

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 15 September 1987

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Burkett) took the Chair at 2.15 pm, and read prayers.

DEPUTY PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

Oath of Office

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to announce that Mr Keith Scapin did on Monday, 14 September 1987, before Mr Speaker take and subscribe the oath of office of Deputy Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations in accordance with the Parliamentary Commissioner Act.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT ACT

Report Tabling: Extension of Time

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been informed of the following ministerial approval for an extension of time for the presentation of annual reports in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act: The Minister for Agriculture, Agriculture Protection Board 1987 annual report. I table the relevant correspondence.

(See paper No 338.)

ORDER OF THE DAY No 1

Postponement

MR PEARCE (Armadale -- Leader of the House) [2.20 pm]: I move --

That Order of the Day No 1 be postponed.

Points of Order

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I understood there was a matter of public importance to be dealt with.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There was a matter of public importance addressed to the Speaker, and in the Speaker's absence I asked that the Clerk of the Assembly advise the Leader of the Opposition that when the Speaker arrives it will be his decision then to handle that matter of public importance rather than my acting in his absence. He will be here, I imagine, within 30 minutes.

Mr PEARCE: I appreciate your reluctance to rule on this issue in the absence of the Speaker, but I understood there was agreement between the Government and the Opposition in respect of matters of public importance -- that the way we have rewritten the Standing Orders of the Assembly gives members a right to raise a matter of public importance once a week. That is different from the old Standing Orders, which meant that the Speaker had to make a deliberation on a matter of urgent importance. My understanding of the Standing Orders is that now a judgment is not needed to be called on by the Speaker. In those circumstances, perhaps you could rule, Mr Deputy Speaker, that this matter be dealt with.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Perhaps we could proceed with the matter of public importance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 2.23 to 2.36 pm

Debate Resumed

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Confidential Information: Matter of Public Importance

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Burkett): I have received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition which states that he wishes to move a matter of public importance relating to the

release of personal and confidential information recorded by Government departments and instrumentalities, and financial and commercial institutions.

As I can see nothing in this request contrary to Standing Orders or to the Sessional Order, I intend to allow the motion to proceed.

[Eight members rose in their places.]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will allocate 30 minutes to Opposition speakers and 30 minutes to Government speakers.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch -- Leader of the Opposition) [2.38 pm]: I move --

That this House calls on the Premier to guarantee that personal and confidential information recorded by Government departments, instrumentalities, and financial and commercial institutions will never again be used selectively for political purposes or be released publicly by himself, or any member of his Government.

This motion seeks assurances from the Government. It is not seeking to condemn. Last Thursday, early in the day, we sought to move such a motion of condemnation. It seems from reports throughout the media in this State that public condemnation and outrage at the Government's action has been widespread, indeed, universal. It would not serve any useful purpose in this Parliament therefore to go down that path again, although we do not in any way support the action taken by the Government.

What we, and the public of Western Australia, want is an assurance from the Government that such actions will never be repeated. People throughout Western Australia have a strong belief in our Westminster system of Parliament and Government. They trust the Government with their information and knowledge. Until recently those people believed that when they dealt with the Government, or any of its agencies, they could do so secure in the knowledge that that information would not be used for any purpose other than that for which the Government or its agency required the information. That belief has been severely shaken in recent times. If this had been a single example of the abuse of that trust, it might have been understandable. I would not have condoned it, but it might have been accepted as an isolated incident by some convoluted argument. However, when one considers the Government's recent activities, one can see why the release of information concerning Mr and Mrs Keith Simpson met with the outrage that it deservedly did.

First, information was released by the Treasurer in August relating to confidential information relayed between an Opposition member, Mr Ross Lightfoot, and Mr Michael Naylor, the chief executive of Goldcorp Australia. The Government may think that was a smart political trick; certainly it got good mileage out of it at the time. Nonetheless, it clearly indicated that the Government was prepared to use its position, in terms of its direction and control over Goldcorp -- and, it would appear, the chief executive of that company -- for political gain. Admittedly that release of information related to members of Parliament, but that still concerns citizens who until now believed that they could deal with a Government agency in confidence. Although the Government may have seen that as being a smart political trick, it has been brought to my notice on more than five occasions by people in the community that they are concerned that they can no longer deal with Government agencies with confidence, because they fear that their information will be released for political reasons. Perhaps the information does not even have to be released. In many instances the threat of its being released is enough. It may be said, "We will release the information unless you do this." That is probably the most sinister and serious concern in this area.

The second example again related to an ex-colleague of ours, the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition. An article in the *Sunday Times* of 30 August indicated that an auditor's report had been addressed and delivered to the Chairman of the Teachers Credit Society expressing concern about documentation, and information about the former Deputy Leader's loans was leaked to the Press. That report was leaked not only to the *Sunday Times*, but also to many other people in the media. We all know who leaked that information and one must question the motive for their doing so.

A third example occurred last Wednesday when, first, the Treasurer and, subsequently, the Leader of the House and the Minister for Education released information concerning a

private dealing of Mr and Mrs Keith Simpson. It is worthwhile recapping exactly what happened. During question time, the Treasurer named Mr Simpson as being a person who took funds from the Teachers Credit Society. He then alleged and tried to prove -- I do not think successfully -- that that was part of a conspiracy. It certainly was not, but for the purposes of this argument that is irrelevant, because the Treasurer then gave support to the Leader of the House and Minister for Education who subsequently, in debate, released detailed personal information that related to Mr and Mrs Simpson's personal dealings.

Mr Pearce: Accurate and very damaging information.

Mr MacKINNON: Whether that is so is not the point. The point is that the Government was prepared to use its position to get the information and then use it for its own political advantage. Whatever the argument that information supported in the eyes of the Government, the use of the information in that way is just not to be countenanced by this Parliament or any other Parliament across Australia, or by the people of Western Australia -- and certainly not by the Opposition. We are seeking from the Government a rock-solid guarantee that in future the people of Western Australia can have their confidence restored in Government instrumentalities and institutions so that other citizens will not see information relating to their personal dealings and activities recorded in *Hansard* and splashed across the newspapers of this State or spread over the television and radio airways, merely because the Government wants to use its position for some political advantage.

As I indicated at the Press conference last Thursday when speaking about the State Budget and also about this matter, we do not have to look very far to see how the information could be used again, this time perhaps against the Press. Were the Government to be unhappy with an article by a certain journalist when writing about the Government's policy, it could obtain some information about him to which it could get access in order to threaten the journalist with its release and so ensure that a certain story was or was not released, depending on how the Government saw it. It is very important also to understand this when we talk about the red herrings drawn across the trail by the Treasurer by his saying, "Look at what the Opposition did to Mrs Beahan and look at what it did to the Minister for Labour, Productivity and Employment."

I remind the House of a couple of things. First, the release of the information about Jenny Beahan was done by the Government itself. We did not seek out that information from official records or secret records to which we had access. The Government released the information. We then criticised it, as we continue to do, as being part of the Government's jobs for the boys and girls attitude.

The second point in relation to the Minister for Industrial Relations is even more ludicrous. The information about the Minister's participation in tax avoidance schemes was obtained from the public record -- the writ lists. The Minister was the subject of a writ because of his involvement in a tax avoidance scheme. Further, every single statement I made as the then acting Leader of the Opposition about the Minister's tax dealings was made outside the Chamber in the public arena. At any time, had he wanted to, the Minister could have taken action against me. In fact I stood on the steps of Parliament House and challenged him so to do if he thought what I had said was wrong.

Clearly we are talking about two different things. In our case we are not talking about access to information to which we are not entitled, because we do not have any such access. Further, we are talking about public concern that is totally justifiable about information that may or may not be held by the R & I Bank, by the Teachers Credit Society, or by the SEC.

From where did the Leader of the House get his information that indicated not only that Mr Simpson had withdrawn the money but also where he then placed it? I ask that question because Mr Simpson has authorised me to say that when he withdrew his funds from the Teachers Credit Society, the cheque was made out not to the SEC but to him and his wife.

Mr Pearce: It doesn't prove anything.

Mr MacKINNON: It certainly leaves a trail that leads directly back to the Leader of the House and the SEC, otherwise how would the Leader of the House have obtained that information? The Leader of the House and the Treasurer have a lot of answers to give.

What other information might the Government be prepared to use -- information from Water Authority records, land tax records, Public Service records, Exim records, or WADC records? How many dealings do the WADC and Exim have on a daily basis with private citizens in our community that may be used against those citizens for "political" reasons?

Our other concern about the misuse of information is heightened when we tie all that to the concerns we have consistently expressed over a long time about political appointments to the Public Service. If in the Public Service we have in the position of head of a Government agency someone who is a political appointment and who is prepared to be compliant with the wishes of the Government of the day, we really do have cause for concern about the integrity of the Public Service system under this Government's administration. We should be entitled to know that the people who head up our Police Force, the Corporate Affairs Department, and our taxation agencies are people of the highest integrity who are prepared to protect and defend the information, the records that the public of Western Australia entrust to their care.

As I said last week, perhaps the only good thing to come out of this whole affair is that the Treasurer has highlighted the real concerns that people must now justifiably express about the Australia Card, because if the Government is prepared to use this information without the ID card, what will it do when it has access to a multitude of information that will be available

through details on the ID card? That must be cause for concern in particular among all Western Australians who are opponents of the ID card; but perhaps more relevantly it must be of concern to people who at the moment believe they should support the ID card, for whatever reason.

Our motion seeks a guarantee, a commitment from the Government that this misuse of personal information will not occur again. The Government might use some political trick either to amend the motion or to denigrate or defeat it, but I urge and advise the Treasurer to be very cautious about doing so, because it was he who transgressed what people as private citizens expect of members of the Government. A failure by him and his Government to give a rock-solid commitment in the form of support for this motion must place very seriously at question his own and his Government's integrity. We all know that politics is a tough game; just about all members on either side have had some allegations made against them one way or another, and it will happen again. But when members stoop to the level to which the Government stooped last week in using for political advantage personal information about a private citizen, we have to draw the line. Enough is enough. There must be a standard to which we should all aspire.

Mr CASH: I second the motion.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balgas -- Treasurer) [2.49 pm]: The Government is not presented with any difficulty in adequately answering each of the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and I will take a few minutes to do just that. But if ever there were an unanswered challenge of hypocrisy it is in the silence of the Leader of the Opposition and his selective rebuttal of the matters that we have raised which we believe reflect in him exactly what he is complaining about in us.

We heard the Leader of the Opposition make his contribution, but none of us heard him refer to the stolen medical records relating to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management which were used by one Opposition member, unchallenged and uncriticised -- in fact encouraged -- by the Leader of the Opposition who today is in such high dudgeon. Yet, today the Leader of the Opposition chooses to be monumentally silent about that occasion. I wonder why it is that the Leader of the Opposition believes it is proper to use those stolen medical records but not to refer to the suspicious dealings of the President of the Liberal Party. I will tell members why he chooses not to mention the difference; it is because it was one of his members using the stolen information, and no-one suggested the information used by the Leader of the House was stolen and it was the Government which raised the matter of Mr Simpson. That in itself is sufficient to rebut the hypocrisy and humbug of a Leader of the Opposition who is not aware on a daily basis of the sorts of things his members are doing in his party's name. It is sufficient to rebut the hypocrisy and humbug of a Leader of the Opposition who changes his politics in last-minute marriages of convenience whenever he believes the political winds are blowing in a certain direction. If there is a spate of horrific

murders this Leader of the Opposition supports capital punishment; if there is a spate of lawlessness, this Leader of the Opposition supports greater penalties. Whatever it is that is current in the community will find a friend in the easy, quick-fix solution of policy put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

Let us look at the instances he raised before we ask him about some of the behaviour of his members as well as his own. Firstly, he referred to Goldcorp and accused the Government of releasing information from Goldcorp in reply to developments that involved the members for Murchison-Eyre and Mt Lawley. The member for Mt Lawley was busily engaged in spreading untruths about the situation. There is the headline which says, "Liberal MPs deny joint gold deal".

Mr Cash: With whom?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In this article the Liberal MP is George Cash, the member for Mt Lawley, and he expects us to let that go unchallenged. What I did was to ask Goldcorp whether that was the truth, and the answer was, "No, it is a lie."

Mr Cash: Rubbish! At least get your facts straight.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition expects me to allow that to go unchallenged. The truth is that in the first instance quoted by the Leader of the Opposition he failed to mention that the information from Goldcorp was a legitimate response to an untruth told and widely propagated by the member for Mt Lawley. It is an untruth, and as far as I am concerned the use of legitimate information to nail the members for Mt Lawley and Murchison-Eyre for what they are, and on this occasion that is the deliberate purveyors of untruths, is a legitimate and proper use of information.

The next instance given by the Leader of the Opposition to support his case --

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Members opposite can squeal all they like. When they speak, we are not to interject.

The second case used by the Leader of the Opposition involved the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and he referred to a story in the *Sunday Times* and said, "Here is further evidence of the Government misusing information." Where is the Leader of the Opposition's proof that the Government leaked any story in respect of the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition?

Mr Lewis interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I did not.

Mr Lewis: Who did? It was one of your minders. Deny it!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Where is the Leader of the Opposition's evidence? He raised the example, now he should back it up.

Mr MacKinnon: I think your memory is fading.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Where is the evidence? If my memory is fading, bring it back to full colour. The Leader of the Opposition does not have the evidence.

Mr MacKinnon interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Where is the evidence? That is two of the three instances that the Leader of the Opposition used to draw strength for his case and neither of them holds water when they are closely examined.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you saying the Teachers Credit Society released that auditor's report?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: No, but that is not to say I released it.

Mr MacKinnon: Do you know who did?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have no idea. I do not know who released any auditor's report, and I have not seen any auditor's report.

Mr MacKinnon: We have seen Press statement after Press statement in which you have claimed to have seen the auditor's report.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know that the Leader of the Opposition is quoting the reports correctly but if he has a Press statement that says I have seen an auditor's report as opposed to an auditor's report having been made, he may quote from it.

In each of the two instances to which I have referred so far, the Leader of the Opposition has not been able to substantiate his case. I will come back to the question of Mr Simpson, and I am sure the Leader of the House will have some additional news for members opposite on that today. I have been challenged to do this by the Leader of the Opposition; let us look at some of the cases he criticised me for citing in defence of the Government's actions. First there is the case of the Minister for Conservation and Land Management, and we still have not heard any criticism levelled at the Opposition member who used those records. Does the Leader of the Opposition support those records having been used?

Mr MacKinnon: We are interested in your answering our questions about your actions.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have tried to answer the first two questions. Does the Leader of the Opposition support the use of those stolen medical records?

Mr MacKinnon: We never stole documents.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Does he support the use of the stolen medical documents? Does he support the use of the records which he did not steal? Does the Leader of the Opposition support the use of stolen records?

Mr MacKinnon: Give us your evidence that they were stolen.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to turn from himself the use of those records, why the humbug and moving of a motion like this? But there is more to come: Who can forget the number of times on which the Leader of the Opposition referred to the MVIT file on Mr Len Brush? On 16 March he said, "Somebody did in fact provide a copy of that file to the Opposition but I refused to use it. It wasn't the sort of information that I thought we should use, so we didn't."

On 1 April, he said that he had the information but he did not use it publicly. He went on to talk about the same MVIT file, acknowledging that it was improperly obtained.

Mr Court: I am glad that we are going to debate that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take this opportunity afforded to me by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's interjection to ensure that the statements made by the Treasurer will not be made in a way which is contrary to my earlier ruling in respect of the Brush affair and the State Superannuation Board which is, at the moment, proceeding through the courts. If I am guaranteed of that, the Treasurer can continue.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Mr Speaker, they do not conflict.

For the third time, on 8 April, the Leader of the Opposition said that he knew about the information but that he would not use it. Yet, in question 153 he spoke about advances made, decisions overtaken, representations completed, and information that could have come only from that file, referring specifically to this matter and standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition. I challenged the Leader of the Opposition and said to him that he had said three times that he would not use that information because he said it would be improper to use it. He said that he did not use the information publicly but had put a question on the Notice Paper. It was in *Hansard* for everybody to see. He then expected us to accept him in good faith. Three times he denied that the information should be used. He then used it and said, "I did not use it publicly; I just put a question on the Notice Paper."

What did the member for Mt Lawley do in respect of the financial records of a bathhouse at 565 Beaufort Street? He declared the proprietor's income fees totalling \$115 000. Someone might legitimately ask whether the member for Mt Lawley was able to reveal that income for taxation purposes by reference to taxation records.

In respect of Exim Corporation, the member for Cottesloe released details of private financial arrangements of the then managing director, Mr Brian Easton. Questions were raised at the same time about Mr Easton's position as executive director of Eastmarc Pty Ltd. In addition, a series of matters were raised relating to the financial arrangements of Mr Gale and of the

involvement of a number of individuals in different investment opportunities in which Exim was involved. When the debate on Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd took place --

Mr Lightfoot interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will get to the member a bit later. By his involvement and actions, he brought down the former Deputy Leader of the Opposition and he prevented the member for Mt Lawley from running for the deputy's job. He has announced already that he will not run for Parliament again. It seems the only person safe from his grapeshot is the member for Greenough.

There was ample evidence in *Hansard* in respect of Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd which would indicate the unauthorised use of financial and other records. It seemed that the Opposition was perfectly happy with being the vehicle for the release and use of that information.

There is more to come in respect of Mr Simpson. It is wrong for people to claim that Mr Simpson is a private citizen. He is the President of the Western Australian Liberal Party. The withdrawal of these funds happened at a time when there was ample evidence to support the view that there was a determined effort by the Liberal Party to get people to question the financial position of the Teachers Credit Society. A number of different people were involved and the society was convinced of it to the degree that it was prepared --

Opposition members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! For a short time last week there was substantial cooperation in respect of interjections. During that time I felt that we made very real progress and that we got through a lot of business. In future, I will preclude members from interjecting for the balance of the day if, in my view, the interjections are disorderly -- that is, if they are designed to stop the person on his feet from making his speech.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There is ample evidence of the selective way in which the Leader of the Opposition views the principles involved in this motion.

Leaving all those instances aside, not one member of the Opposition who was here did not see the member for Murchison-Eyre produce a file, talk about photocopies of cheques, and quote from people's private financial records. For them to try to flee behind some moral position that the Leader of the Opposition might try to carve out is absolute hypocrisy. I remember the member for Murchison-Eyre smugly saying in respect of Brockley Investments that he had information in respect of cheques and other things. From where did he get it?

Mr Lightfoot: Are you suggesting that I stole it?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The same way as no-one is suggesting that the Leader of the House stole the documents to which he referred! It was an authorised release of private information. The problem with the member for Murchison-Eyre is that he has the morality of the gutter. He knows that not one person on his side of the House does not acknowledge that.

Mr MacKinnon: He reported the information to the police and to the Corporate Affairs Department.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: And stood in the Parliament and quoted from it ad nauseam. His morality is the morality of the gutter.

I return to the major theme of this motion. It has been demonstrated that the Leader of the Opposition is able to selectively draw strength for an argument that he is not prepared to advance when his own members and his own actions are being investigated. For so long as he tries to make the cheap political point and score the cheap political trick --

Mr MacKinnon: As you sow, so shall you reap.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: For so long as he deals --

Mr MacKinnon: As you sow, so shall you reap.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: For as long as he deals --

The SPEAKER: Order! The interjections by the Leader of the Opposition are precisely the sorts of interjections to which I was referring. All members in the House would have understood the point he was making the first time he made it. There is no need for him to make exactly the same point by using exactly the same words four or five times.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: For so long as the Leader of the Opposition seeks to score ungenerous and cheap political points; for so long as he fails to develop the constructive approach to policy that requires him to know what his members are doing; for so long as he fails, in a substantial sense, to reflect the honesty that is so lacking in this motion, he will be the Leader of the Opposition only while his members are prepared to tolerate his persistence and for no longer than that.

As far as the Government is concerned this motion is humbug. The motion shows the level at which the Opposition is, and reflects the sort of morality, cheapness and thinness that the Leader of the Opposition's spirit continually reflects.

MR COURT (Nedlands -- Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.11 pm]: What we have witnessed today is the Treasurer of this State refusing to make a commitment that he will not divulge any private information from operations such as the Teachers Credit Society, the R & I Bank, the State Energy Commission or the Water Authority. The Treasurer says that the Opposition's motion is humbug. To the contrary, it is one of the most serious and important motions that will be debated in this House. The Treasurer is becoming the laughing-stock of this State. All he could do today was to repeat his remarks about a so-called conspiracy which has already been proved to be a lot of nonsense. People are questioning that if the Treasurer knew what was going on in February, March and April and was aware of the seriousness of the situation with regard to Teachers Credit, why did not the Government do something about the situation at that time.

When the Treasurer announced publicly that the Teachers Credit Society had serious problems did members hear him say that the reason for the problems was because of the Opposition or whatever? Not at all. They heard the Treasurer say that the society had problems with some of its loans, particularly the large loans. Members heard the Chairman of the R & I Bank say that the overall handling of the society's commercial loans was unsatisfactory; members heard Mr Fischer from the R & I Bank explain the seriousness of the situation and how the management had a tiger by the tail. The red herring raised by the Government last week was part of a desperate exercise to try to cover up the reason that the Government did not do anything when it knew that this serious problem was occurring.

Mr MacKinnon: Exactly. One must ask why the Government did not raise all that at the outset.

Mr COURT: The media asked two questions and the Opposition has asked many questions and we still have not received the answer to the question, "Why, when it knew about the problem with the Teachers Credit Society, did the Government not take action at that time?"

The Treasurer made a monumental blunder last week when he released confidential information about Mr Simpson. The Opposition, in its motion today, wants the Government to give it an assurance that there will not be a repeat of that exercise. We have not received that assurance. How would the Government like to be running the R & I Bank, the Water Authority, the SEC, or one of the building societies knowing that the Treasurer, who is the person responsible, will not give a commitment to the public that he will not release more confidential information.

Mr Pearce: I will release some confidential information shortly.

Mr COURT: Of course the Leader of the House will release confidential information shortly.

Mr Pearce: You will be sad to hear it.

Mr COURT: The Leader of the House is pretty good at doing that. He can release whatever information he likes, but he must accept some of the responsibility for the red herring which was introduced by the Government last week.

What did the Opposition do in relation to the problem confronting the Teachers Credit Society? Any information it had on this matter was forwarded to the Police Department, and the Corporate Affairs Department. The shadow Cabinet made a point of ensuring that in no way would it be responsible for destroying confidence in a financial institution. The Government cannot be more responsible than was the Opposition. After all the damage has been done and the Government has admitted that there is a major problem with the Teachers Credit Society -- we have not mentioned the Swan Building Society yet because that is an issue in itself.

The last time a Treasurer became involved in confidential banking information was about 30 years ago when Mr Hawke was the Premier. At that time he sent a letter to the civil servants urging them to use the R & I Bank. The letter scared the living daylight out of the civil servants because they saw it as a direction to them to use the R & I Bank. Some members in this House may remember the furore that occurred at the time. I do not because I was only 10 years old, but I have read the newspaper reports. At the same time, officers of the R & I Bank entered Government departments during working hours and interviewed civil servants. There was a huge outcry at the time; the civil servants asked what their banking arrangements had to do with the Government. Since that time no Treasurer has released any confidential banking information except for last week when this Treasurer released such information.

Last week the Treasurer had to think up a trick to divert attention from the Teachers Credit Society and the trick he used was the conspiracy idea. He showed poor judgment and to me it was a sign of panic. Unfortunately his tactic has had a very serious effect on public confidence in the financial institutions, which surely the Treasurer should be trying to build up. The Treasurer should say in this House today, "I will give you an assurance that we will not let out that sort of information." That is not the case. All the Treasurer could do today was to speak about this airy-fairy stuff -- bath houses, gold mines, hospitals, Exim and Fremantle Gas & Coke Co Limited. Any time the Opposition has raised this sort of matter in this House it has been specific and it has been able to prove the case it has put forward.

The other concern of the Opposition is about Government advisers. When the advisers were appointed the Opposition's concern was not about the amount of money that was involved, although that was significant, but the fact that advisers were moving into senior positions in Government departments. This Government very cleverly, cunningly, and quietly has placed its political appointees in very senior positions throughout the bureaucracy. The Government thinks that is smart, but the Opposition is very concerned about some of those appointments. For example, it is concerned about who will be appointed to the position of Commissioner of Corporate Affairs. It is one of the most sensitive positions in this State. What happens is that the Government's appointees in these senior positions have access to this type of information and are able to give it to the Government. From where did the Leader of the House get the information about Mr Simpson investing in the SEC?

Mr Pearce: Not from the Teachers Credit Society.

Mr COURT: Where did he get it from? Which political hack gave him the information? From where did the Treasurer get his information about Mr Simpson's dealings with the Teachers Credit Society and the SEC? From where did the Leader of the House get the information about the SEC?

Mr Pearce: Not from the SEC.

Mr COURT: It was not from the Teachers Credit Society and it was not from the SEC -- will he tell us from where he got the information?

Mr Pearce: Last time you asked us to name someone, we did. It was Mr Simpson and you did not like it.

Mr Brian Burke: You insisted on my naming him.

Mr COURT: The Minister and the Treasurer in particular should be aware that the problem in the community with these financial institutions at the moment is one of confidence. His action today of not giving that assurance by supporting this motion is extremely serious because all those people investing or dealing with these institutions have not been given the

assurance from the No 1 person in this State who has overall responsibility that no more confidential information will be given out.

We are also concerned that all these political advisers have now been put into senior positions and two things are becoming obvious: First, they are prepared to feed this Government with confidential information and that is of great concern to us all.

Mr Hodge: How confidential should medical records be?

Mr COURT: We are debating the giving out of this information. The Government is refusing to explain where that information came from. I repeat that we have failed to receive an assurance from the Treasurer that further confidential information from these financial institutions will not be given out.

MR COWAN (Merredin -- Leader of the National Party) [3.21 pm]: The National Party supports this matter of public importance moved by the Liberal Party. I would have thought the Government would jump at the chance to be able to demonstrate that it does indeed protect the public by maintaining the confidentiality of information made available to it in its privileged position as the Government. It surprises me that that has not happened because, whether or not the Government likes it, there is a public perception that the information released about the President of the Liberal Party's financial dealings with the Teachers Credit Society and the SEC came to the Government through its position of privilege and its involvement in the rescue of the Teachers Credit Society.

Mr Brian Burke: That is wrong. I deny it, it is untrue.

Mr COWAN: The Treasurer is demonstrating it very clearly to the people of Western Australia because they believe --

Mr Brian Burke: The motion says "never again" as though it has happened before.

Mr COWAN: That is right.

Mr Brian Burke: It is not true.

Mr COWAN: You could seek to amend the motion.

Mr Brian Burke: We have not voted yet; we have one more speaker and we could still do that.

Mr COWAN: Let us hope that the Government does amend the motion. I repeat that the public perception of this situation is that the Government used its privileged position to obtain this information and then disclosed it under parliamentary privilege. The Treasurer has demonstrated how easy it is for confidential information to be leaked and used for political purposes.

Mr Brian Burke: Let me ask why you did not object to their using stolen medical records about the Minister for Conservation and Land Management?

Mr COWAN: To be frank, I do not remember the occasion; if the Treasurer checks *Hansard* he will find that I was not here at the time. The Government had an opportunity to accept this motion and demonstrate to the people of Western Australia that it would not use its position to publish confidential material.

It appears to me that the motive behind the Government's action was quite clearly to drag a red herring across the trail because to this day we still do not have information about the Teachers Credit Society. As taxpayers, we do not know how much money will need to be repaid; we do not know the extent of the lending or the security offered. None of the questions that should have been answered last week has been answered. That in itself is a despicable action by the Government -- it has taken information which people believed was confidential and has released it. The Government has done itself a great deal of damage from which it will never recover unless it gives the public some indication of exactly how it obtained that information. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, the Government must indicate that it is prepared to protect the security of people about whom that type of information has been publicly released for political purposes.

It is about time this Government and perhaps the whole Parliament addressed the issue of security in matters of confidential information. Quite clearly there is a serious lack of confidentiality and security in many areas which should remain confidential; information about such matters should never be placed before the public, especially not under parliamentary privilege.

MR PEARCE (Armadale -- Leader of the House) [3.25 pm]: The answer to the Leader of the National Party is quite simple: The Government has not made improper use of confidential records that reside with the Teachers Credit Society, the R & I Bank or the SEC.

Mr Clarko interjected.

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

Mr PEARCE: I obtained the information about Mr Simpson's financial position. That information was given to me by a source quite outside each of those institutions. I was able to check that information, as anybody would under those circumstances, and I was able to draw on the wide range of contacts I have in some areas to check the truth of the information.

Several members interjected.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! It is becoming very clear to me that certain members in this place think there is one rule for members on one side and another for members on the other side. That is not the case. To be more specific about what I am saying, when members of the Opposition rise to speak they expect to be heard virtually interjection-free. When the Leader of the House rose to speak there was an interjection before he had said more than four or five words and since then there have been numerous interjections despite the fact that not one minute has passed. If members opposite think that is a fair deal, when they get to their feet and I allow that behaviour, they should not call me into question.

Mr PEARCE: The situation is that an allegation was made by one source that I checked with a second source. I was convinced that it was true and that the release of the information was in the public interest because it seemed to bear on claims made by the Teachers Credit Society back in April that Liberal Party members had deliberately engineered a run on the Teachers Credit Society. That information about Mr Simpson's withdrawal seemed germane to that issue in two ways: It could have been, although we did not allege it, that it was part of the conspiracy to start that run or it could have been that Mr Simpson withdrew his funds because he became aware of what other people were doing. That was the information we had at the time. On the basis of the two sources and public interest in a very serious allegation affecting the life savings of 30 000 people, I produced that information publicly. It turned out to be dead accurate.

To every journalist who has rung me about the source, I have said that I applied the same test they would apply. If somebody made an allegation to them which had a ring of truth about it but they were not sure they would check that allegation with somebody else if they could. I asked what they would do if they received corroboration from a second source and were sure that it was true. Every last journalist has said that under those circumstances they would use it. That is precisely what I did in the Parliament last week. I asked some of those journalists what happens when they do this.

Mr MacKinnon: There is not one skerrick of proof that that is true.

Mr PEARCE: It is true that Mr Simpson withdrew \$150 000 from the Teachers Credit Society simultaneously with allegations that Liberal Party members were seeking to organise a run on the society. Mr Simpson has now publicly admitted the truth of that but he has claimed that there is no connection between the two; that is to say, if there were a Liberal Party members' organised run of the Teachers Credit Society -- and on 6PR Mr Simpson refused to deny that the Liberal Party members were organising a run on the society -- he denies all knowledge of it. He said he would not be taking it up with the parliamentary party. When they asked Mr Simpson to appear on the 6PR programme with me, he would not appear except on the basis that I was off-air. I indicated a willingness to appear, but on Mr Simpson's terms I would not be given a right of reply. Mr Simpson's claim was that if there were a run he did not know about it, and the withdrawal of his funds, which he concedes, was in no way related to this.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: Let me tell members about Mr Simpson's denial of the circumstances. Any journalist will confirm that if one is able to unearth an embarrassing fact like that and make it public knowledge, people start to ring up with more information. Sometimes allegations can be confirmed. I can hear the member for East Melville nodding in agreement! That is what happened in this case. Information has come to the Government from a senior Liberal Party source. I decline to name it, for obvious reasons. The Liberal Party management committee met on four occasions during April to discuss the destabilisation of the Teachers Credit Society.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: The members of the management committee are the president of the party, Mr Simpson, the senior vice president, the treasurer, the finance committee chairman, the Leader of the State Opposition, and a representative of the Federal parliamentary party, who was Senator Fred Chaney. The information came to the Government from a senior Liberal Party source. Would members opposite not die if they knew who it was! The information was that this committee met on four occasions during April to consider the destabilisation of the Teachers Credit Society. It came to the conclusion that if a run of \$20 million could be organised during that month, it would have the potential to bring down the Teachers Credit Society. In fact, on the information I gave to the House last week, close to \$20 million was taken out of the Teachers Credit Society during the period of the organised run. It is not all that difficult to get information out of the Liberal Party these days, given the factional problems the party is experiencing. Access to the minutes of these meetings is now tightly controlled. I am further advised that since May of this year the management committee has not met at all.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: With regard to those minutes, I would say, "Watch this space."

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: Are these revelations not embarrassing? The simple fact of the matter is, if anything comes out which may be potentially damaging to Mr Simpson, 40 per cent of the Liberal Party ring up and tell us what it is. It may be 55 per cent now. That approach to garnering information is one any journalist would use. There has been no improper use of records by the Government, and that is why we are rejecting the motion moved by the Opposition.

There is a real hypocrisy in the Opposition claiming untruthfully that the Government is making use of these kinds of records when the number of times the Opposition has made use of stolen documents in the Parliament has been absolutely legion in the years I have been a member of this Parliament, particularly during the four and a half years of this Government. The Premier instanced many cases. I sit next to a Minister whose private medical records were raised in this Parliament to make a scurrilous and quite untrue allegation. The private records of Mr Len Brush have been touted to journalists by Liberal members to make certain claims. On 31 March this year the member for Murchison-Eyre got up in this Parliament and went through a whole range of transactions which he alleged were conducted in and out of the Teachers Credit Society, making use of confidential records in the process.

The Opposition has not hesitated to make use of confidential records week after week in the Parliament; but when damaging information about their party's president comes out -- not by our making use of confidential records but as a result of accurate and damaging information which came to us from sources outside the type of records members opposite have used with gay abandon, which were checked in the way proper journalists do -- one can see the hypocrisy of the Opposition.

Amendment to Motion

On that basis I move an amendment --

That all words after "House" be deleted with a view to substituting the following --
notes

the continual unauthorized use of personal and confidential information by members of the Opposition for the purposes of vilification of individuals and private businesses;

the gross hypocrisy of calls by the Opposition for guarantees by the Government that personal and confidential information will not be released when the Opposition is not prepared to do the same;

that the Government has not and will not use any information obtained through its privileged position as Government.

Mr THOMAS: I second the amendment.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [3.34 pm]: Needless to say, the Opposition completely rejects the amendment, and in the minute amount of time left I want to point out that this has become a standard tactic of the Government -- to take these matters of public importance motions and twist them around with an amendment brought in at the end of the time so that no member has a chance to reply.

I want to point out that there is absolutely no comparison between the misuse of confidential information in relation to Mr Keith Simpson, a private citizen, together with suggestions of an alleged conspiracy -- of which there is not a shred of evidence -- and the material I brought to this House --

Point of Order

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member's time has expired.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would have been inclined to allow the member to finish his sentence. However, the point of order has been taken and the member's time has expired.

Amendment to Motion Resumed

Amendment (deletion of words) put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the House divided.

Remarks during Division

Mr Hassell: The Treasurer is showing his gentlemanly ways again. He doesn't want to hear the debate.

Mr Brian Burke: You used the stolen medical records of the Minister.

Mr Hassell: When people cannot reply you are a gutless Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I can tolerate some verbal interchange during periods when divisions are called but I am certainly not going to allow quarrels like that to persist.

Mr Hassell: You haven't got the courage --

The SPEAKER: Order! At least give me the opportunity to sit down.

Result of Division

The division resulted as follows --

Ayes (26)

Dr Alexander
Mrs Beggs
Mr Bertram
Mr Bridge
Mr Brian Burke
Mr Burkett
Mr Donovan
Mr Evans
Dr Gallop

Mr Grill
Mrs Henderson
Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hodge
Mr Tom Jones
Dr Lawrence
Mr Marlborough
Mr Parker
Mr Pearce

Mr Read
Mr P.J. Smith
Mr Taylor
Mr Thomas

Mr Troy
Dr Watson
Mr Wilson
Mrs Buchanan (*Teller*)

Noes (18)

Mr Bradshaw
Mr Cash
Mr Clarko
Mr Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Crane
Mr Hassell
Mr House
Mr Lewis

Mr Lightfoot
Mr MacKinnon
Mr Mensaros
Mr Schell
Mr Thompson
Mr Tubby
Mr Watt
Mr Wiese
Mr Williams (*Teller*)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr Bryce
Mr Carr
Mrs Watkins
Mr Peter Dowding
Mr D.L. Smith

Noes

Mr Rushton
Mr Blaikie
Mr Stephens
Mr Grayden
Mr Trenorden

Amendment thus passed.

Point of Order

Mr MacKINNON: Mr Speaker, I still do not have a copy of the amendment that we are supposed to be talking about.

The SPEAKER: That may well be a point of view but it is certainly not a point of order. Could a copy of the amendment be given to the Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment to Motion Resumed

Amendment (substitution of words) put and a division taken with the following result --

Ayes (26)

Dr Alexander
Mrs Beggs
Mr Bertram
Mr Bridge
Mr Brian Burke
Mr Burkett
Mr Donovan
Mr Evans
Dr Gallop
Mr Grill
Mrs Henderson
Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hodge

Mr Tom Jones
Dr Lawrence
Mr Marlborough
Mr Parker
Mr Pearce
Mr Read
Mr P.J. Smith
Mr Taylor
Mr Thomas
Mr Troy
Dr Watson
Mr Wilson
Mrs Buchanan (*Teller*)

Noes (18)

Mr Bradshaw
Mr Cash
Mr Clarko
Mr Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Crane
Mr Hassell
Mr House
Mr Lewis

Mr Lightfoot
Mr MacKinnon
Mr Mensaros
Mr Schell
Mr Thompson
Mr Tubby
Mr Watt
Mr Wiese
Mr Williams (*Teller*)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr Bryce
Mr Carr
Mrs Watkins
Mr Peter Dowding
Mr D.L. Smith

Noes

Mr Rushton
Mr Blaikie
Mr Stephens
Mr Grayden
Mr Trenorden

Amendment thus passed.

Motion, as Amended

Question put and a division taken with the following result --

Ayes (26)

Dr Alexander
Mrs Beggs
Mr Bertram
Mr Bridge
Mr Brian Burke
Mr Burkett
Mr Donovan
Mr Evans
Dr Gallop
Mr Grill
Mrs Henderson
Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hodge

Mr Tom Jones
Dr Lawrence
Mr Marlborough
Mr Parker
Mr Pearce
Mr Read
Mr P.J. Smith
Mr Taylor
Mr Thomas
Mr Troy
Dr Watson
Mr Wilson
Mrs Buchanan (*Teller*)

Noes (18)

Mr Bradshaw
Mr Cash
Mr Clarke
Mr Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Crane
Mr Hassell
Mr House
Mr Lewis

Mr Lightfoot
Mr MacKinnon
Mr Mensaros
Mr Schell
Mr Thompson
Mr Tubby
Mr Watt
Mr Wiese
Mr Williams (*Teller*)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr Bryce
Mr Carr
Mrs Watkins
Mr Peter Dowding
Mr D.L. Smith

Noes

Mr Rushton
Mr Blaikie
Mr Stephens
Mr Grayden
Mr Trenorden

Question (motion, as amended) thus passed.

SUPERANNUATION BOARD

Sub Judice: Procedures

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett): Members, I refer to my earlier statements and rulings concerning matters sub judice and the risk of prejudice to the trial or trials of certain persons connected with the operation of the State Superannuation Board.

The object of my earlier rulings was to protect those persons from the possibility of having their trials prejudiced or in some way affected by debate or statements in this House, and that will continue to be my attitude.

However, I should make it clear I am not seeking to completely eliminate the normal process of questioning the work of government which, in this context, includes the activities of the State Superannuation Board. I simply ask members who are framing questions, replies or speeches to be watchful that the areas they deal with do not come into possible conflict with the rights of individuals against whom criminal charges are proceeding.

WATER AUTHORITY AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from 9 September. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Dr Lawrence) in the Chair; Mr Bridge (Minister for Water Resources) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 5: Section 13 amended --

Progress was reported after the clause had been partly considered.

Mr BRIDGE: Discussions took place last week largely dealing with the concerns the member for Floreat had raised in this Chamber. As a result of advice I have received in respect of that matter and based upon the concerns expressed by the member for Floreat, I am quite happy to amend clause 5. I move an amendment --

Page 2, lines 29 and 30 -- To delete "by repealing subsection (3)" and substitute the following --

in subsection (3) by deleting "5" and substituting the following --

6

Mr MENSAROS: I appreciate the Minister's amendment, as this was precisely the point the Opposition argued about, and suggested the Minister do. The Opposition did not suggest that the Minister in the past was legally wrong. It is true a provision exists in the Interpretation Act which could be used. Yet the current drafting does not require reference to the Interpretation Act. The quorum should be quite clearly set out in the Act. The Minister's advisers should have taken the trouble to inform the Minister -- he could then have explained this point in his second reading speech. At least the Minister should have been briefed, making it possible for him to answer the questions put to him. This was not done, and the Minister found he did not have the information.

Be that as it may, this solution is a correct one. Many people deal with the Water Authority and, if they are required to look up the Statute governing the authority, very few of them could expect to understand the Interpretation Act, or how it relates to the Water Authority Statute. I cannot recall any existing Act pertaining to any other Government instrumentality or agency where one would be required to refer to the Interpretation Act. The Opposition supports the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL (No 2)

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Burkett) in the Chair; Mr Gordon Hill (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 5 amended --

Mr CASH: Clause 4 deals with the definition of "moped". At present it is required that mopeds also include pedals, and the intention is to change the definition so that a moped can be a vehicle or cycle without pedals. The Opposition has considered the request of the Vehicle Standards Advisory Committee, who in fact were the people who wanted a change in the definition to enable drafting of uniform Australian design rules in respect of mopeds, and will not oppose the change to the definition.

I wish to mention the comments of people who will be affected by this change. I offer no opinion as to the comments given to me because in fact the industry seems divided on whether it is a good move to have mopeds allowed to operate without pedals. I make the

points made to me by a member of the industry who explained that pedal gearing on mopeds was put in place to restrict the top speed of a moped. At present, as members know, mopeds can be ridden by drivers or cyclists at 16 years, whereas a motor driver's licence requires a person to be 17 years of age. It was suggested that the removal of the pedals from mopeds would encourage more 16-year-olds to ride this type of cycle. While the 60 kilometre per hour limit on mopeds is to remain, the suggestion was made that in the long term this change of definition could result in more accidents involving 16-year-olds.

The other point is that at present those people wishing to ride a motorcycle are required to obtain a special motorcycle driving licence. That will no longer be required in respect of mopeds, and the situation put to me is that a lot of drivers with A, B, C, and E class licences will take the opportunity to use the new type of moped under this definition. I make no comment in respect of the notes handed to me, but they are the concerns generally in the industry, and it is my duty to bring them to the attention of the Chamber.

Mr HOUSE: I do not have any argument with this clause, and I would go so far as to say that I think the licensing age for driving motor cars could well be lowered to 16 if certain provisions were put in place. However, I have some concern about the moped legislation. It is essential that people who are licensed to ride mopeds comply with all the provisions of the law observed by people who ride motorbikes or drive cars capable of doing 60kmh. That should be made clear and included in the instructions by the Minister to the Police Force.

I raise again the matter of helmets. I know the Government has taken some steps in the Budget, which I applaud, to encourage people to wear helmets by subsidising the cost. I have a minor concern about the quality of some helmets, and I ask the Minister to take this opportunity to make the Government's position clear. Will the subsidy apply only to safety-approved helmets?

Mr GORDON HILL: I thank both members for their support of the clause and the Bill generally. The member for Mt Lawley referred to national standards. This change in the Bill provides for national uniformity on this whole question so the removal of the pedals is in line with moves in other States. I appreciate the concern expressed by the Opposition; it has been expressed to me by people within my electorate who are involved in the retail motorcycle industry and others outside my electorate. The Government will ask the police to monitor the situation and if it finds the design of the mopeds has changed to facilitate greater speeds we will jump on that from a great height and change the Act again if necessary. What we have attempted to do here is to bring Western Australia into line with the other States.

The matter of compliance with the law raised by the member for Katanning-Roe is relevant. Mopeds are regarded as a type of motorcycle and their riders must comply with the law, as do all motorcyclists. So there is no relaxation of the law in respect of the Road Traffic Act for moped users. My understanding is that the subsidy on the purchase of helmets would apply only to those helmets which are approved by and meet the Australian Standards Association's standard. The Government would be keen to see that helmets which are worth promoting were the subject of the subsidy.

Mr HOUSE: I want to make it very clear that I still have some concern, even after what the Minister has said, in relation to the Police Force's judgment about whether a moped which does not have pedals is capable of doing more than 60kmh. I would hate to see somebody prosecuted for riding a moped which they felt complied with the law, but which the police felt did not. It could be a grey area which will take some sorting out. I know the Minister does not have an immediate answer but it could land someone in court, and it will not be easy to argue who is right or wrong if one looks at the legislation.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Section 66 amended --

Mr CASH: This clause deals with the Government's proposal that the police should be given the authority for random breath-testing. As the Opposition clearly set out during the second reading debate, the Government has failed miserably to demonstrate the reasons why the Opposition should support random breath-testing in Western Australia. As was pointed out,

we believe that the current wording of the Act authorises police officers to stop the drivers of vehicles who they believe have been drinking or who are likely to commit an offence while driving that vehicle. If the police find, after stopping a driver, that the person has been drinking the Act already empowers them to require the driver to undertake a breath test. I refer to the Minister's second reading speech in which he said --

It is the view of the Commissioner of Police that this approach to enforcement of drink-driving laws is effective.

The commissioner himself recognises that the present law in respect of random breath-testing is effective. The Government has failed miserably to convince the Opposition, or to present a logical argument in favour of this clause. The Minister has failed to address the question of cost. No-one knows at the moment how much individual breath tests will cost under this new proposal. No-one knows how many tests the Police Force or the Minister believe will be conducted in the first year, and no-one knows the procedure that will be adopted if this amendment becomes law. In respect of procedure, we had a situation where the Commissioner of Police and/or officers of the force have made public statements about the procedure they believe will be instituted for random breath-testing, and the Minister confused the issue by publishing other statements and making statements in this Chamber which are quite clearly designed to confuse the public. We still do not know what procedure will be used. We want to know whether booze buses are going to be used and whether the roadblock technique of stopping 50 or 60 cars will be used, or some other modified version of that procedure put in place.

The Opposition wants to know what manpower provision has been made to enable a clear definition of country policing with random breath-testing. It has been suggested that if most of the police manpower for traffic enforcement is in the metropolitan area the Police Department will not be able to treat, in a fair and equitable way, random breath-testing across the State. It has been suggested also that there are insufficient officers for traffic enforcement in the country areas, so much so that traffic enforcement officers in the country are presently unable to adequately carry out their duties, given the huge areas which they are required to control.

The Opposition again asks the Minister for Police and Emergency Services how the Police Department intends to implement random breath-testing if this legislation passes through this Committee and assuming it passes the other House and becomes law. The Opposition also wants to know what resources have been put aside to deal with random breath-testing. During the second reading debate I pointed out clearly the Eastern States' experience in which police officers were required, as a daily quota, to test 60 motorists under the random breath-testing procedure and it was found that persons committing other traffic offences were not apprehended. They did not have the manpower to stop those offenders.

When talking about police manpower one is reminded of the very effective campaign which the Police Union has run during recent months. It has drawn the Government's attention to the lack of manpower in the Police Force and one has also to consider the commissioner's remarks made in the Industrial Relations Commission late last year, or earlier this year, when he clearly stated to the commission that if a 38-hour week were to become a reality he would need additional police numbers. Those numbers to which the Commissioner of Police was referring have still not been addressed by the Government, even though it will argue that in the last Budget it increased police manpower by 100 officers. Since then, the Opposition has found out that 67 of those 100 officers were in the force because they were the special group associated with the America's Cup. The Government has identified 112 positions in the Police Force which could be filled by civil servants and this will allow those officers to carry out police work. The Opposition is not objecting to those proposals, but the Government has not addressed sufficiently the problem of manpower in the Western Australian Police Force. One has only to talk to the general duties branch, to the traffic branch or to the CIB to ascertain how they feel about the lack of manpower in the force and to witness the low morale in the force.

Will this legislation, if passed, impose an additional duty on the police officers in the prosecution of drunk drivers? The current procedure of the traffic branch is for between four

and six officers to gather on dual carriageways in the metropolitan area and conduct radar speed traps. It is my view and certainly the view of many motorists who have contacted me that this sort of activity is wasting the time of the traffic officers and that their time would be better utilised if they patrolled the streets. As an example I cite Alexander Drive -- I suggest that this is a well-engineered road -- just near Wordsworth Avenue in Mt Yokine. Quite often a squad of four, five, or six policemen is seen on the dual carriageway setting up a speed trap and many motorists believe that it is nothing more than revenue raising on behalf of the Government. While no-one is prepared to condone speed -- most people would recognise that speeding is often the cause of road accidents -- there is a need for the Police Department to use its resources as efficiently and effectively as it can. I suggest to the Minister that this is something he may wish to take up with the commissioner. It is the general view of the public that the services of the officers who continually man radar traps in the same location week after week are not being used efficiently. If those police officers were to patrol nearby roads it would be a more effective means of slowing down motorists.

During the second reading debate I made the point, on a number of occasions, that education and engineering are also very important facets of road safety. Bringing in random breath-testing in the form proposed by the Government will not be the salvation of road fatalities in Western Australia. There is no doubt in my mind that education is perhaps the most effective way to change peoples' attitudes to driving. My views are certainly supported by experts in this field. The Government would be far better off if it took a positive step in trying to educate young school children in the use of motor vehicles and the problems which exist between pedestrians and motor vehicles. It could be worked through the school curriculum so that by the time the children sat for their driver's licence they would have a better understanding of the road regulations and the general safety requirements on the road. I know that the Minister will say that the Government instituted some additional educational programmes during the last year, and the public are most grateful for the action taken by the Government. But we need an overall education programme and the Government has a long way to go before it can claim that it is satisfactorily addressing the education side of road safety.

It is important that roads be constructed in a safe manner. I mentioned earlier the incidence of road fatalities in the Australian Capital Territory and the fact that some journalists have said that because of the very fine road engineering in the ACT it would be difficult for a person to have an accident even if he were drunk. That is not the case in Western Australia and road engineering is certainly an area which the Government must address.

While the Government did not have a stated policy during the last election campaign of bringing in random breath-testing, it appears to be going against the earlier advice of expert committees that the previous Government set up to report on the various measures affecting road safety in Western Australia. In a report that was brought down in February 1981 by a committee of six people it was recommended that random breath-testing legislation should not be introduced. The committee argued in that report that the existing legislation was sufficient and that de facto random breath-testing was an efficient and effective way of monitoring the situation.

The Minister has still to convince the Parliament of the merit of this clause. The Minister failed to do that in his second reading speech, and he has failed to do it so far in the Committee stage. There are a lot of unanswered questions to which not only the Parliament but also the people of Western Australia, particularly the motorists, are entitled to an answer.

Mr Gordon Hill: What are they?

Mr CASH: The Minister has now asked me what these areas of concern are, and I hope his answers to the questions will not be as vague or as generalised and confusing as they were in the case of his proposition, which was announced in the weekend, of imposing an obligation on all motorists in Western Australia to install a particular type of steering lock on their cars; I hope the public will understand exactly what the Government intends in respect of its road safety legislation.

There are many instances of the Minister making vague statements about what he would like to do. For example, in respect of drivers between the ages of 17 and 19, we were promised

that all sorts of amendments to the legislation would be brought before this Chamber. We have yet to see them.

Mr HOUSE: During the second reading debate I outlined all the points that I thought were necessary in making it clear to the Government that the National Party did not support this clause of the Bill. I do not want to enlarge on those points in detail, except to say that I agree with the member for Mt Lawley that we have heard nothing from the Government in the debate to suggest that we should change our mind and support this clause.

I regard this Bill as being one of the most important pieces of legislation that has ever been introduced into this Chamber, because it represents a major change in the way the people of this State will go about their business. From the time that this legislation is proclaimed, the Police Force of this State will have the power to stop lawful citizens -- without any reason -- from going about their business on the pretext that they may have been drinking before they started driving. I cannot support any legislation that takes away people's civil liberties, as I believe this legislation does. I admit that we have a problem on our roads, and nobody condones drinking and driving, but this legislation is a gross overreaction to that problem, and I do not condone such a heavy-handed law.

I was pleased to see the Premier make some pertinent points on television last weekend about further education regarding the sensible use of alcohol. That is exactly the sort of thing we should be doing, and I congratulate the Premier; but I cannot congratulate him on this piece of legislation because it just goes too far.

Not very long ago, parents used to tell their children that if they got into trouble, they should stop a policeman and ask him to help them. However, unfortunately one now hears those same parents saying all sorts of things to their children about policemen, most of which are not very nice. This all stems from the day that we allowed the general Police Force, as opposed to the road traffic police, to take control of traffic in this State. In small country towns like the one in which I live, we regard policemen as part of the community. They take part in all the sporting events and social activities that go on in our community, and they are accepted as friends. We are now going to make a law which will make it very difficult for policemen to take part in the community without being seen as ogres in the way they go about their job. I see no reason to change my mind in respect of this clause, and I intend to vote against it.

Mr CRANE: This part of the legislation concerns me greatly. As has been adequately outlined by the members for Mt Lawley and Katanning-Roe, this clause will give the police the authority to apprehend innocent people when going about their lawful business, which is not the sort of legislation we should be considering in this Parliament. We all want to control drinking and driving, but in doing so we should not have to stoop to such levels as apprehending innocent people -- a practice contrary to the principles of British justice and to all the morals we have been taught as young people growing up in society. It will be a very sad day for Western Australians if this legislation becomes law, and I hope that will never happen. We cannot allow this legislation to become law.

The Government has not given us an adequate reason why it is necessary to stoop to these levels of degradation in our society. We are entitled to be told why the legislation is necessary. As I said during the second reading debate, this legislation brings back to many of us shades of Germany in the 1930s. The Waffen-SS and the Gestapo are well remembered by many of us. This legislation is the type of legislation which allows that type of conduct to happen. No honest, free-thinking, decent person in our society should allow this legislation to become law.

Random breath testing is not necessary in the way in which this legislation would permit it to occur because if police officers have reason to believe a driver ought to be examined, this can be done already. The police do have a responsibility, and the present legislation allows them to make such an examination if they believe it is necessary. I have been picked up while driving along the road, and asked by a police officer whether I had been drinking, and I said, "Yes, I have. I have had several cups of coffee and several cups of tea."

Mr Gordon Hill: Did you regard that as an infringement of your civil liberties?

Mr CRANE: No, because at the time when I was picked up, I was driving faster than I should have been, and the policeman was quite correct in stopping me. I was driving along the Brand Highway, and was coming back from a meeting in Jurien Bay, and I was wrapped in thought because there were a lot of problems associated with that meeting which I had just attended, and I must admit the car was going faster than it should have been. I was apprehended for speeding, but at the same time the policeman asked me whether I had been drinking, and I gave him that answer, and the policeman must have been satisfied with it. The policeman looked at my licence -- I do not know whether he knew who I was; I did not tell him -- and I did receive an infringement for speeding at that time.

So there is no reason why the police cannot stop and apprehend people. The policeman could have apprehended me on the pretext that my rear tail light was not working properly if he had wanted to, and I would not have minded. I do not mind being picked up on the roads for those sorts of things if the police believe there is a reason to do so; but I do object strenuously to any law which will allow innocent people to be interfered with while carrying out their normal private business.

This clause therefore cannot be accepted by this side of the Chamber, certainly not by me. I will not support it; I will definitely oppose it. I believe, by way of what I have heard from many people with whom I have had discussions on this matter, that they are opposed to it also. They are concerned about the drinking problem but this is not the way to handle it at all. It just gives unnecessary powers to people who can be very unscrupulous in the way in which they handle those powers. As members of Parliament we all have -- perhaps one does not see it in the metropolitan area, but we do in country areas -- fairly close liaison with police officers throughout our electorates. I have a very close, friendly and happy relationship with the police officers in my electorate but from time to time we get one or two officers who leave a little to be desired. Probably other members have experienced this; I most certainly have. It is unfortunate but the police themselves admit that this is so and they are trying to do something about it.

I have a high regard for the police and for the commissioner, and for the way in which they endeavour to conduct their business, but I do not believe that we should go so far as to give them the powers that this legislation would give them. As has been said previously, I do not support this legislation and I hope that our arguments can convince the Minister and the Government to go easy on this particular clause because they are in the wrong and they will be proven to be wrong. If they wish to bludgeon this through, they will do so at their own cost.

Mr WIESE: A great many motorists using the roads are completely law-abiding citizens. They are not out there drinking and driving; they go out of their way to drive carefully and to obey the laws of the land. They will now be put in a position, if this clause is passed, that when driving along quite lawfully and legitimately they will be compelled to pull over and to undergo a breath test. If I were ever in that situation, I would resent that sort of treatment, and so would the majority of people affected by this legislation, if it is passed.

I believe that road safety is about educating people and encouraging them to abide by the laws relating to driving on our roads. If we are to have adequate road safety in a State as vast as this, we must depend on the public to comply with the laws because they know that those laws are fair, reasonable, sensible and that they contribute to the safety of all people on the roads. One will never achieve road safety by threats or coercion, and that is what this legislation is all about. This move will only cause a build-up of resentment by otherwise perfectly sensible, law-abiding people. Why should they be stopped for absolutely no reason when they have committed no offence and have done nothing whatever to bring the police down upon them, except that they are out driving on the roads?

It has already been stated that the police have all the powers they need to apprehend the drink-driving motorist. The police are performing perfectly satisfactorily under the present law. I believe that this clause is the wrong way to go about improving road safety; it is not the way to get the cooperation of the motorist. I am opposed to this clause.

Mr GORDON HILL: What we have heard this afternoon is a re-run of arguments that were presented by the Opposition in the second reading debate. Nothing new has come up in

relation to this clause and the points raised by the Opposition have already been answered by the Government. I do not wish to dwell for too long on the points raised by a rather mediocre Opposition. The arguments presented by the Opposition today are a misrepresentation of the position that the Police Department and the Police Force in Western Australia through the Commissioner of Police have presented to me. I have indicated previously the view of the Commissioner of Police in respect of the way random breath-testing will operate in this State. I indicated that last week in the second reading debate when I read from the memorandum put to me by the Commissioner of Police, which I promised to send to members of the Opposition in the upper Chamber -- and I have done so -- and which indicates precisely the way in which random breath-testing will operate in Western Australia.

It has been explained and there is absolutely no suggestion, as the member for Mt Lawley said, that the police will utilise so-called booze buses. On the contrary, the Government and the Commissioner of Police have said quite clearly that it is not, and never has been, the intention of the Police Force in Western Australia to use booze buses in this policing. Booze buses are regarded as labour intensive. The system which will apply in Western Australia is far from that; it would merely serve to enhance policing performance in Western Australia by the formalisation of the system which exists in this State. What we propose and what the Commissioner of Police in this State seeks to give the Police Force is the opportunity to be mobile, to deploy staff at a moment's notice and not to have to tie itself down to so-called booze buses, where it is required to go through a re-testing procedure.

I remind members opposite that this measure is introduced at the same time as we have introduced the Draeger Alcotest breathalyser equipment. That whole process of random breath-testing people for drinking while driving will be sped up as a result of the measures in this Bill. I remind members also of the point of view expressed by the Commissioner of Police to me in a letter, which was that in effect the point which appears to have been missed in the article -- that is, an article in the newspaper which quotes the Leader of the Opposition on random breath-testing -- is that measures which maximise the exposure of drivers to close observation by patrolmen should act as a deterrent to drink-driving. He added in the letter to me that it was not necessary, nor was it intended, to require every motorist stopped to undergo a breath test. That is the position at the moment; not every motorist stopped is required to undergo a breath test. That is the position which will apply with the acceptance of this Bill by the other place.

Mr Lightfoot: Is that part of the legislation?

Mr GORDON HILL: That is the system of random breath-testing that will operate under this legislation. The members of the Opposition are in effect saying when they say that the Government has failed to address this issue and to demonstrate the need for random breath-testing, that the Commissioner of Police himself and the Police Force have failed to demonstrate the need for random breath-testing. That is patently untrue; the Commissioner of Police has indicated consistently in recent years, with the availability of the new equipment the State Government has provided to the Police Force, his desire to see random breath-testing introduced. The Commissioner of Police has indicated his desire to see random breath-testing introduced and in so doing has demonstrated the need for it. The system will mean that we will see a better utilisation of resources within the Police Force; it will be less manpower-intensive than the current system because the whole process of imposing road blocks as we do now will be sped up.

Members opposite refer to the costs involved. Quite clearly there is no additional cost; in fact the costs will be less than those which currently apply while we are tying up police resources and having to meet heavy man-hour commitments.

The Opposition has shown a lack of knowledge about policing in this State as it has done consistently. There is no inconsistency between my view and the view expressed by the commissioner, and certainly the Opposition has failed to demonstrate any such inconsistency. The Opposition continues to raise half truths, untruths and total misrepresentations about the commissioner's attitudes.

The question of man-hours raised by the member for Mt Lawley is a red herring, and he knows it. This Government has a very proud record of providing the manpower needed by

the Police Force in Western Australia. Perhaps it is true that we will never be able to satisfy the manpower requirements or desires of the Police Force and the community in this State, but we have a proud record, one which the Opposition cannot hold a candle to. During the Opposition's time in Government it failed miserably in this respect, and it knows very well that we have gone beyond our commitment to provide the manpower resources wanted by the Police Department, because in this year's Budget we have increased the real strength of the Police Force and, additionally, have provided extra public servants to allow police officers to be deployed on operational duties.

The member for Mt Lawley's comments about the way in which police officers are used by the traffic branch in establishing road blocks is a criticism of the Commissioner of Police's deployment of his resources. The member knows full well that I as Minister do not direct the police in operational matters, and nor should I. He also knows that I am not going to tell police officers to go out on to the roads and catch people for whatever reason. The member's criticism of the use of road blocks is in fact a criticism of the commissioner himself, and for that the member should be ashamed of himself. We know that the member for Mt Lawley does not have a good relationship with the senior levels of the Police Force. I know that when he attends functions attended by the Commissioner of Police, the member totally ignores the commissioner; he will not go near him because he is embarrassed by his continual criticisms of the commissioner, criticisms made in the Parliament and publicly.

The member for Mt Lawley introduced a red herring today when commenting on this manpower question and the way police are deployed. I have a very close relationship with the Commissioner of Police, and the Government as a whole believes he is an outstanding commissioner in charge of an outstanding Police Force. I am sick and tired of the member for Mt Lawley's continual criticism of the commissioner.

The Opposition does not have an understanding of the way in which random breath-testing will work. It does not understand policing in this State, something it has demonstrated time and time again. Members opposite should take their heads out of the sand. Had they read the views expressed by the commissioner in a memorandum addressed to me which I quoted during my response to the second reading debate, they would have had clearly explained to them the whole argument for random breath-testing and the way it should operate in this State.

Mr CASH: Members just saw a demonstration of a person who was out of his depth. The Minister for Police and Emergency Services obviously does not understand his own legislation. He tried to tell us that there would be a particular and specific procedure involved with random breath-testing, yet when challenged by the Opposition to say whether the legislation clearly outlines that procedure, he had to admit that the legislation did not address it at all.

Members of the Opposition well know that under this legislation the police will be able to use booze buses if they so desire. If it is that they are not to use booze buses, if it is that that is the way the Minister and the commissioner intend it to be, then maybe there is a need to amend the Bill. Or is it just a case of the Government, for the sake of a few words, dreaming up at its whim just how it believes things are going to operate? We have seen this before, where, when challenged, Ministers will invent anything as long as they believe the words they utter will get them off the hook. The Minister for Police and Emergency Services has failed miserably. How can members have confidence in him when he is unable to address the very points that the Opposition raised and sought clarification on? He ranted and raved but failed, as is usual, and resorted to personal abuse, much of which was obviously directed at me.

The Minister seemed to indicate that I did not have a good relationship with the Police Force in Western Australia. Of all members in the Chamber I have perhaps the best relationship with our Police Force and I believe I have a very good relationship with the commissioner and the senior officers of the force. That is demonstrated in the confidence they show in me by keeping me advised of current events within the force. I cannot help it if the Minister suffers from paranoia when it comes to Opposition comments on police matters. The comments we make reflect the facts in Western Australia. Regrettably the Minister is unable to come to grips with that.

The Minister does not understand the operations of the Police Force. From time to time at public meetings, when the Minister has come in for severe criticism from members of the public for the Government's failure to deal with law and order, I have used the excuse on behalf of the Minister that it is because he is immature and does not understand. But I can only go so far. The Minister, by the very words he utters, condemns himself, not only in the eyes of members here but in the eyes of members of the Police Force and, worse than that in the eyes of the public, who expect more from a Minister.

When challenged in the Parliament the Minister often runs for cover and he is forever saying, when cornered, that something is "a police matter" or that we should discuss it with the commissioner. What responsibility does the Minister accept when it comes to the police? No-one seems to know. One day something is an operational matter; the next it is a policy matter; the next, as was the case this morning on the Diana Warnock show, it is a clear demonstration of a Minister who really does not understand the Premier's comments the other day about steering locks.

It was disappointing to hear the Minister's views on the proposed steering lock when questioned by both the presenter of the programme and by members of the public who rang in to the programme this morning. He was obviously out of touch with his department. If he decides to put a steering lock on his car, I suggest that he does not get a combination lock because he will forget the combination. He should get himself a lock with three keys. The Minister has not convinced the Opposition of the merits of this proposal. I understand why the Opposition will not be able to support this clause. We already have a satisfactory system of "de facto" random breath-testing on the Statute book.

I suggest that the Government attempt to achieve its aims by public education. Numerous reports have been published on the value of educating young children on road safety but the Government has not addressed that matter. Some very good courses are available currently which the Government would do well to investigate. One excellent course provided by the Edith Hart Education Centre is the court diversionary pilot programme on which most members of this House have been addressed. I have seen the letters returned to the organisation, all of which support the programme. Should the Minister for Police and Emergency Services require any further information on that programme, the educational centre would be pleased to discuss it with him.

Mr CRANE: Again I express my disappointment at the response of the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. I suppose we cannot put a man's head on a boy's shoulders. He does not appear to be able to grasp the situation and explain it adequately to the general public. Laws are made for the guidance of wise men and the obedience of fools. However, they must be good laws. This law will not be accepted by the community. If it is it will create a great deal of resentment between the community and the police, the very thing we do not want to happen. We want to see a warmer relationship between the police and the general public.

When speaking last week in the second reading debate, I referred to the educational programme of Sergeant Chris Morter at Moora and how well it was accepted by the school children of the district. People are still talking about it. We should be encouraging that sort of programme in an attempt to improve relations between the public and the police.

This clause is as repressive a clause as this Parliament could pass. It allows the police to apprehend people for something they have not done on the pretext that they may have done it. Will the Minister for Health introduce legislation shortly allowing for the Health Department to randomly test people for AIDS? What is the difference? In both cases people are being rounded up and examined for something that they may not be guilty of. Where is the justice in that?

I believe that one of the greatest menaces on the road is not the drunk driver on whom alcohol can be detected but the person who is incapacitated from using marijuana on whom its use cannot be detected. We would be accepting our responsibilities if we introduced legislation to prevent that from occurring.

This clause will do nothing to solve a very serious problem. It will alienate the police from the community. I believe that, if this legislation is passed, within two or three years the public will have complete disregard for the police. That will be a sad day for this State and for the general community.

The member for Mt Lawley claimed that he has probably the best relationship of all members with the police. I challenge him on that. If he has he is certainly in big with them because I believe I also have the respect of the police. I have never failed to support them in the conduct of their duty. I am concerned, though, that having apprehended criminals, the courts do not do their duty; but that is another matter.

I believe the Minister is too young, not only in age, but also in experience, for the responsible job he has been given. His actions have shown that he is not up to the job. If we are to gain the respect of the police for the community and vice versa we must pass sensible legislation in this Parliament which can be accepted and will be adhered to. This will cause a great rift between the public at large and the police, and that will be a very sad state of affairs for us in Western Australia.

The Government has already decided what it is going to do; it is quite obvious that the debate in Parliament is a wasted exercise. Decisions have already been made before we have the opportunity of debating them; what we say will make no difference at all. I hope that perhaps some other members -- the Minister for Police and Emergency Services is beyond redemption as far as this legislation is concerned -- and the Government will take another look at what it is doing, taking into account the things I have said and the reasons I have said them. The relationship between the public and the police will be shattered if such legislation as this is allowed to proceed. Therefore, I most strenuously oppose this clause.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result --

Ayes (25)

Dr Alexander
Mrs Beggs
Mr Bertram
Mr Bridge
Mr Brian Burke
Mr Donovan
Mr Evans
Dr Gallop
Mr Grill
Mrs Henderson
Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Hodge
Mr Tom Jones

Dr Lawrence
Mr Marlborough
Mr Parker
Mr Pearce
Mr Read
Mr P.J. Smith
Mr Taylor
Mr Thomas
Mr Troy
Dr Watson
Mr Wilson
Mrs Buchanan (*Teller*)

Noes (18)

Mr Bradshaw
Mr Cash
Mr Clarko
Mr Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Crane
Mr Hassell
Mr House
Mr Lewis

Mr Lightfoot
Mr MacKinnon
Mr Mensaros
Mr Schell
Mr Thompson
Mr Tubby
Mr Wan
Mr Wiese
Mr Williams (*Teller*)

Pairs

Ayes

Mr Bryce
Mr Carr
Mrs Watkins
Mr Peter Dowding
Mr D.L. Smith

Noes

Mr Rushton
Mr Blaikie
Mr Stephens
Mr Grayden
Mr Trenorden

Clause thus passed.

Clause 7 put and passed.

Clause 8: Section 68 amended --

Mr CASH: I seek some advice from the Minister in respect of the words used in his amendment regarding the Alcotest meter. Can he tell me whether the results of the meter will be conclusive evidence in a court and, if so, is there any appeal provision in respect of the use of the machine?

Mr Gordon Hill: Is the member asking whether it is admissible?

Mr CASH: No, I did not say "admissible". There is a clear distinction between the words "admissible" and "conclusive". I asked the Minister whether the results of the machine will be deemed to be conclusive evidence when they are presented in a court and also, what, if any, are the appeal provisions in respect of a machine not working or the methods used in obtaining the breath sample for analysis?

Mr GORDON HILL: The machine is self-testing and that is prima facie evidence which would be examined by the court.

Mr Cash: Prima facie and conclusive are two different things. You have not answered the question.

Mr HOUSE: I wish to raise a question in regard to proposed subsection (7) which reads as follows --

If the breath analysing equipment does not indicate a result in the prescribed manner at the conclusion of the analysis, the authorized person may again require the person to provide a sample of his breath for analysis or to allow a medical practitioner to take a sample of his blood for analysis under section 66 (2).

I raised this matter with the Minister privately because I had some fear about it and I raise it again because I would like his answer incorporated into *Hansard* for future reference. It seems that under the provisions of this Bill the police would have an opportunity to re-take the breath sample ad infinitum because the Bill does not specify how many times the equipment may be deemed to have failed before the police give up analysing the breath or the blood sample of a person being tested. This is an important point because it could allow a charge of harassment to be made against the police. Such a charge may not necessarily be correct but it leaves the police in some doubt about where they stand. I would like the Minister to be clear about his understanding of this clause in relation to how many times the police could deem the machine to have failed.

Mr GORDON HILL: As previously stated in the second reading debate on this Bill, I understand that there is provision for only one additional test. When the question was asked previously I indicated that I would seek further clarification from the department to ensure the accuracy of my comment. I have yet to receive a response from the department. However, if the view expressed by the commissioner is contrary to mine, I will ensure that the Bill is amended in the Legislative Council.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 and 10 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Gordon Hill (Minister for Police and Emergency Services), and transmitted to the Council.

GAMING COMMISSION BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mrs Beggs (Minister for Racing and Gaming), and transmitted to the Council.

MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVERS INSTRUCTORS AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 28 May.

MR CASH (Mt Lawley) [5.14 pm]: This Bill seeks to make two changes to the Motor Vehicle Drivers Instructors Act. They are basically administrative in so far as they seek to increase the penalties in sections 5 and 14.

As members will be aware, section 5 refers to the requirement for driving instructors to be licensed. At the moment the penalty for instructing someone wanting to obtain a motor vehicle driver's licence when that instructor is not licensed attracts a penalty of up to \$200. The intention of the Bill is to increase that penalty to \$1 000. While members may believe that that is a substantial increase, there have been instances recently where a number of people have been charged with attempting to teach others the basic rudiments of driving in return for payment when they have not been licensed instructors. This has occurred mainly within the ethnic community, and the motor vehicle instructors' industry has been very concerned at some of the cases which have been brought before the courts. The Parliament will be aware of recent cases where some Vietnamese and other foreign unlicensed instructors have created a problem for the police, and that area needs to be addressed. While this is a matter that the Opposition is prepared to support, the Government needs to look at the current qualifications for driving instructors in Western Australia.

Much has been said in recent weeks about the need to improve road traffic safety. I return to the point I raised during the last Bill only a few minutes ago concerning the need for the right sort of education for young drivers. If we are to educate our young drivers in a proper manner, there is a need to upgrade the qualifications of driving instructors in Western Australia. I know that is supported in general by members of the industry. The Opposition will support the proposed increases in the penalty for people who are not licensed instructors but are teaching others to drive while receiving payment for it.

Section 14, which this Bill intends to amend, provides for the Government to make regulations as set out in the Act. At the moment a penalty of \$100 is provided for a breach of those regulations. As a result of the Government's financial management system for reviewing fines, fees and general infringement penalties, it has seen fit to increase that

penalty from \$100 to \$500. In view of the time lag since the penalty was last reviewed, the Opposition will also support that amendment.

MR GORDON HILL (Helena -- Minister for Police and Emergency Services) [5.18 pm]: I thank the Opposition for supporting this legislation.

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

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Gordon Hill (Minister for Police and Emergency Services), and transmitted to the Council.

WILLS AMENDMENT BILL*Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Peter Dowding (Minister for Works and Services), read a first time.

Second Reading

MR PETER DOWDING (Maylands -- Minister for Works and Services) [5.22 pm]: I move --

That the Bill be now read a second time.

At present the Wills Act requires that certain formalities must be complied with in order for a will to be valid. Similar provisions exist in other States of Australia and the United Kingdom. The primary purpose of the formalities is to ensure that the document is, in fact, the will of the deceased and not merely a draft or a fraudulently prepared document. These formalities are also said to help protect against duress or undue influence, and to impress upon the testator the importance of the document.

In all jurisdictions in which the formalities exist, their very strict requirements have resulted in cases in which a document clearly intended to be a will and made without any shadow of impropriety has been held invalid. A Western Australian example is a case in which a husband and wife prepared wills at the same time, read and approved the contents, but inadvertently each signed the other's will. The wills were therefore not valid. In Western Australia, about five to seven invalid wills are presented to the court each year. The actual incidence of invalid wills may be higher, as it is likely that some clearly defective wills are simply not submitted for grant of probate.

In November 1985 the Law Reform Commission reported on the desirability of modifying the need for strict compliance with the formalities of the Wills Act. The commission considered two alternatives, the Queensland model of "substantial compliance" and South Australian legislation which allows a court to dispense with formalities in certain circumstances.

In Queensland, if a document is in "substantial" compliance -- that is, virtually complete compliance -- with the formalities, the court may uphold it if satisfied that it expresses the testamentary intention of the testator. In South Australia, the court may allow all formalities to be dispensed with and hold a will valid if, notwithstanding the lack of formalities, the court has no reasonable doubt that the document was intended to constitute a will. It appears that the mistakenly signed wills in the Western Australian case referred to would have been validated under the South Australian legislation, but would still fail under the Queensland provision. The commission recommended that the South Australian approach be followed.

Opinion is divided within the legal profession as to the preferable course. The comments received by the commission were divergent, although most preferred the South Australian approach. Law reform agencies also differ. For example, the New South Wales Law Reform Commission favours the South Australian approach, the United Kingdom Law Reform Committee recommended against it, and the working party appointed by the Victorian Attorney General was divided on the issue, with a majority preferring the South Australian approach.

This Bill adopts the approach taken by South Australia, as recommended by the Western Australian Law Reform Commission. The provisions of the Bill are applied by clause 9 to the wills of persons dying after the amendment comes into operation and are applied not only to a new will but also to the alteration, revocation, and revival of a will. Consequential amendments ensure that references in the Wills Act to a will "executed" -- that is, signed by the testator -- are also read as referring to wills validated under the new provision.

By clause 9 -- proposed section 34 -- it is provided that "a document" may be validated under this new dispensing power. The Attorney General invited comments on the words "a document". On the basis of comments received, the Government has come to the conclusion that the words "a document" should not preclude the possibility of more than one document being considered in order to constitute a valid will. An example of where two documents

might need to be considered under proposed section 34 is where one document was or purported to be a will, and the other document was or purported to be a codicil. In such circumstances the Government considers that the wills legislation should not restrict the operation of proposed section 34 to only a single document and that the ordinary application of section 10(c) of the Interpretation Act 1984, which provides that the singular includes the plural, should apply.

The principal safeguard against too wide an application of the power to validate a will is found in the standard of proof; in case of the making, alteration, revocation, or revival of a will the Supreme Court must always be satisfied that "there can be no reasonable doubt" concerning the testator's intention.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Mensaros.

[Questions taken.]

House adjourned at 6.02 pm

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
SUPERANNUATION BOARD**

Investments: International Fisheries

1223. Mr MacKINNON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Has the State Superannuation Board invested in a business known as International Fisheries?
- (2) When was the investment made?
- (3) How is the board authorised to invest in operating businesses?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 30 September 1986 and 8 December 1986.
- (3) Shares in INF Ltd were purchased by Perpetual Trustees as trustee for the SB Investment Trust. The Superannuation Board holds all the issued units in this trust. The purchase of shares in INF Ltd is an authorised investment for the trust.

Originally it was believed that this question might touch upon matters that are sub judice. It appears that it does not. However, it is difficult to know which of the board's investments may be the subject of consideration by the courts, and I will continue to exercise caution in these matters.

TEACHERS CREDIT SOCIETY

Audits

1470. Mr MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

During the last five years, when were the books of the Teachers Credit Society audited by the Registry of Building Societies or any other statutory body which is responsible for registering and deregistering credit unions-societies?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Audited accounts were presented by the society in accordance with the Credit Union Act in each of the last five years.

TEACHERS CREDIT SOCIETY

Audited Accounts: Tabling

1483. Mr MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Will he table the last officially audited accounts of the Western Australian Teachers Credit Society and the Swan Building Society?
- (2) If he is not prepared to do so, or if there are no late audited accounts available, will he show the major debtors to whom the two societies have lent money with the respective amounts owed, so that public suspicion of untoward dealings may be dispelled?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The 1986 audited accounts are publicly available and I will request the registrar to forward the member copies.
- (2) Not applicable.

HEALTH: NURSE

College Row School, Bunbury

1492. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has a nurse been appointed to the College Row School in Bunbury?
- (2) If so, when will the appointment commence?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1) and (2) A nurse has been selected to commence during October 1987 at College Row School.

WILDLIFE: RABBITS

Farming: Myxomatosis

1537. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the scheme to immunise rabbits against myxomatosis been implemented to permit rabbit farming to take place?
- (2) Because myxomatosis is still having a considerable impact on the control of wild rabbits in Western Australia, is there any risk of immunity spreading to wild rabbits?
- (3) Is he aware that some local authorities and farmers have expressed extreme concern over this move?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) The Australian Agricultural Council has agreed that vaccines against myxomatosis will not be permitted for commercial rabbit farming in Australia. This State will conform with that decision.

(2) and (3) Not applicable.

WILDLIFE: EMUS

Farming: Licences

1538. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Following the announcement that emu farming is to be permitted in Western Australia, what arrangements are currently in place to ensure the fair and acceptable distribution of licences for emu chicks, taking cognisance of the fact that the Emu Farmers Association of Australia has put forward recommendations concerning this issue?
- (2) How many licences for emu farming have been granted?
- (3) Why was the Emu Farmers Association of Western Australia not consulted before the format for pricing and distribution of emu chicks was put in place?
- (4) Does he envisage the Ngangganawili Community at Wiluna controlling the future development of the emu industry when so few chicks are available?
- (5) Is Dromaius Enterprises able to sell emus under the same licence as the Ngangganawili Community after having received special concessions from the Government?
- (6) In the obvious light of the need for a stud breeder to select his parent stock from where he sees fit, how does he expect the emu industry to advance when the only stock permitted to farmers is to come from the Wiluna farm, which has no history of breeding emus with a commercial result in mind?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) The Minister for Conservation and Land Management has final responsibility for the issue of licences for emu farming. However, the Agriculture Department will be processing applications and making recommendations on suitable applicants to the Minister for CALM. It is proposed that there should be an open auction for the Ngangganawili emu chicks. All suitable applicants will be able to bid for chicks in lots of 100, with the community indicating a reserve price. Successful applicants will receive licences.

(2) Two.

(3) There has been extensive consultation with all parties, through the establishment of a large interdepartmental working party, in endeavouring to arrive at a decision to proceed with commercial farming and sale of emu chicks. It is hard to imagine a more open, equitable, or commercially realistic means of selling the current stock of emu chicks than by open auction. The sellers of the chicks have every right to set a reserve price.

(4) No.

(5) Yes.

(6) The member's assertions are incorrect. The Wiluna farm is a good source of breeding stock, does have a history of breeding emus with a commercial result in mind, and has at least 600 surplus chicks this year, which would be ideal breeding stock. I am informed that the only other licensee, Dromaius Enterprises, does not have surplus chicks for sale.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Information Files: Private Citizens

1540. Mr COWAN, to the Premier:

Is the answer given by the Minister for Industry and Technology to question 988 of 1987 Government policy?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Government does not believe that it is appropriate for any individual agency or person to have unrestricted access to any central register of all personal data.

Access should be restricted to information that is required by departments and authorities for the proper performance of their duties, and should be subject to stringent safeguards and standards of accountability.

TEACHERS CREDIT SOCIETY

Treasurer's Involvement

1542. Mr COWAN, to the Treasurer:

(1) Is it a fact, as reported in *The Times on Sunday* of 30 August 1987 in an article entitled "Captain Clean calls in cops", that he and Mr Alex Clark of the Teachers Credit Society met once a week prior to his intervention in the society's affairs?

(2) If yes, were those meetings of a private nature or were they related to public business?

(3) When was Mr Clark first made aware of his intention to intervene in the affairs of the Teachers Credit Society?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) I understand that the Chairman of the Teachers Credit Society advised Mr Clark of his intention to seek Government assistance on 7 August 1987.

TEACHERS CREDIT SOCIETY

Documents: Tabling

1544. Mr COWAN, to the Treasurer:

Will he table all documents relating to the Teachers Credit Society from which information has been leaked and subsequently published in the media?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Documents held by Government contain matters that are commercially confidential to clients and their banker, and they will not be tabled.

I cannot be held responsible for documents which may have been leaked by others.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

Travel Costs

1556. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

(1.) Is he prepared to detail the costs involved of all Ministerial travel over the past twelve months including --

- (a) the purposes of the trips undertaken by the Ministers;
- (b) the costs involved in those tours;
- (c) the persons accompanying the Ministers on those tours?

(2.) If not, why not?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

See reply to question 285 of 7 April 1987.

MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Teachers Credit Society: Action

1567. Mr COURT, to the Treasurer:

When the Minister for Housing was the Minister responsible for credit unions, why, when the Government became aware of problems confronting the Teachers Credit Society in December 1986 as stated on 22, 23, and 24 August 1987, did the Minister not use his authority under section 158 of the Credit Unions Act?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The registry was transferred to Treasury on 24 October 1986, and I was therefore the Minister responsible for its operation at that time.

I was verbally advised by Government officers of liquidity problems, and I was told no action was required because the R & I had made a normal commercial decision to address the problem, and had done so.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Tenancies: Construction

1569. Mr LEWIS, to the Minister for Housing:

How many residential tenancies has Homeswest had built to supplement the existing residential rental inventories in the following towns in the years indicated --

(1) Capel --

- (a) 1984-85;
- (b) 1985-86;
- (c) 1986-87?

(2) Busselton --

- (a) 1984-85;
- (b) 1985-86;
- (c) 1986-87?

(3) Margaret River --

- (a) 1984-85;
- (b) 1985-86;
- (c) 1986-87?

- (4) Bunbury townsite and adjacent residential areas within the Bunbury region --
- (a) 1984-85;
 - (b) 1985-86;
 - (c) 1986-87?

Mr WILSON replied:

Housing unit completions are as follows --

- (1) Capel --
 - (a) 2;
 - (b) 3;
 - (c) 8.
- (2) Busselton --
 - (a) 51;
 - (b) 26;
 - (c) 15.
- (3) Margaret River --
 - (a) Nil;
 - (b) 12;
 - (c) 2.
- (4) Bunbury townsite and adjacent residential areas --
 - (a) 90;
 - (b) 68;
 - (c) 77.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Tenancies: Inventory

1570. Mr LEWIS, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many tenancies are on the Homeswest inventory of residential tenancies within the South West Legislative Council Province?
- (2) How many tenancies are on the Homeswest inventory of residential tenancies within --
 - (a) Busselton townsite;
 - (b) Capel townsite;
 - (c) Margaret River townsite,
 - (d) the Bunbury townsite and adjoining residential suburbs?
- (3) What is the breakdown of the residential tenancies in the following categories within the Bunbury townsite and its adjoining suburbs --
 - (a) bed sitting units;
 - (b) one-bedroom flats;
 - (c) two-bedroom flats;
 - (d) two-bedroom town houses-duplexes;
 - (e) three-bedroom town houses-duplexes;
 - (f) two-bedroom detached houses;
 - (g) three-bedroom detached houses,
 - (h) other categories?

Mr WILSON replied:

(1) There are 1 354 residential tenancies. I advise the member that Homeswest does not keep statistical information on an electoral boundary basis. To compile the answer to this question required the deployment of an officer from normal duties.

(2) Number of residential tenancies in --

(a)	Busselton townsite	269;
(b)	Capel townsite	39;
(c)	Margaret River townsite	32;
(d)	Bunbury townsite and adjoining residential suburbs	1 004.

(3) Breakdown of residential tenancies in Bunbury townsite and its adjoining suburbs --

(a)	Bed sitting units	28;
(b)	one-bedroom flats	67;
(c)	two-bedroom flats	69;
(d)	two-bedroom town house-duplex	78;
(e)	three-bedroom town house-duplex	102;
(f)	two-bedroom detached house	77;
(g)	three-bedroom detached house	460;
(h)	other categories	123.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Tenancies: Applications

1571. Mr LEWIS, to the Minister for Housing:

What was the official number of applications on the Homeswest waiting lists for rental accommodation in the following townsites as at the following dates --

(1) Capel --

- (a) 30 June 1985;
- (b) 30 June 1986;
- (c) 30 June 1987?

(2) Busselton --

- (a) 30 June 1985;
- (b) 30 June 1986;
- (c) 30 June 1987?

(3) Margaret River --

- (a) 30 June 1985;
- (b) 30 June 1986;
- (c) 30 June 1987?

(4) Bunbury townsite and adjacent residential areas within the Bunbury region --

- (a) 30 June 1985;
- (b) 30 June 1986;
- (c) 30 June 1987?

Mr WILSON replied:

Applications on hand as at 30 June each year were --

	1985	1986	1987	
(1) Capel	9	6	(-)	7 (-)
(2) Busselton	114	176	(32)	162 (57)
(3) Margaret River	37	40	(10)	70 (19)
(4) Bunbury	246	387	(34)	269 (86)

Figures shown in brackets indicate applicants dual listed for rental and purchase and are included in the total. No dual list was kept in 1985.

It should also be noted that, due to the extension of the eligibility criteria in 1986, applications were invited from single people.

Applications on hand for singles as at 30 June each year were --

	1986	1987
(1) Capel	1	-
(2) Busselton	4	15
(3) Margaret River	-	2
(4) Bunbury	24	15

Homeswest's substantial building programme has resulted in generally shorter waiting periods being experienced in all these towns.

HOMESWEST

Prestige Brickworks Site: Submission

1572. Mr LEWIS, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Did Homeswest make a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority to do with either the original proposal or the appeals associated with the establishment of the Prestige Brickworks on the old Midland Abattoirs site?
- (2) If no to (1), does Homeswest accept the environmental reports that the establishment of a brickworks at the Midland Abattoirs site will have no detrimental effects or will jeopardise the subdivision and development of the Homeswest land adjacent to Bushmead Road at Hazelmere for residential urban use?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See answer to 1487.

TRANSPORT: TAXIS

Delays: Eastern Suburbs

1575. Mr TRENORDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware of concern about the time it can take to get a taxi in the eastern suburbs, particularly for short journeys?
- (2) If yes, what action, if any, does he intend to take?

Mr TROY replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Taxi Control Board was made aware of the service difficulties being experienced in the Midland area as a result of concern expressed by the Swan Valley Tourism Council in May. A delegation from the board, which included the acting chairman, met with the tourism council in June to discuss the matter further. In addition, a survey of the area was conducted by the board to establish the extent of the problem being experienced.

The board has now taken the following steps in an attempt to rectify the problem --

call upon the taxi radio companies to reassess their job calling system to encourage operators to travel to the area to cover hirings;

establish an additional taxi rank in the area;

give preference to training new drivers who live in the Midland area.

In recent correspondence to the Taxi Control Board, the Swan Valley Tourism Council has advised that the level of taxi service provided to the Midland area has improved. The board will, however, continue to monitor the level of taxi service provided to this area.

AGRICULTURE: PESTICIDES

Livestock: Increases

1577. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the answer given by the then Minister for Agriculture to question 2161 of 1983, have pesticide residue levels suddenly risen in livestock or were testing procedures previously inadequate?

Mr GRILL replied:

Pesticide residue levels in livestock have not risen suddenly. The recent increase in sampling intensity has shown up more residues, as one would expect.

AGRICULTURE: PESTICIDES

Beef: Reports

1582. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is his department notified of the results of pesticide residue in beef whenever any level of residue is detected?

(2) If so, are farmers notified if any level of pesticide is discovered in their stock?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes, farmers are notified if their stock are found to have levels in excess of 25 per cent of the maximum residue limit -- MRL. Farmers may find out their complete results by telephoning the new hot-line -- 008 19 8171 -- from Monday, 14 September 1987.

HEALTH: FOODSTUFFS

Imports: Testing

1583. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Are foodstuffs imported from overseas subjected to any testing?

(2) If so, which foodstuffs are tested?

(3) What tests are carried out?

(4) Are any beef, pork, poultry, or sheep foodstuffs imported from overseas into Western Australia?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Fish, prawns, oysters, coconut, and other foods, depending upon the judgment of the sampling officer at the point of entry.

(3) Standard Tests --

Fish -- mercury -- certain species; prawns and other crustacea -- microbiological testing; oysters -- heavy metals, microbiological testing; coconut -- sulphur dioxide, methylbromide, microbiological.

(4) Some meat has been imported into WA from other countries, New Zealand, Canada, and the USA. This includes lamb, beef, venison, usually in small quantities.

The beef meat from the USA -- 360 cartons -- was also tested for chemical residues. This was in June 1987.

AGRICULTURE: PESTICIDES

Products

1584. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Since high levels of pesticides have been found in beef, have any high levels of pesticides or other chemical residues been found in pork, poultry, eggs, vegetables, or fruit?

(2) If so, in which?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1) and (2) Concerning the Australian diet generally, it is worth noting the conclusion of the NH & MRC at its 101st session in June 1986 that concentrations of organochlorine and organophosphorus pesticide residues were well below the maximum residue limits.

Turning to the specific foodstuffs mentioned by the member --

(i) Pork -- only two samples have been found to exceed the maximum residue limits;

(ii) poultry -- monitoring through the NH & MRC market basket survey and the Department of Primary Industry national residue survey have revealed no samples in excess of the maximum residue limits;

(iii) eggs -- no violations of eggs exceeding the maximum residue limits have been found for eggs marketed by the Egg Marketing Board; occasional violations have been found to occur in free-range eggs from domestic properties. These eggs are not generally for sale to the public;

(iv) fruits and vegetables -- in two separate surveys conducted in the period May 1985 to June 1987, covering 22 different types of fruits and vegetables, the maximum residue limits were exceeded in the following --

Celery -- only two samples;

lettuce -- only one sample;

spring onions -- only one sample;

tomatoes -- only one sample.

AGRICULTURE: PESTICIDES

Returns: Disposal

1585. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Agriculture:

How will the pesticides being handed in to the Department of Agriculture be disposed of?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

A decision has not yet been made. Disposal will be by a joint Commonwealth-State arrangement.

HEALTH: HOSPITALS

Albany Regional: Bed Capacity

1593. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Health:

(1) What is the bed capacity of the Albany Regional Hospital?

(2) How many beds are currently closed?

(3) In which wards are each of the beds closed?

(4) What is the reason for the bed closures?

(5) How long is it anticipated before the hospital will be restored to its full bed capacity?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) 201 current, including those in (2). The average bed occupancy is 138 of the available 161 beds.
- (2) 40.
- (3) 27 maternity wing, six paediatric ward, and seven east wing.
- (4) Maternity -- building alterations; paediatric -- four beds used as temporary maternity nursery; two beds used as temporary children's play area; east -- building alterations.
- (5) Bed availability will be increased as various components of the extensive rebuilding programme are completed.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Fatalities: Road Trains

1594. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

How many fatalities involving road trains in Western Australia have occurred in the following years --

- (a) 1980;
- (b) 1981;
- (c) 1982;
- (d) 1983;
- (e) 1984;
- (f) 1985;
- (g) 1986;
- (h) 1987?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (a) nil;
- (b) nil;
- (c) 2;
- (d) 4;
- (e) nil;
- (f) 1;
- (g) 4;
- (h) 1.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overseas Conference

1595. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it correct that the Minister for Local Government is currently leading a delegation to the International Union of Local Authorities Conference in Rome?
- (2) Who is accompanying the Minister, at the Government's expense, on this trip?
- (3) Has the Government contributed anything towards the cost of any other person attending the conference?
- (4) If so, who and how much?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) Yes, in his capacity as chairman of the planning committee for the 29th world congress to be held in Perth in 1989. The 1989 congress will be an important event for WA, and as an estimated 1 500 international and national delegates are expected to attend, this will have a significant positive impact on tourism and local government in this State.

(2) The Minister will be accompanied by his wife, departmental officers who are involved in the planning and organisation of the 1989 congress, and a professional conference organiser. A significant proportion of all travel costs will be recouped from 1989 congress delegate fees.

(3) Yes.

(4) A grant of \$1 000 each was provided to the Country Shire Councils Association, the Local Government Association, and the Country Urban Councils Association to assist them in sending a representative to the congress.

TRAFFIC CODE

Amendment: Motorised Wheelchairs

1596. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

(1) Is he currently considering an amendment to the Road Traffic Code to allow the use of motorised wheelchairs on footpaths?

(2) If so, when is it anticipated that amendment will take effect?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) It is intended that a Bill to effect this amendment will be introduced in this session of Parliament.

ROADS: MITCHELL FREEWAY

Construction: Contractual Problems

1599. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Are any contractual problems being experienced on the freeway in the vicinity of Cedric Street?

(2) If so, what is the nature of these problems?

(3) What action is being taken to address the problems?

(4) What is the estimated cost which will be incurred to rectify the problems?

Mr TROY replied:

(1) No.

(2) to (4) Not applicable.

HEALTH: FOODSTUFFS

PVC Wrapping: Hazard

1604. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

(1) Has he seen the article on page 12 of *The West Australian* of Tuesday, 8 September 1987, under the heading "Warning on PVC wrapping", which quotes the Australian Consumers Association as warning that cheese or meat wrapped in PVC plastic is potentially dangerous to health in some circumstances?

(2) If so, what action has he taken to remove the potential hazard?

(3) Will he give consideration to a public information programme to identify which products, and under what methods of use the problem is most apparent?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) There is no potential hazard arising from PVC films for food contact applications. The one sample in the survey by the Australian Consumers Association which showed elevated levels of phthalate in the cheese was due to the use of non food-grade material.

Checks by departmental officers of major food retailers show that food-grade PVC wrapping is used in WA.

(3) Since no hazard appears to exist in WA, expenditure of taxpayers' money on such a programme would not appear justified at this time.

The Health Department will keep under review future developments, which will include an examination by the National Health and Medical Research Council of the properties of plasticisers used in PVC food-grade wraps and a survey of such wraps in New South Wales. The department will keep me advised of the outcome of these matters.

AGRICULTURE: SOIL CONSERVATION

Funding

1605. Mr SCHELL, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the total amount of funding for the soil conservation districts fund from each of the sources prescribed in section 25C(3) of the Soil and Land Conservation Act for the last three financial years?
- (2) What is the anticipated funding from each of these sources for the next three years?
- (3) What has been the cost of administering the soil conservation districts fund for each of the last three years?
- (4) What are the total amounts paid by the fund to Government departments or agencies for each of the last three years?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) The soil conservation districts fund has not been established. Funds to assist approved soil conservation district projects have been provided from CRF for the last three financial years --

1984-85 -- \$140 000

1985-86 -- \$172 000

1986-87 -- \$202 200

(2) to (4) Not applicable.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Fire Risks: Catalytic Converters

1607. Mr HOUSE, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Is he aware of concern about the possible fire risk dangers arising from vehicles fitted with catalytic converters that are manufactured with vent holes?
- (2) Has the Fire Brigades Board or the Bush Fires Board assessed the fire risk dangers of vehicles fitted with catalytic converters driving across grass or stubble, or through bush in the summer months?
- (3) What action, if any, does he intend to take?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

(1) Yes, I am aware of a concern in the community that vehicles fitted with catalytic converters pose a fire danger.

(2) Evidence available to the Fire Brigades Board and the Bush Fires Board is that such vehicles present no more danger than conventional vehicles not fitted with catalytic converters.

(3) The situation will be monitored.

LAND RESERVES

Combustible Material: Fire Risk

1610. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Is he aware of concerns regarding the fire risk created by the build up of combustible material on reserves?
- (2) Can a Bush Fire Brigade or a volunteer fire brigade take action on its own initiative to reduce fire hazards on reserves?
- (3) If not, whose permission is needed before it can act?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2)(a) So far as the WA Fire Brigades Board is concerned, volunteer brigades carry out public relations programmes in their respective areas and work in conjunction with local authorities by identifying fire hazards. The local authority issues orders for the abatement of the hazards and both permanent and volunteer fire brigades are available to assist with the hazard reduction programme;

(b) so far as the Bush Fires Board is concerned, only a duly appointed fire control officer may enter on to a reserve and take action to reduce a fire hazard. He may use the services of a bush fire brigade to achieve this. This power of entry is not applicable to State forest or to reserves and parks in which an approved fire protection plan is in operation. These plans are approved by the Bush Fires Board under section 34 of the Bush Fires Act.

(3)(a) So far as the WA Fire Brigades Board is concerned, permits to clear hazards by burning can be obtained from the local authority. Local authorities can authorise the brigade to issue permits;

(b) so far as the Bush Fires Board is concerned, see 2(b) above.

HEALTH

Tobacco Smoking: Deaths

1615. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Health:

Of the 1 822 Western Australians who died in 1984 as a direct result of having smoked cigarettes, how many were --

- (a) males;
- (b) females?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(a) and (b) Of the 1 822 deaths caused by smoking in Western Australia in 1984, it is estimated that 1 265 were deaths of men, and 557 deaths of women. While deaths caused by smoking are still more common in men, the ratio of male to female deaths has been progressively falling owing to the effects of women's smoking habits approaching those of men in recent years.

The death rate from lung cancer, one of the major fatal diseases caused by smoking, increased by 57 per cent in Australian women from 1975 to 1984, compared with only a 10 per cent increase in Australian men over the same period. For this reason, the Government has recently launched a major new campaign on women and smoking, focusing in particular on adolescent females.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT

Review

1618. Mr LEWIS, to the Minister for Small Business:

Further to question 1486 of 1987 which referred to his requirement to review the operation of the Small Business Development Corporation Act of 1983 --

- (a) what department, authority, body, or person will undertake the review and report to him;
- (b) when will the report be made to the Parliament?

Mr TROY replied:

(a) and (b) The review will be undertaken in accordance with section 25(1) of the Small Business Development Corporation Act 1983, and a subsequent report will be made to Parliament in accordance with section 25(2) of the Small Business Development Corporation Act 1983.

HOMESWEST

Inventory: Augusta

1619. Mr LEWIS, to the Minister for Housing:

How many tenancies are on the Homeswest inventory of residential tenancies in Augusta town site?

Mr WILSON replied:

Nil.

HOSPITAL

Gnowangerup: Inquiry

1620. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the inquiry by Mr Michael O'Sullivan with regard to the Gnowangerup hospital been completed?
- (2) Does he have the report?
- (3) Will he make the report public?
- (4) Has the final cost including the costs caused by the former Gnowangerup Hospital Board been arrived at?
- (5) If yes to (4), what is the cost?
- (6) If no to (4), what is the cost to date?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The findings of Mr O'Sullivan have already been made public.
- (4) No.
- (5) Not applicable.
- (6) Not available at present.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Poles: Pesticides

1621. Mr BRADSHAW to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Does the State Energy Commission still use pesticides and herbicides on and around power poles?
- (2) If not, when did the department stop using these products?

- (3) Which pesticides have been used in the last five years?
- (4) Which pesticides does the State Energy Commission now hold, and in what quantities?

Mr PARKER replied:

(1) Yes. Pesticides -- termite infestations in wood poles are treated as necessary by registered pest control contractors. The normal method of treatment involves injection of pesticide -- typically aldrin or heptachlor -- into a narrow band of soil around the pole base.

Herbicides -- to eliminate the risk of a fire being started by operation of a high voltage fuse, an approved residual herbicide such as ustilan is used to permanently kill all grass within a seven-metre radius of all rural fuse poles. A non-residual herbicide such as roundup is used to control regrowth of vegetation under power lines.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) Aldrin and heptachlor are currently used by pest control operators.

Prior to May 1984 pole bases were routinely treated with a chemical mixture having a distillate base, with additives of aldrin -- 1 per cent by volume -- and pentachlorophenol -- 0.15 per cent by weight -- a wood preservative. New poles were treated during installation by applying approximately 18 litres of this mixture around the pole base during backfilling. Subsequent maintenance treatment occurred every three to five years. This form of treatment ceased in 1984.

(4) Very small quantities of the old pole treatment mixture are still held in holding tanks at some commission depots.

EDUCATION: TEACHERS

Salary Scale: Degrees

1625. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does a new salary scale apply to teachers, so that an increment is no longer granted for completing a first degree after January 1987?
- (2) What was the amount which previously applied?
- (3) Is it correct that a teacher who completed a degree in 1986 now receives more than a teacher doing the same tasks, who completed an equivalent degree in 1987?
- (4) If yes to (3), what action, if any, will he take to overcome this anomaly?

Mr PEARCE replied:

(1) There is no new salary scale for primary and secondary teachers. However, a new 20-point salary scale, applicable only to lecturers-counsellors in TAFE colleges, was inserted in the Government School Teachers Salaries Award (1981), effective from 1 January 1987. An increment continues to be granted to three-years-trained lecturers-counsellors completing a first degree.

(2) to (4) The new salary table III, and its operation, is the result of a negotiated agreement between the Education Department and the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia, and is documented in the Government School Teachers' Salaries Award (1981).

EDUCATION: BETTER SCHOOLS POLICY

Criticisms: Teachers Union

1626. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What are the major criticisms made by the Teachers Union of the Better Schools policy?

- (2) Have these criticisms been satisfied or is the Teachers Union still dissatisfied with the scheme?
- (3) What changes, if any, are proposed, either in the original Better Schools policy or its implementation?

Mr PEARCE replied:

(1) The Teachers Union has not expressed a consistent position on the Better Schools recommendations. I am not in a position to speak on behalf of the union.

(2) The Teachers Union is currently participating in various task forces with other key bodies in an examination of how best to implement the Better Schools recommendations.

(3) The task forces examining the Better Schools recommendations will report through a coordinating committee to me in November this year. I do not wish to pre-empt their advice by declaring whether any of the recommendations in the Better Schools document will be modified.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: MUNDARING SHIRE COUNCIL

Electors

1627. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What are the numbers of electors currently in each of the four wards of the Shire of Mundaring?
- (2) What are the proposed numbers of electors in each of these four wards for the elections of May 1988?
- (3) What changes in the number of electors in each ward are proposed?
- (4) Why is it proposed that there be a complete spill of councillors in the central and east wards, but not in the south ward when its alteration in population is greater than in the central ward?
- (5) Is it correct that the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicates a population at 30 June 1986 for the Shire of Mundaring significantly different from that used by the shire in its letter to him relating to the creation of the new wards?
- (6) Will the new wards be virtually equal in the number of electors per councillor per ward. If not, why not?

The answer was tabled.

(See paper No 344.)

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Warwick: Oval Repairs

1628. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he been informed by the General Secretary of the State School Teachers Union that the Warwick Senior High School branch of that union has decided that its teachers will not use the school oval for physical education classes from the first day of term 4 1987, unless positive action is taken to --
 - (a) eradicate the rabbits;
 - (b) repair the oval?
- (2) If yes, what action is he taking to overcome this problem which has already led to injury to a number of teachers and students?
- (3) Does he feel that this is a significant problem which requires immediate attention?

Mr PEARCE replied:

(1) to (3) Correspondence has been received from the Teachers Union on the matter. My department has been most active in endeavouring to resolve the problem, and it is anticipated that the procedures initiated to date will ensure that the oval will continue to be available for physical education.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Claremont Mental Hospital Complex

1629. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Lands:

Adverting to his most concise answer to question 1478 of 1987, would he please give information in detail as to who is, or is going to, or is supposed to provide funds for the maintenance of the buildings at the Claremont mental hospital complex which are not to be demolished?

Mr WILSON replied:

The Health Department is currently responsible for maintenance. The City of Nedlands will become responsible after handover from the Health Department.

TEACHERS CREDIT SOCIETY

Letters: Rural and Industries Bank

1630. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Have the letters from the Teachers Credit Society to the Rural and Industries Bank, which he tabled on 9 September 1987 in the form of being incorporated in a file note, been requested by anyone within the Government from --

- (a) the Teachers Credit Society;
- (b) the Rural and Industries Bank?

(2) If no --

- (a) in which way was the request made;
- (b) by whom were these letters supplied unsolicited to the Government?

Mr PEARCE replied:

(1) Not to my knowledge.

(2) (a) Not applicable;

(b) I have no knowledge of such letters being supplied, unsolicited or solicited, to the Government. I have tabled the material to which I referred in debate. The material was contained in a note provided to the Treasurer, following allegations by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition of political interference in the Teachers Credit Society.

STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Investments: Information

1631. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Has the information regarding individual investments in State Energy Commission loans, bonds, or other accounts -- which he used in his speech on 9 September 1987 in Parliament -- been given to him or anyone in the Government by --

- (a) the State Energy Commission or any of its employees;
- (b) the brokerage firm if any, handling the transactions;
- (c) records of the Teachers Credit Society to whom withdrawal cheques were made out;
- (d) any other source, and if so what source?

- (2) Was the information received upon request and/or direction by the Government, or was it given voluntarily without being sought?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) Not to my knowledge;
 (d) as has been publicly stated, I am not prepared to identify private citizens who forward information they believe to be important and which has not been rejected by the Opposition.
- (2) Voluntarily.

TEACHERS CREDIT SOCIETY

Depositors: Information

1632. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the information regarding names of depositors with the Teachers Credit Society -- which he has used in his speech in Parliament on 9 September 1987 -- been given to him or anyone in the Government by --
- (a) the Teachers Credit Society or any of its employees;
 (b) the Rural and Industries Bank or any of its employees;
 (c) any other source and if so which source?
- (2) Was the information received upon request and/or direction by the Government or was it given voluntarily without being sought?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) Not to my knowledge;
 (c) I presume this question refers to Mr Simpson's decision to withdraw funds at a time when the Liberal Party was seeking to undermine the Teachers Credit Society.
- (2) Voluntarily.

LIQUOR OFFENCES

Statistics

1634. Mr CASH, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) How many --
- (a) publicans;
 (b) licensees of licensed premises,
 in Western Australia were charged under the Liquor Act with the following offences in the years ended --
- (i) 30 June 1985;
 (ii) 30 June 1986,
 (iii) 30 June 1987?
- (2) How many juveniles have been charged with these offences for the same period?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

(1)(a) and (b) The Liquor Act makes no distinction between publicans in the traditional sense and licensees of licensed premises. No separate statistics are kept. The figures sought for licensees, permit holders, and their agents as at 30 June are --

	1985	1986	1987
Section 126(1)(h)	40	53	40
Section 127(1)(b)(ii)	115	49	63
Section 129(1)(e)	20	28	26

Section 129(1)(f) is not applicable to licensees, permit holders, or their agents.

Offences against section 129(1)(g) and (h) are only committed by juveniles.

(2)	1985	1986	1987
Section 129(1)(g)	70	34	73
Section 129(1)(h)	274	405	480
Lectures under (g) and (h)	986	730	873

The other sections mentioned are not applicable to juveniles.

HOSPITAL

Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial: Capital Works

1635. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are any major capital works planned in the near future for the Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital?
- (2) Does he intend to provide suitable accommodation for the pathology laboratories at the Pinjarra Hospital and Armadale-Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital in the near future?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes, planning is proceeding on the recently announced permanent care-assessment unit.
- (2) Yes, depending on the availability of funds.

TRANSPORT

Bunbury City Transit: Subsidy

1636. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for The South West:

- (1) What subsidy is paid to the proprietors of the Bunbury City Transit in the current 12-month period?
- (2) What agreement does the Government have with the proprietors in regard to the length of the contract to provide the service at Bunbury?

Mr GRILL replied:

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

HOSPITAL

Royal Perth: Doctor Resignations

1637. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have a larger number of resident doctors resigned from Royal Perth Hospital this year than previously?
- (2) Have these resident doctors resigned because of the workload?
- (3) Are resident doctors able to claim payment for overtime?
- (4) Has any "overtime" been claimed by resident doctors at Royal Perth Hospital this year?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Not to my knowledge.
- (3) Penalty payments are made for hours of rostered duty in excess of 192 hours in a four-week cycle.
- (4) Yes.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Austmark, Bunbury: Rental

1638. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for The South West:

- (1) How much is paid by the Government per square metre per year for the lease of the Bunbury Tower?
- (2) What is the total floor space of the Bunbury Tower?

Mr GRILL replied:

This question has been incorrectly addressed to the Minister for The South West. It has been referred to the Minister for Works and Services, and he will answer the question in writing.

DOGS

Pit Bull Terriers: Breeding

1639. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is he aware of the claim that pit bull terriers are being bred in Western Australia for fighting?
- (2) In view of the fact that people have been killed by this breed animal, and the claim that these animals are used for this purpose, will he advise what inquiries have been undertaken by the Government regarding these claims?
- (3) What action will follow from these inquiries?

Mr CARR replied:

(1) I am not aware of any claims that this particular breed of dog is bred for dog fighting in Western Australia.

(2) and (3) All claims that these dogs have killed people have, as far as I know, emanated from the United States of America. There has thus been no reason to investigate them. The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act makes it an offence to incite any animal to fight or to keep or use any place where the fighting of animals is permitted, while the Dog Act provides that where, in the opinion of the Minister, a specific or mixed breed of dog is a potential danger, regulations may be made for its control. Should evidence about the breeding of these dogs for fighting be advanced, appropriate inquiries will be made.

HEALTH: DISABLED PERSONS

Association for the Blind: Lotteries Commission Assistance

1640. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) What support has the Lotteries Commission provided to the Association for the Blind of Western Australia's Braille and Talking Book Library during the years ending 30 June --
 - (a) 1982;
 - (b) 1983;
 - (c) 1984;
 - (d) 1985;
 - (e) 1986;
 - (f) 1987?
- (2) Has any support been given to the association's Talking Book Library during the current financial year?
- (3) Would an application from the association for support for its library be considered as appropriate by the commission?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) (a) 1982 Nil;
 (b) 1983 \$190 000;
 (c) 1984 \$170 233;
 (d) 1985 \$ 70 000;
 (e) 1986 \$120 944;
 (f) 1987 \$100 000.
- (2) No.
- (3) Any application from the association would be considered on its merits.

EDUCATION

English as a Second Language

1641. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is English as a second language programme being conducted in any Western Australian schools?
- (2) If so, which schools?
- (3) Will this programme be continued in each of these schools in 1988?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The English as a second language programme is conducted in a number of primary and secondary schools.
- (2) These schools are as follows --

Primary --

Lockridge
 Embleton
 Maylands
 Kalamunda
 Girrawheen
 Hainsworth
 Craigie
 Ardross
 Beaconsfield
 North Perth
 Highgate
 Morley
 Noranda

Camboon
 North Perth
 Victoria Park
 West Balcatta
 Osborne Park
 Graylands
 Beckenham
 Yale
 Thornlie
 Burrendah
 Lynwood
 Baler
 Goldsworthy
 Karratha

Secondary --

Girrawheen
 Applecross
 Mirrabooka

Mt Lawley
 Kent Street
 Perth Modern
 Swanbourne
 Hedland

- (3) Subject to the Commonwealth Government providing sufficient funds, the programme will continue in schools that have sufficient need.
- (4) If the programme is discontinued, it will be due to insufficient numbers of children having a need for ESL.

ARTS: WA MUSEUM

Trustees

1642. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for The Arts:

Will he confirm that Professor S. Bowdler is a trustee of the Western Australian Museum, and in particular a member of the Aboriginal Cultural Material Committee?

Mr PARKER replied:

Yes.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Salaries: Accounting

1643. Mr MacKINNON, to the Treasurer:

Up to what date were salaries paid to Government employees brought into account for the purposes of the 1986-87 Budget outcome?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Government employees whose pay date fell on 25 June 1987 were paid up to that date and, accordingly, these salaries were brought to account during 1986-87. Accrued salaries of four working days charged in 1986-87 were partially offset by credits of two working days brought forward from 1985-86.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Jandakot: Ownership

1644. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Who owns the land upon which the Jandakot Primary School is now located?
- (2) When is it anticipated that the primary school will be relocated?
- (3) Where will the school be relocated?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The Industrial Lands Development Authority.
- (2) When a suitable site has been acquired and funds become available for construction of a replacement school.
- (3) Not applicable.

ROAD: SOUTH STREET

Widening

1645. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Referring to question 829 of 1987, have further discussions now taken place with the Melville City Council with respect to the widening of South Street east of its intersection with Karel Avenue?
- (2) If so, has a decision been made with respect to the level of funding that will be made available to allow this work to proceed?
- (3) If so, what level of funding will be made available to the Melville City Council for the purpose of widening South Street east of Karel Avenue?

Mr TROY replied:

(1) to (3) A decision on the level of funding to be made available has been delayed because of the uncertainty about overall funding for roads prior to the Federal Budget.

I have decided to seek the approval of the Federal Minister for Land Transport for the expenditure of Federal funds on this project. Subject to approval being given, the level of funding to be made available for the project will be finalised.

TECHNOLOGY: COMPUTERS

Non-Government Schools: Assistance

1646. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

What assistance, if any, in the form of hardware and software, does the Government provide to private schools to assist with the implementation of computer study programmes?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The ministry, through schools computing personnel, has a continuing relationship with staff of the Non-Government Schools Computing Centre, an organisation that was established to deal specifically with the needs of non-Government schools in the area of computer education.

One of the provisions of the recent tender for microcomputer equipment for Government schools -- tender 355A1987 -- was that non Government schools also be allowed to select and purchase from the list of recommended equipment at the tendered prices. Until recently WESOFT software was available to non-Government schools at commercial rates through SRIA. Currently no mechanism exists for distribution of these products.

The ministry has provided assistance to non-Government schools in the past. This has taken the form of responses to telephone queries, visits to schools, and, occasionally, inclusion in advisory visits in country centres. Recent discussions foreshadow continuing cooperation between Government and non-Government computer education sections with respect to sharing of information and resources.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Leeming Area: Sites

1647. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What sites, if any, are held by the Education Department for the construction of an additional primary school in Leeming?
- (2) Is it still planned to proceed with the construction of the East Leeming primary school?
- (3) If so, when will construction of that school commence?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) In accordance with the answer provided to question 1013 of 24 July 1986.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The needs of the area will continue to be monitored, and the school will be provided when required.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Fremantle Port: Statistics

1648. Mr LEWIS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many stoppages have there been at the Port of Fremantle since 1 June 1987?
- (2) What was the date of each stoppage?
- (3) What was the duration of each stoppage?
- (4) What was the subject of each dispute or issue?

The answer was tabled.

(See paper No 343.)

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Leeman: Spraying

1649. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Adverting to question 1497 of 1987, did he investigate how many children were affected by the spraying of the Leeman Primary School?
- (2) If not, will he have an investigation undertaken?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) This issue was answered by my response to part (3) of question 1497.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Leeman: Spraying

1650. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware that claims have been made that children were affected by pesticides sprayed at the Leeman Primary School on 4 May 1987?
- (2) Will he investigate these allegations and inquire which pesticides, if any, were used?
- (3) Will he also investigate the safety of the pesticides used?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The matter has been looked into and the pesticides used are known to have been diazinon and dichlorvos.
- (3) The safety of these pesticides has been fully investigated by the National Health and Medical Research Council, and the State Pesticides Advisory Committee; and the member may be assured that they present no hazard when used in accordance with the labelled directions.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

WATER RESOURCES

Great Southern: Adequacy

258. Mr HOUSE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the serious water and feed deficiencies now apparent in many parts of the great southern region of Western Australia?
- (2) If yes —
 - (a) What action has the Minister taken to ensure that the townspeople and farmers in those areas will have adequate access to water supplies?
 - (b) What action has the Minister taken to call an urgent meeting of the Department of Agriculture and the Drought Consultative Committee to review the current situation?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) Without rains providing a useful run-off, I am aware of a potential problem. The sole application for water deficiency declaration probably reflects the situation that water supplies are low but still sufficient for livestock on most farms at this time.

Officers of my department will be undertaking a tour to assess the situation next week, and when I have that report to hand I shall provide the honourable member with written answers to parts (2)(a) and (b) of his question.

AUSTRALIA CARD

Premier's Statement

259. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

(1) Does he now regret his statement that "People who fear the Australia Card are doing something wrong" as reported and attributed to him in the *Sunday Times* of 6 September?

(2) Will he reject the ID card now, or at what stage in the future will he do a back flip and withdraw his unequivocal support of it as the Premier of New South Wales, Mr Barry Unsworth, has done?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) and (2) The Leader of the Opposition should put his question on the Notice Paper.

SWAN BUILDING SOCIETY

Investigations: Corporate Affairs Department

260. Mr COURT, to the Treasurer:

Why did the Government send the Corporate Affairs Department into the Swan Building Society when it ran into problems and not into the Teachers Credit Society when the magnitude of its problems was far greater?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I really do not feel like answering these questions tonight, but I suppose I have to.

The SPEAKER: No, you do not.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have lots of other things on my mind today and the questions are just so odd. Is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition saying that the nature of the problem at Swan Building Society is similar to that at Teachers Credit Society?

Mr MacKinnon: He is asking you a question.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The question does not make it clear.

Mr Court: The Corporate Affairs Department was sent into Swan Building Society, but not into the Teachers Credit Society, which had similar problems but of a far greater magnitude.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The problems are not the same, as I understand it. If there is a fire, one sends the Fire Brigade. If there is a burst water main, one sends the Water Authority. My understanding is that the problems are different.

Mr Court: They are about identical.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: My advice is that they are not. In any case, the Registrar of Building Societies makes a decision on those matters.

Mr Court: I am not trying to trick you.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: But the member asked why we sent in Corporate Affairs --

Mr Court: You made a big public statement about their going into Swan Building Society.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That was not our sending them in.

Mr Court: You are telling me --

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am trying to, but the member keeps contradicting me on the basis of his faulty knowledge. The registrar makes a recommendation. If we receive a recommendation to send in the Corporate Affairs Department or Perpetual Trustees, we might do so.

Mr Court: You are the person responsible for the registrar.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: But I do not tell him what to recommend to me.

Mr Court: But you can give him advice.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I did not tell him to recommend to me to send the Corporate Affairs Department into the Swan Building Society. The absurd situation the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has now reached is that he is saying that I should tell the Registrar of Building Societies to tell me to send Corporate Affairs into Teachers Credit Society.

Mr MacKinnon: Did you request Corporate Affairs to go into Swan Building Society?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: No, and if I did it was on the recommendation of the registrar.

Mr MacKinnon: You did but you didn't.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition does not realise what he is doing to himself. If I were he, I would get a pair for every question time. He does not know what he does to himself.

Mr Court: This is one of the most serious questions you could be asked.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Absolutely. I am preoccupied with its seriousness! I cannot seem to think of anything else except how serious this question is. I just wish it made grammatical sense so that I understood what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was trying to say. Why did I send Corporate Affairs into Swan Building Society and not into Teachers Credit Society?

What I have tried to say is that the registrar makes the decision. Secondly, I do not know, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition appears to know, that the problems are identical. That is not my advice.

Mr Court: I said "the Government", and you happen to be the responsible Minister. I would have thought it was a pretty simple question.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Remembering that the member is new to his job, I have tried to help him; but I do not understand what he is getting at. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should put his question on the Notice Paper along with his leader's question.

HOSPITAL: MARGARET RIVER

Redevelopment

261. Mr P.J. SMITH, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the claim made on talkback radio in Bunbury today by the member for Vasse that the State Government had made no provision for the redevelopment of the Margaret River Hospital in this year's capital works Budget?

(2) If yes, is the member for Vasse correct in his claim?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

(1) Yes. And I am aware of a similar claim made by the Leader of the Opposition on GWN last Thursday evening.

Mr Peter Dowding: Was he wrong?

Mr TAYLOR: They were both wrong. As the MLA for Kalgoorlie, one of the things I have always sought to do in relation to my own electorate when a Budget is brought down is to try to go through it page by page to find out all the nice things that might happen to Kalgoorlie, and since the Burke Government has been in office a fair number of good things have happened to Kalgoorlie, which was not the case in earlier times.

(2) Had the member for Vasse and the Leader of the Opposition bothered to read the supplement to the capital works estimates, and the documentation in relation to them, they would have seen on page 2 under "Health" a line which begins, "Other initiatives

include planning for the Margaret River Hospital". That planning has progressed, and both the Treasurer and I have made commitments in the south west that we will redevelop the Margaret River Hospital.

What upsets me is that all the member for Vasse has done is whinge whereas the Labor member for South West Province has got off his backside and talked to me and others involved to see how the development could best be achieved. There is within the Budget sufficient to do the planning for the hospital.

The other upsetting thing is that, in an effort to be non-political in this issue, I took the member for Vasse and also the former Liberal member for South West Province into my confidence and told them what we had in mind and that there was no doubt that we would redevelop the hospital; but the member for Vasse, at a time when a by-election in the south west is imminent, has shown himself to be prepared to play politics over the Margaret River Hospital. We would never seek to play politics over such a matter. We will get about the redevelopment of the Margaret River Hospital on the basis of the commitments given by both the Premier and me.

AUSTRALIA CARD

Premier's Support

262. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

Does he support the introduction of the Australia Card, otherwise known as the ID card?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I think the Leader of the Opposition reads too much into my refusal to answer his generally not-up-to-standard question. I have absolutely no problem with stating my attitude towards the Australia Card. I was a bit preoccupied with other things before and was not going to detail all of the situation, but I am happy to do so now.

I support the introduction of the Australia Card and have not changed the position that I first announced in respect of that card, a position I expect to continue to expound whenever the Leader of the Opposition is kind enough to give me the opportunity.

Mr MacKinnon: We will give you plenty of opportunities.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If I went over and stood next to the Leader of the Opposition and framed his campaign, told him what to say, and how to comport himself, he would still lose any election he fought because he is very ordinary.

Mr Bradshaw: Flattery will get you nowhere.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In a spark of genius the member for Murray-Wellington thinks I am building up his leader, and he is right. He calls it flattery when I overestimate his leader.

I do not expect to change my attitude, and it is an attitude based on the principle that most of the matters people seek to use to attack the Australia Card do not have the substance claimed for them. Firstly, people talk about the Australia Card as though it were something in terms of identification that we do not presently have to produce in some form or other; as though we can purchase a house or buy a car, enter into a hire-purchase agreement or in some other way in the myriad of circumstances where we are required to identify ourselves, do so without producing some identification. Quite simply, we have to do that now --

Mr Lewis: Why do you need a card?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I suppose because it standardises and makes more simple the process by which in two particular areas people who do things the member would disapprove of can be prevented from doing them. It is not as though we do not have to produce identity now, and we do so without any compunction. In fact, we are often very pleased to be able to identify ourselves so that other people cannot misrep-

resent themselves to be us. The next thing is that people say that we will have an industry that forges Australia Cards. Why are not people forging drivers' licences to pretend to be others? Why are not members opposite concerned about that?

Mr Lightfoot: I suppose they do. They seem to forge everything else.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Murchison-Eyre has not expressed any concern about it. If people can forge an identity document which is a driver's licence, they can forge an Australia Card.

Mr Peter Dowding: The Americans have had a social security number for years.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Many people in many countries have identification systems.

Mr Hassell: Not like this one.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know that that is right.

Mr Hassell: I do know it is right.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Between the member for Cottesloe and the present Leader of the Opposition is the font of all knowledge.

Mr Hassell: No western country has a system like that proposed for Australia.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not convinced that that is the case, but I am convinced that the font of all knowledge is not to be found necessarily in the marriage of the member for Cottesloe and the present Leader of the Opposition. Pardon me for doubting that, but it seems to me there is a certain ambiguity in the attitudes the member for Cottesloe expresses from time to time.

So firstly we require identity on numerous occasions. Secondly, if one can forge an Australia Card one can forge a driver's licence and other means of identity presently used, but we do not seem to be complaining ad nauseam about that.

Mr Lewis: Tell us about the \$20 000 fine.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will come to that. In respect of tax evasion and welfare fraud there does appear to me to be a role to be played by some form of identity. People should not be able to open accounts in someone else's name. Why should people be allowed to open bank accounts in spurious names?

Mr Lightfoot: Do they?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Should they be allowed to ramp shares? Why should they be allowed to ramp shares even if they are silly enough to do it in their own name? I do not see a problem with requiring people to produce some identity and being sure that the identity is a standard and authentic identification of the person involved. That brings us to the problems of civil liberties and others. There is no argument in that advanced by the member for East Melville who said, "What about the \$20 000 fine?"

Point of Order

Mr MacKINNON: While I am interested in the Premier's answer I think that once the answer goes over about five minutes it would be better if the Premier provided it at some time other than question time.

Government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MacKINNON: The Premier has plenty of opportunities to go on for 25 to 30 minutes in answering a question about the ID card, and that is when he appropriately should do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members of the Government surprise me; they are normally much better behaved. When a member of this House takes a point of order with me I should be able to hear all of it.

The point of order is well taken, and irrespective of the fact that it was very difficult for me to hear all of it I was quite sure that the last part of the Premier's comments indicated he was drawing his answer to a close anyway.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am drawing it to a close; I did not want to start it! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to put it on the Notice Paper.

I just want to say one thing; I think I heard the member for Murchison-Eyre say that half the Cabinet has A-Cap shares. I will tell the member what we are going to do. We will have an inquiry into that. He should stay around because he will be a witness. Mark my words, there will be an inquiry into his claim that half the Cabinet has A-Cap shares.

Mr Lightfoot interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There will be an inquiry on the basis that Cabinet must be mentally defective to buy anything the member for Murchison-Eyre is trying to ramp. We will have an inquiry. He said it!

Mr Lightfoot: You loudmouthed buffoon!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Murchison-Eyre is a hurtful man. It is a pity he will not be here after the next election.

Mr Lightfoot: You will not be here either, by what I gather.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I could go on for a long time -- I have only just begun -- but in deference to the Leader of the Opposition, if he wants a considered reply in future, he should not ask a question without notice. He should put it on the Notice Paper, because when I give a considered reply -- only prematurely considered because I have just started -- he wants to sit me down.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK*Teachers Credit Society Liabilities: Commitment*

263. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

(1) What financial commitment has the Government given to the R & I Bank over any liabilities incurred by its takeover of Teachers Credit Society?

(2) Is the Government requesting a firm figure from the R & I as to the extent of the financial liability the Government is expected to carry?

(3) When will full details of this financial commitment be made available to taxpayers?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to put the question on the Notice Paper.

CHEMICAL: CYANIDE*Transportation*

264. Mr TRENORDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

Why will cyanide be transported through the metropolitan area from Kwinana to Northam and on to Boddington via Pingelly instead of Kwinana to Boddington via Pinjarra, a much shorter distance and with substantially fewer people put at risk?

Mr TROY replied:

The question of the transport of dangerous goods is a matter for the Minister for Minerals and Energy. If the member cares to put the question on the Notice Paper, I will ensure it is addressed.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL*Warwick: Oval Repairs*

264. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

I refer to question 1628 which was answered by the Minister today regarding a decision by teachers at the Warwick Senior High School not to teach physical education on the school oval due to the oval being unsafe because of the activities of rabbits.

(1) Does he acknowledge receiving a letter from a parent advising him that her daughter had injured her ankle due to holes on the oval which had been excavated by rabbits?

(2) Does he know that several teachers, as well as several students, have been injured for the same reason?

(3) Is he concerned about these injuries?

(4) If the answer to (3) is yes, what immediate action does he propose to take to resolve the problem?

Mr PEARCE replied:

(1) to (4) The question of the rabbits at Warwick Senior High School was brought to my attention late last year, and when I heard it I thought it was a joke. In fact, it is deadly serious. As early as last year the Agriculture Protection Board was called in to eliminate the rabbits from the oval at the Warwick Senior High School. At the end of the school year the board was proposing to lay some kind of bait, and it had decided on the mechanisms that should be used. The school had agitated for the rabbits to be eliminated, but once the mechanism to eliminate them during the school holidays was set in place a "Save our Rabbits" movement built up in the Warwick area and it was concerned about the method of eliminating the rabbits. I moved to have that action delayed and to have a long-term approach put in place.

Mr Clarko: That was the mistake.

Mr PEARCE: It was a mistake made at the request of students from the school. The students were demonstrating on the school oval about what was to be done to these poor rabbits. Maybe it was an error, but the Agriculture Protection Board has been trying to find several ways to eliminate rabbits in an urban area.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: They are causing damage and there are great rabbit warrens on the school oval. Parents and teachers have written to me complaining about the problem -- some of the people who are now writing to me were those who protested against the poisoning plan last summer.

The school is proposing to build a rabbit-proof fence on two sides of the school oval, but I am advised that rabbits are smart enough to go around a fence which is not enclosed on all four sides and if the area is enclosed on all four sides, it becomes a child-proof fence which is defeating the purpose of having an oval. I am also told that rabbit-proof fences are not all that rabbit-proof because rabbits can dig deeper than the people who build fences. The question of how to deal with the rabbits is very serious.

Mr Clarko: You were going to poison them.

Mr PEARCE: We were, but people in the area expressed concern about poison being put out in an open area for the rabbits. That was the basis on which we withdrew from that proposal and since then the Agriculture Protection Board has been working on a range of methods to eliminate the rabbits. I understand that what has been happening is that the rabbits are being caught and taken elsewhere, but at the dead of night they are hopping back to the oval. I do not know precisely what is being done. However, I do know that the Education Department has been working with the Agriculture Protection Board for nearly a year to try to find a safe and acceptable way to eliminate the rabbits. If all else fails we will have to go back to the proposition of poisoning the rabbits during the next school holidays.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Government Attitude

265. Mr THOMAS, to the Treasurer:

Is he able to indicate the Government's attitude to the Budget announced this evening by the Federal Treasurer?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I am delighted to be able to say that the Federal Treasurer has almost finished his Budget speech and that already he has announced the details of a startlingly good Budget. It is, in fact, a balanced Budget. For the first time in many years a national Government is living within its means

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Where is the applause from the Opposition benches?

Mr Clarko: It is collecting more in taxes.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In fact, the deficit which was last year \$2.7 billion is this year \$27 million -- nought per cent of GDP. I am pleased to say that largely as a result of the efforts of the Minister for Housing in this State negative gearing is being reintroduced. The trusts and other vehicles which were established on the basis of the four per cent depreciation allowance have been grandfathered into the new situation so that they can maintain their attraction and the housing trusts notably run by one of the building societies will be able to continue. Government spending will fall in real terms by 2.4 per cent.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Whereabouts is the National Party, those Calvinistic economists with the self-righteous God, unadmitting of any sort of increase in spending? This is a real reduction in Government expenditure of 2.4 per cent.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There will be no new taxes and no increases in the existing taxes. An amount of \$250 million will be made available for the family package and it is estimated that one million jobs will be created by the present Government by the end of the bicentennial year.

I think this is deserving of three cheers.

[Cheers.]

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Thank you.

TEACHERS CREDIT SOCIETY

Losses: Reports

266. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

(1) Has he received any report, whether preliminary or otherwise, or any estimate from the R & I Bank, or his department, or the Treasury, or from any other department as to the likely losses of the Teachers Credit Society, if any, or as to what the outcome of the Teachers Credit Society's position is likely to be when fully assessed?

(2) If so, will he advise the House what it is?

(3) If he says he has not received any such assistance, as he kind of indicated the other day, will he advise when he expects to receive an assessment and will he make it public in this House?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) to (3) I would not be rude or ill-mannered to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as to try to answer the question. He asked me that question a moment ago.

Mr Hassell: It was quite different from that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for a copy of his question. If it is different, I will try to answer the question asked by the member for Cottesloe.

Mr Hassell: If you know about the Federal Budget perhaps you would know something about your own portfolio responsibilities.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Would the member shut up for a few seconds. I have a copy of the question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and it is the same as the question asked by the member for Cottesloe.

Mr Hassell: It is not.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will read it out.

Mr Hassell: Do not waste time.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The question reads --

- (1) What financial commitment has the Government given to the R & I Bank over any liabilities incurred by its takeover of Teachers Credit Society?
- (2) Is the Government requesting a firm figure from the R & I as to the extent of the financial liability the Government is expected to carry?
- (3) When will full details of this financial commitment be made available to taxpayers?

It is the same question.

Mr Hassell: It is not. You are just wasting time. You know all about the Federal Budget, but you do not know your own portfolio.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am sending a copy of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's question to the member for Cottesloe.

Mr Hassell: You are deliberately wasting time and you know it. You will not tell the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is my contention that the question is almost identical to the one asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I do not have copies to give to every member to determine that. I might be wrong; I hope I am. I will do my best to answer it. To the best of my knowledge we have not been told any figure by the R & I Bank.

Mr Hassell: I did not ask you for a figure; I asked for a report.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: To the best of my knowledge I have not. I do not mind sitting after six o'clock; I am keen to encourage you. I want you to ask your questions; go ahead.

I do not know of any report. If one has been made, it has not reached me. As I indicated in the Parliament a day or two ago, I spoke to David Fischer from the R & I Bank. He told me that it would take several weeks -- I think he said "many weeks" -- for the bank to arrive at a figure.

I am not surprised that I have not received the report the member referred to. It may have come to my department, but I do not know about it. If it had come to my department I would have been told.

The second part of the question was, if I have not received the report, when do I expect it? All I can say about that is that David Fischer indicated to me that it would be several or many weeks before they had finished their work.

Mr Hassell: A preliminary assessment?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I did not ask him for a preliminary assessment.

Mr Court: He came out and made an announcement.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: He was doing an assessment, but I do not know that it was referred to as preliminary. I should be happy to ask him for a preliminary assessment. He told me it would be several or many weeks. The impression I gained was that that meant five, six, or seven weeks, but I did not confirm it.

Mr Clarko: Parliament will be rising by then.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not committing myself to making it public before I have seen it. Members cannot expect me to do that because I do not know what it will contain. It may have something about the member for Cottesloe which neither he nor I want made public. There may be something bad about him which he does not want made public, or there may be something good about him which I do not want made public.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I may have difficulty wheeling and dealing successfully in business, as the member does.
