

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 11 May 1994

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.30 pm, and read prayers.

BILLS (13) - ASSENT

Messages from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills -

1. Pilbara Energy Project Agreement Bill
2. Iron Ore (Mount Newman) Agreement Amendment Bill
3. Adoption Bill
4. Business Franchise (Tobacco) Amendment Bill
5. Petroleum Royalties Legislation Amendment Bill
6. Poisons Amendment Bill
7. Acts Amendment (Vehicles on Roads) Bill
8. Acts Amendment (Official Corruption Commission) Bill
9. Reprints Amendment Bill
10. Reserves Bill
11. Special Investigation (Coal Contract) Bill
12. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Amendment Bill
13. Goldfields Gas Pipeline Agreement Bill

PETITION - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL, CLOSURE

Hon John Halden (Leader of the Opposition) presented a petition from 949 citizens strongly objecting to the proposed closure of Carawatha Primary School and the relocation of the language development centre.

[See paper No 36.]

PETITION - MT HENRY HOSPITAL, BED LEVEL MAINTENANCE

The following petition bearing the signature of one person was presented by Hon Kim Chance -

We, the undersigned people of Western Australia respectfully ask the members of the Legislative Council:

1. That the State Government continue to provide the same level of Permanent Care Nursing Home Beds for patients at Mt. Henry Hospital. This is in addition to the Speciality Units.
2. That the Minister for Health cease immediately any plans or negotiations to transfer Mt. Henry Permanent Care Beds to the Private Sector.
3. That the Restorative Unit North and South, and the Day Hospital be retained at Mt. Henry Hospital in its current format.

[See paper No 37.]

PETITION - TRADING HOURS, DEREGULATION

Hon J.A. Cowdell presented a petition from 1 640 citizens of Mandurah and surrounding districts opposing the wholesale deregulation of trading hours in Western Australia and the reintroduction of 24 hour trading in Mandurah.

[See paper No 38.]

PETITION - OCEAN REEF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, OVERCROWDING

The following petition bearing the signatures of 1 048 citizens was presented by Hon P.R. Lightfoot -

We, the undersigned people of Western Australia wish to convey our deep concern at the imminent overcrowding at the Ocean Reef Senior High School for 1995 and beyond.

We believe that as citizens and parents, we have a right to expect a firm commitment for the provision of high school facilities for the students in the Clarkson/Quinns area commencing Year 8 in 1995, as the projected overcrowding at Ocean Reef Senior High School will have a detrimental effect on the quality of education for all the children concerned.

[See paper No 39.]

PETITION - SUNSET HOSPITAL, HERITAGE VALUE

The following petition bearing the signatures of 540 persons was presented by Hon Reg Davies -

We the undersigned citizens of Western Australia call on the Parliament to:

- (a) Acknowledge the heritage value of Sunset Hospital,
- (b) Ensure that Sunset Hospital has the necessary funding for its proper refurbishment,
- (c) Insist that the Government does not sell or close the Sunset Hospital and relocate its residents, and
- (d) Acknowledge that many long term residents with no family see Sunset Hospital as their 'home' and fellow residents as their 'family'.

[See paper No 40.]

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION - STANDING COMMITTEES

Reappointment

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [2.45 pm]: I move, without notice -

That the members, as they were in the previous session, be reappointed to the following standing committees -

- (1) Standing Orders, House, Library, and Printing.
- (2) The Standing Committees on Legislation, Estimates and Financial Operations, and Constitutional Affairs and Statutes Revision.

I have consulted the Leader of the Opposition regarding this and a number of other motions which I will seek leave to move without notice this afternoon. They relate generally to the reappointment and membership of certain committees which lapsed on the recent prorogation of the House.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION - STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Reappointment

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [2.46 pm]: I move, without notice -

That the Standing Committee on Government Agencies shall consist of Hons Kim Chance, M.J. Criddle, Barry House, B.M. Scott, Tom Stephens, and Doug Wenn.

This motion involves a change in the membership of the committee.

Hon Tom Stephens: Hear, hear!

Hon N.F. Moore: The feeling is mutual.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Hon Norman Moore has been a member of the Government Agencies Committee since its establishment in 1982, and he has retired from the committee and is to be replaced by Hon Barbara Scott.

Question put and passed.

SELECT COMMITTEES - WESTERN AUSTRALIAN POLICE SERVICE

Appointment

On motion, without notice, by Hon George Cash (Leader of the House), resolved -

That a Select Committee on the Western Australian Police Service be appointed -

- (a) with the same terms of reference and membership as those of a select committee appointed in the previous session;
- (b) that the select committee have access to all documents, evidence and other material possessed, obtained and controlled by the previous select committee; and
- (c) that the committee report not later than 12 April 1995.

MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE - LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper

On motion, without notice, by Hon George Cash (Leader of the House), resolved -

That a message be sent to the Legislative Assembly requesting that consideration of the following Bills be resumed at the stage they had reached in the previous session -

1. Acts Amendment (Petroleum) Bill
2. Secondary Education Authority Amendment Bill
3. Acts Amendment (Coal Mining Industry) Bill

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [2.51 pm]: For the information of members I should advise that all of these motions without notice and matters were in fact discussed with the Leader of the Opposition, not just the first motion without notice. By way of explanation, as these Bills lapsed on prorogation but are Bills that were first initiated in the Legislative Council it is necessary for us to send a message to the Legislative Assembly in the terms I have just outlined. I further advise the House that we would anticipate the Legislative Assembly providing a message to the Legislative Council requesting us to reinstate certain Bills that were initiated in the Legislative Assembly.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths): For the benefit of the members of the House I point out there is a longstanding custom in this place that when members want to seek leave to move motions without notice the President gets some warning of it so that the President is not sitting up here like a stick of rhubarb not knowing what someone will come out with. I do not know why that longstanding custom has been deleted over recent times, but I suggest that it be reinstated in the future.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper - Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting that consideration of the following Bills be resumed -

1. Commission on Government Bill
2. Metropolitan Region Scheme (Fremantle) Bill
3. Interpretation Amendment (Australia Acts) Bill

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION - ASSEMBLY PERSONNEL

Appointment

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

MOTION - SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Airports, North West, Greater Use by International Traffic

HON TOM STEPHENS (Mining and Pastoral) [2.54 pm]: I move -

That -

- (1) A select committee be appointed to inquire into and report not later than Tuesday, 6 December 1994 on what action might be taken by the Commonwealth and State Governments and local authorities to encourage and implement greater use, by international passenger and freight air carriers, of airports located in the north west of the State, particularly -
 - (a) the current method of costing airport operations and whether that method deters or penalises remote airports in terms of international traffic;
 - (b) existing customs and immigration arrangements, their costs, and whether, consistent with the operational requirements and efficiency of both services, more cost-efficient arrangements might be introduced;
 - (c) what benefits to the state would accrue from greater use of north west airports in terms of trade and tourism from the Asian region.
- (2) Within the limits of state power, the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr President, I am sure you will not mind my noting the presence of Dr Peter Tannock and students of Notre Dame University Indiana in the President's Gallery. They are students involved in an Australian history course working with Dr Tannock. I welcome them to the Chamber, I am sure on behalf of all the members, and I thank you, Mr President, for letting them be in the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: It would be too bad if I did mind, which I do not, but I would also like to join with the member in issuing a welcome to those visitors.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This motion is addressed in the same terms as a motion that was previously moved in this House during the last session. In fact, it has simply one variation; the date of Tuesday, 6 December 1994. The date I moved this motion originally in this House was 8 July 1993. I spoke extensively about my reasons for moving my motion at page 1384 of *Hansard*, further on 21 October and again on 18 November at page 7353, and it was the subject of a question on notice on 16 December. I have extensively canvassed the argument to the House as to why this motion should be agreed to; that is, we in the north west of Western Australia are faced with some particular challenges to attract into our state alternative direct air services to the north of the state from overseas and to make sure we can pick up a volume of traffic that will provide the opportunity for competition entering our routes. I am pleased that the Minister for Transport is nodding his head in response to my comments that not a lot has changed since I spoke in the Chamber.

Hon E.J. Charlton: It has changed, actually.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I say that not a lot has changed because we are still not yet blessed with the north west connection that the north west so desperately needs with international ports specifically. We need to have a connection with our nearest neighbours in South East Asia - Denpasar, Singapore and other parts of South East Asia - as quickly as possible. I am sure there is no argument about that. A couple of things

have changed; that is, Ansett has recently announced changes to its own air fleet with the decision to purchase the new airbus, which members will be interested to know will see another five new A23 airbus jets with delivery next year, with an option on another five to be delivered in 1997. These will supplement the 12, 135-seat A320 twin jets already in the Ansett fleet. This order replaces a longstanding commitment for 10, 321s. The additional A320s will be used to replace Ansett's ageing B727 tri-jets, with 149 seats, and some of the old 69-seater Fokker F28 twin jets that are about to be replaced on our north west air routes by these larger aircraft. That will have a dramatic impact on the capacity of Ansett to service our intrastate routes, and poses dramatic challenges to make sure we have an air service operating within Western Australia that can look after the needs of the Western Australian community.

Hon E.J. Charlton: It is all under control, Mr Stephens.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: In that context it is very important that we do not simply let this issue go along a time lag, as is happening.

Hon E.J. Charlton: That is not right. What you are commenting on is what happened up to 12 months ago. Since then a whole range of things has happened, which I will explain.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: There is no difference on the ground today from what there was when I gave notice of this motion nearly 12 months ago. We still do not have an international carrier operating into the north west of Western Australia. We need that to get the payloads necessary to ensure that our scheduled air services are being operated at competitive air fare structures. In addition, we have the real risk associated with our connecting services around the north west of Western Australia because of the changing nature of the Ansett fleet. It is important this Minister recognises there is a real capacity within government to let these questions slide on and on. I saw that happening previously, I admit.

Hon E.J. Charlton: With respect, a whole range of things has happened. When I get the opportunity to respond I will explain them. Do not make accusations about what you think might be happening.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: On that basis it seems to me, Mr Deputy President, that the Minister is indicating that he has heard my arguments, so I will sit down and then respond when the Minister for Transport has spoken.

Adjournment of Debate

Hon GEORGE CASH: I move -

That the debate be adjourned.

Several members interjected.

Hon George Cash: The member has spoken.

Hon Tom Stephens: The Minister invited me to sit down.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Barry House): Order!

Hon George Cash: I do not know what was said as I have just entered the Chamber, but I have moved that the debate on this matter be adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (13)

Hon George Cash
Hon E.J. Charlton
Hon M.J. Criddle
Hon B.K. Donaldson
Hon Peter Foss

Hon Barry House
Hon P.R. Lightfoot
Hon Murray Montgomery
Hon N.F. Moore
Hon M.D. Nixon

Hon B.M. Scott
Hon W.N. Stretch
Hon Muriel Patterson (*Teller*)

Noes (13)

Hon T.G. Butler
 Hon Kim Chance
 Hon J.A. Cowdell
 Hon Cheryl Davenport
 Hon Reg Davies

Hon N.D. Griffiths
 Hon John Halden
 Hon A.J.G. MacTiernan
 Hon Mark Nevill
 Hon Sam Piantadosi

Hon Tom Stephens
 Hon Doug Wenn
 Hon Tom Helm (*Teller*)

Pairs

Hon Max Evans
 Hon P.H. Lockyer

Hon Graham Edwards
 Hon Bob Thomas

The PRESIDENT: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.
 Question thus negatived.

Debate Resumed

HON E.J. CHARLTON (Agricultural - Minister for Transport) [3.06 pm]: I certainly did not indicate to the mover of the motion that he should sit down immediately but that it was not in his best interests to go on making a whole range of assumptions on the basis of which he was making his comments on this motion, because a number of things have happened. I indicated I would explain these things to him. I was not intending to let the motion lie on the Notice Paper indefinitely, and we would have proceeded with it certainly tomorrow. Obviously, I am happy to respond now that the opportunity has arisen as a consequence of the decision of the House.

There are a number of matters to relate to members and a few points to be recognised. The important point is that the international carriers, to which the member referred, need to be brought into Australia. Any activity by an international carrier to move into the north of Western Australia is something the Government totally supports. I and members of the Department of Transport have met on a number of occasions with operators from South East Asia, encouraging them to enter Western Australia in the north of our State. Those negotiations have been going on. The carriers obviously have to be convinced that it is in their commercial interests. They will not do it unless it is.

Hon Tom Stephens will know that the airport at Kununurra must be a length which will enable those carriers to land and take off. The airport in Broome has recently been upgraded and the terminal facilities improved. That was a long time after the Opposition was in government, when it had the opportunity to do that. The people in the north and the international carriers concerned wanted to see that happen long before. The problems experienced were a consequence of the previous government's inability to deliver and enable the airport at Broome to achieve what was expected of it at that time.

Hon Kim Chance: I thought Broome was privately owned.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: As a consequence, the private operators now own the Broome establishment.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! When I call for order I expect the member I am calling to order to know that I am doing so without my having to record in *Hansard* the member to whom I am referring. I take it that members have a rough idea that I mean for the person I am glaring at to come to order. The member is out of order by standing and having a conversation with somebody while somebody else is addressing the House. I do not want to be too pedantic about it; however, for the member to carry on as though I have not said anything is a bit beyond the pale.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: The situation at the Broome airport has resulted from its inability in recent times to cater for international aircraft carriers in a proper manner, simply because its facilities are not able to present themselves accordingly. The only way that can happen is from a commercial viability point of view, because it is a privately owned and operated airport. I said that the previous government had attempted to get it up and running with a different financial arrangement, which did not succeed.

When we came into government we had to work on the situation before us and to encourage those people. The Government has given them a commitment. I have been to Broome on a number of occasions. In addition to that the Premier had the privilege of opening that new facility some months ago.

I agree with Hon Tom Stephens that in addition to those two airports there is a great opportunity to take advantage of all the natural benefits that the north of Western Australia has to offer with the Port Hedland airport. In addition to the changes with Ansett, which I believe will bring about a benefit for its travellers, a number of other operators in the north of Western Australia will be able to interlink with those other carriers to generate far greater tourist and passenger opportunities for the north. It is ludicrous to have flights from South East Asia almost flying over the top of northern Western Australia but not stopping there on their way to Perth. The Government has been pursuing with those carriers the possibility of their stopping off at any one of those airports in the north of Western Australia so that passengers who want to take advantage of the spectacular tourist opportunities in the north may do so and pick up a later flight to continue their trip to Perth.

Michael Foley from the Department of Transport, together with the Premier, the Tourism Commission and other associated people in trade and commerce, brought together a link to ensure the establishment of a viable opportunity. We have this great chance to take advantage of it. The Government is leaving no stone unturned in its attempt to put this opportunity in place. Hon Tom Stephens said that nothing had changed; however, a lot has changed. For instance, no contact had been made with those international carriers prior to our coming into government about taking up this opportunity to stop in the north of the state. I am not talking only about charter flights, but about regular flights from South East Asia. The response from the international airlines has been positive. The Government is taking them to the area one by one to look at the operations and their potential.

The other issue that goes hand in hand with that is accommodation. There is a lack of accommodation, particularly in Kununurra. As I mentioned previously, the length of the runway itself must also be addressed. Funds cannot be spent on lengthening the runway if that work is not reciprocated by international carriers using that facility. In turn, that cannot occur without the balanced accommodation that goes hand in glove with that. The Government is trying to put all of those pieces together. That takes money and resources. The Government is bringing all those people together to ensure that we get that balanced approach that will enable all of that to happen.

I repeat: The Government has had discussions with the international carriers, with potential financiers to provide accommodation, and with the tourist people in this state, across the nation and overseas to ensure that these balanced and progressive decisions are not made only by government, because government has only a small part to play in ensuring that these developments can go ahead. Another matter of crucial importance, which I am sure the member will be pleased to hear, is that this Government hired consultants to examine the trade opportunities out of Western Australia. A range of products are being produced in this state with markets in South East Asia. The great problem is that although there are markets for the products, there is no capacity for their transportation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is not one set of rules for the members and a different set of rules for the Clerks. I just stopped a member from having a longwinded conversation with the mover of the motion, yet here is the Clerk doing it again. I do not know whether I am going senile. I think he should cut it out.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I am attempting to inform Hon Tom Stephens, if he is interested, about the number of initiatives already being taken. A dramatic increase has occurred in flights into Perth Airport from South East Asia; however, that has not been linked to an increase in the opportunities of moving freight out of Western Australia. As a consequence of that, the Government has hired consultants to examine this issue. The products being produced in Western Australia are ever-increasing; namely, the lobster

export opportunities, the flowers, and other perishable goods from a range of different types of products across the state. Additionally, increasing export opportunities coming out of Kununurra need to be shipped to South East Asia. As Hon Tom Stephens would know, the people in Kununurra have successfully promoted their products in South East Asia under the banner of the Ord River. As a consequence of that they need the opportunity to get their products into that region.

We have contracted the consultants, who have issued a report to the Government; and that report identifies the inability of the current system to cater for that demand. Although the Government knew of the problem, the consultants have identified the areas that need to be addressed. Cold storage facilities need to be implemented at Perth Airport and the same process needs to be implemented at the other end. It is no good having the products loaded onto planes in Perth if a distribution mechanism does not exist at the destination. The other problem identified is that inspection of the product must be in Western Australia rather than at the other end because that leads to delays. For example, flowers from Holland are inspected in Holland before leaving for Japan. On arrival in Japan, no hold-up occurs and the flowers go straight to the retail outlet. That is important to avoid perishables standing around for hours and minutes in an airport freight terminal, and it determines whether it is a very valued product or a product that is not worth putting on the local market. It is crucial that these matters be addressed.

The Government has appointed the consultants to provide a report identifying the particular products, the problem areas at airports with cold storage, transportation, and a whole range of things. The next move by the Government was identification of the products, how much of the product exists, where it is produced, its destination, and at what time of the year it is required. That information has been correlated. In the past the issue of these perishable goods leaving our state has not been addressed in a coordinated way. What has occurred is that the entrepreneurial division of people in our state - and it is renowned worldwide - produces a product and does not have the capacity to transport the product to its destination. Now the capacity to produce and market the product have been identified, but we have not been able to get the product there. What is happening is that month after month these products are being produced but are either sold at very low prices because of the loss of quality or simply not sent at all. It is important for Hon Tom Stephens to know - and this is not a criticism - that what the Government has done in the last 12 months, particularly in the last six months, in overcoming this problem, is to talk to the international airlines regarding extra capacity. Their main concern is passengers. Every time passenger numbers increase, that means more fuel and less freight. Every day on every flight, there is no knowledge of the reservations for the particular freight component. If freight is of less value than the passengers, then passengers come first and the freight is left behind, and it is left in a facility that is not up to a quality standard.

I recently visited New Zealand to look at public transport systems and the changes being implemented there. I visited a freight forwarding operation, where a different arrangement operates from what occurs in Western Australia. They are miles ahead of us. The freight forwarding operation I visited caters for a whole range of vegetables that are chilled when produced.

Hon Tom Helm: Are you saying New Zealand has something in common with us?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: No. I am saying that New Zealand is far ahead of us.

Hon Tom Helm interjected.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I am saying that New Zealand is disadvantaged because its producers are further away from the market than we are. In Western Australia, we are a stone's throw from South East Asia compared with New Zealand, and they are outdoing us on many fronts. They are market oriented, and have undertaken research and given initiative to the people to do it right, whether it be loading sheep - which they perform twice as quickly as we do - or whatever.

Hon Tom Helm interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am frantically trying to relate what the Minister is talking

about with this motion. Frankly, I cannot. I have got people interjecting in one ear and I am trying to listen to the Minister with the other. I cannot see anything to do with this in his motion; maybe there is.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I make these comments because the member has moved to set up a select committee to inquire into a whole range of activities, including airports in the north of the State. I am stating that because of the Government's actions a select committee is not required. The member, when he moved the motion, made comments, which I will not quote, to the effect that things needed to be done. I stated before what needed to be done and I have been outlining that. The member began his comments by stating things which should happen regarding changes to Ansett and international carriers being brought in. Discussions with those carriers have been undertaken. The member made the point that nothing had been done. I have pointed out that something has been done. Further, one does not need only international carriers but also cold storage, market opportunity, and a process whereby the importer in South East Asia and the exporter here know that the ability exists to obtain those things. This has been achieved by consultants who have submitted a report. We are now at the stage of identifying particular products, where they are coming from, where they are going to, the time of the year, and the quantity. This is to ensure that the international carriers are aware what the freight potential is that will be put in place. The Government has completed these things and consultants have been paid, so no need exists to appoint a select committee. That information will be made available to the member.

Hon Tom Helm: Give us more.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: We know the member is a joke.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Here they are saying they want a select committee to fly around the world, and what we need to do is identify the exporters and their products that are here in the State. I am offering Hon Tom Stephens and anybody else interested the important facts that have already been identified; that is, to ensure the international carriers will be encouraged to stop in the north we must provide some financial reward so that it is commercially viable for them to do so. A select committee can be set up and members can have all the benefits of that, but at the end of the day that is the basis on which it will happen.

The PRESIDENT: Honourable members -

Points of Order

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I understand you, Mr President, are about to draw the attention of the House to the time and I wish to clarify the situation. I have difficulty obtaining advice from the Clerk because I must remain in my seat. I gave notice of this motion many months ago on 18 July 1993. I have now taken the first opportunity to move that motion in this session and to have it debated. If the leave of the House is not granted by the Government to continue debate on my motion to establish this select committee, what process is available for me to have a matter such as this finally decided rather than its being left to languish at the bottom of the notice paper?

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is not a point of order.

Hon Tom Stephens: I seek your guidance.

The PRESIDENT: There is nothing the member can do about it. Firstly, however, the Government will not make a decision; the House will decide whether debate on the motion proceeds. One dissenting voice will deny leave, and in that case the member can do nothing about it today. There are some things he can do subsequently and I will talk to him about them subsequently. I will not have a long discussion now about the rules that apply to the procedures in this House. I am compelled to put to the House right now the question that one hour has elapsed, and to seek leave of the House for the debate to be continued. If the House does not give leave and there is one dissenting voice, we shall go to the orders of the day.

Hon Tom Stephens: On another point of order.

The PRESIDENT: You did not have one in the first place.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I seek further guidance. I understand the only item on the Notice Paper at the moment is the Address-in-Reply debate. Therefore, it would not be usual for the Government to refuse leave to proceed with this motion in order to go to the Address-in-Reply debate.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. I reiterate that the House makes the decision although the member keeps referring to the Government making the decision. We can have a long debate about that, but I will not go into it at the moment. The member does not have a point of order. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that one hour has elapsed since the time set down for this sitting and, therefore, leave of the House is required if debate is to continue.

[Debate adjourned, pursuant to Standing Order No 195.]

STATEMENT - HON TOM HELM

Notice of Motion, Regulations Disallowance

HON TOM HELM (Mining and Pastoral) [3.34 pm] - by leave: The reason I seek leave to make a short statement is that the House will be aware that today is the last day on which a move can be made to disallow the regulations which were the subject of the motion of which I gave notice. The reason for the motion is not necessarily to disallow the regulations but to allow the House to debate them before they go through.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Alkimos City Centre, Metropolitan Region Scheme Major Amendment

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan - Minister for Health) [3.35 pm] - by leave: I make this ministerial statement in my capacity representing the Minister for Planning with regard to documents I tabled yesterday. Members may recall that in August last year the State Planning Commission released for public comment plans for a major regional city centre at Alkimos, north of Perth. The site for the future city centre was included in a proposed major amendment to the metropolitan region scheme - the blueprint for land use in the Perth region. The amendment covered about 1 630 hectares in the suburbs of Alkimos and Eglinton in the rapidly expanding north west corridor. It included 558 ha for the central city area, 682 ha for parks and recreation, and 155 ha for public purposes. The proposed city centre includes land for a 60 000 square metre shopping centre, as well as land for other mixed business, commercial, residential and civic purposes. The proposed city centre is about halfway between Joondalup and Yanchep, and is suitably located to take advantage of any future extensions to the northern suburbs rail line.

After almost 10 months of extensive consultation with landowners, the local authority and other interest groups, the commission has finalised its recommendations in line with the proper consultative mechanisms contained within the major amendment process. The commission received 61 submissions. Of that number, 51 were opposed to certain aspects of the amendment while 10 were generally in favour. After considering the written and verbal submissions, the commission made a number of recommendations which were submitted to the Governor yesterday, and of which he has approved. These changes I believe reflect the wishes of the local communities affected.

Objections were received from residents of Eglinton-Carabooda to the proposed parks and recreation reservation between Wanneroo Road and the Mitchell Freeway and this has been deleted, except for land to protect the Pipidinny and Beonaddy System 6 wetlands. The proposed important regional road reservation for Eglinton Avenue has also been deleted. The suggested modifications of many landowners to the urban deferred zonings, parks and recreation reservations and regional road reservations have been made.

Although the amendment has been altered from its original form, it still fulfils the Government's twin roles of making available enough zoned land for housing to meet Perth's growing population needs, and to preserve land which is environmentally sensitive. In all, the amendment has been reduced in size from 1 630 ha to some 1 609 ha, which is still enough to house the 50 000 people who are expected to live in the area. Importantly, the future Alkimos central city area remains unchanged so that it can one day be developed along similar lines to Joondalup. The speed and efficiency with which this amendment has been processed, as with others the Government has brought before the Parliament, further demonstrate that the statutory process, when properly followed, works to the benefit of the whole community.

[See paper No 19A-D.]

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Motion

Resumed from 5 May.

HON JOHN HALDEN (South Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [3.38 pm]: In my initial comments on the Address-in-Reply I wish to comment on what is happening in the technical and further education sector at the moment, particularly with regard to the autonomous colleges, integrated autonomous colleges, or whatever name the Government now has for this proposal. There is no doubt that the coalition Government in its election promises quite clearly said it would establish autonomous TAFE colleges and further said it would establish an autonomous TAFE colleges commission, to be known as the TAFE Comm, which would be responsible directly to the Minister for Education. On that basis it must be said that the Government put forward a clear policy in regard to this area. As I go through the events that have transpired in chronological order since that announcement in January 1993, it is apparent that the policy adopted by this Government and the Minister indicates that autonomous TAFE colleges will not be established.

We will have colleges with far more control centrally, particularly from the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Training and of course from the Minister. Although there are trappings around the edges and some of the words may reflect a desire for autonomous colleges, the practice and the words do not leave anyone with any comfort. I refer here to a group of people involved in education, training and industry who are concerned that the course that is being adopted by the Government is not a path that will lead to autonomous TAFE colleges or anything like that.

Prior to July 1993, the Government commissioned Bob Vickery to undertake a review of education in this state. At the same time, we had the McCarrey report, which looked into this matter but took many of its findings and comments from the Vickery report. I cite now some of the comments by Vickery. The Vickery report said there was a lack of clarity between the roles and responsibilities in TAFE; it said more autonomous and flexible operating environments for colleges were necessary, and there was a need for an alignment of course provisions more closely to industry needs. In regard to the first and last points, the Opposition has no great problem. In regard to the second point, at that time we wanted to explore that concept more. However, when one reads the Vickery report a number of concerns come to mind. There is this call for autonomous TAFE colleges but nowhere in the document is there justification for colleges of that type. Nowhere in the document is there justification for a whole range of other recommendations. It contains a discourse about what is currently happening and what should happen but nowhere is there justification for it.

It is fair to say that one of the constants for all lecturing staff at TAFE over the last few years is that they have been subjected to a regime of change. It is the unanimous view of key stake holders that major change is required. What does this say when change has taken place over the last decade and we are about to have more change? It says that the pace of change has been so rapid that it has never been allowed to consolidate or to be effectively reviewed to find out the advantages of the changes or what problems they

have caused. I suggest that one of the problems that has arisen out of this issue is that morale has been poor. But with the proposed changes now, with little consultation with the teaching profession, where in documents subsequently released there has been very clear suggestions that teachers will not be consulted, it is not surprising that last Saturday we had the spectacle of around 680 TAFE lecturers voting on motions of no confidence in the Minister for Education, and not being prepared to accept an enterprise bargaining agreement with the department involved. The lecturers feel isolated and marginalised. I must emphasise that no information has been given by Vickery to explain why changes are required. It is that point that most galls those involved in this sector. The Vickery report demands that things be radically altered but it offers no explanation. There appears to be an assumption that saying there should be change is enough to justify that change. It is probably true to say, based on comments by the Minister for Education in this place, that teachers are the true enemies of progress.

Hon N.F. Moore: I never said that. I said the teachers union management, not teachers.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: You said that.

Hon N.F. Moore: Read it carefully.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Minister should listen to what I say.

Hon N.F. Moore: I know what I said, and I know what I meant - and it is not what you say I said or meant.

Hon John Halden: As I recall, the Minister referred to the teachers union as Neanderthal.

Hon N.F. Moore: I said the teachers union - Mr Quin in particular, if you want me to be specific.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Before the Minister goes down that path, he should recall the history of the Neanderthals who survived for 300 million years. If the Minister keeps running headlong in this way he will not receive cooperation or effect the reforms he would like. He will guarantee the survival of the teachers union because those comments and that attitude will make sure teachers revile against the Minister.

Hon N.F. Moore: What are you whingeing about then?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: They will not accept the attitude that the Minister portrays in this House.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Prior to the adjournment I was making the point that the Vickery report suggests there was a need for autonomous colleges. The report does not explain why that would result in benefits. There was no single argument to justify a radical amendment of what was the department of employment, vocational education and training, the Department of Training as it is now. Over a number of years there has been a policy of regionalisation in the old department of DEVET, and now we find that the Department of Training is taking a further step towards autonomous colleges. It has been argued that this policy will see fewer administrators and more money available for lecturing and lecturers. However, in 1983 the ratio of purely administrative staff members to lecturing staff was 6.2 administrators to every 100 lecturers.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Was that in each of the colleges or the whole system?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: That was in the colleges. In July 1993 there were 9.1 administrators to every 100 lecturers, an increase of 32 per cent. Autonomous colleges are a process of devolution. There are those of us who believe in devolution to varying degrees, and I am one of those people, but if we are to have a devolutionary process we will have a new stratum of administrators, not centrally but at the college level. If we are to have contact with industry and the community and due accountability at that local level we will have to provide this new stratum.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: What happens to the administrative structure at the centre?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: That is the point I was getting to. Those who propose these

changes say that the administration level at the centre diminishes. My experience, both when in government and previously when I studied this issue, showed two things: Firstly, in spite of the promises for decreased numbers at the central administrative level, this does not happen; and, secondly, if it does initially, there is a process of creeping change which brings the numbers back into the central administration to oversee the additional stratum in the devolutionary process.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: What about a decentralised process?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: People call it what they like.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: There are two different concepts. You are talking about a middle management to oversee a devolutionary system. In a decentralised system you do not have a middle management because you do not have that oversight.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: That is not what has been proposed. If one reads the document carefully it is clear that it is not proposing decentralisation of responsibility and power. What we are seeing are not proposals from Vickery or McCarrey but from Peter Gordon, a report which I will refer to and of which I will give the member a copy.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I will appreciate that.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Subsequent to that report is another paper put out by the Minister. The Gordon report and the ministerial report plus the overhead slides, which provide far more information - I will be happy to provide those to the member or the House - show we do not have the decentralisation of responsibility and power. We have the centralisation, particularly of power, at the central administrative level. At the start of my speech I said that this centralisation of power is more and more in the hands of the chief executive officer and Minister, which is contrary to the recommendations by McCarrey and Vickery.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: You are arguing that it is the centralisation of policy and the decentralisation of administration.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The member is right. What I suggest about administration is that although responsibility is shifted to the local level, the ability to provide the services at that level is such that the responsible communities and industries are unable to provide it with the resources allocated.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: It is similar to the private schools program.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Indeed, and that is why I used the analogy of devolution. Having made those comments and heard those interjections, which I thought were helpful, I suggest this process of autonomous colleges will quite rightly cost more to administer. I refer the House to question 203 in *Hansard* at page 1822, where Hon Kim Chance asked the Minister for Education -

Will the recommendations of the Vickery report, if implemented, be cost neutral?

The Minister responded -

If all the recommendations were implemented in a certain way they could cost some money. I have been advised that autonomous colleges cost more to run than technical and further education colleges. However, there is also evidence to suggest they can be run cheaper than a TAFE college.

The Minister issued a press statement on 24 September 1993 in which he said that the restructuring would be "cost neutral" and the changes "carefully implemented to ensure minimal disruption". It is interesting that he now asserts it will be cost neutral, but nowhere in any of the documents - the Gordon, Vickery and McCarrey reports, a subsequent ministerial statement, or the whole box and dice of material associated with this matter - is there any suggestion that proves it will be cost neutral.

Furthermore, at the moment we are beginning to see, by virtue of the public meeting of the State School Teachers Union on Saturday, that teaching staff at these colleges do not believe there will be "minimal disruption". They are quite clear that there will be

significant disruption. They fear - one of the key recommendations in the Vickery, McCarrey and Gordon reports - a change in industrial conditions for these workers, included to justify the changes. Again, consultation with those involved was minimal to non-existent. They see, as the letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Training said to them regarding negotiations about a new enterprise bargaining agreement, that they have increased hours, a reduced overtime component and massive cost cutting in staff training. All that resulted in no increase in pay whatsoever.

The meeting also discussed devolution and its funding. Again the members came to the point that there was no documentation to suggest that it would be cost neutral or that there would be any savings.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Would any documents prove anything else?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: These are a series of documents that have come to my attention from moment to moment. I suggest the Minister for Education would prefer I did not have them, but I do.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Perhaps you will table them?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I will be happy to table them. Those documents clearly show no financial justification -

Hon T.G. Butler: Can you read each one in detail before you table them?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I intend to read a number of them in detail because they will clearly support my case.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson interjected.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I do not know whether Hon Derrick Tomlinson wants me to filibuster or whether he wants to divert my attention to some other matter.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon W.N. Stretch): You have been doing a good job and should continue.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. In August 1993 the McCarrey report said that the vocational education and training system should be aimed at a client focused system of delivery. It went on to say that the committee and the commission endorse proposals to move toward more autonomous colleges and believe competition can be obtained by colleges having contractual arrangements with the State Training Board, the delivery of services to be funded through the Australian National Training Authority.

One of the interesting things about the series of reports I have is the issue of "client" focused systems of delivery. When I think about "client" focus in terms of TAFE I make the assumption that in a primary sense the reference is to students or trainees. However, the Gordon report says that "clients" are not that group of people, but industry. That highlights the necessity to work out in the first instance who is the "client" in training. I would be only too happy to entertain an argument in this Chamber if it was the bent of someone at a later time to make a speech that the "client" should not be students, but should be industry. Industry certainly has a role in this matter, but it should not be the primary client focused group.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Why?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Because that group is the students.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Why?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: When one asks for whom is training provided, the answer to me is that it is for those who are seeking it; that is, students or trainees - not industry.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Your conclusion is quite wrong.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: As I said to the Deputy President when I started my speech, I will be only too happy to entertain with any member why the client group should be students and not industry.

I refer to a document written by Mr Peter Gordon, who, at the time of writing it, was the chief executive officer of the then department of employment, vocational education and training. It is entitled "Autonomous TAFE Colleges Beyond the Rhetoric" and contains about 24 pages. The document is riddled with rhetoric. It has in it continual references to the words flexibility, productivity, dynamic, responsive, accountability, responsible autonomy, benchmark, best practices, strategic management, framework, delivery efficiency, out-sourcing, service delivery, responsibility, competitive neutrality, client focus, cost efficient, cost effective and provider output specifications.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Jargon.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Exactly. It also has a series of other, equally rhetoric-type statements such as "embracing the management techniques as the funder purchaser provider model", "bench marking and best practices approach", "direct and tangible accountability", "will deliver the client focus", "dynamic cost efficient training systems so desperately needed", "inefficient monopoly situations", "an agenda of radical reform", "moving power away from central bureaucracy", "out-sourcing", "privatisation initiative", "best practice models are embraced", "authority and accountability are focused and specified", "labour flexibility and continued improvement in productivity", "progressive thinking in public sector management", "accurate", "timely strategic information", "predictability of outcomes", "revenue earning initiatives", "a management competitive framework", "a management competitive service delivery system", "a carefully guided transition", "a challenging set of mechanisms and processes", and "integrated rolling recurrent and capital budget". It seems to me when one reads all of those words repeatedly, and sometimes joined with the barest of conjunctives, they are nothing but jargon.

The best example of jargon used in the paper is "a managed, competitive framework". If one's ideological bent is to go back to Adams Smith I suggest that, in ideological terms, when trying to implement free market strategies into the training of students and trainees in this state, he would be perplexed about how one could possibly come up with the concept of "a management competitive framework". It is nonsensical in philosophical, and any other, terms. What is "a management competitive framework"? The report is drivel from beginning to end.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Jargon only makes sense if you read it in context. Take it out of context and it is nonsense.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Hon Derrick Tomlinson made a speech yesterday regarding Hon Bob Pike and his different philosophical approaches on certain matters. Whatever is "a management competitive framework" in terms of Liberal Party thinking -

Hon Doug Wenn: This will take years.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: That is Liberal Party nonsensical thinking.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: "A management competitive framework" in terms of any concept of free market systems is also a nonsense. The whole document is a nonsense from beginning to end.

It is riddled with jargon, and to call it beyond rhetoric is to go beyond the pale. One consistent theme throughout this is the continual call for changes to the wages and employment conditions within the TAFE training sector. The articles I have read regarding this matter continually refer to new arrangements under section 41 of the Industrial Relations Act. What that means is that there will be a core permanent work force with a periphery of part-time temporary workers who have no security whatsoever relating to continuation of employment. The Minister stated in his press release that minimal disruption will occur. When a vast core of people are taken out of a secure working environment and placed in casual and temporary employment I suggest that, like many of the other concepts in this report, is absolute humbug. The papers want to loosen up the number of hours people work and are allowed to work. How much money they will lose, how many conditions of employment will be removed and the ease with which their jobs can be disposed of - that is exactly what these documents refer to by way of

flexibility of employment. Flexibility renders the person at the mercy of the system regarding their employment. The documents state that there will be a major shift to contracts and out-sourcing and no career paths or very limited career paths for non-management staff.

One of the great ironies in this matter is that the principals of TAFE colleges in this state are being asked to reapply for their jobs. A belief exists that management positions in these TAFE colleges will go to management people and not existing principals, principals with a background of teaching and knowledge of the system. That is a great indictment when the system that is supposed to train people in this state does not have the confidence to train its existing managers to manage under this system or the proposed new system. It states that minimal disruption will occur, but every principal and every senior person in a TAFE college is fearful for his job. The word is out that generic managers will replace them. I relate an instance of a senior person in a TAFE college writing a 30 page resume to justify why he should retain his job now. That is called minimal disruption in one of the crucial areas of education, of economic development, in this state. TAFE is involved in the training of our young adults and people to acquaint them with skills so they can perform more productively in our environment.

It does not stop there. Under the euphemistic heading of "Planning" on page 17 of the Gordon report, there is apparently an opportunity for dialogue with every possible group to ensure this process continues and is successful. Which group is left out of those that should be consulted in this dialogue? The group left out is TAFE lecturers or teachers. It is an absolutely astounding omission - the only people who will not be spoken to are the ones delivering the services. It is particularly relevant for someone to have written a report which is central to government policy regarding this matter. The report states that changes in governance of the vocational, education and training system must continue to drive down service and delivery costs while at the same time increasing the motivation and commitment of staff. Can we imagine someone actually saying that and believing it; or maybe it is written and not believed - I am not quite sure.

If service and delivery costs are to be driven down - that is, through TAFE lecturers - with an expectation of increased motivation and commitment by staff while reducing their livelihood, the quality of their lifestyle will be reduced, making it difficult for them to make ends meet. I suggest the one thing which will not be obtained is increased motivation and commitment. Perhaps Liberal dogma is to have people at their most vulnerable point regarding economic survival, and people will commit themselves to survive on a meagre existence.

A response to the proposal for autonomous colleges was provided by the Western Australian State School Teachers Union. I will not read that, but I highlight the six points regarding this process. My beliefs and fears regarding these proposed changes are supported by the union. The union states that broadly the process consists of firstly, tightening central control over resources and curricula; secondly, devolving or decentralising to colleges responsibility for determining how best to maintain declining resources; thirdly, transferring the focus for industrial relations to the work force; fourthly, imposing increasingly elaborate accountability procedures on colleges; fifthly, strengthening the line relationships between college directors and the central administration; and sixthly, changing the role of directors from educational leaders to resource managers.

I refer to one other matter regarding this report. The report suggests that TAFE become a self-regulator in a system of accreditation and that total domination of industry occur in the running of TAFE. I do not accept the last point, but the industry role needs to be questioned. I need to be convinced that self-accreditation results in better outcomes. If this approach is adopted the whole process regarding quality which has been accepted by this Government under the Australian National Training Authority will be diminished. On 18 April 1994 the Minister produced a document titled "Ministerial Requirements of the Vocational Education and Training System" which referred to the integrated autonomous colleges system and was the result of exhaustive examination of various systems of college government - a line of continuum from a highly centrally controlled

environment to total statutory independence. The new system offers the best of both worlds by extending local control to the maximum while properly recognising the Government's requirements for accountability and coherent planning. I have a number of letters in my possession which have been directed to the Minister from industry - from the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, signed by Lyndon Rowe. In one instance he said there was a concern that the overview and supporting document indicate a middle of the road approach to college management; that is, neither one of centralised control nor an autonomous college network. This was considered to be disadvantageous to both ends of the spectrum.

The document, "Ministerial Requirements of the Vocational Education and Training System" alleges that colleges will be locally managed. I have a document from an independent college which states that under this system what is currently an independent governing council becomes an advisory body to the Minister and the Western Australian Department of Training, which usurps the council's authority and responsibility. In the process the council becomes a political body with all members appointed by the Minister.

We know the Minister likes to dabble in political appointments. He hated it when the Opposition, when in government, made political appointments; but he loves doing it himself. He is renowned for appointing failed Liberal Party candidates to college boards in the north west and this independent college clearly states that, "In the process the council becomes a political body with all members appointed by the Minister." Another letter from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia states -

The suggestion that the partial autonomy is only a first step might be more acceptable if there were well defined steps towards full autonomy supported by clearly defined underpinning commitments . . .

Is there? No, there is not. It is clearly a compromise position, presumably between the chief executive officer and the Minister as they grapple with who will have the most power under this system. However, the students and the trainees have been lost in this process.

It is interesting that the Gordon report does not refer to the necessity to provide quality of education and training in a direct sense, nor does it address it by substantial argument in any one of its 24 pages.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Does that need justification?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Most definitely it does. In fact, it needs more.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: The provision of quality education needs justification?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: It would be a help if it were mentioned.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: You said "justification". I wonder where the Labor Party is going.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: It is going a lot further than is the Government. No doubt the member has been out of this Chamber on parliamentary business, but on his return he has decided to interject. I am happy to give this document to the member to read. It does not mention one word about quality education, yet Hon Derrick Tomlinson wants to defend the Minister for Education. Clearly, it is a situation of defending the indefensible. I would like to continue my remarks.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: You have been.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I know that when the member shouts loudly I am striking a chord.

The Chamber of Commerce and Industry's letter continues -

. . . there is no plan to take either the college management or councils to the point where they could take over the responsibilities associated with publicly funded vocational education and training (and therefore be deemed accountable). Nor do the three major planks of the partial autonomy program advance such a course

(limited control over staffing, minor fee for service control [in effect, no more than a return to pre-College of customised training conditions] and minor works [which is probably something that will be better left under central organisational control in the partial autonomy context].

That is not autonomy for colleges.

One of the headings in the "Ministerial Requirements of the Vocational Education and Training System" document - like the previous document I referred to it is full of rhetoric - refers to debureaucratisation. The Minister said that there must be less rigidity and regulation in the system and that the parameters must be defined in accordance with government policy within which local managers can be left to manage.

It is interesting that one of the independent colleges wrote to the Minister that the implementation of the system would destroy its fee for service for customised training programs. It said that it introduced the unnecessary bureaucratisation of fee for service activities and reduced the incentives that are currently available to staff to involve themselves in fee for service training.

The Minister said in this document that he was developing an integrated training network. He also said there must be the capacity for the strategic economic and industrial development needs of the State to be addressed and that this can be achieved only by an integrated statewide network where local autonomy is complemented by strategically managed competition. We now have another concept; that is, strategically managed competition. I do not know what it means. An ideologically bent right-winger on the other side of the House will have to tell me.

Again, an independent college wrote to the Minister and said that it had a major contract with an iron ore producer under the IACS model, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Department of Training would take over those activities against the wishes of the college and the iron ore producer. Local industry in that region has made it clear that if Perth based bureaucracy becomes involved in the training process it will take its business elsewhere.

This document presents a number of other problems. There is a need for clear separation between the policy and planning function and the service provisions of the new Department of Training and TAFE. In the document presented on 18 April there is no clear separation. No attempt has been made to address that issue, despite calls from a number of senior industrial people in this State.

It is interesting to note that an independent college said the 18 April proposal is yet another example of the increasing centralisation and bureaucratisation of control inherent throughout the IACS model. In addition to that, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry said in a letter to the Minister -

If full autonomy is not to be the Government's policy position . . . then the pretence of moving in that direction should be dropped and all reform energies . . . directed at putting in place a fully accountable centralised structure.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I may have missed it when I was absent on parliamentary business, but will you tell me from what you are reading?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am reading from my notes, but I referred to this matter in question time last Thursday. In my notes I am quoting from a letter to the Minister from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Will you give me the full details of the document?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The letter is dated 21 April 1994 and it is addressed to Mr Ian Williams, Chair, State Training Board, PO Box 6085, East Perth. The letter headed, "WA College Autonomy Within the Reformed VET System" and is signed by Lyndon G. Rowe, the chief executive officer. I do not intend to quote from the document again and I will table it for the information of members.

[See paper No 41.]

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I would hate Hon Derrick Tomlinson to live in anguish that I was not going to table that document, because it is a condemning document.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I will not die in anguish.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Exactly. I would hate that. It is a condemning document, even more from the point of view that if I, as the Opposition spokesperson in this area, had wanted to condemn the Government, I might have gone to the State School Teachers Union, which is only too happy to condemn the Government, and principally the Minister, but this letter from Lyndon Rowe probably adds more weight to my argument than anything that I could say and exemplifies that industry has considerable concern about the Minister's proposal. It is not just Lyndon Rowe who is concerned about this issue. A number of chief executive officers who represent industry in this town and who are on a number of boards related to this matter are likewise concerned. They have written to the Minister, and the Minister, who may have acquainted himself with that correspondence as a result of a question of which I gave him some notice today, would be able to see that industry is particularly concerned about the proposals and where they are heading at this time.

I have received an unsigned critique of the documents titled "Autonomous TAFE Colleges Beyond the Rhetoric" and "Ministerial Requirements of the Vocational Education and Training System", which I am only too happy to table. That document was prepared for me by a senior bureaucrat in the Department of Training, and it may be appropriate to acquaint the House with what some bureaucrats in the system think about these two propositions and proposals. It states -

The Court Government's radical free-market philosophies will lead to the rapid down-grading of the State's quality education and training system put in place by Labor and remove access to the opportunities that it has provided to many thousands of Western Australians over the past ten years.

Basic principles of social justice, with their emphasis on access and equity are ignored in the haste to privatise the State's vital training system.

Individuals in the very near future may have to pay thousands of dollars to private providers of training in all industry areas if the proposals go ahead as the State's provision through TAFE is progressively wound down in favour of private providers.

The potential costs to implement the system, which are not detailed, may in fact, reduce even further, the money available for training in the Government sector.

Certain regional areas will become severely disadvantaged.

The radical, free-market approach, greatly discredited in the United Kingdom under Thatcher regime and the Conservatives, ignores the State's most important resource, its people.

And, I suggest to Hon Derrick Tomlinson, the clients of this department. It continues -

In a headlong rush for the State's training system to become totally subservient to the short-term goals of business and its bid to open up competition for private providers, the Government is abrogating its training responsibilities.

More prosperous countries such as Germany, invest heavily in training and the State is instrumental in the delivery of programs through a well-resourced vocational education and technical training education system. The partnerships between government and industry are strong and the obligations of the State in this area are taken seriously.

There is a danger that TAFE system will end up delivering essential but relatively unpopular programs, however, with vastly depleted resources.

The Minister abrogates his accountability for taxpayers' funds. Boards of management of colleges required to undertake high-risk responsibilities that will be very unattractive to many business people, the very people these radical, free-market philosophies are designed to attract and advantage.

It is the business of Government to ensure for the long-term future of the training of its people within a framework of responsiveness to the needs of industry.

It is proposed in these documents that there will be a tendering process for the allocation of funds for training, and government and non-government providers will be able to tender in that area. Added to that is the proposition in the document of self-accreditation. There is also a question mark about quality control. If we have no quality control and if we have self-accreditation, what we will end up with in regard to a tendering process is the lowest common denominator providing the training. Those training providers will be able to and will choose to provide the training quite clearly where the market demands are greatest. I use as an example the situation in the United Kingdom, where hairdressing courses provided in the private sector are of six months' duration and in the government sector are of three years' duration.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Is that where you go for your haircuts?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Indeed, it is not. Unfortunately, I do not go there often enough, and now that we are in Opposition I doubt that I will ever get to go there again.

We will have under that sort of regime a situation where private providers will provide attractive courses. If there is a process of self-accreditation, the quality of outcomes will have to be assessed very carefully. The document suggests that private providers will want to provide courses where the demand is highest, and where they can maximise their return for the money they have spent. The Government will be left with less money to provide courses in the less attractive, but not necessarily less essential, areas of this state's economy. It is also important to note that there is no suggestion that fees may be charged or may be in any way controlled. Therefore, again one wonders if we will not then be providing education in these particularly attractive areas for those who can most afford it, and where those who cannot afford it will have the other system, and this will disadvantage them, as has been the case in the United Kingdom.

The comparison that is made with training in Germany is significant. The resources that are directed to training in Germany comprise a significantly larger proportion of gross domestic product than is the case in this state, and probably until the White Paper came down last week, significantly less than we were contributing nationally. I am quite sure that as a result of that commitment, the Federal Government has at least got onto the right track in regard to the necessity to provide significant resources to this group of people.

The other area that should be touched on is that the provision of Crown protection will be removed from these college councils that are proposed to be created. Therefore, colleges will be able to make entrepreneurial decisions and go into the free market environment, and if they make money, the state will call for a dividend on that money, but if they lose money, the council will be responsible for that loss, as it would be if they were directors of any other company. How many people of quality and substance from the education and training fields, and from industry, will be prepared to put themselves on the line in regard to those sorts of onerous responsibilities, which will deliver to them no personal gain? I do not know whether these people will be paid, by the way, for their attendance at these councils.

I suggest that very few people will be prepared to place themselves at that degree of jeopardy without the likelihood of any personal gain. Another interesting thing about the document of 18 April is that it has a series of headings including common principles; debureaucratisation; responsiveness to a union; local ownership, control and flexibility; devolution - not decentralisation; supporting regionalisation; coherent planning; an integrated training network; arresting vested interests; accountability; refined reporting lines; quality assurance; and compliance. Like the previous report, it is all rhetoric. Many people in both industry and the union movement, and I suggest - as I said at the beginning of my remarks - the last heading is the capture all heading: Ministerial Control. The document reads -

There must be capacity for the Minister to exert authority over the system so that implementation of Government policies is not hindered or frustrated, because

ultimately, "government is held accountable for the outworking of policy decisions."

I do not know whether we would object to that, but in many cases the overheads in these documents have a common theme. That is, as stated on the last page of the document: easily effected ministerial control. It is not just ministerial control but also centralised control by the chief executive officer.

An independent college made a number of points about the problems it saw associated with this proposal. It says -

Under the IACS model the College Council:

- is not the employer of staff
- loses its current significant role in the appointment of the Director
- becomes only advisory on appointments, planning, resource agreements and performance contracts
- no longer has financial responsibility and accountability
- is appointed solely by the Minister
- loses its capacity to nominate two members of Council

Having heard those six points, does any member really think that we are talking about autonomous colleges? Here is an independent college saying, "This is what we will lose; we will go backwards from being an independent college. We were hoping to have autonomy, but we will now head in the opposite direction." It is time that this Government, and particularly this Minister, came clean about the sort of system that we will have. He should not call it autonomous when in the same breath he refers to it as a middle of the road approach. If it is somewhere between autonomous and centralised, it cannot possibly be autonomous. The Minister says that and continues down the path suggesting euphemistically that that is what he is trying to develop. He sets in place no procedure to head towards autonomy but does set in train a whole range of procedures to ensure that he and centralised bureaucracy are in control of the councils throughout the state.

From the perspective of this independent college there is now a belief that the recommendations of the Gordon report and the Vickery Report on the Review of Education and Training, have been subverted by this last approach advocated on 18 April by the Minister about autonomous colleges. As we head down the path, it is quite clear that the starting point was that the government of the day, the then Opposition, promised autonomous colleges. It called for reports that advocated autonomous colleges and also advocated that flexibility was an essential requirement of that process, flexibility meaning the downgrading of working conditions and rates of pay for workers in the system, while at the same time trying to commit itself in some fairyland way to the fact that staff would become committed to that approach. The Government then did not bother in any serious way to consult staff in this process. If that is the approach that this Minister intends to take - I know that he has an aversion to unions and a phobia about unions, as I said in this House before - and if he is to effect change with teachers and trainers, he will have to do that without this sort of approach.

The other matter I would like to cover, in conclusion - I am pleased that the Minister has returned from parliamentary business - relates to the proposition in the Vickery report to reduce the number of IETCs from 23 to 13. I know there has been considerable disquiet within IETCs about their future and their role.

Hon N.F. Moore: State training boards have been given that job to do.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am aware of that. The Minister cannot duck everything off to bureaucrats on every occasion.

Hon N.F. Moore: But they are not bureaucrats. The State Training Board is an industry representative body including Mr Meecham. It seems to be appropriate that industry should decide what the IETC should do, not the Minister.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I know that. The Minister does not need to tell me that.

However, it would be appropriate for the Minister to make some decision about the future of this proposal, which he is prepared to claim as his own, and not duckshove it off to independent boards or bureaucrats or to have the chief executive officer fronting up to explain decisions that the Minister says are his responsibility when, in fact, they are quite clearly political policy of the Government.

Hon N.F. Moore: It has nothing to do with the chief executive officer.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Quite clearly it falls within the Minister's jurisdiction.

Hon N.F. Moore: Why does the member not ask me a question in question time so that I can respond without interjecting now?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Hon Derrick Tomlinson has done very well protecting the Minister. I am only too happy to take that course of action. The IETCs still have to cover the same number of industries and the same number of employers. On that basis one would imagine that there is no cost saving in a reduction of the IETCs because they still have to deal with the same number of people. As I understand it, certain sections of the industry want to retain their IETCs, to put forward their training requirements with an industry perspective and not be combined with other industries which are not necessarily related to their own employment and enterprise. It would be incumbent on the Minister not to direct this matter to the State Training Board but to make a decision to ensure the future of the IETCs. Will they continue to function as the people who accredit training or will they be reduced to advisers and people who might be consulted in the process of accreditation? I know of a number of approaches that have been made to the Minister by representatives of IETCs. Rather than the deflection that has gone on, the Minister should meet with these people and put his position clearly, even if it is only the one he has in mind at the moment, so that they have an idea of what he is thinking about their future.

I just wonder about the role of this new system of the State Training Board. I understand that we will have a new piece of legislation. Is the Minister seriously consulting with the board now about the legislation or will the proposed legislation, in which the board will have no input about the role of training, be put before him in some fait accompli way?

The Minister appointed this board and it is incumbent on him to make the board members' role clear to them. An industry representative on that board told me that board members were unclear about their role. I am sure they felt that originally they had a central role and focus in the development of the new training legislation in this state. At this stage I understand that is not their role and they are somewhat concerned that their role has been changed without their being given due notice.

[Questions without notice taken.]

Hon JOHN HALDEN: In January 1993 the then coalition opposition committed itself to autonomous TAFE colleges. That proposal was reinforced in the Vickery report and, to a lesser degree, in the report by Peter Gordon. The position has changed and we are now faced not with autonomous colleges because this situation may lead us to the worst of both worlds. It is a situation in which there is responsibility at the community level, but no ability to do anything but accept the flak when resources are not delivered. The situation is one that has caused concern not only for me but also for people in the TAFE sector, the union that represents it, and the industry. If the Minister for Education thinks he is well informed and that the only sector of the industry that objects to his current proposal for integrated autonomous colleges is the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, he is grossly out of touch with reality.

Hon N.F. Moore: The Minister did not say that.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: He implied it.

Hon N.F. Moore: I did not. Read the question.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Minister should look at his answer. The reality is that a number of senior members of the industry are of the opinion that the proposal on 18 February by the Minister represents the worst of both worlds. The Minister is wrong. He should return to the drawing board.

Hon N.F. Moore: Tell me who they are.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Minister knows that I am not about to tell him that.

Hon N.F. Moore: You make up these things.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I made up the comment about the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, did I?

Hon N.F. Moore: Most of your comments you make up. Tell us who they are!

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Of course I will not. These people are members of boards established by the Minister and they would not want me to tell the Minister who they are. That would destroy my credibility, and no-one would talk to me. The Minister should not be ridiculous. He is living in the land of Noddy.

Hon N.F. Moore: So you will protect those who leak information?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Absolutely. It was not a bad effort. It was a good set of leaked documents.

Hon N.F. Moore: You are proud of what you have done to the Public Service.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Barry House): Order! The Minister should stop interjecting, and the Leader of the Opposition should address his comments to the Chair.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I understand why the Minister is touchy about the matter. He has such little support in the broader community for his proposal; and what he proposes now will lead to the people who once supported him deserting him.

The document I referred to earlier included the concept of flexibility. This flexibility will cut workers' wages and conditions. The Minister tries in a glib way to say that flexibility is about working hours. It does not mean that people should work more than 15 or 16 hours a day -

Hon N.F. Moore: A week.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Minister is proposing that people should not be paid overtime; they should work until 10.00 pm, receive fewer holidays, and receive no compensation for that situation. At the same time, the Minister wants commitment from those people to his changed system. Again, the Minister is not living in the real world. He will never achieve what he wants by taking a draconian approach.

Hon N.F. Moore: What is the real world?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: It is not what the Minister proposes or thinks.

Hon N.F. Moore: Can you tell me what you think we should do? You did nothing for 10 years.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I remember speech after speech by the Minister, telling us that our proposed changes would not be successful.

Hon N.F. Moore: You did not make any. Mr Pearce had one go, but it was not successful.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The Minister knows that is not correct. In reality, if the Minister wants change, he should accept that the members of the teachers union and the teaching profession are not Neanderthal.

Hon N.F. Moore: No-one said they were.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: They are the people who will cope with change. They had to cope with a significant amount of change in earlier years. The Minister will not achieve a change without commitment. That is most important. Changes can be made, but without commitment we will end up with nothing. Without commitment the Minister will achieve nothing except the bludgeoning of staff at these centres. The proposals are not well developed. They are not clear or concise. They have not been thought through, except in some vague, ideological way. To commission a report, which purported to be beyond rhetoric, and to find a document 24 pages full of rhetoric, is indicative of the

process. It is about rhetoric, not on-the-ground delivery and an increased quality of education service in the training sector. If the Minister thinks he has had a few problems with the proposal so far, he will face more problems because he will not accept how change is to be effected. He does not understand how to undertake a consultative and cooperative approach.

I do not regard all the changes as outrageous or ill-conceived - although some of them are that way because they have not been thought out. If some of the proposals had been given more thought, it may be that the Minister would not support them. Nevertheless, the Minister will not be successful with this process unless he accepts a new *modus operandi* on how to deal with people. It is inappropriate to not deal with the principal union and to duck shove an industry and training council and to not allow the State Training Board to have a greater role in legislation brought before this House. This approach will not work. If the Minister has been advised that it will work, he should change his adviser. I do not think the advice is coming from the Minister's office; the officers are not that silly.

Hon N.F. Moore: Who is giving me that bad advice?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I made that suggestion already.

Hon N.F. Moore: Who?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Does the Minister want me to repeat it?

Hon N.F. Moore: Yes.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: It is the chief executive officer, I presume.

Hon N.F. Moore: So, he is no good?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I did not say that. The advice on this matter is poor, as it is about centralised control.

Hon N.F. Moore: What do you think we should do?

Hon JOHN HALDEN: In reality, it is the Minister's proposition.

Hon N.F. Moore: You criticise all the time. You have never said anything positive in your life! For five minutes tell the House how the college system should work. You never know, I may listen to you.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Why does the Minister not make an appointment, and I will discuss the matter with him. We are developing our TAFE policy at this moment.

Hon N.F. Moore: You had 10 years in office and you did nothing!

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Has the Minister considered that I may want to do things in a different manner from my predecessors.

Hon N.F. Moore: I hope you do; it would offer them a little more hope.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am not about saying what the Opposition will do when it comes to government, as that policy is being developed. If the Minister wants an informal chat about what is wrong with the proposition in a broad sense, that could be arranged. I had a chat with people today regarding a review the Minister is conducting. I do not think that the Minister sent that person to see me, but we had a constructive chat.

Hon N.F. Moore: You have outraged people so much that they seek an appointment with you.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: I am referring to the building and construction -

Hon N.F. Moore: That is another one. A couple of people have been to see you because they are outraged at what you say about them in this House.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: People can see me at any time, which is not the case with the Minister because his door is always closed, as it has been for a long time.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is terrible that people must seek you out because of the things you say in this House. You're a disgrace and could not care less about defamation! You use this House as a coward's castle.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Barry House): Order! This debate should not be conducted like a court room dialogue.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy President, for your protection from the outrageous comments from the Minister for Education.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is a fact.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: The proposal as it now stands is not about autonomous colleges, but centralisation of power.

Hon N.F. Moore: You have my assurance that it is nothing of the kind. You have my assurance, as a member of the government which set up the independent colleges, that that is not what it is all about.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: That is what it is all about. I have read the documents, and few people support the Minister's position. If the Minister continues down this path he will continue to have problems.

During the last 15 minutes of counteraccusation and insult, we have lost the focus of this issue; namely, providing better training. It seems that the proposal developed by the Government does not do that, and the reports I have seen hardly mention education or training. Education outcomes will not be improved on the basis of structural change in the organisations.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is a good start, Mr Halden, as you must get that right before anything is done.

Hon JOHN HALDEN: That sociology went out of vogue and contemporary thinking in the 1960s. In my shadow portfolio, this issue will be my responsibility. I will not necessarily take on board anything done by the current Minister or my predecessors on this side of the House. However, when considering better outcomes in training and education, one must consider, as was glibly mentioned in a couple of these reports, how the sector is to be properly resourced and how to achieve a commitment from the sector. The Minister should pay attention to these points rather than merely considering structural change.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: At various times during the member's speech he offered to table the documents, including the transparency, to which he referred. Unfortunately, the member did not name the documents. I request that the documents now be tabled.

[See paper No 43.]

HON P.R. LIGHTFOOT (North Metropolitan) [5.56 pm]: In my contribution to the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's speech, like my colleague, Hon John Halden, I shall talk about a subject alluded to by the Governor on the opening day of this session; namely, law and order. Although this is a massive problem of worldwide significance, my concern is regarding how it relates to Western Australia and Australia. I do not suggest that I have the key to unlock the secrets of how we can resolve the problems. I hope by discussing the matter in this forum some solutions are found for what are burgeoning and debilitating, all too frequent, occurrences in Western Australia today.

I took the opportunity last week, at my request to the Attorney General's department, to inspect the Central Law Courts, which are bounded by Irwin and Hay Streets and St George's Terrace. The courts were purpose built in 1982, although one would not think so upon inspecting them. They probably served their purpose for the first few years of their service, but regrettably the burgeoning number of prisoners and those on remand means that the holding cells are not only totally inadequate in design, size and position in the court complex, but are among the worst buildings that I have seen anywhere in the world, including South Africa and Hong Kong. Although I have not been to many third world countries, these cells resemble what one imagines will be found in a third world country.

Hon Tom Helm: Are they worse than the lockups in the bush?

Hon ROSS LIGHTFOOT: They are worse in some aspects than lockups in the bush.

One aspect which makes them so bad is the number of people occupying them at any one time. Bush lockups invariably have access to open air, space and sometimes views.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: Mr President, I will address you even though there is no-one on the other side to address.

Hon N.D. Griffiths: Hon Ross Lightfoot should turn his head to the right.

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: There is one member of the Opposition on the other side.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is not normal to mention the state of the House.

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: Yes, sir. It is not normal to do that. I thoroughly endorse what you have said.

Prior to the dinner break Hon Tom Helm asked by way of a modest interjection what was the state of the central law courts.

Hon Tom Helm: Modest!

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: I thought it was modest coming from Hon Tom Helm because there was very little vim, vigour or brimstone. He asked, were the central courts' holding cells worse than those in the bush. Having seen many of those in the bush lockups, purely as a person with a voluntary interest in the cells, the answer is yes. The cells in the bush lockups have at the least fresh air, access to courtyards outside and often to footpaths, where - I do not suppose alcohol - certainly food and other types of amenities, such as toothpaste, can be passed through the security fence. I have seen this in the bush. It happens at Wiluna, Laverton, Leonora, Leinster, Coolgardie, Cue and Mt Magnet, but there is nothing like that in the central law courts.

The cells are on the fourth floor in the centre of the building. In the main cell there were seats. There still remains evidence of a rudimentary sort of seating, but the vinyl covered foam rubber has been ripped away and not replaced. There is the bare, what I imagine to be, waterproof plywood remaining. At the end of that cell, which I estimate to be 40 feet by 20 ft or maybe 50 ft by 30 ft, there is a single toilet, which wisely has a stainless steel pan but not a seat, because that has long since been ripped away. The officer showing me round could not remember when the toilet had a seat. At one time there was a door on the toilet but that alas went a long time ago with the seat. When there are up to 70, 40 or 20 people, whatever the amount in there, it must be someone either in desperate need of that solitary receptacle or someone brought up in a different manner to mine who would want to use the solitary facility.

It is used daily by prisoners, some of whom are found not guilty. So they have been subjected to this most appalling period of incarceration and punishment, which one might say is cruel and unusual, and then found not guilty. If they are found not guilty, having been charged under Crown Law or one of its burgeoning off-shoots round the country, there is no recourse to damages for that period of incarceration and deprivation of liberty. That does not have a price. That is, in fact, part of the price, we say, that we pay for the society that we do not choose to live in but have to live in. When Hon Tom Helm asks whether it is as bad as the ones in the bush, I can say without equivocation, yes it is. To compound the unbelievable, anti-civil situation of that single, solitary, doorless toilet in this one holding pen, there is also no extraction fan. When I was in there last week there had been up to a dozen detainees using it. I was rather pleased to get out of it. I cannot imagine what it is like when there are 40 or 50 people in there, but I know this: There is simply no excuse for this in a country that prides itself in being the leader in growth of the OECD countries. I am talking of Western Australia as opposed to Australia, and I am well aware that Western Australia is not a part of the OECD, but it is part of one of the nations that form the OECD. There is no excuse for the appalling conditions that include excrement on the holding cell walls, prisoners who have urinated over the walls which have failed to be cleaned and a cell which fails to have what I think are simple, rudimentary facilities like a toilet door, comfortable seats and, above all, an extraction fan. If we have to watch people in the toilet it should be by a covert means with

television camera facilities and not through an open door. That dehumanises people. Even if they are convicted, it is cruel and unusual punishment. I am ashamed to say that I am part of a society that tolerates these most appalling conditions. We give approximately \$200m, if not more, in aid to countries abroad. I will bet that those countries to which we give aid have better facilities in their central law courts than we have here. I urge Mr Keating, if we do not have the money to fix those appalling conditions, perhaps to turn some of that aid to Western Australia so that we can hold people with some dignity, irrespective of whether they are found guilty of the crimes for which they have been charged. We do not have to dehumanise them. I am appalled at the conditions that exist under a system of which I am a part, as well as you, Mr President, and every other member here.

That is not all. The whole complex obviously does not have enough toilet facilities. With the single, pathetic, isolated toilet in this black hole of Calcutta, in the midst of our central business district, in the heart of a state which prides itself worldwide in the Perth Festival of Arts, there is also only one hand bowl. That hand bowl is to serve dozens of people, and sometimes as I said, over 100 people. That is obviously totally inadequate.

In addition to that, there is just one tiny cell for females. I was thankful that females were not incarcerated there with general male prisoners. However, I was not pleased when I heard that someone like Catherine Birnie, who participated in some of the most horrific murders, if not the most horrific murders, in this state, used those cells with people who had allegedly committed a traffic offence. They failed to pay their fine and were thrust in with the most abhorrent people we could imagine. That goes on in the other holding cell where there is no discrimination between the people within those central law courts. Those tiny cells serve 15 courts.

While the court system is burgeoning and the justice system has allowed for more judges in the District Court, and the courts of summary jurisdiction which are served by magistrates are in that complex, the holding complex remains the same. In fact, the situation reaches such a ludicrous standard that at the sally point - I understand that is the term; the sally point being where the utility pulls up and the prisoners are discharged and brought to the holding pens - where prisoners are brought in on remand from other prisons around the state, there is no stairway. Perhaps that was a security measure deemed to be necessary to prevent an escape. However, where there was no stairway - in other words one had to use a lift from the sally point to get to the fourth floor - the prisoners, in the case of an electricity strike or failure, are then taken into the street and into the main body of the building through the front entrances and up stairways from the back entrance to the fourth floor. Thankfully the lifts are divided so that people who are detained can be secured from any damage they may do to the people detaining them. The lifts seem to me to be rather relevant and adequate. However, when there is no stairway, in case of a power failure or fire or any other security measure that may be taken, it must be viewed very seriously.

I also was unable to find where there was a cell suitable for violent prisoners or detainees who may damage themselves prior to going into court. I was unable to find it because there is none there; there are just normal cells. When I use the term "normal", I mean there is not a padded cell. Members must remember that we, as a state, are charged with the welfare of all prisoners, not just prisoners who may be temporarily incarcerated for the purposes of determining whether they are guilty or to what degree they are guilty. As I have said, I am appalled that people who could be in those cells for merely failing to pay a traffic fine are in with rapists and murderers. I find that unequivocally unacceptable.

As I may have said, those cells often house 60 prisoners, but the record is 107. If that is not a black hole of Calcutta, I do not know what is. It must be appalling down there with 107 prisoners and one toilet - in the case of female prisoners there is a separate toilet - with that number of detainees. On top of that, up to 42 staff, by necessity, frequent those areas. So the feeling of being crushed is compounded by the necessity of having staff there. I have spoken to many of them and they are dedicated people. God only knows, they do not have the tools to work with. However, they are dedicated to the degree that

they want to do something; they are not about to give it away. The staff predominantly, but not exclusively, are police who, totalling 42, had to club in and buy an old fridge to keep their drinks cool - I think the fridge is about the same design as my mother bought in the early fifties. As I said, there is no extractor fan there and I doubt whether there is any air-conditioning. If there is, it is totally inadequate. There I was, filled with nostalgia looking at the fridge the police officers had bought which took me back to the fifties when my mum bought one. It was all rather sad.

Another issue is the broom cupboard, which does not have any brooms in it I am thankful to say. However, it has been converted to -

Hon Doug Wenn: Was it not big enough?

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: Someone was going to say it was Superintendent Len Thickbroom - I was not referring to him. It was converted to a dressing room for senior officers.

Hon Doug Wenn: How do they sweep it out if there is no broom there?

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: It is about as big as a domestic pantry.

Hon Mark Nevill: Did they come out of the closet?

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: I do not know whether the rules apply here that if one does not answer interjections they are not recorded in *Hansard*. I hope that is the case.

The PRESIDENT: It is not.

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: Heaven knows how many can change their clothes at one time. Certainly of the half a dozen or more commissioned officers on police duty, not all of them could fit into what was formerly a closet to change. Lockers are included - the authorities have done the best they can. However, it must be a kind of Houdini trick for everyone to shuffle around in there. Those commissioned officers are pretty big men.

Hon Mark Nevill: The mind boggles.

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: The mind boggles indeed.

I am sure every member in this House will endorse what I say: No-one deserves, no matter what their status in life and no matter what their social level in life, to be reduced to the status of an animal because they have been arrested. It may be that a person is found not guilty, but even if a person is found guilty of the most horrendous crime, they should not be treated in this fashion. When I saw these men, I thought they were guilty because they looked guilty. They were in the most appalling situation: The shoes were lined up outside because they did not dare leave them with their sneakers on. I do not know what they would do with them - bash the bars down with their rubber sneakers! Their belts had been removed and they had been stripped of their ties. But they could have taken their shoes if the laces had been removed. There must be balance on this. One cannot have a society that prides itself on being elevated and caring if this is happening in the heart of our city. I have spoken to the Attorney General and she is equally appalled by this situation.

Hon Cheryl Davenport: Did she know about it before you drew it to her attention?

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: I did not ask her that. What I am about to say is valid and I expect the member to deny it: During the 1980s when so much money was lost, had that money not been lost, as the Minister for Education stated, we would have had the primary schools, secondary schools and been able to add to the campuses of the tertiary institutions. The appalling conditions of the central law courts would have been repaired if that money had been available. Having stated that, the money must be found to do it. I do not want to be part of a society that tolerates the most appalling third world conditions when we boast about how high Australia is in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development countries - that is, the 25 countries that form OECD; 19 in Europe and five outside Europe, including Australia, Canada, the United States, New Zealand and Japan. I do not want to be part of a society that closes its eyes to those people in need, and I will not be. I will speak out about it.

During the opening of Parliament last week, I had the honour of accompanying His Excellency the Governor and the Chief Justice and the Justices of the Western Australian Supreme Court for half an hour during business in the other place. I mentioned to the Chief Justice that I visited the cells and was appalled by their third world status - that is, the overpowering smell, the appalling excrement and urine on the walls, the cramped conditions of prisoners, and the cramped conditions of the staff who are expected to care for these people was as bad - although that area was cleaner. Yet they performed their duties in a jocular manner with a job that must be one of the worst in the civilised world. The Chief Justice invited me to see the Supreme Court holding cells. Something is radically wrong with our system if we think that if it is out of sight it is out of mind. I say this tonight not because I want to incur the wrath of the Chief Justice or to embarrass anyone on my side of the House or any other Western Australian, but because I am appalled at the conditions that are suffered by people from all walks of life, not just people from the lower socioeconomic bracket, but also people from the top of that very same ladder. It must be fixed. I intend to take up the Chief Justice's invitation and view the Supreme Court holding cells to see what they are like. Unlike the cells of the ones built in 1982, I understand these were built in the 1890s, almost a 100 years before. If nothing has been done with those when the state was about one-tenth the size it is now, then I will have to steel myself for what to expect. How that escaped the attention of all governments during the last 10 years is a mystery to me. It has been stated, and I believe it is true, that the squeaky hinge gets the oil. This hinge is squeaking, and I would like to think that the Government gives it some oil, otherwise it will continue to squeak. I will not comment on the Supreme Court cells as I have not seen them.

One other aspect concerns me within the Supreme Court system. As stated, it does not matter from what echelon of life one comes, we are all equal before the law. That does not mean that people need to be dragged down from the top to meet shoulder by shoulder with the people from the bottom. I would rather lift the people from the bottom - and I am talking about socioeconomic backgrounds - to show them that we are a caring society, a caring government and a caring Parliament. When one looks at the police vans, they are not archaic, but modern vehicles yet are most inappropriate and demeaning. The vans are little more than caged tumbrels bringing people from all walks of life to court, to the sally point which I mentioned. They are inappropriate for a modern society. Escape may be prevented, but I do not know about that. I have not examined them carefully, but what I have examined leaves me with a feeling that when a person is detained by the state for whatever crime - whether it is a failure to pay a parking fine, breaching a domestic undertaking or for a more serious crime - to have to crawl in on his hands and knees into one of these animal cages that are better suited to stray dog collection is demeaning and dehumanising. We should not be part of that as a modern society. By my speaking tonight in this Address-in-Reply debate, perhaps more appropriate forms of transport may be considered. Perhaps we should seek to emulate other parts of the world that we profess to admire, and from which we profess to plagiarise some of our laws and standards and some of our parliamentary procedures, to see if we cannot lift our game concerning people we hold by legal means behind bars for whatever reason. Those people who are forced to crawl on all fours like dogs into those vans are often found not guilty or guilty of a minor offence or misdemeanour. We should review the types of vehicles that bring people temporarily into custody - and we are charged with their welfare temporarily - and to places where they can be heard in an open court. They do not need to be demeaned at this stage. Regardless of people's crimes - in many cases I have not been aware of their crimes - when I have looked at them in the cells I have been of the opinion that they were guilty. It is a psychological thing that takes over. The same psychology applies to people who are forced to crawl on their hands and knees into these most inappropriate vehicles; they appear to be guilty as well. That is not balance and it is not a case of a person being innocent until he is proved guilty; it is making a person appear guilty until he is proved innocent. That is fundamentally and seriously wrong.

Members should not hold their breath, but I will conclude on another law and order issue. Regrettably, there is a great deal of crime in our society. People tend to close their eyes

to it and say that we are approaching the twenty-first century and we must live with it. That really is not the case. It is similar to unemployment. If we accept 6, 7 or 8 per cent unemployment in this country as the norm and the price we must pay for such a high standard of living, then of course it is the figure which becomes an arbitrary level of whether we are in "full employment". On the other hand, one can accept that during Sir Robert Menzies' time he won his third last election in 1960 or 1961 by one seat because unemployment increased from 2 to 3 per cent - an increase of 50 per cent. The Australian people were not prepared to put up with a 50 per cent increase in unemployment.

Hon Mark Nevill: He won the seat of Moreton on Communist Party preferences.

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: The member must read different history books from me and I would have to get the Supreme Court Justice to swear that that is true. He won by one seat. If one wins that is all that matters, but it was an uncomfortable period. The best forms of government are those which have a very strong opposition, but I will not enlarge on that tonight.

I cannot accept that 6, 7 or 8 per cent unemployment in this country is acceptable. We must bring that percentage down. In the same way, I cannot accept that we are prepared to wear a certain level of crime, and nor should we. A lot of that crime is committed by youths, teenagers or young men and women in their early twenties. Not invariably, but significantly they are unemployed. What can we do about it? There is no quick fix.

Hon Mark Nevill: Have a look at the White Paper.

Hon Cheryl Davenport: And have a look at the dysfunctional families.

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: We could look at the breakdown of the family unit, because it certainly contributes to crime. The fact is we are breeding generations of unemployed people.

One of the reasons that there was low unemployment in the 1950s and 1960s was the advent of national service. I served for three years in compulsory national service and on reflection and in retrospect they were good years and I enjoyed them. However, society is different today. It is not aggressive, although I firmly believe that he deserves peace who is prepared to defend it. Nevertheless, this country could have a real national service; not necessarily a combative military service, but one which learnt to repair this country. It need not be in a defensive or aggressive sense, although some basic training in that area is highly desirable. We could have a national service which involves youth in repairing the ecologically fragile coastal dunes from Eucla to Darwin. They could assist in reafforestation and salt reclamation work, the mapping of endangered species or finding out what marsupials exist in a given area. In addition, they could control the devastation that feral and domestically introduced animals create in this part of the continent. They could also assist the 40 000-odd people of Aboriginal descent in Western Australia, and God only knows they need assisting. We need a contribution from our youth and they should not be unemployed. Surely to goodness we could look at a real national service in which they could make a contribution and a commitment to this nation. I prescribe to the old maxim that the devil makes use of idle hands. If those youthful idle hands were put to good use it would raise their self-esteem and this country would be better off for it. The effort that would be put into it would be rewarded and I hope that the youth, both female and male, would go on to become good Australians and be occupied in a manner which suits Western Australia and our style of living and gives them the chance to get off the dole queues, which in turn would reduce the 20 per cent youth unemployment in this nation. We do not need that. All the quick fixes and give-aways in the world will not give that permanency of employment which our youth, the best asset this state has, deserve. They must be given the opportunity to feel that they are making a contribution to this great state.

I was not pleased last Friday night when Alan Carpenter interviewed Attorney General Hon Cheryl Edwardes. In spite of the unwritten code that members of the Press advise someone of the questions that are proposed to be asked that did not occur on "The 7.30 Report".

Hon Mark Nevill: No reporter has advised me of the questions he intended to ask me.

Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT: Hon Mark Nevill is never on television, that is why. However, Alan Carpenter slipped in a couple of quick questions on the Attorney General's imprecise account. It appeared to me to be a slight on all women. Some people, particularly men, cannot handle it when women reach high office. I have a great deal of respect for Hon Cheryl Edwardes in her position as Attorney General. What occurred last Friday does not do the ABC any good. I do not know whether Alan Carpenter is a bigot, but that is certainly how he appeared. He did not do that to Hon Joe Berinson and he has not done it to any other male in high office, but he was prepared to do it to a woman. It was below the belt. What little admiration I had for Alan Carpenter subsided at that interview. All journalists in Western Australia have to lift their game and be much more circumspect about how they treat people in high office and not demean women in general who achieve that high office, which Alan Carpenter is most unlikely to aspire to.

HON MARK NEVILL (Mining and Pastoral) [8.10 pm]: I will bring three or four topics to the attention of the House in this Address-in-Reply debate. Firstly, I will deal with the recent float of the State Government Insurance Office. Whether the float was good or bad for the Western Australian economy or taxpayers is a question that I will debate at another stage when all of the facts and figures are available. We do not yet know the costs of that float and the net revenue to the Government, so we cannot determine whether the state is better off from that float. One issue about the float that caused much anger and concern throughout the community was the failure of the Government to ensure that Western Australians were given preference in the issue of SGIO shares. Questions have to be asked about whether an underwriter was necessary. The original allocation of shares was 30 per cent to stockbrokers' clients; 20 per cent to the general public, which included the SGIO staff, who were allocated 2 per cent; 10 per cent to policy holders; and 40 per cent to institutions. I believe that the policyholders, who are the backbone of the SGIO and its income base, should have been given the opportunity to take as many shares in the SGIO as they wanted, provided there were enough shares.

During the float, I put out a number of press releases, none of which succeeded in getting published in *The West Australian*. The theme of one or two of those releases was that the float was good for investors but not so good for taxpayers, and I outlined the reasons why. It was no surprise to me, and I think to most people, that the share issue was oversubscribed and closed early. I think the request for shares was almost double the 165 million shares on offer. The float attracted investors. The major stockbrokers in the float were J.B. Were and Son and Bain Securities, which are basically Eastern States-based brokers, and the shares which they issued went mainly to Eastern States financial institutions. *The West Australian* of 12 April listed the top 20 shareholders in the SGIO float as ranging from Westpac Custodian Nominees, with 37.386 million shares, to GIO Life, with 720 000 shares. The only Western Australian company in that list appears to be Saltbush Nominees, which is a Hartley Poynton company, presumably holding shares for Hartley Poynton's clients. A large tranche of shares ended up in the Eastern States.

In my view, although there was publicity about the SGIO float, many of the Western Australian policyholders were not given adequate information about how to apply for shares. That information could have been provided by a letter to all policyholders. Obviously, the SGIO cannot offer shares unless it gives people a prospectus. That letter to policyholders could have asked them if they would like to purchase shares; and, if so, they could have been sent a prospectus. That was perhaps one way of getting policyholders onto the share registry. I can understand that the SGIO might not be interested in having a large number of shareholders who hold 2 000 or 3 000 shares because it is expensive to send annual reports, financial statements and the correspondence that is required to service a wide registry. It is certainly a lot easier if the share registry is fairly tight and there are not all of the expenses that attach to a broad share base. However, the greater the number of policyholders who have shares in the SGIO, the stronger that company will be.

I understand, although I am not sure of the precise details, that the Government did wind

back the institutions' shareholding from 40 per cent to 36 per cent in an endeavour to give the general public of Western Australia and the policyholders a piece of the action. However, most people received only half the number of shares for which they had applied. The anomaly is that those people who had applied for shares in their own name and in the name of their partner in many cases received more shares than did those people who had applied for shares in their own name only. Some people read the signs in the Press and knew that the float would be oversubscribed and, like me, put in a bid for twice as many as they wanted, so they ended up with the number of shares that they were interested in purchasing.

I regard the SGIO float as an attractive opportunity for investors. I am not so sure that it was good for the state, and we will not know that until the information is presented to the House in regard to the costs of the float, the value that has been attached to the SGIO, and what revenue stream will be lost to the Government in future years. When we look at those issues, we will be able to get some idea of whether we have just embarked on some fashionable ideological exercise and whether we should repeat that exercise with Bankwest. Therefore, it is important that there be a thorough analysis of the SGIO float.

Another point to note is that the brokers sold most of their shares to Eastern States institutions. An article in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 13 April, entitled "SGIO's eastern stags have a field day", indicates that brokers in the Eastern States who were given large numbers of shares dumped those shares on the day the stock was floated on the market, and made a substantial killing. The interesting part is that most of those shares were bought back by Western Australian sharebrokers. It seems to be unnecessary to have sent those shares to the Eastern States in the first place. The question can be asked about whether those who organised the float were more interested in looking after the interests of sharebrokers than the interests of Western Australians. The article says -

SGIO Insurance listed at a premium of 19 per cent to its \$1 issue price . . .

Stockbroker JB Were & Son sold 5.01 million SGIO shares yesterday, about 25 per cent of the 19.9 million shares staged during the former WA Government insurer's first day as a listed company . . .

. . . the other eastern States-based underwriting broker to the float, Bain Securities, was also a net seller of about 1.55 million shares.

This left the two Perth-based underwriting brokers, Hartley Poynton and Porter Western, as the main supporters of the stock . . .

. . . the SGIO board and its advisers had envisaged a listing premium of 15 to 20 per cent when the float was priced on January 27. He said the \$100m in over-subscriptions the SGIO had to return to investors indicated the level of parochial for established WA businesses . . .

That parochial support was not catered for in terms of shares to Western Australians. It is my view that the Eastern States institutions should not have got those shares early in the piece. The first offer should have been to policyholders, then to the general public of Western Australia, and the brokers should have applied for the remaining parcels.

The second item I raise involves the related issue of the State Government Insurance Commission. A number of changes have occurred since the election in March 1993. We have had the \$50 levy which the Government placed on the premiums for the SGIC to restore the third party insurance fund. That levy will raise about \$50m this year. That \$50m, by the end of the Government's first term, will total \$200m in extra funds going into the third party insurance fund. Motor vehicle third party insurance payments have also been reduced dramatically with the introduction of the \$10 000 deduction and other reduced benefits. That will save the SGIC about \$45m a year, totalling almost \$200m over the first term of this Government. That changes the figures in the fund by \$400m.

The other change for the SGIC is the sale of the SGIO, which we are told raised a further \$129m. The SGIC holds a number of properties in the central business district, the values of which during the past four or five years have been written down by \$275m. That is only a paper loss until those assets are sold. I notice that the SGIO Atrium

building was valued this year at \$31m. By comparison with some other CBD properties, I think that is ridiculously low. We can be fairly certain that the State Government would not sell that building for \$31m. In my view whoever valued that property has been overzealous in the write-down of its value. The SGIC owns Forrest Centre, has an interest in Westralia Square, and also owns the SGIO Atrium building. I understand that Westralia Square is fully let and the Atrium has the SGIO tied up on a rather healthy 10 year lease. Forrest Centre in which its headquarters are located, is another prime piece of real estate held by the SGIC. The value of those three properties could increase rather dramatically in the next couple of years. An article in *The West Australian* newspaper of 20 April entitled "CBD letting rally moves up a gear" states -

Perth's commercial property market recovery continued faster than expected with a significant fall in vacancy levels during the first three months of this year . . .

JLW Research said CBD office vacancies had dropped . . . to 25.5 per cent . . .

That was in the three months between December to March. Further, the premium office space in the city, Central Park, Exchange Plaza and QV1, was also filling up rapidly at that time. The graph in this article shows a massive surplus of premium grade office accommodation in the central business district. In early 1992 there was a 50 per cent vacancy rate in premium grade office space. In two years that has dropped by over half, and it is now lower than A and B grade classifications of office space in Perth. I think that is a healthy sign that values will strengthen. If the property market is anything like the share market, it can result in rather sharp increases which no doubt will occur in the next few years. In my view that will restore the fund and obviate the need for the \$50 levy. The SGIC has also benefited from the early payment by Consolidated Press Holdings Ltd of \$58m for the south side properties. The last two payments are supposed to be made on 30 June this year and next year. The SGIC has done quite well out of the closure of that particular deal. In fact, it is set to book a profit on the written down value of the Westralia Square building.

When we put all those factors together, the State Government Insurance Commission and particularly the motor vehicle third party insurance fund is looking fairly healthy and will be restored sooner than most people expect. The Government said the \$50 levy per car per year must stay for five to seven years. I believe that as soon as that fund and the valuations improve the bottom line, that levy should be at least wound back and perhaps incorporated into premiums. It will be very interesting to look at the annual report of the SGIC as at 30 June this year, because it will show a strengthening of its balance sheet. It will be interesting also to see the annual valuations of the properties it holds because during the past four or five years we have had write-downs in the value of these properties. I expect we will have increases in the valuations from this year onwards which will have a significant effect on the balance sheet of the SGIC.

The other matter that concerns me was raised by Hon Ross Lightfoot; that is, the way we treat fellow members of Parliament. I do not know whether Alan Carpenter was harsh on the Attorney General - I did not see the interview - but I thought it was novel for an interviewer to give the questions he was going to ask before he asked them. I have never heard of that. Presumably one knows what topic one will be talking about, but no-one has ever given me the questions they were going to ask. It is a luxury that would be very pleasant. I have a lot of respect for Alan Carpenter. He seems to ask people relevant questions, which some interviewers do not manage to do. Hon Ross Lightfoot said he was being harsh on the Attorney General because she was a woman. My point is very different from that. We have read in the newspaper over the past couple of days a reference to a former Premier, Ray O'Connor, as being involved in the organisation of a race fix in Bunbury. Who made the allegation? A former owner of a massage parlour! That Bunbury Cup meeting was in 1983 when Ray O'Connor was the Premier of this State.

Hon Barry House: It was January 1983.

Hon MARK NEVILL: Until early 1983 he was the Premier of this State. I cannot for the life of me understand how anyone could consider the Premier of this State being involved

in fixing a race. It is an absolute nonsense, yet that has been splashed over the media. We also had the gratuitous comment by a racing trainer that the former Attorney General of this House was in the pay of Laurie Connell. Anyone here who knows Hon Joe Berinson, knows that is a nonsense proposition. Financially he is one of the most conservative men I have ever met, and he would have no such dealings of that sort. I find that allegation as distasteful as the one against Ray O'Connor, but these scoundrels can make these sort of comments and they get spread over the Press. We are very good at remembering the mistakes of former politicians, yet we very rarely give them any credit for the good that they do.

Hon Reg Davies: Until they die.

Hon MARK NEVILL: Yes, and then we get up and make hypocritical speeches about them, I suppose. It has concerned me with people like Brian Burke and Peter Dowding that everyone is too scared to give them credit for the good things that they did. We are all happy to condemn them for the things that we believe that they did not do so well. I recently attended the opening of GoldCorp. Brian Burke was mentioned just fleetingly by the chairman of GoldCorp. I think it was considered politically incorrect to mention that the former Premier had anything to do with GoldCorp. That is wrong. Richard Court, whom I have always found very gracious in acknowledging members of Parliament, also did not mention any contribution that Brian Burke had made to GoldCorp. I thought that was an omission that should not have been made.

We heard on news reports this morning that the Government is looking for a partner to join GoldCorp to assist in its future operations. Although that matter has not been discussed by our party, I am sure that it would receive a lot of support from within our party. We certainly would not like to see the sale of GoldCorp for a number of reasons, but many of our members would be strongly supporting the idea that GoldCorp could benefit from an equity partner that could strengthen its links around the world in its business of selling gold and precious metal products. Whether that be a merchant bank, a major bank or some trading corporation, I do not know, but certainly the precious metal products area is being concentrated in fewer and fewer hands and it is probably important that GoldCorp does find a stronger partner. GoldCorp was essentially something very close to Brian Burke's heart. We know of his strong interest in coins and stamps. He saw that potential in GoldCorp.

The original idea to develop the business of the Perth Mint came about in 1984. It was adopted in 1985 and implemented in the 1986-87 financial year. In 1986, I visited the Mint and it was quite clear that the Mint, as it functioned, was quite antiquated; the equipment and processes used were virtually the same processes that were developed in the 1930s. I decided to visit South Africa and look at the rand refinery and the Pretoria Mint to see what was happening over there. It was a fascinating trip. It just so happens that some of the people whom I met there came here and started GoldCorp. Don Mackay-Coghill and Brian Bath were the two people who started off the South African Kruger rand program.

The Perth Mint was originally established in 1899 as a branch of the London Mint. It continued through till 1970 or 1971 when it was sold to the Western Australian Government. The director of the Perth Mint, Ralph Calm, went to South Africa in 1931 to set up the South African Mint. They looked to Perth as their founder, which is something of which most of us are not aware.

The goals that were set down for this program were to provide modern gold refinery facilities to cope with the explosion in gold production which was occurring in Western Australia. When I went to the Mint, I spoke to some of the people there. They were not aware that Roxby Downs was the biggest gold deposit in Australia. I was surprised that they were not trying to get in on the ground floor to refine the gold from the Roxby Downs mine in South Australia. With the equipment that the Mint had at the time, it would not have been competitive when it came to refining. It would have been battling to cope with what it was already doing.

The other goal of the program was to add value to Australian precious metals before they

were exported. That was to be achieved by the development and marketing of a legal tender bullion coin. If it were not for the personal intervention of Brian Burke on the Prime Minister of the day, Bob Hawke, Western Australia would never have got the capacity to mint legal tender bullion coins. That was something that the Australian Mint would never have given up unless it was directed to by federal Cabinet or the Prime Minister. That was an achievement that can be credited to Brian Burke. He got the permission to mint legal tender bullion coins. It is that permission which probably makes it very difficult to fully privatise GoldCorp. I am sure that the Federal Government is of the view - as I am - that it would not sell the right to strike legal tender coins to a private company. That should remain with government. If one gives a private company that right, where does it stop? It makes it very difficult to privatise GoldCorp totally without removing the capacity that it has at the moment to strike these legal tender gold bullion coins.

Another goal of the program was to modernise the Perth Mint and make it a more commercial concern. The program that started seven years ago has only just been completed. It has involved the expenditure of about \$40m, most of which has been funded internally. Over \$30m has been spent on establishing the Australian gold coin program in the world market, which is fiercely competitive. When they set out on that program, they said that it would take 10 years to get that coin into the world market. They have achieved it much quicker than that. Two years ago, it was the most popular gold coin in the world market. Of course, the Kruger rand got into trouble in the mid-1980s because of sanctions and the other pressure that was put on South Africa in order to get rid of the apartheid laws which had been part of that country's legal system.

The net assets of the corporation have risen from \$5.11m in 1987 to \$38.65m at the end of June 1993. That is quite spectacular growth. The majority of that has been funded internally. Through that period, GoldCorp has maintained its liquidity and been able to trade quite well. International coin sales were launched in 1987. As at June 1993, more than \$1.6b worth of coins had been sold. Eighty nine per cent of that income has been earned outside Australia. More than 76 tonnes of gold, 122 tonnes of silver and 11 tonnes of platinum have been used in the coins that have been sold. GoldCorp's total profits since 1986-1987 have been \$19.86m, of which \$10.34m has been paid to the State Government in lieu of Commonwealth tax.

GoldCorp, of course, was a subsidiary of the Western Australian Development Corporation. Although people criticise some of the activities in which the WADC was involved, at the end of the day when it was wound up, there was a profit of \$150m. They are not my figures; they are the figures that Hon Max Evans gave me in answer to a question. That \$150m profit of the WADC does not include what GoldCorp is achieving as a separate entity. The point I wanted to make is that many successful things occurred but, for political correctness, people do not want to give any credit where it is due. They do not want to look at the past objectively. They prefer to pick out the worst features of the past.

In 1989, mainly for political reasons, GoldCorp was required to sell its gold banking business, which was growing very rapidly, to the R & I Bank. That was because of the political pressures of the day and the Government's involvement in business dealings. There was a fear that perhaps GoldCorp could get into trouble in its gold banking business. Obviously the government was in a bit of deep water with its decision to bale out Rothwells. Once it had made the decision on that weekend to bale out Rothwells the issue became a tar baby that it just could not get rid of. No-one seemed to know exactly what the situation was with Rothwells. GoldCorp sold off the gold banking part of its business to the R & I Bank at the time. It had at least 30 major gold loans on its books. Every one of those loans was a performing loan; not one of them went bad. The Gold Bank was transferred to the R & I Bank at a cash value; there was no premium for the business. Before that the R & I Bank was not involved at all in the resource industry in Western Australia. That gave the bank a foot in the door of the gold industry in this state.

It is a pity in some ways that the Gold Bank was transferred. Brian Bath, Don Mackay-Coghill and the other directors and management of GoldCorp knew more about the

business than anyone in the R & I Bank would ever know. At that time the R & I Bank's commercial section was an absolute mess. That is no secret. It has been cleaned up in recent years. However, like all banks in the 1980s when the pirates were running rampant, it was either get big or get out. Loans were arranged over the telephone and the collateral came later. The R & I Bank was probably no different from any other bank during that period. It ended up with the gold banking business of GoldCorp. That valuable asset was transferred to the R & I Bank at a cash value of total assets minus total liability. No premium was paid. It got it for virtually nothing. Had GoldCorp kept the Gold Bank I am sure its performance would have been a lot stronger. Perhaps if it had got into the gold banking business of gold loans it may even have neglected its coin business. One never knows. It was certainly a successful arm of the Gold Bank which, for political reasons, was shifted over to the R & I Bank.

During the whole period that GoldCorp has been operational, it has had strong support from the Opposition. I have never heard any criticism from the Opposition of GoldCorp since it was set up. There was some frivolous criticism from Hon Ross Lightfoot in 1986 when he was concerned about whether any Russian or South African gold was contained in the coins being produced by GoldCorp. I do not think people took that too seriously.

Now that the seven year establishment period of GoldCorp has come to an end, and it pays the Government a maiden dividend this year of nearly \$100m, from memory, Brian Burke should receive due credit for the role he played in having the Mint modernised and for getting it into a business where it now refines 150 tonnes of Western Australian gold each year. It has very successful activities in other countries. Its investments include the new gold refinery in Perth at a cost of \$9.2m and the new gold refinery in Kalgoorlie at a cost of \$4.6m. It has also refurbished the historic Mint building in Hay Street. If members have any overseas visitors I suggest they take them to the Mint because the display of specimens and coins from the state gold collection is spectacular. There is a shop at the Mint which sells all sorts of gold products from coins commemorating the Year of the Dog and the Year of the Rooster to lapel buttons which are sold to Asia every year. I can remember entertaining the Japanese Consul in Esperance in 1985. He said that he had just been in Kalgoorlie but he could not buy anything made out of gold, other than normal jewellery. There were no coins or souvenirs. That has obviously changed. People can purchase those things at the shop at the Perth Mint.

A new factory has been built in Melbourne for the production of precious metal industrial products at a cost of \$2.2m. A new office was built next to the Perth Mint at a cost of \$2.1m; new minting plant and equipment cost \$2.2m; and computer equipment cost \$1.2m. GoldCorp has also invested \$5.5m in the Kaltails project at Kalgoorlie, where it has a 10 per cent interest and Normandy Poseidon Ltd holds the remaining interest. There is a Perth Mint gold shop at the Sydney Airport and the Perth International Airport. An amount of \$5m has also been spent refurbishing the Perth Mint's factory building at the back. That is not a bad effort for seven years. Now it is ready to take on a partner to strengthen its activities and, it is hoped, to increase its penetration into the Asian markets. I quoted those figures from GoldCorp's 1992-93 annual report.

When we think of our former colleagues we should be a little more charitable towards them because, like the two members of this Parliament who had their names spread over the Press in the past week with rather crude allegations made about them, we should for our own good talk about some of the positive things that our colleagues have done and not just the negative things. At the end of the day it all reflects on us. Unless we change our attitude to those sorts of matters we will reinforce the public's view of politicians. We need to be a lot more positive. That could be seen when recently a Minister had his name spread over the front of a newspaper because he was involved in a traffic accident. No urgency motion was moved in this House. If we started doing that sort of thing it would mean that if one were involved in a traffic accident and hit someone on a bicycle or a motorbike, we would be saying that we all should be charged with the maximum offence whether we were guilty or not. Those sorts of things must be left to the police to decide, and it could be quite enticing to put the boots in to someone in that position.

However, on that occasion we did not move an urgency motion about this that or the other. That is important because if we had, it would mean any time members of Parliament were involved in an accident they must be charged with the most serious offence. That is not right; we should be treated the same as everyone else and the police should decide what level of offence is warranted by the accident.

Finally I wish to comment on government debt. I will keep reminding the Government of its commitments when it campaigned very heavily before the last election to reduce government debt, cut the size of the public sector, and reduce taxes. Its other commitments were to bring in a balanced budget and regain the AAA rating. Those last two objectives were to be achieved in the first term of the Liberal Government. Certainly it will be very difficult for the Government to achieve the AAA rating by the end of its first term. It was stated in the Liberal Party election document that a Liberal government would eliminate state government debt by the year 2010, which is only 16 years away. According to the analytical information in the Treasurer's Annual Statements, the loan liabilities now stand at \$11.4b, and if that figure is divided by 16, it means the Government must reduce its debt by \$700m a year. That is not on. If superannuation is added to the debt figure, the Government has \$18.53b in unfunded liabilities and debt. To achieve the abolition of that debt by 2010, it must be reduced by an amount of \$1b each year. That represents 20 per cent of the budget. It is nonsense.

The Government made another commitment to phase out payroll tax over two terms, and to introduce a substantial reduction in payroll tax during its first term. It is not clear what that means but, presumably, a quarter or third would be substantial. Last year we saw a small increase in payroll tax in the Budget papers. The actual revenue from payroll tax was \$504m in 1992-93, and the estimate for 1993-94 was \$559m. Payroll tax receipts are expected to be \$40m over budget this financial year and, therefore, payroll tax collections have increased 10 per cent. That will make the task of substantially reducing the tax by the end of the first term incredibly difficult. If the Government is to phase that tax out by the end of the term it will need to reduce payroll tax collections by \$80m a year, but they have increased by \$40m this year. That will be very difficult for the Government but it made that commitment and campaigned very heavily on it.

Other commitments made by the Government were to cut the size of the public sector and reduce taxes. In the 1993-94 Budget there is a planned increase of 7.5 per cent in taxes, fees and fines. That is from a Government that said it would reduce taxes. Obviously, collections will be more than that because the economy is growing at a faster rate than the Budget figures anticipated. That is a rather savage increase bearing in mind the inflation rate of approximately 2.5 per cent. The increase of 7.5 per cent in this year's Budget is at least 5 per cent above the rate of inflation. The most interesting figure in the growth in net debt is the general government sector debt, which is the debt associated with the parts of government funded by the consolidated fund. Main Roads Department is included in that. It is funded from taxes and does not generate its own revenue. The debt in that sector has increased by 12.5 per cent, and the Government must claw that back from core government activities. The public trading enterprises obviously will generate funds to pay back that debt. I now quote from the Institute of Public Affairs 1993-94 "Budget Backgrounder" as follows -

The Western Australian Government, unlike most other State Governments, will not have a special redundancy scheme in operation during 1993-94, which is in itself surprising.

It continues -

Another indicator of the Court Government's relatively lax control of consumption spending in 1993-94 is the projected growth in the public service. The WA Government expects the number of public servants employed in the budget or general government sector -

That is not referring to trading enterprises. It continues -

- to increase by around 610 full-time positions this year. In contrast, all other

governments - including the Commonwealth and Queensland - expect to reduce their budget-sector workforce in 1993-94.

This Government has made a commitment to cut the size of the public sector and yet Western Australia is the only state to increase in that area. This Government has only three Budgets to bring down before the next election and the only way for it to get on track and honour its promises is to bring down an horrific Budget this year. The Trades and Labor Council praised the last Budget and the Government's typical supporters, such as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Institute of Public Affairs, gave it a good serve. It will be interesting to see how the Government approaches the coming Budget. Again, it will present confusing figures and we shall not be able to compare apples with apples. Last year a change was made from the old consolidated revenue fund and general loan and capital works fund to the consolidated fund. This year an early Budget will be introduced so it will cover a different period. We shall not be presented with actual figures but will have expected figures for 1993-94, plus anticipated figures for 1994-95. We shall not be able to compare the figures with last year's figures, and we shall all be guessing.

Hon W.N. Stretch: I hope you accept that the changes were positive changes.

Hon MARK NEVILL: Yes, the change to the consolidated fund. I do not know about the early Budget, but the consolidated fund was in process anyway. There was nothing new about the McCarrey report. With those few comments, I indicate the Government has the job ahead of it.

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural) [9.10 pm]: I support the motion moved by Hon Murray Nixon that the Address-in-Reply be presented to His Excellency the Governor. In doing so, I am reminded of the time Hon Murray Nixon and I sat as colleagues and members of the Farmers Union general executive. In our own way I think we were both a little aside from the mainstream of the Farmers Union ideology.

Hon Mark Nevill: Did you talk?

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes, indeed we did. At this stage I should indicate, for the sake of both our reputations, Hon Murray Nixon and I did not often agree. At the risk of seeming to unfairly paraphrase Hon Murray Nixon's serious and thoughtful approach to the subject of economics and public management, I do not think he will mind my saying that his view is generally characterised by the thought that low taxation is necessary for the benefit of a strong economy.

Hon E.J. Charlton: We will never know.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Minister will have his opportunities. In his Address-in-Reply contribution, Hon Murray Nixon said that the reason our early settlers were able to build such magnificent buildings was the benefit of low or no taxation. That may be so, and I will not debate that point with Hon Murray Nixon, but I believe the lower cost of labour which prevailed at the time and was caused partly at least by the uneven distribution of wealth in that colonial society may have been more important. To illustrate the point, Hon Murray Nixon referred to the church at Gingin, Saint Luke's, which was built in 1865. In the York Museum there is a record of a stock sale at the time. Colonial ewes were priced at £5 a head. Imported ewes cost more. The price was equivalent to about the yearly earnings of a farm labourer. To put that in context £5 converts to \$10 - but not in the 1865 currency, because it is about the earnings of a farm labourer now for an hour's work. That aspect might have had a lot to do with the huge magnificence of the early buildings and probably equally as much as the absence of taxation. Hon Murray Nixon has already disagreed with me, but I think it was a good point.

As our society has matured and institutions such as trade unions have brought about the equalisation of wealth, our community has achieved a level of economic egalitarianism which has probably made it one of the greatest places and societies in the world in which one could ever hope to live.

We have just witnessed a remarkable event in South Africa. That country has a society which for years has been marked by repression; a society which, in spite of its immense

inherent wealth, was unable to achieve what we would call a viable society. That South African society as we knew it was one going nowhere, cut off economically from the rest of the world and divided within itself. It was in that form because it was a society incapable of delivering equity. South Africa has now begun a long haul towards social and economic democracy. I am not brave enough to predict whether South Africa will successfully complete that journey. I am not even brave enough to predict how far along the road it might travel; but like every person in this Chamber, I hope it will reach the end of the journey successfully.

In paying tribute to South Africa for getting as far as it has, it is necessary to recognise that like any major social reform, much of the success of the reform has been due to the trade union movement. Without taking anything away from Nelson Mandela or the African National Congress, much of the unity and cohesion which has given the ANC its strength came from the union movement in general, and in particular the National Mine Workers Union.

Hon P.R. Lightfoot: What about Chief Buthelezi?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I will acknowledge others later. I am proud that the Australian Labor Party has been closely involved in the South African elections on behalf of the ANC. The Australian Labor Party was the only foreign political party to work full time with the ANC in the lead up to and during the elections. Other parties, including the United States Democrats, provided assistance to the ANC - but, in that case, also to other political groups on a less permanent basis. I am sure that the relatively smooth election process in South Africa was greatly assisted by the efforts of those foreign political parties. It would be a mistake to recognise that only the ANC played a part in the process so far. Clearly, both Inkatha and the Nationals have successfully put behind them decades of hate and disruption in order to achieve a return to democracy. It is my fervent hope that the same spirit of goodwill can be maintained, because frankly the alternative for South Africans is unthinkable.

One of the components of an egalitarian society is taxation. I do not think any of us particularly enjoys paying tax, but it remains one of the most effective ways of redistribution of wealth and providing public services such as medical facilities and roads. We can agree to disagree.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Roads!

Hon KIM CHANCE: We will come to roads. I promise the Minister. We can agree to disagree about the most desirable levels of taxation and redistribution of wealth, and the services which flow from taxation. The reason we agree to disagree is the reason we sit on opposite sides of the Chamber. Eventually all of us must agree that at some level taxation and redistribution of wealth is desirable, even essential, for the achievement of a just society. The former federal Treasurer, John Dawkins, summed up Australians' attitude to taxation when he said, after delivering his last Budget, that Australians want a Scandinavian level of social security and a Singaporean level of tax to finance it. The really distressing thing is that some people believe that is possible. What distresses me even further is that the then federal Treasurer, John Dawkins, went on to indicate that in saying that he was not excluding members of his own Caucus who believe that kind of thing is possible. I am not sure whether the Treasurer was exaggerating. I sincerely hope so.

The balance between taxes and services is evident in the area of road funding. I make two points. First, I am a long term critic of the level of Commonwealth funding applied to roads. The first speech I made in this place criticised the manner in which Commonwealth funds are applied to roads, as well as the total level of funds and the effect that they have in Western Australia. Second, I endorse the spirit at least of the Minister for Transport's campaign to raise awareness in Canberra of the need to increase road funding. I thought I should make that clear from the start because some of the things I will say now might make the Minister doubt both those points of commitment. But those points hold true.

Hon N.F. Moore: Are you having a bob each way?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not intend to have two bob each way, because I can explain my position clearly. My concern about the Minister's campaign - more correctly, the Fix Australia, Fix the Roads campaign - is that it encompasses a wide range of interest groups.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Road user groups.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Predominantly road user groups, but not exclusively. I am concerned that the campaign is not based on completely factual and balanced information. I understand that any media campaign requires brevity, and sometimes corners must be cut to get the fundamental message across. However, if our case to the Commonwealth is not credible, it will be treated with contempt.

I now refer to a document, which I will name but from which I will not directly quote. It is a letter from me to the Country Shire Councils Association. A number of factors in the road funding equation need to be clearly understood before we can put a credible case to the Commonwealth. We must understand the real figure for Commonwealth revenue collection from excise and other sources and the real figure for road spending, and the relativity argument which has been projected by the Minister and others. That argument is particularly relevant to the national highways scheme regarding the length and the amount of spending on them by the Commonwealth. We must understand the real need for funding on Western Australian roads, and the spending items which compete for available funds.

The Commonwealth's collection from excise and other forms is massive. The Minister mentioned today, presumably the forward estimate, \$9.7b. My figures are sourced from the federal Minister for Transport and are from the federal Budget estimate for 1993-94, the year about to be finalised. The fuel excise collection was estimated to be \$8.379b. The Minister may have another figure. The figure to which I refer is a gross figure. I almost interjected upon the Minister when he gave his figures earlier today to ask him whether he was referring to gross or net excise collection. However, if the federal Budget estimate is for \$8.379b, it is necessary to deduct the diesel rebate from that. This is the money paid back to the farmers, fishermen, foresters, miners or others who have purchased diesel fuel not used on roads. That rebate amounts to approximately \$1b. Therefore, of the \$8.379b, only \$7.4b eventually reaches the federal consolidated revenue fund. This is not the \$9b as claimed. The Minister could argue that I am fiddling with figures, but the difference is a sizable \$1.6b.

Hon E.J. Charlton: You're fiddling with figures.

Hon KIM CHANCE: How?

Hon E.J. Charlton: You said it yourself. The amount is what is collected from industry and the motoring public.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The net figure was \$7.4b.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The amount was the same for the previous year, and the year before that and so on.

Hon KIM CHANCE: We need to know the correct figures. When saying that the collections total \$9b, the impression is given that the Federal Government has \$9b to distribute. In reality the figure for distribution is \$7.4b, which is \$1.6b less; that represents almost a quarter of this state's Budget.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Tell us how much they give back to roads.

Hon Graham Edwards: Obviously, the Minister wants to change tack.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That is an important point which must be made. Federal road funding is drawn from the consolidated revenue fund. Excise is a taxing measure which ends up in CRF. Almost all road spending is drawn from that fund as a separate appropriation.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Do you believe that is a good idea?

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes, I do.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Really?

Hon KIM CHANCE: Obviously the Minister does too, because he does the same thing with the state Budget.

Hon E.J. Charlton: We don't.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I will demonstrate how the Government does that to the extent of \$200m.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The member knows that the state fuel levy and licence fee go into the transport trust fund.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Some of it does.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The fuel levy and licensing money does.

Hon KIM CHANCE: From memory, \$136.6m goes into the fund, but only \$84m goes out and ends up in the Main Roads Department. Therefore, \$52.6m is lost somewhere.

Hon E.J. Charlton: That is where you are wrong.

Hon KIM CHANCE: We can argue that at the appropriate time.

The total available road funds nominally is \$1.2b. That figure leaves aside the projects which are effectively completed.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The figures you cite indicate what your government was doing with the fund: It was giving \$43m a year to public transport.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That much?

Hon E.J. Charlton: It was \$43m every year from 1986. Imagine what could have been done with that money on Western Australian roads.

Hon KIM CHANCE: This is a confusing enough subject, so perhaps we should deal with it one point at a time. The total availability of road funds is nominally is \$1.2b, but other projects have been recently terminated, such as the \$595m grant from the One Nation package and the \$275m for the Black Spot program. These have effectively been wound down. In part they have been replaced with a \$350m allocation, as agreed to at the Heads of Government meeting last year.

Hon E.J. Charlton: That is not right. They have not been replacing them at all. That money has come as untied funding, and it was previously provided as tied funding. It is not replacing the black spot and arterial road funding.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The \$350m is provided as untied road funding. It is not an untied general revenue grant, but is delineated road funding.

Hon P.R. Lightfoot: You appear to be struggling to defend the indefensible.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Minister is having trouble comprehending what I am saying.

Hon P.R. Lightfoot: I am having trouble comprehending what you are defending.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I will try to maintain the flow of my argument as this is not an easy subject to explain.

Hon E.J. Charlton: If you look at the federal Budget estimate figures released yesterday, and add all those points up, you will see that the money allocated this year is less than the figure for last year.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Will the Minister keep quiet if I say that I agree with him on that point?

Hon E.J. Charlton: Yes.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I thank the Minister.

A further allocation of \$325m is allocated as index funding for identified local road grants in recognition of local government authorities' commitment to their road responsibilities. This brings the identified road spending commitment in 1993-94 to approximately \$1.471b. However, much of the revenue collected from excise collection is returned through the CRF in the form of untied grants to the states. I hope that point is understood. Each state is then entitled to dedicate those untied grants to roads if so desired.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Do you know what Western Australia does?

Hon KIM CHANCE: If the Minister is going to say what I think he is, he will be wrong. He should leave that point now.

The Western Australian Government also raises road taxes which are not spent on roads.

While Commonwealth excise is not earmarked for roads, the WA transport trust fund is, at least in theory. Despite this, only \$84m of the business franchise licence fee revenue of \$136.6m went to main roads. The balance of \$52.6m presumably goes into the state CRF. I take the Minister's point that this is influenced by what our government did the year before.

Hon E.J. Charlton: What your government did in 1986 was to siphon off \$43m a year.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Minister means it funded Transperth, which is a legitimate road use.

Hon E.J. Charlton: It put that \$43m a year aside every year from 1986. For seven years \$43m a year is \$300m in real terms.

Hon KIM CHANCE: For transport purposes.

Hon E.J. Charlton: It didn't go into roads. That is what you said. Where it is going -

Hon KIM CHANCE: It is for transport purposes.

Hon E.J. Charlton: You call it what you like. What your government did was to put it to Transperth to keep fares down, which did not attract one extra passenger. In addition, the other part goes to the operation of the Department of Transport and is used for transport related purposes.

Hon KIM CHANCE: And is transport funding. I do not think we have an argument there.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Let Hon Kim Chance develop his argument.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Other state charges on WA motorists disappeared into the state's consolidated revenue fund without being spent on roads.

Hon E.J. Charlton: I know what you are going to say.

Hon Graham Edwards: Let him make his speech.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Shut up.

Hon Graham Edwards: He has made a good speech. You shut up.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Let Hon Kim Chance continue and address his remarks through the Chair.

Hon E.J. Charlton: What he is going to say is absolutely untrue.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Let me say it first, and then the Minister can tell me whether I am a liar. Stamp duty on vehicle registrations of \$93m a year - and that is the 1993-94 estimate - raised on motorists is not spent by the WA Government on roads.

Hon E.J. Charlton: When you talk about Federal Government income do you quote sales tax and vehicles tax? Of course you don't. You tell half a story.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KIM CHANCE: I have not finished the story. When I finish the story, if the Minister still believes I have told half the story he can tell us. Until I have told the whole story, with respect, the Minister does not know. The vehicle registration recording fee is \$21.3m in the 1993-94 estimates. That is also raised by the state as a road user charge and also not spent by the state on roads. Fees for driving licences total \$24.9m in the 1993-94 estimates and again represent a road user charge not expended by the state on roads. In the Police Department there are various charges of \$19.8m in the 1993-94 estimates and again the road user charge is not expended by the state on roads.

Hon Graham Edwards: Does that include fines?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not know how it is made up. I would have thought fines would be a separate matter.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Mine never went on roads!

Hon KIM CHANCE: In total, \$207.6m of state charges on road users has been diverted by the state in one way or another to the state CRF. To put that figure in context, that \$207.6m is an amount greater than the total of Commonwealth road allocations to Western Australia. There is a perfectly reasonable explanation for this. I do not say for one moment that that list is an indication the Government is doing anything wrong, but the Commonwealth can use the same argument. We say to the Commonwealth that it is raising all this revenue from road users, chiefly through excise, and not dedicating all that money to roads. However, we are doing the same thing in Western Australia. One probable response from the Commonwealth Government to that argument is that it may tell us to get our own house in order. Let me deal with Western Australia's relativity argument.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Are you going to tell the whole story about how the Federal Government collects the extra money from road vehicles or transport?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not know how fair I can be.

Hon E.J. Charlton: You have not been very fair so far.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I have said that the state is doing precisely what it is criticising the Commonwealth Government for doing.

Hon E.J. Charlton: You did not say that. You said the Federal Government collects fuel excise and the State Government collects a whole lot of other levies. I challenge you to tell us what the Federal Government collects in addition to fuel excise.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I will do that. For the record, the Federal Government also collects other road user charges which are not expended on roads. I hope that makes the Minister for Transport happy.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Tell me how much it is.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not know.

Hon E.J. Charlton: You should if you are going to tell the whole story.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KIM CHANCE: It includes sales tax, tariffs and taxes on components, such as tyres, parts and bearings. It is a very significant amount of money. I have seen the figure at some earlier stage. I thank the Minister for reminding me.

Hon E.J. Charlton: You are welcome.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Mr Charlton has claimed that Western Australia's allocation for national highways for 1993-94 is only 7 per cent of the national total. In addition, he said that Western Australia has 25 per cent of the length of the nation's national highways. We have 9.5 per cent of the population and we provide 10.7 per cent of the excise collections. I am sure every one of those figures is scrupulously accurate.

Hon P.R. Lightfoot: We are 33 per cent of the nation.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am sure that is scrupulously accurate too, and I thank the member

so much. On the subject of relativities, Mr Charlton could also have told us that Western Australia receives 9.1 per cent of national arterial road funds, 12.4 per cent of untied arterial road funds and 15.8 per cent of federal funding for local roads.

Hon E.J. Charlton: There is no such thing as national arterial roads any more.

Hon KIM CHANCE: There was relevant to the papers of the 1993 Budget estimates, because they included the 1992-93 figures. I went on to say that 12.4 per cent of the untied national arterial funds were received by Western Australia. Western Australia has reasonably good roads by Australian standards. If people doubt that, they should look at what roads are like in the Eastern States.

Hon B.K. Donaldson: That is to the credit of the Main Roads Department.

Hon E.J. Charlton: All you did was siphon the money off.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KIM CHANCE: Not long ago I drove between the two large New South Wales country towns of Orange and Bathurst. From memory one town has a population of 30 000 and the other 50 000. They are big centres quite close to Sydney. I thought we were badly done by on Great Eastern Highway, but the road between Orange and Bathurst is probably about 10 years behind Great Eastern Highway. It was a good 30 centimetres narrower and had a ditch running alongside the edge of the bitumen which meant that a Kenworth truck bucked as soon as it put a wheel over the edge. For those who have driven them, Kenworths are relatively domestic trucks in that they do not leap and jump all over the place in poor road conditions.

It occurred to me then, after considering the bulk of some of the New South Wales major highways, that perhaps we are not getting a bad deal at all.

Hon N.F. Moore: Did it not cross your mind that New South Wales has the same problem we have?

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes. Considering how the amount of money is shared out, I do not think we are getting a particularly bad deal.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Say that again Mr Chance!

Hon KIM CHANCE: Commonwealth spending on Western Australian roads equates to \$106.31 per capita. That is approximately \$3.48 less than is spent in Queensland, but is more than is spent per capita in New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria or the Australian Capital Territory. In fact, only the Northern Territory and Tasmania enjoy substantially higher per capita spending of Commonwealth funds on roads. This is not to say we cannot do better, but it is a beginning in terms of recognising what is the real situation.

Hon P.R. Lightfoot: You must relate that at some stage to the fact that the state earns 27 per cent of export income with less than 10 per cent of the population.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I think in terms of tax equity the better figure was given by the Minister. I quoted it earlier; that is, while Hon Ross Lightfoot's point of view may well be relevant, the Minister has made the point somewhere before that we contribute 10.7 per cent of the excise revenue.

Hon E.J. Charlton: So you agree that at least we should get our own money back?

Hon KIM CHANCE: No, I do not.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Even though we are a third of the nation and we earn only 25 per cent of the actual gross, you do not think we should get even our own money back?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not think that is necessarily a key factor in determining how Commonwealth funds should be allocated, given that they are allocated on the basis of established need and by some fairly complex formulae which I think the Minister understands. A key element in national highways funding is the number of vehicles on those highways, despite the fact, as the Minister has said, that we are contributing some 10.7 per cent of the excise and receiving only 7 per cent of funding for those national

highways. A key determinant in road maintenance cost is vehicle density. There is absolutely no point in allocating the same number of dollars for each mile of highway, if one highway is carrying five times the volume of traffic as another. Members should consider what is Western Australia's share of national highways. The vast bulk of it is north of Geraldton or east of Norseman. Vehicle densities are extremely low on a huge number of our highways. Certainly they were expensive highways to build and that is why Western Australia's share of road funding has, at least over the past eight or nine years, been higher than average. The Pilbara highway program is now finished.

Hon N.F. Moore: You should have a look one day if you think it is finished.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The major highway through to Hedland is finished. It was a long term commitment of the Government to get that road built.

Hon N.F. Moore: There are other roads to build.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Of course there are other roads to build.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The commitment made by Mr Brown to have it completed by 1990 or 1992 has not yet been achieved.

Hon KIM CHANCE: How much has yet to be completed? It was my understanding that it was complete.

Hon Graham Edwards interjected.

Hon E.J. Charlton interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Barry House): Order!

Hon Graham Edwards: The fact is you do not like to be proved to be wrong. You want to sit back and knock someone else but you will not accept it in return.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Graham Edwards and the Minister for Transport will come to order. Hon Kim Chance is on his feet.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Thank you Mr Deputy President.

Hon Graham Edwards interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KIM CHANCE: I hope the Minister for Transport and Hon Graham Edwards will jointly move to extend my time, because they have used about half of it so far.

Hon N.F. Moore: You will not get much support.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am sorry the Minister for Education says that I will not get much support.

Hon N.F. Moore: If you keep saying that I will send your speech to everybody in my electorate and you will never get a vote again.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am pleased to hear the Minister say that he will do that. I believe I sent one to the Shire of Derby-West Kimberley. I hope the Minister will circulate the speech so that people will understand just what is the real situation. The process of excise collection is simply one more form of federal taxation income. It forms a portion of the consolidated revenue fund, from which funding for roads must compete with every other form of expenditure of appropriations. As a result, we must be aware that every additional dollar we attract for roads will have one of two possible results. It will either mean it is a dollar which will be cut from other outlays, perhaps health, defence, welfare, education -

Hon B.K. Donaldson: That is the oldest trick in the trade; we have been hearing it for 10 years from the Federal Government.

Hon KIM CHANCE: One way or another that dollar must be found. It can be done by reducing appropriations in other areas or it can be deficit funded.

Hon N.F. Moore interjected.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes, I must be entirely fair, savings can be achieved through microeconomic reform. For this reason we must be able to define our goals clearly for improved road allocations and we must be able to show that the cost will be balanced by appropriate benefits to the nation. I acknowledge that the Fix Australia, Fix the Roads campaign has made a cursory attempt at trying to do that. However, I still think that the hundreds of thousands of dollars which are being spent on advertising for that campaign could have been of more use if they were used on some good sound research.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Did you go to the summit?

Hon KIM CHANCE: No; unfortunately I was not in Western Australia at the time and I would have enjoyed attending. I would support a campaign that could show that spending, for example, \$200m on a total upgrade of Great Eastern Highway would return benefits to Australia worth substantially more than \$200m. I suspect that that is probably the case. However, my suspecting something will not make the Commonwealth part with an additional \$200m.

Hon E.J. Charlton: Why do they not take notice of the basic economic and engineering information that is available to them?

Hon KIM CHANCE: If the Minister had waited until I spoke my last sentence he would know. My suspecting something will not make the Commonwealth do it. However, a well researched and constructed case might have convinced Canberra. I am suggesting to the Minister that rather than wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money on a campaign convincing Western Australians that we are hard done by in road funding, it might have been more effective to spend that amount of money on additional research within the Department of Transport to construct a case to convince people in Canberra that we should be doing something like that. I cannot imagine how convincing Western Australians that we are hard done by as a result of insufficient road funds will do anybody any good, except the advertising agency.

Hon E.J. Charlton: I have news for Mr Chance: We have done both.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Good; I look forward to the result. We need to understand the dynamics of that gap of \$5.93b between Federal excise collections of, in net terms, \$7.4b and the road funding figure of about \$1.47b. The Minister may argue about my figures, but I do not think they are far out. To suggest that all, or even most, of that sum should be expended -

Hon E.J. Charlton: I never said that.

Hon KIM CHANCE: All right. To suggest that a greater amount of that gap should be spent on road construction and maintenance -

Hon E.J. Charlton: I did not say that.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Indeed the Minister did.

Hon E.J. Charlton: No, I did not; I said it should be substantially increased from 7¢ out of 31¢.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That is a substantially increased amount of that current gap. To suggest that more should be spent on road construction and maintenance is a feasible argument, but it must stand up against every other call for that money. We are not talking about a road tax as such; we are talking about an amount of money in CRF. It may have come from road users, but we must remember that a large part of that gap is called on by road users.

Every time the Minister for Health needs an increase in funding for the Shenton Park rehabilitation unit -

Hon E.J. Charlton: That has been taxed already. We were told by your government in Canberra a couple of years ago that a levy was imposed on everybody in Australia to do that.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Every time the Minister for Health needs additional health

funding, the Commonwealth make a huge contribution to the health funds in Western Australia. Every time the Minister's hospital system has to spend \$1m on the rehabilitation of a paraplegic, that must come from somewhere. It is appropriate that the consolidated revenue fund receive a contribution from road users, but I will not argue whether \$5.93b is the appropriate figure. What I say is that the Minister needs to recognise that road users already receive a substantial part of that money. As that \$5.93b goes into CRF, it is coming back to the state in another form. All of the tied and untied general purpose grants which are allocated by the Commonwealth to the state come out of the same pool of the federal consolidated revenue fund. When those tied and untied revenue grants arrive in the Western Australian Treasury, Western Australia makes its own decisions about how that money will be spent. Some of that money comes from road users and it can be allocated back to roads if the state makes that decision.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The Black Spot program that gave \$6.5m to Western Australia has been estimated - not by me, not by the department, but by all the other people involved - to have returned a saving to Western Australia of \$60m. As a consequence of spending that money on the black spots, that is the return on investment that the Federal Government would receive if it allocated extra funds to the road system in those critical areas of the state.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That is interesting information. Turning to funding and services, it is impossible to discuss services without raising a health related issue. In this case I raise the question of State Government nursing homes - namely, Mt Henry and Sunset. During the last session, in an urgency motion I moved I expressed concerns that had been voiced to me and others about proposed changes at Sunset and Mt Henry nursing homes. Then I was flying largely blind, relying on what I had been told and what I had read, even though I had made a brief visit to Mt Henry some time before that. Since then I have spent considerable time at Sunset and Mt Henry nursing homes. That has not been done in an attempt to raise support among the workers at those institutions. It was an attempt to reconcile in my own mind what has been stated by the Health Department and the Minister compared with what I was hearing from people there. I was trying to reconcile the vision that the Minister painted of Sunset and Mt Henry with what I could see with my own eyes, and I have been unable to reconcile these differences.

On one hand, the Minister's position is that the facilities and standard of living at the State Government nursing homes is inadequate and substandard. The conditions, we are told, provide neither privacy nor dignity, and people of equivalent health status to those of people at State Government nursing homes are now enjoying private bedrooms with ensuite facilities in non-government nursing homes. The continued existence of State Government nursing home beds is denying better conditions to nursing home patients generally. That is the line we have been asked to accept.

What I found on my unannounced visits was something quite different. The buildings at Sunset are old and in need of maintenance, but are also solid and functional and enjoyed by the residents. It is far from being a hospital-type atmosphere. In the largest ward I visited - a barn-like structure is the image painted by the Minister - I found a mutually supportive group of long time friends enjoying the company of the dog that followed us into the ward. It is an environment in which a dog is welcome to wander in and say hello to the patients; because they are not patients, but residents. It is their home. Residents clearly enjoy the grounds in which they live. A tour was conducted with a couple of residents, and the tour is regarded as part of the daily routine at Sunset. The residents do not regard themselves as deprived in any way because they do not live in a modern motel-style room. These residents may require skilled medical help at any time, and that need is readily apparent to others in the ward. How would that need be known if the residents were in an enclosed room alone in one of these modern motel-type rooms with ensuite facilities? How would a medical need be recognised by the skilled staff who work there unless they were being continually interrupted?

Conditions at Sunset could be better. It would be dishonest of me to say otherwise. It is also dishonest to allow my middle aged, middle class standards, based on an obscure concept of privacy, to influence people who may well have different sets of values. I

gained the strong impression that the residents consider to be important things such as skilled medical care when they need it; a relaxed, stress free environment; and above all the companionship of others, because these are largely people who have no families. Many residents never receive visitors. Their companionship is their fellows at Sunset or Mt Henry. Even in our privileged and fortunate state - and I am referring to us personally - we value things such as confidence and security and companionship above loneliness. Where does one draw the line between privacy and the utter desolation of being alone?

Mt Henry is a more modern establishment. As the Minister stated, it is similar to a hospital. To some extent, the comparisons are unavoidable. Mt Henry and other hospitals have rooms which lead to a wide corridor which is needed to turn a stretcher on wheels around. I cannot see any other alternative which would be possible in a more modern design. Mt Henry's ward layout consists of two and four bed units, with some three bed units incorporating a small lounge area. Conditions at Mt Henry are less open and airy than at Sunset because of the modern design. Conditions at Mt Henry are similar to accommodation provided by private nursing homes in Western Australia. We are told that private facilities are vastly better. What is different from Mt Henry and the private facilities in Western Australia is that Mt Henry has a staff ratio - that is, trained staff - of 1.12 staff to each resident. I am not aware of any private facility which matches that ratio. With a few exceptions, Mt Henry staff are trained enrolled nurses or trained state registered nurses. Private nursing homes tend to employ a percentage of people euphemistically called nursing assistants. Mt Henry also employs four doctors. I am not aware of a single private facility which has its own doctors. Above all is the fact that each resident at Mt Henry is there because the facility was recommended as the best available for that person. Mt Henry is a centre of excellence and it caters for a wide range of medical conditions. The hospital's admission policy includes in its criteria, "patients who have high dependency nursing and medical needs which cannot be met in the private sector, including patients with behavioural and psychiatric problems". That policy implies that Mt Henry residents will have limited options in obtaining alternative accommodation to meet their needs.

I have no doubt that some of the existing facilities, including those under construction, will provide superior accommodation judged by our standards. In many cases this type of private low care level of nursing home will be entirely appropriate to people's material needs. It is just as obvious to me that some nursing home residents need a higher level of care or they simply prefer the services provided by the existing government nursing homes found at Sunset and Mt Henry.

I have always tried to understand the Minister's point of view on health matters and I have tried to remain sensitive to the fine balance which must be achieved between cost and services. In this case I understand the difficulty he has with the chicken and egg scenario imposed by the current federal-state agreement relating to the transfer of beds from the state nursing home sector to the private Commonwealth sector where it is desirable and appropriate. To that extent, the Opposition is prepared to assist the Minister in any representation he makes to the Commonwealth Minister in an attempt to overcome this problem.

All members need to reassess their motives in this matter. Are we being driven by a genuine desire to improve the conditions for nursing home residents or are we imputing our ideas of what is desirable over what is the apparent genuine desire of residents to remain where they are? In all the publicity surrounding this issue and the public comment generated by it, not one person has telephoned or written to me to say that as a member of a resident's family he or she would rather the family member was moved from one of the so-called unsuitable government facilities to a private nursing home. The Minister's intentions may be honourable, but I am certain that he needs to spend a little more time considering the options and the points of view of residents.

I will raise another issue which I have only partly researched because the facts I have found so far are quite remarkable. Members from regional electorates would be aware of the regional enterprise development initiative scheme. It is a worthwhile scheme and it

was developed during the Labor government's term in office. The scheme makes grants equal to no more than 15 per cent of the total capital commitment by enterprises developing in regional areas which meet a certain set of criteria which are quite clear. My research was innocent because I have an interest in regional development and I wanted to know how the scheme was operating under the new government. The Opposition spokesman for small business, the member for Helena, asked the Minister for Commerce and Trade on my behalf a series of questions about that scheme. I was interested in where the successful applicants came from and I went through the list provided by the Minister and applied the electorate name to determine whether they were in Liberal, National or Labor Party electorates. Twenty seven applications were successful and I will name the electorate and the party which represents it: Merredin, National Party; Roe, National Party; Wagin, National Party; Avon, National Party; Merredin, National Party; Roe, National Party; Vasse, Liberal Party; Bunbury, Liberal Party; Albany, Liberal Party; Stirling, National Party; Pilbara, Labor Party; Vasse, Liberal Party; Avon, National Party; Moore, Liberal Party; Wellington, Liberal Party; Maylands, Labor Party, but the manufacturer was relocated to Mandurah, Liberal Party; Merredin, National Party; Wagin, National Party; Greenough, Liberal Party; Stirling, National Party; Stirling, National Party; Avon, National Party; Warren, Liberal Party; Murray, Liberal Party; Avon, National Party; Avon, National Party; and Roe, National Party. Of the 27 successful applicants, 25 were in National and Liberal Party held seats. One was in a Labor seat and another was in a metropolitan Labor seat but it was transferred to a regional Liberal seat.

I will go through the dynamics of regional Western Australia.

Hon George Cash: If you go through the Agricultural Region you will find that the Labor Party does not have a lot of Assembly seats.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Labor Party holds one-third of the regional seats in Western Australia. In addition, it holds all the remote regional seats in Western Australia and that is where one would expect there to be a greater need for this type of assistance. Why has this happened? It is one thing for the Leader of the House to say there is a concentration of those seats in the Agricultural Region which are held by the coalition parties, but it is absolutely irrelevant. Are there no developing industries in Port Hedland, Karratha, Broome or Kununurra? What a load of nonsense!

I will monitor this scheme in detail in the future because it looks and smells to me like a roort - it probably is a roort. In dollar terms it does not get better, it gets worse. The total funding allocated under this scheme was \$552 653. All of that money went to Liberal and National Party electorates, with the exception of the one ALP seat which was allocated \$3 450.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am grateful to the House for granting me that extension of time.

Hon E.J. Charlton: This is the best speech you have ever made. I am looking forward to conveying it to all your constituents.

Hon KIM CHANCE: In regard to one of those successful applications in the Merredin electorate, I actually recommended that that person seek assistance under the regional enterprise development initiative scheme, and my friend Hon Bruce Donaldson progressed the matter beyond that point. I concede that Hon Bruce Donaldson was largely responsible for bringing that matter to fruition, and I am grateful to my friend for doing that. I support the scheme, as does Hon Bruce Donaldson, but something has gone wrong when one-third of the regional seats in Western Australia held by the Australian Labor Party have virtually a nil result in dollar terms - \$3 450 out of -

Hon E.J. Charlton: How many applications were made from those other areas?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not have that figure. I have the successful applications. I think I see which way the Minister's mind is working. Perhaps the Minister is saying that if we looked at the unsuccessful applications, which of course are not and should not be available to me, and I believe there are about 41 of them, we might find that they also

came from coalition seats. That is entirely possible. If that is true, that indicates that something is terribly wrong with the scheme because it means that the scheme is not being marketed or promoted in Labor seats. We have established an imbalance in regard to the electorates from which the successful applications came. We have an even worse imbalance in regard to the amount of funds allocated under that scheme.

This is an area that I have yet to research more fully, but I have looked at one case in some detail, and it appears that the guidelines that were laid down for the use of the scheme have been overlooked in one way or another; or, if not overlooked, have been interpreted so liberally that they have become meaningless. In the case to which I refer, the successful applicant - whom I will not identify, because I am concerned about not the applicants but the system - was a country supermarket, or retailer of consumer goods. I was surprised that a supermarket would qualify for an enterprise development grant because I am more familiar with the type of enterprise for which Hon Bruce Donaldson and I provided some assistance in Merredin; namely, a manufacturing-type enterprise. That is the kind of enterprise for which I thought this scheme was more suitable. It was a surprise to me that any kind of retailer, much less a supermarket, would receive a substantial amount of money under this scheme. In fact, it was the case of the supermarket that first drew my attention to this matter, because plastered all over page 5 of a country newspaper, complete with photographs, was the handing over of the cheque to this country supermarket, and the proprietor, the successful applicant, said that he intended to use that \$10 000 which he received to increase the stock in his store. The regional enterprise development initiative scheme guidelines state, at the second dot point, that -

Applicants should not cause unfair competition to existing regional businesses.

Are we to believe that this supermarket, which has just received \$10 000 of taxpayers' money to increase the level of its stock, will not compete unfairly as a direct result of that grant with other people in that town and region who are also selling goods? This is absolutely ridiculous.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Why?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do not know whether Hon Derrick Tomlinson wants me to give him a lesson in economics.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: I want to hear your reasons.

Hon KIM CHANCE: If we have two competing sellers of goods, the marginal price at which they can sell their goods determines their level of competitiveness. If one seller receives a grant of a substantial amount of money and thus reduces his marginal cost of goods, he will gain a competitive advantage over the other person.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: That is not what you said.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I said he used that grant to increase his stock, and that put him at a competitive advantage. Similarly, if one person receives a substantial amount of money by which to make his goods more attractive and to increase his range of stock, that person would stand to gain a competitive advantage over another retailer who has a smaller range of goods. Indeed, that is exactly why this supermarket went on this expansion program. This supermarket proprietor did two other things. He expanded his trading hours, and he provided a personalised home delivery service. That did not appear in the newspaper article, but that was identified by the Minister for Commerce and Trade in an answer to a parliamentary question. I do not know how carefully we have to go through this. I thought it was clear enough. Because of a grant of taxpayers' funds, a retailer has been given the capacity to provide at least three services which would advantage that retailer over other retailers in that town and region. If this supermarket has not been given, via REDIS, the capacity to compete unfairly with other retailers in the same town and region, then I cannot read, frankly.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: That is the opposite of what you just said. You do not read very well, and you think even worse.

Hon KIM CHANCE: When the member reads this tomorrow, he will be ashamed of himself, because if he cannot follow the logic of one business being given a handout by the taxpayers to compete with another retailer who has not been given the same handout, and if he cannot call that unfair, then his sense of logic is thrown out the window.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: What I fail to follow is the logic of your argument. When you read your argument tomorrow, you will see that you have failed to be logical.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KIM CHANCE: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. I am sure Hon Derrick Tomlinson will be ashamed of himself in the morning, because I am sure he will think clearer and will see that the argument is logical.

Hon Tom Helm: But he still will not love or respect himself.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The member's extended time is running out.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I will not go a long way further with this, at least not tonight.

I do intend to go through everyone of those cases in great detail. I received some information only today which made me believe one involved a grant of \$45 000 to an organisation in the fish processing industry. I have been unable to determine from the list of fish processors licensed in Western Australia that the person involved even has a licence to process fish. I hope I will be able to ascertain more from the freedom of information application. My case stands on its own so far. There is a clear misappropriation on the basis of electorates and on the basis of dollars. If, as I believe, the Minister for Transport wanted to try to suggest that possibly all of the applications had come from coalition seats, that also worries me. That means that the scheme is not being sold in Labor electorates. It is quite a possible format. I am more concerned about that than the apparent blatant oversight of the guidelines provided by the scheme.

It is a great shame when a good scheme - one I have supported ever since we introduced it and during the term of this Government - a scheme of that quality is corrupted either deliberately or by mismanagement; but corruption it is. Whether it is innocent corruption or corruption by neglect, I do not know. But one way or another this scheme has gone very wrong. Before I have to check out everyone of the places that I have listed in front of me, I hope that by an FOI application or by wringing answers out of the Minister for Commerce and Trade he will recognise that something is terribly wrong with this scheme and will order a top level investigation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Muriel Patterson.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [10.22 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Adjournment Debate - South Africa

HON CHERYL DAVENPORT (South Metropolitan) [10.22 pm]: I will take a few minutes before we adjourn to place on record, on the day after the investiture of Nelson Mandela as the new President of a free democratic South Africa, my personal congratulations to all of those involved in the process which culminated in the elections conducted in South Africa between 26 and 28 April this year. It is no secret that this goal has not been achieved in four years without violence, death and heartache, which none of us here in Australia could ever hope to comprehend. This goal has been reached through tremendous commitment by many people, like the now Second Deputy President of South Africa, F.W. de Klerk and his National Party. Rarely do we ever see leaders who willingly work in a process to ensure their own defeat and their party's defeat in the pursuit of democracy. On this occasion, we have seen both.

I mentioned the commitment of Nelson Mandela and the African National Congress and,

finally, within only a week or 10 days of the election being conducted, of Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi and his Inkatha Freedom Party. I congratulate their vision and wish the new non-racial democratic South Africa unqualified success.

I also want to congratulate my party for the assistance I know it has given to the ANC. A letter signed by Nelson Mandela as ANC candidate for the President of South Africa states -

... since its inception the ANC has been committed to the creation of a non-racial, democratic South Africa. A South Africa that will protect the rights of the individual, while building a nation in which all are equal and secure.

It's a commitment I know is shared by the Australian Labor Party.

But the ban on the African National Congress was lifted a mere three years ago. And unlike you we have never fought an election. It's meant we've had to instantly acquire skills that under normal conditions would have taken decades. That's why, I want to take this opportunity to express my profound appreciation of the support our struggle has received from the Australian Labor Party, and therefore from you.

Support not just in international forums, but support for ANC endorsed activities through your federal government's aid program. And more recently, your Party's very direct assistance in providing campaign organisers.

The campaign expertise that Ian Henderson (Assistant National Secretary of the Labor Party) -

Jenny Beacham, State Secretary of the Victorian Branch of the Australian Labor Party, and Terry Cameron, State Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party, were also involved. To continue -

- is currently providing our campaign, follows a long tradition of support from Labor's Parliamentary leadership. Support from leaders like Gough Whitlam, Bob Hawke, and more recently Prime Minister Keating.

It's therefore reassuring to know, that in these final days, I can continue to rely on the support of the Australian Labor Party, and for this ... I thank you.

Yours in the struggle,

I also want to associate my personal involvement with the plight of South Africa. In 1981 when I was an electorate officer with former Senator Patricia Giles, I became involved with the Suttner family. People may have heard of Raymond Suttner. His mother, Sheila, came to see Senator Giles, seeking a visa for her son, Raymond, who was then imprisoned in South Africa and at that time had been for five years under the suppression of communism legislation. For having assisted the ANC to produce and distribute pamphlets throughout the communities in South Africa - I would see that as a democratic right - he was imprisoned for seven and a half years. In 1986, during the state of emergency, he was imprisoned again for another two years. He was imprisoned without trial and for 18 months of that sentence he was placed in solitary confinement. I am delighted to say that, although we were unsuccessful in one instance in obtaining a visa for him, in 1983 when the Labor Government was elected to power, the then foreign affairs Minister ensured a visa was available for Raymond Suttner to come to Australia on his release from prison. At that time we thought, "It would be awful if he did not take up that visa" - and he did not! When he was released from prison he chose to stay in South Africa and fight for what he believed would eventually become a democratic South Africa. Last week at the completion of the elections, he was elected twenty-ninth on the ANC ticket as a member of the new Parliament of South Africa. His life has been devoted to the cause and I am pleased to have been associated with somebody who has been prepared to put in such a long fight to see democracy occur.

In 1990 I was fortunate to travel to Zimbabwe to attend the conference of world women parliamentarians for peace and met with a number of ANC women who had been exiled from South Africa. At that stage Mandela had not long been released and the ANC was

working on achieving a good outcome to just commenced negotiations so that an election could occur. In 1991 the Australian ambassador to South Africa, on his way back to South Africa, spent some hours in this Parliament.

I was fortunate to meet with the Ambassador, who told us that the events the outside world has witnessed this April and May would happen. I did not believe him. I am delighted I was wrong. When I was driving home from Parliament last evening I heard an interview with a man who has been away from South Africa for 20 years. His name was Seeway Lawamba, and his words brought a tear to my eye. He said -

I never thought I would ever see the day I would be able to return to South Africa and live as a normal person and be able to lead a normal life.

Many of us take for granted the lives that we lead as free citizens in a democratic society. It has made me value my freedom. In conclusion I will quote from *The West Australian* of this morning which states -

In his inaugural speech, Mr Mandela called apartheid "an extraordinary human disaster that lasted too, too long".

"We shall build the society in which all South Africans, both black and white, will be able to walk tall, without any fear in their hearts, assured of their inalienable right to human dignity - a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world," he said.

Nkosi sikilel, i' Afrika - God bless Africa.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.31 pm

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

SCHOOLS - MELVILLE AND BELMONT SENIOR HIGH *Academic Extension Programs, Relocation*

13. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Education:

Some notice of this question has been given.

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that the academic extension programs at Melville and Belmont Senior High Schools have been axed?
- (2) If yes, were the schools consulted before the decision to relocate was made?
- (3) If yes, for what reasons were the programs axed?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question.

- (1) The academic extension programs at Melville and Belmont Senior High Schools are being phased out. As from 1995 no new students will be admitted to the programs of those schools. The programs were relocated from Melville Senior High School to John Curtin Senior High School and from Belmont Senior High School to Cannington Senior High School. The programs at Melville and Belmont Senior High Schools will continue to be offered to those students currently enrolled in them.
- (2) Both schools were informed before the decision to relocate was announced. In the case of Melville Senior High School there have been a number of discussions with the previous principal.
- (3) The programs were relocated because Melville and Belmont Senior High Schools were not able to attract sufficient numbers of students into their programs. This was due to their location, and not the quality of their educational programs. The academic extension program is not the property of individual schools, but a systems program designed to provide a service to the whole of the metropolitan area. Schools are chosen for their location. The programs have been relocated to John Curtin and Cannington Senior High Schools because both are centrally located and readily accessible by rail and bus links. Both schools are ideally located to service large sections of the metropolitan area which previously had restricted access to the academic extension program. John Curtin Senior High School is now available to the south west quadrant and fast growing Peel District and Cannington Senior High School to the south east corridor.

COLLEGES - AUTONOMOUS PROPOSAL *Organisations Expressing Concern*

14. Hon JOHN HALDEN to the Minister for Education:

Some notice of this question has been given. In answer to my question without notice on 5 May 1993 which asked the Minister if any organisation apart from the chief executive officer of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry had complained about the autonomous colleges proposal, the Minister replied, "None". I again ask the Minister if any organisation has expressed concern to him, through his office or the department, about the proposal, and, if so, would he provide the House with a list of those organisations?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. I have only just received the answer which has been prepared by my office, and it is not an answer which is satisfactory to me at this time because it does not answer the question. Maybe it is a typical answer of the sort we have received in the past.

Hon John Halden: We are used to that. Give it to the Minister for Transport; he does that all the time.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Mr President, the question originally asked on opening day was prefaced with the statement that there had been massive and widespread condemnation of something or other and it asked whether a number of organisations had expressed that widespread condemnation. I cannot think of the exact wording.

Hon John Halden: There was nothing like that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It was an over the top expression, as the Leader of the Opposition is wont to use.

Hon John Halden: How outrageous.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The response I gave was that no organisation had expressed the sort of opposition that the question implied.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You are trying to avoid the question.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I had received a number of submissions from people, generally fairly benign responses. Subsequent to answering the question there have been a number of organisations whose submissions have now reached me, so the question of timing is important. Some submissions had not reached me. They had reached my office, but I had not read them. A couple of organisations have expressed some concern about the autonomous college proposal that is contained in the model that has been presented to the State Training Board and to the college chairman and college director. I cannot think of them all off the top of my head but Hon John Halden mentioned in his comments on opening day that Lyndon Rowe of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry had indicated he did not support some aspects of it, and that is correct. Hedland College has expressed the view that it does not support some aspects of the college model. A number of letters have been received from colleges in the metropolitan area which were very pleased indeed with the progress that has been made in the setting up of autonomous colleges.

I want to make clear what has happened with respect to the autonomous college model. I set down a number of criteria for the development of autonomous colleges and requested the Department of Training to develop a model based on those criteria and to take into account the recommendations of the Vickery report. Out of that process has come a model which is an integrated autonomous college model which Mr Wild from Hedland College considers to be a difficult proposition. He does not see the words "integrated" and "autonomous" being able to be put together in the same context. What needs to be understood is that there is the intention in this model to have autonomous colleges; that is, autonomous as opposed to independent colleges.

Hon Tom Helm: How can they be autonomous and integrated?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I will explain to Hon Tom Helm one day what the two words mean because it would take me longer to explain to him than anybody else.

Hon Tom Helm: You do not know.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The idea in this model is that colleges have the maximum degree of autonomy but work within a statewide system.

Point of Order

Hon SAM PIANTADOSI: I do not believe the Minister is answering the question. He is giving a speech and is pointing out different models but that was not the nature of the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is not a point of order.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Hon N.F. MOORE: The model that involves a system-wide approach to the development of autonomous colleges has been presented to the State Training Board and to college chairmen and directors with the request that they give us their views about that particular model. It is subject to change and to my responding to the views of a whole variety of people, and I am taking on board their views. Interestingly, the strong criticism - if there is any - and that is Lyndon Rowe's criticism, is coming from that side of argument which is contrary to the side that Hon John Halden was representing.

Hon John Halden: You should not make that assumption.

Hon N.F. MOORE: There is a view among people whom the Opposition represents - for example, the teachers' union, which does not believe in any autonomy at all -

Hon John Halden: That is not true.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The problem I have is finding a place in between a range of opinions which varies between the existing system - which we all acknowledge, I hope, is not the best way to operate - and the independent college system that is in place in the north west as a result of the previous Liberal government.

Hon Tom Helm: With support from the teachers' union.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon Tom Helm's knowledge of history is limited. When the Labor government went to the polls in 1983 its platform was to abolish the independent colleges in the north west.

Hon Tom Helm: It was not.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It was because the Labor government came to the conclusion, as we did, that that was the way to go.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will raise a point of order. The Minister now is totally getting away from the question. I gave him a lot of latitude.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Hear, hear!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I did not intend to give the Minister any more time because he initially said the answer to the question was not satisfactory, and I am taking it that the Minister is reading the answer.

Hon N.F. MOORE: No, I am not.

The PRESIDENT: I did not see you turn over the page. What I am getting at is that the Minister cannot half answer the question. He either answers it or does not answer it.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Normally when a member sends a question without notice, of which some notice is given, it goes to a Minister's office and the office prepares the answer because the Minister is usually off doing something else. The office sends the Minister a copy of the proposed answer. It arrived on my desk as I walked into the House a moment ago.

I am now trying to explain what the answer ought to be. I apologise for responding to interjections. However, the organisations that have responded to me may not wish Hon John Halden to know that they have responded and what they have said.

Subject to their approval, I will provide the member with a list of all the organisations that have responded and they can advise him what that response is.

PARMELIA RESOURCES NL - OR PORTMAN MINING LTD, IRON MAKING PLANT ESTABLISHMENT, GOVERNMENT NEGOTIATIONS

15. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for Mines assisting the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Is the Government in any way negotiating with Parmelia Resources or Portman Mining over the feasibility of establishing an iron making plant in WA?
- (2) If yes, what locations are being considered?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

- (1)-(2)

I do not have an answer to that question. In fact, I do not even have the question. My earlier signal to the member was to indicate that I have an answer to another question. He must have two questions. As to the question that he just asked, I will endeavour to provide an answer tomorrow. If he has another question, I might be able to help him with an answer.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I wish to respond to what the Leader of the House said about that question. I take it that he is saying to the member that, if he places that question on notice -

Hon GEORGE CASH: I will endeavour to get an answer.

The PRESIDENT: Tomorrow?

Hon GEORGE CASH: That is right.

The PRESIDENT: There is a difference. We do not want to mislead the member. I am advising him that his question will be taken as a question on notice.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT - AWARDS MADE, 1993
Claims by Police Officers

16. Hon A.J.G. MacTIERNAN to the Minister for Health representing the Attorney General:

Some notice has been given of the question.

- (1) How many awards were made in 1993 under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, and what was the total value of those awards?
- (2) How many, if any, such claims were made by police officers, and what was the total value of the claims?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

- (1) In 1993, 658 awards totalling \$4 825 738 were made under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1985. Thirty-four awards totalling \$274 835 were made under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1982.
- (2) In 1993, 58 claims were made by police officers. The total value of those claims is not readily available.

**LAND ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF - KARRATHA OFFICE,
CLOSURE**

17. Hon B.K. DONALDSON to the Minister for Lands:

Some notice has been given of the question. Is the Minister aware of the recent reports made in the media by Hon Tom Helm regarding the closure of the Department of Land Administration's Karratha office?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question. I am aware of the statements made by Hon Tom Helm in relation to DOLA's Karratha and Kununurra offices being extremely busy due to the expertise they provide in the areas of mining and pastoral matters.

Pastoral issues have always been dealt with by the Perth based Pastoral Board within DOLA, and any mining matters fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Minerals and Energy.

As to Hon Tom Helm's assertion that there will be some loss of local services by the closure of the Karratha office, it needs to be understood that the Pilbara region has been under the control of a Perth based regional manager for many years. The regional manager has a sound knowledge of the area and will obviously make more frequent visits to the region to ensure the level of service is maintained.

Additionally, local business will enjoy an economic boost with the opportunity to take over DOLA's map and land sales.

**LEGAL AID COMMISSION - CANNABIS RELATED OFFENCES,
ASSISTANCE COSTS**

18. Hon A.J.G. MacTIERNAN to the Minister for Health representing the Attorney General:

Some notice has been given of the question.

- (1) In each of the last three financial years, what has been the total internal and external cost to the Legal Aid Commission of WA in providing assistance for persons charged with cannabis related offences whether for associated bail applications, pleas of guilty or defence and appeal matters?
- (2) In each of the last three financial years, what has been the cost to the Ministry of Justice and/or the Director of Public Prosecutions in prosecuting cannabis related offences and dealing with ancillary matters such as associated bail applications and appeals?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question.

- (1) The information that the Legal Aid Commission collates pertains to all drug related offences. It should be noted that many drug related offences which involve merely pleas are dealt with by the duty lawyer service and thus are not the subject of a grant of aid.
- (2) It is not possible to quantify the costs to either the Ministry of Justice or the Director of Public Prosecutions in prosecuting and ancillary matters related to offences involving cannabis.

I seek leave to table a document related to that.

Leave granted. [See paper No 42.]

RESERVES - DRAINAGE 39667, PLANTAGENET LOCATION
Survey Report

19. Hon P.R. LIGHTFOOT to the Minister for Lands:

Some notice has been given of the question. During April this year, the Minister advised that he was arranging for a surveyor to be instructed to survey the boundaries of reserve 39667 at Napier. Will he please inform the House of the current situation?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question. The Albany based survey firm of Harley, Hedderwick and Webber Pty Ltd recently surveyed Plantagenet location 5110, reserve 39667, to establish the boundaries of the drainage reserve and document any encroachment of spoil onto the adjoining location 4947. It has been determined that spoil emanating from the drainage reserve has encroached upon Plantagenet location 4947. The condition of the adjoining land would support previous advice given that the encroachment preceded the establishment of the lease over the reserve. Accordingly, the Department of Land Administration cannot take any action against the lessee to remove the existing spoil. However, it will assess the survey report and look to adding a new condition to the annual renewable lease to prevent further encroachment.

FORTESCUE MAGNETITE PROJECT - AGREEMENT ACT

20. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Resources Development:

Some notice has been given of the question.

- (1) In the light of comments made by the Minister for Resources Development in *The West Australian* on Saturday, 7 May 1994, is he to establish an agreement Act to cover the proposal - that is, the Fortescue magnetite project - referred to in that article?
- (2) Is the Minister to take overall charge of the project referred to in that article?
- (3) If so, will the Minister have the power to override the Environmental Protection Act or the Land (Titles and Traditional Usage) Act?
- (4) Will the Minister have power to determine assessment levels administered under those Acts?
- (5) Will the Environmental Protection Act require consequential amendments, and what will those amendments be?
- (6) Will the Minister, in taking charge of the project, assume the roles of the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question. The Minister for Resources Development has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, as is normally the case with agreement Acts.
- (3) No, but see (6).
- (4) No.
- (5) This is unlikely, but details of the arrangements have yet to be finalised.

- (6) Yes, to the extent required by the agreement Act as endorsed by Cabinet. But the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs' role under the Land (Titles and Traditional Usage) Act will not be affected.

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT, NEERABUP - CROWN LEASE,
GRANTED**

21. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Minister for Lands:

Some notice has been given of the question.

- (1) Has the Crown lease been granted to allow the construction and operation of a concrete batching plant at Quinns Road, Neerabup?
- (2) If so, to whom was the lease granted?
- (3) What are the lease conditions, length of lease and rent payable on such a lease?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) No.

(2)-(3) Not applicable.

**ROAD FUNDING, COMMONWEALTH - FEDERAL BUDGET,
ALLOCATION TO WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

22. Hon B.K. DONALDSON to the Minister for Transport:

Some notice has been given of this question. Will the Minister advise the House how Western Australia fared in Commonwealth road funding under last night's Federal Budget?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The result the Government has received at this time is that Western Australia will receive less funding than its depleted allocation last year. The Government has been advised that an increase of \$2.7m on last year has occurred. However, taking into account the inflation rate and the fact that the federal Minister for Transport in a fanfare of publicity indicated that \$3m would be given to upgrade Great Eastern Highway at Greenmount for safety reasons, the state has in fact received less than last year. It is another despicable performance by the Federal Government, aided and abetted by its friends in Western Australia, the members of the Labor Party.

Hon Kim Chance: How did we do that?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: They have been nothing other than critical of support to attract more funds to Western Australia. The people of Western Australia can feel justifiably devastated that the allocation to this state is actually less. It is also worth noting that as of just a few minutes ago I was informed by media representatives in their attempts to find out about the situation from Canberra that the federal Minister for Transport has indicated that the figures published by the Federal Government last night are not to be seen as final. Therefore, at this late stage we still do not know what Western Australia will get. It may even be less than that; however, it is hoped that it will be more.

Hon John Halden: Don't go to Canberra and get \$3m.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: I challenge the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Labor Party in Western Australia to go to Canberra and see whether they can get more money. It is the same challenge that I put to them last year. When they get back they should announce that they can get the

extra funds, rather than being critical and negative and saying that the roads in Western Australia are marvellous. The income from fuel excise has increased in the past 12 months from \$8.4b to \$9.7b. That means an increased amount of over \$1b has been taken out of the pockets of Western Australians; however, the Federal Government has seen fit to allocate less to our roads.

SCHOOLS - OCEAN REEF SENIOR HIGH
Overcrowding, New School Commitment

23. Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS to the Minister for Education:

Given the presentation of the petition from 1 048 people confirming widespread concerns about overcrowding at Ocean Reef Senior High School and calling on the Government to give a firm commitment to provide high school facilities for the students in the Quinns-Clarkson area commencing year 8 in 1995 -

- (1) Will the Minister now give a commitment that these facilities will be in place by the beginning of the 1995 school year?
- (2) If not, why not?

Hon N.F. MOORE replied:

- (1)-(2) I am not prepared to make that commitment for the reasons I outlined on the opening day of the Parliament. The Western Australian State Government inherited a difficult budgetary situation; it was anything but flash. The Government is seeking to do something about paying off the debt the former government left it. For three years in a row the previous government did not build one senior high school. Now we have a significant backlog in demand for new schools. I am happy to explain to the House, when we get a moment to talk about this matter, the pent-up demand in the school system for new schools. That is one of the reasons we talked about school rationalisation. However, I return to the member's question.

Hon Graham Edwards: I would appreciate it if you did.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government has agreed to build a school to open in 1997 to alleviate some of the overcrowding at Ocean Reef. However, in line with what was done in the past by my predecessor, Hon Kay Hallahan, when a decision was made to open a school at Warnbro, which will open the year after next, it was agreed that students would go to either Safety Bay or Rockingham in the year prior to the school opening. The proposal the Government is putting to the people in the Ocean Reef-Clarkson area is that, with the excess capacity in a number of high schools between the centre of the metropolitan area and Clarkson, it is feasible to begin the new school in one of those existing schools which have adequate room.

Hon Graham Edwards: Such as?

Hon N.F. MOORE: The school at Craigie was one suggestion, and there were others. However, I do not want to be too specific about it because I do not know which were suggested. There is an excess capacity in a number of schools in that area. It is feasible to open the new Clarkson school in one of those existing schools until funds are available to build a new senior high school at Clarkson. Under the Government's program a new senior high school will open at Ballajura next year, in Warnbro the year after, and in the Clarkson area in 1997. I expect there will need to be another school built in the following year. It is a significant capital item - about \$20m for each senior high school - so within the constraints of our financial system the schools will be built as quickly as possible. However,

to alleviate the problem at Ocean Reef the students will attend another school the year before it is built.

RETAIL TRADING HOURS - DEREGULATION
Ministry of Fair Trading Report

24. Hon J.A. COWDELL to the Minister for Fair Trading:

When does the Government expect to receive the Ministry of Fair Trading report on the deregulation of retail trading hours?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

Shortly.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - HEALTH SERVICES, WICKHAM, ROEBOURNE, PORT SAMSON REGION REVIEW

25. Hon KIM CHANCE to the Minister for Health:

Some notice has been given of this question. In regard to the review of the provision of health services in the Wickham, Roebourne and Point Samson region -

- (1) Who was on the working party which carried out the review?
- (2) Has the Minister received the working party's report?
- (3) Were the local communities consulted during the review period?
- (4) If not, why not?

Hon PETER FOSS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1) In July 1993 a preliminary working party was formed to examine the current model of service provision for Wickham, Roebourne and Point Samson. The time frame for the review was one month, and a discussion paper was produced in late August 1993. The working party membership consisted of six health professionals associated with the service area. They comprised management, nursing, public health and medical service disciplines. The preliminary working party recommended a comprehensive review of health service requirements in the Roebourne, Wickham and Point Samson area in its brief report to the regional director. The regional director subsequently appointed a dedicated project officer to conduct this review. The review commenced in February 1994 and is due for completion in August 1994.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Not applicable.

FORTESCUE MAGNETITE PROJECT - AGREEMENT ACT

26. Hon J.A. SCOTT to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Resources Development:

Following my previous question about the Fortescue magnetite project, if an agreement Act is to be established, who will administer the environmental management - the Environmental Protection Authority, the Department of Minerals and Energy, the Minister for Resources Development or the proponent?

Hon GEORGE CASH replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The Minister for Resources Development has provided the following reply -

The project will operate under environmental conditions and works approval and licences set under the Environmental Protection Act processes. Reporting on environmental management to government will be coordinated through the agreement Act, as is normally the procedure with agreement Acts.

ANSETT AUSTRALIA - NEW AIRBUS JETS ORDER, IMPACT ON REGIONAL CENTRES; EXISTING SERVICES MAINTENANCE

27. Hon TOM STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

In view of Ansett Australia's recently announced decision to place an order for another five new A320 Airbus jets for delivery from next year, with an option on another five to be delivered from 1997, for Ansett's domestic fleet; given that these will supplement the 12 135 seat A320 twin jets already in the Ansett fleet; and noting that this order replaces a longstanding commitment for ten 321s and that the additional A320s will be used to replace both Ansett's ageing 149 seat B727 tri jets and some old 69 seat Fokker F28 twin jets -

- (1) What does the Minister anticipate will be the impact on the daily Ansett jet services to Western Australia's regional centres, and particularly on Ansett's services to the Kimberley, Pilbara and Gascoyne regions?
- (2) Will the Minister raise with Ansett the need to ensure that all existing services are maintained within Western Australia?
- (3) Will the Minister obtain from Ansett a time frame inside of which it will inaugurate a direct service between Broome and Bali?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON replied:

- (1) This part of the question is seeking an opinion from me. I obviously cannot speculate on what may or may not happen.

Hon Tom Stephens: It is not seeking an opinion.

Point of Order

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I would have thought that if the Minister were correct and the question had sought an opinion, you, Mr President, would have ruled it out of order.

The PRESIDENT: That is not necessarily the case. As I have said on so many occasions, members can ask questions in this place but they cannot control the answers they are given. The answer is not always what they want it to be.

Hon John Halden: Boy, do we know that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member raised a point of order, which he is quite entitled to do, and I am endeavouring to satisfy his inquiry. It is a matter of opinion as to whether Hon Tom Stephens' question was seeking an opinion. If the Minister chooses to interpret it as seeking an opinion, that is his prerogative because if the Minister does not wish to answer the question, he does not have to do so. I recommend that the honourable member who asked the question be very careful to use the right terminology in his questions.

Hon Tom Stephens: I would be very happy to.

The PRESIDENT: The member has now gone past that point. I am answering Hon Graham Edwards' query. I would not have ruled that the question was seeking an opinion; however, the Minister has indicated in his response that he will not answer it because he thinks it was.

Hon Doug Wenn: Because he does not know the answer.

Hon N.F. Moore: Do you know what Ansett is doing next year?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Hon Doug Wenn does not even know what he is doing, let alone what anyone else is doing.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If members want to continue with questions without notice, they must satisfy several people. I am one of those people, and I get very angry when people who are seeking information ask a question and then immediately proceed to ensure that the information cannot be given to them. That seems to be an exercise in defeating their own purposes. If members do not like the Minister's answers, remedies are available. The fact of the matter is that members must at least let the Minister answer the question to determine whether they like it.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: To continue -

- (2) The member will be well aware from his time in government that it will be a commercial decision by Ansett. This Government has had discussions with Ansett about the continuity of services to the north of the state, and to all points in between. As it is a deregulated area, Ansett will decide what it does in the future. I emphasise that the Government has had very meaningful discussions with Ansett to encourage it in the most strenuous way to take particular note of the services required by the people living in the north of the state. As far as other services in the area are concerned, as I said earlier this afternoon, we are looking forward to the possibility that the increased traffic movement of people in the north will encourage other operators into the area to link with the jet services to provide an increased and better service in the future.

Hon Mark Nevill: Are you referring to Derby?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: No, I have not come to that yet; I am talking about other places. Ansett will make a decision about Derby some time in the future. Again, we can only speculate about what may or may not happen. We have told Ansett in no uncertain terms that we want Derby to have a high standard of service.

Hon Tom Stephens: A jet service?

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: Yes. What happens in the future will depend on Ansett. Again, it is rationalising its operations and it must be for financial reasons because people do not pull out of a service if they are making money. When that happened in Carnarvon the Government encouraged another operator to take Ansett's place and to provide a service. It will do the same thing if the worst happens and the service to Derby is not continued at its current level. We have been through this matter with a range of people in the north of the state, including the development commission, local organisations and Ansett. We look forward to continuity of service in the north but, in addition to those other things, we are trying to get international carriers involved.

- (3) This part of the question relates to the international link to which I referred earlier. Whether it is Ansett or some other carrier, it is only a matter of time. As soon as we get the airports and the other associated facilities in place, that will happen. We must fast track it as hard as we can and we must all work together to bring all those various components together. It involves not just airline carriers, but also all the other people.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Mr President -

Point of Order

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The Leader of the House may be about to call question

time to an end. In view of the fact that only seven questions have been asked by the Opposition to this point, and we are about to move back to the Address-in-Reply, is some mechanism available to us to keep question time going until more questions can be asked by the Opposition? The Ministers have been filibustering and your comments to the Chamber, Mr President, have also taken some time.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The very question that the member asks me is destroyed in the same way as that which caused him to raise the point of order; that is, members ask questions and then proceed to be disorderly to the extent that the question cannot be answered. Therefore, the time is used with the result that instead of asking 10 questions, the Opposition asks only seven. It is self-destructing. There is no point of order but I must say a couple of things on this matter.

I am getting fed up with the way in which some members treat questions without notice. I have said to this House over umpteen years that one of the most valuable periods in a sitting of a parliamentary session is the time allocated to asking questions without notice. If members behave during that time in such a way that they bring about the curtailment of that question time, they are not only doing themselves a disservice, but also they are doing this place a very vital disservice. Some members may remember and some may not care to remember - I have an awfully long memory as some members know - that I have never supported time limits being placed on questions without notice in this House. Unfortunately, the rules do not permit me to extend the time; the rules permit me only to reduce the time. Over the last few months Government members have heeded a warning I gave, but if they cease to heed that warning I am still in this Chair. Members can get rid of me any day they want to, but while I am in the Chair I will not tolerate Dorothy Dix questions being asked to bring about a state of affairs where Ministers make ministerial statements in the limited time allocated for questions without notice. There is plenty of scope for Ministers to make ministerial statements at any time during the sitting of each day and, if Ministers want to tell us about their views on certain things, they need only jump up and seek leave of the House to make a statement. It is abhorrent to me for question time to be used for that purpose, and it is in contradiction of the spirit of our operations as a House of the Parliament. I will keep insisting on a set of standards for as long as members keep me in this position. The day they do not want to stick to those standards, they have the solution in their hands; they need only 18 members to do it. There is no point of order.
