposition removed payroll tax on 10 per cent of businesses and applied the GST to all businesses - admittedly with some adjustments in other taxes - it would actually shift the tax burden from the big companies which are able to pay to smaller companies which are always in a much more vulnerable position.

Mr Cowan: That does not apply to exporters.

Dr LAWRENCE: That is precisely what happens and I do not care what the member says. It certainly does not apply to exporters, and I understand that, but for local companies producing local goods that is exactly what occurs if there is no increase in the revenue of the Federal Government from the GST - and is there no such increase?

Mr C.J. Barnett: You don't understand it.

Dr LAWRENCE: I understand it very well, because I have had a good, hard look at it. The Opposition cannot say in this case that it will abolish payroll tax and replace it with the revenue from the GST, unless the GST raises revenue from a different group of people, which it will. I agree that it is the consumers who will pay the GST for the most part, although in some cases businesses must absorb the costs themselves, to the extent that they do not pass it on; in the housing industry, for example. So members opposite cannot duck that one either. Consumers will pay, and business will pay in some sectors, so it will be a redistribution of income from the consumer to the business community. That is a fact. In the case of payroll tax it is very clear, and independent analyses have shown - and they are actually quoted in Dr Hewson's package - that not only would there be that transfer of wealth from consumers to business, but also there would be a very direct effect that would result in 70 per cent of households being worse off. It would not be just a general transfer, but even with all the juggling, weaving and concessions it is very clearly the case that 70 per cent of households would be worse off. So people would be paying directly for the abolition of payroll tax in their daily grocery bills, which in my view is likely to mean that they would be

purchasing less of what those companies want to sell, and they would be paying for it at a higher price so they would have less disposable income.

That brings me to two more points which deserve to be made about the Fightback junior package. The first relates to job growth. In their document the Liberals have made some mention of the fact that they have set themselves targets for job growth, although they have not said exactly how they would get from the current position to the target. I draw attention to the heroic nature of those targets, because they are in fact pretty ordinary. The National Institute of Economic and Industry Research is my source for this, no-one else. Its projection for job growth in Western Australia by the year 2000 is for employment to reach 976 000, which represents an increase of 223 300 over an eight year period. That is a growth of over 200 000 in the Western Australian employment base. That projection is based on the status quo - on the nature of the industries we have right now, and on projections about their possible growth based on growth rates rather similar, I might say, to those the Liberal Party includes in its package. Even if we apply job growth projections over the last eight years rather than the next eight years the figure is 165 000; so if we look at what has happened over the last eight years, including the current recession, that leads to the conclusion that job growth in Western Australia over the period members opposite claim this heroic figure would be 165 400.

So, using projections on the growth of the economy with the status quo but looking at the opportunities we have, the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research says that we should expect employment to grow by 223 300. What do the Liberals tell us they want over the same period? They are selling us a bit short, because they want 140 000. They are saying that they do not even expect us to continue grow at the rate we have been growing, with the recession built into it, and they are not anticipating opportunities that even the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research is quite happy to put into the public arena. Members opposite are saying that, in terms of the current rate of growth in Western Australia, the projections we can expect on the basis of our industry base and even looking at the rate of growth over the last eight years, will be 100 000 worse than that. They will send us backwards at a million miles an hour. I must say that it is the one completely honest part of their document, because I agree that if they were ever to get into power to institute their silly ideas on State debt and to tie themselves to Dr Hewson, we would certainly be going backwards to the tune they have identified. Employment would drop in real terms.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed; the Address-in-Reply, as amended, thus adopted.

POLICE AMENDMENT BILL 1991

Restoration to Notice Paper

MR PEARCE (Armadale - Leader of the House) [3.10 pm]: I move -

That the message from the Legislative Council requesting that consideration of the Police Amendment Bill 1991 be resumed be agreed to.

This concerns the reinstatement of a Bill introduced to the Parliament by the Opposition in the Legislative Council on the request of the Opposition because the Bill had reached a stage of progress in this House. Normally, an Opposition member would handle an Opposition Bill but when I made time for the reinstatement of Opposition Bills prior to the setting of the Government's precedence of business on Tuesdays and Thursdays, this one arrived too late. Therefore, the Opposition cannot legally reinstate the Bill today; however, in order to be clear about what is reinstated, I am prepared to move this motion on its behalf in the Government's time.

Question put and passed.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) AMENDMENT BILL 1991

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 7 November 1991.

MR MacKINNON (Jandakot - Leader of the Opposition) [3.11 pm]: The Opposition will

support this legislation, although it has some questions regarding its impact. Subject to answers to those questions we may seek minor changes in another place.

The Bill amends the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act to authorise the imposition of a penalty when an assessment is raised because a licensee understates the value of tobacco products sold during the sales period on which the licence is based. Under the current provisions, where a licensed supplier understates the value of tobacco products sold, with a subsequent underpayment of the licence fee, the Commissioner of State Taxation is authorised to provide an assessment for the amount underpaid. However, this does not authorise the commissioner to impose any penalty. Therefore, somebody could deliberately attempt to evade payment by understating the amount of tobacco products sold, be apprehended, but suffer no penalty. Therefore, no incentive is in place for a person to adhere to the legislation. Principally we are happy to support the notion of a penalty.

However, clause 4, on which I seek an explanation, states -

(5b) The Commissioner may, in any particular case, remit wholly or in part a penalty referred to in subsection (5a).

If we are designing a Bill to pick up people avoiding tax, why remit any penalty whatsoever? I would have thought that penalty should apply in every case. An option of application should not apply unless, of course, a constant reporting requirement is in place so that the commissioner reports the occasions when the penalty is remitted along with his reasons for doing so. If that were not the case - the Minister may believe this is drawing a long bow - a person who is a friend of the Government could deliberately avoid tax and then bring pressure to bear on the Minister to have the penalty waived. In those circumstances nobody would know about it, which would be unfair.

Although the Opposition is happy to support the Bill generally and in most of its particulars, I would appreciate an explanation of this concern from the responsible Minister prior to the legislation passing to the Legislative Council. We could then make a judgment on whether the legislation should be amended. Accordingly, with those qualifications, the Opposition supports the Bill.

MR WIESE (Wagin) [3.14 pm]: The National Party likewise supports the general thrust of this legislation. The questions which could be raised are rather limited, but let us be realistic: If a person is understating the value of products sold, and thus paying less tax, we totally support the concept that that person should be penalised. This legislation achieves that result. The Bill also contains a provision for the Commissioner of State Taxation to reduce the penalty if grounds exist on which he believes that should be done. That takes care of some situations in which the full weight of the law perhaps should not be imposed. We also support that provision of the Bill which provides that its contents will apply only from the time it is passed; in other words, it involves no retrospectivity. If retrospectivity were involved, the National Party would look at the Bill in a very different manner. However, we support the Bill.

MR PEARCE (Armadale - Leader of the House) [3.16 pm]: I thank both members for their support of the Bill. The best way of explaining the query raised by the Leader of the Opposition is to say that the current situation regarding licence fees on purchases of tobacco products is that a person has an obligation to pay the fee. However, if that person underpays, no penalty applies. This legislation provides an incentive for people to be honest, and it also allows for flexibility in its penalty. The penalty is the equivalent to the amount of licence fee payment avoided. If someone is found to be underpaying the licence fee, the penalty immediately imposed is the equivalent to the amount underpaid. However, that gives no flexibility in varying circumstances and gives no account to normal considerations of measure of guilt or intention by the party. This clause is designed to give some latitude to the Commissioner of State Taxation to determine the penalty on the particular circumstances of the case. In some circumstances the penalty could be harsh if it is set in an arbitrary way.

From our point of view it would be easier to say that a person must pay the amount equivalent of the amount underpaid, and that be the end of it. However, this provision provides a chance for more fairness in awkward situations. If the Opposition feels very strongly about not supporting that flexibility, the Government will consider its amendments. Nevertheless, the legislation should be passed in its current form. If in the future some

suggestion is made that the power has been used in a discriminatory or arbitrary way, perhaps that is a matter we could reconsider. Cases of automatic application of this penalty would be unreasonable and harsh in some circumstances, and this flexibility should be allowed. Otherwise, the penalty will be applied irrespective of the circumstances.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Pearce (Leader of the House), and transmitted to the Council.

NURSES BILL 1991

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 15 May 1991.

MR MINSON (Greenough - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.19 pm]: This legislation has been in and out of this House for some time. It was first introduced towards the end of 1990, soon after I became the Opposition spokesman for health. It was not dealt with during that session and was reintroduced in 1991 with few or no changes. We now consider the Bill in 1992.

I will not speak at length on this subject during the second reading debate because most of the work will be done at the Committee stage. Members will have seen on the Notice Paper the considerable list of amendments. I will deal with a few matters under parts 1 and 2 of the Bill and draw to members' attention a few aspects concerning midwifery which should be discussed and put on the record. One cannot disagree with the objectives included in the Bill which are to promote standards, knowledge in the area, clinical skills, educational standards and safe nursing practices. I would have thought they were obvious, but it is nice to have them written down. However, the Bill does not provide anything which the nursing profession does not already do, and which it does very well. A move has been made world wide for the introduction of what is known as the comprehensive nurse. It seems to me - the Minister may discuss this matter in his reply - that this Bill paves the way in Western Australia for the introduction of such a creature.

I have some problems with the structure of the board described under part 2 of the Bill. I am concerned that midwives will not be given direct representation from their own college. I wish no slight on the Nurses Federation, which is the main industrial association for nurses, but I understand only about 30 per cent of nurses belong to it. However, when one takes into account the number of midwives in Western Australia - and if I am any judge of what is happening in the community, their increasing importance - it is reasonable that they be given representation. It is also very likely that most of the people listed as potential members of the board will perchance be members of the ANF. Therefore, the ANF, apart from the members it has in its own right, will have more than adequate representation on the board. For that reason it would be a good move to allow midwives their own separate nomination. I will be moving an amendment to provide separate representation for that group. I refer to representation of the ANF. When more than one or two members from a group are representative on a body, by adding an extra person, one does not necessarily add another full opinion; one tends to get a group opinion. I suggest that it is unnecessary to include a midwife representative nominated by the ANF and that she should be a nominee of the Australian College of Midwives.

I refer now to the possible inclusion on the board of a representative of mental health nursing education. If things have not changed in the past few months I believe the education of mental health nurses is separate from general nursing and has been for a long time. The exclusion of a mental health nurse representative from the board will pre-empt not only the fact that a change will occur, but also what it is likely to be. I admit to having mixed feelings about this because of the discussion and arguments in the community regarding the comprehensive nurse. If mental health nurses must first be trained as general or comprehensive nurses and then must specialise, a problem may arise. Certainly the indications are that the cost of mental health nursing will increase because, rather than

employing someone who is specifically trained over a lesser period, we will be dealing virtually with a double certificated trainee. It follows that those people will demand extra money, and reasonably so. They will also be looking for considerable satisfaction from their work, having been trained in general as well as specialist nursing. I have been through a couple of mental institutions and I am not sure that someone so highly trained will gain job satisfaction. I know that it is often said, particularly by the psychologists who attend mental health institutions, that many of the inmates are in need of nursing, not only in a psychiatric sense but also in a general health sense. For that reason it is desirable that most, if not all, nurses in those places should be generally trained. Perhaps the system has room for two classes of mental health nurses - those who are generally trained as well as specifically trained and those who are only specifically trained as is the case now.

I am under the impression - it has been difficult to get figures - that, in countries where the comprehensive nurse structure has been adopted and where psychiatric nurses must be trained after they graduate as general nurses, most nurses do not take their second diploma. The eventual outcome of that will be that the supply of mental health nurses will decrease. That may well create a situation where generally trained nurses are asked to work in mental institutions without having the specific training. As I said earlier, I cannot verify that, but I understand that in America, following the introduction of the comprehensive nurse with specialisation, the percentage of mental health nurses has now fallen to about four per cent of the total nursing population. Whereas, I understand that developed countries such as America, Australia and England, which have a highly developed mental health system, want an average of about eight per cent of the nurse trainees to be mental health nurses. I hasten to add that I have no real verification of those figures, but I would be interested in the Minister's reply.

I think it is time that a debate on independent midwifery was held in this Parliament because I have become aware of considerable support in Western Australia and in Australia for a drift away from traditional doctors doing deliveries with midwives assisting. A number of women and women's groups believe there is a need for society and the medical profession to regard pregnant women as healthy and not necessarily part of the health system. I have some sympathy for that point of view. However, it is interesting that in the push for independent midwives problems are beginning to arise. An article which appeared in the *Medical Observer* on 8 November 1991 under the heading "WA GPs oppose independent midwives" stated -

At a recent meeting the three groups agreed that -

any patient in hospital must be under the care of a registered, accredited medical practitioner;

independent midwifery without medical supervision should be opposed; and

the practice of obstetrics should not be sanctioned when the doctor is not the primary health care-giver.

I can see arguments of considerable proportions developing on this issue because there is no doubt that a considerable body of opinion believes that we should move more towards the English system where midwives do nearly all of the patient management and delivery of babies. Also, that most women should not go to hospital but to a birthing place. I think it is an unfortunate name, but the term used is "birthing stations". I am not sure that I can think of a better name, but it raises in one's mind very funny pictures. The Parliament will eventually have to become involved in this debate. The *Medical Observer* stated further -

"Australia is fortunate to have self-regulation at the forefront of obstetric delivery and it would be unfortunate if there were developments in this field which would jeopardise the current high standards that are offered to the community," . . .

"Unfortunately, there is a possible conflict between the rights of the mother when she is adamant that there be no formal medically trained personnel involvement, and the rights of the fetus to the maximum opportunity for optimum health during delivery.

"The rights of these two place the medical profession in a difficult position. The issue of litigation and medical indemnity in relation to independent midwifery and the doctor who is covering is complex and poses enormous problems for the medical practitioner in terms of time, midwifery competency and patient selection."

I have had brief talks with some midwives and with specialist obstetricians on this matter. If a woman chooses not to seek medical management from a traditional general practitioner or obstetrician but chooses to have the pregnancy managed solely by a midwife with delivery being facilitated by that midwife and something goes wrong, we will run into terrible legal and ethical problems because it seems fairly clear that if something goes wrong and there is a need for a surgical intervention, an obstetrician would be entitled to say, "I don't want to have anything to do with this case because I have not managed it." These matters should not be taken lightly. The question of where the responsibilities and liabilities of a midwife lie and what is the subsequent liability of a general practitioner and obstetrician will be difficult to determine. I know that may not blow up in the next five minutes, but certainly within the next five years this Parliament will be debating this matter at some length. I am not sure whether the Minister is nodding his head in agreement.

Mr Wilson: I am waiting for you to come up with the solution.

Mr MINSON: I do not have the solution. When I was researching this Bill, I talked to both sides, but not at length. That is why I raise the matter now, although I am not definite about any solutions to the matter.

Mr Wilson: I think you are very wise.

Mr MINSON: Yes. From what I can see, it is a case of an irresistible force and an immovable object. I see big problems occurring down the track.

Finally, there is an undercurrent of discontent in the nursing profession about the status of the hospital trained nurses and those with a degree. I have heard it said that some of the new graduates are not as competent as nurses who were trained in the traditional way. I have also heard it said that that is true but only for the first year or two and the extra theoretical background afforded to the nurses with degrees stands them in better stead and after a certain amount of on the job training they become much more efficient practitioners. I am not in a position to comment on that. However, if it is good enough for the State to issue certificates upon the completion of their training, it is incumbent upon the State to ensure that they are given equal opportunity throughout their nursing lives. This Parliament should outlaw any discrimination against the employment of either a nurse trained in the traditional way or a nurse who has obtained a bachelor of applied science degree. I know that debate will not go away as the debate on independent midwifery will not go away. I will conclude my remarks there because everything that needs to be said on this Bill will be said during the Committee stage.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bradshaw.

SOUTH WEST DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AMENDMENT BILL 1991

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 7 November 1991.

MR OMODEI (Warren) [3.40 pm]: Before speaking to the Bill, I must express concern that the Government appears not to have learnt its lesson from the last time it introduced such a Bill to this House. The main thrust of the Bill is to set up area advisory committees.

Mr D.L. Smith interjected.

Mr OMODEI: Is this Bill not exactly the same as the previous one?

Mr D.L. Smith: I refer the member to clause 5 which contains the definition of area advisory committee.

Mr OMODEI: The Bill goes on to talk about area advisory committees. Is the Minister saying that this Bill is different from the one introduced last year?

Mr D.L. Smith: Yes. The last Bill provided for central advisory committees, and for area advisory committees generally. This Bill provides for an area advisory committee and that area advisory committee means the Peel area advisory committee.

Mr OMODEI: Members on this side of the House are not opposed to the establishment of a Peel advisory committee. Indeed, in previous debates we have supported the concept of a Peel development authority. On our election to Government we will set up such an

authority. Whether we agree to the entire Bill is another matter. This Bill refers to other area advisory committees. We are aware that the original South West Development Authority Bill allowed for the setting up of advisory committees to the board of the South West Development Authority. Our argument in debate was that no other powers were required. A facility exists under the original 1984 Act to set up these committees anyway. Of course, the Government then brought in a Bill to set up area advisory committees which was contrary to the view of local government bodies in the south west. It was on that basis that we opposed the Bill and amended it to broaden the number of members on the South West Development Authority.

The proposition by the Government to set up an advisory committee for the Peel area will be supported by members on this side. In the Committee stage the clauses that refer to an advisory committee will be scrutinised closely by the Opposition. Clearly, while we have no problem with an area advisory committee for the Peel region, we object strongly to the setting up of area advisory committees across the State.

Mr D.L. Smith: This Bill intends to appoint an area advisory committee for Peel. If the member cared to look at the definition in the Bill he would appreciate that.

Mr OMODEI: I have seen the definition. Perhaps the Bill passed to me by the attendant earlier was slightly different from the one I hold now. However, I emphasise that we will scrutinise this Bill during the Committee stage.

No doubt the expansion of the Peel and Mandurah areas justifies an improved facility for regional development. During the launching of the campaign for the Liberal candidate, Arthur Marshall, the parliamentary Liberal Party announced that it would support the expansion of the regional park in the area with the main focus on the Peel-Harvey estuarine systems. We have had extensive meetings with farmers in the locality who are concerned about the impact of the stringent guidelines on the surrounding landholders if applied in the Peel-Harvey area. The Liberal Party intends to bring down a comprehensive plan for the Murray-Peel-Harvey area. That will result from consultation with both urban and rural landholders. Some problems exist as a result of effluent disposal in the Murray River system around Yunderup. We have other problems also stemming from agricultural pursuits in the area. None of the problems is unsolvable. With a concerted effort by the community and the Government we can achieve these solutions to the benefit of all concerned.

We have a strong plan for the area and a very good candidate for the next election. It will be an interesting contest. Already our activities as a political party have prompted the Government into action in the last couple of weeks. Once we announced our plan for Peel-Harvey, we soon saw the Minister for South-West and the Minister for the Environment dash down to Mandurah the next day to make some garbled statements about the future of the area. We also look forward to the development of the Dawesville Cut. We are very keen to see that proceed. It has taken some time for the Government to act. However, with a properly constituted Peel Advisory Committee things will be different. Is it correct that the advisory committee has been acting for some time?

Mr D.L. Smith: It is acting informally; it has no statutory base.

Mr OMODEI: Was it set up under the original Act as an advisory committee to the board?

Mr D.L. Smith: It was not set up under the original Act; it is acting as an advisory committee.

Mr OMODEI: That begs the question. I do not want to criticise members of that committee. They are probably well intentioned people seeking to do something for the district; but how much further will the Government go in order to have informal committees in an acting capacity?

Mr D.L. Smith: Only when the Opposition attempts to frustrate what we are doing, as it has done in the past.

Mr OMODEI: That is not correct.

Mr P.J. Smith interjected.

Mr OMODEI: The member should read previous debates. The previous Bill talked about area advisory committees. At no stage have Opposition members been opposed to an area

advisory committee for the Peel region. We would welcome a separate Bill to provide for a Peel development authority.

Mr D.L. Smith: Would you oppose one for Warren?

Mr OMODEI: We do not need one for Warren. We have a very good member of Parliament, and we have good local authorities which are capable of making decisions. I have a very good relationship with the chairman and executive officer of the board. I was talking to Sir Don Eckersley only the other day.

Mr D.L. Smith: He said you had done almost nothing to advance the interests of your region. Your electorate secretary does more than you do.

Mr OMODEI: That is good, that is why I have an electorate secretary. She is very efficient.

Mr D.L. Smith: She does more in her personal capacity - as a member of the main street program.

Mr OMODEI: The Minister should check his facts. I have two electorate secretaries - one works one day a week and the other works four days a week.

Mr D.L. Smith: One is more active than the other.

Mr OMODEI: She is doing a very good job with my blessing and on my advice. It is interesting that the Minister has raised the question of the Warren area because at the moment the South West Development Authority advisory committee does not include a representative from Bridgetown, Manjimup, Pemberton or Northcliffe. Is that appropriate, considering that those areas cover approximately 40 per cent of the south west of this State? Is that a new political thrust by the Government to keep the Warren district from being represented on this advisory committee?

Mr D.L. Smith: As you know the positions are advertised -

Mr OMODEI: Does the Minister select those members?

Mr D.L. Smith: No.

Mr OMODEI: Has he actively ignored the Warren district?

Mr D.L. Smith: A panel of names is given to me from which I select a member. As you know, there was a limited number of applications from the Warren area. The person appointed from that area later declined on health reasons and had to be replaced.

Mr OMODEI: Why was that person not replaced by a person from the same area?

Mr D.L. Smith: Because of the limited number of applications.

Mr OMODEI: I find that very hard to believe. If the Minister had advertised adequately in the area I am sure more applications would have been received. Perhaps, as a result of this debate, a nomination may be made from the Warren district - whether from Bridgetown, Manjimup, Pemberton, Northcliffe or Walpole. It is certainly a significant part of the State.

Mr D.L. Smith: There is a representative on the board from the area - John Brockman.

Mr OMODEI: Yes, and he is a very good member.

Mr D.L. Smith: It is remiss of you to have overlooked him.

Mr OMODEI: Not at all. I have a very close association with John Brockman. He is an excellent president of the Shire of Nannup. The Government dropped him from the advisory committee because it did not have the guts to introduce the right Bill in this House.

Mr D.L. Smith: You knocked him off.

Mr OMODEI: The Opposition expanded the membership of the board. It amended the Bill, which is something the Government did not have the good judgment to do.

Mr D.L. Smith: After you objected to his being appointed.

Mr OMODEI: That is not true, and the Minister knows it. He is clutching at straws. The concept of regional development has always been close to my heart. However, the politicisation that the Government has attempted has been strongly resisted by people in the south west.

Mr D.L. Smith: Are John Brockman and Sir Donald Eckersley political appointments?

Mr OMODEI: No. Does the Minister intend to go through all the members of the advisory committee for the past eight years?

Mr D.L. Smith: If you want to.

Mr OMODEI: Quite a few political appointments have been made; I know that and so does the Minister. I will not be drawn into a debate about the benefits or whys and wherefores of individual members. Most of them work very hard, including those from the Government's side of politics, for the south west region. It is a shame that from time to time the Government has used the South West Development Authority for political purposes. I am not saying it is happening now. A large proportion of the staff of the authority work above and beyond the call of duty. I have a close association with many of them, and they ask for my opinions and advice.

Mr D.L. Smith: I would say all of them.

Mr OMODEI: I hope that is true, but certainly it applies to a number of those people, not the least of whom is Sir Donald Eckersley. He acts in an exemplary fashion and is a great ambassador for the south west of Western Australia. From time to time he seeks my advice, comments or opinion.

Mr D.L. Smith: As he is encouraged to do. I note that he seeks input from you, but you do not offer the same to him.

Mr OMODEI: I have an open door. Anybody from the south west - whether from Walpole, Boyup Brook, Donnybrook, Greenbushes, or any of those areas - can visit me at any time. In my capacity as shadow Minister I talk to people from all over the State, and most come to me because they are disillusioned about the performance of the current Government. They want advice from me because I have experience in the local government, regional development and agricultural spheres.

Mr D.L. Smith: I get more representations from your constituency than from anywhere else in the south west.

Mr OMODEI: Do they have a problem with their local member?

Mr D.L. Smith: They know where to come to get something done.

Mr OMODEI: Such as a power line to be constructed through 126 farms, or a by-pass road through the middle of the shire clerk's farm, or through one of the nicest, quietest, tourist towns in the south west which has huge potential. The Government plans to allow trucks carrying mineral sands to go through the middle of that town. Alternatively, they may use a by-pass road, very close to the town, which goes through some of the most beautiful farms in the area. One fellow in that area has a very successful property growing stone fruit and apples, and the proposed road will go through the middle of his orchard. How many of those people have come to the Minister for assistance? What does the Minister say to Andy Kaptein when he asks why the Government proposes to build the road through the middle of his orchard?

Mr D.L. Smith: He has not approached me.

Mr OMODEI: I wonder why not. Perhaps he thinks it would be an absolute waste of time. The people who approach the Minister would do so only from a political point of view; the names of those approaching the Minister for assistance could be written on the back of a postage stamp.

Mr D.L. Smith: A very large postage stamp.

Mr OMODEI: The Minister could not find an additional \$10 000 for my local tourist bureau, and heaven knows how many people close to his political party receive special treatment in dollar terms. The Pemberton-Northcliffe Tourist Bureau wanted some additional funds and I thought \$10 000 was mean. It is an excellent community. It is one of the most successful tourist bureaus in the south west.

Mr D.L. Smith: I am sure that the tourist bureau will be interested to learn that the local member did not appreciate the South West Development Authority giving it \$10 000.

Mr OMODEI: That is not the case; I am saying that the amount should have been \$20 000 or \$25 000.

Mr D.L. Smith: Do you know that the \$10 000 was part of a grant of \$20 000?

Mr OMODEI: When will it receive the other \$10 000?

Mr D.L. Smith: It has already had \$10 000.

Mr OMODEI: Why then does it want a further \$25 000? The tourist bureau asked me to approach the Minister for extra money because its members had worked their fingers to the bone and had exhausted their resources.

Mr D.L. Smith: You did not talk to them long enough to find out all the facts.

Mr OMODEI: If the Minister checks the facts, he will find that I have a very close association with that group. If the Minister talks to Mike Ivers when he goes home tonight, he will give the Minister the full chapter and verse on whether the member for Warren is close to the Pemberton-Northcliffe Tourist Bureau.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Warren please now relate to the House how his closeness to the Pemberton-Northcliffe Tourist Bureau has something to do with the debate? I am sure he will be able to do so.

Mr OMODEI: The Pemberton-Northcliffe Tourist Bureau has been funded to some extent by the South West Development Authority, which is the parent body involved in this matter. I presume from the Minister's comments that the Peel advisory committee is acting under some arrangement for the South West Development Authority. It was not very hard to make that connection. Of course, most of the activities in the south west have some association with the South West Development Authority. To be quite honest, I dare say that the things that are happening in the Pemberton-Northcliffe Tourist Bureau have little to do with the Peel area advisory committee, although there is a connection in that we would like a bit more support from the Minister to appoint a person to the advisory committee of the South West Development Authority to represent that area. I expect that the establishment of a Peel area advisory committee, under a properly constituted Act, will give the people who are appointed to that committee the confidence to work for their district with the knowledge that they have been properly elected under that Act. I warn the Minister that if he thinks he will have area advisory committees all over Western Australia, he will get great resistance from me as member for Warren. I believe that local government members are more than capable of representing the people who properly elect them, rather than their being appointed under some Statute.

Mr Read: What is the difference with the Peel region?

Mr OMODEI: It is obvious in this case that the Peel region wants to have an area advisory committee, but that does not necessarily mean that every other local authority wants to have an area advisory committee.

Mr Read: Are you conceding that local government in the Peel region is happy with an area advisory committee?

Mr OMODEI: Yes. From what I can gather, there is no violent objection from the local authority. I say clearly that if the local authority made representation to me, as a person who is interested in regional matters, that it was unhappy with the Peel area advisory committee, I would stand in this place and defend vehemently the right of local government. Local government representatives are properly elected by the community and should rightfully be the main representation for a district. I hope there will be representation from local government on the Peel area advisory committee.

Mr D.L. Smith: That is what will happen. The local authority has nominated one person.

Mr OMODEI: That is excellent. That is what we proposed last time in our amendments to the Bill, but the Minister for South-West chucked the dummy in the dirt and decided -

Mr D.L. Smith: Do not try to make excuses.

Mr OMODEI: It would have been very simple for the Minister for South-West to amend the Bill last time to set up a Peel area advisory committee, but he chose deliberately not to do that because he thought that people on this side of the House would wear some discontent from the people in the area, and of course that has not happened. The Minister slipped up badly.

There are a number of problems in the Peel area. The area is developing very quickly, and it is receiving close attention from members on this side of the House. The proposed developments in the Peel Inlet and the Dawesville Cut will require amendments to the Department of Planning and Urban Development's legislation and will include the involvement of a number of Government departments, including the Peel Inlet Management Authority, the Water Authority of Western Australia, the Department of Marine and Harbours and, of course, the Department of Conservation and Land Management. We will be looking with great interest to the developments in that area, and I hope that with our close association with the Mandurah electorate through our good member, Roger Nicholls, who is doing an exemplary job in that area, and with the advent at the next election of a strong candidate for the Liberal Party for the Murray district, the people of the Murray and Mandurah areas will be in a good position to lobby the Government for improvements and for the necessities that are essential for their district. We support the section of the Bill which seeks to set up a Peel area advisory committee, and I look forward to continuing this debate at the Committee stage.

MR NICHOLLS (Mandurah) [4.04 pm]: Mr Speaker, I thank you for that endorsement a while ago.

I will not speak for a great length of time but I want to put on record some of my views about the South West Development Authority Amendment Bill. The Minister for South-West and the House may recall that I was less than supportive of this Bill when it came before the House last year. In fact, it is fair to say that I was critical of what I believed the Government was trying to do and of its intentions. The main question that I had was: Why do we need this Bill? It is my understanding that section 29 of the South West Development Authority Act allows for an advisory committee to be set up, and I believe that an advisory committee does exist and has representation. Mayor Tuckey has been on that committee and is still on that committee.

Mr D.L. Smith: The reason is that so many things are happening in the region that we need specialist advice from a specialist committee.

Mr NICHOLLS: The Minister is dead right. So many things are happening in the Peel region that we need a specialist authority to look at this area.

Mr D.L. Smith: Once the population is over 45 000.

Mr NICHOLLS: That is a lot of hogwash. What is magic about 45 000 people?

Mr D.L. Smith: Forty-five thousand has been the number for all authorities.

Mr NICHOLLS: The Minister's own data and projections indicate that the Peel region is growing rapidly. I admit that when we had this debate on another occasion, we disagreed on the role that a development authority should take, but in the current harsh economic climate there is a real need to have a total emphasis on commercial development to create employment. The South West Development Authority has done very little to create employment in the Peel region. It has done a lot to create vote-catching schemes, and it has done a lot of pork barrelling. Few genuine, long term jobs have been created by the South West Development Authority over the last four or five years.

Mr D.L. Smith: Are you looking at employment growth or unemployment statistics?

Mr NICHOLLS: If we look at the unemployment statistics for the Mandurah area and at the number of jobs created -

Mr D.L. Smith: I said "employment growth".

Mr NICHOLLS: Is the Minister telling me that the South West Development Authority is responsible for the employment growth?

Mr D.L. Smith: You were in the process of telling me that the South West Development Authority was responsible for the unemployment.

Mr NICHOLLS: No. I said I could not see how the South West Development Authority had generated jobs.

Mr D.L. Smith: It has indeed.

Mr NICHOLLS: So the South West Development Authority has been responsible for generating that employment growth in the Peel region?

Mr D.L. Smith: Yes.

Mr NICHOLLS: I do not support that view. In fact, the employment growth has probably happened largely in spite of the involvement of the South West Development Authority, particularly when I think back to the silicon plant and the musical chairs - definitely from where I was sitting - that went on when the bargaining chips were going down and we had to pay to shift that plant from site to site. We shall have a special Peel area advisory committee when we still do not have a Peel development authority. Not many minutes ago I remarked to the Minister, quite jovially, about some of the comments that he was reported to have made about the location of Government services in Bunbury. As far as I am concerned, the South West Development Authority has gone headlong down a political path of trying to pork barrel and centralise in Bunbury a Government focus. I do not have a problem with Bunbury being the centre of the south west region but I do have a problem when we see - definitely from my perspective - the Peel region being treated as a poor cousin.

Mr D.L. Smith: Who opened the local office of the Department of Planning and Urban Development in Bunbury a month ago?

Mr NICHOLLS: The Minister for South-West, and he did quite a good job, but we still do not have the infrastructure to handle the population that will be in that area in the near future. When we start talking about Budget Appropriations and looking at where the dollars will go and at how the focus will be spread around by the South West Development Authority, we see that the Peel region is a very poor cousin. The Peel region is a poor cousin and has suffered because of the overtures from the parent South West Development Authority. There is a strong need to establish an autonomous, independent office in Mandurah, which takes care of its own budget and is accountable for its allocation. Such a body could look at commercial development prospects in the Peel region without having the overtures from the Bunbury office which, frankly, has not seen a high priority in the Peel region.

Mr D.L. Smith: Expenditure in the Peel region will exceed \$30 million.

Mr NICHOLLS: It will need to exceed a much larger sum to make up for the years of neglect.

Mr Read: What neglect?

Mr NICHOLLS: The years of neglect in Government funding. The only time the Peel region received any real funding was before an election through the Government's pork barrelling activities; these were the only occasions when the Government genuinely looked at the growth of the region.

Mr D.L. Smith: We have the Dawesville Cut, the dual carriageway and -

Mr NICHOLLS: The Dawesville Cut was a joke. It was promised in January 1989!

Mr Pearce: You asked for it to be put off.

Mr NICHOLLS: I raised some different perspectives. The Minister cannot tell me that Roger Nicholls dictates when and where the Government will spend its money!

Mr Pearce: We consult you.

Mr NICHOLLS: The Minister is trying to pass the buck because since 1983 this Government has been hanging out the carrot of the Dawesville Cut. The only reason that it is proceeding with it now is because the member for Murray's career path depends greatly on whether the Dawesville Cut goes ahead. I said that this project should go ahead. It was not until the Peel-Harvey Estuary reached an appalling state that the project went ahead - no choice was left.

Mr Read: What did your lot do? Buy a wheat harvester?

Mr NICHOLLS: The Peel region has not received a fair share of recognition. It is not because people were not providing suggestions or priorities; however, Caesar sits in Bunbury, surveying from the building which looks like a milk carton and determining how to hang onto the seats of Mitchell and Bunbury. The Peel region is not high on the list of priorities. It is due to the tyranny of distance.

Mr D.L. Smith: You should check Government expenditure in Mandurah during the last three years and compare that to Bunbury and elsewhere.

Mr NICHOLLS: The priorities have been set, but the Government has not met them.

The crux of my comments is that we must have an autonomous, independent Peel regional development body. This would not involve a change of staff, but its staff should be allowed to operate on a budget and to make decisions for the area and to aggressively pursue commercial development to create long term prospects for the area.

Mr Read: They are already doing that.

Mr NICHOLLS: I suggest to the member for Murray that they are not able to do it as well as they could because they must check with Bunbury to ensure that their actions meet with approval.

Mr Read: You must not visit the office very often; I suggest that you do.

Mr NICHOLLS: If the member and I differ in opinion on many things -

Mr Read: I agree with you on many points.

Mr NICHOLLS: I will be glad to know them.

Mr Read: I will tell you if you allow me.

Mr NICHOLLS: Certainly, the member may make a speech once I have finished mine. It was said in much conversation that the de-inking plant was a great idea, but I believe it went no further than the pages of the South West Development Authority's 1991 annual report.

Mr Read: That has gone to the member for Peel's marginal electorate in the Kwinana area!

Mr NICHOLLS: That is great for the Kwinana area.

Mr Read: It will be going into the Peel region.

Mr NICHOLLS: I do not question the rights or wrongs of the decision; however, the points raised in the SWDA report create an expectation in the Peel region and these things do not eventuate.

Mr D.L. Smith: Come and see me one day, and I will show you a list of things.

Mr NICHOLLS: I would like to take up the Minister on his offer but I would prefer him to work aggressively to develop the SWDA office in Mandurah to ensure that an independent body is established. This could be renamed the Peel Development Authority, or something similar.

Mr D.L. Smith: This Bill is the first step in that process.

Mr NICHOLLS: The Minister is putting the cart before the horse. I would like to know how long it will be before we can see the necessary legislation.

Mr D.L. Smith: The Peel region is growing at the rate of 30 000 people a year so it should hit the 45 000 mark in three years.

Mr NICHOLLS: It would help greatly if it were to happen now.

Mr D.L. Smith: We do not disagree that it is a good idea; we disagree on the timing.

Mr Omodei interjected.

Mr D.L. Smith: If I am not here, it will not happen.

Mr NICHOLLS: I do not want the Minister to disappear, if all other members of the Government do not support the proposal of an independent Peel development authority.

Mr D.L. Smith: There will not be a Peel advisory committee if there is a change of Government. There will be no development authorities.

Mr NICHOLLS: I hope there is a change of Government, because the Liberal Party clearly has endorsed the concept of true development authorities to enhance employment prospects in the long term. The problem the Minister and the SWDA have at the moment is that they overemphasise social aspects. I have no problem with the construction of more playgrounds with more swings - that is great. However, I am not sure that the social aspects are as important as the economic aspects. It is a pity that the Minister for Community Services is not here, because he may agree with me that these aspects come under the auspices of his department.

Mr Omodei: The Minister for South-West confuses his role as Minister for Local Government.

Mr D.L. Smith: If you understood how it works, you would not say that.

Mr Omodei: It is Caesar ruling Caesar.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mandurah has indicated that he would like to interject.

Mr NICHOLLS: There should be no misunderstanding that an autonomous, independent Peel region development authority should be established, followed by an advisory committee which can have real input to that development authority. I believe the Minister and the Government are setting up a development authority to appease the Peel region, but it will not have much impact unless it is an independent, autonomous authority in the Mandurah region which can allocate funds and be accountable for those funds instead of having to go cap in hand to Bunbury.

Mr D.L. Smith: The member for Mandurah should travel with his leader and listen to what he is saying in those areas.

Mr NICHOLLS: I came into Parliament as an individual, free thinking person representing the electorate of Mandurah; so I have no problems standing up for the comments I am making now. As far as I am concerned the Minister has a right to disagree with my comments, but I want the Minister to know that I think he is going down the road of political appeasement rather than allowing the Peel region to develop at the rate it is capable of developing by allowing the development authority in the area the independence and autonomy to be actively involved in a greater capacity than it currently is. In that scenario an advisory body would be very appropriate, influential and beneficial. At the moment the Minister is going down the road of political appeasement and is ultimately trying to stall for time to get past the next election to make sure that his priorities in the Bunbury area are well and truly addressed. We know that the Peel region will continue to go irrespective of what sort of assistance it is given.

I am concerned at the composition of the advisory body. I have spent a great deal of time arguing the value of having an independent, autonomous regional development authority looking at local needs. However, the Minister's second reading speech indicates that representation on the advisory committee will number 13 - discounting local government members - but no more than eight of those 13 will reside in the Peel region. I am mystified why an advisory body to the development authority in the region would have a ceiling placed on the number of people residing in that region. Surely we would want everyone on the committee to reside in the region.

Mr Read: Everyone on the committee resides in the region.

Mr NICHOLLS: Maybe I am reading this in the wrong way.

Mr Read: It does not matter whether what you are reading is wrong, the current committee members all reside in the region.

Mr NICHOLLS: The Minister's second reading speech states that membership shall consist of up to 13 members with not more than eight persons being resident in the Peel area. Did I get that wrong?

Mr D.L. Smith: I would have to check *Hansard*, but the fact is that they are all from the Peel region.

Mr NICHOLLS: They may all reside in the Peel region at the moment, but according to the Minister's speech we will have a loading of people who do not reside in the area; that worries me greatly.

Mr D.L. Smith: They will all come from the area.

Mr NICHOLLS: That is not what the Minister's speech indicates.

Mr D.L. Smith: If *Hansard* says otherwise it is incorrect.

Mr NICHOLLS: I am reading from a copy of the Minister's second reading speech.

Mr Pearce: It is probably a typo.

Mr NICHOLLS: I hope that is the case, but I would like the Minister to check that and if it is incorrect to correct it during his response.

Mr D.L. Smith: It certainly is incorrect. All members of the advisory body reside in the Peel region and that will continue to be the case.

Mr NICHOLLS: Commonsense suggests that is what should happen. I raised the point because it needs clarification and correction. I do not wish to go any further than my original comment: Why do we need a separate Bill? There must be a reason, but I cannot find the reason in the parent Act or in its amendment. Therefore could the Minister outline why we need a special Bill to set up a Peel regional advisory body? I could understand it if we were setting up the development authority.

Mr D.L. Smith: I suggest the member for Mandurah read the *Hansard* from the last debate.

Mr NICHOLLS: I have treated this Bill as a separate Bill and not an extension of a Bill that has failed.

Mr D.L. Smith: The reasons for wanting the authority to be separate are set out in that debate.

Mr NICHOLLS: Can the Minister reiterate those reasons and put them back on record prior to the Committee stage? I wish to make it quite clear to the Government and the Minister that I believe the decision not to go down the path of creating a separate development authority now, prior to the advisory committee, is wrong. I urge the Government to rethink its decision. I do not see any significance in the population base of 45 000 in such a rapidly growing region. It would not require any more resources; all it requires is a change in the legislation. An office already exists, and it has its own staff, so why change the number of staff? The resources and staff are there; all that is needed is independence and autonomy and that can be established by a simple piece of legislation. That authority could then get on with setting priorities that are established by its advisory committee, the local government authority in the region and the people in the region. The authority could then be held accountable for the funding allocation.

Mr D.L. Smith: I have just checked the *Hansard*. I would have thought the member for Mandurah would use the corrected copy rather than what he is using. It states that members comprise 12 persons being represented from the people of the south west region.

Mr NICHOLLS: I have a copy of the Minister's speech which he read and which was also provided to the Hansard staff. I can only presume that the Minister corrected his speech.

Mr D.L. Smith: I will certainly correct it in response.

Mr NICHOLLS: I would not like to see a continuation of the blowout of the South West Development Authority budget with increased borrowings. If we are not careful we will be in a situation where we will not have any funds for genuine developments because of the SWDA's overemphasis on social aspects in trying to win political mileage rather than the aim of genuine commercial development.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Read.

House adjourned at 4.29 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HOME CARE - AGED AND DISABLED

Home Carers' Assistance - Commonwealth Dollar Savings

57. Mr MINSON to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What assistance, financial or otherwise, is received by carers of the aged and incapacitated who are cared for in their own homes?
- (2) What is the estimated number of these persons cared for in their own homes?
- (3) Have the dollar savings to the Government health system (by these persons being cared for in their own homes) ever been calculated?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Financial assistance may be received through carer's pension and domiciliary nursing care benefit. Other than these social security benefits, the major source of assistance is the Commonwealth-State home and community care program - HACC. This program funds a range of services which are designed to assist the maintenance of frail aged and disabled persons in their own homes and avoid premature or inappropriate institutional care.
In Western Australia over 240 services are currently funded under the program, which has a budget of approximately \$50 million for 1991-92. It is estimated that about 45 per cent of HACC expenditure directly or indirectly assists carers.
- (2) The total number of persons currently being assisted under the HACC program in Western Australia is estimated to be 40 000.
- (3) It is not known whether the extent of any dollar savings to the Commonwealth has ever been calculated.

EDUCATION, MINISTRY OF - HEARING IMPAIRMENT TESTING POLICY

Preprimary, Year 1 and 2 Students

122. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the current policy of the Government in testing students for hearing impairment in -
 - (a) preprimary;
 - (b) year 1;
 - (c) year 2?
- (2) Has this policy been changed in the last two years?
- (3) (a) If so, what policy changes have taken place;
- (b) why were they effected?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) Students attending preprimary-preschool and in year 1 participate in a screening test for hearing impairment. In addition, teachers and parents who have a concern about a child's hearing may refer the child to the school nurse who will undertake an assessment. This may occur at any time during the year and may either precede or follow the routine hearing screening test. Students in year 2 are not routinely screened for hearing impairment. However, if a parent or teacher is concerned they may refer the child to the school nurse for a special assessment.
- (2) There has been no change in the policy of testing students for hearing impairment in the last two years.
- (3) Not applicable.

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - WOMEN'S INFORMATION AND REFERRAL
EXCHANGE REPORT**

Minister Assisting the Minister for Women's Interests Amendment Directive

138. Mr COWAN to the Minister for Women's Interests:

- (1) Did the Minister assisting the Minister for Women's Interests consult the Minister for Women's Interests before directing the Public Service Commission to alter its report on the matter of the relationship between the Women's Information and Referral Exchange and the Western Women Group?
- (2) Why did the Public Service Commissioner obey that directive from the Minister assisting the Minister for Women's Interests, when that Minister has no responsibility for or authority in relation to the Public Service Commission?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1)-(2) No such direction as alleged in (1) and (2) was given.

AGRICULTURE - JERDACUTTUP REGION, RAVENSTHORPE
Poor Seasonal Conditions - Government Assistance Measures

147. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are poor seasonal conditions being experienced within the Jerdacuttup region of the Ravensthorpe Shire?
- (2) If so, are many farmers being forced to agist their sheep and thus bear the high cost of cartage?
- (3) Will the Minister consider offering the farmers some reimbursement for the cartage costs for sheep agistment?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) What other assistance measures will the Minister consider extending to the Ravensthorpe farmers?
- (6) Has the Minister been invited to visit the Ravensthorpe Shire to inspect the drought conditions?
- (7) If yes, when did the Minister visit the area?
- (8) If not, will the Minister visit the region to meet with local farmers to discuss their concerns?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1)-(2) Poor seasonal conditions were experienced in the Jerdacuttup area and sheep were agisted out of the area.
- (3)-(4) In 1989 the Commonwealth Government removed drought from the national disaster relief arrangements, under which the Commonwealth and States provided subsidies for transport of stock from drought affected areas. Under existing arrangements financial assistance is available through part B of the rural adjustment scheme.
- (5) The Jerdacuttup ward has been declared water deficient and the Government has taken action to ensure that water was made available to within 40 km of all farmers in the ward.
- (6)-(8) No. However, discussions with the shire have taken place regarding their town water supplies.

**BILL SEWELL COMMUNITY RECREATION COMPLEX, GERALDTON -
FUNDING ASSESSMENT COMPLETION**

153. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Construction:

- (1) Has the Minister now completed the assessment he is making of the funding requirements necessary to properly maintain and preserve the buildings contained in the Bill Sewell Community Recreation Complex in Geraldton as outlined in the Minister's letter to me of 21 January 1992?
- (2) If so, what are the details of that arrangement?

Mr McGINTY replied:

- (1) The issue of providing Government funding to assist in the long term preservation maintenance of the Bill Sewell community recreation complex is still under active consideration. However, decisions have been made to enable the current necessary maintenance to be carried out. This includes cleaning and repairs to gutters, bitumen repairs and tree lopping.
- (2) No answer required.

**SWIMMING POOLS - MANAGERS
*Employment Regulations***

155. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What regulations apply to the employment requirements for swimming pool managers in Western Australia?
- (2) When were those regulations set?
- (3) When were the regulations last reviewed?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Health Act (Swimming Pools) Regulations 1964, specifically regulation 14.
- (2) Qualifications were established 1 October 1972 and have been reviewed and amended 29 June 1984, 16 August 1985, and 21 December 1990.
- (3) The regulation was last reviewed and amended in 1990. Review regarding qualifications requirements is currently ongoing and will be finalised well before next summer.

**AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF - NOTICES OF INTENT STATISTICS
*Clearing of Land Applications - Clearing of Land Refusals***

178. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

For the years 1983 to 1992 (inclusive) -

- (a) how many notices of intent have been received by each of the Department of Agriculture's regional and district officers and by the department in total;
- (b) what is the total area of land which has been applied to be cleared, by district region and in total;
- (c) what is the total area which has not been permitted to be cleared, by district, region and in total?

The answer was tabled.

[See paper No 87.]

**MOUNTS BAY ROAD BUS PORT - LITIGATION BETWEEN
GOVERNMENT AND CONCRETE CONSTRUCTIONS (WA)**

181. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is litigation still proceeding between the Government and Concrete Constructions to do with the building contract and other matters associated with the construction of the Mounts Bay Road bus port?

- (2) If yes to (1) -
 - (a) what are the details in general terms of the substance of the claims and the specific amounts of monies claimed by either of the parties involved;
 - (b) what is the status of the litigation;
 - (c) when is it expected the dispute may be resolved?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) There is no litigation between the Government and Concrete Constructions in relation to the Transperth city busport.
- (2) Not applicable.

**WATER AUTHORITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - DARDANUP
RETICULATED SEWERAGE SYSTEM DEFICIENCY
*Major Health Concerns***

190. Mr BRADSHAW to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Are there major health concerns due to the lack of reticulated sewage system in the town of Dardanup?
- (2) If not, will he investigate the matter and have a reticulated sewage system installed as soon as possible?
- (3) If yes to (2) will the community be expected to contribute?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1)-(3)

An inspection report carried out by the Health Department concluded that a problem exists with failed leach drains. As a consequence, discussions were entered into between the Shire of Dardanup and the Water Authority of Western Australia on a jointly funded reticulated sewerage system.

**SCHOOLS - ROSSMOYNE PRIMARY
*Ceiling Collapses - School Maintenance Funding***

192. Mr KIERATH to the Minister for Construction:

- (1) With respect to the Rossmoyne Primary School's recent ceiling collapses, were these occurrences directly related to activities in the roof spaces associated with the school improvement works?
- (2) Is the Minister examining work practices in roof spaces to ensure that ceilings are not rendered unstable?
- (3) Considering the delay between the initial ceiling collapse and the overall ceiling inspection, what measures have been taken to ensure that immediate action is taken in school safety issues in Western Australia?
- (4)
 - (a) Is the Building Management Authority inspecting ceilings in schools of similar construction to Rossmoyne Primary School which have been subject to recent work within their roof spaces;
 - (b) if so, will the results of these inspections be made public?
- (5) What funding is being provided for ongoing maintenance in schools in Western Australia?

Mr McGINTY replied:

- (1) There is no specific evidence that recent building activity at the Rossmoyne Primary School contributed to the ceiling collapses.
- (2) Tradesmen who work in roof spaces are generally aware of the need to avoid damaging the fibrous plaster ceiling support straps.
- (3) The ceilings were inspected by the Building Management Authority immediately following the first ceiling collapse. The second ceiling that

collapsed exhibited no visible signs during the inspection that it was likely to also collapse. The BMA as a matter of course responds immediately to safety issues in schools upon request from the Ministry of Education.

- (4) (a) The BMA is inspecting all fibrous plaster ceilings initially targeting schools with a history of roof leaks and other ceiling problems. The remainder will be inspected in the course of the annual building condition survey over the next 12 months.
- (b) Ceilings are repaired as they are identified as a routine maintenance item.
- (5) The Government has previously announced a two year \$75 million maintenance program for schools for the 1991-92 and 1992-93 years.

**WOMEN'S INFORMATION AND REFERRAL EXCHANGE - REQUESTS FOR
PERSONAL FINANCIAL AND LEGAL MATTERS**

Financial and Legal Referrals

194. Dr CONSTABLE to the Minister assisting the Minister for Women's Interests:

- (1) (a) How many requests for information about personal financial matters did the Women's Information and Referral Exchange receive in -
 - (i) 1989;
 - (ii) 1990;
 - (iii) 1991;
- (b) how many requests for information about legal matters did WIRE receive in -
 - (i) 1989;
 - (ii) 1990;
 - (iii) 1991;
- (c) how many requests for this information have been made to date in 1992?
- (2) (a) How many financial referrals did WIRE make in -
 - (i) 1989;
 - (ii) 1990;
 - (iii) 1991;
- (b) how many legal referrals did WIRE make in -
 - (i) 1989;
 - (ii) 1990;
 - (iii) 1991;
- (c) how many referrals have been made to date in 1992?
- (3) What are the five categories of information and referral most sought after by clients of WIRE?
- (4) What is the average number of enquiries per month made to WIRE by -
 - (a) rural women;
 - (b) Aboriginal women?

Dr WATSON replied:

- (1) (a) (i) 1 652
- (ii) 1 590
- (iii) 1 230

Note: Clients requested information on a range of financial matters including the following -

maintenance, pensions and benefits, and social security problems - which made up the bulk of calls; emergency financial assistance; rent relief/bond relief; finance, loans, banking, mortgages, investment, low interest loans, superannuation; budgeting; debts; bankruptcy; taxation/accountants; sources of funding.

- (b) (i) 6 962
- (ii) 8 569
- (iii) 6 635

Note: The categories for legal matters include requests for solicitors, legal aid, legal advice, JP; separation and divorce; property; custody, access, overseas abductions; injunctions, restraining orders; de facto legal positions, rights - custody, access, property; other legal matters - crime, accidents, shoplifting - MVIT; wills, vpublic trustee; discrimination and equal opportunity; name change - Registrar General - births, deaths, marriages.

- (c) Financial matters - Jan-Feb - 121
- Legal matters - Jan-Feb - 871

- (2) (a)-(b) Not available, information on referrals not recorded.
- (c) Not available.

Note: As a new system of statistical records commenced in July 1991 figures from that date can be made available, but require time to extract from the database as they are not easily retrievable in this format.

- (3) (i) Communication
- (ii) Law/justice
- (iii) Housing/accommodation
- (iv) Health
- (v) Personal/family
- (4) (a) No statistics available. Collection of statistics relating to rural women commenced in 1992 - figures not yet available.
- (b) No statistics.

MARKET CITY - INTERSTATE METROPOLITAN MARKETS

Trading Hours

207. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What hours do metropolitan markets in other capital cities of Australia now operate?
- (2) Who determines the hours of operation of the Metropolitan Market in Western Australia?
- (3) What are those operating hours?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) Each metropolitan market operates with its own set hours and restrictions. I will forward the details of those arrangements to the member in writing.
- (2) Perth Market Authority.
- (3) Trading hours are 5.00 am to noon, Monday, Wednesday and Friday; 7.00 am to 3.00 pm, Tuesday and Thursday. Hours relating to receival times and restricted access to buyers and vehicles are detailed in Market City's trading arrangements. I will forward the details of those arrangements to the member in writing.

PERTH MARKET AUTHORITY - LAND TAX PAYMENTS

208. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does the Metropolitan Market Trust in Western Australia pay land tax?
- (2) If so, when did the Trust begin paying land tax on its property?

- (3) How much land tax did it pay in each of the years ending 30 June --
- (a) 1986;
 - (b) 1987;
 - (c) 1988;
 - (d) 1989;
 - (e) 1990;
 - (f) 1991
 - (g) 1992?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2)-(3) Not applicable.

PERTH MARKET AUTHORITY - MEMBERSHIP

209. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Who are the current members of the Metropolitan Market Trust Board?
- (2) What are their terms of appointment?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) W.J. Toms - Chairman
T. Frzop
B.E.G. Mews
P.J. Maynard
P.R. Casotti
C.L. Smith
F.V. Flanagan

- (2) All terms expire on 5 September 1993.

ROADS - SOUTH COAST HIGHWAY, RAVENSTHORPE-ESPERANCE *Slashing Road Verges Cost*

211. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Has the Government invited expressions of interest to construct and operate a rendering plant to process raw material from the Robb Jetty Abattoir and from outside sources?
- (2) On what basis has this decision been made?
- (3) When was the decision made?
- (4) By this move will the Government be transferring the operation of waste disposal from Hazelmere to Robb Jetty?
- (5) (a) When will a final decision be made on this matter;
(b) by whom will that decision be made?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) The WA Meat Commission has invited expressions of interest.
- (2) The WA Meat Commission received a proposal from a rendering plant operator to relocate to Robb Jetty. Prior to any decision being made on this proposal, the commission called for expressions of interest to establish any possible alternative proposals.
- (3) The decision to invite tenders was made at a meeting of the WA Meat Commission on 20 December 1991.
- (4) Not necessarily. Another option could be to transfer the raw material emanating from the Robb Jetty operations to another site.

- (5) (a) When all proposals are properly evaluated.
- (b) The Meat Commission.

ROADS - SOUTH COAST HIGHWAY, RAVENSTHORPE-ESPERANCE
Slashing of Road Verges Cost

221. Mr AINSWORTH to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the cost per kilometre for slashing road verges on the South Coast Highway between Ravensthorpe and Esperance?
- (2) How many kilometres of the same road verge are now being widened?
- (3) Why was the slashing undertaken in areas that were to be widened only a few months later?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) \$58.12 per km.
- (2) None.
- (3) Not applicable.

**"PEOPLE'S CONVENTION ADVANCE WESTERN AUSTRALIA FAIR" -
 RESPONSIBILITY**

223. Mr WIESE to the Premier:

- (1) Who is responsible for organising and funding the "People's Convention Advance Western Australia Fair" on 15, 16 and 17 May 1992?
- (2) (a) What is the amount of funding from the State Government;
- (b) which Government agencies are involved?
- (3) What is the purpose of the fair?
- (4) What criteria are to be used to measure its success or failure?
- (5) (a) Has any State Government agency sent out invitations to the fair;
- (b) if yes, how many;
- (c) at what cost?
- (6) What service or facility will the fair provide that is not already available anyway?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) The fair is organised by the Office of the Family. The fair is funded through the Western Australian Family Foundation and sponsorship.
- (2) (a) This is not fully determined as sponsorship is still being negotiated;
- (b) 22 Government agencies; 18 community groups.
- (3) As explained in the brochure, the fair has three major components -

Further exploration of the issues raised by the community including keynote speakers, seminars, workshops, and entertainment addressing the key themes of community, family, environment, employment and self-esteem. People will be actively encouraged to explore their hopes and dreams for the next century.

An expo style display incorporating the public sector, private enterprise and community based groups with the theme "Vision for the Year 2000".

State Government's response to the report and recommendations of the Community and Family Commission, especially the priority issues requiring attention for the Western Australian community leading into the 21st century.

- (4) (a) Numbers attending the fair;

- (b) number of exhibitions;
 - (c) number of organisations waiting to contribute to seminars;
 - (d) number of people requesting to present papers;
 - (e) level of publicity and public discussion about the issues raised by the Community and Family Commission.
- (5) (a) Yes.
- (b) 30 000 to date.
- (c) Approximately \$6 000; this includes inserts in other established mailouts.
- (6) The Advance Western Australia Fair honours a commitment I made two years ago. Over 7 000 people participated in the consultations of the Community and Family Commission by preparing submissions and attending public meetings. There has been a community expectation that the Government will respond to their vision for the State at this fair. The fair is unique to Australia, its emphasis is on participation by all members of the community. Clearly this is an example of Government enabling and empowering all members of the community to have their say on the future of the State.

**MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE - SENIOR POLICY OFFICER
(AGRICULTURE)**

Mann, Colin - Job Title and Level

224. Dr TURNBULL to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the level and correct job title of the Minister's Senior Policy Officer (Agriculture), a position currently held by Mr Colin Mann?
- (2) (a) Is it a contract position?
- (b) If so, what is the term of the contract?
- (3) (a) Is the current holder of the position a permanent public servant?
- (b) If not, what is his status?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) Senior police officer level 7.
- (2) (a) Yes.
- (b) Annual - renegotiated in April of each year.
- (3) (a) No.
- (b) Contract employee on secondment from the Western Australian Farmers Federation.

SHEEP LICE - LEVY

Future

227. Mr OMODEI to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does the Government intend to continue with the sheep lice levy?
- (2) If yes, at what level will the levy be set?
- (3) Will the Minister advise as to whether individual farmers will be consulted by way of a referendum for approval or disapproval of this levy?
- (4) If no to (3), what justification does the Minister give for not allowing individuals to have a say on the future of the sheep lice levy?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

(1)-(2)

Consistent with our commitment to industry, I have initiated a review of the sheep lice eradication campaign. The review panel will recommend on the future of the program, including the level of any possible levy.

- (3) Every wool producer in the State has received information about the lice program, together with an invitation to make a submission to the review panel. The cost of a special referendum of wool growers was considered to be prohibitive.
- (4) Not applicable.

VEGETABLES, FROZEN - IMPORTS

Eastern States, New Zealand, Vietnam - Prevention Action

228. Mr OMODEI to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are frozen vegetables imported into Western Australia from -
 - (a) the Eastern States;
 - (b) New Zealand;
 - (c) Vietnam?
- (2) If yes, what action has the Minister or the Government taken to combat importation of these products?
- (3) What other frozen vegetable commodities are being imported into Western Australia in competition to Western Australian products?
- (4) From which other Australian States are these imports coming?
- (5) Will the Minister advise which other countries are exporting frozen products into Western Australia in competition to locally processed goods?
- (6) What action, if any, has the Government taken to combat, inhibit, or reduce importation of frozen vegetables into Western Australia?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution guarantees free trade between the States. International trade is the responsibility of the Commonwealth. I have made representations to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industries and Energy on horticultural imports into Australia. The Minister has advised that he is committed to keeping subsidised imports out of Australia through anti-dumping and countervailing measures, while remaining within the rules and guidelines governing international trade. The Commonwealth is developing a strategy for the development of the food processing sector.
- (3) The main products imported are peas, beans, sweetcorn, spinach, processed potatoes and mixed vegetables.
- (4) Detailed statistics of interstate trade are not readily available.
- (5) Imports into Australia originated from various countries, with the major suppliers being New Zealand, USA, Netherlands and Belgium in 1990-91.
- (6) Refer to (2) above.

PLANT QUARANTINE - POST ENTRY FACILITY, SOUTH PERTH

Review Report - Fumigations

229. Mr OMODEI to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Will the Minister make available the recent reports and recommendations on the future on the plant introduction of a plant quarantine facility in South Perth?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) (a) Will the Minister take appropriate measures to ensure that the plant introduction and plant quarantine facilities are adequately maintained for the future benefit of horticulture, agriculture and forestry and the Western Australian public in general;

- (b) if not, why not?
- (4) Has the quarantine facility been closed?
- (5) If yes to (4), when will the quarantine facility be reopened and fully operational on a standard compatible with other Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development countries?
- (6) Is the Government considering permanent closure of the quarantine and plant introduction centre in Western Australia?
- (7) If yes to (6), will the Minister give the reasons for the closure?
- (8) As the quarantine section at South Perth was closed in October 1991 -
 - (a) where was the fumigation of imported plants and material carried out;
 - (b) was the fumigation carried out by the quarantine service;
 - (c) were there any losses of plants as a result of the fumigation process at another facility;
 - (d) who paid for the losses of plant material at these premises?
- (9) Will the Minister advise the comparative costs of fumigation in Western Australia compared to other States in Australia and other OECD countries on the following -
 - (a) inspection on arrival;
 - (b) supervision of fumigation;
 - (c) standard fees for growth in post-entry quarantine?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1)-(2) The post entry quarantine facility for plants at South Perth is funded by the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth has recently undertaken a review of post entry quarantine facilities in Australia. The review report is expected to be released for industry comment next week.
- (3) Yes.
- (4)-(5) No.
- (6)-(7) See (1).
- (8) The quarantine section at South Perth was not closed in October 1991. The only change was that, due to the fumigation facility requiring extensive maintenance, fumigation of plants from overseas had to be undertaken by a private company.
 - (a) A private company using similar equipment to that at South Perth.
 - (b) Fumigations are supervised by the quarantine service.
 - (c) There has been no appreciable increase in the loss of plants.
 - (d) The Department of Agriculture is not aware of any claims for losses.
- (9) Fees for inspection, supervision and growth in post entry quarantine are set by the Commonwealth and are uniform throughout Australia. The Department of Agriculture is not aware of comparative costs with other OECD countries.

**WATER AUTHORITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - AEROBIC TREATMENT
UNITS
Tests**

232. Mr OMODEI to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the Water Authority of Western Australia conducted tests on the use of aerobic treatment units?

- (2) If so, what are the results of any such tests?
- (3) If aerobic treatment units are acceptable to WAWA will they be allowed to be used in the following -
 - (a) areas zoned as special residential;
 - (b) areas zoned as residential;
 - (c) areas zoned as special rural?
- (4) If aerobic treatment units are not suited in the zones mentioned in (3), what modifications are required to make them suitable?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) No. However, the Health Department have undertaken testing and would be better able to answer your inquiry. I have therefore referred the matter to the Minister for Health.
- (2)-(4) Not applicable.

AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF - FRUIT FLY BAITING SCHEME
Bridgetown District - Landholders' Exemption

235. Mr OMODEI to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Bridgetown district totally covered by the Plant Diseases Act 1914 in relation to the control of fruit fly baiting?
- (2)
 - (a) Is the total Bridgetown area covered by a compulsory fruit fly baiting scheme;
 - (b) if not, why not?
- (3) Is the Bridgetown district currently being subjected to a serious outbreak of fruit fly, particularly in stone fruit?
- (4) If so, what actions have the Department of Agriculture taken in relation to this issue?
- (5) Are any Landholders exempt from the application of the fruit fly baiting scheme in -
 - (a) Western Australia;
 - (b) the Bridgetown district;
 - (c) if yes to (3), will the Minister give reasons for this occurrence?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) All landholders in the Bridgetown district must, under the Plant Diseases Act, control fruit fly on their property.
- (2)
 - (a)-(b) There is presently no compulsory fruit fly foliage baiting scheme operating at Bridgetown due to a lack of support for the previous scheme. However, it is understood that the local shire council is investigating the reintroduction of a scheme.
- (3) Fruit fly has been a problem in most districts this season following the mild winter.
- (4) The Department of Agriculture supplies advice and literature on the control of fruit fly. Complaints by a commercial grower of poor fruit fly control on neighbours' properties are followed up.
- (5)
 - (a) Yes, as not all areas are gazetted as fruit fly infected.
 - (b) If there is no scheme landholders in gazetted infected areas must control fruit fly by orchard hygiene, baiting and/or cover spraying.
 - (c) See (3).

LAND VALUATION TRIBUNAL - APPOINTMENTS*Public Notice*

263. Mr LEWIS to the Treasurer:

- (1) How are official appointments to the Land Valuation Tribunal (under the Land Valuation Tribunals Act 1978) notified to the public?
- (2) Is there a register of appointees to the Tribunal and if so is the register part of the public record and available to be searched?
- (3) If no to (2), how is the public able to inform itself of the currency of appointments to the Tribunal?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) No public notice is given.
- (2) A record is maintained but there is no public register.
- (3) By inquiring with the Office of the Tribunal Registrar or with the State Taxation Department.

LAND TAX - SOUTH PERTH VALUATION LAND DISTRICT*Individual Assessment Notices Issued, 1985-86*

264. Mr LEWIS to the Treasurer:

What was the total number of individual land tax assessment notices issued in the valuation land district of the City of South Perth in the 1985-86 financial year?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

The information requested cannot readily be extracted from land tax records.

LAND TAX - FREMANTLE VALUATION LAND DISTRICT*Individual Assessment Notices Issued, 1985-86*

265. Mr LEWIS to the Treasurer:

What was the total number of individual land tax assessment notices issued in the valuation land district of the City of Fremantle in the 1985-86 financial year?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

The information requested cannot readily be extracted from land tax records.

LAND TAX - ARMADALE VALUATION LAND DISTRICT*Individual Assessment Notices Issued, 1985-86*

266. Mr LEWIS to the Treasurer:

What was the total number of individual land tax assessment notices issued in the valuation land district of the Town of Armadale in the 1985-86 financial year?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

The information requested cannot readily be extracted from land tax records.

LAND TAX - SUBIACO VALUATION LAND DISTRICT*Individual Assessment Notices Issued, 1985-86*

267. Mr LEWIS to the Treasurer:

What was the total number of individual land tax assessment notices issued in the valuation land district of the City of Subiaco in the 1985-86 financial year?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

The information requested cannot readily be extracted from land tax records.

FINES - UNIT FINE SYSTEM ESTABLISHMENT

273. Mr COURT to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Government still considering introducing the unit fine system where penalties are geared to a person's income level?
- (2) If yes, when will it be introduced?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is not yet possible to provide a firm timetable. The new system involves significant changes which require careful and detailed formulation.

VALUER GENERAL'S OFFICE - SALE SEARCH FEES AMOUNT
Sale of Tax Maps and Strata Plan Searches

279. Mr COURT to the Treasurer:

What is the total amount derived from sale search fees generated through the Valuer General's office from the sale of tax maps and strata plan searches?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

1979-80	4 948	(1st year as Valuer General's Office)
1980-81	5 536	
1981-82	11 629	
1982-83	11 237	
1983-84	11 891	
1984-85	20 907	
1985-86	42 596	
1986-87	78 449	
1987-88	134 167	
1988-89	155 098	
1989-90	139 012	
1990-91	112 268	
YTD	92 254	
TOTAL	\$819 992	

BURSWOOD RESORT CASINO - USAGE OF GAMBLING FACILITIES
Economic and Social Impact on Perth

282. Mr COURT to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) What percentage of Western Australian local adult population would utilise -
 - (a) gambling facilities at the Burswood Casino;
 - (b) other non-gambling facilities?
- (2) What percentage of tourists and visitors use gambling facilities?
- (3) What impact does the Burswood Casino have on Perth from -
 - (a) an economic point of view;
 - (b) a social point of view?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) (a)-(b)

I do not have statistics on the percentage of the local adult population which utilise gambling and other non-gambling facilities at the Burswood Resort. However, the following details were illustrated in the Burswood Property Trust's 1991 annual report in relation to casino attendance figures -

Headcount	1985-86	1.56(casino opened 30.12.85)
(in millions)	1986-87	2.6
	1987-88	2.4
	1988-89	2.61
	1989-90	2.52*
	1990-91	2.35*

*estimated to be understated by 15 per cent as headcount taken only at main door of casino.

- (2) The percentage of tourists and visitors that use gambling facilities are not known. However, the Burswood Resort is an important facet of the tourism infrastructure in Western Australia and has created another marketing tool to attract people from overseas, especially the Asian region.

- (3) (a)-(b)

The impact of the Burswood Casino on Perth is evident from the benefits accruing to the State since it opened. These include -

Employment of approximately 2 500 full time and part time staff. (The Burswood Property Trust's payroll was \$47 million for 1990-91).

Many avenues of entertainment at the resort which were previously unavailable to Western Australia.

A market for the goods and services of many Western Australian businesses.

Casino tax based on 15 per cent of gross casino revenue amounting to approximately \$108 million.

LAND TAX - PEOPLE OR ORGANISATIONS PAYMENTS

Individuals, Corporations, Partnerships, Trusts, Other Liable Bodies - More Than One Property Statistics

284. Mr COURT to the Treasurer:

- (1) Of the people or organisations who paid land tax in the last financial year, how many were -

- (a) individuals;
- (b) corporations;
- (c) partnerships;
- (d) trusts;
- (e) other liable bodies?

- (2) Of those people or organisations paying land tax, how many were paying tax on more than one property?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1)-(2)

The information requested cannot readily be extracted from land tax records.

INDUSTRY COMMISSION - RAIL TRANSPORT REPORT

Rail Fares Increase Recommendation

285. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is one of the recommendations of the Industry Commission Rail Transport Report -

"8.3 The Commission recommends that over the next five years rail authorities increase urban fares so that fare revenue plus Government payments for community services (including contributions from on-user beneficiaries covering the operating and new capital costs of urban rail services)"?

- (2) If so, is it the Government's plan to implement this recommendation?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) The Government has not made any commitments in relation to implementation of any of the Industry Commission's recommendations. Any increases in rail fares need to be considered together with those applying to

bus services, given the integrated nature of the public transport system operating in Perth and the increasing proportion of trips involving bus-train transfers. Moreover, fare increases also need to be considered in the context of the Government's aim to increase the level of patronage of the urban public transport system. Finally, the non-user benefits of public transport, such as reduced road congestion, are substantial and justify fares not fully covering costs.

AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF - CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM 1992-93
Highest Priority Programs

293. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What specific programs will have the highest priority in the 1992-93 capital works program?
- (2) What will be the estimated cost per project?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

The content of the 1992-93 capital works program for the Agriculture portfolio is still a matter of discussion between myself and the Premier.

PAYROLL TAX - ABATTOIRS EXEMPTION
Metro Meat Ltd Exemption

332. Mr TRENORDEN to the Treasurer:

- (1) Has there been any payroll tax exemptions to abattoirs in the past two years;
- (2) If so, why?
- (3) What were the criteria that allowed for these exemptions?
- (4) Were they available to the whole industry?
- (5) Did Metro Meat Ltd receive any exemptions over the last two financial years for payroll tax?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(5)

The Pay-roll Tax Assessment Act does not provide for the exemption of abattoirs and I am advised by the Commissioner of State Taxation that no such exemption is ever given.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**ROYAL COMMISSION INTO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF GOVERNMENT
 AND OTHER MATTERS - BURKE, TERRY**

Fundraising Lunch Earnings 1987 - Australian Labor Party Arrangement Evidence

42. Mr LEWIS to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of evidence reported to the Royal Commission that Mr Terry Burke earned \$337 000 at a fund raising lunch in 1987 as part of an arrangement he had with the ALP to receive 25 per cent commission on donations?
- (2) Is she aware also that Mr Terry Burke, in evidence to the commission, indicated that he did so only after ensuring he obtained the support of the Administrative Committee of the ALP?
- (3) Is it correct that, as reported in the "Biographical Register of Members of the Parliament of Western Australia - 1930-1990", the Premier was a member of that committee from 1985 to 1988?
- (4) If so, is it correct that the Premier, also a Minister of the Crown at the time of this arrangement, approved the arrangement and had knowledge of it?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I determine whether the Premier should legitimately

be answering this question, could the member for Applecross point out how his question comes under the jurisdiction of the Premier as it relates to our Standing Orders on questions without notice?

Mr LEWIS: The Premier is the Treasurer and the Premier of this State.

Several members interjected.

Mr LEWIS: What is so funny?

The SPEAKER: Order! If I am still confused when the member for Applecross has concluded assisting me, I will then call on other members to help.

Mr LEWIS: On that basis alone, as she was a Minister of the Crown at the time, it is her responsibility to answer the question.

Dr Gallop: That is a very strange position.

Mr LEWIS: Is she afraid to answer the question?

Mr Pearce: In any event, the Premier would have to answer outside the House.

The SPEAKER: The question does not fall within the guidelines of this House. I will not rule it out of order; however, in future, when members ask questions they should make certain that they are in accordance with Standing Orders.

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(4)

I am happy to answer the question because it gives me an opportunity to point out that the tactics of the member for Applecross are predictable. As night follows day he will pop up in here with a question about the Royal Commission which he believes is designed to implicate me in actions and in some way denigrate my position. Yesterday he popped up with a question about a conspiracy requiring the Royal Commission itself to correct the impression the member sought to create. If the member for Applecross had any decency at all, he would apologise for the question and the inference to be drawn from that question.

Mr Lewis: I asked you a question.

Dr LAWRENCE: The member for Applecross will never admit when he is wrong. The Royal Commission had to go to extra trouble, through its senior solicitor, Mr David Wicks, to correct -

Mr Lewis: Did your staff ring them?

Dr LAWRENCE: Yes, we did, because we wanted to ask the question; but not Mr Wicks.

Several Opposition members interjected.

Dr LAWRENCE: There is no secret about that. It is quite proper. The members of my staff rang and asked the Royal Commission whether anything had been said in the commission or whether anything had been said by the commissioners that might have given that impression. The commissioners said that not only was that not the case but also they were disturbed by what they had heard of what was reported on television and what the member for Applecross had said in this House; and they took it upon themselves to issue a correcting statement, as they have done on a number of occasions when they believed they had been misrepresented either by the media or in this Parliament. That is quite proper, and the member for Applecross should apologise.

The question of donations that have been made to the Labor Party and of commissions earned by Mr Terry Burke is being examined by the Royal Commission. The commission level, as I understand it from reports - not from first hand knowledge, as the member for Applecross is suggesting - was 25 per cent.

Mr MacKinnon: Were you the one who approved it?

Dr LAWRENCE: I said not from my first hand knowledge. Read my lips.

Mr MacKinnon: You were on the committee.

Dr LAWRENCE: I was on the administrative committee for some time but I have no direct knowledge, apart from that which was provided to the commission. That is a very simple and straightforward answer, but I want to ask members opposite an important question: What level of commission have certain Liberal Party fund raisers charged in order to collect donations?

Mr MacKinnon: Which fund raisers where? I cannot recall.

Dr LAWRENCE: I can tell members opposite that there is pretty good evidence around that at least one of the Liberal Party's fund raisers -

Mr MacKinnon: What evidence?

Dr LAWRENCE: I will get to that in due course. At least one of the Liberal Party fund raisers sought and accepted a commission of 50 per cent.

Mr MacKinnon: \$337 000-worth?

Dr LAWRENCE: That matter will be raised in due course when we are talking about the disclosure of political donations. It is incumbent upon members opposite not only to accept the rebuff from the Royal Commission, in this case to the member for Applecross, but also to examine their own books and their own house before they start to make allegations in this House. Members opposite should put their own house in order and not be such hypocrites.

Several Opposition members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will recall that last night I cut short question time. Members may not have recognised the reason that I did that. I have on occasions far too numerous to mention here and to even remember asked for some degree of decorum during question time. The situation is getting worse. As a result of that, the image that is projected to the various members of the public and, indeed, to the media is particularly bad. As a consequence, at least while I have members' confidence as Speaker, I do not intend to allow question time to continue in that way, and if that is the way members want to play it on particular days, we will just go on to further business. Having said that, let us try to get through as many questions and answers as we can. That is not helped by incessant interjections.

ASHBURTON BY-ELECTION - LIBERAL ACTION FOR ASHBURTON HEALTH CARE PROPOSALS

Government's Misrepresentation

43. Mr GRAHAM to the Minister for Health:

Has the Government misled the electorate of Ashburton about the health care proposals contained in the Liberal Party's Action for Ashburton document?

Mr WILSON replied:

I thank my friend, the member for Pilbara, for his question. I acknowledge his very close and careful interest in all things which affect the people of the Pilbara, and I know that this is a matter of deep concern to him in representing those interests. Therefore it is a very important question that must be carefully answered so that the people of the Pilbara know where they stand on this issue.

I am aware of the article to which the member refers and the purported complaints by the Liberal candidate for Ashburton that the Liberals' intentions for the Patient Assisted Travel Scheme have been misrepresented. That is what I think she is purported to have said. It is very difficult to take those complaints seriously, because the suggestion that the Liberals will in some way means test the PAT scheme comes directly from their own document entitled Action for Ashburton.

Mr Minson: It does not say that at all.

Mr WILSON: I will quote directly from the document.

Mr Minson: You are just the same as the rest of them.

Mr WILSON: Perhaps members opposite do not want to hear it, but I will quote directly -

The Liberals in Government will make sure PATS assistance is focused on those most in need . . .

Opposition members: Hear, hear! Absolutely!

Mr WILSON: That is all we have in the document, just that bland statement. The unavoidable implication of the statement is that the universal access to the PAT scheme that people currently enjoy under this Government would end under the Liberals.

Mr Minson: Tell us about the 16 hour bus trip. That is what I mean by targeting.

Mr WILSON: It no longer exists.

Mr Minson: You cannot tell me that.

Mr WILSON: It does not exist.

The SPEAKER: Order! I was going to be rude and ask how short are members' memories, but I will not. It does not matter what somebody says in this place and whether members agree with it. There will always be occasions when they do agree and occasions when they do not. When members do not agree with it, it does not provide them with an automatic opportunity to constantly interject. The less members interject, the quicker we can get on with the answers and the more questions we can fit in. If the Opposition cooperates with me I will make sure the Ministers conclude their answers very quickly; but if members do not cooperate with me, how can I help them?

Mr WILSON: I simply reiterate that, with the bland statement made in the Liberals' policy document, without any detail at all about how it will be applied, we can only draw the conclusion that what they have in mind is means testing.

The Liberals' proposal to make PATS less available is not the only aspect of what they propose for health services in the Pilbara. That should be of concern, and I know it is of concern to the member for Pilbara and the electorate. They have also proposed to engage in the totally wasteful exercise of shifting the regional hospital from Port Hedland to Karratha. At least, that is the proposal of their candidate; I have not heard any endorsement of that from the Leader of the Opposition, nor from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is the Opposition spokesman on health matters.

Mr MacKinnon: I am not allowed to interject any more.

Mr WILSON: The Leader of the Opposition is not permitted to interject not only here, but also in the campaign so far; he has had plenty of opportunity to do so. The Leader of the Opposition and his deputy have been silent, and meanwhile the Liberal candidate is saying what she supports; however, we do not know the position of her leadership.

The SPEAKER: I cannot help the Minister if he is provocative in his answer.

Mr WILSON: I will stop being provocative, Mr Speaker, if it is hurting. As the member for Pilbara said, this proposal will involve the expenditure of at least \$25 million. We know what the candidate stands for, but we do not know what the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy stand for.

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the Minister draw his answer to a close?

Mr WILSON: I am, Mr Speaker.

Another proposal to which the Liberal Party has committed itself is to take the control for women's health centres away from the women who now run them and place them into the hands of the health professionals. Why should the communities not have a say in how their health services are run? Apparently

the Liberal Party intends to take that option away from the people of the Pilbara - it endorses this notion. These decisions will be taken out of the community's hands and will be made by others.

We need real answers from the Liberal candidate and the Leader of the Opposition so that we know what they mean when they talk about health services in that area, because the Opposition's interest in health services in the Pilbara began about a month ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before allocating the next question, I draw Ministers' attention to the fact that we have been here for 17 minutes since the lunch suspension and two questions have been answered. That is not good enough.

SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNAL - BUILDING DISPUTES
Small Claims Hearings - Effect of Home Building Contracts Act

44. Mr WIESE to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is it correct that the Small Claims Tribunal currently hears all small claims which arise from disputes over building contracts?
- (2) Will the proclamation of the Home Building Contracts Act have the effect of preventing the Small Claims Tribunal from hearing these cases?
- (3) If yes to (2), will the tribunal established under the Home Building Contracts Act be able to handle all of these small home building claims, as well as the larger claims of cases involving more than \$6 000 which arise from disputes between home builders and building contractors?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1)-(3) The Small Claims Tribunal will continue to hear cases of building disputes involving amounts of less than \$6 000. Disputes involving more than that amount will go to the new disputes committee.

GENERAL PRACTITIONERS - FREMANTLE HOSPITAL
Ashburton Transfer - Expenses Payment

45. Mr MINSON to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the Minister confirm that a doctor from Fremantle Hospital has been sent to the Ashburton region to take up employment in a private practice and that the Government is paying that doctor's travel and accommodation expenses?
- (2) Will he confirm that concomitant with the practitioner's movement to the Ashburton, the Karratha Hospital has been instructed to cut its staff by 2.5 FTEs?
- (3) How long does the Government intend to keep that doctor in the region?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1)-(3) I can confirm that arrangements have been made for a doctor, who recently completed his special training in emergency services at Fremantle Hospital, to move to Karratha to take up a position at the end of April with one of the private practitioners. That arrangement will involve a contribution from the department to the doctor's accommodation expenses and expenses associated with his taking up that position in private practice. It is anticipated that he will be there for a period of three months, or at least until a permanent private general practitioner can be located who has an interest in moving to the area on a permanent basis. That decision will depend upon the success of encouraging a private practitioner to take up that position.

MINERAL SANDS - BEENUP
Road Options Consideration and Rejection - Nannup Bypass Rerouting Reason

46. Dr ALEXANDER to the Minister for Transport:

In respect of the current proposal to transport mineral sands from the

projected Beenup mine via the Vasse Highway which includes a route through the centre of Nannup with consequent social, health and safety risks, can the Minister tell the House -

- (1) Specifically what other road options were considered by Cabinet and why they were rejected?
- (2) Why was the proposed so-called Nannup bypass routed through part of the town, passing close to the school and several houses?
- (3) Why did the Government not insist that the Nannup railway be reopened and that the product be carted by this safer and more environmentally sound mode of transport?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

(1)-(3)

Mineral sands will not be transported from Beenup through Nannup.

**BHP (BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY CO LTD) - BHP IRON ORE
(GOLDSWORTHY) LTD**

Retrenchments

47. Mr KIERATH to the Minister for State Development:

Is it correct that 190 employees have been retrenched from Broken Hill Proprietary Co Ltd's Goldsworthy operation? If yes, what discussions has the Government had with BHP to try to find alternative employment for these people?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

I have had some discussions with Broken Hill Proprietary Co Ltd in relation to its entire iron ore mining operations. I am very pleased that BHP has made the decision, as I mentioned yesterday, to invest \$240 million in its Port Hedland facility to make it one of the most efficient iron ore exporting operations in the world. I am pleased to say that BHP has made a decision to become more directly involved in the operations at McCameys Monster and to increase the size of the Yandicoogina mine from five million tonnes to 10 million tonnes. I was also pleased that BHP took over the Goldsworthy operations to make them more effective and efficient and I am confident in the management of BHP to handle its own affairs.

GREINER, NICK - EASTERN AND WESTERN STATES WEALTH GAP CLAIMS

48. Mr CATANIA to the Premier:

Is there any substance to Mr Greiner's extraordinary claims, reported at the weekend, about a wealth gap between Australia's eastern and western States?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

Members may have noticed Mr Greiner's statements and it is important in this House particularly to repudiate them. Mr Greiner appears to have fallen victim to the pretty silly disease that seems to be gripping Liberal leaders around this country at the moment as they try to fall over themselves to fall behind Dr Hewson who is demanding unthinking support for his Fightback theories. In addition, I suppose that Mr Greiner, for whom I normally have considerable respect, may have decided he would be able to assist the Leader of the Opposition during this by-election campaign; but all he did in attempting to go to the aid of a fellow sufferer in the form of the Leader of the Opposition was to insult the people of this State and to fly in the face of every bit of reasonable evidence about the future economic soundness of Western Australia. Mr Greiner's suggestion, for instance, that investment here is falling contradicts the findings of reputable and independent economic monitors including Access Economics, a group that I know members opposite are fond of quoting. In a recent document called "Investment Monitor" Access Economics provided an analysis of current and prospective investment

in Australia. They make comparisons between all the States which Mr Greiner might well look at. Australia-wide some \$79 billion of investment projects, including all those over \$5 million, which are under construction, committed or under consideration, were reviewed; since then 51 projects worth \$4.7 billion have been added. The important point and one we have to drive home to members opposite who are the purveyors of gloom and doom about this State, as is Mr Greiner, is that Western Australia accounts for by far the largest proportion of that figure - \$16.3 billion or 21 per cent. Given the population of this State, that is pretty impressive and far from being backward in creating wealth for this country, Western Australia is very much at the forefront. Queensland is next with \$15.4 billion or 19 per cent and New South Wales comes a pretty poor third; so it is extraordinary that Mr Greiner would make that sort of nonsensical statement. In conclusion, the report states -

Because of the continued strength in mining, and particularly energy projects, Western Australia has moved above the larger States and has the most projects in terms of value. It exceeded Victoria in the September 1991 issue and has exceeded NSW in the current issue.

Mr Greiner and members opposite would do well to get their facts right and stop selling this State short. It is also important for members to realise that although we have high unemployment at the moment - it is a very significant problem - employment growth in Western Australia percentage wise is the highest of all the States.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL - INTRODUCTION DELAY

49. Mr WIESE to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Can the Minister verify that the proposed local government Bill will not be brought before Parliament during this session and may in fact not be brought before Parliament prior to the next State election?
- (2) What are the reasons for the Government's failure to proceed with this legislation according to its previously announced schedule?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

(1)-(2)

The reason for the delay in the introduction of the legislation is partly due to a request from local authorities for further consultation. The intention is to have the draft Bill available for the local government conference in August with a view to then deciding whether to introduce the legislation in the next session, depending on the feedback. However, I still require the approval of the Cabinet legislation committee to have the drafting expedited to enable that to occur.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX - EFFECT ON SPORTING CLUBS AND MEMBERS

50. Mr CUNNINGHAM to the Premier:

- (1) What effect will the goods and services tax have on sporting clubs and their members, particularly those in remote country areas?
- (2) What will be the effect, particularly in country areas, of the Federal Opposition's policy to reduce by \$10 million the funding available through the Federal Government's community cultural, recreation and sports facilities program?

Mr Clarko: You should have made a ministerial statement.

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

A brief ministerial statement would be something I had initiated. This

dreadful GST was initiated by the Federal Opposition and endorsed by members opposite. There is no way in the world that members opposite can duck this issue. It is one of the areas in relation to which members opposite should hang their heads. The effect of GST on sporting and cultural activities will be devastating, mark my words, especially in the rural areas. The document from which I read this morning makes it quite clear that the full 15 per cent of the GST will be added to most sporting costs and services.

Mr Clarko: Nonsense.

Dr LAWRENCE: The member for Marnion should look at the Liberal Party's document. I can read where it states those areas that are exempted, and sport and culture is not included.

Point of Order

Mr MINSON: Not long ago we passed a motion providing for brief ministerial statements to be made. Yet we have had none of them - perhaps one or two - and questions like the one from the member for Marangaroo continue to waste the time of members who wish to ask legitimate questions. I ask that the Speaker rule that the Premier cannot proceed with her question so that someone else can.

The SPEAKER: It may be that the particular content of this question and its answer do not interest the member for Greenough. However, it clearly interests the member for Marangaroo because he asked the question. He has as much right to ask a question in this place as anybody else.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Dr LAWRENCE: If the view of the Opposition is that anything the Government says which is critical of the Opposition should be made by a ministerial statement the Government would be happy to oblige. However, I would have thought question time was the time to address issues which are not specifically the responsibility of a Minister.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: I have some detail, although I am clearly not reading from it. It is important that members opposite recognise that membership fees and the equipment needed for sporting and cultural activities will be subject to the GST. In addition, as the member for Marangaroo has clearly indicated, part of Dr Hewson's famous package is to abolish what has been an excellent program - \$10 million available through the Federal Government's community cultural, recreation and sporting facilities program. How on earth will country people get access to the sorts of facilities they need in the first place if those funds are cut off? Presumably it will be from State Governments. At the same time, Mr Hewson will cut our supply of funds by five per cent. All sorts of funds to assist sporting and cultural groups will be denied from the Federal Government source and groups will have to pay 15 per cent on top of everything.

A fairly interesting matter that has not been brought to people's attention is that not only tickets to the football and the costs that people must meet in their everyday sporting activities, but also summer and school swimming lessons will attract the GST. These are important health and safety activities. Members opposite should pick up the hot-line as have some members on this side and ask some of the hard questions. One of the hard questions that was put again today on the hot-line was: What about Government schools' amenities fees? We know that private school fees will not attract the GST, but what about amenities charges in Government schools? Do members opposite know what the answer was? It depends on the composition of the fee and it is not known. Schools will have to be tax collectors.

**WATER AUTHORITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - KIMBERLEY-PERTH
PIPELINE PROPOSAL**

Western Australian Resource Council Report - Studies Release

51. Mr BRADSHAW to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the report of the Western Australian Resource Council of November 1988 which states in part that Perth is beyond the economically competitive range for using the Kimberley rivers and that there are insufficient benefits to outweigh the costs of a Kimberley-Perth pipeline, and, under general conclusions, that viable future supply options are available for south western Australia even with climate change and strong growth in demand?
- (2) In view of the Government's proposal to spend \$3 million on a feasibility study into the Kimberley-Perth pipeline, will he explain the flaws in the WA Resource Council's report?
- (3) Will he also release any study or studies he or the Water Authority have undertaken so far into the proposed pipeline?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

(1)-(3)

I am aware of that report. In its evaluation of the future water requirements of the metropolitan area the Western Australian Resource Council clearly favours the south west.

Mr Lewis: Have you spoken to the Water Authority?

Mr BRIDGE: Yes, I have.

Mr Lewis: What did it say?

Mr BRIDGE: What I am saying.

Mr Lewis: Have you spoken to Peter Walsh?

Mr BRIDGE: Yes, and he said that the preferred future water supply for the metropolitan region was the south west. Quite clearly, the Water Authority shares that view. However, I am on record as not sharing that view. I am not aware of any authority that has written to me and said that my authority is any less than theirs and that I should listen to Peter Walsh and agree with him. Therefore, until somebody tells me that I should agree, I will continue to disagree with the Water Authority and Peter Walsh for one very important reason: We want to be satisfied at the end of the evaluation of the Kimberley pipeline proposal that there are no benefits from using that scheme to supply Perth's water. For that reason, the State Government has committed \$3 million towards this feasibility study. The member for Wellington and others know that I have been required to approve the expenditure of approximately \$1 million for the further evaluation of a water supply to the town of Nullagine. Nobody disputes that and nobody has said that I should not agree with that. That is one example. I also approved of the expenditure of \$2 million for the further study into waste disposal technology in the Beenyup area. Nobody has disputed that. That is a legitimate responsibility of the Water Authority. Is it not extraordinary, therefore, that, when we want to spend \$3 million on an evaluation of the Kimberley pipeline, everybody thinks it is outrageous?

Mr Lewis: But it is against everybody's advice.

Mr BRIDGE: It is not.

Mr Lewis: You are the only person in Western Australia who believes in it.

Mr BRIDGE: I am pleased that the member is interjecting because I have always believed that, because he has not been very vocal in his outright support of the scheme, he has given it bipartisan support. However, the question of the member for Wellington and the interjections of the member for Applecross

tell me one thing: We must get a message to the community that the Liberal Party is as weak as water about this scheme. It reminds me of the poem -

They will follow in your footsteps
While you're probing for the light,
But they'll run to get before you,
When they see you're going right.
Yet without the courage
to forsake the beaten track,
Wearily they feel their way behind
A bolder spirit's back.
