

Legislative Council

Thursday, 27 November 1986

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

ACTS AMENDMENT (RECORDING OF DEPOSITIONS) BILL

Assembly's Amendments

Amendments made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) in the Chair; Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

The amendments made by the Assembly were as follows—

No. 1

Clause 5.

Page 3, line 26—To delete “subsection” and substitute the following—

subsections

No. 2

Page 3, after line 35—To insert the following subsection—

(3) A person shall not allege that a deposition intended to be read as evidence on a trial is an incorrect transcription of a recording unless, not less than 7 days before the commencement of the trial, that person has given the prosecutor notice in the prescribed form of his intention to raise that allegation.

No. 3

Clause 6.

Page 4, line 18—To delete “subsection” and substitute the following—

subsections

No. 4

Page 4, after line 28—To insert the following subsection—

(3) A person shall not allege that a deposition intended to be given in evidence at the trial of the person against whom it was taken is an incorrect transcription of a recording unless, not less than 7 days before the com-

mencement of the trial, that person has given the prosecutor notice in the prescribed form of his intention to raise that allegation.

No. 5

Clause 8.

Page 6, line 19—To delete “retained.”; and” and substitute the following—

retained;

(h) with respect to such other matters necessary or expedient to be prescribed for the purpose of ensuring that a transcript of a recording is correct. ”; and ”.

No. 6

Clause 12.

Page 9, after line 15—To insert the following subsection—

(3) A person shall not allege that a statement intended to be given in evidence against a defendant is an incorrect transcription of a recording unless, not less than 7 days before the commencement of the trial of the defendant, that person has given the prosecutor notice in the prescribed form of his intention to raise that allegation.

No. 7

Clause 13.

Page 10, after line 9—To insert the following subsection—

(3) A person shall not allege that a deposition intended to be read as evidence on a trial is an incorrect transcription of a recording unless, not less than 7 days before the commencement of the trial, that person has given the prosecutor notice in the prescribed form of his intention to raise that allegation.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I move—

That the amendments made by the Assembly be agreed to.

Under the Bill as passed by this Chamber, a certified transcript of a deposition given and tape recorded at a Coroner's inquest or committal hearing could not be used as evidence at the trial on proof that the transcript was not a correct transcript of the recording.

Comment on the Bill raised the question as to when and how a person could challenge the accuracy of a transcribed deposition; and the amendments carried by the Legislative Assembly provide the basic requirements for that procedure. It is envisaged that parties will be able to obtain a copy of the transcribed deposition well in advance of the trial in which it is intended to be used.

A person intending to assert that a deposition has been incorrectly transcribed must give the prosecutor at least seven days' notice of this intention. The notice will be in a form to be prescribed by regulation. This notice procedure will facilitate the resolution of the issue and avoid unnecessary delay at trial.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: The Opposition concurs with the amendments. Simply explained, they mean that where, at a Coroner's hearing or a court hearing, depositions have been taken by the electronic media, it could be a defence later for someone to say that transcript is quite wrong or has been tampered with. To protect that procedure the Bill allows a person, on receipt of the depositions, to check them; and if he feels they are wrong he will have to fill out a prescribed form at least seven days before the matter goes to trial.

The fact that three clauses are amended is quite insignificant. They all point to the same thing in different courts. One clause deals with the Coroner's Court, another with the District Court, and the third with the Local Court.

The Opposition supports the amendments.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments agreed to.

Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN EXIM CORPORATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 November.

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [11.12 a.m.]: I begin this morning by lodging with the Government, the House, the media, the public, and anyone else who cares to listen, the strongest possible protest on behalf of Opposition members at what is clearly the Government's decision to ramrod this Bill through the Parliament.

I understand that a couple of days ago, in the normal course of negotiations that go on behind the scenes, the Attorney General approached the Leader of the Opposition in this House to determine when debate on this matter might take place. I understand we were asked to deal with this Bill this week. The Government learnt quite clearly from the Leader of the Opposition in this House that Opposition members were simply not in a position to debate a Bill of this magnitude, complexity, and importance with but a few hours' notice.

I remind members that this Bill was introduced into the House, if I recall correctly, in the early hours of yesterday morning, and no-one in his right mind could suggest that that is a good way to make the laws of this State. In my view this Bill should not be debated at least until next week. I do not know what other members of the Opposition might say in regard to this matter because I do not speak on their behalf in this instance, but personally I would prefer to see the Bill defeated rather than pushed through with the indecent haste that is apparently attached to the Government's intentions in this regard.

Mr President, you would be aware it is a Bill involving millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. It is a Bill of some 46 pages, for the information of the Government members who, apart from the Attorney General, have not even bothered to look at it. It is at least as important and complex a piece of legislation as the Environmental Protection Bill dealt with last night. In the case of that Bill, which was handled by Hon. Sandy Lewis, not just one day's notice or one week's notice was given to the Opposition, but something like four months' notice, because the Environmental Protection Bill was laid upon the Table of the other House in the first part of this session this year. The Government recognised that it was very important and very complex, and so was prepared to allow the Opposition Parties four months to take it away and discuss it with people who would be affected by it.

If that was the case with the Environmental Protection Bill which went through the Parliament last night, surely the Opposition, the media, and the taxpayers who will fund the Exim venture, are entitled to demand of the Government that we be given at least a little more consideration than just over 24 hours' notice.

The Opposition makes it clear that it has no objection whatsoever to dealing with the Bill on its merits, say by next Tuesday. That was the understanding we had from the Govern-

ment when the Leader of the Opposition was approached the other day. We are not saying that the Attorney General told us fibs or broke his word, but we do suggest quite strongly that the Attorney General was left in no doubt whatsoever that in the case of a Bill of this complexity and importance we should not have to come to grips with it on only 25 or so hours' notice.

People must understand that the House was diverted on another important Bill, and it is not possible, the minute a new Bill is introduced and reaches the second reading stage, for us to examine it immediately. There are a great many other things we have to do. We are at the end of the session, and we are being asked to deal with the legislation in a cavalier way which will rebound not only on the Opposition, because now we are making our protest, but also on the Government. Let me give a specific example that came to the Opposition's notice last night.

In July this year the Leader of the House, in his capacity as Minister with special responsibility for the America's Cup, asked this House to deal with a Bill relating to special arrangements for the America's Cup concerning crowd control, water control, and the like. He asked us to deal with it in the space of two working days. The Bill was introduced into this House on a Thursday night, a few minutes before the adjournment, and I had to resume debate for the Opposition on the next Tuesday afternoon. The Leader of the House then received the concurrence of the House to deal with that Bill in all its remaining stages throughout that Tuesday. That was a case where the Opposition accepted at face value that the Government had a legitimate case—that it was important legislation that needed to be put on the Statute Books.

The upshot of that—and I do not know if the Minister with special responsibility for the America's Cup is aware of this—is that a document published in London is now being circulated condemning the provisions of the Bill passed in this State in July. I am relating that matter to the Bill under discussion by saying that is the consequence of our being asked to put through legislation without members having had the time to properly study it.

The document to which I referred, the World Insurance Report, which is put out by the *Financial Times* of London, contained the most trenchant criticism imaginable of the legislation passed in this House.

I will read two paragraphs.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not let the member read one paragraph. I know the member is making a point, but it is not necessary and certainly not permitted for him to read the content of that document in order to make that point. I have allowed the member to go on for a long time because he was, even though quite remotely, able to tie what he is saying into his dealing with the Bill. The explanation of who wrote that document or what is in it certainly has nothing to do with this Bill.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I accept that. It was for that reason that I prefaced my remarks on this matter by saying that that is the inevitable consequence of being asked to put through legislation so that the public do not understand it; and indeed there is a deliberate attempt by the Government to ensure that the members and the business community do not understand it. My protest is on the record, and the consequences of this legislation will be on the head of the Government. When something goes wrong with the Western Australian Exim Corporation Bill as it inevitably will, the Government will have been warned by the Opposition that it is going down the path it went down on that other matter in July of this year.

Earlier this year, the Premier spoke piously, as only he can, in a nonsensical way about looking for ways of uplifting the operations of Parliament and ensuring that members did credit to their professional duties. This is another case of the Premier being totally hypocritical because he—make no mistake about that because the Ministers in this House have their riding instructions—gave the order to ensure that this Bill gets through with a minimum of public discussion. I for one want him to know that we can see through it and, in time, the public of Western Australia will see through it.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Tone it down.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I ask the Minister to mind her business and to turn her attention to the shocking thing that her Government is trying to do by way of this Bill rather than making inane interjections.

Until two weeks ago this House had sat for no more than 112 hours in the entire year. I have said, as have other speakers on this side of the House, that it would be only a matter of time before the Government came to us with important legislation and asked us to remove all of our objections and remove any chance of debating it properly in order to put through

legislation in a concerted form. We are now two weeks down the track and it has happened. This Government has been in office for four years. If there were some measure of urgency about the Bill, why have we not seen it in the last four years? The Government has been in office for the second time around for nearly 10 months. If there was some sort of urgency about the Bill because of the Government's dealings on the overseas market, surely it was also important enough to bring it to the Parliament earlier so that the public, and particularly the business community, had the chance to look at it in some detail.

Hon. Tom Stephens: If you spent less time on leadership battles and more time on the Bill, you might have been ready for it.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That is another irrelevancy; but we learnt a lot of that from Mr Burke and Mr Davies five or six years ago.

Government members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I know that Government members are caucused in this House and do not have their own opinions.

Government members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I ask how many of them, and in particular I ask the Minister for Community Services who seems to be unduly edgy this morning—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! When I call for order, for goodness sake, come to order. This place is starting to sound like another place. I am not, as one of the Presiding Officers in this Parliament, going to allow this House to degenerate to a standard similar to that I have heard the other place degenerate to in the last few days. I say to all members, including the member on his feet, that there are rules in this place and those rules will be stringently applied by me in order to ensure that the provisions pertaining to the debate of legislation are kept intact for the purpose for which they were designed.

I think I have been terribly tolerant. One of the measures of the success of the operations of this House in my 22 years has been the degree of tolerance that members on both sides of the House and the Chair have extended to each other. I have therefore allowed the member to go on at some length. What tends to happen is that, after my exercising tolerance on this occasion, members will want to go further on the

next occasion and the next until they reach the stage where any resemblance to complying with the Standing Orders is purely accidental.

We are currently debating the second reading of a specific piece of legislation. In the past, when a member has wanted to express matters prior to getting around to discussing the contents of the Bill, he quickly, in a couple of sentences, expressed his dismay at those matters, but then got around to talking about the Bill. I suggest to Hon. Phillip Pendal that while I can sympathise with the attitude he is taking, there is contained within our Standing Orders sufficient provision for any member to take action to express the sorts of concerns he is expressing in real detail so that every member has an opportunity to comment without using the opportunity provided for debate of the content of a Bill.

The member may want to eventually talk about the Bill, and we have time limits on speeches today. He could well run out of time before he gets around to debating the legislation. I am not criticising Hon. Phillip Pendal, but I remind the whole House that the tolerance we have adopted over years starts to wear a bit thin when members do not eventually get around to sticking to the rules.

Point of Order

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr President, you said that there were time limits on speakers today. I thought that no time limit applied to the lead speaker.

The PRESIDENT: I know that. I was trying to make a point, loosely using the rules.

Debate Resumed

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: As the speaker on his feet was trying to make a point, loosely using the rules. Mr President, I was aware that you were calling for order, but you were looking at the people on your right. I have often expressed this difficulty privately to people in this place. Under Standing Order No. 64, when the President wants a person to resume his seat, the President rises. It was for that reason that I understood you were referring to the members on your right who were rudely interjecting on me.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I know what the Standing Orders say, but when I call, "Order", whether a member is standing up, sitting down, or doing anything else, he should stop talking. That was the point that I was making.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: When the interjections were made, I was about to make the point that as a member I am in no position to know whether the Exim Bill is good legislation. Not even the State Council of the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry says that Exim is a lousy organisation. That body has said that there is no justifiable reason for rushing the legislation through Parliament, and that by rushing the legislation through, the Government is stifling public discussion on an important issue. That was the point I was approaching when members opposite interjected because they did not like what I was saying. I defend the right of any member of this House to be given sufficient time to debate and to study legislation.

I have effectively been denied the right to talk during the second reading debate about the contents of the Bill because it was necessary for me to point out to the Government, in the few moments available to me, the poor tactics and lack of courtesy on the part of the Government in not allowing at least some time for Opposition members to study the Bill.

How many members on the Government side of the House are aware that the financial statements to do with Exim in its current form arrived in the Parliament only a few days ago? What opportunity does that give to Opposition members to consider those statements and relate them to the Bill before us? Not only is it not fair; it is also a deliberate attempt on the part of someone—I am not sure who—to make sure that the Bill is passed with a minimum amount of discussion. One must also ask why it has taken from 31 July—which date, I presume, is the end of Exim's financial year—until November to get those statements. Many people have criticised statutory bodies and Government departments for having the temerity to present late reports to the Parliament.

I have no axe to grind with Exim. It may well be doing a good job. Indeed, the State Council of the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry confirmed its support for the continuing existence and role of the Exim Corporation and the Western Australian Overseas Projects Authority. Thus, not even the Chamber of Commerce is giving the stick to the Government for having an Exim Corporation, even though members of the Opposition have done so. However, the Chamber of Commerce is saying the very thing that the Opposition is saying today: That the Bill ought to be delayed at least until Opposition members have had time to look at the financial statements of Exim

with other than a cursory or rudimentary examination of them, and go through some very detailed information in the second reading speech.

For that reason, if it is the intention of the Government to proceed without having given the Opposition a proper chance to consider the legislation, I for one will vote to defeat the Bill, even though I am not entirely sure that that is necessarily the right course of action in the end. However, the Government has brought such a course of action on its own head. I lodge that protest on behalf of the Opposition and myself.

Personal Explanations

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [11.35 a.m.]: Mr President, I seek leave to make a personal explanation on the question of my discussions in respect of the timetable of this debate.

Point of Order

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: My point of order relates to why Hon. Phil Pendal had to give up the time of one of our speakers to make a point, when the Attorney General expects to make the same point in a personal explanation?

The PRESIDENT: Although there is no point of order, I will take a couple of minutes to explain the difference to the honourable member. The difference is that Hon. Phillip Pendal chose to use his opportunity to speak on the Bill to do what the member just said he did. During the course of his speech, I called, "Order" and made some explanation. During that explanation I said that there were sufficient provisions in our Standing Orders for a member to take action to do what he was doing if he wished to do it and that he ought not take the time of the House and his opportunity to talk on the second reading of the Bill to do it. I have already told the honourable member that he could have moved a motion condemning the Government or doing whatever he wanted to do. He did not take the opportunity that the Attorney General has taken.

The Attorney General has taken the opportunity to seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation. One voice will stop the Attorney General from doing that. Therefore, the Attorney General is perfectly free, should the House desire, to have the opportunity to make his statement.

Personal Explanations Resumed

Leave granted.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Mr Pental indicated fairly enough the nature of my initial discussions with the Leader of the Opposition. In particular, he acknowledged that I made no commitment to delay the Bill beyond this week, and that is correct. Yesterday I explained to the Leader of the Opposition that it was proposed to bring on the debate today. There were reasonable and important considerations leading to that, but I need not detail them for current purposes.

However, while Mr Masters clearly indicated his objection to our proceeding today, our discussion was not on the basis that the Opposition was put at some impossible disadvantage or that the time available would preclude members opposite from giving the legislation reasonable consideration. His objection was put in more general terms. For my part, knowing that the Bill has been available in its present form from the date of its introduction in the Legislative Assembly over two weeks ago—

Hon. P. G. Pental: That is not here.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: —I accept that—and given the other considerations, mainly connected with the imminent rising of the Legislative Assembly, I believed that was a reasonable basis on which to proceed. However, if the Opposition maintains that it is put at the serious disadvantage that Mr Pental indicated and that other members have suggested to me this morning, I indicate that from the Government's point of view we would not propose to proceed. Therefore, we would not oppose a motion that debate on the Bill be adjourned. The debate would then come on next Tuesday and we would be able to proceed at that stage.

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [11.39 a.m.] —by leave: Mr President, can you now see what has happened? With the greatest respect, I suggest that the Attorney General has just said what he should have said 24 hours ago.

I have now given up my right to speak on the substance of the Western Australian Exim Corporation Bill in order to do what was requested of me, and that was to make a protest.

I simply make the point that it is good news to hear from the Minister handling the Bill that at some point within the next few minutes, if an adjournment is moved, he will not oppose

it. That is what he should have done yesterday and the Opposition would have had no objection at all.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! When leave is granted to a member to make a statement, the leave is for that person only to say something.

Second Reading Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Margaret McAleer.

CEMENT WORKS (COCKBURN CEMENT LIMITED) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 November.

HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [11.43 a.m.]: This is a fairly straightforward piece of legislation. Its purpose is to ratify and vary negotiations that the Government has had with Cockburn Cement Limited in regard to the agreement made in 1971, which is commonly called the principal agreement.

The procedure of incorporating agreements in legislation and bringing them to Parliament for ratification has been a matter of process since the Mt Newman agreement and various others to give companies involved in major capital expansion some degree of comfort as to the way they proceed with their developments and the various stages associated with those developments without Government interference. The Parliament ratifies the agreement and irrespective of who is in Government—whether it be the Liberal-National Party coalition or the Labor Party—any organisation such as Cockburn Cement Limited can act with a degree of comfort when planning its activities into the future.

I am concerned—and I refer to the Minister's second reading speech—as to why it was necessary to amend the agreement to reflect the existence of the Mining Act 1978. Rights were previously held under the Mining Act of 1904. Does that mean there is an overlapping of the new Act, which repealed the previous Act? If not, why do we bring this agreement to the Parliament when any agreement or activity by an organisation or corporate body in this State is bound by the Statutes of this State? I cannot find a reason for its being included in the second reading speech.

I have not had the opportunity to study the matter in detail, but there must be some technicality that requires a company or corporate

body to abide by the laws of this State irrespective of when they were passed or amended and when new legislation is brought into effect. I do not know whether it is a structured arrangement. I cannot come to grips with it, although I have not researched the matter. I hope the Attorney will enlighten me because I am interested to know for my own personal benefit, not only in relation to this legislation but also future legislation.

Last night we passed the new environmental legislation. I know the reason for updating the agreement was to include matters to cover environmental reporting and compliance with environmental laws. I presume they are also supplementary. In some ways this agreement has been negotiated contemporaneously with the likelihood that the environmental legislation would be passed. I presume that this agreement also takes that into account.

The other point I make is that the agreement requires the company to submit and have approved at two-yearly intervals dredging and management programmes in respect of the company's operations in Cockburn Sound. Members would be aware that the basic material required for cement is coral. I cannot understand why, when one is planning a major capital investment, one should report at two-yearly intervals. It has been suggested by the Government it is necessary for it to have four-year terms of Parliament in order to implement its policies and be able to carry them through. This point has been made in the strongest possible manner because Governments have been unable to operate within the framework of a three-year term of office.

I want to know why a business which has reached agreement with the Government and undertakes major capital investment and strategy plans that may pass over a 10-year period, has to report, and have its management programme approved, at two-yearly intervals. I think there should be a reasonable length of time granted, provided it was satisfactorily proven there were no problems. There is no requirement for the amount of paperwork that is caused in this regard.

There are other organisations which the Government gives the go ahead with major investments without any environmental impact. At the moment I am still waiting for the Gidgegannup Football Club to have its environmental impact study approved. Already, the casino and other projects have had their environmental impact studies approved, even though the Gidgegannup Football Club was in

first. The people still cannot use the football ground because their environmental impact study has not been analysed and their programme for the next 20 years has to be worked out. The Gidgegannup recreational club cannot get its proposal off the ground; yet we have the casino and other projects that have gone ahead before it. It is amazing that the Government can get other projects off the ground without any regard to the environment. There has been a lot of give and take—"We want this, we will give you that."

The Environmental Protection Authority is the third party to this agreement. Why do we institute these agreements and put them into Statute? We do it to enable organisations to undertake major investment in a degree of comfort. I know Cockburn Cement Limited has reached agreement with the Government but I wonder how far its arm was twisted—because it has been twisted—on environmental matters.

When it suits this Government to talk about environmental matters it does so; when it does not suit the Government, it sweeps them away. I do not know why Mr Bartholomaeus cannot make the Press these days. He used to be very good at that, and we used to hear him from the rooftops. He always ensured that "rent-a-crowd" was here. Now he has nothing to say under this Government. I presume he is a paid adviser.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Yes, he is.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Mr Bartholomaeus, that person with great interest in the environment and great feeling for the future generations of Western Australians, has suddenly vanished into the role of a Government adviser, and that is why we do not hear any more attacks on environmental matters.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I hope he has something to do with the Cockburn Cement agreement.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Sir, I draw your attention to the fact that this agreement was negotiated on the grounds of environmental matters, and the reason it is before the House is because of environmental matters and the need to vary the agreement. There have been trade-offs in the process.

I understood these agreements came to this House to enable companies to get a degree of security, but if they are going to have their arms twisted by this Government future developments will be held up, and people will not have the level of confidence needed to go ahead

with major developments. That is already occurring if members care to look around Western Australia.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Are you suggesting the reefs that have been blasted at Rottnest could end up in the cement?

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: Yes, there is a possibility. We have not heard anything about that. We have not heard Mr Bartholomaeus say a word.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [11.52 a.m.]: The honourable member canvassed issues which go well beyond the scope of the Bill. In respect of the Bill itself, I indicate that it is to facilitate an amendment to the agreement between the Government and the company, and it is in the interests of all of us that the agreement between the two parties should be facilitated.

In the earlier part of his comments, the honourable member raised some general questions. I am not in a position to answer them now, but I will undertake to consider them further.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and passed.

PERTH BUILDING SOCIETY (MERGER) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 November.

HON. MAX EVANS (Metropolitan) [11.55 a.m.]: I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill because it recognises a very important institution in our society—a great financial institution in Perth which has been going since 17 October 1862, 124 years. It now has assets on loan of \$1.23 billion, which have gone to the benefit of Western Australians to build homes.

I have some sentimental attachment to this company. Sir Keith Watson, a former member of this House who held Metropolitan Province, was Chairman of PBS for many years, and during a period of consolidation and growth after the second World War. He was replaced by Mr Geoffrey Gadsdon, who was well known at the

Sunday Times and the Young Australia League. Geoff Gadsdon and Harry Sorensen set a strategic plan for the development of this society to achieve considerable growth in this State and throughout Australia. We are greatly indebted to people like Sir Keith Watson and Geoff Gadsdon for the foresight, hard work, and dedication they put into this cooperative society. They did not have any shares in it; they did it as a dedicated service to the community and the public at large.

The company has now moved into other States and taken over two building societies in Victoria, the Hotham Building Society and another smaller one, and the aim now is to bring the societies together. Because these companies go back so far into history there is no legislation to make this change simple. In Victoria the Government has changed the building societies Act to allow a merger, but in this State there is not time to change the Building Societies Act, and a special Bill has been introduced for this purpose. It will enable the assets of the two bodies to be merged from Hotham into PBS, and at that stage they will be transferred into a new corporation called the Challenge Bank Limited.

Directors of Hotham and Perth Building Societies have already applied to the Federal Treasurer to set up as a savings bank. It is interesting that in 1862 when the company was formed the chairman said it was a superior savings institution. Now it will become a savings bank. Once the assets are transferred to the Challenge Bank Limited and it has the approval of a banking licence, it will be floated as a public company in which the people of Western Australia and Australia can take part.

This is a notable performance by a Western Australian company which has moved from the west to the east to take over other companies, and which is now going national and will be a major national financial institution. We congratulate the directors of the company and give them our support. We support the Bill.

HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [11.59 a.m.]: I support the Bill and the comments made by Hon. Max Evans. In essence it is somewhat regrettable that this legislation has come to the House as a special Bill to enable the Perth Building Society to achieve savings bank status in view of the fact that the legislation in Victoria will be amended to enable mergers and takeovers. I say this because the Victorian system, which grew from the Starr Bowkett system, has not had the experience nor in any way made the contribution in Australia to

housing that has been made here in Western Australia, and in particular by the Perth Building Society.

Legislation in this State has led Australia with respect to the operations of both permanent building societies and terminating building societies. The building societies in this State have operated with sound management within the guidelines of their legislation. To say the least, they have made remarkable progress over the last 30 to 40 years during the great growth period of this State under Sir David Brand and Sir Charles Court. It was the building societies in this State that were able to accomplish this great growth which was required and which was associated with the enormous increase in population this State enjoyed to the extent that in those years the population increase in WA at least trebled the national average. It is this progress and initiative to accept change and this ability to change that has made the Perth Building Society the institution it is today.

Its chief executive officer, Mr Harry Sorenson, is currently the president of the world organisation of building societies, without doubt because of the status achieved by building societies in WA. No doubt that is a very onerous task for him but it exemplifies the attitude held throughout the world to building societies in this State. If members travel to New York or London, or to Malaysia with a letter of introduction from Mr Harry Sorensen they will receive a warm welcome and the people there will be very anxious to discuss their method of operation. Their final remarks will be to ask members please to convey their best wishes to Mr Sorensen and to Mr Brian Mickle, the current Chairman of the Perth Building Society.

It is also interesting to examine the enormous growth of the Town and Country WA Building Society, whose assets are close to those of the Perth Building Society. Its growth has been remarkable in little over 20 years, and again this is a measure of its management and the legislation under which it has operated in WA.

The Perth Building Society at one time endeavoured to take over perhaps the oldest building society in Australia, which has bank status, and I refer to the Bendigo Building Society. The Sandhurst Building Society in Bendigo ultimately merged with the Bendigo Building Society.

The Labor Party was somewhat reluctant to accept the recommendations contained in the report of the Campbell inquiry, the chairman of which had his life shortened possibly because of the arduous duties he performed. The Labor Party instituted a supplementary inquiry and the result was the Martin report, the recommendations of which reinforced everything in the Campbell report.

As a result the Perth Building Society now has the opportunity to become the Challenge Bank and to go on serving the people of WA. I wish it well. Obviously this will be just another era entered into by a society of longstanding which has not grown old and become covered with cobwebs but has shown initiative and the ability to accept change.

HON. KAY HALLAHAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Community Services) [12.05 p.m.]: The Government is very pleased to have the Opposition's support for this legislation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon. Garry Kelly) in the Chair; Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

Hon. MAX EVANS: Is it the Government's intention to amend the Building Societies Act in the future in order to allow for other mergers as was done in Victoria? Further, have we been assured that the Challenge Bank will keep its head office in Perth?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN: I would be happy to get that information for the honourable member and make it available to him over the lunch break.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I did not speak at the second reading stage but nonetheless the National Party supports the legislation and compliments the work of the Perth Building Society and its chief executive officer, who is known to us. The concern raised by Hon. Max Evans is shared by us, because if it is to become normal practice for societies to move in this direction we believe the legislation should contain some provision to ensure that societies that do expand in this way maintain their headquarters in this State. The National Party will be interested to hear from the Minister on this point.

We support the Bill, and we believe in this sort of expansion, but we would like to see some work done to keep the headquarters of these organisations in WA.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 5 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. Kay Hallahan (Minister for Community Services), and passed.

WATERFRONT WORKERS (COMPENSATION FOR ASBESTOS RELATED DISEASES) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 November.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [12.10 p.m.]: The Opposition does not oppose this Bill.

Obviously asbestosis is a disease which has gained a great deal of prominence over the years. It is a terminal disease and was not fully understood until a few years ago. As a result, a great deal of care is taken and precautions have been implemented in the workplace to ensure that people do not suffer from asbestosis.

This legislation deals with waterfront workers who may have worked with asbestos without taking the necessary precautions and safety measures. Someone made a comment that they were working up to their knees in asbestos dust. However, the disease became known many years after people had been working with asbestos.

In his second reading speech the Minister stated that because of the nature of the work and the time lapse, it is difficult to identify the responsible employer. Waterside workers may deal with one boss one week and another boss the following week. I know that does not pertain to the waterside workers only, and I am sure that in the building industry, for obvious reasons, construction workers have different employers from one month to the other. When this sort of problem arises the responsible employer cannot be identified.

The Government recognises that the people suffering from the disease should be entitled to compensation, and that is the reason for this

legislation. I refer to the way in which the Government will finance the compensation. A significant amount of money is involved. I do not have the figures, but I am sure the Minister, in his reply to the second reading debate, will refer to them.

The Opposition is not opposed to compensation being paid to those people outlined in the legislation. Indeed, it supports the proposal. The Government proposes to finance the compensation from the employers' indemnity supplementation fund, which was established before I became a Minister and when Mr Ray O'Connor was in charge of the Industrial Relations portfolio. A Government adviser, who is present in the House today, advised me about this issue when I held the portfolio, and he knows all about it.

With regard to the funding of this proposal, I refer to a letter concerning the insurance industry and which was addressed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. The letter was signed by Mr Trigg, who is the group manager of the western zone.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We cannot hear you.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will not repeat what I said, but I will draw the attention of members to the concern expressed by the insurance industry regarding the way in which this proposal will be funded.

The letter to which I am referring is dated 14 November 1986 and is headed, "Workers' Compensation Supplementation Fund Act 1980". I will provide a copy of the letter to any member who is interested. The letter reads—

Apart from the retrospective nature of the proposals this Council has no argument with the underlying moral, financial and political reasons for the decision.

It does however object to the press comment—

"Mr. Burke said that the move would not lead to increased workers' compensation premiums for employers.

The premium levels of workers' compensation have risen dramatically over the years, and are a deterrent when employers consider employing more people. I am not saying that workers' compensation premiums and workers' compensation should be abolished—far from it. However, workers' compensation premiums are a significant factor in the decision of employers to employ more people.

The letter continues—

The compensation cost would be met from a fund that has been created to cover insurance companies that fail.

When we were in Government, a number of companies failed and the unfortunate thing was that employers had taken out, in good faith, insurance for workers' compensation claims to ensure that their employees would be covered for injury. A couple of companies went broke and, as a result, the onus reverted to the employer.

We all know that significant claims can be made for workers' compensation, and that if an employer is faced with a claim for \$100 000 he could be put out of business.

The employers' indemnity supplementation fund was set up when we were in Government to pay out the employers who had relied on the two companies that had failed.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It was set up for a specific purpose.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, it was and I will come to that.

The letter continues—

1. The funds were supplied by employers in Western Australia for a specific purpose.
2. Insurers, including S.G.I.O. and self insurers, have played a very important role in the collection and management of the funds.
3. The Insurers Advisory Committee under the Act has been instrumental in regulating collections, monitoring the operations, making adequate provisions for known liabilities and finally recommending that the 1% levy be withdrawn from 4.00 p.m. on June 30 1986.

The committee was set up to administer the fund in the best possible way. In other words, in the opinion of the advisory committee, sufficient money had been raised to meet any demands resulting from the failure of the two companies. In fact, it thought it was the end of it.

I am happy to provide a copy of the letter to Hon. Mick Gayfer.

It is very strange that the advisory committee was not consulted when the Government made its determination to use the fund to meet the requirements of this Bill. Will the State Treasury now guarantee any shortfall in the funds, bearing in mind the new claims proposed to be made against it? It seems that

sufficient money was raised to meet the demands of the failed companies and the Government now proposes to use some of that money for waterfront workers suffering from asbestos. There could now be a shortfall. The understanding was that the levy would cease to apply on 30 June 1986. If more money is drawn from the fund for other purposes, who will meet any shortfall? Will the one per cent levy be reintroduced?

I referred earlier to a meeting of the Insurers Advisory Committee, established under part 6 of the Workers' Compensation Supplementation Fund Act, held in Perth on 24 April 1986. The minutes state that in summary the position at 30 June 1986 was expected to be \$4.428 million and the anticipated income to 30 June 1986—I guess that is from the investment of those funds—was \$0.5 million. The total position for the fund at 30 June 1986 was \$4.928 million. The estimated amount for outstanding claims against Palmdale at 27 March 1986 was \$245 584; the Bishopsgate outstanding claims at 27 March 1986 were \$759 802; and the total estimated outstanding claims were \$1.005 million. The net funds in hand were something like \$3.923 million.

These funds were collected for the specific purpose to which I referred. They were intended to meet the requirements of the two failed companies; and the people managing the funds and making the contribution of a one per cent levy legitimately want to know whether the levy will cease or be continued to meet the new demands placed on it by this legislation.

I have gone into some detail in this second reading debate, although the Bill contains a clause specifically dealing with this question. However, I thought it would give the Minister the opportunity to respond. If he does not have the details in front of him, I will raise the matter in the Committee stage.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind honourable members that the reading of newspapers in this Chamber is out of order.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Opposition does not oppose the legislation. Compensation for this sort of disease is justified, but there is strong concern about the use of money from the employers' indemnity supplementation fund which was raised for a specific purpose. There is fear that it will be necessary for subscribers to continue paying the one per cent levy for a much longer period than expected.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [12.24 p.m.]: The National Party, in its deliberation on this Bill, questions only that part which has been referred to by Mr Masters; that is, the using of the employers' indemnity supplementation fund for the purpose of offsetting any moneys not readily available because of the employers' responsibilities towards workers handling asbestos.

The principle that payment should be made to workers who can establish that they were employed in the loading or unloading of ships carting asbestos is not questioned. Neither is there any question that the employers who employed those people at the time should pay out. But, we query the fact that a fund has been set up specifically for one purpose and now licence will be given by us to operate on those funds in a manner which could be a little questionable.

If the Government were so intent on paying compensation to the workers affected, surely an alternative could have been found; as it is retrospective legislation, the Government should have taken the money from Consolidated Revenue or some other source rather than virtually commandeering a fund which was established for a specific purpose.

I notice that the Minister shudders at the word "commandeering" and perhaps that is a little harsh. However, our concern is well-founded. When a fund has been set up for a specific purpose, why should somebody, particularly a Government, decide that the fund will be used for something else? That is wrong and yet we have no argument with the purpose for which the funds will be used.

We know that when the employers who do not pay or cannot be immediately located in order to meet their responsibilities are subsequently found, the money will be credited to the fund from whence the advance was made. But it does not alter the fact that the books will not be entirely balanced between the debiting and the crediting process.

I firmly believe that it is not the responsibility of the fund set up for a specific purpose to now be used for a different purpose.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [12.28 p.m.]: I thank the members who have spoken in support of the Bill. I will clear up a couple of misconceptions.

The legislation is not retrospective. The one per cent levy ceased on 30 June 1986. There is more than enough money in the fund—in excess of \$5 million—to cover those members of

the Waterside Workers Federation who have been unfortunate enough to contract this disease. I think there are 12 employees in all.

It is true that workers' compensation is a problem. Mr Masters knows my views on how it should be handled and I do not think he is at great variance with them. Perhaps one day we shall become sensible, bring the premiums down, and remove the impost from the employers who have to pay. It is happening in other States and in other parts of the world. Workers' compensation is a medical problem, not a legal problem.

Mr Trigg is a member of a committee looking at the problems of the recovery of money from those who have somehow or other dodged their liability. Payments to the 12 people concerned will not cut deeply into the funds because their life expectancy is not very long—one of my best friends on the waterfront is affected. In the meantime, the committee will be looking at the people who should be paying, and it is expected that more than 90 per cent of the money will be recovered.

The amount of money to come out of that indemnity fund should not affect it greatly. It is in excess of \$5 million. Mr Masters says there have been no more insurance company collapses. A committee has been set up and Mr Trigg is serving on it. Although it would be in excess of 90 per cent—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: These people are dying, and the fund was set up. It is no good Mr Gayfer having two bob each way on questions like this. The facts are that the indemnity fund is there, and it is hard to pinpoint whom to sheet it home to. The indemnity fund has been used for what it was created for.

I thank Mr Gayfer and Mr Masters for their support of the Bill. Any further questions of detail I can answer during the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (**Hon. D. J. Wordsworth**) in the Chair; **Hon. D. K. Dans** (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I take exception to the way the Minister finished his second reading reply. We are not querying the men who, as

the Minister said, are dying. Nobody said anything about that. As a matter of fact Mr Masters and I gave our support and sympathy.

Hon. D. K. Dans: And I thank you for it.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is fair enough. But to turn round and attack us when all we are saying is that there is a fund which, as the Minister has said, has a lot of money in it, and which was set up for a specific purpose which is now being altered, is not good enough. The moneys from that fund will be used for another purpose.

Surely, if there is urgency—and we back the Minister on that urgency—to find funds by way of a shortfall, it should have come from another source such as the Consolidated Revenue Fund rather than from a fund specifically designed for other purposes.

My query has been just that. Surely there was another way of doing it. It was never suggested by us that those who are entitled to it should be deprived.

Hon. D. K. DAns: I have never suggested that Mr Gayfer said that at all. What I said was that this supplementation fund was set up for the benefit of both the employer and the employee. I think it was set up under Mr Masters.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It was.

Hon. D. K. DAns: It was set up specifically for this purpose. It was accepted that this was the best fund to use, because we could still recover money and put it back into the fund. As Mr Masters and Mr Gayfer know, we could have gone to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, but that would have immediately put an impost on premiums. The insurers are well aware of what we are doing. They are well aware of this Bill. There is no need to give any guarantee we will go back to the supplementation fund because, as I have already said, it is intended, given time, to identify those people and to recover that money.

I would not like to stand up here today and say that we have gone along and got \$100 000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and therefore there would be an increase in premiums—and that is the best way to go about it. I have the letter from Mr Trigg here. He wants to know whether there will be some guarantee on the floor of the Parliament that we will not go back to that supplementation fund over and over again. The answer is that we are not going back to that supplementation fund.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr Trigg's letter has just been handed to me but I have not yet read it. I have just turned to the second page and found recommendations, but I have not read them.

I spoke of the protection of that fund, as I would have of any fund I thought had been set up for a specific purpose and was being used for some other purpose as a result of legislation.

The Minister, in his closing remarks, thought I was supporting Mr Trigg. I am a bit wary of Mr Trigg because we tended to support him once before and he changed his mind halfway through. I want the Minister to know that my belief is that a fund is like a public trusteeship. When it is set up for a specific purpose, I shudder every time it is used for something else.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: This will probably be the last comment I will make on the Bill, unless something else comes up. I had the best working relationship with Mr Trigg.

Hon. D. K. Dans: So have I.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister said that the fund had now ceased as far as contributions are concerned. The figure has levelled off, and there is a fixed figure available for certain purposes. The Minister said there would be sufficient funds to meet the demands under the existing arrangements plus the new arrangement. For the record, does the Minister mean to say that if there is a shortfall at any stage—in other words if the draw on the fund is greater than the money available, or what will be available—will the Government pick up that shortfall?

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not understand Mr Masters' question. Is he asking whether there will be a shortfall paying out people with asbestosis?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I apologise if I was not clear enough in my explanation. Two companies, Palmdale and Bishopsgate, went bust. They left employers and employees in a bad spot. A fund was levied at one per cent on insurance companies to raise money to meet demands made on the failed companies, to prevent certain employers from going broke, and to make sure that people entitled to workers' compensation payments received them. That is what the fund was set up for originally. We are now adding to the demands on that fund—the need to pay out waterside workers who suffer from asbestosis. So there is an extra demand on the fund.

The fund has levelled off. As mentioned in the letter, there is \$3.923 million in it. That \$3.923 million may not be sufficient to meet the demands. We think it is all right at the moment, but there may be a shortfall. If there is a shortfall, will the Government pick up that shortfall?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I will give no guarantee about that because I cannot. I will just give some explanations. The interest on the \$5 million—and I round it off to \$5 million—is ample to meet any claims for asbestosis. There is also ample to meet any claim arising out of Palmdale and the Bishopsgate's recovery. The recovery, given time, would ensure that there is no shortfall.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 11 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), and passed.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 November.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [12.43 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this legislation. It addresses a problem which we discussed when dealing with the previous legislation; that is, the cost of workers' compensation premiums. That cost has an effect on employment which, if the Government does not act quickly, would certainly affect the workers' compensation premiums and would thereby result in employment opportunities being lost. This would certainly be an imposition on employers themselves.

Section 122 and clause 17 of schedule 1 deal with the areas presently being addressed. The discretionary powers given to the board are discussed under section 122. As far as the previous Liberal Government was concerned when it introduced this legislation, those discretionary powers clearly set out an intent which is there for all to see. Nevertheless, a decision was made recently by the High Court which brings into doubt the intention of this legislation. We are simply now placing limi-

tations, which were originally intended in the legislation, back into the Act so that there is no doubt in anyone's mind about the amounts that can be awarded and the limitations that are placed on those awards.

I do not think there is very much point in going into any great detail on this Bill because there is no dispute as far as members on this side of the House are concerned. The new Bill reflects the intentions that were originally behind the Act. The new legislation fixes a sum of \$50 000 beyond the proclaimed amount, which is to be given at the discretion of the board. The intention was that the discretion should be exercised where there was a genuine need; and the High Court decision, as I understand it, stated that that genuine need did not have to be demonstrated and that people could continue to claim higher and higher sums of money at great cost to the people involved in workers' compensation. I do not think there needs to be great debate on that.

The other point I would make deals with working directors—that is, directors of companies—who, for one reason or another, had been able to avoid involving themselves in workers' compensation policies. In other words, if I were a working director and were actually out in the field working, I would not have needed to cover myself for workers' compensation unless I had seen fit to do so. As a working director I did not need to have a policy and could avoid having one, but when it came to a claim for some reason as a working director I would be entitled to make a claim on the company or the reserve fund if no money was otherwise available. It was quite obviously a loophole which needed to be closed, and the Government has done that.

I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.30 p.m.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), and passed.

ACTS AMENDMENT (WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 November.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [2.33 p.m.]: The Opposition certainly does not oppose this measure. The Bill will simply change the title of the Workers' Assistance Commission to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Commission which more properly reflects the work carried out by the commission.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), and passed.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from 20 November.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [2.36 p.m.]: It is normal during this debate for one to choose to speak on whatever subject he wishes. I will commence my speech by attempting to quash the speculations which have been made in the Press about my connection with a Perth businessman, Mr Laurie Connell. No member in this House would be unaware of what happened on Tuesday—there was a change of leadership of the Liberal Party.

I make it clear from the outset that the comments I will make are personal and have nothing to do with Mr Bill Hassell.

My connection with Mr Laurie Connell is one purely of friendship. I have been closely questioned by the Press about my arrangements with the man. I make it clear that the only time I had anything to do with Mr Laurie Connell—

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am trying to ignore the interjections which are not only unparliamentary, but also out of order.

The **PRESIDENT:** Order! If honourable members are to continue with their audible conversations I will get angry.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The Press has very carefully tried to put together speculation that a recent meeting held at Mr Connell's office between some members of the the Liberal Party and Mr Connell may have been connected with the leadership challenge in the Liberal Party. I concede that it is the right of the Press to do that. However, that speculation is nothing but unmitigated nonsense.

Mr Connell's name was mentioned by members from both sides of the House in respect of the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd. Several members were of the view that the Government had done the wrong thing in its acquisition of this company.

Whether the Government's action was right or wrong, Mr Connell took exception to the comments which had been made in Parliament and wrote to the Liberal Party voicing his disapproval about what was said and inviting members of the party to meet with him to allow him to explain his connection with that company. His letter was dealt with in the party room and it was passed on to the appropriate committee. I am not a member of that committee, but the members of it accepted Mr Connell's invitation to meet with him to allow him to explain how he was involved with the company concerned. I do not find that unusual. Members of the Liberal Party were not summoned to attend that meeting, but they took advantage of the invitation.

The day on which members met with Mr Connell he was to attend a meeting of the Western Australian Meat Commission and had three-quarters of an hour only to explain his connection with the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd. He left it to members to make up their own minds and that is what I, along with the other members, did. That was the end of it.

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I was surprised about the Press speculation.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Were you there?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Yes, I was there and I was pleased to be present. I had nothing to do with setting it up but it was a courtesy to be present and we did not receive a summons. That was pure Press speculation and it was absolute nonsense.

If ever a bloke in Perth has had unfair treatment from both sides of the political spectrum, it is Laurie Connell. I make no secret of the fact that he is a friend of mine; in fact, he has friends among members of Parliament on both sides.

Hon. T. G. Butler: Are you apologising for that?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am not apologising for it. Hon. Tom Butler, the new member, reminds me of one of the seven dwarfs, I am not sure which one it is—perhaps it is the one at the end with the red light on his bundle. He never ceases to amaze me.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The reason I like Laurie Connell is that he does not muck about. If he has something to say, he does not wait around; he rings or fronts the person and sorts out the problem. I do not like wimps or those people who snivel around in the background when they have something to say rather than coming straight out with it.

I was asked by the Press whether or not Mr Connell financed my last election campaign.

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: He is a very good judge of horseflesh and of his political friends. The answer to the Press question was that he did not finance my election campaign; I wish he had because I would not then have the overdraft I have at the moment. I make it crystal clear to everyone, and I challenge any of the good judges on the other side of the House to prove otherwise, that Laurie Connell did not give me one cent. I do not know whether he gave any political party or any member any money. However, if he did, that is his business and their business. I am not interested. I want to end the speculation here and now. In fact, I think he would consider it a great joke if anyone were to put that suggestion to him.

He and I own a racehorse together; but as a financial arrangement, it is a disaster. We are well behind the eight-ball with this venture. It is no secret that my hobby outside this Parliament is racehorses. A member must have some hobby after sitting in this House listening to inane comments, such as those coming from the other side at the moment.

I am a member of the Carnarvon Race Club Committee, and while we were having a couple of beers at the races one day Laurie Connell suggested that we go into partnership together

to race a horse which he had intended to send to Singapore. He said that if we gave it a go it might win but if it was no good, we could send it to the glue factory. That was a reasonable proposition and we have had moderate success with the horse.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: What about your boxing interests?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: If the member carries on like that, I might put them into action.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I say that in jest, as the member knows.

In my view, Laurie Connell is one of the most generous blokes in Perth, and he cops an unfair amount of criticism from the Press.

Hon. T. G. Butler interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: If members opposite said that, they would be taken in a van to Curtin House, or wherever Labor Party members are incarcerated nowadays. As an apprentice, the member should sit and be quiet.

Let us take, for instance, the case of Rottnest Island. Nobody could have copped more criticism, just because Laurie Connell did a deal with the State Government.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: What about the blasting?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Let us not talk about the blasting; that is the sort of thing Hon. Sam Piantadosi organised before he was a member of this House. Whenever anybody wanted those kinds of jobs done, they went to see the member.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not want those sorts of comments made by members on either side. I would sooner that there were no interjections.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Thank you, Mr President. I will try to ignore the interjections.

The PRESIDENT: You are initiating them.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Laurie Connell was given the job of renovating some cottages on Rottnest Island. Part of the deal was that he would have the use of the cottages until after the America's Cup. I venture to say that he will not use the cottages during that time. However, he fixed them up because he loves Rottnest Island. He provided the money, and I understand a first-class job has been done. But I understand he has copped a lot of criticism. He gives a great deal of money to charities, including the spastics group. He is the softest touch in

Perth. He gives away \$2 million a year. However, he said the other day that if people keep criticising him for every move he makes, he will not give away a cent.

Mr Connell did not become the fifth biggest merchant banker in Australia for any other reason than that he has ability. People know that he does a good job. All decent sized deals arranged in Perth end up on his desk at some stage.

Apart from having a few beers with him at the races, I do not see him. I have no axe to grind and I am sure he would have a haemorrhage if he knew that I was talking about him today in Parliament. Those people who have a quid, such as Dallas Dempster, and John Roberts of Multiplex, are immediately implicated when there is a change of Government from Labor to Liberal or Liberal to Labor. Every time Mr Connell visits a Minister of the Crown, it looks as though he is up to something sly; but businessmen must carry on with their business, no matter who is in Government. I am not criticising the Liberal Party or anybody, I am making personal comments.

Hon. T. G. Butler: I am on your side.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: If the member is on my side, I am starting to worry.

People like Alan Bend, Denis Marshall, and Alastair Norwood are under great pressure from Press speculation and the public just because they have a few dollars. I have never met Alan Bond, and I cannot comment on the sort of bloke he is. However he, and the people like him, are doing a great job in this State; they employ a lot of people. These businessmen are being penalised just because they are successful.

Every time I picked up a newspaper this week I saw Laurie Connell's name, with the Press trying to connect his name with mine and with the manipulation of the change in leadership of the Liberal Party. That is absolute nonsense. He had nothing whatsoever to do with it. It is an unfortunate comment for anybody on either side to make.

Hon. Mark Nevill: We have not made it.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I did not say that the Labor Party had. However, the Premier, Brian Burke, said on the radio, and was taken to task for it, that as soon as there was a change of Government these blokes would scurry to the political party on the other side. That was a terrible thing to say. Businessmen must conduct their business and deal with the Govern-

ment of the day. There is no way in the world that we shall not be in Government after the next election, and of course these businessmen will deal with the Liberal Party just as they have dealt with the Labor Party. That is not hard to understand.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw Hon. T. G. Butler's attention to the Standing Orders which state that he can speak on this motion once only.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I make a plea to everybody concerned to let these blokes get on with the jobs they are doing; if they are making a dollar, let them continue to do so. Without them I do not know where this State would be.

I am looking forward to picking up a newspaper in the next few days and not seeing these business people connected with the Liberal Party. I understand that Laurie Connell will not talk to the Press these days. That is unfortunate because he has a great deal to say. I do not criticise the Press; it is their job, and they do a first-class job. However, Mr Connell is terrified because his name is in the newspapers all the time. If I were to have morning tea with him tomorrow and were seen scurrying out of his office, that would cause further speculation.

Hon. D. K. Dans: If you walk out, it will be okay.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: It has me beat. I advise members that on Saturday I shall be at the races with Laurie Connell. He has invited me to go to the Rothwells Cup, and if I am seen drinking with him it does not mean I shall be arranging a coup.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Mr Masters can relax, then?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: He has always been relaxed.

Mr Connell has invited me to the races and I shall go. Those are my last words on the subject. I wanted to make the matter crystal clear. They are my personal views and are no reflection on Mr Hassell or the Liberal Party.

I wish to refer to an issue in my electorate. Kailis Fisheries controls an operation at Learmonth with 15 or 16 fishing boats and up to 350 people are employed. I have informed this House on many occasions that the only way that these people can get their prawns off the boats is by using 12-foot dinghies and bringing them through the breakers because there is no jetty or refuelling place to bring them ashore. I informed the Government of

the matter about two or three years ago and the then Minister, Mr Ken McIver, came with me to inspect the area and put the wheels in motion. An undertaking was given to build a fishing boat facility. It was to be funded in the 1987-88 Budget.

I am becoming somewhat nervous because when the Budget came out this year I saw a small amount of \$50 000 for survey purposes. I have been to Mr Troy, the Minister concerned, and he has been most helpful. He informed me that the Government is having second thoughts because of the cost factor. I urge the Government to look again at that cost factor.

Since we took up the matter with the people from the Department of Marine and Harbours a young seaman has been drowned. Several loads of prawns have been lost. I refer to the prawn fishing at Exmouth where fishermen have to bring their product ashore some 500 to 600 metres by dinghy because the water is too shallow. We eventually came to an agreement with the Department of Marine and Harbours when Mr McIver was Minister and as far as I knew the matter was settled. Now the Government is having second thoughts because it believes it will be too expensive and it is looking at the situation.

Hon. D. K. Dans: When I was in Exmouth last there was a great push to have the jetty put somewhere else.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am well aware of that push. Tourism is a very big industry in Exmouth and people want to operate tourist boats. They want a facility closer to town. Let us not get the two matters mixed up. The facility I am talking about is at Kailis Fisheries and is a fishing boat facility only. It is like a pontoon with a walkway on it. It is merely there as an unloading facility. Exmouth needs a facility similar to a marina.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I suggested that but they did not want it. They said they would not go to Kailis Fisheries and it should all be unloaded at the jetty available.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: There is no hope of pleasing everyone. I have great sympathy for the boating people in Exmouth. A marina is a definite must and in due course it will come. I am more concerned that a facility is available to all fishing boats. It should be built where there is a factory. The Minister concerned has very kindly sent an officer from his department up there. I urge those members who have some say in this matter to do something about it. Mr Dans has some local knowledge on the matter. I

understand he has been up there a couple of times. He knows precisely what I am talking about.

Kailis Fisheries might suddenly make up its mind to process the prawns in Perth rather than Exmouth. That would distress me because the Exmouth industry provides an enormous amount of employment for people who find it difficult to get employment elsewhere.

I hope both subjects I have spoken on this afternoon are noted by members. I support the motion.

HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan) [2.55 p.m.]: I wish to restrict my comments to the area of job creation, which has received continued funding and support from the Government in this Budget.

I am chairman of the Job Link programme which is a Department of Employment and Training initiative. It is a programme which is very successfully community-based and has the support of many groups. It also has the active support of a number of Opposition members who are involved in it. The Job Link programme is the flagship of the State Government's attack against unemployment. That is evident when one looks at the fact that it has something like 37 community-based programmes in the State. These programmes are distributed from the Kimberley to the south-west, and cover the State very well.

Total participant enrolment since 1985 in this scheme has been something in the order of 16 657 participants of which a total number of 6 476 have been placed in employment. There were 3 185 participants enrolled in the Job Link in the last quarter, of which 1 596 have been placed in employment at a cost per placement of \$935. I think that is a tremendous effort.

Apart from the high placement rate, there are a number of characteristics of Job Link that should be highlighted. These characteristics are the targeting of the most disadvantaged groups in the labor market, the perception of the unemployed that Job Link is a non-bureaucratic body which is responsible to the needs of individuals, and local community ownership and mobilisation of additional local resources.

Job Link has received a wide variety of community sponsorship including industry and local government. It is seen to be a very effective brokerage network linking unemployed people to the wide range of employment education training and enterprise options. It is a system that operates not only on the supply side but

also on the demand side through job creation initiatives. It has also been possible to implement a wide range of employment strategies within the community and has been able to provide a useful Statewide network for the department to develop other initiatives through trainee recruitment, NES training, youth training, and so on.

It is a system that is complementary to other Federally funded employment programmes and services. It enjoys a high community profile which is something that tends to annoy some people in the community; however, it does not matter how well we do something in this country, there will always be detractors.

It is unfortunate that we have those detractors in the community and I really think they should pull their heads in and get behind this programme and support it. A large percentage of the unemployment problems could be solved by the community working to support unemployment programmes in the same way in which it works to support such things as football clubs, cricket clubs, and other recreational clubs in the community.

I think it is particularly important for country communities to get behind these schemes. I was fortunate enough to be in Katanning a few weeks ago and I opened the Kanwork programme. It is a very successful programme which has the support of the community. When there is a downturn in the rural economy, it is unfortunate that, in seeking jobs, many of the young tend to move from the country to Perth. If such organisations as cricket and football clubs wish to remain viable, they need to do something about getting the youth of their communities involved in that area, because without their young people such clubs would not exist.

I want to congratulate and thank the Government not only for supporting Job Link but for supporting other schemes such as Westrek, which I believe is probably one of the most successful alternatives to working for the dole. The scheme was put forward by people in the community and I commend the Government for its consideration of community-based employment programmes generally. I am very pleased that Job Link will be further developed in coming years because of that consideration.

I support the motion.

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Minister for Budget Management) [3.05 p.m.]: I thank all honourable members who have participated in this debate.

As we all know, the range of subjects which can be discussed on such a motion is limitless and that makes it impossible to attempt any sort of comprehensive reply. I can advise members, however, that all comments have been referred to the relevant Ministers, where I am sure they will receive appropriate attention.

Question put and passed.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [3.07 p.m.]: On behalf of Hon. Kay Hallahan, I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill in providing for a change of name from WAIT to the Curtin University of Technology will enhance the institution's status. This change will attract not only industrial sponsorship but additional sources of research moneys.

In recognition of the institution's enhanced status, the functions of WAIT have been changed to reflect its position as a university of technology. It is therefore appropriate to provide WAIT with additional flexibility, especially in the areas of property and financial dealings commensurable with existing practices at the University of Western Australia and Murdoch University.

Care has been taken in the amending Act to preserve the identity of the body corporate and any rights and obligations existing under it are therefore not affected. In addition, reference to the Western Australian Institute of Technology or an abbreviated version of that title in other written laws, documents, or other instruments shall be construed as a reference to the Curtin University of Technology unless it is inappropriate to do so.

It is expected that this enabling legislation will contribute substantially to WAIT's ability to aid in the development of Western Australia.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. N. F. Moore.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)*Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [3.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On 8 June 1984 the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the liquor laws in Western Australia presented its report to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator of Western Australia.

As a result of an extensive examination of the report, a study of the liquor legislation in other States, and consultation with industry, the Liquor Act is proposed to be amended in two stages.

The first stage provides for a clear separation between the judicial and administrative functions of the Liquor Act. The second stage will involve a complete review of the Liquor Act, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Royal Commission and the views of industry.

This Bill is designed to provide such a separation and at the same time provide for a less expensive, more efficient, and more streamlined method of administering the Liquor Act.

It is proposed that the judicial and administrative functions of the liquor laws be separated by—

- (1) Abolishing the presently constituted Licensing Court and by creating in its stead a Liquor Licensing Court headed by a single judge, and
- (2) establishing an administrative body headed by a Director of Liquor Licensing.

The newly established Liquor Licensing Court will be responsible for the granting, renewal, transfer, forfeiture, suspension, surrender, or removal of those liquor licences where there is provision within the Act for industry and public objection. These licences are shown as category A licences in the Bill.

An important provision of the Bill which will be of great benefit to the industry, measured by way of less cost and less delay, is the power conferred on the Director of Liquor Licensing to deal with an application in respect of category A licences where the objection pro-

visions pursuant to the Act are not utilised. In other words, if there is no objection from any source to an application in respect of a category A licence, the director will deal with it administratively, rather than the matter being dealt with by way of formal court hearing. This will save time and money.

There is a safeguard in respect of the director's powers in that any decision by the director on a category A licence and certain other matters is appealable to the Liquor Licensing Court.

All other matters relating to licences and permits which are carried out currently by the Licensing Court and which do not require judicial determination, under these new proposals will be carried out by the administrative body and not the court.

In granting powers to the director to determine certain matters, the Bill provides that the powers of determination are to proceed with as little formality as possible. Where it is considered necessary, the director may conduct a hearing and all parties are permitted to be present. Such hearings will be of an informal nature.

This procedure will be of major benefit to the liquor industry and the public, as many matters are capable of being administratively determined, especially where there may be some dispute and conciliation is required. The cost saving such an approach would achieve is self-evident.

The passing of this Bill is seen as a first step in the process of updating and simplifying the Liquor Act. The Act is unnecessarily complicated and obtuse and experiences in other States have shown that a simple, easy to understand, but effective Liquor Act is possible. The establishment of a liquor licensing administrative body provides the resources and structure to undertake this task.

Briefly, the court will deal with the following matters—

—The grant of all category A licences;

the revocation or suspension of licences or any other disciplinary proceedings against the licensee;

application for the limitation of trading conditions on the grounds of complaints from local residents, where the director has failed to reach a settlement between the parties;

proposed alterations to category A licensed premises that would result in a significant material difference to the nature of the licence;

the grant of entertainment permits;

any disagreement with a determination of the director;

removals or transfers of licences that have attracted formal objections; and

matters referred to it by the director because of some difficult point of law involved, or for some other reason.

The director of the authority will be responsible for—

The grant of all other licences not being category A licences;

alterations to all licensed premises except those that significantly affect the nature of a category A licence;

fee assessments and reassessments;

unobjected removals or transfers of licences;

surrender of licences;

variation of trading hours; and

all other permits, certificates, declarations, and informal applications.

Generally, the emphasis of the Bill is on reducing the complexity of applying for certain types of liquor licences, and on introducing a more streamlined structure which will be able to respond to the needs of the people and the industry.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. P. H. Lockyer.

Sitting suspended from 3.11 to 4.00 p.m.

[Questions taken.]

House adjourned at 4.08 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Staff: Austmark Tower, Bunbury

561. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it the intention of the department to move any staff into the Austmark Tower block in Bunbury?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) from what sections;
 - (b) how many from each section;
 - (c) what offices will they be vacating; and
 - (d) what will the offices mentioned in (c) be used for?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I refer the member to the answer to question 646.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Leases: Renewals

613. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) How many departments have renewed their leases for premises in the year ended 30 June 1986?
- (2) Of these, how many departments are now paying more than they paid on the expired lease?
- (3) What is the percentage increase of the new leases as compared with the expired leases?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) The information given below relates to leases as such and not departments. There are leases of buildings with multiple occupancies. There are also departments that have more than one lease.

The total number of leases renewed in the year ended June 1986 was 66, including 14 leases on a monthly basis. Of the 66 leases, 27 pertained to electorate offices. The number of leases with increased rental was 43, and the average increase in rental 23.28 per cent.

AGRICULTURE RESEARCH STATION

Gascoyne: Staff Reduction

632. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to reduce staff at the Gascoyne Research Station?
- (2) If so, how many staff are involved?
- (3) Which departments will be affected?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (3) Staff at the Gascoyne Research Station are employed by the Department of Agriculture. The department's staff reduction programme has not yet been approved by the Government, but it is not proposed that more than one position will be involved.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

Esperance-Kalgoorlie: Schedules

635. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What number of trains are scheduled daily between Kalgoorlie and Esperance?
- (2) What are the items and quantities of bulk cargo carried monthly on this route or parts of the route?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) West Kalgoorlie-Esperance—one train each day.

West Kalgoorlie-Redmine—two trains each day.

West Kalgoorlie-Hampton—four trains each day.

Malcolm-Hampton—four trains weekly.

- (2) For the monthly period 26 October 1986 to 22 November 1986, statistics were as follows—

Traffic	From	To	Tonnes
Nickel concentrate	Redmine	Hampton	29 879
Nickel concentrate	Malcolm	Hampton	3 767
Nickel matte	Hampton	Kwinana	4 857
Salt	Esperance	Robb Jetty	1 078
Fuel	Esperance	Norseman	731
Fuel	Esperance	Redmine	976
Fuel	Esperance	Kalgoorlie	6 135
Lime	Kewdale	Redmine	140
Coal	Collie	Hampton	6 583
Wool	Esperance	Metro	1 365
Bagged superphosphate	Kwinana	Esperance	669
Bulk superphosphate	Kwinana	Esperance	4 399
Bulk cement	Kewdale	Esperance	77
Aerated waters	Kewdale	Esperance	212
Total West traffic	Kewdale	Esperance	335

It is estimated that for the 1986-87 season 46 000 tonnes of grain will be hauled from Salmon Gums to Esperance and 19 000 tonnes of grain will be hauled from Grass Patch to Esperance.

ROAD

Balladonia-Fisheries Road: Vandalism

639. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has it been reported to the Minister that a road between the Fisheries Road east of Esperance and Balladonia has of late been absolutely blocked by trees being felled across the track?
- (2) Does the Main Roads Department consider such practices to be a hazard and dangerous to those using the road?
- (3) If so, has it been determined who was responsible for blocking the road?
- (4) Have similar roadblocks been put in place after the road was cleared for traffic?
- (5) If so, what action has been taken to prevent such dangerous practices?
- (6) Have prosecutions taken place?
- (7) Have road closure signs been erected on the road?
- (8) Has it been determined who would have such signs in their possession and were they empowered to use such signs for this purpose?
- (9) Are there indications that the blocking of such roads was carried out at the same time as the erection of these signs?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (9) I have not seen any recent report along the lines referred to. The issues raised will, however, be investigated as a matter of urgency and I will reply to the member in writing as soon as the investigations are complete.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Staff: Austmark Tower, Bunbury

644. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Industry and Technology:

- (1) Is it the intention of the department to move any staff into the Austmark Tower block in Bunbury?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) from what sections;
 - (b) how many from each section;
 - (c) what offices will they be vacating; and
 - (d) what will the offices mentioned in (c) be used for?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I refer the member to the reply to question 646.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Staff: Austmark Tower, Bunbury

654. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it the intention of the department to move any staff into the Austmark Tower block in Bunbury?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) from what sections;
 - (b) how many from each section;
 - (c) what offices will they be vacating; and
 - (d) what will the offices mentioned in (c) be used for?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Parliamentary question 646 refers.

LAND ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

Staff: Austmark Tower, Bunbury

655. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is it the intention of the department to move any staff into the Austmark Tower block in Bunbury?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) from what sections;
 - (b) how many from each section;

- (c) what offices will they be vacating; and
- (d) what will the offices mentioned in (c) be used for?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Parliamentary question 646 refers.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Staff: Austmark Tower, Bunbury

656. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is it the intention of the department to move any staff into the Austmark Tower block in Bunbury?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) from what sections;
 - (b) how many from each section;
 - (c) what offices will they be vacating; and
 - (d) what will the offices mentioned in (c) be used for?

Hon D. K. DANS replied:

See reply to parliamentary question 646.

RACING AND GAMING OFFICE

Staff: Austmark Tower, Bunbury

657. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Is it the intention of the department to move any staff into the Austmark Tower block in Bunbury?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) from what sections;
 - (b) how many from each section;
 - (c) what offices will they be vacating; and
 - (d) what will the offices mentioned in (c) be used for?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

See reply to parliamentary question 646.

TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

Collie: Closures

661. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- Is it Westrail's intention to close the—
- (a) Collie to Wagin line and if so, when;
- (b) Collie to Narrogin line and if so, when?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Westrail has requested approval to close the Muja-Bowelling, Bowelling-Wagin, and Bowelling-Darkan branch line sections from 30 June 1987.

As required by section 18A of the Transport Co-ordination Act, the Minister for Transport has requested that the Director General of Transport prepare a report on the prospective closure of these branch line sections. Following completion of this report, the Minister for Transport will make a decision on the future of the branch lines in question.

TRANSPORT

Westrail: Transportable House, Darkan

662. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it Westrail's intention to remove a transportable house from Darkan and replace it with a barracks?
- (2) If so, would Westrail give consideration to selling the house?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter is still under consideration.

TRANSPORT

Helicopters: Rottnest Island

665. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it correct that the Government is considering licensing a helicopter service to Rottnest?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) will the present aircraft service remain viable;

(b) is there a temperature limitation on loadings;

(c) will an all-year-round service be provided and at what level?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) I have approved of this service. No licence has been issued yet.

(2) (a) The present operator entered service in competition with another operator, the route having been determined at that time as a tourist route open to competition; this is believed to be in the best interests of users;

(b) this is the province of the Commonwealth Department of Aviation;

(c) yes, at a reduced frequency in winter.

ARTS: PAINTINGS

New Norcia: Restoration

668. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

(1) Has the Benedictine Community at New Norcia made an approach to the Government for assistance in the restoration of the damaged paintings in its possession?

(2) If so, what has been the Government's response?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

This question has been incorrectly addressed to the Premier. It has been referred to the Minister for The Arts, and he will answer the question in writing.

FEDERAL MINISTER FOR TOURISM

Comments: Bungle Bungle

669. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

(1) Has the Minister seen the Federal Minister, Mr Holding's reported comments on Bungle Bungle in *The West Australian* of 7 November 1986?

(2) Does she endorse all his reported comments?

(3) Has the Tourism Commission been involved in or consulted by Federal and Aboriginal authorities in the matter of Bungle Bungle?

(4) Did she make any effort to have a Tourism Commission officer on the Department of Conservation and Land Management's planning team which is responsible for the preparation of the draft management plan for the area?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) The issues raised in Mr Holding's comments are matters which have been and will continue to be addressed in the planning for the future use of Bungle Bungle and will incorporate discussions with the appropriate Aboriginal authorities and communities.

(4) The commission is represented on the Bungle Bungle planning group which includes representatives from the Department of Conservation and Land Management, the Shire of Hall's Creek, and the local Aboriginal community.

SPORT AND RECREATION CAMP

Noalimba: Alternative Bookings

671. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

(1) Is it correct that five groups totalling 572 people who were booked into Noalimba next year, have rejected alternative camp accommodation and requested their deposits be returned?

(2) Is it correct that five country high schools, totalling 412 people, who were booked into Noalimba for Country Week 1987, cannot be accommodated at other department metropolitan camps, because they are booked out for the period?

(3) Is the Government aware that eight other groups booked into Noalimba totalling at least 1 000 people in pursuit of sporting, religious, education, and social goals consider alternative accommodation in other metropolitan camps unsuitable and have cancelled or will cancel their bookings?

(4) Is it correct that a factor in Perth's successful bid for the world swimming championships in 1990 was the guarantee of cheap accommodation at Noalimba for 500 athletes?

- (5) Is it correct that many groups, particularly those with national and international flavours, would not consider any of the other department camps suitable alternatives should Noalimba close, and is it also correct that these would probably be lost to Perth and Western Australia?
- (6) Is it correct that in the event of Noalimba closing, many thousands of Western Australian school children and adults from country centres throughout the State would be unable to come to Perth?
- (7) Is it correct that each of the four metropolitan camps considered as alternatives to Noalimba have severe limitations on—
 - (a) the number of personnel they can accommodate;
 - (b) the number of groups that can be accommodated at the one time;
 - (c) the type of group they can accommodate?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) to (3) The groups affected by Noalimba's closure have been advised both verbally and in writing in order that the maximum possible assistance is given to relocate them into other departmental camps.

The number of people referred to in points (1) to (3) represent a very small percentage of the total, and it is expected that the great majority of users will be suitably accommodated in the department's other facilities.

- (4) The number of athletes and officials expected to attend the world swimming championships in 1990 is many times the total capacity of Noalimba, and adequate departmental and private facilities will be reserved for this event. The department is liaising closely with those responsible for organising the championships.

The organisers have also been made aware that they will have the opportunity to take part in the feasibility study which will consider all reasonable options, including the partial redevelopment of Noalimba or the establishment of a modern self-sustaining accommodation unit near the WA Sports Centre.

- (5) There is no adequate evidence to support such a claim. In any case, the feasibility study referred to in (4) will be addressing needs associated with national and international sporting events.
- (6) No.
- (7) (a) The low occupancy rate of Noalimba suggests this will not be a problem.

- (b) and (c) Departmental camps have variety both in style and flexibility of accommodation. Woodman Point in particular has the potential to cater for multiple groups, and this is being addressed.

It has been consistently made clear that the feasibility study which is being undertaken in respect to the long-term future of Noalimba will take full account of the needs of user groups and will consider all reasonable options prior to recommending a final course of action.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Investigation: Task Force

677. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) Is it correct that the Government has set up a task force to investigate all financial institutions?
- (2) Who are the members of the task force?
- (3) What are their guidelines or terms of reference?
- (4) When will this task force report?
- (5) Will industry input be invited by the task force?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (5) On 23 October 1986, the Premier issued a media statement about the establishment of a working party to examine legislation covering permanent building societies and credit unions.

I have arranged to provide the member with a copy of the media statement.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PRISONER RAYMOND MICKELBERG

Chiropractic Treatment

202. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Prisons:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that prisoner Raymond Mickelberg is having some difficulty receiving chiropractic treatment for a back ailment, and that it is reported that his chiropractor has indicated that without treatment his leg will wither?
- (2) If the Minister is not aware, would he make himself aware of the matter and undertake that Raymond Mickelberg will receive the appropriate attention in due course?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I have had no recent report to that effect. At earlier times, however, I have had a number of reports indicating that the medical treatment available to Mr Mickelberg is fully adequate to his requirements. If the question has again been raised, I will seek further advice on it.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILLS

Debate

203. Hon. E. J. CHARLTON, to the Leader of the House:

Could he give an indication as to when items Nos. 14 and 15 on today's Notice Paper are likely to be debated?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I do not have a crystal ball and cannot gaze into the future, having in mind the rather short debate we had on the Environmental Protection Bill!

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Three Springs Toilet Facilities

204. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

What is the estimated cost of the toilet facilities for the Three Springs Primary School?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question. The estimated cost is \$120 000. The facilities consist of replacement student toilets and the provision of staff toilets. There was no provision for this in the 1986-87 Budget, but it will be in a future Budget.

LISTENING DEVICES ACT

Portfolio Responsibility

205. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General:

Does the Attorney General administer the Listening Devices Act?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I am reluctant to reply in these terms, but the fact is that I do not believe that I administer this Act. I would not want to be too definite about that, and in any event I suggest that if the member has a question on that legislation, he might put it on notice.

LISTENING DEVICE

Importation

206. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General:

I am advised the matter referred to in my previous question has been clarified and that the Attorney General does indeed administer the Listening Devices Act.

- (1) Has his attention been drawn to the story on page 3 of today's edition of the *Daily News* concerning an import into Australia, which I understand has been tested today by law reformer Brian Tennant, which is alleged to be an instrument now on sale in Western Australia and which has the capacity to overhear people's conversations without their knowing about it?
- (2) If his attention has been drawn to that, does he have any comments about it and does he share Mr Tennant's concern?

- (3) If his attention has not been drawn to that imported article, will he have the matter investigated to ascertain whether there is any breach of the Listening Devices Act?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (3) My attention had not previously been drawn to this item, but I will make a point of looking it up and making the appropriate inquiries.

=====