

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 19 June 1990

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett) took the Chair at 2.00 pm, and read prayers.

## LIBERAL PARTY - OFFICIAL POSITION CHANGES

### *Notification*

THE SPEAKER: I have received advice by a rather circuitous route that the member for Greenough has been elected Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party from Monday, 18 June 1990. I will recognise the member for Greenough from the seat normally occupied by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. However, I suggest that leaders of the relevant parties directly inform the House of changes in official positions. Those positions should include all ministries, deputy leaders and leaders of parties in Opposition and Government and the positions of Whips. In recent cases columns of newspapers or the *Government Gazette* have informed the appropriate people. It is important that members of this House be directly informed of such changes, where possible prior to advice being given to the media. Leaders of the parties may wish to give this suggestion some consideration when next a change of position occurs.

## PETITION - GRAYLANDS HOSPITAL

### *Prison/Forensic Unit Opposition*

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [2.05 pm]: I was concerned that you, Mr Speaker, may not be able to see me in this lofty and distant position.

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

We, the undersigned respectfully sheweth:

That the community is extremely concerned about Government plans to establish at Graylands Hospital a prison/forensic unit for mentally disordered offenders and persons who have committed serious offences but been found "not guilty" by reason of insanity, particularly because such unit will now be in the heart of a residential area and close to a public primary school and private college and therefore your petitioners humbly request that:-

1. Plans to establish the prison/forensic unit be abandoned forthwith; and
2. Any future plan to open a prison/forensic unit within a populous suburb and next to schools and playgrounds be fully discussed with and justified to the community and all relevant authorities and interests before such future decision is made.

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 16 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 54.]

## PETITION - ARMADALE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

### *Buildings and Facilities - Deterioration*

MR FRED TUBBY (Roleystone) [2.08 pm]:

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

We, the undersigned, are gravely concerned with the continued neglect of the buildings and facilities at the Armadale Senior High School.

Students and staff are forced to endure second rate facilities which include: badly deteriorated buildings caused through a lack of maintenance; deteriorated asbestos roofing to all buildings; inadequate and badly deteriorated manual arts rooms; outmoded and inadequate science laboratories; cracked and disintegrating verandah ceilings; cracked, dangerous and unserviceable basketball court; a proliferation of structural cracks in brick walls; poor library facilities; plus outmoded and inadequate administration and staff facilities.

We request that these conditions be redressed by giving them the highest priority in the forthcoming Budget.

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 1 528 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 55.]

### LIBERAL PARTY - NEW SHADOW CABINET

#### *Television Footage*

THE SPEAKER: I advise the House, as some members apparently are not aware, that permission has been sought from me and granted for television footage to be taken for a short time at the beginning of today's session to allow television stations to gather film footage of the new shadow Cabinet.

### PETITION - MT LESUEUR

#### *Coal Mining and Power Stations Opposition*

MR KIERATH (Riverton) [2.11 pm]:

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

We, the undersigned, request that the Parliament, in recognition of the immense biological diversity and importance of the Mt Lesueur area:

- (1) create a National Park with boundaries as recommended by the Environmental Protection Authority,
- (2) no coal mining or power stations be permitted within the boundaries or adjacent to the Mt Lesueur National Park.

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 56 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 56.]

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY TO GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

#### *Governor's Acknowledgment*

THE SPEAKER : I have to announce that, accompanied by the members for Nollamara, Mandurah and Wagin, I attended upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-Reply, as amended, to His Excellency's Speech delivered at the opening of Parliament. His Excellency has been pleased to respond in the following terms -

Mr Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly:

I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty The Queen, and for your Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech to Parliament on the occasion of the opening of the Second Session of the Thirty-Third Parliament.

FRANCIS BURT,  
Governor.

## **SENIORS (WATER SERVICE CHARGES REBATES) BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Bridge (Minister for Water Resources), and read a first time.

## **DOOR TO DOOR TRADING AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

MRS HENDERSON (Thornlie - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [2.20 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania have uniform legislation. At the meeting of Consumer Affairs Ministers in July 1989, it was agreed by Ministers that the Door to Door Trading Act should be amended to provide consumers with a period of six months in which to rescind a contract if the trader accepted consideration, or provided services, during the statutory cooling-off period of 10 days. The power to rescind the contract during the six-month period already exists if a failure to comply with other sections of the Act exists. It appears that the omission of this recommended provision was an oversight in the original draft legislation. The amendment also clarifies a previous drafting ambiguity which meant that consumers had a right to rescind only if a dealer or supplier was convicted of an offence under part III of the Act. This amendment will give consumers a right of rescission if a party engages in conduct which constitutes an offence.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Fred Tubby.

## **ACTS AMENDMENT (RESOLUTION OF PARLIAMENTARY DISAGREEMENTS) BILL**

### *Third Reading*

DR LAWRENCE (Glendalough - Premier) [2.22 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR COWAN (Merredin - Leader of the National Party) [2.23 pm]: I place clearly on the record the National Party's strong opposition to this legislation. We offered the Government an opportunity to reach a certain level of compromise regarding some aspects of the legislation which was sought by the Government; I refer to those issues which involve the possibility of a double dissolution whenever a Government is forced into a position in which it cannot govern due to a denial of Supply. I strongly recommend that the Government re-examine its position on this legislation over the next few days. When this Bill is sent to the other place, the Government should behave a little more responsibly and give the other House an opportunity to return legislation to the Assembly which will resolve one of the difficulties involved when a Government is forced into a difficult position through the denial of Supply.

The National Party is not prepared to support this legislation. We will continue, however, with our policy of a double dissolution provision which will apply in any situation which may occur as a consequence of the denial of Supply. In that case, if members in the other place made a decision to block Supply, they would have to face the consequences of that decision in going to the people at the same time as does the Legislative Assembly - the House in which the Government is commissioned. The National Party is strongly opposed to the legislation in its present form, and I advise the Premier that if the Government wants to effect some reforms in relation to a constitutional impasse, the Government should accept the amendments proposed by the National Party in another place.

**MR MacKINNON** (Jandakot - Leader of the Opposition) [2.24 pm]: I also indicate that the Liberal Party will never support legislation which is designed to castrate the Legislative Council by effectively neutering it of its power. We have opposed this kind of legislation in the past, we have opposed this Bill and we will continue with that policy.

**DR LAWRENCE** (Glendalough - Premier) [2.25 pm]: I reaffirm the Government's commitment to this legislation which is based on a sound principle which is supported by the people of Western Australia; the Opposition opposes this legislation at its cost.

Question put.

The **SPEAKER**: Members, I advise that to be successful, this Bill requires a constitutional majority; as there was a dissenting voice, I will have to divide the House. Ring the bells.

Division taken with the following result -

---

Ayes (29)			
Dr Alexander	Dr Gallop	Mr Marlborough	Mr Thomas
Mrs Beggs	Mr Graham	Mr McGinty	Mr Troy
Mr Bridge	Mr Grill	Mr Pearce	Dr Watson
Mrs Buchanan	Mrs Henderson	Mr Read	Mr Wilson
Mr Catania	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Ripper	Mrs Watkins ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mr Cunningham	Mr Kobelke	Mr D.L. Smith	
Mr Donovan	Dr Lawrence	Mr P.J. Smith	
Dr Edwards	Mr Leahy	Mr Taylor	

Noes (24)			
Mr Ainsworth	Mr Hassell	Mr Mensaros	Mr Thompson
Mr Bradshaw	Mr House	Mr Minson	Mr Trenorden
Mr Clarke	Mr Kierath	Mr Nicholls	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Court	Mr Lewis	Mr Omodei	Dr Turnbull
Mr Cowan	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Shave	Mr Wiese
Mr Grayden	Mr McNee	Mr Strickland	Mr Blaikie ( <i>Teller</i> )

---

Pair

Mr Carr

Mr Watt

Question thus passed with a constitutional majority.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## SUPPLY BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 31 May.

### *Adjournment of Debate*

**MR CLARKO** (Marmion) [2.29 pm]: I move -

That the debate be adjourned.

I move this motion because -

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I appreciate the member's desire to elaborate on why he has moved this motion, but as members are aware, Standing Orders do not permit an explanation; I must put the motion immediately.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

## Ayes (24)

Mr Ainsworth	Mr Hassell	Mr Mensaros	Mr Thompson
Mr Bradshaw	Mr House	Mr Minson	Mr Trenorden
Mr Clarko	Mr Kierath	Mr Nicholls	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Court	Mr Lewis	Mr Omodei	Dr Turnbull
Mr Cowan	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Shave	Mr Wiese
Mr Grayden	Mr McNee	Mr Strickland	Mr Blaikie ( <i>Teller</i> )

## Noes (28)

Dr Alexander	Dr Edwards	Dr Lawrence	Mr D.L. Smith
Mrs Beggs	Dr Gallop	Mr Leahy	Mr P.J. Smith
Mr Bridge	Mr Graham	Mr Marlborough	Mr Taylor
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Grill	Mr McGinty	Mr Thomas
Mr Catania	Mrs Henderson	Mr Pearce	Mr Troy
Mr Cunningham	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Read	Mr Wilson
Mr Donovan	Mr Kobelke	Mr Ripper	Mrs Watkins ( <i>Teller</i> )

## Pairs

Mr Watt  
Mrs Edwards

Mr Carr  
Dr Watson

Question thus negatived.

*Debate Resumed*

**MR MacKINNON** (Jandakot - Leader of the Opposition) [2.36 pm]: The Opposition opposes this Bill. Before I indicate the reasons for that I will take the unusual step of paying tribute to the member for Cottesloe who has yet to officially retire from the Parliament. We have few opportunities in general debate for such a tribute so I take this opportunity prior to his retirement on 30 June. As members will be aware the member for Cottesloe has a record of which he can be very proud. In 1977 he was elected to this Parliament and in 1980 was elevated to the Ministry under Sir Charles Court. When the Liberal Party went into Opposition he was elected as its leader and after he was removed as Leader of the Opposition he became a senior member of the Opposition and has served in a variety of roles. He has made a significant contribution to this Parliament, to our party, and to the people of this State.

**Mr Ripper:** One which you cut short.

**Mr MacKINNON:** No I did not. The member for Cottesloe has been contributing in a productive way and, may I say without too much acrimony, the quality of his contribution has been far greater than that of any member opposite - including Mr Ripper. He has made a significant contribution to the Parliament and has fought fiercely to protect the independence of Parliament. He has fought fiercely in our party to ensure that its organisation did not find itself in a situation, as the Labor Party has done, where its members are caucused and directed by its organisation. He has fought fiercely and without fear or favour for the protection of individual freedoms of the people of this State, which is foremost in Liberal philosophy. Who will forget his work on the ID card and his protection of individuals and the rights of those individuals to justice? Who will forget his contribution in highlighting the injustice imposed upon Mrs Tan and his leadership, as one of the first people in Western Australia, in speaking out vigorously and vehemently on corporatism and the evils inherent in such a philosophy? We are about to debate that subject today. He was one of the first people in Western Australia to lead the charge against corporatism and he will continue to do so until he leaves this Parliament in a few days' time.

Unlike a few senior members opposite the member for Cottesloe will not have to leave Western Australia to continue his life; he will not have to go to Sydney to continue practising the law because of any shame or disgrace brought upon himself; and he will not have to go to Hong Kong to practise law to escape the people of Western Australia. He will be able to leave this Parliament with his head held high knowing that he has done absolutely nothing in his parliamentary career of which he is ashamed.

Throughout all the political ups and downs of what has been a very fine political career Bill Hassell, the member for Cottesloe, has been supported by his family. I pay tribute to Sue Hassell, his children and his family who have stood behind him for all that time. I have made no secret of the fact that I am disappointed that Bill Hassell has chosen to retire, but he has made that decision and I understand full well his reasons. I extend to Bill Hassell and his family my best wishes for their future. He is one member of Parliament who can leave this place with a record of which he can be justifiably proud.

Only one question should be debated in relation to the Supply Bill: Why has the Government asked us to approve these funds, which are taxpayers' funds, when it will not submit itself to any public examination into how the Government of Western Australia - of which the Premier was a part - has cost the State \$850 million and has placed a further \$1300 million of taxpayers' funds at risk? Opposition members have been asked to agree to a Bill which has been introduced by a Government which has been racked with dishonesty, deceit and incompetence. In the light of that, how can the Government believe that we would support this Bill? The reasons for the Opposition and the overwhelming majority of the people of Western Australia believing that a Royal Commission is the only way to get the truth about the events which have put our State into debt for years to come are quite clear.

The tragedy that has befallen Western Australia had its origins back in 1983-84. It involved the dealings between Labor politicians and a small band of people - the four on the floor entrepreneurs. Who can forget those words of former Premier, Brian Burke? I remember them well. He spoke about the four on the floor entrepreneurs and now this Government has become a four on the floor style Government. Collectively those dealings have become known as WA Inc.

The final cost of the deals which went horribly wrong is unclear and I have indicated the figure is in the order of \$850 million lost, with a further \$150 million severely at risk. The only reason many of those losses could not be swept under the carpet or ignored - I am sure the Government would wish that could be done - is by the efforts of the Opposition and a small number of journalists dedicated to uncovering the details which have not, were not, and still are not voluntarily being revealed by the Government. In fact, this Labor Government deliberately misled the Parliament and the public about the agreements it entered into. It kept the details of those agreements from the public, particularly in the dying days of the 1989 election campaign. The Government entered into agreements and placed public funds at risk. Who can forget the four on the floor statements by the former Premier, Brian Burke or those by the former Deputy Premier, David Parker whose statement of 12 April last year still rings in my ears; that is, "There is no guarantee, there will be no guarantee, no guarantee was issued by the former Treasurer and no guarantee was issued by me." Do members opposite remember those words?

Several members interjected.

Mr MACKINNON: The member remembers them well and he sat in this place in the same way as he does today - like back bench electoral fodder who blindly follows a dishonest and deceitful man. The member was prepared to put up with a leader who lied and cheated; this member will not stand up and be counted; he will not retire from this Parliament like the member for Cottesloe with his head held high. This member's politics equate with the colour of his jumper.

The documents which the Opposition forced the Government to table in the Parliament in October 1989 proved that guarantees had been given and that the guarantees the former Deputy Premier said did not exist, now form the basis of a \$500 million law suit against the State by Bond Corporation. The Premier has a great habit of trying to mislead and deceive like her predecessors. I have no great love for or truck with Bond Corporation. This Government entered into those deals and it has placed \$500 million at risk and anything I say should not be taken as supporting Bond Corporation's case - that will be judged by the courts in due course.

Major questions about those losses need to be answered. The lost funds have been included in the Supply Bill and the question should be asked, "Where did the money go?" Members need only look at last Saturday's *The West Australian* to read what Kevin Karlson, the liquidator for Petrochemical Industries Ltd, said. He is of the opinion that the only way to get to the bottom of WA Inc transactions is to appoint a Royal Commission. His comments

are very interesting and the Premier has not indicated - even today she does not want to know - who are the beneficiaries of Gofair. She probably does know.

Dr Lawrence: It has nothing to do with the Government.

Mr MacKINNON: Kevin Karlson said it had a lot to do with the company. The Premier was in Cabinet when the Government approved the use of taxpayers' funds totalling \$400 million towards the purchase price.

Dr Lawrence: There was no contribution either.

Mr MacKINNON: By whom?

Dr Lawrence: By the Government.

Mr MacKINNON: The Government paid \$175 million towards \$400 million and of that amount a fair bit went to Gofair. It is interesting that the Petrochemical Industries Ltd liquidator wants to know where the money went, wants an inquiry and wants to know who the beneficial owners are of Gofair, but the Premier says it has nothing to do with her. The Opposition believes it has everything to do with the Government and as Mr Karlson has rightfully said, if it is illegal and the money has been wrongfully paid the Government should get it back. The second question that should be answered is whether there is any chance of recovering the debt. When a deal is deemed to be illegal, the court can order that the deal be undone and the money repaid. This may be possible not only with this deal, but also with others.

Where does the true responsibility for the losses lie? Members would have read the recent comments by Mr Connell - a friend of the Government, not a friend of the Opposition.

Several members interjected.

Mr MacKINNON: Are members opposite denying that he is a friend of the Government?

Mrs Beggs: I do not know the man.

Mr MacKINNON: The Minister opposite can say that, yet she sat there day after day defending her Government's committing \$150 million initially of taxpayers' funds for the rescue of Rothwells. She was in Cabinet when it endorsed a \$400 million Petrochemical Industries Ltd deal which was designed exclusively to save Laurie Connell's neck and the Minister has the temerity to say he is not a friend of the Government. I bet they do not want to know who he is because he is now saying that all the players in the game should be called before a Royal Commission and he was speaking about Mr Burke, Mr Dowding, Mr Berinson and senior advisors heading the Government agencies. He is saying that he alone does not want to carry the brunt for what rightfully was in his opinion, and in mine, a decision which falls at the feet of the Government of Western Australia.

During the February 1989 election campaign Premier Dowding maintained that no public funds involving the Petrochemical Industries Ltd project were at risk apart from the \$175 million entry fee. That entry fee was said to be an accurate valuation of the worth of the project. Documents now show that to be a total untruth. He said that entering into the PICL deal had removed any liability from the \$150 million Rothwells' guarantee; that losses from the Rothwells collapse would not exceed \$55 million and that the Government had ceased its business dealings. The Premier at that time claimed all those things as fact, but every one of those claims has subsequently proved to be nothing more or less than a blatant lie.

I have outlined only a few of the deals which have come to light since the last election. It is the Opposition's opinion that the Government's misleading of Parliament, its avoidance of parliamentary approval for its actions, its gross financial mismanagement and its deliberate hiding of the true state of affairs from the people during the election and to date void the mandate it received from the people in 1989 which makes this an illegitimate Government in every sense of the word.

What was or was not known prior to the 1989 election is not so much the issue before us today. The issue is this Premier's refusal to agree to the only measure which will restore the faith of the people of Western Australia in this Government; that is, the appointment of a special Royal Commission. If, as the Premier claims, the losses were purely the result of naive decisions made by her predecessors - perhaps a naivety she contributed to as she was

part of the Cabinet which endorsed those deals - surely she should welcome the chance to clear the name of her Government and clear herself of any suspicion of deliberate wrong doing. An innocent person never fears scrutiny of his or her actions. I have never feared scrutiny of any of my actions. The Deputy Premier, the Leader of the House and others groan and continue to talk about Bunbury Foods. Let a public inquiry be held into that matter. I have nothing to fear. A guilty person fears scrutiny but an innocent person does not. The Premier's claim that the McCusker inquiry is basically to investigate these matters has again been denied, not just by Mr McCusker but also by those people at the centre of this investigation. I refer to Mr Connell who was again quoted in the *Sunday Times* this weekend as saying -

The real story will never come out in the courts. . .

Only scapegoats will face charges from the McCusker inquiry. . .

Time will tell. He continued -

Mr Malcolm McCusker is only investigating a narrow range of issues - he is not even investigating the full Rothwells' story.

He went on to say -

The Government was directing Rothwells from 1987 until its collapse in November 1988.

He also said -

The Premier, Mr Dowding, was a de facto director of Rothwells at the time of its collapse.

Further on he stated -

. . . the McCusker inquiry does not aim to find out why Rothwells collapsed but to obtain evidence to support charges against a few scapegoats, primarily me.

I am not an apologist for Laurie Connell. I know what he, as a person who should be at the centre of the McCusker inquiry, is endeavouring to do. However, what he says in that instance is true and for that reason it should not be ignored. Mr Dowding, as Premier, was to all intents and purposes a director of Rothwells at that time, but he is not part of the inquiry. That is the very point the Opposition has been making.

Dr Lawrence: How do you know to whom and about what Mr McCusker has spoken?

Mr MacKINNON: We know what are the terms of reference, and I challenge the Premier to publicly indicate that Peter Dowding's involvement in Rothwells is part and parcel of that inquiry.

Dr Lawrence: Mr McCusker is the person doing the inquiry; you should ask him.

Mr MacKINNON: The Premier again does not answer because she knows that the facts are exactly as I have stated. Mr Dowding's involvement is not part and parcel of the inquiry. The Opposition does not believe it is possible to get to the bottom of this disaster without examining the history of the dealings of the Labor Party, its leaders in Government, and the businessmen who were involved from 1983 to the present time. I refer, for example, to the Argyle diamond mine project with Alan Bond, the continuing dealings with the Burswood Resort Casino project and Mr Dempster, the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd with the absent Mr Yosse Goldberg, the old Swan Brewery site, the State Superannuation Board and the involvement of Len Brush, and the Midland abattoir affair and Peter Ellett. I understand that the latter deal, which was financed by Transcontinental from Victoria, and the funding for which was extended because of favours and friendship, is now at risk. The list includes also the city property deals between the State Government Insurance Commission, the Superannuation Board, the Western Australian Development Corporation, Mr Anderson and others, the purchase of shares in the Bell Group from Mr Holmes a Court and subsequent indemnity by Bond, and so on. These deals should all be inquired into and they are central to the question of a special Royal Commission. The Opposition will continue to press for that Royal Commission until such time as it is appointed and the people of this State get what they are entitled to; that is, an explanation of where their money has gone, if any can be reclaimed and who is responsible for the losses incurred. Any claim that a special Royal



Commission would prejudice present court actions and other investigations is totally unsustainable, as the Opposition has said many times before.

The longer the Premier resists this call from every corner of the political spectrum, the more her motives will come under suspicion. She cannot ignore the fact that Mr Connell and Mr Dempster are asking for an inquiry because people such as these are at the centre of the affair. The list of people includes Kevin Karlson, the independent liquidator, the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the National Party, the Liberal Party, the Australian Democrats and others. Even the late Colin Jamieson, a former leader of the ALP, was reported in the *Sunday Times* in November 1989 as saying that a Royal Commission was the only desirable course left open. Colin Jamieson is another man who left this Parliament with his head held high, and his comments are a clear indication of why he was able to do so.

The Premier claims that she had no involvement in the WA Inc dealings. That may be true in the sense that she did not hold a key economic portfolio, unlike the present Deputy Premier. However, as I have indicated, she was a Minister in the Cabinet which approved the worst deal of all, the PICL deal, in July 1988. Why does the Premier refuse time after time to indicate to the Parliament her knowledge of that deal? Was she present at the Cabinet meetings when this deal was discussed? What was she told about that deal?

Dr Lawrence: The Leader of the Opposition knows very well there is an important principle at stake here; namely, that Cabinet decisions and discussions are confidential.

Mr MacKINNON: The important principle is to survive at any cost and not to incriminate oneself by explaining the facts.

Dr Lawrence: Were I to confirm or deny, I would violate the principle and you well understand that. It is a cheap ploy to continue with that point.

Mr MacKINNON: The arrogance of the Premier does not surprise me; it follows the traditions of her predecessors, Burke and Dowding. There is nothing wrong with the Premier indicating to this Parliament what her knowledge was of this matter at the time. When did she become aware of the deal?

Dr Lawrence: You are asking the same question in a different way.

Mr MacKINNON: It is not a secret and neither should it be. The Premier's wish to hide behind this is an indication of the extent to which she is worried about revealing the truth. If she has nothing to hide, why not reveal the facts? The Premier will not reveal anything. She came to this House as a person of some integrity and decency.

Dr Lawrence: I am not sure what you are asking me to reveal.

Mr MacKINNON: When did the Premier know about the PICL deal that was approved by the Cabinet in July 1988?

Dr Lawrence: You have answered the question for yourself.

Mr MacKINNON: Avoidance and deceit from the Premier. No answer. David Parker was quoted as saying that some of the names may change but most things have stayed the same. I think that is right.

Under the Westminster system Ministers bring decisions for which they are not prepared to take sole responsibility to Cabinet for approval. I assume the PICL deal went to Cabinet for approval. The Premier indicates that it is a State secret and we are not allowed to know when that happened, despite the fact that \$175 million of taxpayers' funds were committed to that deal. The Premier says it is a State secret and the Parliament cannot be told when the deal was approved by Cabinet. What a load of poppycock. Those Ministers who were members of Cabinet share a collective responsibility for that commitment.

Dr Lawrence: You are making assumptions.

Mr MacKINNON: The Deputy Premier was present. Should a Minister not wish to share in that responsibility it is his or her duty to resign, yet the Premier did not do so. I refer to the *House of Representatives Practice* Second Edition in 1989 in which Mr A.R. Browning is reported as saying the following in relation to the collective Cabinet responsibility -

... it is required by convention that all Ministers must be prepared to accept collective responsibility for, and defend publicly, the policies and actions of the Government or else resign.

The Premier has demonstrated again today that she is not prepared to answer relevant questions about the central deal involved in the PICL/Rothwells collapse. That principle was acknowledged by the former Deputy Premier, David Parker, following his resignation when he was questioned about the role of the present Deputy Premier - the so called silent partner in WA Inc - by Kevin Hume on ABC radio. He said -

Everyone in the Government was involved. That is why the Premier and I resigned, to take responsibility for those people.

That is the matter in question: What did the Premier know in July 1988? Did he approve of the deal?

Mr Taylor: You are like a ho hum bird; you run round and round in ever decreasing circles and you know where you will end up.

Mr MacKINNON: That is an example of a Government led by a Premier who wants to elevate public and parliamentary debate to a new plane so that issues are debated on their merit; the Deputy Premier parrots inane interjections and the Premier takes no action. So much for a Premier who came to this Parliament with a great gush of new found commitment to principles and quality of debate!

Mr Gordon Hill: You are an absolute hypocrite.

Mr MacKINNON: I made no comments or claims as the Premier did.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to members of the Government that they know as well as everybody else in this place that interjections are disorderly, technically, but that my attitude to them is that provided they add to the debate and are not used to shout down the person on his or her feet they are appropriate. However, it is not appropriate for members to stand in the aisles and yell interjections, as that is highly disorderly and I do not want it to happen again.

Mr MacKINNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The former Deputy Premier, David Parker, was quoted in the *Sunday Times* of 18 February as saying that some of the names may change but most things have stayed the same.

Therefore, despite the Premier's wishes, most things have stayed the same. The Premier's claim that it is not yet time for an investigation or a Royal Commission is patently absurd. The further these events recede into the past the harder it will be to ascertain facts as people's memories fade and documents are lost, or destroyed deliberately, and key facts may disappear with the passing of a person such as the late Bill Burgess, who was a director of Rothwells during all the relevant times.

The argument that a special Royal Commission should not be held because it is likely to cost the taxpayers money is completely spurious. To argue that democracy should not be allowed to function or that Governments should not be held accountable because a cost is involved is frightening. What is the price of freedom and accountability? In any event, the cost of a Royal Commission, as I have said more than once, would be more than covered if this Government refused to proceed with the old Swan Brewery redevelopment and the site were to become an extension of Kings Park; that would more than adequately cover the cost of any such inquiry.

The longer these events are subject to rumour the worse it will be for the reputation of this State. If the Premier does not think that the reputation of this State has been badly sullied, and continues to be sullied, by her obstinacy then she is even less informed than I believe she is. For some time now Western Australian businesses have experienced severe difficulties in raising capital for investment programs. Until the air is cleared about these matters it will be impossible for outsiders to regain the confidence that has been lost in the State. With all this background, it is hard to believe that Premier Lawrence is still resisting a call for a special Royal Commission. The Premier is one of the few people opposite who has knowledge of these events. Few people in this State now believe that a special Royal Commission should not be held. The Premier is resisting that Royal Commission because of a desire to protect herself and supporters of what became known as WA Inc.

Should the Premier decide to tough it out in the hope that her image will be sufficient to win

any future election I believe she will suffer an unpleasant surprise. No Government has ever won an election, nor is one likely to, by arguing that it should not account to the public for its actions. The Premier should not forget the lesson of Watergate where President Nixon was not forced to resign because he had been involved in the Watergate burglary but because he was found to have attempted to cover it up after it occurred. The Premier of this State is in a worse position than President Nixon was because she participated in the WA Inc disaster and, even worse, is attempting to cover it up now.

Any Premier who refuses to make himself or herself accountable to the people cannot survive in a democracy. We saw this with former Premiers Burke and Dowding. If the present Premier continues to refuse to make herself accountable the quality of our democracy will certainly be called into question. As I have said previously, she will not survive. As I said last year, it is unusual for an Opposition to vote against a Budget or Supply Bill in either House. I indicate that we will have no part in supporting a Government which continues to resist the inevitable; that is, a proper public, broad ranging inquiry into the whole of the affairs of WA Inc and where the money has gone.

The Government is now seeking Opposition approval through this Bill for much of that money. If it believes we will stop pressing for a Royal Commission, or that we will rest and accept some of the excuses and reasons why there will not be a Royal Commission, it had better think again. Every member of the Opposition is committed to ensuring vigorous pursuit of a Royal Commission into this matter and will continue to do so until a result is achieved.

**MR TAYLOR** (Kalgoorlie - Minister for Finance and Economic Development) [3.08 pm]: Nothing has changed; we still have a second rate Leader of the Opposition in charge of a second rate Opposition in this State.

#### *Point of Order*

**Mr COWAN**: I take it that this is not the Minister in reply.

**Mr Pearce**: No. This is the Treasurer's Bill.

**Mr COWAN**: We do not often get communication from the Leader of the House.

#### *Debate Resumed*

**Mr TAYLOR**: As the Leader of the National Party should know, the Treasurer is responsible for the Supply Bill; that is well known.

Nothing has changed. The Opposition continues to be caught in this time warp of Supply and whether it will be blocked and what might happen in the Legislative Council. We have already seen a rather half hearted attempt to defer Supply in this House today and now the Leader of the Opposition says that the Opposition will vote against Supply just as it did last year.

One would have thought that with the events of the past week or so the Opposition would have learnt one thing in relation to the view held about it by the people of Western Australia; that is, it is going nowhere. The Opposition is going round and round in ever decreasing circles. The ho hum Leader of the Opposition has not one thought or one view about where this State is heading. He has not considered what effect these tactics - which are bound to fail - will have on the future of Western Australia and particularly on the business community.

In the last week the business community's view of the Liberal Party has been clearly stated; that is, that Opposition members are dead set losers. The Opposition is led by a dead set loser who does not have the support of members of his party. It is also clear that the people of Western Australia, particularly those involved in the economy of Western Australia, have concluded that - this has been expressed to me on a number of occasions in recent days - it would be an unholy disaster for the State if the Liberal Party was ever to succeed and get into Government. The business community of Western Australia has generally recognised that the Liberal Party does not know how to run its own party and therefore would not know how to run the State's affairs. The Opposition is in a state of utter confusion.

It gives me great pleasure to quote from events in the past week in relation to the Opposition, in particular criticisms made about the so-called intellectual giant, the Leader of the

Opposition, who found it within himself yesterday to say that some Ministers are not up to their job. He said of people of the calibre of the Minister for Works and Services, who has seen more of life than he, that she was not up to the job. It is an absolute and utter disgrace for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that people of the calibre of Graham Edwards are not intellectually capable and do not make any contribution to this State. Graham Edwards on every single occasion would leave the Leader of the Opposition behind. Of every person sitting in both this House and the Legislative Council there is no-one more respected and admired by all members of Parliament than Graham Edwards. For the Leader of the Opposition to select Graham Edwards in this way is absolutely and utterly cowardly. He will be shown up for it; he was shown up not only yesterday but also today. I will have the greatest pleasure in making sure that the Leader of the Opposition eats those words every day for the few days that he may have left as Leader of the Opposition because he is a disgrace to his job. His comments in relation to my ministerial colleagues are a disgrace to the position he holds as Leader of the Opposition.

I will quote what some of his colleagues have had to say about him. On 9 June the departing member for Cottesloe had this to say of Barry MacKinnon -

Well I think that what's happened today, in the midst of a major political strategy that we have undertaken -

That was some political strategy. He went on to say -

- has damaged Barry MacKinnon very severely and has made his position impossible and I think that probably Barry recognises that . . . and he will step down.

He did not recognise that either last week or earlier this week but I have no doubt at all that many members in the Opposition recognise that he has been damaged not only by the events of last week but also by the events of yesterday and the things the Leader of the Opposition had to say about other people. The member for Cottesloe went on to say -

Well I rather think that Richard Court will become the leader -

I have no doubt that he will become the leader. Mr Hassell also said of Richard Court that -

- and I think he'll be a very good leader . . .

It would not be hard for someone else to be a better Leader of the Opposition than the current one. The member for Cottesloe, when speaking about Supply and about how the Opposition was going to address Supply, said -

. . . I have the feeling and political judgment is that the blocking of Supply option is not available in practical terms. I mean it clearly is available but I have the feeling that in political practical terms it's no longer available, it's gone out the window.

Would the Leader of the Opposition make up his mind. Would he say that he is in charge of what is happening in the Legislative Council? What will happen to this Bill when it gets to the Legislative Council? Would the Leader of the Opposition answer that question now rather than waiting for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to tell us what will happen? What is the answer?

Mr MacKinnon: The Government will find out when the Bill gets to the Legislative Council.

Mr TAYLOR: If the Leader of the Opposition thinks that is beneficial to the way this State operates I must say it is a very bad supposition. I refer to a few more comments made about the Leader of the Opposition by his colleagues. Mr Cash, the Leader of the Opposition in the upper House has said -

Well, he's been working very hard and doing the very best he can -

It almost sounds like a report that our kids get at school which may say that he is really hopeless but we do not want to disappoint his parents. Mr Cash went on and said -

- but there's no doubt that there's some members who have had some questions about our capacity to win an election.

Elections are principally about policies and leadership. The Opposition is bereft in both areas. That is recognised by members of the Opposition. Let me also quote what the *Sunday Times* - of all papers - had to say about the lack of leadership in the Liberal Party -

The lack of leadership depth in the Liberal Party can be traced directly to past pre-selection attitudes that have allowed too many time-servers to keep their seats warm. If some dead wood had been pruned long ago there may have been some real leadership contenders now.

Obviously Tony Williams did not write this editorial. It is certainly a gross reflection on the Leader of the Opposition that 13 members on the Opposition benches recognise that Barry MacKinnon is not capable of leading the Liberal Party in Western Australia. *The West Australian* reported the member for Wellington - this is a classic - as saying that he was -

... loyal to the leader but if a spill of positions took place, he would reconsider the matter.

That is some loyalty when a member says that he is loyal to the leader but if things change he may have to rethink his position. The member for Mandurah said that it was very unfortunate that the whole thing had happened. Another member of the Liberal Party said that it could be said that Mr MacKinnon's leadership would continue to be questioned even if he survived that day. Another Liberal Party member said -

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The practice seems to be developing among a number of members in this place to introduce at some times craftily and at other times more blatantly the word "lie" or "lies". That word is unparliamentary at any time and I ask members to desist from this practice. It may well be that the interjection that I have just heard was not heard by anybody else because it was not made particularly loudly. However, I caution members that I take very strong exception to the way this word is creeping in and it is my intention to stamp it out. If that means taking unpalatable action against certain members then that is the course of action I will take. I caution members now that they should not use the word "lie" or "lies" in debate in this place.

Mr TAYLOR: Another unnamed Liberal Party member said -

I am very concerned that the tacks (sic) have already gone into Barry that far that even with support he's going to be eventually dragged down, . . .

I note also that the person who tackled him for the leadership of the Liberal Party said at the conclusion of that challenge that his total commitment is to the Liberal Party. I suppose that is where it should be, but I also would have expected that perhaps his loyalty should have been to his leader.

The Opposition cannot even get right the question of blocking Supply. The now Deputy Leader of the Opposition said on 11 June, well after the leadership challenge, on Radio 6WF "Drive Time", that -

... the whole question of Supply and of elections has got to fade into the background . . .

One of the leading political journalists in Western Australia said about that issue, one day after the challenge to the Leader of the Opposition and the changes that took place, that, "The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could not get it straight in terms of what they were going to do. Were they in fact going to continue down the track that we have seen in this State for the last few years or so, or were they going to change?"

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said the change had taken place; yet today we see that the change has not taken place, and it would seem we are back where we started from. The reason is that the Leader of the Opposition does not have a clue about what will happen to the legislation when it gets to the upper House. It must be of concern to Western Australians that we have an Opposition party which is not prepared to say exactly what it will do with such critical legislation, either because it believes that it is some sort of State secret, or because it does not know what will happen.

I refer now to what a person who is outside the parliamentary Liberal Party had to say about this issue. Bill Cunningham, the Senior Vice President of the Liberal Party, said on the Gerry Gannon show on Radio 6WF -

Morale is fine. There is an air of, I think, disappointment to see Bill going. There . . . as of last week, I think morale was very good, because there was a lot of

shaking in . . . over the last week and with the leadership issue settled, and the lay party is really determined to see this party get itself right back on track, and I think morale is good, because we have an angry party . . . angry to get on with the job, because last week, we did see, if I could just use quickly a football analogy for you, there we were in front of the goals, with a long kick into goal square, and we had the front position and unfortunately at the last minute, I am talking here of the parliamentary party, they took their eye off the ball and got hit on the head instead of marking the ball.

That is exactly what happened to the Opposition. The Opposition does not know whether it is coming or going. It can offer to the people of Western Australia nothing more than a continuation of the same facade, the same sort of charade, about this issue. This issue is too important to Western Australia to be treated in that way by an Opposition that is now quite well known as being an incompetent Opposition, which is incapable of formulating policies and of saying what it will do should there be an election in 1993. Let us look towards an election in 1993, and towards the Liberal Party's getting its house in order so that it can offer itself to this Parliament and to the people of Western Australia as a reasonably competent Opposition which is prepared to address the real issues concerning Western Australians rather than messing around on the sidelines with something that it has been unable to move away from for the past two years.

This legislation is critical to the future of this State. It needs to be addressed in this House today, and to go to and be passed by the Legislative Council next week, so that the Government can get on with its job of governing Western Australia. I again make it very clear, as the Premier has said, that the Government has not ruled out a further inquiry or inquiries into the issues raised by the Opposition. However, the critical issue, and the issue to be addressed by this Opposition, is that we are going on with, and are determined to go on with, governing Western Australia in the way that quite properly should be the case. The Opposition also has a job to do, as part of the Westminster system; that is, to be a reasonably competent Opposition, which can say to the people of Western Australia that it also looks forward to an election in 1993.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has to make up his mind whether he will go down the track that the Leader of the Opposition has signposted here today. Will he talk about these matters fading into the background, or will he chop and change his position on a daily basis? We will find out about that over the next few weeks.

This legislation deserves the support of this House, as it will get, and it deserves the support of members in the Legislative Council.

Government members: Hear, hear!

MR COWAN (Merredin - Leader of the National Party) [3.25 pm]: Before I begin my comments in respect of the Supply Bill, I say in response to the comments of the Minister for Finance and Economic Development that yes, it is perhaps true that this House needs to examine the legislation and give it the weight that it deserves. No one would question that. However, by the same token it is a requirement of the Government that it consider also the question of a Royal Commission in Western Australia and give that the weight it deserves, because until the Government does that the Minister for Finance and Economic Development will find himself acting as the hatchet man in this House trying to defend the Government's position, and he seems to be very much alone in that task, although every now and again the Leader of the House sails in to help him out. I say in respect of the remainder of the Minister's colleagues that he is playing very much a lone hand.

Mr Taylor: That is very far from the truth. You might have a look at the members on your back bench.

Mr COWAN: Maybe the Minister for Finance and Economic Development and the Leader of the House do it with more telling effect but -

Mr Pearce: All you need is one good full forward in the forward pocket.

Mr COWAN: I could tell members a story about a country football team which once had only two members playing, but I will not do that now.

The Treasurer quoted from a former Treasurer, who was quite well known, when she said in her second reading speech on the Supply Bill that -

... a Supply Bill represents a proposal to Parliament for a general appropriation to enable the services of the State to be carried on until specific appropriation contained in the Estimates of expenditure is approved.

That is all very right and proper, and the amount that is to be appropriated in this case does not vary to any great extent from that in previous years. Last year the amount was \$2.5 billion, and in the previous year it was \$2.2 billion, so the sum this year of \$2.4 billion is pretty much in line. There is also an additional amount of \$200 million from the General Loan and Capital Works Fund, which makes a total amount of \$2.6 billion. I do not think anyone would see anything untoward about that amount.

One would normally use the Supply debate to question some of the policies of Government, and in particular those monetary policies which are causing people a great deal of concern. I intend to do that because this opportunity should not be wasted by talking about issues such as WA Inc or Royal Commissions, or whatever. We need to get back to the present financial position of this State rather than the Government's past financial mismanagement because that is well documented and is very much on the record, and everyone knows what it is about.

I refer now to areas of budgetary management which have not been given any great degree of publicity and which are causing a great deal of concern to people. First, there has been a reduction in the delivery of services by Government. One of the advantages of having State Governments, and one of the reasons that I will always oppose any great change to the system of Government we have in Australia and that I am a great advocate of State Governments and State's rights, is that the States have a responsibility to provide essential services.

In the provision of those essential services the major task is to constantly improve, rather than reduce, the level of services given to the people of Western Australia. I acknowledge that it is much easier to maintain the level of services in the metropolitan area where the vast bulk of our population resides than it is to maintain the level of services in the country, when the Government must weigh up the cost of delivery and the effectiveness of a service against the number of people who will receive it. Quite often we read of decisions which result in people in country areas losing services because not enough people remain in a town to warrant the retention of such services.

However, some evidence exists of the impact of the Government's requirement that Government departments maintain a strict expenditure discipline - and I think they were the Treasurer's own words - in the last two or three months of this financial year because of the expected downturn in Budget revenue. I would expect every department to be efficient, but it seems from what has been relayed to me that the Government's decision making has impacted more heavily in some areas than it has in others. A great deal of publicity has been given to the Health Department's difficulties in meeting its budget. The Health Department has been told that from now on it must meet its budget, and that if it cannot do that services in certain hospitals will have to be reduced or withdrawn. There have been several examples of that; indeed, services in hospitals have been withdrawn in order to allow those hospitals to stay within their budgets.

Dr Lawrence: None of those hospitals which had services withdrawn will succeed in that. They will still be quite substantially over budget, but not so much as they would have been otherwise.

Mr COWAN: Can the Treasurer confirm whether or not Royal Perth Hospital had to close a ward?

Dr Lawrence: A full ward? You would have to ask the Minister for Health. However, the point is that the hospitals at Geraldton and Bunbury which had to curtail services will not fall under budget - they will still overspend their budgets.

Mr COWAN: Yes, they will, and this raises another point. I subscribe to proper budgeting, the Treasurer should have no doubt about that. I think it is most important that hospitals are placed on a budget and work as hard as they possibly can to meet that budget. However, they must do better than merely getting to month nine or 10 of the financial year and saying, "We are over budget", and then being told by somebody, "Tough".

Dr Lawrence: They were told in late January or early February.

Mr COWAN: That is an advance, and I am pleased to hear that; but I think they could do a little better. Does the Treasurer not think so?

Dr Lawrence: Quarter by quarter we can look at their performance, but sometimes it is not evident until rather later, as it was not in this case.

Mr Pearce: Isn't the hospital board supposed to stay within its budget? It is a very decentralised decision making process.

Mr COWAN: Most of the hospitals which have a hospital board are capable of staying within their budget limitations. If the Leader of the House can show me those hospitals operating under a board system which went over budget, I will be very pleased. In addition, it must be acknowledged that one reason why intense pressure is placed on the hospital system - and this is not a reflection on the Treasurer but on the whole of the health system we have in Australia - is that people are opting to become public patients rather than private patients. This has placed considerable pressure on public hospitals. The majority of hospitals which had to reduce their level of health care were public hospitals - Royal Perth Hospital, Geraldton Regional Hospital, and perhaps a couple of other hospitals in the metropolitan area. That is a problem which must be addressed. In my view, to address it we need at least a two-pronged attack. One line of attack is to ensure that the hospitals' administrations are conscious of the need to be better at budgeting; then we must address the real issue, which is the problem of health care and the way in which health care is provided, so that some pressure is taken off the public hospital system in this State.

Dr Lawrence: You will have noticed Mr Wilson attempting to do that.

Mr COWAN: I know he is, and I hope the Treasurer would agree that I have not been critical of the Minister for Health. However, in some cases people have been scheduled to have operations and have been told that because of budgetary constraints their scheduled operation now must be postponed. Again, that represents a reduction in services and is directly caused by the difficulties associated with the public health service that we have and the pressure that is imposed on it.

Let us talk now about education and, more specifically, the maintenance of Government buildings used for education purposes. I have it on reasonably good authority that the cost of maintenance of Government buildings in the country has increased by roughly 10 per cent. One would assume that that is pretty much in keeping with all other costs - an increase of about 10 per cent would match inflation. However, when we examine maintenance cost increases in the metropolitan area we discover that they have jumped enormously. The simple reason for that is that in the metropolitan area the Building Management Authority uses a day labour force and, in using that day labour force as opposed to the use of contractors, when a fault is reported again and again the responsibility for supervision and repair, and the guarantee that the fault has been corrected, rests with the day labour group, which is employed directly by the Government. If the Government employed a contractor, when the contractor was asked to fix something he would tender a price. If the tender were let, he would fix it, and if the fault was not repaired properly the onus of responsibility would rest with the contractor, not with the Government. However, presently, the use of a day labour work force for anything other than urgent or emergency situations is costing taxpayers a great deal of money.

Mrs Henderson: Do you know that figures have been done on that?

Mr COWAN: I do not know about the figures, but I can say to the Minister - and I do not want her to start a witch-hunt in the department -

Mrs Henderson: I am not about to.

Mr COWAN: I do not want either the Minister for Housing or the Minister responsible for the Building Management Authority to start a witch-hunt; however, I have seen a computer printout stretching right across my office which showed that one particular fault was reported 17 times in two years and another was reported 14 times in two years.

Mr Troy: What sort of fault was it?

Mr COWAN: One was a simple plumbing fault and the other was probably something to do with carpentry, in that the roof leaked. If the Treasurer wants to talk about expenditure discipline she must look at discipline on a much broader basis than just saying, "We are



going to make sure you stick to your budget or the budget will be cut." I think a review is required of the way in which money is appropriated for repairs and maintenance to Government buildings. Very clearly, the repetitive nature of complaints that are coming from people using Government buildings indicates either incompetence or that someone is having a lend of the system. Whichever way it goes, that is an inefficiency which must be addressed and improved.

I note with some interest that this Government wants to yank another \$25 million out of Gold Banking Corporation in order to allow it to balance its books. That kind of attitude must be deplored. Do we really need that level of funding from Gold Banking Corporation, and do we have to impose that debt on it to balance our books?

Dr Lawrence: That is a repayment which was initially a contribution by the bank.

Mr COWAN: Why does that have to be done this year?

Dr Lawrence: It was budgeted to be done this year.

Mr COWAN: Was there any other requirement which allows the Treasurer to balance her Budget?

Dr Lawrence: It was part of an appropriation last year and the income of the Government was expected to include that amount of money. However, I will double check the timing of that repayment.

Dr Alexander: As a great upholder of parliamentary processes, you should support the repayment if the allocation is according to the Budget.

Mr COWAN: I am pleased to hear the Treasurer say that she will examine the Budget to see whether it was contained as a provision in last year's Budget. If we have already given support to that move, we will not change our minds. However, does this have to be done before 30 June? I was told by the Treasurer that the provision was agreed to last year -

Dr Lawrence: I will double check on that.

Mr COWAN: I will have a look at it myself; the Treasurer has greater resources than I and she will be able to obtain a quicker response.

I refer now to the question of Commonwealth funding. It is clear that the outlays to the States from the Commonwealth form a very substantial part of any State's funding. In the case of Western Australia it forms around 40 per cent of all the revenue of the State of Western Australia.

Dr Lawrence: Commonwealth taxation has been reduced from 45 per cent down to 35 per cent of all the State's revenue.

Mr COWAN: I will take the Treasurer's word on that.

Dr Lawrence: That is sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Mr COWAN: That is a very sizeable sum of money; the figure should be maintained at a level which allows the State to have some expectation that it can implement - using a fashionable word - micro-economic reforms.

Dr Lawrence: I wish they would use other language to describe it.

Mr COWAN: The Federal Government wants the States to implement these reforms at no cost to the Federal Government. Previous Premiers have made it clear that the time has passed for a financial package from the Commonwealth to the States to be the subject of an envelope slipped under the door of the respective Premier's bedroom suite at a Canberra hotel; we have graduated past that. From the information available, it is clear that the Commonwealth has been placing too much of the burden of financial responsibility on the States to allow a reduction in the Federal Government's budgetary outlay. It is very easy for the Commonwealth to reduce its funding to the States and, at the same time, to maintain its own budgetary outlays - plenty of statistical evidence exists to prove that this is the case.

Dr Lawrence: If you look at the Federal outlays, it can be seen that they have grown somewhere around 30 per cent over the years while the State's figure is somewhere around nine per cent. That has been generated by cutting funding to the States.

Mr COWAN: The Treasurer is right; perhaps she could make my speech for me!

Dr Lawrence: It is obvious that this matter is on my mind.

Mr COWAN: The issue of the State funding by the Commonwealth must be addressed. I will be very disappointed if we go into the 1990s with a continuation of the Premiers' Conference in the current format in which the Premiers approach the Commonwealth to haggle and request a better deal. The Premier of Western Australia is no different from the Premiers of other States, and we have already heard the declaration by each State Premier, and by the Federal Treasurer, that their respective bargaining positions will be strongly maintained. Invariably we see the Commonwealth coming out of the Premiers' Conference as the winner; the Commonwealth holds the purse strings, and it is a regrettable fact that the States transferred that responsibility to the Commonwealth as a temporary postwar measure.

Dr Lawrence: It was in 1948.

Mr COWAN: It was a temporary measure which has become a permanent fixture in the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States. It is time we did away with a Premiers' Conference which involves bargaining on both sides. The Premier can lead the way by developing a system which allows the Premiers to know precisely what percentage of funding will be available, and also to know precisely the amount granted by the Commonwealth to all other States. That would be a much more appropriate system. Commonwealth allocations to the States represents about 30 per cent of all revenue. It would not be difficult for the Commonwealth and the States to reach an agreement whereby a formula was established to determine the return of revenue to the States. That formula would need to be developed over a period and would need to be sensitive to a number of issues.

Dr Lawrence: Theoretically, that is what the Grants Commission does.

Mr COWAN: But, practically, the final decision rests with the Federal Treasurer. It is easier to cut other States' expenditure than for him to reduce his own. This is not something that is exclusive to the current Federal Treasurer; it has always been the case at Premiers' Conferences. In this day and age it is time that this was ended. If we cannot achieve that, perhaps the States should get together and examine the Constitution to determine a way of reversing the position so that the taxing powers are restored to the States. If that were the case we would have the situation in which the Prime Minister and the Treasurer would come to the Premiers' Conference begging for some funding which would allow them to undertake the original responsibilities allocated under the Constitution; these responsibilities include defence, immigration -

Dr Lawrence: Foreign affairs - that is about it.

Mr COWAN: When federalism was first established, nine Federal Government departments were created, and now we have 29. The other 20 departments are really encroaching on the responsibility of the States. It is time for the establishment of standard councils or advisory bodies which contain representation from the Commonwealth and the States rather than the establishment of fully fledged departments in those areas which are clearly the constitutional responsibility of the States. Conservation and environment represent one area and road transport another. There are vital issues to be addressed and yet departments in Canberra are determining ways and means of encroaching upon the States' responsibilities and relocating them in Canberra. The best example which has occurred recently - and the Treasurer will be familiar with this as a former Minister for Education - is the desire of the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training to control the education system in Australia. I cannot understand the need for that and I am sure the Treasurer cannot either. Nevertheless, the Federal Minister has proposed that action. Now the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications, who has no constitutional responsibility in the States, other than that relating to international transport which might require his involvement outside the three mile territorial limit, is offering States an overall transport package provided they pick up some safety issues. He is offering a very small amount of money, \$12 million over a three year period, for the States to abrogate their responsibilities and transfer them to the Commonwealth or, conversely, for the States to bow to the demands of the Commonwealth on the condition that it will give the States more money. I serve notice on the Treasurer that if she seeks to introduce any safety measures through legislative means she should not expect that legislation to be passed in another place, because the National Party is strongly opposed to some of them. The National Party is also strongly opposed to the principle of the Federal Government dictating to Western Australia on transport issues - issues which are clearly the constitutional responsibility of the State.

I go further and indicate that the 9¢ a litre the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications so generously offered the States in lieu of their raising the State fuel levy and vehicle registration fees is fine for motorists who drive fewer than 20 000 kilometres a year. People who drive more than that distance will be on the wrong end of the deal because it will cost them more money. I have surveyed my constituents and have found only two who drive fewer than 20 000 kilometres a year, and most drive distances far in excess of that. More importantly, much of the State of Western Australia is totally dependent on the road transport system; the people who supply that service, the road hauliers, will be most affected by the proposal. As a consequence, yet another impost will be placed on the people I represent. The National Party will have great pleasure supporting the Treasurer if she tells the Federal Government what it can do with its transport proposals.

It is very important for somebody to begin the process of restructuring the Commonwealth-State funding arrangements. While the Commonwealth holds the whip hand and it can dictate terms, it will never agree to any changes to funding arrangements between the States and the Commonwealth for the simple reason that it gives the Commonwealth the power to cut funds in those areas which will not hurt it. For that reason it is an appropriate time for the States to get together, regardless of their political persuasion, and begin the process of a joint application to the Commonwealth for a change in the Commonwealth-State funding arrangements. If that means that somewhere along the line the States must accept responsibility not only for spending the money but also for raising the funds, that will not be a bad thing. One of the problems always thrown up in the past by the Commonwealth is that the States do not raise the money, the Commonwealth is responsible for raising the funds and it is adversely affected when it increases taxes. That is a valid argument, and the States proposing a restructured arrangement must be prepared to accept responsibility for raising those funds themselves rather than relying upon the Commonwealth. We cannot continue down the path followed by Federal Governments for so many years. It is time a concerted effort was made. The Treasurer would do the State and the nation a great deal of good were she to lead the debate seeking changes to the Commonwealth-State funding arrangements.

**MR THOMPSON (Darling Range) [3.56 pm]:** I want to explain my position on this Bill, but before I address that matter I indicate my support for the remarks of the Leader of the National Party. The States are losing their power in many respects and, if looked at closely, this can be retraced to the time of the second World War when the States voluntarily relinquished powers to the Commonwealth in the interests of the war effort. It was never intended that the Commonwealth should continue to have tax raising powers after the war ended. Of course, that arrangement was never reversed and now the Commonwealth raises the money and then sends it back to the States, sometimes equitably but mostly inequitably. Also, a cap in hand approach is adopted by the States going to the Commonwealth to get sufficient money to govern effectively. At the same time, the number of conditions imposed by the Commonwealth when making money available to the States has risen. It is becoming quite obvious that more and more influence is gravitating towards Canberra and, correspondingly, less and less effect can be achieved by the individual States. I confidently predict that, if this trend continues, we shall find ourselves hard pressed to justify the expense of State Parliaments. That will not happen in the short term but I predict that - it does matter which political party is in Government in Canberra - while the Commonwealth Government continues to control the purse strings, more and more power will gravitate towards Canberra, which will be a disaster for the people of Australia. Australia is too big a continent and has too diverse a population to be governed effectively from Canberra.

It is my intention to support the measure before the House. The simple question is that we are asked to vote to the Government sufficient money for it to carry on until such time as the Budget comes before the Parliament, when the Parliament can consider the Budget that will ultimately give the Government the necessary money to continue. An unfortunate trend appears to have evolved fairly recently in this Parliament whereby the Opposition believes that Supply may be opposed. I can recall in the early days of my time in Parliament, and I entered Parliament as a member of the Opposition, that the question of Supply was handled very quickly. It was almost a procedural matter. I can recall that on a couple of occasions only one speech was made from the Opposition benches, when the Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity to raise some general criticisms of the financial management by the then Government. The matter was then simply put to the House and the question was carried on

the voices. I believe that that is the way in which this measure should be carried. Events in the Liberal Party in recent times were of obvious interest to me. Indeed, I invite members to recall what I said in this House a couple of weeks ago - that the course the Liberal Party was following was fraught with extreme danger. I believe the events which have unfolded since then have borne out what I said. There was always a distinct possibility that some Liberals in the upper House would not be prepared to block Supply. Clearly, that was the catalyst for what has occurred since that time. It is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition attempted to lock the Legislative Councillors into that position. I thought he was experienced enough to know that that course would cause damage. I appeal to the Opposition to give itself a better chance of winning the 1993 election by being more positive in its approach to its job as an Opposition. It is quite within the Opposition's rights, and I believe its responsibility, to continue to call for a Royal Commission, as I continue to call for one. However, I believe the Opposition is losing community support; it is almost recognised as a single issue party because of its preoccupation and fixation with this matter.

As I said in this House some time ago, I am a supporter of the free enterprise philosophy and want to see the Liberal Party on the Government benches. I warned the Opposition in a speech a couple of weeks ago that its course of action could result in its not achieving that objective in 1993. In recent times the Opposition has experienced an upheaval and I hope that it now recognises that it needs to examine its role and to concentrate on more positive issues, to get its policies in order and market them appropriately in the community, and generally to do the things necessary to convince the community that it is a viable alternative to the present Government. At the moment the Opposition is not perceived as being a viable alternative and will not be so perceived while it continues to be preoccupied with past events. The community are concerned about things that have occurred in the past, but they know that life must go on and they are looking for positive initiatives coming from this place relating to matters that concern them in their daily lives. I will be voting for Supply to pass because I believe that is the correct thing to do.

**MR CLARKO (Marmion) [4.04 pm]:** Undoubtedly the people of Western Australia strongly support the appointment of a Royal Commission into the gross financial mismanagement by this Labor Government over the past seven years which comes under the umbrella of WA Inc. Of the numerous opinion polls held I have not seen one which did not come out strongly in favour of a Royal Commission. Figures ranged between 70 per cent and 80 per cent, so three-quarters of the people of Western Australia strongly support the appointment of a Royal Commission. The media in various places have supported such an appointment. Various community groups strongly support the appointment of what I call a "special Royal Commission" because some of the terminology which would accompany such a Royal Commission would be of a special nature.

For several years the matters of WA Inc have dominated totally the political scene in Western Australia, and probably the social scene. In recent times weak reeds in our community, Laborites and supporters of the Labor Party, have been asserting that we should stop talking about the appointment of a Royal Commission or blocking Supply and get on with the job of government in Western Australia and dealing with the problems which face this State in a time of crisis which has largely been brought about by the policies of Paul "Undertaker" Keating. We cannot do that. It would be grossly improper and administratively unsound to paper over the abysmal record of financial matters in Western Australia.

I repeat that the people of this State strongly support the appointment of a Royal Commission. Those people believe there has been gross mismanagement of the State's financial affairs. I put it that many of these people believe corrupt practices were used by Government Ministers, bureaucrats, Government advisers and others. That is how serious this matter is! Nothing could be more serious. This is not just a matter of mismanagement as many people put strongly the argument that there are examples of gross corruption. This has created a credibility gap for the present Government. Rumour and innuendo about WA Inc are standard stories in the pubs and clubs and on the streets of Western Australia. It is not just the credibility of this Government but also the credibility of all Western Australians which is suffering. A senior businessman said to me that if one goes to Melbourne - where one apparently must go to arrange big loans from major financial institutions such as banks - one finds that the finance people look on Western Australians seeking to borrow large sums

of money with absolute scorn. I must admit this does not merely involve the question of WA Inc but also the so-called business cowboys of Western Australia who, along with the activities of this Government, have helped ruin our reputation.

This Government does not deserve to be granted Supply until it has agreed to the appointment of a Royal Commission. That is the reason I will vote against this Bill, which I believe deserves to be opposed in a major way. In the 16 years I have been a member I have never previously voted against a Supply Bill. However, it is now time to vote against one. The Treasurer has said repeatedly that she is still considering the appointment of a Royal Commission and has not ruled that out to inquire into the disgraceful financial problems of Western Australia. Obviously, a person would be a fool to say a Royal Commission would not be an appropriate means by which to investigate these matters when the Treasurer says that such a Royal Commission is a possibility.

The past few years have seen more financial mismanagement than ever before in the history of Western Australia; everyone would admit that. One need only read newspaper editorials over the past year which highlighted the gross financial mismanagement of this Labor Government to know that. From my reading, there has never been another State or Federal Government which has caused a financial mess like the one caused by the Government of this State.

The extent of this loss is unknown. All sorts of people come up with figures about the extent of the financial mismanagement. Mr Berinson last year chose a figure of about \$300 million. A businessman told me recently that he met our Ambassador to Ireland a few months ago, and Brian Burke allegedly said, "You cannot blame me for any more than \$150 million." What an incredible statement! One would have thought he was speaking about two quid. If that were the extent of WA Inc's losses, it would be an absolute disgrace. Is the amount \$300 million, as Mr Berinson said it is, or is it \$850 million, as has been freely put about in recent weeks; or is it \$888 million, which is a tidy sum for those interested in mathematics, or is it roughly \$1 billion or \$2 billion? When I first entered Parliament, \$2 billion was about the total expenditure of the State in its Consolidated Revenue Budget. Is that what this Government has sent down the drain? Members on the Government side might say that is not true, the Government has not mismanaged and lost \$1 billion. Presumably the Government cannot say it has lost less than the \$300 million admitted by Mr Berinson, the former Minister for Budget Management. Mr Berinson is one of the very few keen brains in the party machine, and members opposite would not want to take him on. That loss demands a Royal Commission.

Western Australia has had Royal Commission inquiries into all sorts of things, many of which I would describe as being of little moment, but here is a matter of grave moment and we cannot persuade the Government to establish one. The blame for not allowing the hidden secrets of WA Inc to emerge rests fairly and squarely on the Premier, who has been described as Dr Feelgood. We would all feel good if she gave us a Royal Commission, which is what 80 per cent of Western Australians want. If she does not do that she will always be referred to as Dr Dolittle. The Premier keeps avoiding a Royal Commission which the people want. Many articles in the newspaper have caught my eye. I am a regular reader of all Western Australian newspapers, but a most amazing statement was reported in *The West Australian* on Wednesday, 23 May 1990, under the heading "No apology for State's losses". It was written by Lisa Jane O'Neil. It reads -

The State Government made no apologies for past unsuccessful business endeavours, Premier Carmen Lawrence told a Building Owners and Managers Association lunch last week.

She makes no apology for the \$300 million quoted by Mr Berinson or the \$800 million-odd of the newspapers, or the \$1 billion to which most people expect the figure to rise. The article continues -

The Premier said she did not believe there was such an entity as WA Inc, only that "several Government agencies had become involved in a number of financial losses - which are being repaid at \$50 million for five years".

Clearly, \$50 million for five years is \$250 million, which does not even add up to the figure Mr Berinson admits has been lost. Talking about property related issues, the Treasurer went

on to comment that the Asset Management Taskforce hoped to achieve between \$35 million and \$50 million of its \$55 million budget by the end of the financial year. The article continues -

She said the AMT had not been set up to pay off WA Inc debts and the money would not be used for that purpose.

The Asset Management Taskforce, as far as I am concerned, is merely selling off the farm. It is absolute, culpable nonsense. When the Government sold the technical college site in St George's Terrace, that was sold to several other people, each of them making a huge profit, proving the property was sold too cheaply in the first place. If anything needs an investigation, that does. Having made profits for several of our major entrepreneurs in Perth through selling this block too cheaply, we no longer own one of the best blocks in our State, one of our best assets has gone.

The Treasurer talks about schools and hospitals. What sheer nonsense. The maintenance program in our schools in Western Australia today is the worst it has been in recent history. If we go back to 1985-1986, we see that a figure of something like \$40 million was spent on maintenance. The comparable figure now being spent in like dollars is in the order of less than \$25 million. We are spending almost half what we used to spend on maintenance. If members examine our Budgets for the last 20 years they will see the maintenance figure growing each year; if not every year, certainly over several years. It has grown in real terms, and quite properly, because there are clearly more and more buildings in Western Australia and so we have to spend more in real terms on their maintenance. We all know what a shambles our hospitals are in; they cannot operate properly.

Mr Lewis: You cannot get into one to find out.

Mr CLARKO: That is right. If one gets in there, one is banged on the head by some person who is drug affected. I put it to members that this Treasurer's statement was one of the most shameful I have ever heard any Treasurer make. At a time when virtually everyone in this State is seeking a Royal Commission, the Treasurer says she makes no apology for WA Inc. The blame for holding no Royal Commission lies fairly and squarely on the Treasurer, Carmen Lawrence. She avoids a Royal Commission, though she keeps the door partly open by saying she may hold one. She and everyone in Caucus must take the blame for trying to hide the truth about this gross financial mismanagement. The initial leaders of this Government were Brian Burke and Peter Dowding, but she was a "responsible" Minister in the Dowding Government. Perhaps she is an "irresponsible" Minister from the Dowding Government. Cabinet's collective responsibility makes it quite clear that all those Ministers must share the blame for WA Inc. The Treasurer says she has not closed off the idea of a Royal Commission but it would be wrong to do it before the McCusker report becomes available. Everyone knows that the McCusker report deals with matters relating to Rothwells, so if she gives us a Royal Commission into Rothwells, that would not resolve the problems relating to WA Inc in any shape or form. Petrochemical Industries Ltd must be one of the major areas to be investigated, where this incredible sum of \$400 million was paid for blue sky, as my leader describes it. All the matters relating to WA Inc must be closely examined by an appropriate Royal Commission. Any politician on the Government side of the House who prevents the revelation of the truth about these matters should be ousted from the Treasury benches. Supply is a means by which members have the opportunity to say that this Government is not entitled to what might be called in small companies a float. It would be like an accountant who was involved with a set of books which did not stand up being accused of potential corruption. If that fellow asked for a couple of hundred dollars for a float for petty cash, one would be unlikely to give it to him. This Government does not deserve Supply because it has grossly mismanaged everything which has gone on with regard to WA Inc for many years. All around Australia newspapers have said it is incredible that this matter has not been shafted home to this Government.

The Deputy Premier spoke a few moments ago and said, "We need an Opposition which addresses the real issues. Let us get on with the real things which need to be addressed." What needs to be addressed is WA Inc. We need to know what has happened in the financial dealings of the Western Australian Government. The purpose of a Government's Budget is to tell us what was allocated last year, and how much is proposed to be spent in the forthcoming year. That is how the Government handles the financial affairs of the State and

its Budget is central to the issue of Government finance. This Government does not have the credibility to be given hundreds of millions of dollars to enable it to carry on. This Government is not entitled to and does not deserve these funds because it has a record of grossly mismanaging the financial affairs of the State and everybody in the State knows that. People criticised the Opposition when it chose to vigorously pursue a Royal Commission, but even if that goal is not achieved in the next few weeks the Opposition will continue along that course because that is how seriously it views the matter. The Opposition is concerned about the Government's financial mismanagement and that story must come out so that everybody will understand what has happened. Those Ministers on the Government benches who were not involved will stand clean and clear and those who were involved - even if they live in some other part of the universe - will be exposed. Once all the dealings of WA Inc are exposed the matter will be resolved and we will be able to get on with the business of paying back the Government's debts. The amounts set aside in the Budget for the financial year just ended must be repaid. An amount of \$70 million was lost on one single item and \$10 million on another, and these losses were entered in Government accounts in a peculiar manner. Certainly those amounts, large as they may be, must be repaid, and if the truth comes out and we know what is owed we can work out a means of repaying those moneys. We will then be able to deal with issues such as minerals and the environment which are so vital to a huge State like Western Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition has been criticised but in October 1987 he made the boldest and strongest decision in Western Australian politics when he refused to become a party to the \$150 million Government guarantee. I invite anyone on the opposite side to toss up a better decision - nothing has come from the Government benches for years.

Mr Shave: The investment in the petrochemical plant was bolder.

Mr CLARKO: That was just black sand.

Mr Read: What about the North West Shelf gas project?

Mr CLARKO: The member for Murray has brought up North West Shelf gas which, before the Leader of the Opposition's decision, was the biggest decision. That is a success which is occasionally criticised by certain leaders of the Labor Party. They can only criticise; they cannot rely on the record. Every Labor leader - Brian Burke, Peter Dowding and the present Premier will if she has not done so already - has knocked the North West Shelf, but they have admitted at other times that it is a good project and the biggest single project Australia has ever seen. It is vital to the future industrial development of Western Australia and is a major part of our export program, which is in a complete shambles because of the disastrous policies of "put up the interest rate Keating". Mr MacKinnon's decision in October 1987 was outstanding and it was not popular with the people who have traditionally supported the Liberal Party, but as the years have gone by it has been seen to be correct. Since that time a Premier and a Deputy Premier have gone down the gurgler because they made wrong decisions and in trying to get themselves out of that \$150 million Government guarantee they got themselves into a far worse situation where the amount of taxpayers' funds which has been grossly mismanaged is in the order of \$1 billion. The Leader of the Opposition went through that period when a Premier and a Deputy Premier on the other side of the House were given the chop. Of all the stories about Peter Dowding one of the best, and one which will be written up in political histories, was when he thought there would be a spill against him and he got some of his hatchet men and women to run around and get Government members to sign a pathetic little note stating, "I love Peter". The daggers were in Government members' hands that night; they put them down to sign the note but they were picked up a few months later and put into Pete's back!

Mr Shave: The note wasn't witnessed by a JP.

Mr CLARKO: No it was not. That story is one of the highlights of the minor side of politics in this State - how Pete was able to get the numbers! Everybody in Western Australia must understand that the blame for there being no Royal Commission rests fairly and squarely on the shoulders of our Premier. It will all go back to the Premier if there is no Royal Commission and Supply is blocked, and as a result an election is forced. It is Carmen Lawrence who declined to give the people of Western Australia a Royal Commission when they called for it. It must be recognised by all that the ball is in Carmen Lawrence's court and that she has to make the decision. Carmen Lawrence is the one to blame if the

community of Western Australia is faced with any problems. A simple solution would be for Carmen Lawrence to appoint a Royal Commission. She must ensure that the terms of reference are adequate to the task and that, as with Queensland's Fitzgerald inquiry, the powers of the royal commissioner can be widened by returning to the Parliament. The Royal Commission must have ample powers and, if it does not, the Premier must take the blame. The Labor Party must share the blame and the people of Western Australia will ultimately punish it for not taking that course of action.

It has been argued that the people of Western Australia do not want a State election and the Treasurer has said that it is unprincipled to block Supply. However, that course of action is laid down deliberately and specifically in the Constitution of Western Australia. The definition of "principle" in the Treasurer's dictionary is not the one which is used by the ordinary people of Western Australia. The Constitution sets out that any Bill can be blocked including Supply. That cannot constitute unprincipled behaviour as the ordinary citizens of Western Australia understand the meaning of the word. The Supply Bill should be opposed for the purpose of gaining a Royal Commission, which must be established on proper terms.

**MR PEARCE** (Armadale - Leader of the House) [4.29 pm]: I am very disappointed in the attitude the Opposition has taken on the Supply Bill. I would have thought that in the course of the events of last week Opposition members might have reflected on their strategy and that they might have learnt a little bit. On the last occasion that I spoke on this issue I said - quite apart from the issue of principle - the Opposition should shy away from the thought of blocking Supply because it could not win an election if one were to be held on that basis.

Even with all the hoo-ha on the other side of the House when I said that, that judgment was shared by many members, as was demonstrated by subsequent actions. The Opposition would not have won an election if it had been held three weeks ago, never mind in August this year.

**Mr Clarko**: That is not what Morgan said; it said we would have won by eight and a half per cent!

**Mr PEARCE**: That is not what the polls said at all; that is what the member for Marmion hoped they would say. When I last raised this point, it was not apparent that members of the Opposition could count; however, it is now clear that many members of the Opposition could count. It appeared that many members of the Opposition in the other place made the same calculation as I: Quite simply, the Opposition could not win an election under the current leader as a consequence of blocking Supply. The Opposition was on a loser from the start which led to the pressure which blew up in the Liberal Party during the course of last week. The Opposition comes back to the House with the cards reshuffled with some young faces on the front bench, some older faces on the back bench and some of the older, older faces being moved right out. The Opposition has put the same argument as it did three weeks ago with the only difference being that while some members believed the argument three weeks ago, not one member opposite believes the argument this time. The member for Marmion made the old connection - which I believe the party has now abandoned - between blocking Supply and forcing a Royal Commission; that was a case of *deja vu*. If members opposite want to present a credible Opposition for the 1993 election, it is no good their trotting out old arguments. The turmoil in the Opposition has been about the arguments on the very issues we have been discussing in the Parliament over the last few months. The Opposition should pay attention to what the people are saying, which is that the Opposition should push for a Royal Commission all it likes. As the Treasurer has said on a number of occasions, the Government has not ruled out a commission or a wider inquiry. That can be decided after the special investigator, Mr McCusker, reports; that situation has not changed. However, no-one wants to see a connection between the blocking of Supply and the holding of wider inquiry. Members of the Opposition do not want that either; that is a simple fact known by the member for Marmion, although he will not say so.

Last week, as members opposite were preparing to vote on their leadership, pressure was applied to withdraw the support given to the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition and to transfer that support to the Leader of the Opposition; therefore, a remarkable turnaround took place during an eventful weekend. Members of the Opposition were not just rethinking their position at the last minute; members did not walk into the party room with the intention of voting for Mr Court and then decided that poor old Barry looked a little hurt, that he was not



such a bad bloke after all and that they would vote for him. In pragmatic political terms, the Government could not have had a better result with the revolt in the Liberal Party. These events demonstrated a great deal of unease about the leadership and direction in which the party was moving. Some members of the Liberal Party, some anonymously and some using their name, reported that they were worried that they could not win an election with the current leader. I could have told them that, as indeed I have done on many occasions; I congratulate members opposite on their perspicacity! The vote was held for the leadership which was won by the narrowest majority.

Mr Lewis: How many votes did you receive?

Mr PEARCE: I have never stood for the leadership or the deputy leadership of my party.

Mr Lewis: Yes you have; you were most put out! You are telling untruths.

Mr PEARCE: I have never stood for the leadership or the deputy leadership of my party.

Several Opposition members interjected.

Mr Lewis: We are not sure whether you should be the Deputy Premier because you do all the work.

Mr PEARCE: There was some speculation in the Press about whether I would run against our excellent Deputy Premier. I said that I was not inclined to run. I told the Deputy Premier when I first came into the party room on the occasion of the vote - I had not spoken to him previously - that I would not be contesting the ballot against him. When Mr Burke and Mr Bryce resigned as Premier and Deputy Premier, they announced their intentions in the party room a week before the ballot was held. I seconded the motion of regret on their resignation, and in doing so I announced that I would not stand as a candidate for either of those positions, and I proceeded to put my weight behind the people who were elected. I have never fronted up for a ballot for the leadership positions, so I have never had any votes. Even with a margin of 21 votes to 13 - if the cited figures are correct - it would have taken only four people to vote the other way due to preselection pressure and the result would have been different. Therefore, it was a narrow margin.

One can always tell when a party is going well after such a turmoil because the party is confident and happy about its new leader - as we were when we came into the Parliament with a change. However, when the Opposition crept into the Chamber today, one by one and two by two, as members slunk into their seats no-one would look up at the television cameras; what a sorry looking crowd the Opposition was.

Mr Clarko: You have had two Premiers in two years; three Premiers in three years.

Mr PEARCE: That indicates the talent in the Labor Party! When I look around at the whole new Opposition front bench, the only person I see with any standing in the community is the Leader of the National Party.

I would have thought that the Opposition would learn a lesson from the events of last week. It should have come to the Parliament stating that it accepts the situation regarding Supply; it should accept that it went over the top and it should be prepared to allow the Government to have Supply in due course. If the Opposition still wants a Royal Commission, it can still push for it through legitimate channels. I am sure that the public would respect the Opposition much more if it had done that from the start. The Leader of the Opposition hinted that this was the new policy, but he was not prepared to abandon the old line. However, the old dinosaurs, like the member for Marmion, never abandon a line once it is adopted. When I first became a member of this Parliament in 1977, he, as the then member for Karrinyup, was well installed and he has never changed his line in all that time. He is elephantine, in many other ways, particularly in terms of memory. The member has the capacity to adopt a fixed line and nothing will change it. I was not at all surprised when the member for Marmion rolled out the old arguments as before, but if the Liberal Party is to be a new party with new faces and policies it cannot use old speeches. It must realise that a new approach is demanded by the people. I thought *The West Australian* on 14 June was rather unkind in suggesting that the member for Marmion was one of those members opposite who should make the supreme sacrifice for the Liberal Party and make room for new talent.

Mr Clarko: I thought that Saturday's paper was much better.

Mr PEARCE: I do not know about that, but the member for Marmion did not do his party any good with the speech he just made. The State deserves to have a better Opposition than the one it has. I say that in all sincerity because it is the case. Any democracy requires a good Opposition to keep the Government on its toes. Manifestly, it has not been doing that and it is widely recognised in the community.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: It is no joy to me.

Mr MacKinnon: I remember when the House would hang on your every word.

Mr PEARCE: That does not worry me one bit. If members opposite are to be a decent Opposition which the State deserves they should take a different attitude to the Supply Bill than they are taking. The Opposition should be honest and admit it has been forced to abandon its old line of attack and is adopting a new one. If it adopted it wholeheartedly it could present itself as a united team following a new policy. What it is saying is, "Let's hang on and we will see what happens when the Bill reaches the upper House." Everyone in the State except the Leader of the Opposition knows what will happen when the Supply Bill reaches the upper House. It is no good clinging to old hopes. If the Opposition wants to make an impact on the community and present itself as a unified team it must have a new approach. It is a matter of great disappointment to me and to the Government that instead of a new team with a new approach we have the same tired pack, a little more tatty from more shuffling, rolling out the same clichés it rolled out previously. The State deserves better and I hope the Opposition shapes up.

MR LEWIS (Applecross) [4.42 pm]: I point out to the Government that it has a responsibility to appreciate that the public of Western Australia requires a comprehensive Royal Commission into the affairs of this Government as a result of its dealings in the last five or six years. It is incumbent on the Government to do that. It is all very well for the Leader of the House to pour a bucket on the Opposition and suggest that it is not up to speed. I suggest to the House that the Opposition is more than up to speed. On the one hand this Government has not been governing for 16 months; that is, since the last election. It has been staggering from controversy to controversy and has not been getting on with the job of governing. On the other hand the Opposition has identified very clearly what the public of Western Australia want. It has put forcefully to the Government in this House that the public expect a Royal Commission. Until there is a Royal Commission this Government will continue to flounder from problem to problem instead of getting on with the job of governing for the benefit of all Western Australians.

I will direct some of my comments to an area which has given me a great deal of concern; that is, the management of the Government housing authority known as Homeswest. I am glad the Minister for Housing is in this House because it is high time these comments were made.

I am of the opinion that Homeswest has lost sight of its charter. I understand Homeswest is a Government housing authority and, as such, has a responsibility to house those people who perhaps do not have the resources to look after themselves and to find, within their resources, housing of a reasonable standard. Unfortunately, Homeswest has become so involved in its direction that it has forgotten its charter. The management of Homeswest has reached the stage where it leaves a great deal to be desired.

I do not want to be critical, but this Parliament is about people speaking their mind and informing the Parliament what they believe the public perceives is happening. It is high time the truth was told about what is happening within Homeswest. The Minister must reappraise the performance of Homeswest, the policies it is adopting and the direction in which it is taking public housing in Western Australia. The bottom line really is that as a Government housing authority it should and, indeed, must get maximum value for its housing dollar. In other words, it should endeavour to house the maximum number of people from the financial resources provided to it by this Government by way of loans and appropriations. I am suggesting Homeswest is not doing that. It has embarked on a program of housing elite groups of people in a quality of housing that is far above that which is expected in the public sector.

Mr Ripper: Do you want them in tin sheds?

Mr Lewis: No, I do not want them in tin sheds.

Mr Taylor: That is an extraordinary statement.

Mr LEWIS: No, it is not and the Deputy Premier should hear what I have to say.

I am suggesting Homeswest should not expect to house people who need housing in a standard of housing which is higher than that in which the rest of the community is housed. Homeswest is embarking on housing projects which one can only explain as luxury housing and it is completely outside its charter. It comes down to a misguided belief that Homeswest should compete with the private sector and house those people who need to live in Homeswest housing at a standard comparable to the private sector and above it. I believe that is not Homeswest's charter.

Let us look at some examples: Some 12 to 15 months ago a group of people in Denmark formed themselves into a cooperative. Homeswest bought 70 acres of land for between \$130 000 and \$140 000 to house 10 families. The maximum project cost was in the vicinity of \$750 000. In a country town in the south west that represents an average cost of \$75 000 to \$80 000 for each home. Three of those people who formed themselves into the cooperative already had homes, but they wanted an alternative lifestyle and they went to Homeswest and said, "We want an alternative lifestyle", and Homeswest said, "Yes, that is okay." The land was purchased and the people of Denmark were outraged because of the acute shortage of housing in that town. As a result, the Government got cold feet as far as this housing project was concerned and to this day nothing has happened.

Mrs Henderson: That is nonsense.

Mr LEWIS: It is not nonsense. The point is that an elite group of people wanted an alternative lifestyle and they went to Homeswest which was prepared to give them \$750 000 for 10 families. I do not think that is the best use of Government housing resources.

The member for Scarborough asked a series of questions in this place last year, one of which related to Homeswest's policy regarding land content in relation to total dwelling and land cost. The average was about 30 per cent, and that is being kind. At Foggethorpe Crescent, Maylands, which happened to be in the then Premier's electorate, Homeswest paid \$362 000 for land to house 11 families in a block of home units, or about \$33 000 per unit. A contract was let for \$620 000 or \$56 500 each for the units. This happened about six to nine months ago. The total price was approximately \$90 000 each for this block of 11 home units. The land content was 37 per cent of the total project. The land involved happened to be on the river at Maylands and had river views. It was excellent land and not what one would call public housing sector land. I suggest to the Government that it could have sold that land to the private sector and with the funds raised built more houses of the same standard on lower priced land. Homeswest is buying expensive riverside land for public housing. That is a misuse of Government funds and Homeswest has lost its charter.

Another example of this is in North Fremantle where Homeswest intends to use land on the cliff close to Myuna which is of high quality to build 19 one, two or three bedroomed units which will have panoramic views of the ocean and river. That land has been valued conservatively at between \$2 million and \$3 million. If one accepts a cost of \$2.5 million or even \$2 million it represents a land cost for each unit of between \$105 000 and \$131 000. I understand a contract will be let to erect housing on that land costing \$70 000 per unit. Therefore, the cost of each housing unit on this prestige riverside land will be in the vicinity of \$200 000. The interesting thing is that the land content will be roughly 60 per cent of the total development cost. The average rent to be collected on these \$200 000 Homeswest units will be \$42 per week, which shows a gross return on capital of 1.6 per cent.

Several members interjected.

Mr LEWIS: What I am saying, if the Minister listens, is that she should not be using Crown resources to house Homeswest tenants in brand new, luxury apartments which are on the river and which have panoramic ocean and river views. Government resources should be used to spread the cost of houses so that more people who are crying out for accommodation can be housed. I do not believe that Homeswest tenants should be housed in a low standard of housing, and I have no problem with the housing standard. My point in relation to those 19 units in North Fremantle is that the Government could have built 60 homes on lower quality land for the same amount. It is absolutely disgraceful that Homeswest is pouring that

sort of money into a development for an elite or privileged 19 people to live in luxury accommodation on the river.

Mrs Watkins: You are a disgrace.

Mr LEWIS: No, I am not.

Several members interjected.

Mr LEWIS: I am not, these people should not expect to live on the river.

Homeswest has forgotten about the 98 per cent or 99 per cent of good tenants who live in harmony with their neighbours in the community and respect the rights of their neighbours. At the moment there are between one and a dozen families housed by Homeswest who are totally antisocial. What does Homeswest do about them? It surrenders because it cannot move them. What does it do? It goes to the aggrieved neighbours who have had enough and cannot stand any more of the constant fighting, car thefts, destruction of their property, brawling into the early hours of the morning and intimidation by these families and offers to shift them, thereby leaving the problem where it is. That is what is happening with Homeswest.

Members may have read recently in a newspaper about a gentleman in Coolbellup named Moffatt. I wrote to Homeswest and the Minister in August last year about this person, an 84 year old couple across the road and another elderly couple two doors away. The problems those people have experienced for years are hard to believe. The situation got so bad that the antisocial neighbours broke into this person's home, broke his arm and put him in hospital, destroyed his furniture, broke every window in the house and wrecked the house as well. This happened after I had written continuously to both Homeswest and the Minister asking that the antisocial tenants who would not behave themselves be forcibly evicted. Homeswest took no action. We had the Minister for Housing, who is also Minister for Consumer Affairs and who believes that landlords have a responsibility to look after the welfare of their tenants, doing nothing.

Mrs Henderson: Homeswest did.

Mr LEWIS: It does not when it allows these things to go on time and time again. I am sick of hearing the complaints which come into my office from good people, who are trying to live quietly in their Homeswest homes, only to be bothered morning, noon and night by the uncontrollable and antisocial behaviour of a minority of people whom Homeswest is either not inclined, or does not have the resources or internal fortitude, to shift. Rather than trying to shift the victims of these tragedies, Homeswest should shift the people who contribute to the unbearable way in which these victims have to live.

Last year this Government boasted in its Budget that it would create 2 000 new homes, and would spend \$85.7 million on a home purchase scheme. I asked a question on notice at the end of May about how much of the \$85.7 million Homeswest expected to spend. I was told it expected to spend \$65 million this year. So Homeswest is underspending by \$20.7 million, or 24 per cent, in this area alone.

The Government boasted also that it would build 2 000 new homes this year. I asked a question on notice a week or two ago in respect of the actual number of homes that would be completed or spot purchased this year. The answer was 956 units. That represents less than 50 per cent of the Government's program. The Government boasted that it would spend \$108.88 million on construction, but its projection is that it will spend only \$57.6 million. I suggest the reason is that the Government is running short. It has lost a lot of money, and it needs a carry over of funds to balance its Budget. I suggest also that Homeswest cannot manage the Government's own projects and Budget policies, let alone the other problems that it is faced with daily.

I turn now to another area where Homeswest has told untruths in response to questions asked in Parliament. Last year a question on notice was asked in respect of lot 8, Foggerthorpe Crescent, Maylands. The question asked was: When was the contract signed, and when will the work commence? The answer was that the contract was signed in October 1989, and work commenced in October 1989. However, a letter which was received from the building surveyor of the City of Stirling states that the building licence No 89/1771 was issued on 21 September 1989, and footings were inspected on 28 September 1989. So if the answer given

in response to that question is not an untruth, I do not know what is. That is either a deliberate untruth or bad management on the part of Homeswest.

I refer now to another example of bad management by Homeswest. Last year I was approached by a person who was endeavouring to purchase the Homeswest property which she had been renting for some years. Some overtures were made to the then Minister for Housing, Mrs Beggs, and the Minister finally agreed that this lady, a single mother, could purchase that property. I was very pleased about that, and I thank the Minister of the day for granting her request. The property settlement took place in May. I have here five letters which this lady received from Homeswest. The first letter was dated 12 March 1990, and said, "We are pleased to approve your offer to purchase such and such a property on such and such a day, of which the first payment of your loan will commence on 1 April 1990." On 13 March, this lady received another letter from Homeswest, which said, "Homeswest has approved your offer to purchase your home, and your first date of payment will be 1 May 1990." On 17 April, this lady received another letter from Homeswest, which said, "Your application to purchase the particular property has been approved, and the first payment will be payable to Homeswest office on the first day of each month, payable on 1 April 1990."

There is more to come. On 8 May, this lady received another letter from Homeswest, which said, "Re deferment of home loan assistance. The deferment of your home loan application has passed the maximum period allowed. If you fail to contact the undersigned within 14 days for an interview, your application will be withdrawn." This lady had purchased the property, paid a deposit, and commenced payments, yet here we have Homeswest asking her whether she wants to take up the offer to purchase the property! That is not all. On 14 May, barely six days later, she received another letter from Homeswest, which said, "I am concerned that your rental account is now \$175 in arrears as at 14 May 1990. Your last recorded payment was made on 20 April 1990."

So within a period of six weeks, Homeswest had written five letters to this lady, each of which contradicted the previous letter. If that is not gross mismanagement, if that does not show a lack of direction, if that does not show that Homeswest does not know what is going on within its own organisation, then I do not know what it is.

The Government needs to look at Homeswest's charter. Homeswest needs to get back on the rails. The Government should immediately look into Homeswest to ensure that it does the job which the public of Western Australia expects of it. Homeswest must start to take responsibility for its tenants. It must start to take firm action against those antisocial tenants who disregard the law and have no consideration for their neighbours or for other Homeswest tenants. It is time that Homeswest took a firm stand on this. Homeswest needs to smarten up its management so that it will not send out five letters on the same subject to the same person within a period of six weeks, each of which contradicts the other. Homeswest must look at how it can expend its full budgetary allocation rather than achieving only a 50 per cent performance. Homeswest needs to identify whether it will build houses for an elite few or whether it will look more broadly at its charter and build more houses for a greater number of people to achieve better value for its dollars for the people of Western Australia. I believe Homeswest is not on the rails at the moment and it is time the Government took this not as destructive but as constructive criticism so that Homeswest can endeavour to lift its game.

**MRS HENDERSON** (Thornlie - Minister for Housing) [5.10 pm]: I would like to respond to some of the points made in what was one of the most extraordinary speeches I have heard in the years I have been in this House. I must say that I am appalled and shocked to hear a member of this place say that people who are in public housing do not deserve to have high quality housing, -

**Mr Lewis:** That is not what I said.

**Mrs HENDERSON:** - do not deserve to have housing which overlooks the river, and do not deserve to have housing that has any positive outlook at all. In fact, the drift of what the Opposition spokesman on housing said was that we should downgrade the quality of housing for public housing tenants, and that we should put it all in the cheapest part of Perth.

**An Opposition member:** That isn't what he said.

**Mrs HENDERSON:** That is exactly what he said.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HENDERSON: There is no doubt that the end result of what the member for Applecross said is that Homeswest should put all of its housing in one part of the Perth metropolitan area -

Mr Lewis: I did not say that at all.

Mrs HENDERSON: - that it should choose the cheapest land in the metropolitan area on which to build houses -

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HENDERSON: - and that this land should be used because the greatest number of houses could be built in the cheapest area of Perth. I am shocked and horrified at those sorts of comments. Homeswest has embarked on a major program to upgrade some of the very old housing in Perth.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not mean to embarrass any particular member of this House by making this point, but I simply think it is time that members in this place recognised that various people, by virtue of either their position in this place or their level of voice projection, cannot be heard as well as some others. It is necessary for members not only to recognise that but also to treat that fact with some respect. The level of interjection afforded to those people when they are on their feet ought to be a lot lower than that which is afforded to those people with rather louder voices. It is not for me to stand and say each time, "This is the member to whom I am referring"; it is simply for members to judge appropriately and, indeed, to use their manners.

Mrs HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. An incident was reported in the Press some months ago in which a councillor of the City of Subiaco indicated it was his view that no public housing tenants should be housed along the railway land in Subiaco; he believed those people would be better housed in Girrawheen, and he referred to them as the non-achievers of this world. Those comments were quickly refuted and people distanced themselves from the remarks very rapidly. I did not think the day would come when I would hear the comments in this House -

Mr Lewis: I did not say that at all.

Mrs HENDERSON: - that I have heard today. What I have heard from the Opposition spokesman on housing is, effectively, that in order to maximise the number of units that can be built on a certain area of land Homeswest should buy the cheapest land in Perth, concentrate its tenants all in the same area of cheapest possible land -

Mr Lewis: I did not say that.

Mrs HENDERSON: - and not use expensive land which, by implication, was too good for public housing tenants. In particular, the Opposition spokesman on housing talked about North Fremantle. Homeswest tenants have lived in North Fremantle for more than 30 years; it has long been an area where people have lived in Homeswest accommodation. It is not at all appropriate for the member for Applecross to say that those people who have lived in units in that area should now be shovelled unceremoniously out of that suburb because the land there is now of much higher value than it was some years ago.

Mr Lewis: I did not say that at all.

Mrs HENDERSON: That is precisely the point the member made. That land is now more valuable than it was previously, and as a result is about to be redeveloped by Homeswest. Those tenants who have lived in units on that land will be given the opportunity to stay there but, in addition, new housing units will be made available and some of the land will be sold to the private sector for other housing.

Mr Lewis: They should not be housed in \$200 000 homes.

Mrs HENDERSON: The Opposition spokesman on housing showed his abysmal ignorance

when he referred to the situation in Denmark. He indicated it was his belief that Homeswest planned to spend in the order of \$800 000 to house some 11 families in Denmark, and he said this was an indication of a waste of public money. It would not have taken very much work on the part of the Opposition spokesman on housing for him to get the facts. The reality is that the Federal Government established a special scheme to encourage people to take charge of their own lives and to manage their own tenancies.

Mr Omodei: Is it not true that the program was withdrawn because of public outrage?

Mrs HENDERSON: If the member will listen, I will tell him about it. Those people who formed a cooperative in Denmark purchased some land with assistance from the Government and it was then their task to go into the marketplace and raise some money in order to purchase the houses to go on that land.

Mr Lewis interjected.

Mrs HENDERSON: I have heard the member for Applecross on many occasions in this House indicating his support for a model whereby people have greater control over their own lives, where people self-manage, self-regulate and develop more pride, in some ways, in their houses or whatever. These cooperative housing arrangements do precisely that - they give tenants the opportunity to control their own houses, collect their own rents, pay their own maintenance costs and generally look after their own houses. They are constrained to ensure that 75 per cent of the people who go into the cooperative meet the income eligibility limits for normal Homeswest accommodation. The result has been that there are now -

Mr Lewis: Causing them to cop out with an alternative lifestyle.

Mrs HENDERSON: That is a most outrageous comment. There is no evidence for the member to say that those people were not going to seek employment, wherever they were living. They sought to set up a cooperative housing arrangement whereby they would manage their housing. They would receive no more assistance from the public purse than any other person who lives in Homeswest accommodation.

Mr Omodei: That is not true, and you know it. Isn't it true that some of those people have loans at six per cent interest? They have already had loans. Talk about double dipping!

Mrs HENDERSON: It was not a matter of double dipping. The people who go into those cooperatives must borrow money in the private sector in addition to the money they are given through the Federal Government's scheme. They then repay those loans by means of rent, in the same way as do other Homeswest tenants. The scheme encourages self-determination and it encourages people to manage their own properties.

Mr Lewis: Most of them were unemployed.

Mrs HENDERSON: I would like to suggest to the Opposition spokesman on housing, who seems to have a very negative view of that sort of arrangement, that he take the time to go to Fremantle and look at the Fremantle housing cooperative, where a group of low income people are managing their own tenancies, paying off the loans on those properties, and living in accommodation under an arrangement which saves the Government the cost of managing and maintaining those properties. The proposal for Denmark was very similar to the cooperative which is now up and running in Fremantle, but the Opposition spokesman on housing has sought today to misrepresent that, and has sought to give the impression that those people were expecting to receive from the Government grants to cover the total cost of the land and construction.

Mr Lewis: They were.

Mrs HENDERSON: They were not. They were seeking to get a proportion of that money and the rest they were raising in the private sector. The scheme in Fremantle was based on a 60:40 arrangement.

Mr Omodei: Why don't you admit the fact that the Denmark program was withdrawn because of public outrage?

Mrs HENDERSON: I have just explained that the scheme in Fremantle is under way. They raised 60 per cent of their funds in the private market. I realise that the member did not say anything about the development in Fremantle, but I am suggesting that the view he holds about the development in Denmark may be changed if he takes the trouble to look at the scheme in Fremantle.

Mr Lewis: Have you been down to Denmark? Have you looked at the block of land?

Mrs HENDERSON: The reason that the development in Denmark did not go ahead is that over a number of years a controversy has been caused by the question of multiple occupancy. That goes back to the first group - called the Wolery I believe - which sought to establish a number of units on one property in that town; therefore, this controversy has been ongoing for 15 years in that council.

The Opposition spokesman on housing referred to the units under construction in Maylands and referred to the price of land and to the fact that the units had river views. I am shocked that members opposite should think that Homeswest tenants should not have any land with a pleasant outlook. The figures cited by the Opposition spokesman indicated that the price of the land was \$32 000 per block, and the price of construction was approximately \$56 000 per unit.

Mr Strickland: Who sold the land to Homeswest? Who gained the contract to build on the land?

Mrs HENDERSON: If the member for Scarborough wishes to make a speech, he will have an opportunity another time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I was about to advise the member for Scarborough, but he has received some fairly good advice from the Minister.

Mrs HENDERSON: I challenge the Opposition spokesman on housing to find any area in Perth with blocks of land available for \$32 000 with a cost of construction of \$56 000 to build quality housing. The argument of the Opposition spokesman was that these people do not deserve that quality of housing. That is the most disgraceful argument I have heard in this House! He is effectively saying that we should be building for these people fibro housing or timber framed housing with tin roofs which should be concentrated in the areas of Perth with the cheapest land and as far away from the city as possible - that is regardless of the fact that these people are the ones who are least able to afford the costs of transport. It has always been this Government's policy that these people have the right to occupy all parts of the metropolitan area, and that Homeswest housing should be scattered around the metropolitan area to create a healthy social mix of people in all areas of Perth. I totally reject the comments of the Opposition spokesman on housing.

MR DONOVAN (Morley) [5.23 pm]: Listening to the debate which has just taken place, and taking stock of the relative demerits of the argument of the member for Applecross compared with the obvious merits of the argument of the Minister in reply, one could be forgiven for arriving at the conclusion that the Opposition was finally addressing itself to the task of debating Supply and adopting the appropriate role of scrutinising the Supply Bill. It would appear that the Opposition has learned the message that the Premier has been trying to get across to it for a long time; namely, that the blocking of Supply and the establishment of a Royal Commission are two distinctly separate questions, and should be dealt with as such.

The debate began this afternoon with the Leader of the Opposition raising the question - which I have termed, and others have termed inside and outside this House - of blackmail; that is, the question of whether Supply should be blocked. The Leader of the Opposition stated that nothing had changed and, indeed, he closed his remarks by opposing this legislation to grant Supply to the Government. On the occasions that I have spoken on this matter in this House I have said that the blocking of Supply versus a Royal Commission has never been an issue so much involving WA Inc; it has never been so much about Government in this State as about the leadership of the Liberal Party. One should not unduly gloat or be unkind about the Liberal Party's turmoil and upheavals -

Mr Omodei: However!

Mr DONOVAN: - however, the view that the issue of blocking Supply versus the establishment of a Royal Commission is more a matter about the Leader of the Opposition than anything else has been supported outside this place by the media and in public discussions. Indeed, over the past week, and since the recent important by-elections, it has been demonstrated by the Liberal Party exactly how crucial the question of blocking Supply was to its own leadership. It is a matter of history that the Opposition has used every available opportunity to link the matters of WA Inc with the Budget, and to use this link in an untrammelled attempt to gain something which the electors of this State would not give it



in February 1989. The Opposition has used every means at its disposal to achieve this goal including the public savaging of public figures - and using parliamentary privilege to do so, in a way that no other group of people in this State can. The Opposition has bludgeoned Public Service and private sector figures and past and present politicians; one may say that present politicians are fair game, and I accept that argument. However, we have had an example of how that sort of strategy can cause irrevocable harm in the Tony Lloyd case. He was first convicted in the hothouse atmosphere of politics with WA Inc issues and the events that were taking place in this Parliament, and he appealed afterwards and was acquitted with appropriate judicial hindsight. Those are the risks to which the Opposition has exposed Western Australia in its unbridled and unprincipled attempt to gain power out of term, and without the support of the Western Australian electorate.

Mr MacKinnon: How could we regain power without the support of the electorate?

Mr DONOVAN: Indeed the Leader of the Opposition may ask. The method by which the Leader of the Opposition hoped to send this House to face the electorate was using the weapon of the upper House; that is the House that the Opposition in this Chamber claims has a legitimate and independent role of review and should be treated with the same importance and be given the same status as this House. It has always been claimed that had nothing to do with party politics. As we now know the use of that place, as I will discuss later, had everything to do with party politics and the question of leadership in the Liberal Party.

[Leave granted for speech to be continued.]

Debate thus adjourned.

[Continued on p 2228.]

## BILLS (11)

### *Messages - Appropriations*

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

1. Acts Amendment (Gold Banking Corporation) Bill
2. Boxing Control Amendment Bill
3. Explosives and Dangerous Goods Amendment Bill
4. Guardianship and Administration Bill
5. Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Amendment Bill
6. Soil and Land Conservation Amendment Bill
7. State Employment and Skills Development Authority Bill
8. Supply Bill
9. Tobacco Bill
10. Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill
11. WADC Liquidation Bill

## **PARKS AND RESERVES AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Assent*

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

## **RED CROSS - MOBILE DONOR CLINIC**

### *Parliament House*

THE SPEAKER Mr Barnett: I wish to advise some members and remind others that the Red Cross blood transfusion mobile office will be outside Parliament House at the south side of the main entrance tomorrow from 10.00 am to 1.30 pm. This is an important community service and I know that various members of this House are very proficient at drawing blood; perhaps they may care to give some instead.

[Questions without notice taken.]

*Sitting suspended from 6.02 to 7.30 pm*

## SUPPLY BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR DONOVAN (Morley) [7.32 pm]:** In its unprincipled drive to return to Government at any price the Opposition has used as a weapon in its blackmail attempt the other place in this Parliament, which it has said consistently should be held to be independent and free to exercise its power as a House of Review and should not find itself embroiled in cheap party politics. It is not I who needed to be red in the face when that blackmail attempt came crashing down around the Opposition. What was the Opposition's response, and particularly what was the Leader of the Opposition's response, to the traumatic experience that the Opposition sustained over the past week or so? Last night, my little stepson who is four years old fell over in the shower and bloodied his forehead. My spouse had to take him to hospital to get a couple of stitches. When he returned home, young Lachlan - as four year olds do - wanted to blame everybody else for what had sadly happened to him. I remember thinking that last night at least Lachlan certainly had something in common with the Leader of the Opposition because, although that is not how the Leader of the Opposition - allegedly a mature responsible member of this House, with the support of at least 21; that is, two-thirds of his party - is expected to behave, he lashes out in the way a four year old might lash out.

It was most unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition should seek as his targets two of our outstanding members of Government, and of the Labor Party; to single out a Minister in this House, the Minister assisting the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and other matters, the member for Ashburton. That was a gross understatement and underestimation, on his part, of the remarkable track record of that woman. Similarly, and probably closer to home for me, to single out the Minister in the other place, Hon Graham Edwards, was not only an underestimation of the calibre of that person but also was - as the Deputy Premier said earlier this afternoon - something of a cowardly response. Nobody in this Parliament, if not in this State, is as much an example of strength and, if you like, heroism as Hon Graham Edwards who, after losing his legs in a war which the Opposition's Federal colleagues put Australia into, went on to provide an example which the disabled in this State, the fair-minded, the youth and the many youth movements in this State have seen as a fine example of how to overcome disability and go on to remarkable achievements. For the Leader of the Opposition to lash out against the Liberal Party's inability to hold itself together under pressure, to lash out in the face of hostility from "the baker's dozen", the 13 members who wanted to roll him, to seek the cause of his dilemma outside his own party, was not the mark of a leader of responsibility, not the mark of a Leader of an Opposition who ought to be credible because the Opposition has an important job to do in this place.

Compare the actions and behaviour of the Opposition when its unbridled and unprincipled pursuit of power came undone around its ears, when it fell over in the metaphorical bath tub - in its own bath tub - as it did last week; compare that approach with the approach of the Premier, who through all of that pressure and difficulty has simply said to the State and to this House that it is government as usual; nothing is ruled out, nothing is ruled in; inquiries are taking place, and this will be a Government of responsibility. Compare that approach, and that comparison leads only to one conclusion as to what should happen to the Supply Bill. The Premier has said repeatedly that a separation will be made between the question of Royal Commissions and inquiries into WA Inc and related activities and the question of Supply and responsible Government. The Premier will not accept any blackmail attempt by anybody in or out of this place to send this State into chaos.

Like everybody else on this side of the House I support the Premier adamantly and we are not alone in our view. It is interesting to note *The West Australian* editorial of 9 June. *The West Australian*, which is no particular friend of the Labor Party, states -

The blocking of Supply should not be linked directly to demands for a royal commission into the WA Inc mess. The argument should centre on the validity of the State election in February last year.

Oppositions have no right to force elections on the basis that governments won't do what they want. Such a system would make polls simply a waste of time.

In this State a call has been made for an inquiry and for information about what is alleged to have happened in respect of certain events that have come to be labelled as WA Inc. The Premier has not withdrawn from those critiques or from those concerns. Equally, no-one supports a forced election and the Liberal Party knows that. The Leader of the Opposition knew that the day after those two by-elections, which have produced for this House two meritorious new members and which have evidenced the Opposition's inability to persuade two electorates in the metropolitan area of the merits of its case. The Leader of the Opposition knew that when he perceived his job to be on the line and when he went to the public and announced that either there would be a Royal Commission or he would block Supply. Of course, the rest is a matter of history. To underwrite my point that this claim for a Royal Commission versus blocking Supply has been more about leadership problems within the Liberal Party than it has been about WA Inc or the Western Australian Government I will quote the *Sunday Times* editorial of 10 June. In their wildest imagining nobody would say that the *Sunday Times* is any particular friend of this Government, much less of the Labor Party as a whole. The editorial states -

The lack of leadership depth in the Liberal Party can be traced directly to past preselection attitudes that have allowed too many time-servers to keep their seats warm. If some dead wood had been pruned long ago there may have been some real leadership contenders now.

It continues -

When a strong Opposition is needed to keep a vulnerable Government under the closest scrutiny, the State has a Liberal rabble more intent on wielding the knife than in unity and getting on with their jobs.

At the outset of my remarks I said it was a little unfair to be gloating over the upheaval and trauma that has beset the Opposition. I do this now, not in any sense of gloating, but with a sense - this has been alluded to by the Deputy Premier and Leader of the House earlier this afternoon - of the responsibility incumbent upon the Opposition in the parliamentary tradition. That responsibility is to provide for the State a reasonable level of scrutiny, criticism and questioning within the Parliament. However, we have seen something altogether different from the Opposition. I have said repeatedly that we have seen an unprincipled attempt to gain power in order to secure certain frontbenchers' jobs. The principled thing to do in keeping with responsible parliamentary practice is to give the Government its Supply. The Opposition must cease using this Parliament for those sorts of games which bring both the House, the system of Government and the people of this State into more disrepute than anything that has been attributed to so-called WA Inc activities. It is principled for this Opposition to get on with the job of parliamentary opposition so necessary to good parliamentary Government. The Opposition should get on top of its upheavals of the past week and should clear its sights and be ready to get on with its job just as this Government under Premier Lawrence is ready and able to get on with its job. There is no question of what is the principled thing to do in this place; it is to pass this Supply Bill. One hopes that in the hindsight of lessons learnt that is precisely what the Opposition will do so we can all get on with the job of government and proper parliamentary practice in this State.

MR MINSON (Greenough - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.46 pm]: We are talking tonight more about principles than anything else. We have heard quite a few members on this side of the House talk about the Government's mismanagement, and that is certainly evident. We have heard members on the other side talk about elections and Supply when that is not the question. The question is the principle of whether the people of this State will get the truth.

Principles are very important to me, which is why this question is very important. The parliamentary system in this State rests on two things: Firstly, on the Standing Orders of the Parliament and, secondly, on the integrity and honesty of members. The Standing Orders are set in concrete and will not go away. I would have hoped that the integrity of its members was rock solid as well. However, the events of the past few years have led me to believe that this is not the case.

Mr Ripper: What about the events of the past week?

Mr MINSON: Mr Ripper should not worry about the events of the past week; at least we know who the leader of the Liberal Party is.

Mr Pearce: How long is that information good for?

Mr MINSON: When it comes to principles, it is interesting to note that the Leader of the House, who earlier indicated that winning an election would be his way of judging whether Supply should be blocked -

Mr Pearce: We won an election; in fact, we won three.

Mr MINSON: The Leader of the House stood on his feet before dinner and suggested that the Opposition could not count and was being ridiculous and that the real principle behind blocking Supply, if one was going to do it, was to win an election.

Mr Pearce: I said that was the reason why you are not trying to do it.

Mr MINSON: The Opposition does not want an election; it wants a Royal Commission. I will briefly run through some of the things that have occurred since 1983 but more particularly in the last two or three years. Many of the details of WA Inc did not emerge until after the last election. In fact, they were actively suppressed until after the election. Considerable evidence was presented to this House revealing that several members of the Government had misled this Parliament. That argument raged during most of last year. Things became bad for the Government and the former Premier, Brian Burke, disappeared. I think he announced he was not really the right person for the job and should not have been nominated in the first place. Many people in Western Australia agreed with him. He went to Ireland and still there were no disclosures of any truth and the Government said it had nothing to hide. Things became worse and not only did Premier Dowding leave under a cloud, but also devastating Dave disappeared and dubious Julian is sitting on the back bench. Still we have not been told the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MINSON: My apologies, Mr Speaker, I will not use that term again.

Are we to believe now that two Premiers have left, a couple of Ministers have gone and one is sitting on the back bench, that the Government still has nothing to hide?

We now have the mark III version Premier who has promised truth, honesty and justice in the Australian way, but what do we have? We have more of a snow job and a weight loss as well. I notice the Premier is looking extremely well and perhaps I might join the weight loss program she is on. If the weight loss program works as well as the money loss program, it will be successful.

However, the burst of innocence did not last very long and as far as I am concerned the Premier has failed the test. She has had adequate opportunity to appoint an inquiry with sufficient powers to reveal the truth to the people of Western Australia. The various polls which have been taken indicate that somewhere between 80 and 85 per cent of the public of Western Australia want an inquiry and the Premier should do the right thing and honour her promise of honesty by calling a Royal Commission or a similar inquiry.

The principle I referred to earlier was the principle that the Opposition has to consider with respect to its duties to the people of Western Australia. As Her Majesty's Opposition it has a duty to bring to account a Government which appears to be dubious and devious. The method by which that can be done deserves to be considered by the Opposition. Firstly, the Opposition can ask the Government what has happened and it has certainly done that. The Opposition has asked the Premier and the Government to do the honourable thing and appoint a Royal Commission which the people of Western Australia badly want. Secondly, the Government can be brought to account by its own members, if they are courageous, crossing the floor. I realise that is a pipe dream and under our rigid party system it will not happen. Thirdly, the Opposition should use whatever means it has at its disposal to force the Government to do what it should do.

Mr Pearce: Why don't you kidnap a couple of Government members and threaten to execute them if a Royal Commission is not appointed?

Mr MINSON: That may happen! The principle at stake is what the Opposition has to do to bring this Government to account. The Opposition has asked the Government nicely, but it has not been given the details and it really is a pipe dream to expect Government members to cross the floor.

Dr Alexander: What will happen in the upper House?

Mr MINSON: Government members will see what happens in the upper House when the Bill reaches that place.

Quite a few members opposite oppose the blocking of Supply but I suspect they do not all oppose it. However, they trot out some fairly hefty arguments and I would like to consider them briefly. Firstly, members opposite say hardship will be caused if Supply is blocked because the Government will not have any money to operate. Of course, this is up to the Premier and the State Government. The Opposition has put the proposition to the Premier that Supply will be granted if she does the honourable thing and appoints a Royal Commission. Failing that the Governor can sack the Government and appoint an interim Government which, in turn, will call an election. On attaining Government the Opposition will appoint a Royal Commission. Any talk of hardship to the community is totally unnecessary and it can be avoided.

The second argument trotted out by Government members is that the blocking of Supply interferes with a democratically elected Government. I have never heard such nonsense. It is beyond me that anyone would think that having an election is opposing democracy. No-one can tell me how having an election is against democracy. It is ridiculous.

Mr Ripper: You want a rerun.

Mr MINSON: I do not want a rerun, I want a Royal Commission.

Mr Pearce: You don't want an election now because you know what will happen.

Mr MINSON: We can have an election now - all the Premier has to do is call one.

The third argument that is trotted out is that of the expense of an election. This is also nonsense because the expense of an election to the taxpayers would be a small price to pay for the truth - in the end that is what we would get. There should be a better way and it is interesting the Premier went to great lengths when introducing the Acts Amendment (Resolution of Parliamentary Disagreements) Bill into the House to explain that it will solve the problem. I can assure the Government it will not solve the problem and the Bill will be vigorously opposed by the Opposition in this House and in the other place. However, there is a way this can be handled; that is, by citizens' initiated referendums. It used to be part of the Labor Party's policy, but it was removed from the party's platform after Labor decided it did not want to do what the people wanted it to do. I suggest it is high time it was put on the agenda of all political parties in this State.

Mr Pearce: You should hear what Sir Charles Court has to say about citizens' initiated referendums.

Mr MINSON: I am not at all interested in what Sir Charles Court has to say about the matter. However, if it were in place in this State now we would not be debating Supply, but we would have a Royal Commission in place because the people would have demanded it. The parliamentary system of this State rests on integrity and principles and they are at stake. In my opinion the Government should not be granted Supply until it advises this House about what the last grant of Supply was spent on. I will not be voting to give the Government Supply and I urge other members to do the same.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth) [7.58 pm]: Much of the debate which has taken place on this Bill has been in respect of a Royal Commission. Very few members in this House would doubt the necessity for such a commission in view of the amount of money which has been lost to this State. I do not want to canvass the argument for a Royal Commission because it has been canvassed exhaustively not only on this occasion, but also on several occasions over the last few months. The *Hansard* volumes are swollen with the debates that have taken place on this subject. Sooner or later we will have a Royal Commission - it is absolutely inevitable. Mr Dowding and Mr Parker who have left this House would welcome a Royal Commission in the hope it would establish they were naive and misled by the success and the apparent invincibility of some of the entrepreneurs in this State. I believe it is inevitable that

they will be provided with an opportunity to clear their names. The Premier has indicated that she will reconsider this matter when the McCusker inquiry is completed. I understand that will be in August next, which is not long to wait. I hope that at that time the Government will agree to a Royal Commission, if only to remove the threat of one. Quite obviously, if a Royal Commission is not appointed the matter will hang like a sword over the head of this Government until an election takes place, maybe in two and a half years' time. The point is that this issue will persist unless a Royal Commission is appointed. For that reason I believe it is inevitable and in the interests of all.

I am not particularly interested in this matter as it has been canvassed extensively during this and other debates. For that reason I turn to the possibility of a Supreme Court investigation into the petrochemical debacle, which formed a large part of WA Inc. That is the part which probably was subjected to more criticism than any other. We do not need to wait for a Royal Commission to have an inquiry into Petrochemical Industries Ltd because it could be done under the Companies Code, section 541, which has existed for years and which has been used extensively in this State, although we seldom hear about it. The Corporate Affairs Department has about five cases each year under section 541 of the Companies Code. We never hear anything about those cases, but they occur.

Recently an Eastern States corporate affairs department took action through its liquidator to have a section 541 Supreme Court investigation into Spedley's merchant bank. That investigation proved to be extraordinarily successful beyond the wildest hopes of those involved in the affair. A section 541 investigation is implemented by a liquidator in the Supreme Court of the State. Evidence is taken under oath and severe penalties, including up to two years' imprisonment, exist for failing to answer a question, giving a false reply, or for not attending a hearing, yet it gives protection to the people giving evidence.

During the past few weeks Laurie Connell and Dallas Dempster have both called for a Royal Commission, ostensibly to indicate to all in the State that they have nothing to hide. I think the Government should call their bluff and provide them with the opportunity to clear themselves and to say what they wish to say as they would be protected under the course of action I am suggesting. We will then find out if they have anything of consequence to say. At the moment it seems they are claiming there is much they wish to say but they are not in a position to say it because they do not have the protection that we have, for instance, in this Chamber, or that they would have before a Royal Commission.

They would be protected under a section 541 investigation provided they declared that an answer they were about to give could incriminate them. They could then not be charged with anything arising from their evidence. That would not let them off the hook as it would give the Corporate Affairs Department, or anyone else, a lead as to what avenues should be pursued. However, witnesses would be protected from anything arising from their answers to questions in that their evidence cannot be used against them. I see absolutely no reason why such an inquiry could not take place concurrently with the McCusker inquiry. We have to wait for the result of the McCusker inquiry and the Legislative Council inquiry, and Australians generally will be waiting for the result of the Spedley merchant bank inquiry.

While those inquiries are proceeding there is no reason why we should not be examining Petrochemical Industries Ltd. Any information elicited would obviate the necessity for that information to be obtained when a Royal Commission is ultimately appointed. It would obviate the necessity to cover the same ground. A section 541 inquiry would establish the facts, just as the McCusker inquiry is establishing the facts in relation to Rothwells. The terms of a Royal Commission could be adjusted accordingly.

There is absolutely no reason why a section 541 inquiry could not proceed in respect of the petrochemical affair. Both Dallas Dempster and Laurie Connell have asked for an opportunity to speak their minds. They have asked for a Royal Commission. A section 541 inquiry would provide such an opportunity. An article appeared in *The West Australian* of 16 June under the heading, "Connell, Dempster face new PIL probe." The article states -

Former petrochemical project partners Dallas Dempster and Laurie Connell have been threatened with a Supreme Court examination under oath over the financial mystery surrounding Gofair Investments.

That is exactly the sort of inquiry I am asking for. It is the type of inquiry about which I

have been questioning the Attorney General over the past few weeks. The liquidator inquiring into the petrochemical affair is now asking for one of these investigations but only in respect of a trivial amount of \$1.8 million involving Gofair Investments, which is a Hong Kong based company about which he is unable to get answers from either Mr Dempster or Mr Connell. I suggest that instead of confining the inquiry to Gofair the Corporate Affairs liquidator should conduct a full scale inquiry into the petrochemical business.

To give members an idea of the powers under this provision I will refer to some extracts from the Companies Code. I am dealing here with section 541, "Examination of persons concerned with corporations." I will establish first who makes the investigation. Section 541(1) states -

In this section, a reference, in relation to a corporation, to a prescribed person, shall be construed as a reference to an official manager, liquidator or provisional liquidator of the corporation or to any other person authorized by the Commission to make applications under this section or to make an application under this section in relation to that corporation.

What can those people inquire into?

Section 541(2) of the Companies (Western Australia) Code states -

(2) Where it appears to the Commission or to a prescribed person that-

- (a) a person who has taken part or been concerned in the promotion, formation, management, administration or winding up of, or has otherwise taken part or been concerned in affairs of, a corporation has been, or may have been, guilty of fraud, negligence, default, breach of trust, breach of duty or other misconduct in relation to that corporation; or
- (b) a person may be capable of giving information in relation to the promotion, formation, management and administration or winding up of, or otherwise in relation to affairs of, a corporation,

This section outlines the matters into which the liquidator can inquire in the Supreme Court. The liquidator can jump the queue. Three years have passed since the share market crash of 19 October 1987. Nobody in Western Australia has been charged as a consequence; although corporations and companies have failed all over the countryside the Corporate Affairs Department has been inactive.

An inquiry into the petrochemical affair could inquire into any aspect of the matter. An investigation would be all embracing and the liquidator in the Supreme Court could question anyone connected with the affair on any aspect of the matter. This provision has only recently been highlighted in the Eastern States by the Spedley examination.

If a person is brought before the Supreme Court as a consequence of section 541(6) we find that -

(6) A person who is ordered under sub-section (3) to attend before the Court shall not, without reasonable excuse-

- (a) fail to attend as required by the order; or
- (b) fail to attend from day to day until the conclusion of the examination.

If he does not comply with this section the penalty is \$10 000 or imprisonment, or both. If a person is asked to attend he must attend every day. The Companies Code states further in subsection (7) that -

(7) A person attending before the Court for examination pursuant to an order made under sub-section (3) shall not refuse or fail to take an oath or make an affirmation.

If that person does not take an oath or an affirmation he is subject to a penalty of \$10 000 or imprisonment or both for what might seem a relatively simple offence. Subsection (8) states -

(8) A person attending before the Court for examination pursuant to an order made under sub-section (3) shall not refuse or fail to answer a question that he is directed by the Court to answer.

If he fails to do so again the penalty is \$10 000 or imprisonment for two years, or both. Section 541(9) of the Companies (Western Australia) Code states -

(9) A person attending before the Court for examination pursuant to the order under sub-section (3), if directed by the Court to produce any books in his possession or under his control relevant to the matters on which he is to be, or is being, examined shall not refuse or fail to comply with the direction.

If he fails to produce these books the penalty again is \$10 000 or imprisonment for two years, or both. As a further indication of the strength of this particular section of the Act, subsection 11 states -

(11) A person attending before the Court for examination pursuant to an order made under sub-section (3) shall not make a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular.

If the person makes a false statement the penalty is \$10 000 or imprisonment for two years, or both. Anyone brought before the Supreme Court of Western Australia by a liquidator or by the Corporate Affairs Commission under section 541 of the Companies (Western Australia) Code can be subjected to the most exhaustive examination under oath. If he does not comply with the provisions under this section he will be subjected to the penalty of \$10 000 on each count or two years gaol, or both. Company officers, directors and entrepreneurs if so ordered must go before the Supreme Court under this section and cannot give false information or refuse to give information. That is exactly what has happened in the Spedley merchant bank investigation. It is subject to an examination under this provision in the Eastern States.

Under the legislation the power exists to exhaustively examine officers and directors of companies. It is very rarely utilised with only about five cases a year coming before the Supreme Court. Such cases never attract publicity in Western Australia because they involve relatively minor companies. The petrochemical affair is a major affair and should be the subject of an investigation of this kind. Such an investigation would not affect a Royal Commission in any way. It could be run concurrently with the existing McCusker investigation. All it will do is expedite the inquiry that must inevitably take place into Petrochemical Industries Ltd. It will not be a case of duplicating the information before a Royal Commission later, because the information that is obtained as a result of this inquiry would be taken into consideration by the Government when it drafted the terms of reference for a subsequent Royal Commission. A Royal Commission is inevitable from everybody's point of view; from the point of view of people who have been accused, from the point of view of the people of this State, and from the point of view of the Opposition.

I am aware that other members wish to speak on this matter and I do not want to detain the House. Once again I ask the Government to give consideration to my request and if it does that it will go a long way towards satisfying the public demand for knowledge in respect of what actually took place with Petrochemical Industries Ltd.

There is no limit to what can be inquired into before the Supreme Court, I repeat, under oath. The people concerned are protected in respect of the statements they make but are not protected in another court, of course, by plaintiffs simply using their information as a lead and then pursuing that information. Of course, the Supreme Court can take action - and section 541 of the Companies Code makes specific provision for this - if they give a false answer, so the answers must be accurate.

We have seen the spectacle of Mr Connell and Mr Dempster asking for a Royal Commission, ostensibly to clear their names, because a Royal Commission would give them a certain amount of protection. With this provision they can say anything they want to, provided it is true, and they will be protected. At the same time, it would clear the air for the Government, the people of Western Australia and the Opposition; therefore I commend this course of action to the Government.

**DR ALEXANDER (Perth) [8.20 pm]:** I wish to respond to some of the points raised by members opposite, and in particular, a little later I want to talk about some of the Homeswest matters to which the member for Applecross referred earlier today. Also I wish to make some comments about this attempt by the Opposition to link the blocking of Supply to a Royal Commission.



The member for South Perth has just given us a very eloquent statement about the powers of a Royal Commission. While it was very informative, nobody on this side of the House doubts the powers of a Royal Commission -

Mr Grayden: I was talking about the Companies Code, section 541.

Dr ALEXANDER: - or other things associated with various breaches of the Companies Code, to which he referred; nobody on this side of the House doubts the seriousness of the current situation and the seriousness with which people are treating it; I do not think anybody doubts that the public want more information about the transactions that have gone on in the last few years; but what the public do doubt, and what they certainly reject, is this attempt to link that question to the blocking of Supply. I believe that is where the Opposition's strategy has run into trouble.

Mr Omodei: The simple solution is to call a Royal Commission.

Mr Kierath: Would you support a Royal Commission?

Dr ALEXANDER: Not at the present time.

Mr Kierath: I would have thought that as a member of the left you would have supported one.

Dr ALEXANDER: The member cannot presuppose what I might think as a member of any particular faction. I do not think that from his standpoint he is qualified to judge.

Mr Kierath: I thought you had integrity.

Dr ALEXANDER: Integrity does not equal demanding a Royal Commission now.

Mr Bradshaw: I would have thought it meant not signing that letter last year to support Premier Dowding.

Mr Taylor: What did you say? "I will support my leader and then see what happens and make up my mind."

Dr ALEXANDER: That is right. I understood members on the Liberal side were going to depose the Opposition Leader two weeks ago. Several Liberal members - the member for Nedlands, the member for Cottesloe - actually went on radio and said, "Yes, we think Mr MacKinnon will step down."

Mr Blaikie: The only problem is that they did not count properly.

Dr ALEXANDER: Exactly, and it seems that certain adjustments were made over the weekend so that the Leader of the Opposition was recycled; and he is still there, running the same arguments as he was running a couple of weeks ago and saying exactly the same things. And members opposite present themselves as a credible alternative Government!

Mr Omodei: You have said yourself that you are concerned about this. Why don't you get on with the job and call a Royal Commission?

Dr ALEXANDER: The Government is getting on with the job.

Mr Omodei: I don't think it is - 85 per cent of the people are saying it is not.

Dr ALEXANDER: They are not saying that; they are saying they want more information. At the moment several inquiries are in place which are seeking to get some of that information. While members opposite do not accept the point that the McCusker inquiry cannot be cut across, it is absolutely valid and absolutely clear that until that inquiry has reported, a decision on a Royal Commission should not be made. I think, like members opposite do, I guess -

Mr Blaikie: I hope not.

Dr ALEXANDER: I hope not too, in that respect, but I think more information is required about the dealings that have gone on in the last several years.

Mr Blaikie: Is it true that Mick Michael does not send you Christmas cards any more?

Dr ALEXANDER: Fortunately he never did.

Mr Bradshaw: What happened to the inquiry you called for?

Dr ALEXANDER: I think it was a mistake not to have an inquiry into the Perth City

Council at that point, and I have said so publicly. However, we are not talking about the Perth City Council now. What we are talking about are statements made by Liberal members of this House. For example, according to *The West Australian* of 11 June, the member for Wellington, John Bradshaw, said that he was loyal to the leader but if a spill of positions took place he would reconsider the matter.

Mr Bradshaw: Let me explain.

Dr ALEXANDER: The member has a lot of explaining to do but I am not sure that now is the time to do it.

Mr Bradshaw: I said I would look at the situation after the spill had occurred.

Dr ALEXANDER: That is called keeping one's options open. Another Liberal said that -

he was still trying to weigh the relative rights and wrongs of the situation and would have a sleepless night. . . .

But now that the matter had come out in the open it could be that Mr MacKinnon's leadership would continue to be questioned, even if he survived today.

An Opposition member: And that was signed by Malcolm Bryce.

Dr ALEXANDER: I believe that it was in fact signed by one of the Liberal members. I turn now to the question of Supply. Just a few moments ago we heard the new Deputy Leader of the Opposition advocating the blocking of Supply; but what did he say on 12 June after the leadership question had apparently been resolved? He said this -

The whole question of Supply and of elections has got to fade into the background . . .

Mr Minson: That is right; we want a Royal Commission.

Dr ALEXANDER: But now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is talking again about blocking Supply. Why does he not make up his mind what he wants? Clearly there is some ambivalence.

Mr Nicholls: Are you going to deliver a Royal Commission if McCusker does not come up with all the answers?

Dr ALEXANDER: That is a possibility. We have yet to see what McCusker comes up with. Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr ALEXANDER: What we on this side of the House have said is that after Mr McCusker reports, the situation with regard to a Royal Commission or other form of inquiry will be considered.

Mr Nicholls: Will you support a Royal Commission if that report does not come up with the answers?

Dr ALEXANDER: Personally, yes; but why would the member pre-empt the outcome of that inquiry? I do not think that is fair or just at all, either to Mr McCusker or to the people who may well be charged as a result of the McCusker inquiry, and some have already been charged.

Mr Minson: It has absolutely nothing to do with the rest of the debacle.

Dr ALEXANDER: That is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's opinion.

Mr Minson: It is not just my opinion, it is the terms of reference.

Mr Nicholls: Will you back a Royal Commission if he does not come up with the answers?

Dr ALEXANDER: It depends on what the member for Mandurah means by "the answers".

Mr Nicholls: Political manipulation.

Dr ALEXANDER: The member for Mandurah would have a Royal Commission which would go into the history of the world as we know it. If there is to be a Royal Commission I think we should take it back to at least 1976. Perhaps some of the matters that should be looked at by a Royal Commission could include, for example, matters associated with a

company known as Cherrita Holdings, Landall, and other such companies. If we are talking about deals that have allegedly been done by Governments in consultation with the private sector we should look very closely at those sorts of things.

Mr Bradshaw: We have no problems with that.

Mr Nicholls: What about Kimberley Finance?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr ALEXANDER: What the Opposition simply cannot decide is whether it is serious about blocking Supply. First it said it was, then it said, "Maybe we are not and maybe we are"; now it is saying, "We will vote against Supply in the lower House but we are not sure what will happen in the upper House." It will be interesting to see what does happen when the Bill reaches the upper House.

Two weeks ago the Opposition insisted that its upper House colleagues would block Supply come what may and that an election would take place in August. The Opposition was making this threat and we were supposed to be rushing back to our electorate offices to start gearing up for an election. I understand that the National Party has been on an election footing for the last 18 months.

Mr House: Call an election; we will be happy to have one any time you like. I thought you were issuing a challenge.

Dr ALEXANDER: I am challenging the Opposition to make up its mind about whether it will block Supply.

Mr Kierath: We have made up our mind.

Dr ALEXANDER: The Opposition has now decided to only half block Supply.

The SPEAKER: Order! The debate is developing into a cosy little chat among a group of people and it can hardly be termed a debate. I have two suggestions: I offer one to the member for Perth in that he should refer his remarks to the Chair; to everybody else I suggest that they should desist from, say, three-quarters of the interjections, and we will see how that works. That should bring us pretty closely back to a debate.

Dr ALEXANDER: I was just beginning to enjoy myself.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is that a quarter of the previous interjections?

Mr Fred Tubby: The member for Perth is like his tie.

Dr ALEXANDER: It is a nice tie.

Mr Fred Tubby: It is all mixed up.

Dr ALEXANDER: If one must wear a tie in this Chamber, why not wear something like this?

Clearly, the blocking of Supply and the establishment of a Royal Commission is touching on a few raw nerves. I now refer to some remarks made by the member for Applecross regarding Homeswest in which he said, as far as I can remember, "Why should Homeswest tenants be given luxury houses?" Several things were wrong with his comments: Regrettably Homeswest tenants do not receive luxury housing although they receive a very good standard of housing. However, the member for Applecross suggested that the standard of housing for Homeswest tenants was too high - that is an objectionable statement.

Mr Kierath: He said that in some cases the land value was too high; there is a big difference between that and what you are trying to imply.

Dr ALEXANDER: The member said that Homeswest tenants should not be housed in accommodation which is as good as some built in the private sector. Homeswest tenants are as entitled as anybody else in the community to a good location and a good standard of housing, and if that includes riverfront developments, so much the better.

Mr Strickland: If they pay for it.

Dr ALEXANDER: Obviously, Homeswest tenants are not in a position to pay the market rate for housing because that is why they are in the Homeswest sector. It is quite justifiable for Governments to house Homeswest tenants -

Mr Strickland: In subsidised housing.

Dr ALEXANDER: Yes, Homeswest tenants are subsidised by definition, but tenants pay according to their means and their rental levels are pegged to their incomes.

Mr Fred Tubby: How long is the waiting list for Homeswest housing?

Dr ALEXANDER: It is too long, but it is much shorter than it was in past years.

Mr House: It is much longer in country areas.

Dr ALEXANDER: It depends where one is talking about; I am not talking about the country areas; I am talking about the city areas that I am familiar with in which Homeswest is trying to overcome the housing shortage.

Mr Cowan: You should try to talk about the area east of the Darling escarpment occasionally.

Dr ALEXANDER: I do know something about the area east of the Darling escarpment, but I happen to represent an electorate to the west of the escarpment - that is the area in the central city.

Mr Kierath: That is temporary.

Dr ALEXANDER: That is the member's opinion; I believe I will be representing the area for quite some time to come.

Mr Kierath: We will be doing our best next time around.

Dr ALEXANDER: I believe that the Opposition did its best last time and it was not good enough.

Homeswest has half a dozen ongoing developments in the Perth electorate which are of a very high standard - they may be too high for the liking of the member for Applecross - and those units for pensioners and others in the East Perth, Mount Lawley, Highgate and areas closer to the city, are helping to overcome the housing shortage to which the member referred. Certainly a long waiting list exists; I have many constituents coming to my office who have been on the waiting list for what I consider to be too long. However, Homeswest is making a strenuous effort to overcome the problem with building projects in the inner city. Talking to tenants from those developments, as I do regularly, it is clear that they are delighted with the standard of housing and with the fact that they are able to live in a location to which they have a strong claim.

People with small incomes who live in rental accommodation close to the city are often forced from that housing by the expansion of the commercial development of the city. For those people the only alternative is Homeswest housing.

Mr Lewis: What about the \$200 000 homes in East Fremantle?

Dr ALEXANDER: I am not talking about the \$200 000 homes in East Fremantle; I am talking about the homes in the \$50 000 to \$100 000 cost group in locations close to central Perth.

Mr Lewis: Ask people in the median cost homes what they think about the \$200 000 Homeswest houses because the median price of a house is \$96 000.

Dr ALEXANDER: I do not believe that the member's information is totally correct as it contradicts what the Minister for Housing said earlier. I do not believe that Homeswest makes a habit of building houses of the cost referred to by the member.

Another issue associated with this subject is that of cooperative housing.

Mr Lewis: Why do you not go down to those people who live in East Fremantle opposite the sailing club involved with the America's Cup in the \$150 000 townhouses?

Dr ALEXANDER: Those are the member's figures. If Homeswest tenants have a location like that, it is terrific. After the second World War Homeswest was building housing estates in South Perth -

Mr Lewis: We are talking about State housing achieving the maximum number of quality homes for the maximum number of people, and not building a select high-quality home for a small minority of the people.

Dr ALEXANDER: The member was suggesting that a Homeswest tenant should not receive high-quality housing.

Mr Lewis: Not at all!

Dr ALEXANDER: That was my inference, and perhaps I am incorrect.

Mr Lewis: I am saying that Homeswest is not using its resources properly.

Mr Omodei: If I go to my electorate tomorrow and say that the member for Perth is in favour of \$150 000 Homeswest homes overlooking the sea, must I tell people that they must do without?

Dr ALEXANDER: No, Homeswest has managed its budget extraordinarily well over the last few years. On occasions it may have built houses for more than the average cost in a location which may be better than the average location on which it builds, but that is quite justifiable in that some Homeswest tenants have access to good housing in some excellent locations.

Mr Lewis: In the last four years Homeswest has not spent its capital budget, and that is how the Government has balanced its Budgets.

Dr ALEXANDER: That is the member's version. My version is that in the electorate of Perth Homeswest is doing an excellent job in overcoming the housing shortage.

Referring to the housing cooperatives, about which the member for Applecross also seemed to be distressed -

Mr Lewis: It was only one, please.

Dr ALEXANDER: Okay. The development to which the member referred is one that I have received some correspondence about -

Mr Kierath: Have you seen the site?

Dr ALEXANDER: No, but that proposal is one of a number of housing cooperatives which offer a viable alternative to conventional family or single housing which, on average, in the cooperatives to date, have resulted in a housing cost per head which is often lower than the costs about which the member for Applecross was complaining in other Homeswest developments. Although the initial capital cost may be relatively higher, when this is divided among the number of tenants involved the cost per head is lower and the subsidy element - which the member also appears to be complaining about - is lower than with many Homeswest developments.

Mr Lewis: Seventy five acres of rural land.

Dr ALEXANDER: I do not see that cooperatives should not be developed in rural locations as well as in urban locations.

Mr Lewis: People have been lined up for years trying to get a house.

Dr ALEXANDER: A cooperative is assessed according to its merits, and from what I have seen the merits of that development certainly deserve further consideration. The cooperative developed in Fremantle - not the one referred to earlier by the member for Applecross, but in South Fremantle - is an excellent example of the pooling of resources for public housing objectives.

Homeswest areas and Homeswest tenants have, for a long time, been subject to a stigma. Homeswest is adopting a philosophy which seeks to remove that stigma by building a higher standard of housing and making that housing of better design possibly, in some cases, at a slightly higher cost. To my way of thinking any cost involved is fully justified in order to remove that stigma from Homeswest areas and tenants.

The areas around central Perth and central Fremantle are no doubt the areas in demand for tenancy housing by people eligible for Homeswest housing. Many of those people have been forced from housing because of rising rents and commercial development. Apart from going to the outskirts of the city they have no alternative but to apply for Homeswest housing. If they have been residing in an inner city location for several years their friends, relatives and contacts are in those areas. The services they seek access to, particularly health services for older people, are centralised. Those people will benefit from and need to continue living in a

central location. If the per unit cost of these developments in the inner cities of Perth and Fremantle is slightly higher per unit than in the suburbs -

Mr Lewis: Three times higher.

Dr ALEXANDER: That is only one example, and the member is not quoting the broad range of examples which would show the average cost to be lower and in line with private sector cost. Private sector housing costs are higher in the central city and land is more expensive. The Government acknowledges that, but public sector tenants deserve equal treatment to private sector tenants. I fully support Homeswest's activities to seek to develop in locations which normally would be the preserve of the wealthy only.

MR KIERATH (Riverton) [8.43 pm]: This Bill is about providing money to the Government to carry out its services. When asked to consider providing funds to the Government it is a matter of considering whether the Government has carried out its job competently in the past. On this occasion it is like sending good money after bad.

I recently outlined in the House how the Government had stolen between \$500 million and \$800 million of taxpayers' funds, but it is now seeking further funds and several questions need to be answered. The Government has secretly taken the money from the people of Western Australia. Decency and integrity demand that the Government not be granted further funds until it answers questions about how it has spent the money in the past.

The question with which we are faced is whether we should have a Royal Commission or whether we should block Supply. Some members opposite have latched onto the term "blackmail". I do not believe that it is a form of blackmail. It is quite simple; the Government has a choice: Either it appoints a Royal Commission or it calls an election. We stand for freedom of choice and the Government has a choice. I wonder what the Government has to hide if it is not prepared to appoint a Royal Commission. Even its mates are calling for a Royal Commission because they feel they have been set up as the patsies and the real instigators of these deals are getting off scot-free. Mr Connell would like a Royal Commission because the McCusker inquiry is looking at a narrow view of corporate involvement in Rothwells.

Last year I commented on the actions of a former Premier of this State. He rang members of the Kwinana Town Council asking them not to remove the council's money from Rothwells. The day after I made my speech I received a telephone call from Mr Malcolm McCusker, QC, and when I put this information to him he said his inquiry did not have the scope to investigate those things. All he could investigate was the implication of a director of Rothwells and whether he said Rothwells was solvent when, in fact, he knew it was insolvent. The McCusker inquiry is very narrow and has nothing to do with the deals commonly known as WA Inc.

We must ask why the Government will not stand up and be accountable by appointing a Royal Commission. It has too much to lose; it cannot afford a Royal Commission. We need go no further than what occurred in Queensland. The Queensland Government thought it could control a Royal Commission, but it brought down the Government. The Government knows that if it sets up a Royal Commission its days are numbered. The Government has a choice: Appoint a Royal Commission or the Opposition will refuse to grant Supply.

Let us consider what the Government has to hide. The Petrochemical Industries Ltd project is being wound up and we are aware of the massive debts involved. The rights to the project - the intellectual property, the research and the marketing - were owned by the taxpayers of Western Australia and were developed by the department. The Government did not owe one cent on it, but the project was given to a company controlled by Dallas Dempster.

Mr Nicholls: For nothing.

Mr KIERATH: Yes, for absolutely nothing. One would have thought if it had some value the Government would have put the project up for tender and called for registrations of public interest. A public asset was given away to one of the Government's mates. The poor old taxpayer of Western Australia in conjunction with someone else paid \$400 million to buy back the project which had been given away by the Government. The company was given exclusive rights to the project, and if anyone wanted to set up a petrochemical plant in Western Australia in the next 10 or 15 years they would not have been allowed to do so. The

Government is good at giving exclusive rights to projects and if anyone wants to set up a similar plant they have to buy the existing project from the Government. It transferred \$400 million from the public register to the private register and the taxpayer is left paying for it.

For those members who are not aware, Central Park comprises the area on which the old Perth Technical College was located. Again, it was a prime asset owned by the people of Western Australia. It was not mortgaged, but what did the Government do? It sold it for \$4.5 million to certain friends of the Government's and they happened to be members of the Curtin Foundation. What is the Curtin Foundation? It is a place where the money is laundered to make donations to the Australian Labor Party. Central Park was previously owned outright by the Government and now it has bought it back for \$148 million. This Government owned that property outright, and the only addition to it was certain approvals by the Perth City Council allowing for a trade-off of floor space for a park or a botanical garden area. The Government bought back the property, this time not directly through taxpayers' funds but through the Superannuation Board. Again, a public asset has been traded off at a cost of \$148 million to the public purse. Those two items amount to \$548 million. I will not bore the House by going through the other activities known as WA Inc, but it is important to note the directions of people involved in those projects.

With regard to the Central Park development, an undertaking was given by the Chairman of the Superannuation Board that the Government contract would be put out to tender; that is, it would not be given to a mate as a favour, but the whole deal would be open and fair. Was that contract put out to tender? No. To whom was the contract given? The builder, who is a founding member of the Curtin Foundation, is none other than Mr John Roberts. We have seen the political manipulation involved in taking these assets off the public register and transferring the money from the public purse into private hands. We have seen this modus operandi employed over and over again. Money has been lost from these projects, the value of which has been inflated. I am using the word "lost" in a generous sense because the money has been lost either through total incompetence or it has been stolen.

Dr Watson: It has not been stolen.

Mr KIERATH: It has been. How can the Government take something it owns, sell it to a mate, buy it back at an inflated price, and transfer \$540 million? That money has been taken secretly, and it has been done through the Western Australian Development Corporation legislation.

Dr Watson: Who has the money?

Mr KIERATH: The Opposition wants a Royal Commission to find out who has the money. More importantly, why did the Government give away that amount of money? Why did it give away \$540 million when people in my electorate are screaming out for funds? It is a disgrace, and if members opposite had any integrity they would resign, face the people and let them judge the Government. The Government is not game to let the people decide, especially bearing in mind the latest opinion polls. The Government does not have the courage to face an election. The very least it should do is appoint a Royal Commission.

We have witnessed the rorts and scams in an effort to steal public assets. We have witnessed the skimming of the cream, and noted that some of the money has become part of campaign contributions. The Bill before the House asks for more money to be granted to the Government to be spent in the same way. The Premier was manipulated by the backroom boys - perhaps "anointed" is the right term to use - because the Federal election was about to take place. The Federal Government realised that it would be beaten in Western Australia and it had to resort urgently to damage control. Poor old Pete was assigned to the back benches. He is on the public record as saying that he wanted to come into this House, square the ledger and lay his cards on the table. However, at the last minute his mind was changed for him by someone on the other side of the House. Someone mentioned the word "blackmail" earlier; this is certainly a case of blackmail, because the former Premier was given an offer he could not refuse.

Mr Gordon Hill: Let us get this straight. The Leader of the Opposition asked for both by-elections to be held on the same day. When the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition resigned, your leader asked that both by-elections take place at the same time.

Mr KIERATH: I will provide a transcript indicating that the former Premier, Mr Dowding, said that he had a few scores to settle and he was looking forward to coming into this House. He was not given the chance to settle those scores. At least when Opposition members give notice of their intention to resign, they do not scuttle to some other State, they stay in Western Australia.

I relate the amount of money that has been stolen to the amount alleged to have been stolen by Raymond Mickelberg and the gaol sentence he received. On the same basis Government members could be sentenced to 33 000 years in gaol. If that were divided by the number of Government members in this House, it amounts to more than 1 000 years' gaol for each member. The Casuarina Prison which is being built will hold 380 prisoners; it may be that it could hold all those involved in WA Inc dealings.

The Leader of the House said earlier that the Opposition was coming out with the same old line. The Opposition has been saying the same things since 1987. In that year it was fashionable for certain members, and certainly the then Premier and Deputy Premier, to say that if anybody stood against the scheme to rescue Rothwells, his actions would bring about the downfall of financial institutions in Western Australia and Australia. At the time I was a member of a town council and I can tell members how scared those councillors were. They were told that if they withdrew their money from Rothwells they would bring about the destruction of the financial system as we knew it. What has happened since then? Rothwells has gone under but the other financial institutions in this country have not collapsed. Only the dodgy companies have collapsed. The leader of the Liberal Party was prepared to say that the proposed rescue was wrong and he did not support it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is most unlike Government members to behave in that way.

Mr KIERATH: The Leader of the Opposition said the rescue would not work before the Government launched the rescue. The leader of the Government at that time was Mr Burke and his deputy was Mr Bryce. They have now gone and they were replaced by Mr Dowding and Mr Parker, the new saviours. They have now gone and the current leader is Dr Lawrence. One wonders how long this leadership will last. In the intervening period the Opposition has had the same leader who was prepared to say in 1987 that the rescue would not work. The Government must understand that the Opposition had the foresight and vision, and understood what was going on, which is more than could be said for the Government.

Mr Read: Rubbish.

Mr KIERATH: It is not rubbish. It is on the public record. The Opposition was vilified by the Government and some of its rich mates for having the courage to stand and tell the truth. Where are those rich mates now? Those same people, supporters of the Government, are now calling for a Royal Commission. It is amazing how they have turned. They do not like being the patsies. They know they are being set up to cop it all while the Government is getting off scot-free. They are now prepared to spill their guts and tell the truth. Now that the heat is on, they want a Royal Commission to be held. If the Government thinks that the Opposition will give up in its quest for a Royal Commission, I can assure the House that it is wrong. It does not matter what happens, we shall keep going until a Royal Commission is appointed.

Several members interjected.

Mr Taylor: There were a lot of conspiracy theories around the place. I can tell you that about that interesting analogy.

Mr KIERATH: There are a lot of similarities with Queensland. The Queensland Government tried to resist a Royal Commission, but ultimately it engulfed and consumed it; there was nothing the Government could do to prevent it. The same thing will happen here. We will not quit until we get a Royal Commission. The only way the Government can get off the hook is to agree to a Royal Commission. By refusing to agree to a Royal Commission, the Government is keeping it on the political agenda. I have heard the cries from members opposite for us to leave this alone and get on with something else. The Government has within its hands the power to take it off the political agenda. The Government can do that tomorrow at the stroke of a pen. The Government can put



conditions on it. Were the Government serious about what it has said about the McCusker inquiry, it could delay the introduction of a Royal Commission until after that inquiry has been completed. We will agree to that.

The Government can take the issue off the political agenda by agreeing to a Royal Commission, but it will not do so because it cannot afford to have the public find out what it is trying to cover up. That is why the Government will continue to resist a Royal Commission. The Government has been very quick to quote figures and say that a certain number of people do not believe the Opposition should block Supply, but what about the 83 per cent of people who want a Royal Commission? That does not count because it might embarrass the Government. Some people might get caught. They might be permanent visitors at Casuarina prison. At least they will have a modern prison to go to.

Mr P.J. Smith: If we do not have a Royal Commission, you will block Supply. Then what do we do? What is the alternative?

Mr KIERATH: The only alternative is to have a Royal Commission. The public know that something is rotten. They are not sure what it is because in many cases it is so complicated they do not understand it. A few weeks ago I tried to outline the schemes, the deals, the rorts and the scams. These schemes are disguised and complicated issues. Even I have difficulty in understanding them at times.

Mr P.J. Smith: Do you think the Royal Commission will make it simple?

Mr KIERATH: People want some independent information. They do not want it tainted with sticky fingers where the Government has manipulated the inquiry. The only independent source of investigation is a Royal Commission. The Government's own party established an independent Royal Commission into Aboriginal deaths in custody because it recognised the importance of taking the matter out of the political arena. A Royal Commission will allow the Government to establish once and for all its total innocence, if it is innocent.

Mr P.J. Smith: But you are still making the threat.

Mr KIERATH: No. As I said previously, the Government has a choice. We will keep on asking for a Royal Commission, regardless of what happens in respect of this legislation. Members opposite can interpret that as a threat.

I have a responsibility to the people of Riverton. I have to look after their interests. I have promised that I will serve them. Why does this Government not have the money to supply the proper services of Government in my electorate? We are talking about an amount between \$500 million and \$850 million which this Government appears to have given away to its rich mates. A person who lives in my electorate got the colossal sum of nearly \$4 million over a five year period. He also received more than \$500 000 in exchange for providing two signatures. At the same time we had two primary schools with student populations approaching 1 000 students, but no new schools could be built; there was no money. In fact, the Government sold off one of the sites in October 1985 because it did not believe a new school was required. It is now an official fact that one of those schools is the largest primary school in the State, but the Government says it cannot build a new school because it does not have any land.

I try to look after the people of Riverton because they put me in this House. I will fight with everything I have to look after their interests, even if that means taking on the Government. Some people are saying that members opposite are like Robin Hood in reverse; they are robbing from the poor and giving to the rich. Were I to support this Bill, I would be condoning the actions of members opposite. I cannot in all conscience condone those actions. I do not know to which member opposite I should point the finger, but collectively members opposite have stolen between \$500 million and \$850 million. I would like to find out who it was. There is no way that I can support the granting of Supply because I do not support the activities of this Government. I believe that what it has done is totally wrong. The Government has betrayed the people of Western Australia and the people of my electorate. There is no way in the world that I can condone theft.

MR FRED TUBBY (Roleystone) [9.06 pm]: I support the Leader of the Opposition in the tribute that he paid to the member for Cottesloe. The member for Cottesloe has made a significant contribution to this Parliament and to the people of Western Australia. During the

time he has been in this place he has been fearless in his pursuit of the rights of individuals, and he has also been fearless in attacking the Government. He will be sorely missed, not only by the Liberal Party, but also by all Western Australians. As the Leader of the Opposition said, he can leave this place with his head held high. He does not have to sneak off during a parliamentary recess and move overseas, or to some other hiding place in the east.

I will not support this Supply Bill because over a number of years the Government has wasted \$850 million of taxpayers' money, and no-one seems to know where it has gone. No-one seems to know whether we will be able to recover any of that money. Until it holds a Royal Commission to investigate these issues, this Government does not deserve to be entrusted with any more funds. These questions must be addressed in a Royal Commission, and I will not support the granting of Supply until a Royal Commission is forthcoming.

The funds which have been wasted could have been spent on the provision of goods and services and public works right throughout the length and breadth of the State. The entrepreneurs around town saw this Government coming, and they have done very nicely out of it. Unfortunately, the people in my electorate, and in many other electorates, have suffered. They have suffered in particular in respect of school maintenance. In 1987, the Government replaced the cyclical maintenance program in schools with what it called a needs based maintenance program. No one has specified what is meant by the term "needs", but in my opinion it seems to be based on political needs rather than on the needs of particular schools. I have here a chart of some of the planned identified maintenance needs for the 1989-90 Budget. It shows the amounts allocated to metropolitan districts - not electoral districts but education districts. I was very interested to see under these identified program maintenance needs that the Armadale district, which takes in both the Leader of the House's electorate and mine, was allocated \$202 200. I was interested also in the allocations to a couple of other districts. Dianella, a marginal seat with a Government member, was allocated \$1 134 400. Melville, a marginal seat held by one of our members, was allocated \$1 087 650. Thornlie, which is a nice, safe Government seat received only \$196 050.

Mrs Henderson: What about Jandakot?

Mr FRED TUBBY: I am sorry, I do not know what education district Jandakot fits into.

Mrs Henderson: What is the Leader of the Opposition's seat now?

Mr FRED TUBBY: It is Jandakot, but these are not electoral districts but educational districts. Jandakot might fit into the Cockburn educational district; I do not know. However, the Minister for Housing should be screaming about the allocation for the Thornlie district. Perhaps the schools in her area are all new, but those in the Armadale district are not and all we were allocated was \$202 200. Someone could walk into the Armadale Senior High School and spend that amount of money in identified program maintenance needs and no-one would even see where it went. That school desperately needs money - money that this Government squandered; \$850 million of it. The Minister for Education has been to the Armadale Senior High School and he knows exactly what I am talking about. He saw the wall that had fallen down from the first storey balcony; he saw where the ceilings were starting to fall down around the verandahs; he saw the asbestos roofs and where they have a monitoring unit near the edge of the verandah to monitor the fibres falling off one roof. I think he also went to see the basketball courts, where the students can no longer play because the courts are considered too dangerous due to the cracks. The facilities provided for the administration and teaching staff are appalling, to say the least. It would have to be the least maintained school in the State.

Mr Gordon Hill: It does not say much for the sitting member.

Mr FRED TUBBY: It has only just come into my electorate - it was in the electorate of the Leader of the House up until the 1989 election. For five years he was the Minister for Education and yet he did not spend one red cent on the Armadale Senior High School.

Mr Gordon Hill: He did not pork barrel.

Mr FRED TUBBY: I wish he had! Three successive Ministers for Education have visited that school. For five years when the Leader of the House was Minister for Education he went to that school on numerous occasions; the Premier and former Minister for Education visited the school; and now the current Minister for Education has visited the school. Each

one of them tut-tutted and asked for the work required to be placed in writing. They wandered around and saw what they could do. I will give the Premier credit - she at least, as Minister for Education, completely upgraded the home economics area; but that was only one small area that needed doing. In the manual arts room one must place one's feet carefully in case one's foot goes through a hole in the floor - that is how bad that area is. The whole school is in need of a major upgrade and I urge the Minister, if Supply is granted, to make sure that Armadale Senior High School is right on top of his list of priorities. If Supply is not granted and we have an election and I become the Minister for Education I can guarantee that Armadale Senior High School will be right on top of my list of priorities. If that is pork barrelling it will still be done. Armadale Senior High School has been ignored for too many years.

Dr Gallop: Will you also sack the gardener you wanted to sack?

Mr FRED TUBBY: The senior gardener at Kelmscott Senior High School? I did not want him sacked at all. That was the Minister's lot - the present member for Fremantle. The Miscellaneous Workers Union wanted him sacked because that gardener did some work and the Miscellaneous Workers Union cannot stand gardeners who actually work.

Mr Gordon Hill: You talk to him. That gardener used to be in my electorate.

Mr FRED TUBBY: The Minister for Local Government is dead right - he got rid of the assistant gardener who caused the problems.

Mr Gordon Hill: Yes, because he did not do any work.

Mr FRED TUBBY: He would not know the meaning of the word "work".

Mrs Henderson: You have just said he was working too hard.

Mr FRED TUBBY: The one the Miscellaneous Workers Union was trying to get rid of was his supervisor, who was trying to get some work out of him. The union tried to get rid of the senior gardener because he was the guy who was trying to get the other gardener to work. The union cannot stand gardeners who work, but they prop up gardeners who refuse to work. They transferred him from the electorate of the member for Helena to the electorate of the member for Armadale. The Minister for Education should have sacked him; he should not just transfer his problems to other electorates.

Dr Gallop: Do you think the Minister for Education should sack gardeners?

Mr FRED TUBBY: The Minister for Education should instruct the ministry to perform its duties, and if incompetent gardeners are on the staff the ministry should do the sacking. The Minister should be instructing the ministry to get out there and supervise gardening staff correctly and not kowtow to the Miscellaneous Workers Union, which is so powerful, so strong and so influential in the Ministry of Education that it can do anything it likes - and the Minister will not deny it.

Mr Gordon Hill: Rubbish.

Mr FRED TUBBY: It is not rubbish. The Minister for Local Government should talk to a few members. He should talk to the Minister on the front bench and find out why that gardener could not be sacked. It was because of the power of the Miscellaneous Workers Union - that man who is now sitting in this House.

Mr MacKinnon: He is not tonight.

Mr FRED TUBBY: No, he is absent at the moment, but he sits in this House. Perhaps that link between the Miscellaneous Workers Union and the Ministers in this place will be broken. I hope it will, so that at least the ministry can start supervising the gardeners correctly. Members opposite have sidetracked me considerably with this topic.

I now wish to mention a problem which has been going on for over 20 years in my electorate; that is, the Roleystone television translator tower. Ever since transmission commenced in this State some areas of the hills have been unable to get any reception. For the last two years these residents have been living in hope because some testing has been carried out to see if a translator tower would solve the problem. The result of the testing was that a good site was found on which to establish a translator tower and it happened to be on a hill, on land owned by the Department of Planning and Urban Development. Due to some

procrastination on the part of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, which did not know whether it would be in or out of the project, the commercial operators in Perth decided to go ahead on their own and erect this translator tower. They approached the Department of Planning and Urban Development with a view to erecting the tower on the department's land, and the department said it would cost the operators \$12 000 this year for the lease, and from then on they would pay that sum plus whatever else is extracted over future years.

Because this translator tower is to be constructed by the commercial operators, maintained by them and used to provide a public service in that it will be improving television reception in the hills area, I do not think it is right that this Government should ask anything but a peppercorn rental for the very small area of land that will accommodate this tower. The whole thing has come to a dead stop. I have contacted the Minister for Planning and she has done nothing but procrastinate about the whole issue. I have spoken to her personally and she has sought my advice on it. I told her exactly what I have told the House; that is, the commercial operators are providing a public service and therefore should pay no more than a mere peppercorn rental for this piece of land.

On 15 May I placed a question on notice to the Minister representing the Minister for Planning which read -

- (1) Has a final decision been made on the leasing arrangements for the erection of a television translator tower on Planning and Urban Development land in Roleystone?
- (2) If yes, what is to be the annual lease payment?
- (3) If no, when will this matter be finalised?

It is now 19 June and I am still waiting for a reply to my question; no decision has been made. This is absolutely disgraceful as people have been waiting for over 20 years for a reasonable reception. Testing has been going on over the past two years and residents could finally see a conclusion to their plight, but the whole thing has come to nought simply because a Government department has demanded a high rental for the small area of land involved. This is quite unnecessary. The Minister must step in and make a practical decision so that the program can go ahead. I hope the Minister will make that decision quickly, because even were permission granted today it would take another six months to do the work.

The Government has wasted \$850 million, which could have been spent on schools and their maintenance, and particularly on the Armadale Senior High School. Ministers are demanding ridiculous rents from commercial bodies which are trying to provide a community service. As a consequence of those two issues I will not support the Bill as it would mean sending more money down the track to follow that which has been lost in the past. I oppose the Bill.

**MR RIPPER** (Belmont) [9.23 pm]: Members of this House and observers have often noted the soporific quality of debate in this place and have justly compared those qualities with the soporific quality of daytime TV soap operas. The events of the past week or so gave me cause to hope that we might see some more excitement in this place. I was confidently expecting that we might have at least a short run of "Dynasty" and I was bitterly disappointed when I discovered that as a result of a 21:13 vote we still have "Days Of Our Lives". That is something members will regret in terms of excitement and interest in this House.

On a more serious note the purpose of the Bill is to authorise the Government to expend money to provide services to Western Australians. We must judge the people in this place on how they vote on the Bill, not on their rhetoric or on the reasons they give. What is the Leader of the Opposition's position on this Bill? I do not ask what is the Opposition's position because it seems to have several positions. Shorn of all the rhetoric, of all the reasons given and of all the sound and the fury, the Leader of the Opposition proposes that the Opposition should vote against the provision of services to Western Australians. He proposes that the Opposition should vote against giving the Government authority to pay teachers, police officers and hospital workers. Whatever reasons the Opposition gives, the Bill before the House authorises the Government to spend money on providing services to Western Australians and if the Opposition votes against that Bill or takes action which denies those services to Western Australia it is threatening the political conventions which underlie

our system of Government. Those conventions are important as our Constitution, and indeed our system of laws, depend not only on what is written but also on conventions.

I have had a quick look through the index and the documents that comprise our Constitution and members will be interested to note that no mention is made of the Opposition in that document. The entire role and status of the Opposition in our political system is based on convention. The position of Leader of the Opposition is not a position in the written Constitution, but it is certainly a constitutional position so far as the conventions are concerned. That is one simple example which demonstrates how important the conventions are to the operation of the Constitution in our political system. Most people would say that our political system is essentially based on a competition between Government and Opposition, yet one finds when looking in that document that the Opposition does not rate a mention; its position is based entirely on convention. It behoves everyone to pay attention to those conventions when they consider taking political action.

Western Australia is celebrating its centenary year of responsible government and it is a basic convention of the Westminster system of Government that the Government is responsible to the lower House of Parliament. It is that basic tradition which the Leader of the Opposition will flout if he can get the numbers in the upper House.

Some weeks ago in this House we had a debate on accountability.

Mr Omodei interjected.

Mr RIPPER: I will refer to the role of the upper House in a minute. Some mention was made in the Auditor General's statement of a problem with the accountability of the State Government Insurance Office. The SGIO was accountable in two directions: To the SGIC and separately to this House. The Auditor General pointed out quite correctly that this created a conflict and that a body should not be accountable to two institutions. In making those comments the Auditor General was supported by the Opposition. However, if one followed the logic of the Leader of the Opposition's proposal to block Supply in the upper House, one would have a Government which is not accountable to one House of Parliament but to two Houses of Parliament. This would be a direct contradiction of the Westminster political system. That is a very dangerous thing for our political system because the Houses are elected on different electoral systems and it is most unlikely that the same political force will control both Houses of Parliament, given the different electoral systems we have adopted. By following the logic of the Opposition's proposed action the Government will be accountable to two different bodies composed of different political forces. That is a recipe for political instability and social conflict and is not something one would expect a political party in this State to support in the centenary of responsible government. The convention which underlies responsible government is that the party which maintains the confidence of the lower House is the party which forms the Government. No convention states that the confidence of both Houses of Parliament must be maintained; the lower House is the determining House so far as the formation of the Government is concerned. That is a very important convention which, in the centenary of responsible government in Western Australia, should be supported by all political forces.

I am quite surprised that the conservative political parties have sought to undermine convention in the way they have. I am even more surprised that they have posed this threat to social cohesion. Many of us can remember the aftermath of the events of 1975 and the bitterness in the community, the arguments and the conflict which surrounded that event. Even today some people have very bitter memories of the dismissal of the Whitlam Government following the Opposition's deferral of Supply in the Senate. That is an important factor to which conservatives, of all people, should pay particular attention for the future of this community, for its quality of life, to preserve social cohesion, to minimise unnecessary social conflict and to preserve respect for our Constitution.

Democracy requires that not only should the majority rule, but also there should be an acknowledgment by the minority that the authority is properly constituted and should be obeyed. If the Opposition were to go ahead and take this action, if it were successful and if it won a subsequent election, it would find that this problem would come home to roost as it came home to roost for the Fraser Government. That has been confirmed by a distinguished member of that Government, John Howard, who said that the Fraser Government was inhibited in making the decisions necessary in the interests of the country because of the way

in which it came to power. Its legitimacy was not properly constituted or recognised by a significant section of the community because of the actions it took to flout convention.

Mr Omodei: Who had the control of the Senate in Fraser's early days?

Mr RIPPER: It does not matter who had control of the Senate; it does not matter who has control of the upper House. What matters is the convention that the lower House determines these matters. If both Houses differently elected are determining these sorts of matters, what we have is political instability and social conflict.

It is surprising that the conservative political forces, of all of the political forces in this State, are threatening to take this action. Why do we have conservatives in politics? The role of conservatives is as the protectors of our traditions and as the guardians of social cohesion; yet those forces are flouting our traditions and threatening our social cohesion. The action which the Leader of the Opposition proposes his party should take betrays parliamentary traditions; it betrays the interests and the rights of Western Australians; it betrays their expectations of Government services; and it betrays conservative political ideology. It is an example of naked opportunism.

Perhaps the situation is not as bad as all that. That is the policy of the Leader of the Opposition; however, it is not necessarily the policy of many of his political colleagues. We have been entertained over the last few days. Those of us who pay attention to the media have noticed that the Leader of the Opposition's policy is not necessarily the policy of many members of the Liberal Party. For example, on 8 June on 6WF "Drive", the member for Cottesloe said -

I may be quite wrong, Kevin but I feel my judgment, politically, is that the opportunity to block Supply has passed.

That is one member of the Opposition who does not follow the strategy proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. Another statement made by the President of the Legislative Council, Hon Clive Griffiths, is probably a little more dramatic. He said on 6WF News -

The Legislative Councillors of the Liberal Party resolutely make the decision (rejecting Supply). Leaders of (the) parliamentary Liberal Party do not make the decisions on behalf of Upper House members. Anybody that does, does so at his peril, I suggest.

He also follows a different policy. Again, those of us who pay close attention to the media would have noticed a third position appearing in the *Albany Advertiser* which states -

Although not committed to the concept of blocking supply, himself, Mr Watt . . .

That is the way the *Albany Advertiser* describes Albany MLA Leon Watt's position on the blocking of Supply.

The most interesting position is that adopted by the new Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He was caught in a somewhat embarrassing position where his statements on the Supply question were interpreted in many quarters as being at variance with the statements of the Leader of the Opposition. Peter Kennedy, a leading political journalist, analysed his statement on the Des Guilloyle program on 6WF - the ABC has had some good programs apart from the recent "Four Corners" program - in these terms -

. . . so clearly the new deputy leader has identified Supply as a catalyst to the timing for the move against MacKinnon and also that now saying Supply and the threat of an early election must fade into the background, whereas only a couple of weeks ago it was Barry MacKinnon saying it looks as if we're locked into an election by August . . . so clearly a change of direction, and I think Kevin Minson probably reflects the mood of a big section of the parliamentary Liberal Party.

It seems to me that there are a variety of positions in the Parliamentary Liberal Party and we might not be subjected to the very serious deleterious effects of the strategy proposed by the Leader of the Opposition because it does not seem that he commands the confidence of his deputy or of the remainder of the Parliamentary Liberal Party.

It may be that the avowed policy of the Opposition Leader will not be followed. However, if it is followed, it will be an indictment of the Opposition's commitment to constitutional processes and to social and political stability in this State. It will be an indictment of the

Opposition's commitment to its own political ideology, to the quality of life, to the services which Western Australians expect and to social cohesion in this State. However, we may not see that. Today we are seeing a weakening echo of more robust times and the last twitches of a dead political strategy.

I want to deal with a few comments that were made in debate today and in recent debates about Homeswest. I was astonished to hear the member for Applecross comment on Homeswest tenants and their rights. He said he wanted Homeswest tenants to have poorer quality housing built on cheaper land. He said Homeswest is spending too much; it is building housing for tenants on land that is too good and houses that are of too good a quality. I was surprised by that because that seemed to be at variance with something I heard earlier from the Opposition in this House. I researched *Hansard* and discovered a speech by the member for Melville in which he said -

The Government has called these group houses pensioner units and used nice names such as single, detached housing and so on. I would like to talk about these single detached houses. Do members know how big these houses are? They are on 350 square metres of land. One would not put a rabbit into that sort of place. The Government is saying, "This is what people want."

That is an example of more division within the Opposition. On the one hand the member for Melville said that the quality of housing is too poor and on the other hand the member for Applecross said, "Make it worse." That is an interesting contradiction. It would be nice to say that both of them cannot be right, but that one of them may be right.

Mr Gordon Hill: They can't agree on leaders, either.

Mr RIPPER: That is right. Perhaps the difference reflects the respective positions which the two members occupy in this House, especially when those positions are compared with their reported aspirations. It might be tempting to say that both these people cannot be right and, therefore, one is. It seems to me that both are wrong. One very important objective of Homeswest's housing policy is supported alike by Homeswest tenants and communities in which Homeswest housing is located; that is, the importance of maintaining a diverse social mix so that one does not create a ghetto of Homeswest tenants. Homeswest housing should be distributed throughout the metropolitan area and Homeswest tenants should have the right to live in all suburbs. There is no reason why Homeswest tenants should not be located in all suburbs of Perth. The member for Applecross is quite wrong when he suggests that some areas are too good for Homeswest housing and that some views are too good for Homeswest tenants. As a member representing a substantial number of Homeswest tenants whose quality of life I am interested in, I do not hold the view that some areas are too good for them. I do not believe some views should be reserved for people whose financial position does not make them eligible for Homeswest housing.

Mr Lewis: What about the shopkeepers in the area? Have you spoken to them?

Mr RIPPER: I will deal with that question in a moment.

Mr MacKinnon: I said you have to use your resources properly.

Mr RIPPER: Of course we should use resources sensibly but we should not confine Homeswest tenants to particular ghettos, to cheap land and to certain suburbs.

I refer to the comments made by the member for Melville who criticised the low to medium density housing units which Homeswest has been constructing in the metropolitan area.

Mr Shave: That is your term. Low to medium density is a nonsense term.

Mr RIPPER: It is a technical term which is agreed to by the local government authority which approves the planning in my area. The Belmont City Council has no objection to the use of that term for Homeswest developments in my electorate.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Donovan): Order! It is very difficult for the *Hansard* reporter who is trying to decide which point of view to record - the member on his feet or the members interjecting. We should use the resources of this place rather more wisely and somewhat more courteously so that the member on his feet can be heard and the debate can proceed with some degree of order.

Mr RIPPER: This gives me the opportunity to deal with some of the questions related to low and medium density housing. The member for Melville was extremely critical of Homeswest developments in Willagee. I place on the record my appreciation of Homeswest unit developments in the electorate I represent. My experience is that those developments are very enthusiastically supported by Homeswest tenants. People come to my office to ask if I can help them obtain a unit in those new developments. These are people currently in Homeswest housing who see the new units, are enthusiastic about them, and want to transfer to one of those new units. I have visited the units and spoken to the tenants, and the universal response is that they are very happy with Homeswest. So good is Homeswest's reputation in the area that the Belmont City Council has used in its guidelines to private developers for medium density development some of the planning features of the Homeswest development. When a private developer comes to me because he cannot get approval for the construction of some basic units, I take him on a tour of Homeswest housing and show him the type of development the local authority wants. I advise him to copy the Homeswest developments and to build at the same standard if he wants approval for private developments. That is the current situation with regard to Homeswest developments in my electorate, and it is very much appreciated by the residents and results in their actively seeking transfers to the new units.

Homeswest has come a long way from the days when a State Housing Commission home was a weatherboard construction with a little number identifying it for all to see. In my electorate one cannot distinguish between a Homeswest development and a private development except that by and large the Homeswest developments are better than the private developments.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker has made the point on a number of occasions that it is very difficult to hear the member on his feet and to record him accurately in *Hansard* when at least two other members are interjecting and carrying on another debate. I ask the Minister and the member for Applecross to cease their debate, and the member for Belmont to use the resources of the Chair and to direct his remarks to the Chair. In that case I am sure the next seven minutes will be the most productive of his speech.

Mr RIPPER: In that case I am sure the next seven minutes will be very productive, and I will certainly address my remarks entirely to you, Mr Acting Speaker.

I conclude on the question of Homeswest developments in the Redcliffe and Rivervale areas. These developments are highly respected by the local community, and are welcomed by tenants and prospective tenants. They reflect a commitment by this Government to public housing, which is not evident in the record of the previous State Government. Members of the Opposition have pretended they are active and vigorous representatives of the interests of Homeswest residents. I suggest that those members examine the record of the previous State Liberal Government and compare it with the record of this Government. The number of Homeswest units completed each year in the term of this Government is far and away ahead of the number of units completed under the previous Government. One can only conclude that Opposition members who adopt these postures on Homeswest housing are guilty of a substantial degree of hypocrisy.

One interjection by the member for Applecross is worth replying to. He mentioned local shopkeepers in my electorate who are concerned about the progress of Homeswest developments, and asked whether I had spoken to them. It is interesting to compare the action taken by the member for Applecross with my action. The member for Applecross issued a Press release and that was the end of his action. I organised a meeting between the local retailers and Homeswest officials. A full briefing on the progress was provided for the retailers and the opportunity was available, and plenty of time allowed, for local retailers to put their views squarely to Homeswest. In the long run I believe those local retailers will find their businesses will be substantially advantaged by the Homeswest developments. The population density in the area before redevelopment was very low. Many houses were on quarter acre blocks and were occupied by one person. That is not a good catchment for local businesses in the area. One of the positive spin-offs from the Redcliffe redevelopment will be the enhancement of that local business area, and perhaps a return of some of the services for which pensioners in particular will be very grateful. For instance, the population had



fallen to such an extent that no local bank has an office in the area. When the redevelopment occurs and the population increases we will see some of the benefits of low to medium density housing as there will be additional population to support the extra services that people need.

My final comment on Homeswest matters concerns the comments of the member for Applecross regarding antisocial tenants. He led the House to believe that Homeswest does not take action against antisocial tenants.

Mr Fred Tubby: It does not.

Mr RIPPER: That may be the experience of the member who interjected; it may also reflect his inability to achieve results for his constituents. My experience has been that Homeswest will act on cases of antisocial behaviour. We had substantial problems in Rivervale last year and three households were either evicted or transferred compulsorily. I am not saying that it is easy to do because Homeswest is the houser of last resort.

Several members interjected.

Mr RIPPER: The member for Melville is somewhat ignorant of certain events and confuses events of the past two weeks with those which occurred in the final six months of last year. Homeswest has a difficult task because it is the houser of last resort. No-one wants to see children, who may not be guilty of any offence, out on the street or living in cars. We have to think of such matters when making decisions about what happens. My experience has been that Homeswest will act to preserve the security and quiet enjoyment of its neighbourhoods and will act to evict antisocial tenants. What is required is more members of Parliament showing concern about these matters and taking appropriate actions. The major purpose of this debate, it should be said once again, is to point out that Homeswest's services and other Government services will be affected if the strategy of the Leader of the Opposition is followed because it proposes denying this Government authority to spend for the benefit of Western Australians. It is an appalling strategy which should be rejected by all those concerned with the integrity of our constitutional processes.

MR BRADSHAW (Wellington) [9.55 pm]: It is important that members put their views on the Supply Bill. I found some of the statements made today, such as those of the member for Belmont, quite incredible. He talked of how good Homeswest is. It may be all right, but one sees that this Government has failed the people of Western Australia when one looks at the number of people who are now queuing for houses and who have to wait four or five years for a Homeswest house.

Mrs Henderson: Our housing lists are shorter per capita than when members opposite were in Government.

Mr BRADSHAW: I am talking about Western Australia.

Mrs Henderson: On a population basis, they are shorter.

Mr BRADSHAW: People have to wait longer.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! This may be what occurred while I was out of the Chamber briefly, but it will not occur now that I am back. The member for Wellington is well known for listening silently to other members and not interjecting in any way; I will therefore give him the protection of the Chair.

Mr BRADSHAW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. A huge number of people are now waiting for Homeswest houses. This is not necessarily to do with people who normally would have been channelled into Homeswest houses but with the fact that this Government has failed the people of Western Australia and fewer people are able to afford their own homes because of high interest rates and inflation. This is forcing more people into State housing.

It is interesting that last year the former Premier decided he was under threat because there were rumours about members opposite sharpening knives to give him a good one-two in the back - which they eventually did - so he produced a letter with all their signatures on it which virtually bound members opposite to the misdeeds and mismanagement of the State which had occurred over the previous four or five years and probably since this Government came to office in 1983. If some members opposite had any principles or gumption they would have said that what had been going on was not good enough.

Our schools are deteriorating and none of our public buildings is receiving reasonable maintenance. In a few years we will face a bill for millions of dollars of maintenance to bring all our public buildings back to a reasonable standard. The health system is in a shambles because of the chaos created by a lack of funds for the health system. The Bunbury Regional Hospital, for instance, sends patients to Perth for routine operations such as removing a fish bone from the throat, or appendectomies. Members opposite have not made one squeak about those matters. It is interesting that they were prepared to sit back and defend what has happened in the past and also sign a letter of support. It is reported in today's *Daily News* that more people are lining up for charity because they are in desperate straits due to the policies of this Government. A record number of bankruptcies have occurred in Western Australia.

When driving up from Harvey today I thought the roads were absolutely atrocious. Just south of Waroona on the South Western Highway part of the road is in such a bad state that there are signs similar to the ones at Fairbridge, also on the South Western Highway, telling motorists to drive slowly because the road is so bad they are likely to bounce across into oncoming vehicles. Those signs have been there for a year. I had a conversation with the sergeant at the Pinjarra Police Station who says that road is dangerous.

Mr Taylor: Drive slowly, then.

Mr BRADSHAW: That is why those signs are up.

Mr Taylor: It is not dangerous if you drive slowly.

Mr BRADSHAW: One should not have to drive slowly on a main road which has a 110 kmh speed limit. It is a sad state of affairs when our roads are deteriorating so badly. In a few years we will be up for hundreds of millions of dollars to bring our buildings and roads up to standard.

I was told yesterday that Homeswest has just done a deal with Skipper Mitsubishi to lease 150 vehicles. The fact that they need 150 vehicles is no big deal because they will probably replace 150 other vehicles. However, they are to be leased instead of bought as they were in the past. It will obviously be cheaper in the long run to buy a vehicle rather than lease it.

Mr Graham: Will you give your leased vehicle back?

Mr BRADSHAW: I did not suggest that we lease vehicles. I do not agree with the leasing of those vehicles, either. All Government departments will do the same thing in the long run and it will be very expensive for the people of Western Australia. The Government is capitalising on the cars being replaced, which will bring millions of dollars to try to balance the Budget for the Government this year. It is a very poor state of affairs when we capitalise on what we have tied up in these vehicles instead of selling them off and buying the next lot. It is all well and good in the short term, but in the long term the result will be disastrous for the people of Western Australia.

Members opposite have been burying their heads in the sand with regard to the money which has been lost as a result of the Rothwells rescue, the petrochemical plant, the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd deal and all the wheeling and dealing which has been done by this four on the floor Government since the time of Brian Burke. If it had been eight on the floor we would have been completely sunk. The amount of money which has gone is atrocious. All we want is a Royal Commission. We are not proposing the blocking of Supply because we want to do that. Basically we want a Royal Commission, and the only avenue we have is to block Supply. I support that move 100 per cent, though I would prefer the Government to say, "We will have a Royal Commission." It is all right to say, "The McCusker inquiry will look at all these things." It will not; it has a very narrow field of reference; it will not look at the things we want looked at such as the people involved in these projects where the Government has lost millions of dollars.

Last year I put a question on notice to the Minister representing the Attorney General asking if the Corporate Affairs Department or any other body had looked into the \$400 million paid out to Dallas Dempster and Laurie Connell, and the split of \$350 million paid to Laurie Connell and \$50 million paid to Dallas Dempster. The answer was that it was an impertinent question. What rubbish! I asked a simple question. The Corporate Affairs Department should have been investigating this matter to find out why there was such a strange split in this deal.

Another interesting thing is the lack of interest in Gofair Investments shown by the Corporate Affairs Department and the Government. When the Government and Bond took over the petrochemical plant there was no plant, but there was an account for \$58 million. All that was said was, "We are not going to pay it." Nobody asked who Gofair was, or whether it was legitimate. Was there a squeak from anybody? Not a squeak. The Government knew that it was a rip-off. The long term plan was to rip off those people who were to invest in this petrochemical project. It is atrocious that this Government tossed this problem aside. I believe the Government tossed it aside because it knew who was involved; it knew it was a rip-off and it was the Government's mates who were doing the ripping off.

It is important that the people of Western Australia should know where the money has gone, even though members opposite do not want them to know because they know a few of their mates will be caught up in it and will end up in gaol once the truth of the matter comes out. It is very important that we have a Royal Commission. I implore the Government to come to its senses and set up a Royal Commission. The Government should not talk about the McCusker inquiry because that has a very limited field. The Government has not come to the party at this stage and it does not look as if it will because it does not want to dob in its mates. I shall oppose this legislation.

MR SHAVE (Melville) [10.05 pm]: A couple of comments were attributed to me regarding Homeswest redevelopment and I would like to clarify them. For the benefit of the member for Belmont, who obviously does not understand anything about density -

Several members interjected.

Mr SHAVE: I stand corrected. Density has nothing to do with intelligence; it has to do with the number of houses one can build on a block. My principal argument and disagreement with this Government is about what constitutes high density and what constitutes low density. I will not detract from any statements I have made previously about R40 zonings. I do not propose to go through the figures to justify the fact that when one puts 64 units on 18 blocks which previously housed 54 people and now house 132 people, that constitutes high density. If the Minister and the member for Belmont say that does not constitute high density, that is their prerogative.

I see that in this week's *Canning-Melville Times* the Minister for Housing says that the redevelopments will also result in big savings for the taxpayers with less demand for costly infrastructure like roads, sewerage and power on the outskirts of the metropolitan area. She says it is ridiculous for young families to be forced out to the fringes of suburbia when prime real estate close to the city can be redeveloped and used more efficiently.

Dr Alexander: Do you not agree with that?

Mr SHAVE: That is typical of what this debate is all about -

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of background conversation is extraordinarily high.

Mr SHAVE: This debate is about where people want to live and how they want to live. The longer the Minister tries to tell people that they should live in rabbit warrens and not have a decent backyard in which to bring up their kids, the worse it will become for her Government. If she believes that people would not opt to live in outer suburbia with a backyard and a garden and somewhere for their kids to play, she is wrong. To convince the Minister of that I shall give some statistics which apply to Willagee. Because the Minister was not intelligent enough to do a survey of the people before telling them what was good for them, which is typical - it is socialist propaganda to tell people what they should do instead of letting them do what is best for them - let me tell her that I have done an extensive survey of the suburb of Willagee and the overwhelming majority of people support my view.

Mrs Henderson: That is not true.

Mr SHAVE: That is true. I am sorry, but this was an independent survey, not one of the Minister's Government surveys. These people were commissioned. They went to Homeswest people, and this is what the Homeswest people said to them. They said we should have done this before. We went ahead and drew up the plans. Now Homeswest has drawn up another set of plans. I do not know whether that was for the benefit of the people or for my benefit, but a message was received at my office that three Homeswest officers wanted to come down as a matter of priority and show me the new concept plans for

Willagee. We have seen the original concept plan and we have seen money spent; now we have another plan. I am interested to see the new concept plan.

Mr Court: Will it have communal sand pits?

The SPEAKER: Order! The House is deteriorating again. It is only 10 o'clock; it is not yet late enough for this sort of behaviour.

Mr SHAVE: For the benefit of the member for Nedlands, if they do have a communal sand pit for the children they will continue to contract various colds and associated health problems, as are being experienced in other areas such as Coolbellup where Government developments have been thrown into chaos.

One thing is absolutely sure, no way in the world does anyone at Willagee want pensioner units built on super blocks of land in the middle of detached housing or units, or whatever they are called, where elderly people cannot have peace and quiet. If the Minister speaks to the people who are coming to see me - apparently they intend to visit me tomorrow but I will be in Parliament - she should inform them that if they are to show me anything it should be something which is sensible and which works. What does not work is to put up a whole group of pensioner housing units in the middle of areas allocated for younger people with families.

The Government's redevelopment plans for Willagee are not what the residents want. The majority, that is 71 per cent, do not believe that senior citizens should be housed in property adjacent to families with children and teenagers. They reject the Government's proposal to locate senior citizens' units and family units in close proximity. The residents surveyed said that the senior citizens would suffer from a lack of privacy and peace. It is reasonable to understand that. Where would the Minister want to be, if she were an elderly person?

Mrs Henderson interjected.

Mr SHAVE: That is just so stupid. The Minister refers to the average person, and that shows how silly she is. The average person who is elderly buys a unit away from younger people.

Mrs Henderson: Look at the Belmont venture. People are lining up to go into them.

Mr SHAVE: The people living in units in Belmont have a choice - either they live under a tree or they take what the Government gives. Of course they take a unit because they have a choice - live under a tree, in a refuge, or wait four or five years because of the Government's incompetent policies. Like her predecessor, the Minister is an incompetent Minister.

To return to the subject, an overwhelming majority of 98 per cent of people interviewed prefer detached housing for families. The Government's plan to provide unit accommodation for families is totally rejected by residents. The Government's plan to cram double the number of properties into Willagee is against the wishes of people who live in the area; it is also against the wishes of the residents.

The statistics are obvious; it goes on and on. The Minister should realise that every time an election or a council election is held in Willagee the situation gets worse for the Government and for the people the Government supports because the Government is flogging a dead horse. The Minister can say what she likes; she can say that what I am doing is for electoral reasons. If it is for electoral reasons, I will be successful because the people of that area support what I say.

Mrs Henderson: They don't.

Mr SHAVE: They do.

Mrs Henderson: Why didn't they vote for your candidate?

Mr SHAVE: The overwhelming majority of people surveyed, that is 65 per cent, believe that more crime and greater social problems would result.

If the Minister wants to talk about candidates, I was not actively supporting any candidate. However, a prominent councillor in the area who is a member of the Labor Party and hands out Labor Party cards at the Willagee Primary School was defeated 2:1 and 3:1 at the last election. If the Minister thinks that I am wrong she should go out of the Chamber and have a look because again she is wrong. The Minister has been listening to other people instead of talking to the people involved; again she is wrong.

Comments were made by the member for Belmont regarding people in Belmont being happy with what is happening; that is, they are happy about being given a house. It should interest the Minister to know some of the people who have been objecting to the proposal in Willagee went to Belmont, independent of the Minister's people, and received the same response. They were appreciative of having a house or a unit; they did not want to live under a tree or in a refuge and that is understandable. However, they wanted more open space.

I notice that one of the departmental officers has been making public comment about the densities for various suburbs. The whole issue will be resolved only when the Government accepts that on a quarter acre block of land, it is unacceptable if three units are built in which to house families with children because such a development cannot provide decent open areas for children. If the Government is wise enough to realise that it should be opting for R20 zoning in State Housing areas where duplexes can be built but not triplexes, we will have no problem. Until the basic problem is addressed, the issue will not go away.

**DR LAWRENCE** (Glendalough - Treasurer) [10.17 pm]: I rise briefly this evening, after a lengthy and rambling debate for the most part from the Opposition, to reaffirm the Government's position in relation to Supply. Before I do so - and I am sorry he is not present - I express my regret that Mr Hassell, the member for Cottesloe, will be leaving us.

**Mr MacKinnon**: Hear, hear!

**Dr LAWRENCE**: Mr Hassell is a man who has made a substantial contribution to Parliament, a man of intellect and integrity. Members of this House would want us to wish him well, and to express regret on behalf of the Opposition for his passing because the Opposition ranks will be sadly depleted by that departure. We wish that in future Mr Hassell will enjoy whatever life he chooses.

**Mr Court**: Will he become a Royal Commissioner?

**Dr LAWRENCE**: He and I have had discussions on that.

**Mr MacKinnon**: Will he?

**Dr LAWRENCE**: I do not think that I can offer him that role. It was a nice joke and I appreciated it.

The question of what the funds are spent on has preoccupied some members tonight. We have received an unhelpful contribution from some members of the Opposition - epitomised, I regret to say, by the last member to speak - on the question of funding for housing.

**Mr Shave**: I am hurt.

**Dr LAWRENCE**: I said it mildly. However, to be distracted by some issues raised, although they are important, would be to miss the main point of the debate this evening. I take some comfort from the fact that the Leader of the National Party at least tried to address some of the issues facing the State especially in the ensuing weeks. I refer to the comments on the Commonwealth-State financial relations. I will be attending the Premiers' Conference next week and it is critical that this State expresses clearly its dismay at the apparent Commonwealth position that we should endure further cuts in grants to the States. In the last seven years those grants have been cut substantially, both in global terms and in terms of the special purpose grants. It is the latter for the moment on which I wish to comment because they are very important in relation to the State's capacity to provide the sorts of services that have been alluded to in some debates.

**Mr MacKinnon**: I agree with some of your comments, particularly where you say you need three to five years to plan finances. I do not agree with your statements about the States not having cutbacks. The Labor Government has squandered the best revenue windfall this State has ever seen and it doesn't deserve any special consideration.

**Dr LAWRENCE**: The Leader of the Opposition wants to make this situation unique to Western Australia. The difficulties that the States face are universal. The situation in Tasmania which has enjoyed, for want of a better description, a Liberal Government until recently, is so parlous that it could be described in most terms as bankrupt, despite having received substantial additional support from the Commonwealth Government.

The Leader of the Opposition should realise that this State has very clearly indicated on a number of occasions the losses that are attached, for instance, to the rescue of the Teachers

Credit Society, Swan Building Society and Rothwells Ltd. In comparison to the very severe cuts imposed by the Commonwealth Government and in comparison to the significant downturns now being experienced they are not significant features of our economic climate. The sooner the Opposition recognises that, the better, in terms of its policy development and its understanding of the current financial position.

Over the years the Commonwealth has not only significantly cut grants to the States in overall terms, but also attached onerous conditions to special purpose grants. Increasingly - this precedes the current Hawke Labor Government - the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to use the Premiers' Conference, and the allocation of funds in between those conferences as a mechanism to control State policy making. Governments throughout this country of all political colours will, I am sure, complain of that.

We have seen examples in relation to health, the most recent being the women's health policy; education, for example in relation to Aboriginal education policy; housing and child care; and we have seen the most recent and difficult examples in relation to transport policy. It is important that the States, together with the Commonwealth, engage in a very careful reassessment of federalism and Federal-State fiscal relations. I will be developing that theme further in the ensuing days.

I congratulate the Leader of the National Party for drawing attention to what has the potential to be a very significant diminution in States' powers and States' abilities to finance their own activities in a manner which the people of the State determine to be proper. We are accountable through this Parliament to the people of Western Australia and it is important that any State Government insist upon the State Government's right to policy and policy development. I welcome contributions in those terms from the Opposition.

Much has been made about the use to which funds have been put and I have no doubt that, on any occasion when members wish to discuss their favourite subjects or their electorate concerns, they will find examples where more needs to be done. This State is growing faster than any other State, it has a younger profile population and the demands on its infrastructure and its education and health services are at a level never experienced before in this country, let alone in this State. That needs to be recognised by the Commonwealth in our State financial relationship.

As Treasurer I would not say that every area of Government administration and financial expenditure is as good as it could be. That would be complacent and a Government would not deserve to occupy these benches if it made that claim. However, in relation to many of the areas that members mentioned, the State Government's rate of growth and expenditure has been substantial. For example, a 50 per cent increase was made in the State's allocation to fund hospitals in the last three years. That cannot be considered to be insignificant. Equally, the last couple of Budgets have provided increases for education of up to 13 per cent, more than covering inflation and the growth in the population rate.

However, it is still not enough to meet the ever escalating expectations of the people of Western Australia. That is a problem the Government has to deal with. In terms of the standards and quality of services and facilities, how does the Government ensure that it keeps pace with the community's expectations without placing a severe burden on the taxpayer? In the case of State taxes, which are essentially regressive, how can we achieve this without stifling business initiatives and developments?

They are the issues the Opposition should be addressing when talking about the local areas it would like to see improved. How can the State continue to grow in that way without a very significant change in the sources of funding to the State Government? We need a greater share of taxation revenue. During the seven years that Labor has been in Government, the States have had their share of taxation revenue from the Commonwealth cut from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. As a result, the States have used a variety of means - some less successful than others, some spectacularly less successful than others - to attempt to raise revenue. In that context, the Government must examine some of the business failures of which the Opposition has made so much.

I refer to the Opposition's continued call for a Royal Commission. It has now apparently seen the light of day and, at least in the upper House, has decided that that is not the proper action to take. We saw the spectacle in this State -

Mr Lewis: You mean not having a Royal Commission.

Dr LAWRENCE: I mean blocking Supply in order to achieve a Royal Commission. I understand the Opposition's desire for a Royal Commission or inquiry and I understand that desire by many people in the community. However, I have always objected very strongly to the view that this Bill should be blocked in order to achieve that end. I have put the argument many times in this place - unlike members opposite, I do not intend to repeat my view of it.

Over the last week and a half members have been treated, if that is the word, to the spectacle of the Opposition's, in a very unseemly fashion and in a very public way, pulling itself to pieces. It has not been a pretty sight for the people of Western Australia and I am sure the Opposition's supporters did not find it very attractive. Some of the members opposite who have been damaged in the process did not deserve to be so damaged; Mr Hassell is one of those people. Also, severe damage has been done to the leadership of the Opposition and that means that the party opposite is not in a position to provide the Opposition that this State deserves. It has obviously determined that it will proceed with the present leader, but my own assessment, and that of many members of the public and the media, is that that will be for the short term. In other words, the Liberal Party is in a mess again. While it is running a morally improper argument to block Supply; is not able to convince its own members of the probity of that; is disunited in the public arena; is calling one another names through the media, if it believes that it deserves to be a Government by the end of August, as the Leader of the Opposition was proposing, or by 1993, it should think again.

It is important to note the problem that confronted the Opposition in relation to the blocking of Supply. Most of the thinking members of this Parliament knew from the word go that it was a very serious matter to discuss the blocking of Supply, even in the context that the Opposition regarded as justified and given that many people in this community, including the Opposition, want a Royal Commission to inquire into Government activities.

The Opposition unleashed an argument in the community that it could not win and members opposite should have judged that in doing so it not only destroyed itself but created a degree of disunity and uncertainty in this community that I know is resented enormously even by people who support the Opposition. Sectors of the business community want nothing better than to see the Liberal and National Parties provide reasonable opposition in this Parliament and not continue to destabilise the community and the economy by their constant threats to block this legislation.

Mr MacKinnon: Did you see what the Chamber of Commerce said?

Dr LAWRENCE: I saw what the Chamber of Commerce said; I also know where some of those lines come from. It is important to me and to the people of Western Australia that we look forward to stability. My understanding is that members opposite will go through the charade this evening of voting against Supply in this House, knowing they have the protection of members in the other place who will refuse to take the unprecedented and unprincipled action of blocking Supply. The people of Western Australia owe those members a great deal. The fact that they toyed with the idea at all is perhaps not to their credit, but the fact that they have come to the right conclusion should be applauded.

I note with some disappointment that the members opposite, particularly the leader, now believe that we have, as he put it on television tonight, two Parliaments. He referred to the upper House as the other Parliament. There are not only two Parliaments in the Opposition, but there are also two parties. For the moment that is the best result for the people of Western Australia. For the long term, the division in the ranks of the Opposition, the constant movement of members between allegiances, and the very unseemly public conduct of those members has nothing to recommend it, either to this Parliament or to the other House.

I am pleased that as this debate comes to a conclusion in this House and will soon be taken up in the other House the question of Supply will be put to rest, although we will go through the charade this evening of seeing the Opposition vote against it.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

## Ayes (27)

Dr Alexander	Dr Gallop	Mr Marlborough	Mr Taylor
Mrs Beggs	Mr Graham	Mr McGinty	Mr Thomas
Mr Bridge	Mrs Henderson	Mr Pearce	Mr Thompson
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Read	Dr Watson
Mr Catania	Mr Kobelke	Mr Ripper	Mr Wilson
Mr Donovan	Dr Lawrence	Mr D.L. Smith	Mrs Watkins ( <i>Teller</i> )
Dr Edwards	Mr Leahy	Mr P.J. Smith	

## Noes (21)

Mr Ainsworth	Mr Grayden	Mr Minson	Dr Turnbull
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Kierath	Mr Nicholls	Mr Wiese
Mr Clarko	Mr Lewis	Mr Omodei	Mr Blaikie ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mr Court	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Shave	
Mr Cowan	Mr McNee	Mr Strickland	
Mrs Edwardes	Mr Mensaros	Mr Fred Tubby	

## Pairs

Mr Carr	Mr Watt
Mr Troy	Mr Hassell
Mr Grill	Mr Trenorden
Mr Cunningham	Mr House

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee and Report*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## TREASURER'S ADVANCE AUTHORISATION BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 31 May.

**MR MACKINNON** (Jandakot - Leader of the Opposition) [10.39 pm]: The Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill traditionally comes before the Parliament without very much debate. It is a procedural matter which allows the Government to draw funds in advance for the Budget allocation for the next financial year. During my remarks I will make reference to the way in which this Government has abused this process.

I advise members that it is the height of hypocrisy for the Treasurer to come into this House and talk about the leadership of political parties when she and her colleagues plotted to overthrow former Premier Dowding when he was not even in the State. She is a Premier who did not have the gumption to front her leader and indicate to him what she wanted to do; she is a Premier who hid behind the fact that the former Premier was away. With the current member for Fremantle, who has been rewarded for his efforts, and others they plotted to get rid of the man whom, only a few months before, they had pledged to support.

So much for a Premier who came into this place in such a hypocritical way talking about an Opposition which in fact has resolved its matters in a much more open and genuine way than members opposite ever did.

I turn now to the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill. My analysis of this Bill centres around the uses to which this Treasurer's Advance has been put over the past few years. It has been a convenient source of funds for failed WA Inc ventures which have been repaid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund through the Budget. This process was used first a couple of years ago and has allowed the Labor Party in Government to avoid coming to the Parliament for direct appropriations for these amounts. This provides another example of Labor's contempt of and circumvention of the Parliament.



It is interesting when one looks at the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill this year that the Premier said the following -

The monetary limit specified within clause 4 of the Bill represents an authorisation for the Treasurer to withdraw up to \$180 million for the financing of advances in the 1990-91 financial year. This represents a reduction of \$70 million over the 1989-90 authorisation specified in section 4 of the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act. The reduction is made possible by proposed improvements in the appropriation process which will be announced in the near future and by reduction by potential funding requirements in other areas.

The most important words there are, "the potential funding requirements in other areas"; in other words, the means by which this Government funded WA Inc losses through the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill will no longer be used - at least the current Government has owned up to the fact that it will no longer have to fund those losses. This followed criticism from the Opposition and comments by the Auditor General that it should use proper budgetary processes and not as in the past make payments through the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill or, as mentioned during the debate last year, through the normal Consolidated Revenue Fund process when they should have done so using a special Bill.

The process this Government has used has led it to exceed the legal limit of the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act during the past two budgetary years and has forced the Government to twice increase the allocation for the previous year in the following year. For example the 1987 Act authorised a limit of funds able to be drawn upon of \$175 million. In the 1988 Act that limit was increased to \$210 million, an extra \$35 million, the amount advanced to the R & I Bank to increase its capital base to enable it to absorb the increased liability from Teachers Credit Society. That \$35 million payment to the R & I Bank was identified in the 1988 Consolidated Revenue Fund Bill along with other WA Inc payments including advances of \$1.95 million to LandCorp; \$12 million for payments relating to the collapse of the Swan Building Society; \$18.8 million for Teachers Credit Society; and \$8 million for relocation costs of the Barrack silicon smelter project, a total of \$75.75 million.

We then saw in successive reports of the Auditor General comments which drew attention to the fact that the Government had exceeded its authorised limit proposed in the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act. The Government could not even live within the limits it had set itself but broke the law in relation to the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act. This was drawn to the attention of the Parliament by the Auditor General. It was not good enough for that merely to happen in 1988 and the same thing happened again in 1989. The Government then authorised expenditure of \$200 million which was increased by \$85 million. That corresponded with the amount needed to purchase the remaining assets and liabilities of the Teachers Credit Society.

Other payments that came out of the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act in that year were State Government Insurance Commission \$0.44 million; Western Australian Development Corporation GoldCorp, \$5.55 million; Western Australian Development Corporation LandCorp, \$0.01 million; Exim, \$1.25 million; Rothwells, \$22.54 million; Swan Building Society, \$4.64 million; and WA Government Holdings, \$38.84 million. In all the total was \$158.67 million.

We said during the debate in this place last year on both this Bill and the Budget that this was the process whereby the Government circumvented the proper processes, particularly those relating to WA Government Holdings where the Government should have come to the Parliament and sought appropriation for the amounts in the proper way but did not do so. As I said before, in 1989 the Treasurer's annual statement reported an excess of expenditure as did the Auditor General's report. In fact the Auditor General was recorded in his first report of 1990, which we debated in this place in recent times, as saying the following -

For the second successive year the authorised monetary limit of the annual *Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act* has been exceeded.

The Act specifies the maximum amount the Treasurer is authorised to withdraw from the Public Bank Account for the purposes of making advances charged to the Treasurer's Advance Account.

It then states in the recommendations -

That the Treasurer implement procedures by which control can be exercised to ensure that State entities comply with the limits authorised by Parliament.

I ask the Treasurer in her response this evening to indicate to the Parliament exactly what procedures have been implemented which will ensure that those State entities do comply in future. I sincerely hope we have seen the last of the days when the Government used the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act as a tool to fund its nefarious ventures and expenditures under the WA Inc banner. I sincerely hope that the Government and Premier have listened to the advice of the Auditor General, noted that advice and taken action as a consequence.

As the Premier indicated in her comments on the Supply Bill, there are also matters relating to the Premiers' Conference that should be noted in these types of debates. I will reserve my comments on that matter for a debate to be conducted tomorrow in this place. I repeat that I fully support the Premier's remarks in which she indicated it was time for the Federal Government to give three to five year forward estimates of expenditure. However, if the cap fits the Premier must wear it and if she is asking the Commonwealth to do that so must she bring down three to five year forward estimates in her Budget papers to show what is happening from this Government's point of view. It is not good enough for her to criticise the Commonwealth Government and not live by the same standards just as it is inappropriate for the Premier to live by one standard in the way she became Premier and then criticise others who live by different standards.

In addition, let me say also, as I will demonstrate quite clearly to the Parliament tomorrow, that the Premier should not go to Canberra, as is normally the case, and bleat and cry crocodile tears about severe cutbacks from the Commonwealth. Everybody in Australia knows that cutbacks will take place. Everybody in Australia knows that over the last four to five years, this State has had income well ahead of the rate of inflation, whether it be from land tax, payroll tax or stamp duty. That income should have allowed this Government to ensure that it had the funds necessary to provide for what all could see would be a difficult time in the future, with Governments having to rein back on expenditure. The tragedy of WA Inc is that the Government no longer has those reserves on which to fall back. The Government can bleat all it likes, but I do not believe it will get any joy from Paul Keating. It certainly will not get any joy from this side of the House when it comes to making comments about cutbacks. We all know that had this Government used the funds which were made available to it in a proper manner, this State would have been the best placed State in Australia to meet the financial stringency which will soon be imposed upon it by the Commonwealth Government.

I conclude on a note of agreement with the Premier. I too abhor the principles by which the Commonwealth Government is now imposing its will on the States through expenditure controls. It is a disgraceful situation, and the Premier must agree that, politics aside, her side has taken it to an art form. Malcolm Fraser was no angel in this matter, but Bob Hawke is twice as bad. The Premier has admitted that the latest situation, where the Commonwealth Government is trying to impose expenditure cuts, and a legal blood alcohol limit and other standards in respect of transport matters, is an absolute scandal and disgrace. I give the Premier an assurance that she will have the full, unequivocal and total support of the Opposition in her efforts to try to get some commonsense to prevail in Canberra on these matters. In the near future I will be going to Sydney for a Liberal leaders meeting and I intend to seek the same assurance from Dr John Hewson that a future Liberal Government will again start to prescribe to the proper standards of federalism, which will ensure that the States are recouped their taxation funds, as they are entitled to, with no strings attached, so that the States can properly exercise their constitutional rights and administer their States as they should.

#### *Adjournment of Debate*

MR COWAN (Merredin - Leader of the National Party) [10.54 pm]: I move -

That the debate be adjourned.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

## Ayes (20)

Mr Bradshaw	Mr Grayden	Mr Mensaros	Mr Thompson
Mr Clarko	Mr Kierath	Mr Minson	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Court	Mr Lewis	Mr Omodei	Dr Turnbull
Mr Cowan	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Shave	Mr Wiese
Mrs Edwardes	Mr McNee	Mr Strickland	Mr Blaikie (Teller)

## Noes (25)

Dr Alexander	Dr Gallop	Mr Marlborough	Mr Taylor
Mrs Beggs	Mr Graham	Mr McGinty	Dr Watson
Mr Bridge	Mrs Henderson	Mr Pearce	Mr Wilson
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Read	Mrs Watkins (Teller)
Mr Catania	Mr Kobelke	Mr Ripper	
Mr Donovan	Dr Lawrence	Mr D.L. Smith	
Dr Edwards	Mr Leahy	Mr P.J. Smith	

## Pairs

Mr Watt	Mr Carr
Mr Hassell	Mr Troy
Mr Trenorden	Mr Grill
Mr House	Mr Cunningham
Mr Ainsworth	Mr Thomas

Question thus negated.

*Debate Resumed*

MR COWAN (Merredin - Leader of the National Party) [10.57 pm]: My contribution to this debate will be very brief. Indeed, I will merely repeat some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. It is very pleasing to see that the amount of money which the Treasurer is authorised to withdraw under the Treasurer's Advance Account has been reduced from \$250 million last year to a maximum of \$180 million. Most people are aware that the additional funds last year were advanced for purposes which were quite outside those matters which could be regarded as the ordinary annual services of Government. I do not think anyone in this House, nor, for that matter, anyone in the State of Western Australia, could regard payments to bodies such as Rothwells or WA Government Holdings Ltd - and there were one or two other payments - as having any relevance to the ordinary annual services of Government.

I look forward to the day when the Government will honour its commitment that future appropriation Bills will not contain any part of those appropriations which are in fact not applicable to be listed under the rather broad title of "ordinary annual services of Government". That commitment was given last year, and I intend to do as much as is within my power to ensure that the Government honours that commitment. While that relates to the appropriation Bill, it does not relate to this Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill. It is appropriate that the moneys which are advanced under this system be confined to those matters which are listed in clause 5 of the Bill, but I have a concern about the provision that the Treasurer has the authority to make payments of an extraordinary or unforeseen nature chargeable against the Consolidated Revenue Fund or the General Loan and Capital Works Fund.

Again, that is a very broad definition which would allow the Treasurer to make an advance for any purpose. At this stage, we need an undertaking from the Treasurer that the Government will not repeat what has occurred in the past; that it will not use this method of payment to cover some unbudgeted items which amounted to a substantial figure last year. We debated that matter before giving the authority, or statutory force, well after the payment had been made. It was never envisaged that the Treasurer's Advance Account should be used for that purpose. I seek a commitment from the Government that in future it will confine its activities under the authority given by the Bill to the areas for which it was originally felt the legislation was appropriate. That certainly was not the payment to statutory bodies such as WA Government Holdings Ltd or payments to Rothwells. However,

it is for the special occasions where a department, authority or agency has gone over budget and has no authorisation to appropriate such funds and must seek additional funding for a specific purpose. A case in point would be the public hospitals which have gone over budget, and one would assume they could be funded in the last two or three months of the financial year through this system. Most people, while wanting to scrutinise closely the additional budgetary expenses, would accept that the service needs to be maintained and that a payment should be made. Under no circumstances would they support some of the reasons given for the withdrawal of moneys from this account in previous years. Having said that, I see no reason why the National Party should not support the legislation.

**MR THOMPSON** (Darling Range) [11.02 pm]: The Bill is part of a package of measures necessary to ensure the Government has funds to enable it to govern until such time as the Budget is brought down and passed later this year. I would prefer to see a conservative Government on that side of the House; it is not as though I want to be seen to be supporting the Labor Government when I support the Bill. I just believe that the people of this State made a determination that we would have a Labor Government and that Government - whether I like it or not - is entitled to have the necessary funds to carry on the job of governing. That is why I voted with the Government on this legislation.

**DR LAWRENCE** (Glendalough - Treasurer) [11.03 pm]: Members opposite have raised questions about the purposes to which this account has been put in the past. There is provision in the Bill, as there has been for a long time, as the Leader of the National Party has indicated, to make payments of an extraordinary and unforeseen nature. Such payments, however, by the nature of this Act, are required subsequently to be submitted to Parliament for appropriation; it is not as if they are beyond parliamentary scrutiny. They are, as members opposite have indicated, and certainly it is the Government's intention that they only be made for payments of an extraordinary and unforeseen nature in the first instance, or making a routine advance on such terms as the Treasurer sees fit; that is, temporary financing particularly of public works and the provision of services and supplies. As indicated, the amount available in the account is reduced deliberately and, as indicated in the second reading speech, we will be ensuring further changes and improvements in the appropriation process. They will be the subject of announcements later this year.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Committee and Report*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

### **WADC LIQUIDATION BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of debate from 31 May.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Court.

*House adjourned at 11.10 pm*

---

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION - PAYMENTS

*Rothwells Ltd - Spedley Securities Ltd*

135. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:

- (1) Is the State Government Insurance Commission owed any moneys in relation to -
  - (a) Rothwells;
  - (b) Spedleys?
- (2) If yes, what is the current amount owing, by whom is it owed and how has it been calculated?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1)
  - (a) Yes.
  - (b) Yes.
- (2) The 1989 annual report detailed the following -  
 Rothwells Ltd - at 30 June 1989 \$61.2 million after writing off \$26 million in 1988 accounts. A security of \$17.5 million exists against this debt of which \$10 million is interest earning. Recovery of unsecured proportion is estimated at 62¢ in the dollar. Since 30 June 1989 \$11 million has been received.  
 Spedley Securities Ltd - \$20.5 million after writing off \$10 million based on estimated recovery of 67¢ in the dollar from the liquidation and other recovery action as at 30 June 1989.

## PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES CO LTD - LIABILITIES

*\$30 million and \$13 million - Pike Select Committee*

288. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Finance and Economic Development:

- (1) Is the Treasurer aware that in Mr Ken Judge's evidence before the Pike Select Committee he stated that liabilities stood at over \$30 million at September 1988, but were reduced to a figure not exceeding \$13.8 million by the time of the sale of Petrochemical Industries Ltd on 17 October 1988?
- (2) What were the details of the liabilities of over \$30 million as at September 1988?
- (3) What were the details of the approximately \$13 million of liabilities left as at 17 October 1988?
- (4) Of the payments by Petrochemical Industries Ltd listed in the appendix to the Pike committee report, which were included in the \$30 million September PICL balance sheet and which were included in the \$13 million, 17 October balance sheet?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) I am aware.
- (2)-(4) I do not have the information sought nor is it available to the Government and its agencies.  
 WAGH, as the Government agency involved in this matter, accepted PIL's position as set out in its audited accounts drawn up as at 30 September 1988. These accounts showed PIL's assets at \$13.7 million and its liabilities at \$13.2 million. Price Waterhouse audited these accounts and reported on them without qualification.

PIL's audited accounts as at 30 September 1988 formed the basis on which the corporate structure that owned the Kwinana petrochemical project was purchased by WAGH and the Bond Corporation Holdings Ltd Group. The purchase documents were tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 29 August 1989 as papers on the Table 266c and 266d.

- (3) This information is set out in the papers on the Table 266c and 266d which were tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 29 August 1989.

**GOVERNMENT AGENCIES - ACCOUNTABILITY AND ASSETS  
REPORTING GUIDELINES**

*Auditor General's Second Report 1989*

559. Mr MacKINNON to the Treasurer:

Has the Treasury completed its liaising with the office of the Auditor General in establishing the need and extent to which guidelines could be issued to further improve accountability and reporting of assets transferred between Government agencies in line with the recommendations of the Auditor General in his Second Report dated 31 August 1989?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

In his report (volume 1 of 1990, page 35), the Auditor General stated that mandatory audit priorities have precluded completion of his commitment to review the issue of asset transfers and exchanges with the view to preparing suggestions for the development of administrative procedures and accounting guidelines. When the Auditor General's work is completed, Treasury will be in a position to establish the need and extent to which guidelines could be issued to further improve accountability and reporting of assets transferred between Government agencies.

**POLICE OFFICERS - ARMADALE DIVISIONAL OFFICE**

600. Mr TUBBY to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many police officers are there currently stationed at the Armadale divisional office?
- (2) How many of these officers are on -
  - (a) active duties;
  - (b) administrative duties
 during normal working hours?
- (3) How many of these officers are on -
  - (a) active duties;
  - (b) administrative duties
 at 2.00 am.?
- (4) Are there plans to increase the number of officers stationed at Armadale?
- (5) If so, what will be the increase and when will this occur?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1) 48.

(2) (a) 5  
(b) 10

However, at any given time there could be extra officers present in the Armadale region from CIB, Traffic, Anti-Theft Squad, Liquor and Gaming and Juvenile Task Force.

(3) (a) 4  
(b) 2

However, at any given time there could be extra officers present in the Armadale region from CIB, Traffic, Liquor and Gaming and Juvenile Task Force.

- (4) The planning and development branch, as part of an ongoing process of reviewing staff levels, is currently considering the Armadale regional office.
- (5) Not known.

**AIRPORTS - BROOME AIRPORT**

*Old Site Development Conditions*

651. Mr COWAN to the Minister representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Have any conditions been attached to the development of the old airport site at Broome?
- (2) If yes, what are they?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Proposals to relocate Broome's existing airport facility and redevelop the vacated site were approved in principle by Government subject to -
  - (i) final agreements between all parties being to the satisfaction of the Minister for Local Government; and
  - (ii) the shire council providing a copy of the Commonwealth Government's valuation of the site.

**WRITS - PARKER, HON DAVID**

*Government Payment or Services Rendered*

667. Mr MENSAROS to the Premier:

Averting to the answer to question 996 of 1989 -

- (a) have any services been rendered by the Crown Law Department or any other Government agency; or
- (b) have any moneys been paid;

to Hon David Parker in connection with the writ he issued against the Leader of the Opposition or in connection with subsequent legal activities?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

No.

**MULTI-FUNCTION POLIS - EXPENDITURE**

671. Mr BRADSHAW to the Premier:

- (1) How many people have been working on the multi-function polis project in Western Australia?
- (2) How much money has been expended so far in Western Australia on the project?
- (3) Considering the time and money spent on the multi-function polis, does the Premier support the Deputy Premier's stand on the multi-function polis?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) The Government employed a consultant to work on the multi-function polis proposal. This was supported by an interdepartmental committee of Government officers and expanding the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade.
- (2) \$469 716.
- (3) I completely support the Deputy Premier's position. There has been significant public concern voiced about the multi-function polis concept in recent times. The Government has identified the need for further public consultation and support before any formal submission is made to the Federal Government. Recent events in Queensland have highlighted the deficiencies in the multi-function polis concept and Western Australia's current position is vindicated. There will be a meeting of senior State Government Ministers and personnel in Canberra on 28 June to discuss the matter further.

The multi-function polis project has identified several opportunities which this State will implement, regardless of the outcome of multi-function polis

considerations. The Deputy Premier recently announced the formation of an advanced materials planning and policy unit which will develop a strategy for accelerating the development of the advanced materials industry in Western Australia.

### SEWERAGE - ASHFIELD, BAYSWATER AREA

#### *Delays*

691. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) As the Water Authority of Western Australia initially advised Ashfield residents that proposed sewerage would commence in 1985-86 - 1987-88 and the latest estimation on this project is 1994-95 with possible deferrals, why is there this constant delay when sewerage is leaking into the Swan River in ever increasing amounts?
- (2) When does the Minister propose to authorise the connection of deep sewerage system in the area of Ashfield/Bayswater?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) It is the policy of this Government to ultimately sewer all infill areas in the metropolitan area. So, as to proceed in an orderly fashion, there are naturally a set of priority areas. Priority is currently being given to -
  - (a) areas which are located within or contribute groundwater to the Gwelup groundwater supply scheme;
  - (b) areas which the Water Authority and the Department of Planning and Urban Development agree should be sewered urgently to encourage orderly development;
  - (c) areas that need sewerage from both health and environmental viewpoints;
  - (d) areas that need sewerage from the health or environmental viewpoint.

The Water Authority has advised that the sewerage of priority 1 areas is nearing completion and preparations are now being made to commence priority 2 areas. Ashfield has been identified as a priority 2 area.

- (2) Not before 1994-95.

### HOME BUYERS ASSISTANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MEMBERS

#### *Real Estate and Business Agents Act*

695. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Who are the persons currently appointed as members of the Home Buyers Assistance Advisory Committee, as provided in section 131H of the Real Estate and Business Agents Act 1978?
- (2) How many times and what are the dates that this committee have met since July 1987?
- (3) On what date did the advisory committee last met to consider recommendations to the Real Estate and Business Agents Supervisory Board on the formulation of qualifying criteria under section 131 (2) of the Act?
- (4) What was the last date the Real Estate and Business Agents Supervisory Board formally requested the advisory committee to formulate or update criteria for granting assistance as referred in (3)?
- (5) What was the last date the advisory committee formally recommended to the board, an update or revised criteria for granting of assistance?
- (6) What was the last date the Real Estate and Business Agents Supervisory Board referred to the Minister a recommendation to update the criteria for granting assistance under the home buyers assistance fund?



Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) David Miller, Chairman, Real Estate and Business Agents Supervisory Board.  
Ian Hafekost, Manager, Home Ownership, Homeswest.  
Frank Morissey, Deputy Registrar of Building Societies and Co-operatives.
- (2) The committee has not kept minutes of meetings but met with decreasing frequency after weekly meetings prior to 1986. Meetings have been held when applications meeting the criteria have been received.
- (3) 1986.
- (4) 1986.
- (5) No recommendations since 1986.
- (6) 1986. The future of the fund is currently under consideration and a number of meetings have been held during the past six months to discuss this matter. A decision will be made shortly.

#### HOUSING - KEYSTART HOME LOANS SCHEME

##### *Guarantee*

696. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is the Keystart home loan assistance scheme either guaranteed, indemnified or assisted under section 16 of the Housing Act 1980?
- (2) Are lenders funds to the Keystart scheme either guaranteed or indemnified against any loss?
- (3) In the case of a default of participant borrowers in the Keystart home loan assistance scheme, who carries the loss of such a default?
- (4) How many defaults have there been by borrowing participants from the Keystart home loan assistance scheme to 28 May 1990?
- (5) What is the total amount of money written off by such losses?
- (6) Does the Government or any of its agencies have the responsibility recouping such losses to the lenders?
- (7) If yes to (6) what is the total amount of money paid by Government or its agencies to recoup such losses to 28 May 1990?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Yes. Short term indemnity is in place, and is to be retired by 30 June 1990.
- (2) Yes. See (1).
- (3) The borrower carries the first loss, but if the loss is unrecoverable then the scheme carries the loss.
- (4) One default out of 2 554 borrowers.
- (5) Not yet known since the particular borrower is currently in receivership, and the Keystart scheme managers are awaiting the results of this action.
- (6) No.
- (7) Not applicable.

#### PRICES MONITORING UNIT - PRICE SCANNER INSPECTIONS

##### *Retail Outlets*

698. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) On what date did the Prices Monitoring Unit commence inspections of price scanners in retail outlets?
- (2) Under what legislation does this scanner monitoring service operate?
- (3) How many personnel are there employed on this task?
- (4) What has been the cost of this service since implementation?

- (5) Was the cost of this service included in the answers given to question 553 of 1990?
- (6) How many retailers have had their scanners checked since this service commenced operation?
- (7) How many individual scanners has this unit checked since it commenced operations?
- (8) How many retailers in Western Australia are estimated to operate price scanners?
- (9) How many individual scanners are there estimated to be in operation in Western Australia?
- (10) How many individual scanners have there been found to be defective?
- (11) How many retailers have there been found to be operating with defective scanners?
- (12) Have charges been laid against those retailers found to have defective scanners?
- (13) If no to (12), why not?
- (14) If so, under which jurisdiction were those charges heard?
- (15) Were the retailers found to be guilty of an offence?
- (16) If yes to (15), what were the penalties which were imposed?
- (17) Is the Minister aware that there is a voluntary code of practice which covers scanners in retail stores throughout Australia?
- (18) If so, has the Minister read this code of practice?
- (19) Is the Minister aware that this code of practice has the support of the Trade Practices Commission?
- (20) Is the Minister dissatisfied with the operation of this code of practice?
- (21) If so, on what evidence is this dissatisfaction based?
- (22) If not, why has the Minister established the retail price scanning section of the Prices Monitoring Unit?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Checks on electronic scanners began in March 1987.
- (2) Where there is a discrepancy between the shelf price of an item and the price entered into an electronic scanner, a retailer could be charged under section 12 of the Fair Trading Act.
- (3) Monitoring the accuracy of scanners is one of a range of activities undertaken by the Prices Monitoring Unit, which has three staff. Other functions of the unit include surveys of the prices of goods and services, including groceries, preparation of educational materials for the public and responding to numerous requests from individuals and groups for information about prices. There are no staff specifically employed to monitor scanners.
- (4) The costs associated with monitoring of scanners relate only to staff time and travel to supermarkets. Separate accounts are not maintained for this function.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) The Prices Monitoring Unit has undertaken a total of 187 checks on stores. Some stores have been checked more than once.
- (7) It is only necessary to check one scanner in each store. This is because the concern is not so much with any possible technical defects of individual scanners, but with discrepancies between the shelf price of items and the price

that has been entered into the computerised check-out system. Any problems with the entry of prices will be manifested in all scanners in the store.

- (8) The Retail Traders' Association of WA estimates that 223 supermarkets have electronic scanners.
- (9) Information about the number of individual scanners in use in WA is not available.
- (10) For the reasons outlined in response to (7) above checks are not made on each individual scanner.
- (11) In 1987-88 and 1988-89, 6.5 per cent of items were incorrectly charged. In 1989-90, 5.4 per cent of items were incorrectly charged.
- (12) No.
- (13) In view of the large volume of transactions and the relatively small amounts involved, the most effective approach is to encourage retailers to adopt fair trading practices. Prosecutions will only be considered if self-regulation proves to be ineffectual.
- (14)-(16)  
Not applicable.
- (17) Yes. The Ministry of Consumer Affairs is cooperating with representatives of the retail industry and consumers to ensure that the code is working to the benefit of both trader and consumer. To this end the ministry is represented on the disputes committee established by the Retail Traders Association of WA to oversee implementation of the code.
- (18)-(19)  
Yes.
- (20) As the code comes into operation in November 1989 it is too early to make any assessment of its effectiveness. The Ministry of Consumer Affairs will continue to work with retailers and consumers to ensure that shoppers get fair treatment in supermarkets.
- (21) Not applicable.
- (22) The role of the Prices Monitoring Unit is to protect consumer interests in relation to the pricing practices of the retail and service industries. The accuracy of scanners falls within the scope of the unit's mandate. No separate section has been created specifically for the purpose of monitoring electronic scanners in supermarkets.

#### SETTLEMENT AGENTS SUPERVISORY BOARD - BUSINESS SETTLEMENTS

##### *Settlement Agents Fee Changes*

708. Mr COURT to the Minister for Consumer Affairs :

- (1) Has the Settlements Agency Supervisory Board considered changes to settlements agents' fees for business settlements?
- (2) If so, will the Government be introducing a new fee structure?
- (3) If so, what will the basis of these changes and when will they be introduced?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2)-(3)  
The recommendations of the board are being examined but no decision has yet been made.

#### HOSPITALS - SUNSET HOSPITAL

##### *Wages Costs*

714. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Health:

- (1) For the year ending 30 June 1989, what were the total wages costs of operating Sunset?

- (2) What were the total wages costs for nursing staff, therapists and medical officers and others contributing directly to patient care?
- (3) What were total operational costs other than staff costs?
- (4) What were the occupied bed days total for that institution for the year ending 30 June 1989?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The total wages costs for the year ended 30 June 1989 for operating Sunset Hospital were \$7 375 200.
- (2) Total wages costs for -
 

Nurses	\$3 375 300
Medical	114 300
Therapists (physiotherapists, occupational, speech)	336 600
Other clinical staff	<u>143 900</u>
Total	<u>\$3 970 100</u>
- (3) Total costs of other goods and services - \$2 168 300.
- (4) Occupied bed days for 1988-89 year - 74 068 beds.  
Bed average - 202.93

#### MEDICARE - FEDERAL REVIEW

719. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a review of Medicare being undertaken by the Federal Minister?
- (2) Is the State involved in that review?
- (3) Who, to the knowledge of the Minister, is undertaking the review?
- (4) Will the State participate in the review process or will it merely be given the opportunity to make submissions to public servants in Canberra?
- (5) Is the Minister aware of suggestions by Federal Minister Howe that public hospitals should subject private patients to an assets test?
- (6) Does the Minister agree with this proposal?
- (7) What structural changes to the Medicare system are advocated by the Minister?
- (8) What work is being done by the Minister to influence the Federal Government to change its health policies so that they are workable?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) I am aware the Federal Minister intends, as a new Federal Minister for Health, to undertake a general review of Commonwealth health policy.
- (2)-(4) My understanding is that the details of the review, including who will be involved, have yet to be finalised. However, as I have already stated publicly and continued to argue at the recent Health Ministers' Conference, the State Government has a vital role in the delivery of health services, so it is imperative that we are involved in all decisions on the future of our health system and any comprehensive review is not left to Commonwealth bureaucrats.
- (5) I am aware the Federal Minister has indicated that consideration of some form of means testing of public hospital patients should not be ruled out.
- (6) Yes.
- (7)-(8) What I have publicly advocated is that there be a national summit on hospital

funding involving representation from Governments, the professions, peak organisations and consumers and which should be asked to review the roles and responsibilities in the provision of hospital and health services of Governments, both Commonwealth and State, the private hospital sector and private medical practitioners. Such a review should specifically address the issues of -

the fair distribution of available resources for hospital care and treatment among the community;  
what hospital services are necessary to the health of Australians;  
which of these services the public hospital system should be mandated to provide free of charge under the Medicare scheme.

As well, the review should encompass an examination of the Medicare levy and private health insurance arrangements.

#### HOUSING - ALBANY

##### *Community Health Officers - Unsatisfactory Premises*

728. Mr WATT to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that community health officers in Albany are housed in unsatisfactory premises on Albany Highway?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that previous commitments to provide new premises have not been kept?
- (3) Does the Government have a short or long term strategy to overcome the deficiencies?
- (4) If so, will the Minister provide details of proposed improvements together with costings and timing?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Officers of the Health Department are in the process of examining a proposal to lease suitable accommodation currently under construction in Albany. A precise costing on this strategy is not available until the detailed examination of this proposal has been completed.

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT - BUDGET, MANAGEMENT SERVICES ITEM 13

##### *Expenditure Details*

735. Mr MacKINNON to the Premier:

- (1) As in the Budget papers under the item Management Services, Item 13 - Division 13, shows that expenditure for the Treasurer's office in 1988-89 was \$140 609 whereas the amount budgeted for 1989-90 under this item is \$565 000, will the Treasurer provide for me a break-up of that expenditure for 1988-89 and also for the break-up of that expenditure for the relevant areas in 1989-90 to date?
- (2) What payments have been made and for what purpose have they been paid in 1989-90 to date under this same item?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

	1988-89	1989-90
	\$	\$
Other staffing costs	44 282	173 178
Communications	18 424	19 489
Services and contracts	53 655	48 049
Consumable supplies	8 427	41 609

Maintenance of equipment	3 171	8 319
Purchase of equipment and vehicle	<u>12 649</u>	<u>50 018</u>
	<u>140 608</u>	<u>340 662</u>

\* Treasury assumed responsibility for the ministerial office costs on 1 March 1989.

**POLICE STATIONS - BATEMAN POLICE STATION**  
*Replacement - Murdoch University, Adjacent Land*

755. Mr LEWIS to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Does the Government propose to set aside, or has it set aside land adjacent the Murdoch University for a new police facility to replace the Bateman Police Station?
- (2) If yes, when is it expected that facility will be constructed?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) If the member is referring to the Brentwood Police Station, land has been requested to be set aside at the corner of South Street and Murdoch Drive, Murdoch for a new police facility. However, it is not envisaged that the Brentwood Police Station will close.
- (2) Commencement of construction is subject to departmental priorities and budgetary considerations.

**ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES - ROEBOURNE**  
*Trial Program Extension*

758. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the program for Aboriginal families trialled in Roebourne during 1988 been extended to other areas?
- (2) If so, which areas?

Dr GALLOP replied:

The Roebourne families program question would be more appropriately referred to the Minister for Community Services.

**SCHOOLS - GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS**  
*Covered Assembly Areas*

760. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister list which Government schools do not have a covered assembly area?

Dr GALLOP replied:

No. The ministry does not record all the various types of covered areas provided at schools. New schools have covered areas included in their design. Older schools have additions as funding permits.

**EDUCATION MINISTRY - PREMIER'S FAMILY MEMBERS**

765. Mrs EDWARDES to the Premier:

Will the Premier advise the names of and positions held by members of the Premier's family employed within the Ministry of Education?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

All members of Parliament have family members or relatives who will choose, or have chosen, to find employment in the public sector. However, this in no sense justifies the member's question, which does not deserve an answer.

UNIVERSITIES - MERGER

*Murdoch University, University of Western Australia - Payments*

776. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister for Education:

Referring to question 547 of 1990 will the Minister advise -

- (a) how many dollars have already been paid to Murdoch University in anticipation of the merge;
- (b) how many dollars have already been paid to the University of Western Australia in anticipation of the merge;
- (c) how many dollars have been frozen subject to further negotiations between the State and the Commonwealth?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (a) \$500 000 was paid to Murdoch University in 1989 in anticipation of the merger.
- (b) \$950 000 was paid to the University of Western Australia to offset joint expenditures in anticipation of the merger. Other money made available in 1989-90 to both institutions was for growth-related capital works and not specifically for amalgamation purposes.
- (c) \$11.5 million of growth funds for expenditure in 1992-93 were preferentially allocated as amalgamation funds for the combined University of WA/Murdoch University. It is this amount which has been frozen and which was referred to in answer to question 547 of 1990.

SCHAFFER CORPORATION LTD - ROBB JETTY ABATTOIR

*Adjacent Land Grant*

787. Mr HOUSE to the Premier:

- (1) In relation to the Premier's answer to my question without notice 96 of 1990, has the Premier consulted the Minister for Agriculture as promised regarding the proposed granting of land adjacent to the Robb Jetty abattoir to the Schaffer Corporation?
- (2) Can the Premier now confirm that Parliamentary approval will be sought before the deal is finalised?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

As part of Government's desire to remove all animal product processing systems from the southern part of the Coogee special industrial zones, the Government has formulated, in consultation with the Cockburn City Council and relevant Government agencies, a redevelopment and upgrading program for the Coogee area.

The Minister for Agriculture in answer to parliamentary question 1 663 (14 November 1989) provided details of the initiative to relocate the Gosh leather tannery to nearby land adjacent to the Robb Jetty meatworks.

I am advised by the Minister for Agriculture that the land concerned has been transferred from the Western Australian Meat Commission to the Industrial Lands Development Authority by Crown grant. Subsequent transfer to the Schaffer Corporation has not occurred as yet and is subject to a development performance agreement between the Schaffer Corporation and the Industrial Lands Development Authority.

AUSTRALIA DAY COUNCIL - CHANGES

790. Mr COURT to the Minister for The Arts:

- (1) Has there been any recent change to the Australia Day Council organisation at national and State levels?
- (2) If yes, what are these changes and how did they affect the constitution and the role of the committee in this State?

- (3) If changes have not taken place, is the Premier aware of any contemplated changes, and if not, would the Premier make appropriate enquiries?
- (4) Has the Commonwealth Government been in touch with the State Government about any special organisation for the celebration of the centenary of federation, either as a separate body as in the case of the bicentenary, or as an extension of Australia Council's operations?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The Commonwealth Government has proposed restructuring the National Australia Day Council. Currently the NADC consists of eight State and Territory representatives and six appointments of prominent Australians made by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth's proposal is for the NADC to be comprised of 12 appointments of prominent Australians who are influential in such areas as environment, local government, media, multicultural and youth affairs, together with a single representative of all the State and Territory councils as elected annually by State and Territory chairpersons, and a president of the council.
- (4) With regard to the National and State Australia Day Councils, to date there have been only informal discussions between the councils as to how responsibilities for celebrations might be organised.

#### DAWESVILLE CUT - CANAL WIDTHS AND DEPTHS

793. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What are the average -
  - (a) maximum;
  - (b) minimum;
 widths of the canal to be created as a result of the Dawesville cut project?
- (2) What are the -
  - (a) maximum;
  - (b) minimum;
 depths of the canal?
- (3) What is the planned angle of the sides of the canal?
- (4) What finish will the sides of the canal receive, for example, granite, limestone bunking, corrugated asbestos sheeting, left natural etc?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) (a) 248 metres at average water level.  
(b) 198 metres at average water level.
- (2) (a) 6.5 metres below average water level.  
(b) 4.5 metres below average water level.
- (3) The planned angles of the side slopes of the channel are -
  - (a) 35 degrees for sections which are armoured.
  - (b) 12 degrees for sections which are not armoured.
  - (c) Vertical for sections greater than 4.5 metres deep which are excavated in rock.
- (4) The channel will be armoured with limestone. The outer breakwater sections which are exposed to extreme wave action will be finished in granite.



**ARALUEN PARK - NATIONAL PARK ACQUISITION**  
*Letter Response*

798. Mr TUBBY to the Premier:

Adverting to question 238 of 1990 in which the Premier indicated that I would receive a reply to my letter of 1 March early the following week -

- (a) is the Premier aware that this statement was made over a month ago and I am still awaiting the Premier's reply to my letter of 1 March;
- (b) is the Premier aware that many Western Australians are eagerly awaiting a favourable response to my request that the Government acquire Araluen Park in Roleystone for the creation of a national park;
- (c) can the Premier indicate, once again, when I will receive a response to my letter of 1 March 1990;
- (d) can the Premier indicate if a response time to correspondence of over three months is now a normal procedure for the Premier's office;
- (e) if not, what is the average response time for letters to the Premier's office?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(a)-(e)

I apologise to the member for the delay in replying to his letter on Araluen Park. The delay was due to a re-examination of advice to the member from the Minister for Planning. The member would now be aware of the Government's decision to open negotiations to acquire the Araluen site for the people of Western Australia.

My reply was forwarded to his office on 19 June 1990.

**TENANTS ADVICE BUREAU - GOVERNMENT FUNDS**

801. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Does the Government provide funds for the operation of the Tenants Advice Bureau?
- (2) If so, what has been the cost of this bureau to the tax payer for each year of its funding?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

It is not clear to which agency is referred to; however, if it is the Tenants Advice Service -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) From 1 July - 31 December 1984 -  
Commonwealth Government provided \$28 135.  
From 1 January - 30 June 1985 -  
State Housing Commission \$31 450.  
From 1 July 1985 - 30 June 1986 -  
State Housing Commission \$65 752.  
From 30 March - 30 June 1990 -  
Ministry of Consumer Affairs \$5 369.42.

**HOMESWEST - RENTAL PROPERTIES**  
*Energy Efficient Light Bulbs*

803. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Housing:

As during the recent by-elections the Premier made an announcement to conserve energy by supplying energy efficient light globes to all Homeswest rental properties, could the Minister advise -

- (a) which departmental budget will be required to meet the cost of this initiative;

- (b) what will be the cost of this initiative for the 1990-91 financial year;
- (c) how many rental properties will be involved in this initiative;
- (d) how many light bulbs will be issued in 1990-91;
- (e) will these bulbs be replaced when their life has expired;
- (f) if no to (e), why not;
- (g) if yes to (e), what measures will be put in place to ensure that this initiative is not abused by tenants?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

(a)-(g)

The supply of 10 000 energy efficient light globes to Statewide Homeswest rental properties is to be run as a pilot program. It is the Government's intention to call tenders for the supply of the globes in the 1990-91 financial year.

Details concerning the -

funding mechanisms  
installation program  
ongoing monitoring and maintenance  
evaluation

will be overseen by the new energy conservation unit in conjunction with relevant agencies such as Homeswest, SEC and the energy policy and planning bureau.

#### SCHOOLS - SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

##### *Gymnasium Facilities*

804. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many senior high schools in Western Australia do not have adequate gymnasium facilities?
- (2) Can the Minister list the schools which fall into the above category?
- (3) What is the cost of providing a school with an adequate gymnasium facility?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) While all senior high schools have an area for teaching of gymnastics, a limited number of these facilities are not fully enclosed or suitable for the playing of basketball.
- (2) Armadale SHS  
Mt Lawley SHS  
South Fremantle SHS  
Como SHS  
Mt Barker SHS  
Harvey Agricultural SHS (not fully enclosed)  
Kambalda SHS (not fully enclosed)
- (3) The estimated cost of a sports hall, performing arts workshop and associated facilities such as change rooms, toilets, storage, etc is \$1.9 million.

#### SCHOOLS - MOUNT BARKER SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Agricultural Shed Gymnasium*

805. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the use of an agricultural shed as a gymnasium at Mount Barker Senior High School?
- (2) Does the Minister believe that this facility is adequate?
- (3) When will this facility be replaced by an adequate gymnasium?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) While it is not possible at present to indicate definitely when a hall/gymnasium will be provided at the school, the matter will be listed for inclusion in the 1991-92 draft capital works program.

#### AIDS - MONEY ALLOCATION

807. Mr BRADSHAW to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How much money has been allocated to Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome education, counselling, treatment and acute care in 1989-90?
- (2) How will this be broken down into the different categories?
- (3) Is each category on budget?
- (4) How is the AIDS education carried out?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) \$3 494 000 (\$1 307 000 from WA Budget, \$1 307 000 from Commonwealth, \$880 000 from Medicare).
- (2)

Education and counselling	\$1 427 000
Treatment	799 000
Support services (domiciliary nursing, etc)	388 000
Hospital treatment	\$880 000
- (3) Yes.
- (4) AIDS education is coordinated by the health education and liaison subcommittee of the State AIDS Advisory Committee. There are five main types of program -
  - (a) Education of the general public - mainly carried out by the AIDS bureau and health promotion services branch of the Health Department.
  - (b) Education of high risk groups such as homosexual and bisexual men and intravenous drug users. This area is shared between Government agencies - for example, Health Department and Alcohol and Drug Authority - and community-based agencies, particularly the WA AIDS Council.
  - (c) Professional education of doctors, nurses, teachers, counsellors and others - chiefly carried out by the Health Department.
  - (d) School education programs as part of the Health Department curriculum.
  - (e) Special programs directed at Aboriginal and ethnic communities that might not otherwise be reached by general education programs.

#### COMPANIES (WESTERN AUSTRALIA) CODE - SECTION 541 *Application Authorisation*

812. Mr GRAYDEN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

In respect of section 541 of the Companies (Western Australia) Code has the Commission ever had occasion to authorise a person other than an official manager, liquidator or provisional liquidator to make an application under that section or to make an application under that section in relation to a corporation?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

Not to the knowledge of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.

**COMPANIES (WESTERN AUSTRALIA) CODE - SECTION REQUESTS**  
*Section 541*

814. Mr GRAYDEN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is there any means of ascertaining the number of times specific sections of the Companies (Western Australia) Code have been invoked?
- (2) If so, in each of the last three years, how many times has section 541, which allows liquidators to examine directors and officers under oath, been invoked?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) The Corporate Affairs Department maintains statistics on some, but not all, exercises of its various statutory discretions under the Companies (Western Australia) Code.
- (2) The Corporate Affairs Department does not maintain statistics in respect of section 541 applications. However, approximately five applications per year are made on average to the Western Australian Supreme Court under this section.

**GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION BILL - QUADRIPELGICS**  
*Public Trustee Appointment*

815. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Health:

- (1) With reference to the Minister's statement in introducing the Guardianship and Administration Bill that it will be available to all persons who are unable to manage their affairs "for reason of mental disability", will it also apply to those with severe physical disabilities, such as quadriplegics?
- (2) Will the Public Trustee be appointed the public guardian?
- (3) Will some other office holder be appointed to that position?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The Guardianship and Administration Bill will be available for all persons who are mentally incapable of managing their affairs. Persons with severe physical disabilities, including paraplegics, may fall into this category where there is profound trauma causing mental disability.
- (2) No. The Act establishes a separate statutory office of the Public Guardian.
- (3) While the Bill does not preclude an officer holder being appointed to the position of Public Guardian, no decision has yet been made about the appointment.

**DAWESVILLE CUT - LAND**  
*Future Use*

816. Mr NICHOLLS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has there been any agreement, verbal or documented, between the Government and any interested party regarding the future use of the land in the vicinity of the proposed Dawesville Cut?
- (2) If so, what was the agreement and who was the interested party?
- (3) If no, is there any substance in recent articles in the local Mandurah media indicating agreements which were being pursued by the Government to reduce the cost of the Dawesville Cut?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) No agreements, verbal or documented, have been made regarding the future use of the land in the vicinity of the proposed Dawesville channel. Options for development have been discussed with interested parties to provide background information for consultation with the Mandurah City Council.
- (2) Not applicable.

- (3) The recent newspaper articles in the local Mandurah media have reported on the consequence of development options being discussed.

**DAWESVILLE CUT - SILT**  
*Mandurah Residents Information*

819. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has it been taken into consideration that the ultimate result of the Dawesville Cut may well be the silting up of large parts - particularly ones near to Mandurah - or even the whole Peel Inlet and Harvey Estuary?
- (2) Were people in Mandurah and around the estuary informed of such a possible result?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) Extensive engineering studies have shown that large parts of the Peel Inlet and Harvey Estuary will not silt up as a result of the construction of the Dawesville channel.
- (2) Not applicable.

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL - BILLS PASSED AND DEFEATED**

821. Mr STRICKLAND to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) What are the numbers of Bills passed in the Legislative Council during each of the respective Governments' periods since 1899?
- (2) What are the corresponding numbers of Bills defeated in the Legislative Council during each of the respective Governments' periods since 1899?

Dr GALLOP replied:

(1)-(2)

In order to accurately answer these questions many hours of historical research would be required into the records of parliamentary debates and minutes of votes and proceedings. The source material containing the information sought is available in the records kept by the Parliament. For these reasons it is inappropriate for the Government to be expected to search publicly available records for the member.

**SCHOOLS - ASBESTOS**  
*Advisory Committee Findings*

823. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister for Education:

Referring to question 1836 of 1989 will the Minister advise what were the findings of the advisory committee investigating asbestos in schools in respect of the schools listed in that question and what action has been taken in respect of each of these schools?

Dr GALLOP replied:

The final report prepared by the working party on asbestos cement products, set up by the Western Australian Advisory Committee on Hazardous Substances, is due out shortly. This report will provide further information on those schools listed in the interim report, provided in December. The ministry is developing an asbestos management plan, and this will accommodate recommendations made from the above report.

**DRUGS - PERTH TEENAGERS**  
*Drug Use Data Analysis 1987*

825. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister for Education:

Referring to question 1535 of 1989 can the Minister advise if the analysis of the 1987 data on drug use by Perth teenagers (including school students) of Health Department of Western Australia and the National Centre for Drug Research (Curtin University) has been made available to all members of the House and if not, when will this information be available?

Dr GALLOP replied:

I am advised that further analysis has been required of the study data. The additional analysis has entailed further work on the final report. I will ensure that copies of the report are made available to members of the House at the earliest time practicable.

#### HOMESWEST - RESIDENTIAL RENTAL TENANCIES

##### *Properties - Demolition, Removal, Sale, Disposal Statistics*

826. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the total number of Homeswest's residential rental tenancies -
  - (a) demolished or removed;
  - (b) sold or otherwise disposed of;
 since 1 July 1989 to 30 April 1990?
- (2) How many of the properties referred to in (1) above have been demolished, removed, sold or otherwise disposed of during the month of May 1990?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) (a) 298  
(b) 126
- (2) 39.

#### HOMESWEST - HOME LOAN ASSISTANCE

##### *Waiting Lists*

827. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

What was the total official number of applications on Homeswest's waiting lists as at 31 May 1990 for Homeswest home loan assistance?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

12 481 (6 990 dual listed).

#### HOMESWEST - RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION

##### *Waiting Lists*

828. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

What is the total number of applicants waiting as at 31 May 1990 for residential accommodation on Homeswest rental tenancy lists inclusive of those dual listed for home purchase schemes?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

14 897 (6 990 dual listed).

#### TENANTS ADVICE BUREAU - GOVERNMENT GRANTS

829. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Does the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, or any other Government agency make grants available to the Tenants Advice Bureau, or any other consumer group concerned with the welfare of residential tenants?
- (2) If yes to (1), what are the groups concerned and what are the specific amounts of monies granted to each group during the financial years 1988-89 and 1989 to 31 May 1990?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Yes. See reply to question 801.
- (2) In the period 1 July 1989 to 7 June 1990, \$5 369.42 was provided to the Tenants Advice Service.

**WATER AUTHORITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - VICTORIA-BICKLEY  
REDEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

*Environmental Protection Authority Report No 418 - Public Appeals*

830. Mr WATT to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) In respect to the Environmental Protection Authority report No 418 relating to the proposed Victoria - Bickley redevelopment scheme by the Water Authority of Western Australia, can the Minister advise -
  - (a) what was the closing date for objections;
  - (b) when were objectors advised of the outcome of their objection?
- (2)
  - (a) Has the redevelopment work been commenced;
  - (b) if so, on what date?
- (3) If redevelopment work commenced before objections were fully considered and responded to, why was this done?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1)
  - (a) The closing date for public appeals against the Environmental Protection Authority's report and recommendations on the proposed redevelopment scheme was 19 February 1990.
  - (b) Three appeals were received from members of the public against the EPA's assessment report on this proposal. These appeals were determined by the Minister for the Environment on 27 May 1990, and appellants were informed of the outcome of their objections by mail on 28 May 1990.

(2)(a)-(b) and (3)

No. Work directly related to the redevelopment scheme has not yet commenced.

On 19 April 1990 the EPA received a letter from the Water Authority of Western Australia advising that work regarding upgrading Masonmill Road, as part of access to the Victoria Dam site, had commenced. This work was required to be undertaken by the Water Authority as part of the overall upgrading of road access to the general area for routine operational purposes. However, construction of an upgraded gravel access road into the existing dam area, which was considered to be directly related to the proposed redevelopment scheme, had been delayed until final environmental approval had been obtained from the Minister for the Environment.

Members of the public who have observed these maintenance works on Masonmill Road taking place may have assumed that this work directly relates to the redevelopment scheme, and therefore pre-empted final environmental approval of the proposal. The EPA does not consider this to be the case, as maintenance works associated with the upgrading of Masonmill Road would have been required in any event, even if the proposed redevelopment scheme did not proceed.

**VIRUSES - CUCUMBER MOSAIC VIRUS**

831. Mr McNEE to the Minister for Agriculture:

Concerning the Cucumber Mosaic Virus -

- (a) what arrangements have been made with respect to testing for this virus in the 1990-91 season;
- (b) are these arrangements different from those for the 1989-90 season;
- (c) if yes to (2) would the Minister outline what changes have been made and the reasons for these changes?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

(a)-(c)

The Department of Agriculture will offer a CMV testing service to lupin growers in 1990-91 on a similar basis to that offered last year.

#### TREE FUND LTD - INCORPORATED

840. Mr BRADSHAW to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Has the Tree Fund Ltd been incorporated?
- (2) If so, who or which companies are associated with the company?
- (3) How much money does the Government intend to inject into the tree fund?
- (4) Is the Government to inject money every year?
- (5) How will the Government eventually recover funds from the project?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Malleson Stephen Jaques. My understanding is that all of the directors are partners in this firm.
- (3) There are no proposals to inject money into Tree Fund.
- (4)-(5) Answered by (3).

#### ROADS - NORTHAM BY-PASS

##### *Current Program*

843. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Northam by-pass road on the current program?
- (2) If so -
  - (a) when does the Minister estimate work commencing;
  - (b) what allocation of money is involved;
  - (c) is the allocation State or Federal funds or a mix?
- (3) (a) Does the State Main Roads Department have five year plans or the like;
- (b) if so, is the Northam by-pass on any such State plan?
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that the by-pass is on the current Federal national highway plan?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a)-(c) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) The Main Roads Department continually reviews its forward strategy.
- (b) The Northam bypass is considered together with other projects in the review process.
- (4) No. Until such time that a route is defined and accepted, a submission cannot be made to the Federal Government to include the project on its funding program.

#### MINERAL SANDS - NANNUP-AUGUSTA REGION

##### *Rail Transport Options*

846. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

What are the latest rail options that have been presented to the mining industry for transporting mineral sands in the Nannup-Augusta region?



Mrs BEGGS replied:

The latest rail option considered to meet the transport needs of the proposed mineral sands developments at Jangardup and Beenup involved a new siding some seven kilometres south of Nannup. Although Westrail held some discussions with the industry, no formal offer was made as the proposal was not viable on commercial grounds.

#### BICYCLE HELMETS - GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY SCHEME

848. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What was the cost in annual terms of the Government's subsidy for bicycle helmets for children in -
  - (a) 1988-89;
  - (b) 1989-90?
- (2) What are the anticipated costs to the Government of this subsidy scheme for -
  - (a) 1990-91;
  - (b) 1991-92;
  - (c) 1992-93?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (1) (a) \$263 714  
(b) \$120 000
- (2) (a)-(b) Nil. Funded by the Lotteries Commission.  
(c) Not known.

#### POLICE STATIONS - GOSNELLS POLICE STATION *Maddington Site Relocation Cost*

852. Mr TUBBY to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

What is the estimated cost for the relocation of the Gosnells Police Station to the site which has been made available in Maddington?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

\$4 million.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS - BOAT PEN FEES AND MOORING CHARGES INCREASE

853. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) On what basis were the increases in boat pen fees and mooring charges for the 1989-90 season calculated?
- (2) (a) Who is going to be appointed to the proposed ministerial committee which is to advise on charges and whether capital costs for constructing or acquiring harbours will be included in fees;  
(b) on what basis have these members been appointed?
- (3) Will the Minister assure the House that the Minister will give the fullest possible consideration to hardship cases amongst the Albany professional fishermen?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) On the basis of recovering a higher proportion of overall costs than has been the case in the past.
- (2) (a) A final decision has yet to be made.

- (b) A combination of my nominations and those of the industry will be the basis of membership.

(3) Yes.

### SHEEP LICE ERADICATION FUND - REVENUE

*Answers 681, 751 Discrepancy*

855. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In relation to your answers to my question 681 (i) of 1989, and 751 of 1990, regarding the total amount of money raised in the year 1 July 1988 to 30 June 1989 by the sheep lice eradication fund, can the Minister explain to the House the apparent discrepancy between the answers given?
- (2) What is the correct figure for the total revenue raised in the 1988-89 period by the sheep lice eradication fund?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

- (1) In answer to question 681 (i) of September 1989, the amount raised by the sheep lice eradication fund in 1988-89 was given as \$464 700.  
In answer to question 750 of June 1990, the amount raised by the fund in 1988-89 was given as \$564 700. The amount quoted in answer to question 750 included an amount of \$100 000 in refundable Government moneys, held temporarily to assist the fund's operations, which was not raised from wool growers.
- (2) The amount raised in 1988-89 by the sheep lice eradication fund was \$464 925. An amount of \$225 has been brought to account subsequent to previously quoted figures.

### FISHING - FITZGERALD RIVER NATIONAL PARK

*Commercial Fishing Ban*

856. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) By what authority have the south coast commercial fishermen been denied access to the Fitzgerald River National Park?
- (2) Why are commercial fishermen currently being banned from fishing at the Gordon and Hamersley inlets, when the draft management plan released in June 1989 proposed that these areas be open for commercial fishing?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The authority is an old one derived from the former National Parks Authority management policies which stated that commercial fishing was excluded from national parks unless a permit was issued. Because of the very high status of Fitzgerald River National Park, the former National Parks Authority decided not to issue permits in that park. This position has been maintained by CALM until a decision is made in the final management plan (see below). The actual mechanisms by which this authority could be enforced, should that be necessary, are a number of regulations under the CALM Act.
- (2) They are not banned from the Gordon Inlet which is on the southern edge of the park. The position for Hamersley Inlet is outlined above; that is, it has been closed to commercial fishing for many years.

As the member notes, the inlet was proposed to be made available for commercial fishing in the draft management plan for carefully explained reasons.

Responses to this issue in the draft have been divided. About half support the proposals with about half against. For this reason alone it would be unwise to allow fishing to go ahead. In any event, the proposals of management plans are not ever implemented until they are signed into effect by me. I have no intention of allowing this proposal to be implemented until I have a properly considered final plan in place.

**HOSPITALS - ACCIDENT AND EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS**  
*Security Problems*

857. Mr HOUSE to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Which metropolitan and rural hospitals are subject to security problems in their accident and emergency departments?
- (2) Have any charges ever been laid over security problems in hospitals?
- (3) If yes to (2) above, what is the nature and number of the charges?
- (4) What measures is the Government taking to resolve the problem?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Royal Perth Hospital.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No specific records have been kept.
- (4) Police are providing a visual presence of two constables, working from 8.00 pm to 4.00 am, seven days a week, at the reception area of RPH casualty ward to deter undesirable behaviour.

**SULPHUR DIOXIDE - KALGOORLIE**

858. Mr McNEE to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) With respect to maximum levels of sulphur dioxide for Kalgoorlie would the Minister provide the Environmental Protection Authority recommended maximums in micrograms per cubic metre for the following -
  - (a) the annual mean;
  - (b) 24 hour mean;
  - (c) one hour;
  - (d) 10 minutes?
- (2) Are the World Health Organisation recommendations for these figures as follows -
  - (a) 40-60 micrograms per cubic metre - annual mean;
  - (b) 100-150 micrograms per cubic metre - 24 hour mean;
  - (c) 350 micrograms per cubic metre - one hour;
  - (d) 500 micrograms per cubic metre - 10 minutes, not to be exceeded?
- (3) If so, why are the EPA recommendations so much higher than those of the WHO?
- (4) What priority level did the EPA give to the health of the citizens of Kalgoorlie when drawing up its recommended maximum levels of atmospheric sulphur dioxide?
- (5) Have atmospheric sulphur dioxide levels in the Kalgoorlie region ever exceeded the limits specified by the EPA?
- (6) If yes to (5), how many times?
- (7) What are the maximum levels of sulphur dioxide recorded by the monitoring systems in the Kalgoorlie region for the figures specified in part (2)?
- (8) With reference to the Minister's answer to question 583 (13) of 1990, do these investigations include epidemiological studies of the people living in the region?
- (9) If no to (8), why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The air quality objectives are as set out in the environmental protection policy for control of sulphur dioxide in the air environment in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder residential areas.

- (a) Not applicable.
- (b) 365ug/m3.
- (c) 2 000ug/m3.
- (d) Not applicable.

The maximum level enforced by licence conditions is a three hour average of 1 300ug/m3.

- (2) The World Health Organisation has published such figures as recommendations of goals which should be achieved wherever practicable.

(3)-(4)

The air quality objectives for Kalgoorlie are not controlled by Environmental Protection Authority recommendations but rather by the environmental protection policy for the control of sulphur dioxide in the air environment of the Kalgoorlie-Boulder residential areas.

The objectives established by the policy were based on the USA EPA 24 and three hour standards for the protection of public health and public welfare.

- (5) Yes, the limit specified by the EPA in conditions of licence is 1 300ug/m3 for a three hour period.
- (6) Twice; on 3 May 1989 and 22 June 1989. Prosecution proceedings are under way for each of these events.
- (7)
  - (a) Maximum annual average 93ug/m3.
  - (b) Maximum 24 hour average 567ug/m3.
  - (c) Maximum one hour average 4 389ug/m3.
  - (d) Maximum 10 minute average 5 997ug/m3.

Note: (1) The maximum annual average, 24 hour average and 10 minute average were recorded at the monitoring station nearest the Croesus roaster which has now closed down (closed November 1989).

(2) The maximum 1 hour is the same event which is the subject of a prosecution (22 June 1989).

- (8) No.

- (9) It is inconceivable that levels of sulphur dioxide likely to occur in the wheatbelt will have any detectable effect on human health.

#### WATER AUTHORITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - BOARD MEMBERS

##### *Terms of Office Expiry Date*

860. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister for Water Resources:

What are the dates of expiry of the terms of office of the members of the Water Authority of Western Australia's Board?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

Appointed members -

Mr R.M. Hillman	-	30 June 1990
Mr T.J. Perrott	-	30 June 1990
Mr K.J. Kelsall	-	31 December 1990
Mrs J.M. Hodgson	-	30 June 1991
Ms H.G. Sheehan	-	30 June 1992

Members elected by the employees of the Water Authority -

Mr D. Kuzmanovich	-	16 February 1991
Mr E.J. Murphy	-	30 September 1991

Ex officio members -

Dr W.J. Cox is a member of the board for the time in which he holds the position of Managing Director of the Water Authority.

Mr W.S. Shelton is a member of the board for the term of his appointment as Chairman of the Western Australian Water Resources Council. This appointment expires on 31 December 1990.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD - CONNELL AND DEMPSTER PROBE

*Karlson, Mr - Cash Return Statement*

143. Mr MacKINNON to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of the article in last Saturday's *The West Australian* which was headed, "Connell, Dempster face new PIL probe"?
- (2) Is she also aware that the article includes the following comment -

Last night, Premier Carmen Lawrence said she supported Mr Karlson's request for return of the cash?

- (3) To which cash was she referring?
- (4) On what basis did she make the statement in support of Mr Karlson?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(3)

I am aware of the article and I spoke briefly to the journalist concerned. I had at that stage not seen the transcript of Mr Karlson's interview. I understand he said there were certain moneys paid by those individuals at a time when the Government was taking over a certain share of the enterprise. The implication of what the journalist told me was that the Government had contributed in paying those amounts of money. I subsequently discovered that is not correct. I said Mr Karlson should do whatever is necessary as a liquidator not only in relation to those moneys, but also any other moneys - I was not specific - to recover those moneys.

#### PARKER, MR DAVID - DOWDING, MR PETER

*Inquiry Absence - Leader of the Opposition's Statements*

144. Mr DONOVAN to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of statements by the Leader of the Opposition denigrating the absence from the State of former Premier Peter Dowding and the alleged absence from the State of Mr David Parker, and implying that those individuals are not prepared to appear before inquiries?
- (2) Are these statements correct?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

I am aware of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition today and I am not sure where else they have been repeated or how often. To the best of my knowledge Mr Parker is not absent from the State and is still living in his house at Fremantle. Hence, the calls for his return are totally unnecessary. In relation to the former Premier, Mr Dowding, I am advised he actually wrote to the Select Committee in another place looking at State investments specifically offering to make himself available and asking for a range of suitable dates and times the committee may want to set aside.

As far as those individuals not being prepared to be available is concerned, both have stated publicly that they are prepared to be available. It is clear the Opposition has no respect for the truth and it will from time to time attempt to smear individuals by way of debate or interjection in this place when it is quite clear those two members are available, are in the country, and are happy to appear before an inquiry.

## WATERWAYS COMMISSION - ALBANY ESTABLISHMENT

145. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for the Environment:

When will the Minister make an announcement regarding the establishment of a waterways commission to manage the rivers, streams, estuaries and wetlands in the Albany region?

Mr PEARCE replied:

About three months ago I visited Albany and released a report on the Oyster Harbour and Princess Royal Harbour pollution problems.

Mr Kierath: At the same time that we were there.

Mr PEARCE: I received more publicity than did all members opposite put together. I would not have known that members opposite were in the town if someone had not mentioned it to me in passing. They did not have much impact on the town. I assure members a good crowd turned up when I released the report and I noticed the crowd was swelled by some members opposite.

An Opposition member: It was a rent-a-crowd.

Mr PEARCE: The member for Riverton was one of the rent-a-crowd. Opposition members had so little to do they came to my meeting. They had a cup of coffee and some of them ate three scones. The food disappeared very quickly and they laughed at all the jokes. I noted that at the right part of the speech they nodded their heads. I thought I was getting the Liberal Party on side.

At the end of the meeting I announced there would be a three month period for public submissions on that matter before a decision was made. One of the recommendations in the report, which I publicly supported, was the appointment of a local management group to manage the waterways. I was not proposing to make a decision on it until the public comment period was over. My recollection of the dates is that the public comment period has either expired or is about to expire. When the time has expired I expect it will be one month before a report is received from the Environmental Protection Authority. Within a month I expect to be in a position to release the final report. When that is done I expect the decisions to be made and I expect the first one will be the formation of a local management group.

## AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE COMMISSION - "FOUR CORNERS" PROGRAM

146. Mr CATANIA to the Minister for the Environment:

Is the Minister aware of allegations relating to the Australian Heritage Commission on last night's "Four Corners" program?

Mr PEARCE replied:

I thank the member for the question. Last night's "Four Corners" program purported to represent the forest industry in Western Australia and its problems. I am a great admirer of the ABC and "Four Corners" and as an admirer of that body and program I was disappointed at the poor quality of the program presented on that occasion. The poor quality was based on the fact it did not contain many facts and those facts put forward were mostly wrong. It is not surprising that "Four Corners" did not get the facts right. It studiously avoided speaking to anybody who may have been able to present them with some of that information, including me.

Mr MacKinnon: Didn't they speak to Dr Shea?

Mr PEARCE: They spoke to him for four hours in his office and he was the only other person spoken to apart from an officer of the Department of Conservation and Land Management in the south west. They put to Dr Shea a series of propositions they were proposing to include in the program to obtain his response to them and they did not accept from him or from anyone else counterbalancing information he sought to present to them. I know Dr Shea had his interview taped separately because the initial approach he had from

"Four Corners" was such he feared they had come here with their minds already made up. If any member is interested I am prepared to make available to him the whole tape of the full "Four Corners" interview with Dr Shea. One of the most disgraceful things I have witnessed in Australian journalism is that the "Four Corners" team followed Dr Shea, with his approval, to a family function held at the Canning River regional park at which Opposition members were in attendance, including the member for Riverton. It was the Foundation Day holiday and because it was a family function Dr Shea took his family with him. They were enjoying themselves when Dr Shea was asked for a brief interview and then he was asked if he would be filmed with his family. Dr Shea was asked to hold his child while being photographed. That is the sort of thing anyone would do for a television program. They put on a soundtrack in the final program which made it appear as though Mr Shea spent his time at the function kissing babies in the way that politicians do. He held his own child at the request of the "Four Corners" camera team. It is disgracefully dishonest, and one of the most vicious and unscrupulous things I have seen.

Mr MacKinnon: I hope you made that known.

Mr PEARCE: I certainly have, and not only to the ABC. I indicated publicly today that I propose to make a personal complaint to the national ethics committee of the AJA, and will send a copy of that complaint to the ABC. I am very upset about that attack on the Executive Director of CALM. I was unclear at the time about another section of the report; that is, Mr Paul Llewellyn was presented as a spokesman for the Australian Heritage Commission and said that the Australian Heritage Commission was frustrated, impatient and angry with the Department of Conservation and Land Management because of its failure to respond to a range of matters. I have no personal knowledge of that, and if the Australian Heritage Commission is of that opinion, it has not made it clear to me. A media release was issued by the Australian Heritage Commission in Canberra today under the heading "Australian Heritage Commission refutes 'Four Corners' story" which states -

The Australian Heritage Commission today denied the claim made in last night's "Four Corners" that it is "frustrated, impatient and angry" with the Western Australian Department of Conservation and Land Management. The Commission's Acting Director, Mr Gerard Early, said he was particularly disappointed that the allegation was made on national television -

Members should listen carefully to this next part. It continues -

because he had specifically rejected it when it was put to him by the "Four Corners" team.

That is to say, the "Four Corners" team spoke to the Acting Director of the Heritage Commission, put the proposition to him, which he specifically denied, and they then went ahead and repeated it on the program. The second paragraph states -

"The Commission is also concerned at other aspects of the program", Mr Early said. "There was a clear implication that a private consultant, Mr Paul Llewellyn, was speaking on behalf of the Commission when he was being interviewed. Office footage was also represented as being the Commission's premises in Canberra. Neither is the case."

In a covering letter to the Executive Director of CALM, the Australian Heritage Commission states -

About the only accurate comment was that we declined to be interviewed!

Regrettably, the incident involving the child and that dealing with the Heritage Commission leaves a lot to be answered for.

Mr Omodei: The people behind that program are responsible for keeping your vote above 38 per cent.

Mr PEARCE: I bet they will not vote for me after today when they read some of the things I have said. I made my view and the Government's view clear in a Press conference earlier today. It is quite disgraceful that these things occur and it is particularly disgraceful that it should come from a program with a fine reputation for reporting.

### HEALTH CRISIS - PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE *Tax Deduction*

147. Mr MINSON to the Minister for Health:

- (1) In view of the worsening situation in public health care delivery in this State and across Australia, and in view of the fact that an analysis of this issue clearly indicates the problems would disappear if private health insurance were made tax deductible, will the Minister make representation to the Federal Government to make the necessary changes to the tax laws?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) What alternative plans does the State Government have to address the problem?

Mr WILSON replied:

(1)-(3)

I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in his new area of responsibility, for this question. It is refreshing to be asked a question about health by the Opposition. Not many have been asked in the past.

Mr Minson: You had better get used to them.

Mr WILSON: If they are all like this question, it will not be difficult to answer them.

The question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is a bit late in coming. I made strong representations as recently as a week ago at the meeting of health Ministers in Brisbane when I joined with other State Ministers to put to the Federal Minister the concern that Western Australia and all other States have about the deteriorating situation in public hospitals. That concern relates to the problems associated with what is promised in theory and what Australians probably want; that is, a system which delivers health care on an equitable basis, irrespective of people's ability to pay. However, the demands are so great that the public hospital system cannot accommodate them. That is the case in every State in Australia, and not just Western Australia. In this situation the people who are least able to afford alternative ways of paying for their health care are suffering most.

Mr MacKinnon: It is called Medicare. It is a disaster.

Mr WILSON: The Opposition will find that health Ministers throughout Australia, including those from New South Wales and the Northern Territory, do not ascribe the whole blame to Medicare. In fact, all the State Ministers at that conference, including Liberal Government Ministers, made it clear that they do not regard the dismantling of Medicare as the answer to the problems being experienced. They all agree that the principles of Medicare, which underline the need for equality, are important principles that should be maintained. They were concerned, as this Government is also concerned, about an issue the Liberal Party has not been prepared to address as a matter of health policy; that is, we have equality and in theory we have access, but in practice we do not have that access.

All health Ministers put a case to the Federal Government which included the need to address the public-private health care mix, and as part of that the need to address questions about health insurance which would make private health insurance more attractive to those who can afford to pay. One of those measures is a form of tax deductibility.



Mr MacKinnon: Do you specifically support tax deductability?

Mr WILSON: I support that for those who can afford it. I have made that clear before, and it is nothing new. I have put it to the Federal Government before and have indicated my public support for it. It is not necessary to have much intelligence to accept that as one of the means of resolving the issue.

Mr Minson: Why has it taken so long to catch up?

Mr WILSON: I do not know the answer to that. Everybody can analyse the problems but not many people can come up with the answers. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition thinks that is the simple, straightforward answer, that is not the case. There simply is no straightforward answer. That is a possible answer that could be worked through between the Federal Government and the private health insurers, and legislation could perhaps be introduced by the Federal Government. It would certainly hold out the possibility of easing the strain on the public hospital system, but that would not be done simply by shifting privately insured people from public hospitals to private hospitals. The problem will remain of funding the needs of people who can afford access only to public hospitals. It is not a straight transfer.

That mistake was made by the Opposition's Federal colleagues who fell flat on their faces during the Federal election campaign. I have some sympathy for Wilson Tuckey because although he may not have been wholly on track, at least he had the courage to say at that stage that those who could afford to pay more should pay more. During the Federal election campaign the Liberal Party stepped back and it was not prepared to say that. Because the Liberal Party did not make that commitment, at the end of the day its budget for its health policy did not add up and was \$2.5 billion short of the amount needed. That indicates that there are no simple answers to this problem, and everybody is aware of that. Certainly we need a Federal health policy; that has been promised by the Federal health Minister and we intend to hold him to that promise.

#### TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD - RESIGNATIONS

148. Mr CLARKO to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Have any members of the Totalisator Agency Board resigned recently?
- (2) If yes, which members have resigned, and what are the reasons for their resignation?
- (3) Have any staff members of the TAB been directed to take long service leave?
- (4) If yes to (3), what are the reasons for such directions?
- (5) Are any investigations being made into the financial affairs of the TAB; and if so, by whom, and why?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

(1)-(5)

I thank the member for the question. The Chairman of the Totalisator Agency Board, Mr Harry Jarman, has resigned as chairman due to personal reasons and commitments that he has elsewhere; and one staff member, the general manager of the TAB, has taken early retirement, with effect from 2 July. No other members of the TAB have resigned or have been told to take long service leave, to the best of my knowledge. No investigation is taking place into the affairs of the TAB.

#### MULTI-FUNCTION POLIS - DEVELOPMENTS

149. Mr KOBELKE to the Deputy Premier:

Would the Deputy Premier comment upon the recent developments with regard to the multi-function polis?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

I thank the member for his question, which is both timely and appropriate.

An Opposition member: Have you found out what it is yet?

Mr TAYLOR: I think a few people in the Eastern States are trying to find that out at the moment. The recent events in Queensland have highlighted the inadequacy, in my view, of the way in which the MFP process has been handled. They also vindicate the view that this Government took a month ago to reconsider the State's position with regard to the MFP and to ensure that public consultation occurs before any further involvement in the project is undertaken. The selection of a site for the MFP prior to any substantial knowledge of what will be involved in the MFP proposal is one which obviously leaves a lot to be desired. I understand that even the Japanese do not seem to have a substantial view about what the MFP proposal will incorporate.

I have reviewed the State's position on the MFP and believe that the work has identified some meaningful opportunities for the State. This includes the establishment of downstream processing, which will involve advanced materials. The establishment of the advanced materials policy and planning unit is one which will develop an overall strategy for the implementation of downstream mineral processing in Western Australia. This is one of the major needs of the State and is one in which we clearly have a natural advantage. The work of the unit will incorporate a range of responsibilities, including strategic planning for the advanced materials industry, undertaking feasibility studies, identifying specific infrastructure needs, competitive analysis of Western Australia's position, and acting as an interface between industry, Government and academic institutions. I intend that this group will report directly to me, and I expect that its accomplishments within the first 12 months will be substantial. The unit will be established within the auspices of the Ministry of Economic Development.

#### EDUCATION - MENTALLY AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN *School Integration*

150. Mr AINSWORTH to the Minister for Education:

What progress has been made at both primary and secondary school levels in respect of the program of integration of mentally and physically handicapped children into the general education system?

Dr GALLOP replied:

This question relates to the Government's policy over the last few years of examining the issue of mentally handicapped children and what is the best form of education for them. The Government's approach has been based on a very simple proposition; that is, we ought to widen the range of choices available to such children.

As a matter of background, I point out also that in the education system today we are dealing with additional degrees of handicap than was previously the case, not only in terms of the particular handicaps which children may have but also in terms of the treatment of multi-handicapped children in our system. We need to consider that background when we look at our policies. The Government's policy is to widen the range of choices available to people. That involves the construction of educational support centres within our primary schools. Many of these support centres have been built in recent years, and they enable children who previously had only the option of going to a special school for handicapped children to attend the mainstream primary school system. These educational support centres have been working very well in providing a basis from within which there will be additional social integration and, where appropriate, educational integration of these children into the mainstream classrooms.

This Government still provides special schools for handicapped children, which offer a choice for those children for whom that setting would be more appropriate. Those schools have in operation many programs of integration within their local community. I know that the special schools in my community take the children on shopping trips which encourage them to develop independent living habits. The schools also have vocational programs, particularly at secondary level, which will enable the children to proceed into the work force.

So the basic theme of this Government is to increase the range of choices; to ensure there are more educational support centres within our primary schools, and ultimately to extend that program into the secondary level; to maintain special schools for those children for whom it is appropriate; and, through increasing that range of choices, to enable parents to look around and to provide an opportunity which best meets the needs of their children.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS - CARNARVON BOAT HARBOUR

##### *Siltation Problem*

151. Mr LEAHY to the Minister for Transport:

Can the Minister outline any steps to be taken to ease the problem of restricted access to the small boat harbour in Carnarvon due to the silting of the approach channel?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

I thank the member for his question and for his representations about this matter. There is a recognised siltation problem at the Carnarvon Boat Harbour which has been restricting the movement of larger fishing vessels into and from the harbour. Dredging of Teggs Channel and the harbour approach channel is required to alleviate the problem. Cabinet has recently approved funding of up to \$600 000 for the dredging works. Tenders for the project have been called and will close on 5 June.

The Department of Marine and Harbours is currently seeking to obtain the lowest price for the necessary maintenance dredging work, to be carried out as soon as possible. A prerequisite of the tender process is a requirement of the Environmental Protection Authority that a consultative environmental report be prepared to cover the reclamation aspects of the project. It is expected that will delay the project by three months, and the dredging contract will be awarded once the EPA clearance has been granted.

#### SCHOOLS - JOHN CURTIN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Asbestos*

152. Mr FRED TUBBY to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Why has the Minister allowed the situation at John Curtin Senior High School to deteriorate to the point where teachers have taken industrial action?
- (2) What action has the Minister taken to ensure that the asbestos threat is dealt with as a matter of urgency?
- (3) What action does the Minister intend to take in the other 12 schools which have been identified as having similar asbestos-related health problems?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will call on the Minister for Education to respond to the question, but this is another example of an improper question. Members should take a lot more care when framing their questions, both on notice and without notice. At least two sections of this question are technically out of order.

Dr GALLOP replied:

(1)-(3)

It is good to be asked a question on education by the Opposition spokesperson whose great claim to fame in the education area is his opposition to promotion

on merit. I hope that belief does not apply within the Parliamentary Liberal Party.

The implication of the question asked by the member for Roleystone is that nothing was done in respect of that school, and that is why we have a problem there at present.

This whole question of asbestos in our schools is a very complex and also a very emotional one, and it needs to be dealt with properly. What our Government has done in recent times is, first of all, to make sure that expert advice is available to us in dealing with the issue. The Commissioner of Health chaired a major committee which presented an interim report to Government last December. That interim report, which examined a number of schools in our system, concluded that a negligible risk existed in respect of asbestos in those 12 schools. However, the report did say that we needed to develop a management plan for dealing with asbestos in schools. Accordingly, the Ministry of Education has set up such a committee to consider asbestos, chaired by the Director of Corporate Services and involving all the major trade unions and the Council of State School Organisations. That committee is examining the whole issue through our school system in order to develop a proper management plan.

In recent days the staff at one school - John Curtin Senior High School - have taken action under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act in the belief that a danger exists at that school. I am sure the member for Roleystone would understand the complexity and difficulty of this issue. The advice given to the Government by a committee chaired by the Commissioner of Health, Dr Bruce Armstrong - whose knowledge in this area would probably be second to none - is that no danger exists at that school. Therefore the member for Roleystone's claim that somehow this situation has developed because the Government has done nothing simply does not stand up. Now we have to respond to the situation that exists at the moment because of the action taken by the safety committee at that school.

Mr MacKinnon: But you closed the Middle Swan school, and you had no proof of any damage.

Dr GALLOP: That is wrong; there was clear evidence. The Leader of the Opposition should go and talk to the staff and students at that school who had observable symptoms indicative of problems.

Mr Fred Tubby: In 40 years' time these students may have observable symptoms of problems as well.

Dr GALLOP: Discussion has been going on for two days in an effort to resolve this matter between the Ministry of Education and the school's safety committee. I hope discussions will soon come to an end and that agreement can be reached to solve that matter at that school.

---