

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 12 December 1989

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 3.30 pm, and read prayers.

BILLS (3) - ASSENT

Message from the Lieutenant Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Bills -

1. Spent Convictions Amendment Bill
2. Fisheries Amendment Bill (No 2)
3. Wheat Marketing Bill

PETITION - VIDEOS

X Rated - Banning Maintenance

Hon W.N. Stretch presented a petition from seven citizens of Western Australia expressing concern that X rated videos may be legalised in Western Australia and requesting that Parliament maintain the ban on X rated videos as it has a strong obligation to protect women and children.

[See paper No 792.]

PETITION - GOVERNMENT BUSINESS DEALINGS

Royal Commission of Inquiry Appointment

Hon George Cash (Leader of the Opposition) presented a petition from 19 058 citizens of Western Australia calling for the Government to appoint a Royal Commission of inquiry into the Government's business dealings or if such a commission is not appointed to resign.

[See paper No 787.]

A similar petition bearing 19 031 signatures was presented by Hon J.N. Caldwell.

[See paper No 794.]

PETITION - WESTERN AUSTRALIAN OPERA CO INC

Dissolution Opposition

Hon P.G. Pandal presented a petition from 232 citizens of Western Australia rejecting any Government action that would lead to the dissolution of the WA Opera Company as a pioneering and successful performing arts group and concerned to see that -

1. The company remains financially and artistically strong and independent; and
2. Cooperation with the Australian Opera Company continues without threat to the existence and growth of the WA Opera Company.

[See paper No 789.]

PETITION - GOVERNMENT BUSINESS DEALINGS

Losses Concern - Dowding Government Dismissal

The following petition bearing the signatures of 12 citizens of Western Australia was presented by Hon W.N. Stretch -

The Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament Assembled.

We, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia, are deeply concerned at public disclosures, of losses by Government in various business dealings of hundreds of millions of dollars involving Rothwells, the petrochemical project, Teachers Credit Society, Swan Building Society, Spedleys, R & I Bank, S.G.I.C., and others, which

will apply for many years to pay for these losses. We are also disturbed and disgusted to discover in recent times that before the State Election the truth of these dealings and losses was hidden by Government.

It is our belief that the Dowding Labor Government should be dismissed, and we call on the Liberal and National Parties to take whatever action is necessary to force an election so that the Government may again, with greater knowledge of the truth, be judged by the people.

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

[See paper No 791.]

PETITION - CRIME

Child Sex Abuse - New Legislation

Hon P.G. Pendal presented a petition bearing the signatures of 75 citizens of Western Australia, requesting Parliament to bring in legislation to deal with all cases of sexual and other crimes against children so that -

1. Sentences imposed on adult child sex offenders reflect the serious nature of the crime.
2. Mandatory therapy for offenders be a condition.
3. Magistrates have discretion to accept the evidence of a child irrespective of the child's age.

[See paper No 790.]

PETITION - GOVERNMENT BUSINESS DEALINGS

Royal Commission of Inquiry Appointment

Hon George Cash (Leader of the Opposition) presented a petition bearing the signatures of 38 citizens of Western Australia requesting that the Parliament institute a Royal Commission to investigate certain business dealings of the Government.

[See paper No 788.]

STANDING ORDERS - SUSPENSION

Select Committee on State Investments Relating to PIL, WAGH and Rothwells

On motion without notice by Hon J.N. Caldwell, resolved with an absolute majority -

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as will enable a motion to be moved without notice regarding the Select Committee on State Investments into Petrochemical Industries Ltd, WA Government Holdings Ltd and Rothwells, and for that motion to be debated to its conclusion at today's sitting.

MOTION - HONORARY ROYAL COMMISSION

Select Committee on State Investments Relating to PIL, WAGH and Rothwells

HON J.N. CALDWELL (Agricultural) [3.41 pm]: I move -

That this House calls on the Government to give an assurance that -

1. Immediately prior to prorogation of the Parliament, it will establish an Honorary Royal Commission whose terms of reference and membership shall be identical to those of the Select Committee on State Investments relating to PIL, WAGH and Rothwells;
2. in the event of the Select Committee on State Investments relating to PIL, WAGH and Rothwells being re-established after the opening of Parliament in 1990, all papers and evidence held by the Honorary Royal Commission shall be handed over to the Select Committee;
3. in the event that the Honorary Royal Commission makes a report, such a report shall be released publicly and in its entirety without delay;

4. the Honorary Royal Commission will be adequately funded to enable it to continue the work of the Select Committee on State Investments relating to PIL, WAGH and Rothwells during the period that the House stands prorogued; and
5. in the event of the Select Committee on State Investments relating to PIL, WAGH and Rothwells being unable to complete its inquiry due to the prorogation of Parliament, all papers and evidence held by the Select Committee be handed over to the Honorary Royal Commission that is appointed to continue its inquiry, provided that the terms of reference of the Honorary Royal Commission are the same as those for the Select Committee.

Ample evidence of the need for a Royal Commission, or the substitute Honorary Royal Commission, has been provided; before us on the Table of the House today is a 4 000 signature petition calling for the Parliament to establish a Royal Commission to investigate the problems that have beset our State.

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: It has 40 000 signatures!

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: Indeed, I forgot the extra nought. It is an enormous number and by far the biggest petition I have seen during my short time in Parliament; we should take heed of it. This motion will go some way towards satisfying the concerns of the majority of people in Western Australia. A Select Committee has already been formed under the chairmanship of Hon Bob Pike and comprising Hon Peter Foss, Hon Eric Charlton, Hon Jim Brown and Hon Fred McKenzie, five responsible members of this House who are examining this matter. I believe that they have decided not to meet again until February, but this committee must continue to do its job and we should endeavour to see that it does so.

Unfortunately, neither the Select Committee nor an Honorary Royal Commission has the power to second members of Parliament to give evidence, but I am absolutely sure that members of Parliament will take the opportunity to do so. An enormous number of accusations have been made in both Houses of Parliament and by the people of Western Australia who have demanded that an inquiry be established to examine the loss of funds by this Government. This motion provides a means by which the inquiry can continue. If members of Parliament do not take up this opportunity to clear their names, we can assume that they have something to hide. An opportunity is provided for people to give evidence to the committee, and I hope that members will take that opportunity to clear their names and lay the matter to rest so that we can get on with the job of running the State. If members do not make themselves available to the Select Committee, people will draw inevitable conclusions from that.

Parliamentary privilege has been tested in many places and it is exercised in Select Committees. If it can be proved that somebody has told a lie, that person could actually go to gaol, or, as has happened in this House, the person could be brought to the bar of the House. The National Party brings this motion to the House at this time because we are worried that the established Select Committee will not have the power to carry out its duty after Parliament is prorogued. Presumably Hon Norman Moore feels exactly the same way about this matter because his motion to allow Select Committees to continue after prorogation seems to have been lost in the other place.

Hon N.F. Moore: I am sure that Mr Berinson will encourage members to deal with it when the other place comes back.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: We hope so, but in the meantime we are safeguarding this Select Committee by moving this motion. This motion is an attempt to carry out exactly what Hon Norman Moore has attempted to carry out, and I hope that the motion will have his full support. Members will notice that the motion calls for the House to re-establish the Select Committee as soon as Parliament resumes next year. In other words, Hon Bob Pike's committee should be given Select Committee status when it finally reports, as was the intention of the House when the inquiry was originally established. If this motion is carried, undoubtedly Bob Pike's committee's investigation will continue as was intended by this place when the committee was set up.

I hope the Government will give its support to this motion, albeit grudgingly. However, I am sure it realises that the public have demanded that the evidence become public as indicated

by the 40 000 signatures that were presented to this House today. The Government has a responsibility to support the motion and I commend it to the House.

HON R.G. PIKE (North Metropolitan) [3.51 pm]: In speaking to this motion -

Point of Order

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I have no objection to Mr Pike's now speaking, but I understood that Mr Cash was recorded as seconding this motion.

Hon George Cash: I seconded the first one for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Anyway, the seconder does not necessarily receive the call to speak.

Debate Resumed

Hon R.G. PIKE: I enthusiastically support this motion, as the House will of course be surprised to hear, and refer specifically to the power of an Honorary Royal Commission. I have read section 9 of the Royal Commissions Act quickly. The Legislative Assembly has been requested in the form of a message from this House to give permission to the Premier, Mr Parker and Mr Grill to appear before the Select Committee on State investments. That has been conveniently ignored by the Premier, given his power over the Notice Paper in another place, and therefore this House is considering the motion from the National Party.

The Premier stands accused of ignoring the message from the Legislative Council and allowing it to fall off the bottom of the Notice Paper thus relieving himself and his associates - the gang of three as they are called in regard to this whole debacle - of being able to be called by the Select Committee, notwithstanding the fact that, under privilege, they have the right not to appear even if they are requested. The Premier is dodging the odium of not appearing before the Select Committee by not allowing the Assembly to pass the motion contained in the Council message.

I accuse the Premier of a blatant use of numbers and of being particularly irresponsible in that regard. Under section 9 of the Royal Commissions Act it appears that those gentlemen can be summoned if this motion is passed. The Premier may now determine not to recommend the prorogation of the Parliament so that he can hide behind the fact that the Assembly has not carried the message. That is pertinent to the motion because it calls for an Honorary Royal Commission.

I support the motion.

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [3.55 pm]: It is unfortunate that Hon Bob Pike can hardly bring himself to speak without ascribing some improper motive to somebody. He has followed his usual pattern today.

Hon P.G. Pendal: You give us plenty of opportunity of doing that.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I am prepared to accept Hon John Caldwell's motion. That carries with it the giving of the assurance which the motion seeks.

Hon P.G. Pendal: Surprise, surprise!

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I will no doubt rouse Mr Pike to action again if I follow up that comment-

Hon George Cash: He referred to the gang of three, not the gang of four.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: - by saying that I hope that the House will not take the terms of the motion too literally. I indicate very specifically what I intend to convey by that. I understand Mr Caldwell's concern to be that the work of the Select Committee should not be disturbed by prorogation and that it should continue in one form or another; that is, that it should either continue in the form of a Select Committee or, if the committee is brought to an end by prorogation, it should continue under the same terms of reference and with the same membership, but in the form of an Honorary Royal Commission.

The point that I want to put to Mr Caldwell and to the House relates purely to the practical mechanics of the situation. It appears to me that the prorogation might occur and, given this motion, I will recommend to the Government that it occur within a few days - say, not more than a week - before a formal opening. Obviously, it would not be sensible, for the sake of

one week's gap in proceedings, to disband the Select Committee, establish an Honorary Royal Commission and, a week later, look to disband the Royal Commission and re-establish the Select Committee.

I therefore give the House a series of undertakings: If, on the one hand, the Parliament is prorogued more than one week before the formal reopening, the Government will establish the Honorary Royal Commission as sought by the mover. On the other hand, if the prorogation occurs within a week of the formal reopening, I will give notice of motion on the first day of the new sitting to re-establish the committee with its previous membership and terms of reference. In other words, I am looking only to the technical requirement of proroguing Parliament on the one hand, and reopening the Parliament on the other hand. I ask Hon John Caldwell, either in the course of his reply or perhaps by way of interjection now, to indicate whether that purely technical arrangement is acceptable to him as coming within the terms of this motion. If it is not, it might be necessary to move to very long-winded amendments which, frankly, I believe are undesirable and, in the circumstances, unnecessary. I wonder whether Hon John Caldwell would give me some indication, by way of a short interjection, before I resume my seat.

Hon P.G. Pendal: I would consult with a QC before I answered him.

Several members interjected.

Hon John Halden: You would, you are so stupid. No-one would listen to you anyway.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: Did you say that on the first day of sitting you would take steps to reconstitute that committee?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I would give notice of motion on the first day so that it would be established on the second day.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: Yes, I think so.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I appreciate Hon John Caldwell's indication and I am happy to give that combination of undertakings to meet the situation.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: Does that mean that everything else will fall off the Notice Paper?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: The other business of the House is a matter that is normally addressed at the beginning of a session with a view to re-establishing other business at the stage it had reached before the prorogation of Parliament. It would require consultation between all parties to ensure there was agreement to it.

For present purposes I am addressing the particular proposal and, of course, it would follow from what I have said that, provided my recommendation about the late prorogation of the Parliament was accepted, all the other committees would continue their work up to within a week of the next session.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [4.03 pm]: Hon Bob Pike, who is chairman of the committee which is the subject of this motion, has signified that the Liberal Party is prepared to support the motion before the House. I rise to make a few comments in respect of not only the motion, but also the likely effect on the Parliament of this motion and associated matters.

I make the point that during the interchange which occurred between the Leader of the House and the mover of the motion, as I understood it, the Leader of the House asked the mover whether he was prepared to accept that if the House was prorogued for not less than one week before it was reopened there would be no need to take any action and that he, on the first day or soon after, would move to reconstitute this Select Committee. If the House were to be prorogued for more than a week the Leader of the House gave an undertaking that he would create an Honorary Royal Commission. As I understood it, the mover of the motion was prepared to accept the proposition advanced by the Leader of the House. While we are talking solely about the State investments committee I believe the same arrangement should be given in respect of those other Select Committees currently in progress under the authority of the Legislative Council. I ask the Leader of the House, by way of interjection, to indicate whether he is prepared to give that commitment in respect of all other Select Committees presently in force.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I do not think the other committees would justify Honorary Royal

Commissions, but I believe that I can reasonably expect that my recommendation for no more than a week's prorogation would be accepted, in which case all the committees would simply continue. I would certainly undertake on the first day to re-establish them.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I expected that reply from the Leader of the House because what he did not say was that on prorogation all the other committees would cease as of that moment.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I did say at the end of my comment that the saving of this committee by late prorogation would have the same effect on the other committees.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Is the Leader of the House saying he will apply the same criteria as set out in this motion in respect of the one week or a later period to all other Select Committees?

Hon J.M. Berinson: I am saying that the others would not justify Honorary Royal Commissions. I am happy to consult with the Government and to come back with undertakings on the other committees.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I go back to the comment I made earlier; that is exactly the sort of reply I expected -

Hon J.M. Berinson: It is the only one I can give.

Hon GEORGE CASH: - because it is absolutely meaningless.

Several members interjected.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Hon Jim Brown knows it means nothing and that on prorogation all the Select Committees, except the one outlined in this motion, will cease. I understood the Leader of the House to say that he will give some undertaking to reconstitute the committees when the Parliament is reopened.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Mr Cash, if that does not satisfy you let me take it further and say that I am prepared to apply the same criteria to other committees which are now in place.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I appreciate that undertaking because it is an important principle that has to be adopted.

Several members interjected.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Members opposite should not worry about what the Opposition might do because it will not be long before the Opposition is on the other side of the House and the Government is on this side of the House and then the Government will worry about what the other lot did!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I said last week that it seems to me that members have got into the habit, at the beginning of every day's sitting, of throwing out the door all the dignity and decorum that belongs to a House of Parliament; members are carrying on like people at a game of football. I am suggesting to members that they cease their interjections and let the member who is speaking make his comments. I repeat also that some members may not like what a member is saying in this place and they do not have to agree with him, but they have to listen to him.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am pleased that the Leader of the House has now agreed that the criteria which will apply to the State investments committee will apply to all other Select Committees currently in force in respect of the Legislative Council. It is an important breakthrough and I appreciate it.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Since you expected my first reply, do I take it that you did not expect my second reply?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Yes, without question I did not expect the Leader of the House to agree.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Are you pleased?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Of course I am pleased.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I am too.

Hon GEORGE CASH: The reason I did not expect that answer is that it is quite out of character with the way the Leader of the House handles things.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You have never met such an accommodating Leader of the House in your life!

Hon GEORGE CASH: I have said that the Opposition is prepared to support this motion which has now been extended to cover other Select Committees. In respect of the general call the Liberal Party has made regarding a Royal Commission to investigate the business dealings of this Government and in respect of the calls it has made to adjourn the debate on the Appropriation Bill until such time as the Government agrees to a Royal Commission, with the terms of reference being agreed to between the Government and the Opposition, I make the point that no-one should be under any illusion that this motion will cover the broader question of the Government's business dealings. This motion is specifically related to what has commonly been referred to as the Pike committee on State investments, and that is all. It is true that the committee will be able to investigate a number of matters. However, this motion does not satisfy my call of last week, and the call of other members of the Liberal Party, for the debate on the Appropriation Bill to be adjourned until such time as the Government agrees to the establishment of a Royal Commission to investigate the Government's business dealings on terms to be agreed between the Opposition and the Government. I make that point very clear, because although Hon John Caldwell was good enough to provide me with a copy of this motion a few minutes before the House commenced this afternoon and although I indicated that the Liberal Party would accept it, a number of members of the Liberal Party have expressed concern that the motion does not cover the very broad type of Royal Commission to which I, along with a number of my colleagues, referred last week.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You do not have confidence in Mr Pike?

Hon GEORGE CASH: If ever I had confidence in any member in this place to delve into the very secret dealings of this Government, it is Hon Bob Pike. He has a reputation for not being easily frightened away once he has latched onto someone. I think the Leader of the House will acknowledge that. I have no problem in acknowledging the competence of all members to delve into the matters covered by the committee's terms of reference. However, that committee and this motion do not relate to the broad Royal Commission I called for in this Parliament last week.

Hon J.M. Berinson: How could the broad Royal Commission fail to duplicate the work of Mr Pike's committee?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Other members wish to speak on this matter and I am sure they will address that question.

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral) [4.12 pm]: This debate could have been avoided had the Prorogation of Parliament Bill I introduced, which was passed in this House, been passed through the Parliament. That Bill provided for the House to pass motions such as this to enable committees to continue to operate after prorogation of Parliament. I acknowledge the support of the Leader of the House during the passage of the Bill through this House and that the Government agreed to the second reading in the Assembly. Regrettably, the Bill has not proceeded beyond that stage and no final decision has been made. The Assembly is due soon to return to deal with matters sent to it by this House, and perhaps the Leader of the House will consider requesting the Assembly to deal with the Bill at that time so that this problem can be overcome in toto, without the need for a Royal Commission. If that Bill were passed all Select Committees in progress could continue in the way they have been operating to date, provided a resolution were passed by each House. I ask the Leader of the House to consider that Bill as a means of resolving the problem highlighted by this motion.

I support the remarks of Hon George Cash. The Government is giving nothing away by supporting this motion. I do not believe the Government intended to prorogue Parliament immediately after the end of this session.

Hon J.M. Berinson: In that case, why introduce the Bill?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I introduced the Bill two months ago at a time when I assumed the Government would prorogue Parliament at the end of this session, but I have since changed my mind. However, let the Bill be on the Statute book in any event because it will solve problems that may arise whenever Parliament prorogues. The Government has given away

nothing because I believe this Parliament will continue until shortly before the beginning of the next session.

I make the following point to the National Party: If it wants a proper, full inquiry into the Government's business dealings, a fully-fledged, full-blown Royal Commission of the Fitzgerald-type must be set up. The only way that will be achieved is by forcing the Government into a position where it must agree to that inquiry. Royal Commissions and Honorary Royal Commissions can be established only if the Government agrees to do so. I am a little worried that the Government has agreed to this motion, which may be an indication of its opinion of the Select Committee. The Government has not agreed to a fully-fledged, Fitzgerald-type inquiry into the Government's activities. The only way to achieve that type of inquiry, as requested by the 40 000 people who signed the petition, is by not passing the Government's Budget until such time as it sets up a Royal Commission based upon terms of reference agreed to by the Opposition and the Government. The Government will not set up such a Royal Commission until it is forced to do so. It did not initially support the formation of the Select Committee, and the passing of this motion will not provide the people of Western Australia with all the information they seek. One of the reasons it will not is that Ministers of the Crown are not required to give evidence to Honorary Royal Commissions or to Select Committees. In the last couple of weeks an attempt was made by the Select Committee to obtain evidence from certain members of Parliament, but those members are not required to give evidence because the Assembly declined to give permission. We need a Royal Commission in Western Australia which has the power to question Ministers of the Crown, and anyone else it wishes to ask questions of.

Hon Bob Thomas: And the Leader of the Opposition?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Exactly right, and I am sure he would be happy to give evidence. The 40 000 people who signed the petition do not want just Mr Pike's committee, they want a public, totally independent inquiry conducted by a person who is not a politician, such as Mr Fitzgerald in Queensland. This motion is a good motion in the sense that the Government might prorogue Parliament and it is for the benefit of everybody in Western Australia that Mr Pike's committee should continue after Parliament prorogues. However, it will not count for a row of beans at the end of the day if Ministers cannot be questioned by the committee about their activities.

I will today ask the National Party to support a motion to adjourn debate on the Budget. The Opposition has indicated that it will seek to adjourn that debate until such time as the Government agrees to the establishment of a Royal Commission. This afternoon I propose to move an amendment to the Budget with the full expectation that when a decision is made about whether debate should be adjourned, a decision will also be made about whether a proper Royal Commission should be appointed in Western Australia. Although I support this motion, it does not go as far as the Opposition wishes. There are many questions to be asked and many people to be heard, and it is definitely necessary for a Fitzgerald-type inquiry to be held.

Hon John Halden: We want to hear you justify that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: If Hon John Halden believes that, he must have had his eyes shut and his ears closed for the last five years. He is either stupid, does not know what is going on, or both.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon J.M. Brown): Order! I ask members to show some decorum and to address the motion before the Chair rather than be diverted from it.

Hon N.F. MOORE: This afternoon I shall seek to defer the Budget on the premise that the deferral will cease the moment the Government sets up a Royal Commission to inquire into its business dealings. I hope the National Party will support my amendment and that the proper inquiry needed by this State is set up. To achieve this inquiry, 40 000 people signed a petition. Mr Caldwell quite rightly expressed concern about what those people, who went to such lengths to present that huge petition to the Parliament, must feel. Regrettably, this motion will not achieve what they want. We will only achieve what they want by having a fully fledged, Fitzgerald-type inquiry in Western Australia.

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Metropolitan) [4.21 pm]: We are being sold a pup in relation to this matter, which will ultimately reflect badly on this House. I have no option but to

support the request for the Select Committee to be converted to an Honorary Royal Commission because clearly it would be lunacy for someone on this side of the House to say that he did not want an inquiry of the kind that Hon Bob Pike has presided over to continue beyond the prorogation of the Parliament. That is not the point. We are being sold a pup for the following reason: I have no reason to doubt - and I do not doubt - the bona fides of the mover of the motion, Hon John Caldwell, or his colleague Hon Murray Montgomery. However, to go down this path is to do exactly what this Government wants us to do; it accommodates the Government and answers all of its prayers of the past couple of months knowing that it has been in the most serious trouble.

Hon T.G. Butler: God, you're paranoid!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is enough to put Mr Butler's party at 38 per cent in current Morgan polls. We are being sold a pup because we are asked to accept a watered down version of a fully fledged and independent Royal Commission.

Hon T.G. Butler: You made this speech during the Budget debate.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: There was a great sigh of relief from the Leader of the House when this motion was moved because it suits the Government that this committee be turned into an Honorary Royal Commission so that it appears it is doing the job of a Royal Commission, for which the Opposition has been pushing. Why does that suit the Government? Because the Government knows that it is far easier to discredit an Honorary Royal Commission than it is to discredit an independent Royal Commission presided over by someone like a Supreme Court judge or someone of the calibre of Mr Fitzgerald or Mr Costigan. That is what it comes down to.

Members should mark my words: In the months ahead this motion will be seen to have served the Government's purpose, providing a great deal of relief to the Leader of the House; the Premier, Mr Dowding; the Treasurer, Mr Parker; and the Minister for Economic Development and Trade, Mr Grill. Hon Norman Moore has touched on some of the reasons for that this afternoon. For instance, the Government knows that certain people cannot be called before an Honorary Royal Commission who could have been called before a fully blown Royal Commission. It is a great pity that this motion is playing into the hands of the Government in this way. I have no doubt that this is a direct result of the legitimate pressures exerted from this side of the Parliament as late as last Thursday to achieve a fully blown Royal Commission into these matters.

The Leader of the House responded with speed to this motion that had been in my possession for less than 40 minutes. I would be interested to know for how long it had been in his possession. It is a great pity that we will, no doubt, pass this motion. I repeat that I am bound to support the motion, not least because my colleague, Hon Bob Pike, has agreed to go down the path suggested and I have great faith in him.

Hon J.M. Berinson: But you have no faith in his committee; is that what you are saying?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have no faith in the part the Leader of the House has played in this matter; that is the truth of it.

Hon Graham Edwards: He is not on the committee.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have no faith in any committee investigating matters which do not extend beyond those which Hon Bob Pike's committee is pursuing, because other issues will never be pursued and it is those wider issues that have been canvassed by the Opposition for weeks and months.

Hon J.M. Brown: And years.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Exactly.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members who are interjecting to cease doing so if they wish to stay here for the rest of the debate.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I assure members opposite who interjected in a way which indicated that they see this as a laughing matter, or a matter where they will be able to get away with what they have been doing in the past couple of years, that -

Hon J.M. Berinson: You have talked rubbish all session, Mr Pendal, and you are continuing in that vein.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The fact is that it took years of public pressure in Queensland before a commission of inquiry was appointed.

Hon Tom Stephens: They had something to start with, Mr Pendal.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: What happened in Queensland, what came out in the Fitzgerald Royal Commission, will not hold a candle to the sorts of corrupt activities that will ultimately be uncovered relating to this Government.

Withdrawal of Remark

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I object to that statement by Hon Phillip Pendal, which was unparliamentary and unwarranted. The fact that he has been in the habit of using that expression at every opportunity does not excuse it and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member withdraw that reference to "corrupt Government"?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I withdraw that reference to a corrupt Government.

Debate Resumed

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It does not matter how long this Government resists legitimate demands for a serious inquiry of a broadly based nature such as that which brought people to heel in Queensland. It can resist that approach this month, this session, next year or for the whole of this session, but ultimately the smiles will be on the other side of the faces of those people who a few minutes ago thought it was a smart trick to agree to the appointment of an Honorary Royal Commission in place of the committee chaired by Hon Bob Pike.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Are you accusing Mr Caldwell of a smart trick?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: No.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have already said that I am not accusing Mr Caldwell of a smart trick because I happen to believe in his integrity. However, I believe he has been sold a pup.

Hon Fred McKenzie: By whom?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I am not in a position to know that; therefore, we have no option but to go down that path. I agree with what was said by the Leader of the Opposition and Hon Norman Moore, that the outcome of this inquiry is of the utmost importance; there is no doubt about that. Neither do I doubt that Hon Bob Pike and his colleagues will press the matter as far as humanly possible, but it will in no way - and I do not believe Hon Bob Pike is suggesting this - replace the need for an independent Royal Commission which, in the final analysis, this Government would not be able to discredit even though that will be the tactic used by it should Mr Pike's committee get too close to the truth, as it indisputably will.

HON J.N. CALDWELL (Agricultural) [4.30 pm]: The National Party members have full confidence in Hon Bob Pike, the chairman of the committee, and in its members. We believe they will carry out their duties to the fullest extent possible.

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: I am a bit worried about their having two months off.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: That may be so, but they deserve a couple of months off, after having been in this place for some time. They will undoubtedly meet again some time in February.

Hon D.J. Wordsworth: That is good. It is an urgent matter.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: Some points were made about Royal Commissions and Honorary Royal Commissions. Clause 9 of the Royal Commissions Act says -

The Chairman may cause a summons in writing under his hand to be served upon any person requiring him to attend the Commission, at a time and place named in the summons, and then and there to give evidence and to produce any books, documents, or writings in his custody or control which he is required by the summons to produce.

I cannot see there is any distinction between an Honorary Royal Commission and a Royal Commission; there may be a distinction of which I am not aware. At the end of the day, this Select Committee, or Honorary Royal Commission, as the case may be, will report to the House. The National Party tied up this motion so that the committee would have to report to the House, because had that not been done, the committee may have been disbanded, and may not have tabled a report in this House. That committee will suggest to the Government of the day whether a Royal Commission should be appointed. I hope that Ministers will avail themselves of the opportunity to appear before this committee, because we have to get to the bottom of this matter; and I am sure that after the committee has deliberated on the evidence presented to it, it will recommend that a Royal Commission be set up to investigate the Government's financial mismanagement over the past three years. As I said some time ago, this matter started off with the Midland saleyards, and has carried on from there.

This motion has a lot of merit. It will allow the committee to continue with the work it has been doing. The committee has already found out quite a lot from the various people who have come before it. I am sure that it will suggest to us in its report what should happen in the future in respect of Royal Commissions. The committee's report may even exonerate the Government, although I doubt that because it has lost far too much of our money.

Question put and passed.

[Resolved, that business be continued.]

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT - LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Charlton, Hon E.J.

On motion by Hon J.N. Caldwell, resolved -

That leave of absence for six sitting days be granted to Hon E.J. Charlton (Agricultural) on the ground of urgent family business.

UNIVERSITIES AMALGAMATION BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Racing and Gaming), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON KAY HALLAHAN (East Metropolitan - Minister for Local Government) [4.36 pm]:
I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to bring about the amalgamation of Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia. The decision to introduce legislation enabling amalgamation has been made with the utmost care and deliberation, both because of its impact on two institutions of which we have every reason to be proud, and because of its significance for the future of the State. The Government's decision has been influenced by two separate perspectives on the proposal to amalgamate: That of the senates of the two universities involved, and that of an independent review. I will outline for the House the procedures by which these perspectives were developed.

Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia commenced exploratory discussions on the feasibility of a merger in June 1988. Discussions continued for most of one year, during which time an amalgamation facilitating group, with Emeritus Professor George Davies of Queensland at its head, worked in consultation with university staff and students to examine the ramifications of amalgamation. Meanwhile the advisability of amalgamation was debated widely in both senates, with all interest groups represented arguing their various points of view. Finally, in June 1989 the chancellors of both universities, acting on resolutions passed by large majorities of their senates after lengthy deliberation, requested the State Government to introduce the legislation required to effect the amalgamation of Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia.

As both universities worked through the lengthy progress just described, the Minister for

Education deliberately avoided imposing any pressure on them to make any particular decision. She considered herself bound to allow the two senates, as the governing bodies of autonomous institutions, to come to their own conclusions on whether amalgamation would be in their best interest. Either to insist on or to prohibit amalgamation out of hand would have been to deny their right to reach their own conclusions. If either senate had resolved against amalgamation, it would have been pursued no further. On the other hand, as Minister for Education she was concerned to determine independently whether an amalgamation of Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia would be of benefit to the State as a whole, quite apart from any advantage it might have to the two institutions specifically involved.

In October 1988 the Minister for Education established the Committee of Review of Higher Education in Western Australia, which she herself chaired, to review various aspects of higher education in Western Australia. One of the terms of reference for the review was to consider "the number, size and character of higher education institutions needed in Western Australia". After advertising, the committee received more than 100 submissions, many of them pertaining to the amalgamation issue. The committee visited Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia, met representatives of the various interest groups, and deliberated at length on the merits and drawbacks of a merger. The final report of the committee, released in August 1989, states as follows -

Weighing the benefits of amalgamation against the difficulties of implementation we have come to the conclusion that, in all the circumstances, amalgamation will be to the advantage of the two universities concerned and to the State.

The concurrence of the two university senates with those of the committee of review was the determining factor in the Government's decision to introduce legislation to bring about the amalgamation.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Your heart does not appear to be in this. Your reading is very perfunctory.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The member's comments are not very useful, nor are they appreciated. I have devoted some time to explaining the procedures followed in deciding on amalgamation in order to emphasise that it has been a hard decision to make and, incidentally, not one of which the Minister for Education was initially in favour.

The "difficulties of implementation" referred to by the committee of review are very considerable; it is a major undertaking to bring together two institutions in a way which is equitable to all staff and students concerned. The amount of sheer work entailed is extraordinary, as those who have been involved in the planning process so far are already well aware. There is, moreover, a tendency to identify progress with expansion rather than contraction, and to assume that in a State like Western Australia the number of higher education institutions should proliferate in direct proportion to its increase in population.

The viability of small universities such as Murdoch is defended by some, who point to other small and prestigious universities such as Princeton in the United States. Yes, Princeton University is small, but it is also a private, elite, specialised and enormously wealthy institution, with a graduate school almost as large as its undergraduate school. No meaningful comparison can be drawn with Australian universities of a similar size. A more appropriate comparison for our purpose is Rutgers University, quite close to Princeton, which several years ago amalgamated with several colleges nearby to become the State University of New Jersey. The merger has been extremely successful, with top quality staff being attracted from ivy league colleges such as Harvard and Princeton, and from major public universities such as Berkeley. Although the university is large, with a total of 42 000 students, each campus has its own dean and has retained its particular character.

Within Australia, quite large universities are beginning to emerge as a result of amalgamations. The University of Melbourne, Sydney University and Monash University will each have well over the equivalent of 20 000 full time students in 1990, and the University of New South Wales, La Trobe University and the University of Queensland will each have over 15 000. Although the immediate stimulus for change has been the new Commonwealth policy on higher education announced in the White Paper of 1988, the fact is that Australia is gradually moving into line with a worldwide trend towards mass higher education, supported by resources which, due to their relative scarcity, must be utilised in the most efficient manner possible. In practice, this seems to mean larger institutions.

Why should size make such a difference? It is because the efficiency of a university in terms of its resources, and the effectiveness of its teaching programs and research, are to some extent dependent on whether it has reached a critical mass. A small institution is inevitably top-heavy with administration; a larger one can put relatively more of its total resources into developing and sustaining high quality academic programs. Increasing the number of students makes possible much greater diversity in courses available, and a student culture which is richer in complexity, and more stimulating. The purchase of expensive equipment and materials is easier to justify if their use can be shared by significant numbers of academic and technical staff.

I refer to the following quotation, which is taken not from the White Paper, which expresses an almost identical view, but from *The Times* higher education supplement leader of 23 June 1989 -

Smallness may indeed be an obstacle to both excellence and to access under modern conditions. Most universities are already too small to maintain a comprehensive research mission. Except in most extraordinary circumstances a university with fewer than 5 000 students cannot aspire to be a "research university".

With 3 550 student places being funded by the Commonwealth this year, Murdoch University is very small by national standards. According to the unified national system benchmarks, as set out in the White Paper, only a limited range of academic activities can be justified in an institution with fewer than 5 000 equivalent full time students. As the report of the Committee of Review of Higher Education explains -

If the rules of the UNS were to be applied strictly to Murdoch, it would cease to function as a university, despite its designation, and be reduced to the status of an institution without funding for research, and with a much restricted teaching profile.

The University of Western Australia, with nearly 8 600 funded places, is in a better position, but with 10 Australian universities each taking over 10 000 full time students in 1990 it would be very much in the second rank in terms of size if it were to continue as it is; and consequently less able to attract capital grants, infrastructure and research funding. Western Australia already has fewer postgraduate students for its size than the national average, and receives less than its fair share of research funds.

The Australian of 22 November 1989 reported that Western Australia will receive a total of \$5.1 million in grants for 1990 from the Australian Research Council; the University of New South Wales, a single institution, will receive \$8.2 million. Without an amalgamation the situation could be expected to worsen for Western Australia. Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia will, when combined, have the equivalent of 12 500 full time students in 1990, together with a large academic staff, who are expert in a comprehensive range of disciplines, and a formidable array of facilities. The amalgamated university will be well able to compete successfully for the funding so essential to the achievement of excellence in teaching and research.

Let there be no doubt that in the foreseeable future the competition for funds in the higher education sector will be fierce. The binary system, whereby universities were funded for teaching and research while colleges of advanced education were funded for teaching only, has been abolished. A gradual levelling out of per capita student funding among institutions is in progress as CAEs and former CAEs vie with established universities for research funds. Traditional universities, which in some cases have been resting on their laurels, may find the going much tougher than they expected. A key phrase which sums up the current approach to research funding is "selectivity and concentration"; rather than resources being spread thinly, they are being selectively concentrated where it is believed they will be most productive - in centres of specific research excellence and interdisciplinary strength.

A good example of the potential benefits of the amalgamation is the plan to consolidate the major strengths of both partners by relocating the University of Western Australia's school of agriculture on the Murdoch campus, and linking it with the schools of veterinary studies and biological and environmental sciences already there. Such a concentration of expertise and infrastructure in related areas will provide a fertile breeding ground for research initiatives of great significance to the State, and beyond. The Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training has already announced that \$17 million will be provided to fund the relocation, with building to commence in 1992.

With an amalgamation between Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia, the State will possess three good sized institutions of higher education, each with its own distinctive mission, but able to cooperate with each other to provide a top quality system of higher education, including distance education, to the entire State. Additional metropolitan and country campuses can be added to the existing institutions as population growth requires. It is certainly in the best interests of the State for the amalgamation to proceed.

The Bill before the House is for an Act to provide for the repeal of the Murdoch University Act 1973 and the amalgamation of Murdoch University with the University of Western Australia. A separate Bill allows for amendments to the University of Western Australia Act 1911-1985. This approach to legislation for amalgamation was adopted following legal advice that it was in the best interests of both Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia. The matters dealt with in the Bill are primarily to do with the legal consequences of an amalgamation for Murdoch University, and arrangements for the transition period immediately following the merger. The Bill includes the following features -

The Murdoch University Act 1973 is repealed.

All assets and liabilities of Murdoch University are vested in the University of Western Australia.

All staff members of Murdoch University become staff members of the University of Western Australia, with their previous rights, entitlements and conditions of service fully protected.

All undergraduate and postgraduate students of Murdoch University who are enrolled at the time of amalgamation become students of the new University of Western Australia, with all their rights and privileges protected.

Arrangements for the constitution of the Senate of the University of Western Australia in the period immediately following amalgamation. These arrangements, together with the regulations for election to the senate, ensure proper representation on the new senate of persons previously associated with Murdoch University and are in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee of Review of Higher Education referred to earlier.

The Bill was prepared after consultation with representatives of both Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia. Drafts were distributed in confidence to presidents of the staff associations and guilds of both universities, and to both Wardens of Convocation. Several amendments were made in response to feedback received from these groups. I am confident that this Bill protects the interests of those affected by it, while providing a framework within which the cultures of the two universities contributing to the amalgamation can interact and flourish. It is with pleasure that I commend the Bill to the House.

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

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON KAY HALLAHAN (East Metropolitan - Minister for Local Government) [4.51 pm]:
I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

One of the purposes of this Bill is to make amendments to the University of Western Australia Act 1911-1985 consequent to the repeal of the Murdoch Act 1973-1985, and the amalgamation of Murdoch University with the University of Western Australia. The rationale for the repeal of the Murdoch Act and the amalgamation of the two universities has

been covered at length in the second reading speech of the previous Bill; therefore, it does not require repetition. This Bill proposes to insert a section which recognises the amalgamation of Murdoch University and the University of Western Australia, with the agreement of their respective senates, as an historical event. It also alters certain definitions and the like as a result of the amalgamation, including changing the name of the "Guild of Undergraduates" to the "Guild of Students of the University of Western Australia", a title which includes postgraduate students.

The Bill also amends the Act to require the senate to establish an academic body to advise the senate on academic matters, without prescribing the composition or functions of the body, both of which are to be determined by the senate. Additional academic bodies are to be established by the senate, as it deems necessary. The second purpose of the Bill is to put into effect some of the recommendations of the report of the Committee of Review of Higher Education in Western Australia.

In a submission to the review committee the Auditor General recommended as follows -

The enabling legislation of each institution should clearly define its role, functions, powers and responsibilities.

The University of Western Australia is the only higher education institution in the State whose Act does not include a description of its functions. That lack is made good by the present Bill which includes reference to the role of the University in promoting access to higher education for people living in remote regions of the State. This will be of great benefit for many Western Australians, since the University of Western Australia has not been involved in distance education for many years.

The review of higher education, drawing heavily on the recommendations of the Hetherington report, made a series of recommendations on the composition and terms of office of the governing bodies of higher education institutions. These recommendations are as follows -

That the internal membership of senates and councils have the following composition -

Chief Executive Officer;

Chairperson of the Academic Board or equivalent body, if such a person is not also the Chief Executive Officer;

Up to four members of academic staff, including the president of the academic staff association;

Up to two members of the non-academic staff, including the president of the general staff association;

Up to three students, including ex-officio the president of the student guild, and an elected graduate student.

That the external membership of senates and councils have the following composition -

Chancellor/chairperson, ex-officio, from within or outside membership.

Up to nine members appointed by the Governor, including -

One member representing employer interests appointed by the Minister in consultation with employer organisations; and

One member representing employee interests appointed by the Minister in consultation with the Trades and Labor Council.

The Chief Executive Officer of the Ministry of Education or his or her nominee.

Up to three members from convocation or alumni associations.

Up to three members co-opted by the senate/council.

That the term of office of elected members of senates or councils, other than student members, be limited to a period not exceeding three years and that after three

successive terms a 12 month period elapse before such members are eligible for reappointment.

That the term of office of chancellors/chairpersons be limited to three, three-year terms with the proviso that the Minister for Education may extend the appointment to a fourth term on application from the institution.

That the term of office for student members of senates/councils not exceed two years, served either as two terms of one year or one term of two years.

All of these recommendations, which have been widely canvassed and have found general support, are put into effect in the Bill, with a single exception. Given the particular circumstances of the amalgamation the Convocation of the University of Western Australia shall have four representatives on the senate, including the Warden of Convocation. Eight members will be appointed by the Governor.

The changes recommended by the review of higher education are long overdue and will benefit the University of Western Australia and the community.

I commend this Bill to the House.

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

STAMP AMENDMENT BILL (No 3)

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council. The Assembly also recommended to the Legislative Council that, in view of the differing interpretations of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council regarding the powers of the Council under section 46 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act 1899 to make these amendments, the Presiding Officers of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council seek ways to have the general issues discussed and possible solutions examined.

ACTS AMENDMENT (CREDIT) BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Racing and Gaming), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Racing and Gaming) [4.58 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill deals with the problem that has arisen from the operation of credit unions incorporated in their State of origin carrying on the business of providing credit interstate. This problem has been common throughout Australia and similar amendments have been passed in New South Wales and Victoria and by way of exemption order in Queensland.

Although the position varies between States, credit unions are generally required to either obtain exemptions or register as foreign credit unions under the relevant credit unions legislation to gain exemption from the Credit Act and the Credit (Administration) Act if carrying on business interstate. If a credit union fails to gain exemption from the Credit Act or the Credit (Administration) Act, it may as a result lose interest charges on loans and in some cases lose the right to the amount financed and be fined if prosecuted.

Exemption orders current in Western Australia exempt registered foreign credit unions from Parts III to VIII of the Credit Act and the requirements of licensing under the Credit (Administration) Act. These orders do not exempt those credit unions which are not registered but are exempt by the registrar under the Credit Unions Act. It would appear that interstate credit unions operating in Western Australia have in some cases not only failed to gain registration as foreign credit unions, but also failed to gain exemption and carried on business in this State. Under the Credit Act and the Credit (Administration) Act they may

therefore lose their right to recover interest and principal. This has been occurring Australia-wide as a result of people moving interstate and maintaining their links with their credit union in their home State. As existing loans have been refinanced or new loans taken out, documents have been signed in other States which has involved the local Credit Act jurisdiction.

This Bill retrospectively amends the Credit Act exempting all credit unions incorporated in foreign States and Territories from Part III to VIII of the Credit Act and from the licensing requirements of the Credit (Administration) Act. The amendment also allows the Minister for Consumer Affairs to fix by way of a notice published in the *Government Gazette* for the exemption to cease on a date to be fixed in the future. From that date onwards all credit unions incorporated outside Western Australia which carry on business in Western Australia will be required to comply with the Credit Act and the Credit (Administration) Act in the same way that local credit unions are now required.

The Bill also inserts two new sections into the Credit Act, modifying the application of sections 85 and 86 of the existing Act. New section 85A allows a debtor or the commissioner on a debtor's behalf to apply to the tribunal for a declaration as to whether a credit provider has lost its right to credit charges. This is to overcome a practical problem in the operation of the Act where, sometimes due to the complexity of the problems involved in a dispute between a debtor and the credit provider, there is doubt whether credit charges have been lost. This amendment will allow the debtor to obtain a declaration from the tribunal that this has in fact occurred. Section 86A allows for a credit provider to apply to the tribunal in respect of minor errors. Under the present Act all applications must proceed to a full hearing and the conduct of the credit provider and the debtor must be fully examined in relation to all contracts affected. Sometimes the error might be quite minor and not materially disadvantage or prejudice the debtor in any way. This provision allows an order to be obtained from the tribunal that the contract is deemed to conform with the Act despite the error. Orders made by the tribunal under this proposed section will only apply to errors adverted to in the application by the credit provider.

The amendment will not interfere with existing decisions already handed down by the tribunal and in no way will it affect the criminal liability of the parties involved. The tribunal will be able to deal with errors common to a number of contracts on a common basis without the need to examine separately each and every contract involved.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Max Evans.

[Questions without notice taken.]

MINING AMENDMENT BILL (No 2)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon Kay Hallahan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON KAY HALLAHAN (East Metropolitan - Minister for Local Government) [5.31 pm]:
I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes a number of amendments to the Mining Act with the main proposals being -

- the implementation of Government policy on mining and exploration in national parks and nature reserves;
- a graticular system to describe boundaries for exploration licences; and
- a new provision to provide a substantive power relating to the verification of royalties payable.

Currently the Act allows exploration to be carried out on national parks and A Class nature reserves with the consent of the Minister for Mines and the Minister responsible for the park

or reserve. A mining lease or general purpose lease, however, may be granted only with the consent of both Houses of Parliament.

Following the recommendations of the Committee on Mining and Exploration in National Parks and A Class Nature Reserves, chaired by Dr John Bailey, the Government has accepted that a stricter code of conduct is required on exploration and mining in these classes of land. The proposed amendments exclude the grant of exploration licences within a national park or A Class nature reserve unless that park or reserve, or portion thereof, has been declared open for exploration by resolution of both Houses of Parliament. It is envisaged that, prior to any national park or A Class nature reserve being declared open for exploration or mining, detailed environmental and geological studies and assessments will be required. In this way Parliament will be in a position to determine whether development should take place, and if so under what terms and conditions.

A permit to conduct non-destructive research surveys to acquire geoscientific information within such parks or reserves without holding a mining tenement may be issued by the Minister for Mines after obtaining the consent of the Minister responsible for the park or reserve. The data arising from such surveys would determine whether a need exists for a mining tenement application and subsequent consideration for the park or reserve being opened for further exploration, and should also enable better management of conservation reserves, as well as adding to the State's knowledge of its overall resources.

Provision has also been included to extend the current provisions in the Mining Act which provide that the Minister may vary or impose additional environmental conditions on leases at any time to exploration licences and prospecting licences. Exploration and mining is always subject to ongoing assessment and inspection, and such provisions of varying or imposing additional conditions are necessary to ensure the maximum environmental protection allowable should circumstances change. Furthermore, penalties for unauthorised mining have been substantially increased as a deterrent to those who may contemplate mining without the proper authority. All other monetary penalties relating to breach of tenement covenants or conditions and various offences have also been substantially increased to act as a deterrent and to provide a meaningful alternative to forfeiture of a tenement where that is provided for.

The proposal for exploration licences to be determined by graticular sections is the result of recommendations of a departmental working group and the mining industry liaison committee and has the support of the Chamber of Mines and Energy of Western Australia, the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies and the Amalgamated Prospectors and Leaseholders Association. Basically the proposal is for exploration licences to have boundaries defined by lines of predetermined latitudes and longitudes - one minute by one minute - and to comprise units of graticular sections, each having an identification number, rather than units of contained area as currently provided for. The proposal is modelled on the principles adopted by the petroleum Acts but with modifications to suit the mineral industry and the Mining Act. It is uniquely suitable for defining large parcels of land which have tenure of short term nature and boundaries which will not normally require marking out on the ground, but will be able to be represented on a map with correlation on the ground to acceptable accuracy being achievable should the need arise.

In respect of the verification of royalties payable, a new provision is being introduced to enable the Minister for Mines to make an estimate of royalty where royalty is not paid or properly assessed or calculated, and to accept audit certificates as verifying royalty. It also allows for the production and inspection of records and includes offences and penalties for persons failing to supply the information required to enable assessment of royalties. These strengthen existing provisions in the Mining Act Regulations which have proved inadequate as a basis to ensure fair royalty collection.

The remaining amendments are of a minor nature only and seek either to clarify existing provisions or to streamline procedures in the general administration of the Act. One of these amendments that should be highlighted, however, is the amendment to the Mining Act's definition of "private land" to specifically exclude special leases issued under the Land Act for the purpose of "use and benefit of the Aboriginal inhabitants". Special leases for this purpose have since January 1987 been defined in the Mining Act as Crown land for the purposes of that Act. It has always been the Government's intention that these leases retain Crown land status and this latest amendment reflects that intention.

Finally, it is intended to repeal remaining unproclaimed sections 88 and 90 of the Mining Amendment Act 1985. These two sections were originally drafted to introduce a system of provisional lodgment of dealings, and to separate the provisions of existing section 119 of the Mining Act into two distinct parts - one defining dealings which required registration, and the other stipulating the need for ministerial approval to transactions conferring beneficial interest upon a country. Section 88, as passed, proved on later examination to be too all-encompassing and administratively undesirable; section 90 was required only if section 88 was proclaimed as it is linked to that section. A subsequent amendment was made to the Mining Act to introduce section 103A to provide for provisional lodgment of dealings and, together with current section 119 which is a combination of sections 88 and 90, has proved adequate.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

STATE EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

BILLS (7) - RETURNED

1. Acts Amendment (Detention of Drunken Persons) Bill
2. Evidence Amendment Bill
3. Justices Amendment Bill
4. Supreme and Family Courts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
5. Local Government Superannuation Amendment Bill
6. Companies, and Securities and Futures Industries, Legislation (Acts Amendment) Bill
7. West Australian Trustees Limited (Merger) Bill

Bills returned from the Assembly without amendment.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 7 December.

HON REG DAVIES (North Metropolitan) [5.41 pm]: I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of members some of the problems that face my constituents. I do not want to talk about WA Inc. In fact, I, like many people, will be glad to see the "Inc" fade away.

Hon Tom Helm: Good one!

Hon REG DAVIES: I do not want to dwell on the petrochemical project. Neither do I want to reflect on WA Government Holdings Ltd nor Rothwells. I think we have spoken enough about them. However, I want to talk about the suffering that is being felt by the community as a result of the ill-conceived dealings of this revenue desperate Government. As I said, I think we have talked enough about the subject and it is clear that the Government is not listening.

Hon George Cash: Hear, hear! There are 40 000 signatures that tell us it is not listening.

Hon REG DAVIES: Absolutely. In fact, it exhibits a classic disregard for taxpayers' funds. That is evident when we hear interjections such as, "Here we go again", "I have heard all that before", "The old broken record" and so on. Obviously, the message is not getting through to the Government. As I said, the community is suffering. Certainly, people in North Metropolitan Region are suffering through the ill-conceived activities of this Government - I would not dare use the words used by Hon Phillip Pandal.

Hon B.L. Jones interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: I will bring that to the member's attention later. I have one hour to speak and I will tell the member how people are suffering.

Hon B.L. Jones: Is that a threat or a promise?

Hon REG DAVIES: It is also eminently clear to me that there is some reluctance on the part of other members to support the Liberal Party's call to defer this Bill until we hold a new election. It seems that that will not now happen and the people of Western Australia will be required to suffer for another three years under this Labor Government.

Hon B.L. Jones: Under the Government that they elected to govern them.

Hon T.G. Butler: You ignore the interjections and carry on.

Hon REG DAVIES: I thank the member. I expect that sort of support from him.

Any debate now must centre around convincing the Parliament of Western Australia that the citizens have a right to be informed of all the facts. The people of Western Australia have a right to all of the information relating to the tangled web of mysterious business dealings of their elected Government.

Hon B.L. Jones: If you say that often enough, you will believe it.

Hon Tom Helm: Say again, "their elected Government".

Hon REG DAVIES: It is this Parliament's responsibility to ensure that the citizens are fully aware of how their taxes are spent.

Hon B.L. Jones: They can get a copy of the Budget papers any time.

Hon REG DAVIES: I am sure they can. The member spends her time sitting and writing letters and making interjections. She contributes little else to this place.

Hon Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: I thank the member. I know he is listening to my speech with interest. I am sure he wants to be kept informed of what is going on in the community. He has been kept in the dark by his Ministers. They treat the Government backbenchers as mushrooms.

The Opposition in this Parliament is equally irresponsible if it does not demand that the facts are put before the public. The only hope of achieving that now is to defer debate on this Bill until the Government agrees to a full Royal Commission.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Hear, hear!

Hon REG DAVIES: That Royal Commission should have broad and detailed terms of reference. It should be a Fitzgerald-style Royal Commission into the Government's WA Inc dealings.

Hon B.L. Jones: I thought you were not going to talk about that.

Hon REG DAVIES: I will not talk about it any more.

Hon J.M. Berinson: How does a Fitzgerald-type Royal Commission differ from any Royal Commission? Your colleagues have also latched onto that phrase.

Hon REG DAVIES: It is a good phrase because people are aware of what Fitzgerald brought to the attention of the public in another State. We want the people of Western Australia to know what the Government they elected has been doing with their funds. I will not use Mr Pandal's words for fear of bringing down on me the wrath of the Minister for Budget Management.

Hon Tom Helm: That Royal Commission destroyed the Liberal Party in Queensland.

Hon REG DAVIES: I think the Liberal Party in Queensland was destroyed happily providing it was not part of the dealings that went on in Queensland. I would rather lose Government than be part of the dealings of that Government or of this Government, which appears to be involved in the same sorts of dealings. The people of Queensland decided that they did not want to have a tainted Government and they threw that Government out.

Hon B.L. Jones: That Government was corrupt. They have a Labor Government now; one they can trust.

Hon REG DAVIES: The member used the word "corrupt". I do not want to stoop to that level.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon J.M. Brown): Order!

Hon REG DAVIES: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. The interjections were inane.

This Royal Commission would clear up, once and for all, what has gone on in this State and the people could then judge for themselves whether they were happy with this Government or whether it was time to throw it out. I am sure that when the people of Western Australia have all the facts in front of them they will be in a position, with the enigma unveiled, to make their decision. As an elected member of Parliament I really worry about the State of Western Australia. I sometimes despair and wonder whether the people of Western Australia will ever wake up to what this Government is about. Fortunately, two things happened last week which gave me some hope for the future of this State. First, the result of the Morgan gallup poll showed that had an election been held that week only 38 per cent of Western Australian voters would have voted for the Labor Party compared with 51 per cent who would have voted for the Liberal Party. Second, I received a letter, completely unsolicited, from a constituent who is unknown to me. The letter is from a lady who lives at Hillarys and it contains a lucid message which is a true reflection of the general feeling in the community. Some of the points raised by the lady relate not only to State matters, but also to Federal matters. I beg the indulgence of the House to allow me to read the letter. It reads -

Dear Sir,

I've settled in for a good whinge! These are a few things that annoy me intensely:

TAXATION: High income tax is bad enough, but in conjunction with high sales tax, fuel tax, excise/import duty, "sin" taxes, luxury tax, stamp duty and all the rest, I feel like I'm just working for the government. And what do I get from this cash-rich government? Precious little, because I'm not a "bludger", which brings me to my next paragraph.

Hon T.G. Butler: What does sin tax mean?

Hon REG DAVIES: I have no idea. I am reading from the letter the lady sent me.

Several members interjected.

Hon T.G. Butler: I thought it was a tax I was missing out on.

Hon REG DAVIES: Hon Tom Butler was supporting me during my speech, but now he is interrupting me. I am sorry, but I do not know what a sin tax is.

Hon T.G. Butler: It is one of those taxes I would not like to miss out on.

Hon REG DAVIES: I am sure that the Government is considering taxing us for that, whatever it might be.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon J.M. Brown): Order! This has gone far enough.

Several members interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. This is a very serious matter but members opposite tend to make light of the problems experienced by people in the community.

The lady from whom I received the letter is very concerned and she has written down her thoughts which I want to bring to the attention of members. The letter continues -

SOCIAL WELFARE: I was brought up in the "no free lunch" era but now it's free breakfast, lunch & dinner - why does the government give so much of my money to a bunch of bludgers? If nothing was given to able-bodied sloths, just think what could be done for the aged pensioners and the disabled, both physically and mentally. Instead we have unemployment benefits for people who are too lazy to get up off their bums, family allowance & extra supplements, pensions for women to have babies & perpetuate the poverty cycle, and a virtual carte blanche for the Aborigines. Why? Even I get a family allowance of \$18.00 a fortnight. But I'm certainly not going to pass it up - at least I'm getting a little tax back - even if it probably costs the government \$25.00 to pay my eighteen by the time all the public servants are paid. Which brings me to my next gripe.

Hon John Halden: Are you fixing these up?

Hon REG DAVIES: I will try.

Several members interjected.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Can I ask you a question?

Hon REG DAVIES: The member will have to ask the Deputy President that question.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: Do you agree with her?

Hon REG DAVIES: I am merely bringing to the attention of the House the concerns of a citizen in the community. I did allude to the fact before I commenced reading the letter that not all the points mentioned in the letter relate to State matters. I do not intend to comment whether or not I agree with the lady. The letter continues -

GOVERNMENT WASTE: Australia would have one of the biggest public services per capita in the world. They are unproductive, only playing "round robin" with money, and should be kept as small as possible. The rest of us cannot keep supporting them in their "jobs for life" with incredible benefits. But unfortunately their union is strong, which brings me to another one.

THE POMMY DISEASE: Considering that England shipped all her no-hoper unionists to Australia, could we possibly re-export them? To New Zealand possibly? Since we've been supporting 1/3 of the NZ population on our dole for years, it only seems fair! Unfortunately it will be too late to save Australia - children are being raised to take as much as possible and give as little in return so I guess there's no hope for us. What little work ethic existed here has finally been extinguished. Which of course is why we have so many strikes.

STRIKE LEGISLATION: If essential service workers strike they should be fired immediately and their superannuation funds should be used to recruit & train new workers to replace them. All workers should have contracts (which should be used against them whenever necessary). All union voting should be secret ballot to discourage intimidation, and if the unions cause too much disruption simply de-register them. We've had enough of them and their unreasonable demands.

FOREIGN DEBT: I'm sick of paying for something I had nothing to do with. Big business is responsible with their massive overseas borrowings for expensive take-overs. And they aren't penalised at all because overseas rates are low, whereas Mr. Average & the small business man is pushed to the wall with high interest rates on local borrowing. Legislation needs to be passed to restrict overseas borrowings - let Mr Bond et al finance their take-over through Westpac. In fact I dare say Mr Bond wishes he had now - he wouldn't be in such a mess! And neither would I.

THE "INJUSTICE" SYSTEM: In Australia, crime pays - and until we do something about the light sentencing, it will continue to do so. If we didn't waste so much money on the welfare system we could enlarge our prison system to cope with longer sentences. Of course, if we had capital punishment not only would it free up some cells for the "not-so-bad", but it might deter another Nicholas Meredith. And if nothing else it would cheer up the families of the victims!

MEDICARE: It's got to go! The hospitals are in crisis with 2 year waiting lists for "elective" surgery (personally I don't think hip replacement surgery is "elective") and the rest of us are paying more (Medicare levy & private cover) and getting less for it. Of course, we could afford free hospitals for the poor if we stopped wasting so much money.

Well, in the event you're still reading, thanks for the opportunity to vent my spleen. I feel better, even if I've probably accomplished nothing.

I have photocopied the letter. I did indicate to the House that the lady who wrote the letter resides at Hillarys and I have removed half of her name and certainly her address from the letter because I would hate to see anyone try to recruit her to start up another political organisation.

In the closing stages of her letter the lady referred to the Medicare levy and said that it was

too high and that if the Government stopped playing around with taxpayers' funds more hospitals could be built. From time to time it is very enlightening to consider the problems facing people in the electorate.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

Hon REG DAVIES: Prior to the dinner suspension I said that Parliament was responsible to the people of Western Australia and that it is incumbent on Parliament to ensure that the people are fully aware of how their taxes are spent. This Parliament must defer debate on this Bill until the Government agrees to a full Royal Commission of inquiry, and lists both broad and detailed terms of reference. Amid myriad Government interjections I suggested a Fitzgerald-style Royal Commission inquiry into the Government's WA Inc business dealings. The people of this State could then decide whether the Australian Labor Party should continue to control Western Australia or demand the resignation of the Dowding-led Government. I read a letter received from a lady living in Hillarys who concluded by saying that we could afford free hospitals for the poor if the Government stopped wasting so much money.

It is an interesting exercise to look at the problems facing the people in one's electorate, and to calculate what could have been achieved had the Government not lost so much taxpayers' money. The lost millions of dollars could have paid the medical bills for everyone in this State for a whole year. In addition, the Government could have opened up 5 000 new housing lots. At the same time it could have provided homes for 1 000 needy families, and employed 400 extra police to ensure the welfare of the residents of Western Australia. That is not all: Enough money would have been left to build 10 new schools. It is most daunting to carry out an exercise like that.

Hon B.L. Jones interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: Perhaps the money could also have gone towards building retirement villages for those who need them - not necessarily ex-Liberals. Many elderly people in the community today would love to live in a retirement village environment. Instead, they have watched the money being lost by an inept Government's financial mismanagement. In the face of all these facts Government members have the audacity to scoff and play make-believe violins when the Opposition questions the bizarre series of events which led to those losses. They continue to make inane interjections. Government members do not care.

Several members interjected.

Hon T.G. Butler: Don't look at me.

Hon REG DAVIES: These massive losses of taxpayers' funds have occurred and Government members do not give a damn. That is really disgusting and I find it beyond comprehension.

Hon T.G. Butler: We are not surprised by that.

Hon REG DAVIES: Hon Tom Butler has been defending me all day and I appreciate that. I would hate to spoil our friendship now so I will move to another subject.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: We are very understanding. We know this is your maiden Budget debate and we appreciate that you may make mistakes.

Hon REG DAVIES: At least I attempt to bring to the attention of the Parliament the plight of constituents in the North Metropolitan Region.

Several members interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: Mr Deputy President, I need assistance to stem the interjections across the Chamber because I believe I have a very serious message to impart to members of this House. Although I am a new member I have been observing the activities of the Labor Government of Western Australia since 1983.

Hon B.L. Jones: You must be very impressed.

Hon REG DAVIES: I am not impressed, and neither is 62 per cent of the population of Western Australia, according to the recent gallup poll.

I refer now to the serious question of law and order within the North Metropolitan Region. This continues to perplex those of us who feel the need to fortify our homes and to buy

watchdogs for protection. I warned members earlier that I would not give up on law and order until the Government came to grips with the problems facing my constituents and, most particularly, I mean to pursue the need for a manned police station in Balga. The President of the Labor Party has been supporting me all day and I appreciate that; I now beg him to ask the Government to put aside funds to build this police station in the Balga area to help protect these people.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You want to steal the recreation area in Balga.

Hon REG DAVIES: What a load of rubbish. Hepburn Heights is nowhere near Balga. I am referring to land which has been used by the 6WF transmission station for 30 or 40 years. I moved to that area 22 years ago and was told by the then Postmaster-General's Office that it would be relocated within five years. At present, 22 years later, people in that area still get interference on their televisions and telephones. A lady who lives within 200 metres gets interference from 6WF on her hearing aid. When I turn on my hotplate at home I receive 6WF radio. It is a considerable problem and I am sure it would be a great favour to the people if that transmitter were relocated.

Several members interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: That is an indication of the insensitivity of Government members. They are completely impervious to the needs and problems of people in that area.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon J.M. Brown): Order! Hon Reg Davies will get no interference from me if he directs his remarks to the Chair rather than across the Chamber. It is very inconvenient for the Hansard reporter and for me as Deputy President, and it is not fair to the rest of the Chamber.

Hon REG DAVIES: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy President. I shall be looking forward to your guidance over the ensuing years as a member of this House in bringing to the attention of this House the needs and aspirations of the people of the North Metropolitan Region.

I have suggested that the 6WF radio transmitter station could be relocated to another area because there is no need for cumbersome transmitting stations in these days of new technology. The 44 hectares of land could be used for housing to help alleviate the housing problem. The City of Stirling has a very proud record of looking after the recreational interests of its community. It is the largest municipality in Western Australia with 165 000 residents. There is adequate public open space and in the three years that I was with the City of Stirling I made sure that my area was well catered for.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: That is simply not true.

Hon REG DAVIES: Perhaps if Hon Sam Piantadosi looked at the minutes of the meetings for the City of Stirling he would see what I achieved for Balga while I was a member of the council.

Hon Sam Piantadosi interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: Hon Sam Piantadosi should not upset me.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Reg Davies will address the Chair and Hon Sam Piantadosi will not interject.

Hon REG DAVIES: It is very difficult to stay on the subject when there are such interjections. It is obvious that Hon Sam Piantadosi is paying me back for the other night when he was instructed by the Leader of the House to speak for 10 minutes on the Appropriation Bill. The Opposition goaded the member into carrying on for 41 minutes. The member must have got into a bit of trouble and now he is paying me back by interjecting.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: It was not 41 minutes at all.

Hon REG DAVIES: I direct Hon Sam Piantadosi to look at *Hansard*.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: The people of Balga certainly made their decision known last May.

Hon REG DAVIES: Members of the Government who represent the same area as I do should have woken up by now that petty crime is endemic in the northern suburbs. One has only to open the local newspapers every week to see the list of petty crimes that have been

committed in that area. What needs to be done to alleviate the plight of people in Balga, Nollamara, Girrawheen and Koondoola and to protect their possessions and personal safety? I will keep hounding the Government until a proper police presence is achieved in that area. The Government cannot continue to turn a blind eye to the problems that those areas face; it cannot pretend that everything is okay. There are simply not enough police.

Hon B.L. Jones: Do they have Neighbourhood Watch?

Hon REG DAVIES: There are not enough police and Neighbourhood Watch cannot cope. I was instrumental, as a councillor of the City of Stirling, in instigating Neighbourhood Watch in the Balga area. I slogged around the streets of Balga in the middle of summer to get a couple of thousand signatures on a petition. If I had not done that there would not be a Neighbourhood Watch in the City of Stirling. I am very supportive of that organisation.

Hon B.L. Jones: It usually does its work well.

Hon REG DAVIES: It does not work well because petty crime in that area is endemic; it is out of control. There are not enough police to control petty crime. Members of the Government who also represent that area are aware of the facts. The problem should be addressed as a matter of priority, and funds allocated for this basic entitlement. Every edition of the local and daily metropolitan newspaper informs us of the breakdown in law and order.

A brochure that went to every home in Marangaroo carried the logo of Neighbourhood Watch and the State Government Insurance Office. It says -

"What we have been dreading happening in our community has actually happened."

A Break-In resulting in Grievous Bodily Harm inflicted on this lady.

The brochure calls for all people in Neighbourhood Watch to get together to try to do something. The lady went to the doctor because she was ill and came home unexpectedly while her home was being burgled. As she entered the house she was attacked. An article from one of the daily newspapers is part of the brochure. It states -

... Ms Wheeler owed her rescue to the quick thinking of the Jordanian boarder who arrived home soon after the attack.

"He resuscitated her and kept her alive until the ambulance arrived,"

The woman is still in a critical condition in Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre. There is a need for more police to back Neighbourhood Watch.

Government members interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: There is a need for a manned police station in this area so that people can ring and get the police immediately. I am talking about 40 000 to 50 000 people and I am not asking for 40 000 or 50 000 police. This area needs a normal police station.

Government members interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: I am sorry, Mr Deputy President, it is like speaking to a brick wall; it would be much better if I directed my remarks to you because at least you are listening.

There has been a breakdown in the supply of schools in the North Metropolitan Region. I have outlined what could have been achieved if the Government had not gambled and lost our funds. At least 10 new schools could have been supplied. The types of education facilities being provided to my constituents in the mortgage belt area and in Homeswest accommodation reinforces the status of those people as second class citizens. Last week I learnt that the Beldon school has seven demountable classrooms. It is anticipated that, at the commencement of the 1990 school year, a further two demountables will be provided. That is not acceptable accommodation. Those demountables house approximately 270 students in a school population of 500 - more than half.

Hon B.L. Jones: I have other information.

Hon REG DAVIES: If Hon Beryl Jones had her way, the plight of the teachers employed at the school would be ignored. If the member has more information I will wait for her to tell us all about it. Those teachers must attempt to impart knowledge in those undesirable surroundings. The teachers and children swelter in the summer and freeze in the winter

simply because the Government has mispent funds previously intended to build classrooms to house the population of potential taxpayers.

Hon John Halden interjected.

Hon REG DAVIES: Hon John Halden can say whatever he likes. He has lost all credibility after all the rubbish that he espoused about Hepburn Heights last week. He has lost all credibility in the northern suburbs, although he did not have much when he skulked away from North Metropolitan to contest a seat elsewhere.

It is the responsibility of the State to ensure that proper consideration is given to every student and teacher. These members of our community should be accommodated adequately and at a standard expected in this age. My constituents still remember the Government's promise of three elections ago that preschool for four and five year olds was a priority of this Government. Why do members of this Government who represent the North Metropolitan Region not try to tell this to parents of the Yanchep preschoolers who face the prospect of their little ones travelling 90 kilometres a day to and from their preprimary school in Padbury? They were offered a demountable classroom. Members opposite should look around their constituencies occasionally to see what is occurring. Both of these proposals are totally unacceptable and it is about time the Government got its priorities into some sort of respectable state. This is clearly not a future anybody can believe in.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: You should organise your trip meter next time.

Hon REG DAVIES: I spent a fair bit of time up there getting to know the area.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: It is not 90 kilometres.

Hon REG DAVIES: It is 45 kilometres each way from Yanchep to Padbury. I do not wish to appear obstructive in relation to this Bill, but in the light of the irrational and irresponsible financial dealings of this Government and what I believe to have been a deceitful election campaign by the Australian Labor Party last February - and I am careful not to use the word "corruption" as it appears to raise the hackles of some of the more senior and prominent members opposite - the Dowding Government does not deserve its mandate; it is a mandate gained by deceit. There must be at least a Royal Commission into the Government's financial dealings before the Bill is allowed to pass the House. Therefore, I cannot support the Bill.

HON P.H. LOCKYER (Mining and Pastoral) [7.53 pm]: I congratulate Hon Reg Davies, who has just resumed his seat, as he is obviously making his mark in this Chamber, particularly because of his strong representation of the northern suburbs. He even has the vote of his colleagues who represent the people in that area. There have been incredible outcomes to proposals in this place in the last week, particularly when Hon Reg Davies asked members opposite on behalf of the northern corridor people to support a good suggestion that he made. Amazingly, two Government members stood and said that they would not support his initiative. I do not know what the people in the northern corridor think about that. I should imagine they would be absolutely astounded, because Hon Sam Piantadosi claims to be a great supporter of ethnic people, who form a great proportion of the people in that corridor. They, of course, would benefit from the proposition put forward by Hon Reg Davies.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: About Hepburn Heights?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Hon Sam Piantadosi's credibility in that area is zilch.

Hon Reg Davies: Lower than a snake's belly.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Yes, lower than a goanna's toenail. He will not be able to show a nostril there. As for Hon John Halden getting up and blasting off as he did the other night, he is the one person in this Chamber that I imagined would support such a proposition. I am disturbed that members opposite did not take the opportunity to support that proposition.

Like Hon Reg Davies, I believe the Government has no way to go except to agree to either a Royal Commission or some sort of investigation to unravel the terrible mess it has got us into.

Hon T.G. Butler interjected.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: As for Hon Tom Butler, as I have said before, attaining the position of State President of the Labor Party is no mean feat. It should be the pinnacle of a person's career to lead such an organisation. He was elected unopposed the other day even though he was subject to a pincer movement by people against him. However, they zapped as their victim that poor little fellow Mark Cuomo - who works for one of the Ministers, I think Gavan Troy - and decided they would leave the senior gentleman, Hon Tom Butler - who has presided over the party for a long time - in his position. I am told he was left there because he knows too much and they felt that if they tipped him out anything might happen. Although he is a man of some integrity, goodness knows what he would have said if he had gone outside and spilt the beans. I put to members in the Chamber that Hon Tom Butler knows a lot more than he has advised this Chamber of from time to time. There was never a more worried face than the one we saw a fortnight ago, because it seemed he was gone for all money.

Hon Tom Helm interjected.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I will deal with Hon Tom Helm in a moment; he is in plenty of trouble as I have a nice box full for him, and I will make sure he is in the Chamber when I empty it on him, unlike the other night when he attended to me while I was up north cleaning up the mess he had made.

Hon Tom Butler was not tipped out because he knew too much, but there had to be a sacrificial lamb so Mr Cuomo copped it. I was told that Mr Cuomo was not a bad Treasurer but that the left and right, or the right and left, came in with a pincer movement and out the door he went. To give him his due, Hon Tom Butler is a survivor. He has more tricks in one little finger than most people learn in a lifetime. He said to me when I challenged him, "Get your money on me." I immediately got to all the punters around the place and put as much money on him as I could because I know that he always tells the truth. I won a fortune.

Hon T.G. Butler: You haven't slung anything back.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I took Hon Tom Butler's advice, and he survived. There were blokes in his own party giving 10 to one that he would not survive, but I tell him that he is the best survivor that I have ever known. He survived and slunk his way out of it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I do not care how much giggling and twisting and turning the Labor Party does, or whether it has three more years in office, because it will cop it. The same thing will happen to the members of the ALP as happened to the Nationals in Queensland.

Hon Sam Piantadosi: And the Liberals.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Yes, because between them what a nice old botch they made of things over the years. In the end the people said that they had had enough. Members opposite might laugh about that.

Hon Fred McKenzie: Wasn't Laurie Connell a mate of yours?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: He was, and still is.

Hon Fred McKenzie: So we got into trouble trying to help your mate.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Members opposite did not get into trouble because of Laurie Connell but because they did not know when to say no or when to stop. One bad deal brought on another bad deal and they tried to buy their way out of them. I am glad Hon Fred McKenzie is smiling and not taking this matter seriously because even he knows that he is in plenty of trouble. Members opposite can try what they like, the people will never forgive them; they are gone for all money. Members opposite will do their best, and I expect them to do that because we would do the same thing, but that will not help them. I was surprised when the Labor Party got 38 per cent of the vote because I do not know who that 38 per cent are. The Government is in bags of trouble out there.

Hon Tom Stephens: As long as you are selling their message, we will be okay.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Members opposite could not get a kick if they had a thousand footballs; there is no hope for them; but they will do their best. What will we do with

members opposite? I will start with Mr Helm. We cannot put him back on the tools because his hands are now too soft. Mrs Jones used to be a teacher. There is a possibility that we can squeeze her back into the system, but she will not get the start she had previously. I do not think there is anything we can do for Mr Butler; early retirement may be the best thing for him. He could perhaps receive the Vietnam War pension - or was it the Crimean War? There is hope for Mr Nevill, because he was a geologist, so he will be all right.

I was informed that Mr Stephens had been given the bum's rush out of the seminary, but I have since been told that was not right; he in fact pulled out of his own accord. I understand they will be only too happy to have him back; but the religion which he follows will preclude the two and nine-tenths children which he has at the moment, so he may have to come over to our side. He could have a yarn with the Anglicans; they may let him in. I have been told there is now not a lot of difference between the two churches after the episode with the homosexuality Bill.

Hon T.G. Butler: They could not come over to your side. Your policy on child care is appalling.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I will get on to that in a moment. I do not know what we can do with Mr Halden. He used to be a marriage guidance consultant; he will not get a start there again. Mr Wenn is a good bloke, because he can go back to Telecom. I understand he had some ability in Telecom when he was there, and he has not been here long enough to learn too many bad habits. I recommend direct retirement for Mr Berinson. They would perhaps have him back at the Bar, but I think he would take retirement with pleasure. I recommend for Mr Edwards that he become secretary of the Subiaco Football Club; with the way football is going at the moment, it will by then be an honorary job because there will be no sling from it. That is where the Minister should go, because he is so one-eyed. I do not know what we can do with Mr Kelly. I have been told that when a Liberal Government is in power, it always shows a lot of sympathy towards people who are like him. We will not be able to do a lot for him, but we will do the best we can. As for Mr Piantadosi, he is a dead ringer of "Con the fruiterer", who is on television in the Eastern States. I reckon we could get Mr Piantadosi a start there, and he would do a good job of it. I just wanted to point this out to those fellows and ladies opposite so they will not forget they are in a bit of trouble out there. I would hate them to go to bed tonight and think it will be all okay tomorrow, because it will not be.

Seriously, Hon Tom Butler asked me about child care. Even though the funding of child care is the domain of the Federal Government, it is very important that I bring to the attention of this Parliament a problem that exists and will continue to exist in the north of our State, and right throughout Western Australia. A group of people operate a child care centre in Broome called Chu Chuus.

Hon Fred McKenzie: They are trains, are they not?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I knew the member would like that! Chu Chuus is a 38-place day care centre which has been in existence for a number of years. The only Government funding this centre receives is \$27 185. This funding is in accordance with a scale that is set by the Office of Child Care of the Federal Department of Community Services and Health. That funding provides 13 per cent of the centre's annual budget. The remaining 87 per cent of the budget is made up in parents' fees and the committee's fundraising activities. Last year this extremely hardworking committee raised \$17 500 in funds to supplement the child care centre's operations so that it was able to keep down to a reasonable level the cost per head of day care. That cost is \$115 a week, for day care on a five-day week basis.

Hon Mark Nevill: I hope you will tell people how much the Federal Government contributed to that centre.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I have just said it was 13 per cent.

Hon Mark Nevill: I am talking about the capital cost of building, because we have increased child care places from 46 000 to 114 000 in the last six years, which is a pretty creditable performance.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I am not disputing that; I am talking about the running costs, and about the work of the committee in raising funds, which has enabled the centre to keep down its costs to \$115 a week. Chu Chuus is being used by both the white and Aboriginal

communities, very harmoniously, and everyone pays their fees. An Aboriginal corporation in Broome decided to start up its own day care centre. I do not think that is wrong, because it has as much right to take advantage of the funds as does any other group. The corporation is called Jalygurr/Guwarn, and the centre is advertised under the name of Jalygurr.

Hon Mark Nevill: That is an old Wyndham name.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The Jalygurr centre people are subsidised by the Federal Government, through a different funding scheme, whereby all of its costs are covered. These same costs are not picked up in respect of the other child care centre, even though it provides the same services: It looks after children for the same number of hours a week, and requires the same amount of training for its staff. Because of the increased level of funding, Jalygurr is able to charge \$90 a week. The people who take their children to Chu Chuus have to pay an extra \$25 a week for the same service. I repeat that I am not opposed to the Jalygurr operation, but I am opposed to there being a discrepancy in the funding received by the two centres. There should not be a difference in funding just because of a difference in race; particularly not in this case, where Aboriginal children also attend Chu Chuus. I believe there is an anomaly here.

Hon John Halden: What causes the difference?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The funding provided to Jalygurr is substantially greater than that provided to Chu Chuus. Jalygurr is given funding to pay for its chef, rent and electricity. Jalygurr does not have to do any fundraising but is still able to charge only \$90 a week. The fund raising committee of Chu Chuus has to work night and day to raise the necessary funding. I understand that the centre in Derby charges \$140 a week, and that in Paraburdoo the fee charged is an enormous amount of money. I do not know how the ordinary working person, and particularly a single working mother, can afford to pay for the costs of child care.

Hon Mark Nevill: Do they not get a reduced rate?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: No; they all have to pay this amount of money.

Hon John Halden: It is subsidised.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: They may receive a subsidy on a personal basis, but they still have to pay \$115 to the centre. The point I am making is that it is very important that this discrepancy be removed because it causes unnecessary problems, particularly in smaller communities, where it simply should not happen. The committee of Chu Chuus raised \$17 500 in a year - which is a pretty good effort in a town like Broome; the community and the Lotteries Commission respond all the time - yet these people are getting burned out because they can see that no matter what they do, they will never be able to reduce their costs to \$90 a week, as can the child care centre located just down the road.

Hon John Halden: Did that happen in the metropolitan area too?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: That is no excuse.

Hon John Halden: It is just how you manage the money in the metropolitan area.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: It would not matter how one managed the money, the people at the Jalygurr centre pay only \$90 a week, because the rest is picked up. That centre is subsidised all the time by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs or some Government department; it does not have to do any fundraising at all. Why is one child care centre different from another? Why is there a discrepancy in the fees? The member shakes his head, and I shake mine too, because it is wrong. This problem needs addressing.

The people running the centre have consistently been writing to people such as Neal Blewett, the Federal Minister for Community Services and Health. Although his department indicates that it recognises the problem, nothing is done. Today I contacted some Liberal senators with a view to trying to get the thing sorted out quickly. Perhaps those patronising these child care centres should be means tested to see if they can afford to send their children there. Things like rent should be taken into consideration. The rental for an average flat in Broome is \$200 to \$250 a week. For a house the rental is \$300 to \$350 a week. These centres must employ qualified directors and pay them \$25 000 a year plus district allowance. Problems like this are wearing the centre down.

In most of these committees, as honourable members would know, no matter on which side

they are, there are always hard workers who do their best, but no-one will give the answer. These people are sick and tired of the department. No-one wants to grasp the nettle. Perhaps the fees will have to be increased, but I hope not. I would rather the same rules applied to both centres. They are both doing a wonderful job. The worst part of it is that Chu Chuus has an enormous waiting list; people are trying to get their kids in to Chu Chuus. I hope that somehow some of these spirited comments from across the Chamber will bear fruit.

Some time ago it was reported in the Press that a claim had been made on a portion of land in Broome known as Lurujarri trail. The Lurujarri trail is a trail which has been approved by the Broome Shire as a result of an application from a local Aboriginal group to try to keep its culture and way of life for everyone to see. This group invited a division of the Museum to undertake a study of the area and write a report. The report found 42 sites of significance, or sacred sites of heritage significance. That I do not object to.

The idea of the Lurujarri trail is a very good one and I support it. I do not object to genuine Aboriginal sites being documented by genuine Aboriginal people. As in most communities, there are politics in the Aboriginal community in Broome. Some people claim to be of one tribe with affiliation to the area, and other groups do not agree. The museum people chose to speak to one group only and took that group to be speaking for everyone. That was a mistake which the Museum should not have made. The Museum recommended that not only were these 42 sites of significance, but it recommended an exclusion zone 70 kilometres long and two kilometres wide to cover the whole of this area.

For a variety of reasons I object to that, because I do not believe it can be sustained in terms of the Act, nor is it in the best interests either of the Aboriginal people or of the community as a whole. I have met both sides of the Aboriginal community, I have listened to both their views, and I respect them. The Broome Shire is placed in the difficult position of having to make a recommendation. It has taken the correct step and appointed an independent anthropologist, Mr Rory O'Connor, to give an independent assessment of areas of significance, sacred sites and so on in the area. This study is being carried out at the present moment. The report will no doubt be in opposition to the report of the Museum's Department of Aboriginal Sites.

I have read the Museum's report very carefully. The people concerned act in what they see as the best interests of the Aboriginal people. I do not want to criticise them at all because I believe they are genuinely interested in the Aboriginal people and in preserving their sites. It is regrettable that they do not seem to consult everybody concerned. Prior even to reading the report, Hon Tom Helm supported its conclusions. I am sorry that he does, and I am sorry that he chose to give me a serve in the adjournment debate when I was in Broome. He made some false assertions against me which made him unpopular with the shire president and various other people. I would never give another member a serve in this House if he were not present in the Chamber, and I would not hide behind the veil of privilege. I have never done that in the past and I am hardly likely to do it in the future. I disagree with the honourable member, and the reason he has taken more than a passing interest is because of a fight he has about who will control his Broome branch.

Hon Tom Stephens: Is it the full moon that has brought you out?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: This is the first time I have been on Hon Tom Stephens' side, because I understand he has the numbers.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I understand it was not without a pretty good fight. The honourable member threw a couple of members out of the meeting because they did not agree with him. I would have helped the honourable member toss out that lady if I had been there.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I do not have to chase Mr Stephens round the corridors. I want to make it clear there is no room for political posturing with the Aboriginal people in Broome. My position is very clear. I hope the member makes his position clear when the time comes.

Hon Tom Helm: You oppose the trail.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I am not opposed to it. I hope every member was listening when I said I support the concept of the Lurujarri trail.

Hon Tom Helm: You have said it now.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I said it before and I say it now. The member does not listen. Unless I get the member early in the morning I cannot get any sense out of him. I have always supported the Lurujarri trail. What I do not support is the exclusion zone. The honourable member supports the exclusion zone.

Hon Mark Nevill: Where did the exclusion zone come from?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The honourable member wants to look at the map, does he?

Hon Mark Nevill: Who put this exclusion zone forward?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The exclusion zone was put up by the Department of Aboriginal Sites. I have great respect for the Aboriginal people. When my leader and I talked with them the other day they spoke with great dignity and openness. The thing that offends me is that when a group of Aboriginal people is sitting around there is always a token white bloke in the middle of them. This time it was a Dutchman, who told me his name was Franz Hoogland. He came up to me with his hand outstretched and said, "Good morning, Mr Lockyer, I don't like you", so we got off to a good start! I said to him, "What are you doing here?" He said, "I'm an anthropologist." I said, "Oh yes? I would prefer that you were not at this meeting. I came to talk to the Aboriginal people, not to you." Every time those people tried to tell us something, this bloke jumped in like a salmon coming up the stream in Canada. He was almost as bad as Hon Garry Kelly - we could not shut him up. Fortunately, in the end I succumbed because the aeroplane was waiting to take us away from the meeting.

I want to make it absolutely clear, so that it is no longer unclear to Hon Tom Helm, that the idea of the trail and of genuine sites by genuine Aboriginal people is a good one. The Shire of Broome supports my view, as does the Chamber of Commerce in Broome and the general public there.

Hon Tom Helm: How far do you want to go?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I issue a challenge to Hon Tom Helm: Next time he is in Broome let us call a public meeting on this very subject, just him and me. Of course, he will not be in it.

Hon Tom Helm: Yes, I will be there.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I imagine I would have to get guards to drag the member in there. The people of Broome genuinely support that view but they do not support the exclusion zone, just as the people at Rottnest Island do not support an exclusion zone. We must stop this nonsense - we must not allow these ludicrous claims to offset the very genuine claims made by genuine Aboriginal people; because people are not fools. They see Cable Beach, Rottnest Island and the Swan Brewery as the sites which just happen to be the ones for which claims are made, and that detracts from all the genuine claims. Some sites are of great significance to Aboriginal people and must be protected; some of them must be fenced off and people must not go there.

Hon Mark Nevill: What is excluded in this exclusion zone? Everything?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: No, if the member reads the appropriate Bill he will see it contains a clause which provides that if there is an exclusion zone any proposed development at all must be subject to the Bill. That means that no development can go ahead until permission is given. That might take one day or 10 years, but certainly it is not conducive to encouraging developers to go into an area. That is not to say that the area should not be protected, but the Shire of Broome, the Environmental Protection Authority and the Department of Conservation and Land Management all work in conjunction with the Aboriginal people on these claims, and that is how development sites should be worked out - it should not be done by imposing a blanket zone 70 kilometres long and two kilometres wide.

Hon Tom Helm: Isn't that going to happen though? Aren't the EPA and CALM going to decide it?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Yes, but if we left it to Hon Tom Helm he would accept the exclusion zone. He would think it was a wonderful thing.

Hon Tom Helm: You don't know what you are talking about.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Yes I do. Hon Tom Helm does not support the exclusion zone - he has publicly said that. He has to reply to a letter from the Chamber of Commerce.

Hon Tom Helm: I have done it - you didn't even know that.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I will know about it. I am sure the Chamber of Commerce will show me the letter in due course. I know this matter gets up Hon Tom Helm's nose a bit when he goes up to Broome. I hear he is even threatening to shift his office up there because I am annoying him so much. I have taken to studying him.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: It is the same with a football team which has a star centre-man and the rest of the team is very average. That star centre-man carries the rest of the team. I hope Hon Joe Berinson never gets sick because if he does the rest of the members opposite will go down the gurgler as though it had been greased. They will be gone for all money. If we took Mr Berinson away from the team, they would be a very average lot.

On the subject of bananas -

Hon Mark Nevill: What is yellow and smells like bananas?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: We should wash the member's mouth out with soap, Mr President. In the weekend Press there appeared an article which indicated that, regrettably, in Kununurra there is a dreadful mite called the banana boring weevil which has reared its ugly head and has the potential to destroy the Kununurra banana industry, which in itself would be an absolute disaster. The weevil has been introduced from outside Western Australia, and the Department of Agriculture in Kununurra is doing its very best to sort out the problem but I am concerned because the fruit transported from Kununurra to Perth is trucked through Carnarvon. The Carnarvon banana industry is the lifeblood of Carnarvon in some ways. Carnarvon's whole plantation industry contributes some \$20 million annually to the town's economy, and this weevil could find its way into Carnarvon's banana plantations. I understand it could be introduced via a packing case or something like that. Very urgent steps must be taken by the Department of Agriculture and the Minister himself to find a solution, and I have written an urgent letter this afternoon to the Minister for Agriculture, Mr Bridge, whom I respect and whose help in this matter I would appreciate.

Hon Mark Nevill: I think you should get fumigated.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Why is that?

Hon Mark Nevill: You travel between those two places.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: That might be right. Perhaps when Hon Mark Nevill and I next travel to Kununurra we will have to get our boots fumigated. However, on a serious note - because this is a serious matter - if the weevil does get into Carnarvon it will destroy the industry there, which is a much more compact industry than that in Kununurra and does not need a problem like this.

Already in places like Broome the people have a palm beetle which is destroying their palms. I believe the quick action taken by the Department of Agriculture stopped that problem - it was an evil beetle which came in from Darwin and was quickly fixed up. I believe the Department of Agriculture owes it to the banana growers of Carnarvon either to say that there is no danger or to stop the trucks coming through the town of Carnarvon - to reroute them via the new highway or to keep them away from the town itself. It is like the fruit-fly which was introduced to this State, which stops us from sending our fruit interstate - once it becomes entrenched it will take a lifetime to eradicate. The Department of Agriculture was forced in the case of the Queensland fruit-fly to mount a large and expensive campaign to get rid of it. I commend the department for its efforts to do that. Some people say we have not yet got rid of the fruit-fly but I am informed the department has done a good job of that. It is time now that the department hopped into the banana boring weevil and eradicated it.

Hon P.G. Pental: We have a few boring weevils in this House and I am looking at a couple of them now.

Several members interjected.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I shall ignore that highly unparliamentary comment, Mr President.

In Mt Magnet, as in most towns in the area, there is a small but very hardworking group of people which is greatly concerned about the juvenile section of its community. The group believes there is a definite need, revealed through a Department for Community Services survey, to have a youth recreation and educational centre established in the town. The group has applied both to the Department of Land Administration and to the Minister for Education to set up a permanent youth drop-in centre at the old education site. I hope the Minister for Budget Management will take note of this and will speak to his Cabinet colleagues to give them the opportunity of supporting this move. The Mt Magnet group believes that the youth of the town - youth of all cultures, races and creeds - should have the opportunity to have a meeting place which provides both education and recreation rather than simply having the young people wandering around the streets. I do not think anyone in this Chamber would disagree with that. The group believes that such a centre will help with the assimilation of white people and Aborigines, especially among the young; the group believes it will help simple relations between people in the town. I agree with that; I have a strong affiliation with the town of Mt Magnet.

Hon Bob Thomas: What is the population of the town?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: As I understand it the population is about 1 000.

Hon Bob Thomas: I used to live there when I was a boy.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I was born there and I lived there as a boy too, so Hon Bob Thomas has immediately gone up 500 per cent in my estimation. Imagine having another Mt Magnet boy in this Chamber!

The group wants to use this drop-in centre as a job training centre where people can learn job application skills, further their business education and personal development, and learn TAFE-type subjects. The group wants to run it by a committee composed of sections of the community, including business, the Ministry of Education, and the local parents and citizens' association. The Government and the Ministry of Education can help by assisting the group with its efforts. I understand the Shire of Mt Magnet is firmly behind the group. The group is asking for the old Education Department building which is not being used.

Hon Graham Edwards: If you come and have a talk with me later on, I will see what I can do.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I am pleased about that because the Minister for Sport and Recreation is one person who would have sympathy for the group's efforts.

I understand the group has the support of the business community, the district high school, the police, the shire, mining groups and the general populace. It needs some assistance in getting a project to work on. I am told that the local "One-R" group - WANNAR - and the Black and White Fellowship, representing the local Aboriginal community, submitted a similar submission. The group believes it could operate the whole facility harmoniously. I believe something like that needs to be supported. If we do not set up that type of operation in these towns, we will constantly hear of the things of which Hon Reg Davies spoke tonight, where groups of people cause such problems that extra police are needed.

Thinking about police, I see from the newspapers that they now have a dreadful machine whereby they take one's photograph and snap one for speeding at the same time. I have scanned carefully as many volumes of *Hansard* as I could, but regrettably I must have missed debate on this matter when legislation came to the Parliament to give permission to these blokes to have this machine.

Hon Graham Edwards: I remember the debate.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: We actually had a debate on it?

Hon Graham Edwards: Yes, I am sure we did. That is what we were talking about at the time.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: What is the machine called?

Hon George Cash: It is a multanova.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I will put some questions on notice to the Minister for Sport and Recreation because I think he represents the Minister for Police and Emergency Services in this place.

Hon Graham Edwards: And very well too.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Yes. However I want to find out when this legislation went through because I want to make sure I voted against it. I am very careful about things like this because it once again is a revenue-grabbing operation. Hon Reg Davies said that we do not have enough police in the suburbs because they are too busy fooling around with these new toys. I have always said the best way to lower the road toll and stop people speeding is to get plenty of police vehicles on the road. Last week we were told that the Surf Life Saving Club of Western Australia had lost the use of its rescue helicopter. The reason for that loss was that the Westpac Bank had withdrawn its support, followed by the State Government.

Hon George Cash: The State Government withdrew its support first and as a result of that Westpac withdrew its support.

Hon Graham Edwards: That is not the case. You should substantiate that. You don't know what you are talking about.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I do not care which group withdrew its support first. However I do know that Western Australian beaches were patrolled by a helicopter operated by specialist staff who knew what they were doing. People who go down to the beach from time to time, as I do -

Hon J.M. Brown: What for?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Fair dinkum. There is nothing one can do with Hon J.M. Brown; he reeks with insignificance.

People who go to the beach felt happier to know that the helicopter rescue service existed. Hon Ian Taylor, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, and a man for whom I have some respect, dropped the bombshell as far as I was concerned by saying that in the next couple of months the police would have a twin engine helicopter. That took me back to 1981 when the police purchased their first aeroplane, a Cessna 182; at the time I warned - and Mr Hassell was the then Minister for Police - that it would be the start of a private police air force. Gees, I was not wrong. The police went from that to buying a Partenavia observer aircraft, which has a bubble on the front just to enable the police to have even more opportunity of picking up a few more dollars from we poor people who exceed the limit by four or five kilometres an hour up the back of Wubin or somewhere. However, worse was to come. The police purchased a second Cessna 182; next we had a police air force wing, and the police were learning to fly. Wherever I flew I heard "Romeo Tango Alpha", which used to be the old Road Traffic Authority aircraft code, and I would warn my mates that the air police were around. A massive amount of money is spent on that sort of thing. I do not know what a twin engine helicopter costs.

Hon Garry Kelly: A lot.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Hon Garry Kelly is absolutely right. I would say it would cost \$2 million. What would a patrol car cost, bearing in mind the police do not have to pay tax?

Hon Max Evans: Around \$20 000.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: How many \$20 000 police cars would one get for \$2 million? A lot, and a lot of patrolmen could be put out on the road. I do not object to the police flying around. It is the greatest thing in the world; a lot of my friends have learned to fly with the police. Good luck to them. However the Police Department will not be able to operate the surf life-saving helicopter with the same efficiency as was provided by the previous service for the simple reason that it will have too many duties. The police will use the helicopter, and they will put it to good use because the people in the air wing of the Police Force provide a good, slick operation. They know what they are doing, and the fact that they have been able to persuade Minister after Minister - starting with a Liberal Minister and followed by a succession of Labor Ministers - to buy all this equipment shows that the man in charge of the

air wing is probably now the Commissioner of Police or the Deputy Commissioner of Police and has a lot of ability. When Hon George Cash is the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, he will be riding around in a twin engine helicopter, and will not be able to do anything about the air wing either because it has gone too far.

What has not gone too far however is the opportunity for the Government to change its mind about the surf life-saving helicopter. It may well be that private enterprise in Western Australia is not putting enough money towards supporting this sort of activity; perhaps it should contribute more. Maybe the Government does not have a place in subsidising the wretched thing. However I reckon it is terrible that an organisation like the Surf Life Saving Club of Western Australia should lose a very efficient operation. The Government needs to reconsider what it did. If it buys this twin engine helicopter, I do not believe in my heart that the police will have the time to use it to attend to the emergency calls it will receive. The surf life-saving helicopter was based at Jandakot and was available at a moment's notice. If the Government insists on doing this, and if the helicopter is out on police duties somewhere - as it will have to be because it will not be just for surf life saving duties - I hope something is put in place to allow for the situation where this twin engine helicopter is not at Merredin, looking after Hon J.M. Brown's sheep or something like that, when it is needed in Perth. I hope that is the sort of thing the Minister takes in.

Hon Graham Edwards: The helicopter had a 41 per cent down time and in the last two years only two rescues were directly related to surf life-saving. It was felt that there was a broader use for a helicopter service within the police and emergency services.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: It may well be that it rescued only two people, but what happens if tomorrow 10 people need rescuing? One life saved over 10 years, by itself, is socially acceptable. Private enterprise is as much to blame as is the Government. It is good that the Police Department will receive a flash new helicopter. I can see the young police officers in the gallery smiling; they are probably potential helicopter pilots. Good luck to them. Where does reduction of services stop? There are no policemen in the suburbs, probably because they are spending too much time in twin-engined helicopters.

Finally, football in Western Australia is in a mess. I want the Minister for Racing and Gaming to listen very carefully to what I have to say. I am sick of the bandaid treatment we hand out to the football leagues.

Hon Graham Edwards: It is hardly bandaid treatment. The assistance has been very significant.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Shall we say major surgery? I recently heard a very good speaker on football who said that not all that many years ago -

Hon Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I will come back to what the member said in a minute; I have some very serious suggestions to make of which even he may take some notice. This speaker said that there was a time when people who played league football - around about this time of the year - put their sandshoes on and went for a run down at Como to get fit for a football season. Supporters for the players consisted of the biggest, oldest and fattest ladies who washed the football jumpers and made the afternoon teas and it cost two bob to get into a match. Players were not paid very much in those days; they received 10 bob a game. People played football and crowds attended the matches because it was an amateur game. Nowadays, no-one wants to play unless they receive a fortune. Administrators have built Taj Mahal-like structures for privileged spectators around the grounds. They have tried every trick in the book to bring in revenue including sponsorship and have finally established an Australian Football League. People have stopped going to football matches because they have become too expensive. What does it cost to go to a football match these days?

Hon Garry Kelly: It costs about \$13 for a VFL game.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Supposing a young father like Hon Tom Stephens - he will have his own team eventually, the way he is going - were a keen football supporter and wanted to attend several matches a year, even on a politician's wage he would not be able to afford it.

Hon Garry Kelly: Kids are free now.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: They would want to be. Nevertheless, football is in a mess. It was

reported on the news on television this evening and in this morning's *The West Australian* that the South Fremantle Football Club is about \$600 000 in the red. This has not just happened in 12 months; last year the club made an operating loss of \$137 000. Losses have been accumulating over the years. The only clubs that are not in the red are East Fremantle and Subiaco. I understand the only reason this is so is that their administrations were very astute and foresaw the problems of today. I cannot envisage how the football clubs will ever recover. I imagine the debts will have to be written off and I think they are waiting for the Government to bail them out.

Hon Tom Stephens: Would you recommend that?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: No, the Government is in enough trouble from bailing people out. I have a much better suggestion. Only one person could get them out of this mess and that is Malcolm Brown. He is the only one I know who has suggested any sort of solution.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Unless the Minister undertakes some very aggressive surgery, football is never going to last.

Hon Garry Kelly: It has to be done nationally, not just here.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I am only concerned with Perth at the moment. The kids are not playing football any more.

Hon Doug Wenn: That is because of the likes of Mal Brown.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: That is not the case at all; if Malcolm Brown had his way, all children would play football. We are breeding a race of sissies. When I went to school, one needed a doctor's certificate to say one was near to death or had a leg missing before one was excused from playing football.

Hon Graham Edwards: The numbers of young people playing football are increasing and attendances at all matches are improving.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: If attendances are higher, why are the leagues going broke?

Hon Graham Edwards: They are going broke because of high costs. We have moved away from football as it used to be and the clubs of old no longer exist. You really need to give some credit to the likes of Tannock, Edwards, Firman and Brian Cook, who are doing a tremendous amount of work to pull the league into shape.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I also believe those people are doing their best. However, unless the Minister assigns someone who has a radical view to overhaul the football system and unless the Minister is able to convince clubs to stop building the Taj Mahal-type stands that encourage segregation with sponsors in sheltered seating and other people sweltering in the sun, football as we know it will disappear. People have to be encouraged back to the games.

I am also unsure about the West Coast Eagles operation. I used to be a great supporter of Western Australia joining a national league but ever since it has been part of the VFL - I know it produces some great footballers - local football has gone down the gurgler and Western Australian clubs are going broke while the blokes in the West Coast Eagles team seem to be making a few dollars. I saw on television tonight where players suggested to clubs that they cut back on players' salaries. That is not such a bad thing. For goodness sake, clubs must get football back to what it used to be.

Hon Garry Kelly: It should be a club game.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The member is absolutely right. I hope the Minister will tell the people who are running the Australian Football League that that is what they must do, that the bag is not bottomless and that they cannot be bailed out.

Hon Graham Edwards: It is not my job to tell them what to do. They are addressing the issues very well, and I do not think the Government has a role in telling them what to do.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I take it the Minister is not going to give my mate Malcolm a burst?

Hon Graham Edwards: Malcolm agrees with me on 99.9 per cent of what we have both said. Somewhere in that .01 per cent we have gone astray.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I take it the Minister does not go to his place for dinner on Saturday night?

Hon Graham Edwards: No.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: My concerns are not only about football but also about horseracing. The Minister is meeting race clubs again and he and I will be talking about a Bill in due course. All I can see in the future is gloom for the racing industry unless some drastic steps are taken. I hope the problems in the racing industry are being addressed. That industry also cannot be expected to be bailed out all the time. However, one must understand that an industry like that cannot be taxed nonstop.

Hon Graham Edwards: We have just reduced its tax.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: The Government has got it back to what it was before it took office.

Hon Graham Edwards interjected.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: In the first term of the Burke Government in 1983 the Labor Government lifted the tax on the industry from five per cent to six per cent.

Hon Graham Edwards: Where did the money come from?

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: It came from the bookmakers and turnover tax.

Hon Graham Edwards: It came from the pockets of the punter, not the industry.

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: Unless the Government reduces the tax both industries will go down the gurgler. The Government cannot tax these industries out of business. That topic will need discussion in due course. The football industry cannot expect to be bailed out of the situation and neither can the racing industry. I support the comments made by Hon Reg Davies. He seems to have moved out of the Chamber, but I see an R & I Bank bloke over there.

Talking about the R & I Bank, before I conclude, it appears to be pulling a few tricks. Gold Bank had the rug pulled out from under it when we stopped the Government doing a few larks on the side but the Government moved these deals to the R & I Bank. The R & I Bank has financial problems so it has called in the loans arranged by Gold Bank. The pressure has been put on and I know of one organisation in Kalgoorlie, Goult-Pro Partners, which has gone broke. My friend Graeme Campbell, the Labor MHR for Kalgoorlie, got stuck into the bank for calling in the loans overnight. The people involved had to find \$10 million overnight. That has been done to another company in my electorate which I will not name.

We were able to assist that company by persuading another bank to take over the loan. Obviously the R & I Bank is going through the loans negotiated by Gold Bank with a fine tooth comb. I forecast that small mining companies will go down the gurgler because they will not be able to refinance those loans. Companies will be forced to have fire sales which will cause massive problems. That is what the R & I Bank has been up to and perhaps the long term effects will not be so bad. However, the short term effects are bad - and just because the bank is short of brass.

Nothing will help the situation until we either have an election or a Royal Commission. People will not forget. I support my colleagues. The Bill should be adjourned.

Adjournment of Debate

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral) [8.52 pm]: I move -

That debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (15)

Hon J.N. Caldwell
Hon George Cash
Hon Reg Davies
Hon Max Evans

Hon Peter Foss
Hon Barry House
Hon P.H. Lockyer
Hon M.S. Montgomery

Hon N.F. Moore
Hon Muriel Patterson
Hon P.G. Pandal
Hon R.G. Pike

Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon D.J. Wordsworth
Hon Margaret McAleer
(Teller)

Noes (15)

Hon J.M. Berinson

Hon John Halden

Hon Garry Kelly

Hon Bob Thomas

Hon J.M. Brown

Hon Kay Hallahan

Hon Mark Nevill

Hon Doug Wenn

Hon T.G. Butler

Hon Tom Helm

Hon Sam Piantadosi

Hon Fred McKenzie

Hon Graham Edwards

Hon B.L. Jones

Hon Tom Stephens

(Teller)

Pair

Hon W.N. Stretch

Hon Cheryl Davenport

The PRESIDENT: The vote being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed.

Debate adjourned.

LOAN BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 5 December.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [8.56 pm]: This Bill will enable the Government to borrow up to \$150 million from various sources including the Western Australian Treasury Corporation. The amount of \$150 million is a global figure which the Government will be able to borrow in part from time to time until 30 June 1990.

As members would be aware the Loan Bill goes very much hand in hand with the General Loan and Capital Works Fund Bill in relation to which various Estimates of Expenditure were provided to members some months ago when the Minister for Budget Management tabled the Budget papers. The Bill is very much a machinery Bill; it is necessary for the orderly financing of Government projects and will enjoy the Opposition's support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee and Report

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Minister for Budget Management), and passed.

APPROPRIATION (GENERAL LOAN AND CAPITAL WORKS FUND) BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 5 December.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [9.00 pm]: This Bill appropriates out of the General Loan and Capital Works Fund certain moneys to enable goods and supplies to be granted for Government services for the year ended 30 June 1990. The Capital Works Program for this year - that is, 1989-90 - amounts to \$1.6 billion. Of that amount approximately \$338 million is to be appropriated by this Bill from the General Loan and Capital Works Fund.

It is interesting to look at the various schedules in the Budget papers provided when the Budget was introduced into this House some months ago. These give some understanding of the manner in which this Government has treated the General Loan and Capital Works Fund in recent years. The funds expended during 1988-89 were estimated as \$405.5 million, but the actual funds expended were only \$303.9 million. The amount brought forward from the previous year was \$71.7 million, and by taking that figure off the \$160.4 million - the closing balance - we see an amount of \$88.6 million was underspent.

The history of this Government over a number of years is that it tends to estimate a very high expenditure program for a year, but when the actual expenditure program is analysed it always falls well short of the estimate. That does two things: Firstly, in the year of the

proposed expenditure it builds up the hopes of various people that certain capital works will be funded during that year. The Government is able to release many Press statements and enjoy the favour they provide and be regarded as good people. Secondly, during the year it is able to modify its program and cut back on the proposals announced earlier in the year, and by not completing the various projects it is able to carry forward significant funds. We have seen this occur in the General Loan and Capital Works Fund over a number of years. If we were to go back over the last five years and work out all the underspending in various areas, this would probably produce a sum of about \$400 million.

It is worth looking at the Estimates of Expenditure for the year ending 30 June 1989; the figure is approximately \$405 million with the actual spending being \$303.9 million. This gives a differential not of \$88.6 million, as I mentioned earlier, but represents a figure of \$101 million in underspending. This year the Government is prepared to spend in the order of \$338 million with \$70 million carried forward from last year. It will be interesting to see how much of the proposed \$338 million will actually be spent by the Government.

A close analysis of the General Loan and Capital Works Fund indicates that the Government uses it like a yo-yo; it promises the earth at the beginning of the year but does not spend the money. This money and the jobs to be done are carried forward into the next year and the Government again starts promising the world. In the Estimates of Expenditure in this financial year a series of schedules outline the various Capital Works Programs which the Government hopes to carry out this year - I say "hopes" given the comments I made earlier about the fact that the Government does not necessarily live up to the proposals it advances at the beginning of any financial year.

It is my intention to invite the Minister to comment in respect of various programs. Mr President, I seek your advice as to whether the questions advanced regarding the Estimates of Expenditure and the General Loan and Capital Works Fund should be addressed at this stage, or whether we should go into Committee to discuss in detail the various departmental allocations. If we are to go into Committee, I would prefer to address those matters at that stage.

The PRESIDENT: It is appropriate for this Bill to go into Committee; however, in general terms the member may ask questions now.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I suggest that it would be helpful if the member would indicate at this stage areas of concern to allow me to prepare itemised responses.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I thank you, Mr President, for that advice. We may ask detailed questions during the Committee stage, and I indicate to the Minister the questions I intend to raise with him then. It is not possible for me to advise him of every single question that I will raise regarding the Estimates of Expenditure for the General Loan and Capital Works Fund, but I am more than happy to outline a number of significant areas that require comment. I indicate to the Minister for Budget Management that I assume he will have Committee notes for all those matters during the Committee stage so he will be able to refer to them and give a general understanding of the items.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I will have notes, but it will be helpful if you direct my attention to particular concerns now.

Hon GEORGE CASH: If the notes are available we will make progress, but if they are not it is clear that we will have to report progress early in the Committee stage to get hold of the notes in order that the questions are addressed.

One of the matters in which I have an interest is the proposed courthouse at Joondalup on which the Government intends to spend in the order of \$1 million this financial year. I ask the Minister to provide, at the appropriate time, details of the building program in respect of that facility and to advise how it ties into the police complex which the Government has promised at Joondalup. How will the \$1 million be spent this financial year? Given that last year an amount of about \$7 000 was spent on that item, how far have the building schedules progressed? I am surprised that the Government has been able to set aside \$1 million for a new courthouse at Joondalup when it has made little progress on the proposed police facility which it has been promising in that area for some time. Prior to the last election I visited the site of the proposed police complex at Joondalup and all I could find was a huge sign advising the people in the area that the site was for a proposed police facility and that the

commencement date for building was to be very soon after the election. Of course, having travelled to that site after the election I found that the commencement date was well overdue and that very little work had occurred on the site. From inquiries through parliamentary questions to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services it seemed that the Government did not intend to proceed with that police facility. However, the pressure put on the Government by my colleagues and members representing the North Metropolitan Region caused the Government to acknowledge its earlier election promise and I hope that significant work will commence on that site in the very near future.

I refer to the heading Economic Development and Trade and to the number of payments which are to be made during this financial year. An amount of \$8.438 million has been allocated to the Defence Technology Precinct and I ask the Minister to explain how and where that money will be spent, given that last year an amount of \$1.475 million was actually spent on that item.

An amount of \$1.958 million has been allocated to the Technology Park development at Bentley. An item listed under the subheading Assistance to Industry is the Orbital Engine Company on which the Government expended \$2 million last financial year. Members will be aware that the Orbital Engine Company is part of the Sarich organisation. I note that there is no proposed expenditure proposed for that company this financial year. This Government lost one of the greatest opportunities this State has had to assist in financing a value-added business - the development of the Sarich orbital engine. I recall that an amount of less than \$20 million was required by the company to ensure that it remained as a viable manufacturing organisation in Western Australia. Certain requests were made of the State Government and of the Federal Government and I regret that both Governments failed miserably in their duties, or certainly their responsibilities, in respect of that company. For the sake of a few million dollars that company is to go offshore. The manufacturing of the engine will take place offshore, mainly in the United States of America.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I must say that I cannot recall any criticism by Mr Sarich of the State's response to his submission.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Mr Ralph Sarich, perhaps being the gentleman he is, was somewhat restrained if the Minister claims he did not see any comments -

Hon J.M. Berinson: I think his concern was mainly with the Federal Government.

Hon GEORGE CASH: That is right, but he was also concerned at the State Government's lack of apparent action to try to convince the Commonwealth Government to allocate funds to this organisation.

It is fair to say that the State Government met representatives from the Sarich organisation on a number of occasions over a fairly long period of time, to try to work out what opportunities and what propositions might be advanced by the State Government to convince the Sarich organisation to build its engine in Western Australia. There were various and conflicting reports from Mr Parker, the now Treasurer, when he was dealing with this matter. I am certainly not sure about how hard the State Government was working to ensure that the Sarich company would remain in Western Australia. By the time the Sarich organisation approached the Federal Government all was lost; all for the sake of about \$20 million.

The reason I raised my concern in this area is that only a few months ago the Federal Government felt disposed to offer an American organisation, Kodak, through its Australian subsidiary, an amount of between \$60 million and \$70 million to ensure that the Australian operation of the company remained in Australia. It is interesting that perhaps the only reason the Federal Government was prepared to advance money to Kodak was because its operation in the Eastern States was the employer of a significant number of people and a Federal election is fast approaching. I would assume that the Federal Government was very conscious of not wanting to see that company close down and find those people out of work and, as a result of that, it was prepared to concede a huge amount of funds.

Hon Barry House: It was in Mr Hawke's electorate.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I thought it was close, but Hon Barry House tells me it was more than likely in Mr Hawke's electorate. The fact is that the Sarich Orbital Engine Company would have been a significant employer of Western Australian labour if only the Government had exercised the options available to it. I advise the House that within a few

years, possibly less than five years, we in Western Australia will look back and regret the decision taken by this Government not to apply itself to ensuring that the Orbital Engine Company had its manufacturing business in Western Australia.

Items listed under the Education Schedule for 1989-90 indicate additions and improvements to Mt Lawley Primary School. When I was the member for the former electorate of Mt Lawley, in another place, I tried to have money spent on that school. Now, the Government has conceded that the representations that I, and others, made in the other place on that matter should be funded. Approximately \$304 000 is expected to be spent on Mt Lawley Primary School in this financial year. Will the Minister explain what works will be involved because the school needs significant renovation to its main building? Transportable classrooms to the rear of the school proper are 50 or more years old. Is the money to be spent on those buildings?

An amount of \$130 000 is set aside for land acquisition for the Joondalup police complex. Will the Minister inform the House if all the land in the Joondalup area has been acquired and what amount of money was spent? An amount of \$56 000 was spent on preparing preliminary plans for the Joondalup police complex and a further \$1.655 million is estimated to be spent this year. Very little work has commenced on that site. Is that building program on schedule or will we see a similar situation as has occurred in other building programs? Has the money been underspent this year and will the project be carried forward into next year's programs?

The Police Force intends to transfer some of its operations to Curtin House; the current police headquarters in Adelaide Terrace is overcrowded. An amount of \$5.5 million is to be spent on refurbishing Curtin House for the Police Department. What works are intended? Is that project on target because I understand that it is significantly behind schedule and, given that we are now six months into this financial year, an awful lot of work will have to be done in the next six months if that \$5.5 million is expended this financial year?

Members will recall that some years ago a Bill was introduced into this House to establish the Superdrome in Graylands. It is a huge sporting complex built on University of Western Australia land. Some years ago, when this Bill was first discussed in Parliament, various buildings were being built on University of Western Australia land. At that stage of the building program no-one had organised the formal lease between the University of Western Australia and the WA sports centre trust. Was that ever finalised?

Hon Graham Edwards: Yes. It is on a lease basis.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Did the university actually formalise that lease program?

Hon Graham Edwards: As I understand it, yes.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am not sure about that. The two groups could not agree to the various boundaries of the land. The Government has spent a considerable amount of money on this site and does not appear to have finalised those matters. I am not suggesting that the university is intending to run away with the building, but a few years ago the Parliament was anxious to spend the money before anyone could determine where it would fit. An amount of \$6.3 million has been set aside for additional swimming facilities at the Superdrome. What sporting facilities will we get for the \$6.3 million? Is the building program on target? Can we expect it to be completed in time for the international sporting events that are due in 1991?

During the America's Cup the Government spent a considerable amount of money in the Woodman Point area because the Government believed that that area was needed for tent accommodation for people coming to Western Australia during the America's Cup. That did not eventuate just as the car parks and other ancillary developments were carried out. This year an amount of \$602 000 will be spent on the Woodman Point development. What is the proposed expenditure for? What progress is being made in that area? Honourable members will be aware that the Government in the past has made statements that the Woodman Point area will one day resemble a Kings Park of the south. Considerable amounts of money will need to be spent in that area if it is to be a Kings Park of the south.

Hon Graham Edwards: Have you had a look at it lately?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Yes, I have. I am a supporter of that development. Every time I go

down there it seems that little progress has been made, although I accept that huge amounts of money are pouring into that area. The Minister for Sport and Recreation just asked whether I had been down to Woodman Point recently, to which I answered yes. The last time I was there, which was only a month or two ago, I was disappointed to see that some of the brick paved car park had been ripped up by people, either trying to steal the paving bricks, or because of malicious vandalism.

Hon Graham Edwards: That happened earlier in the piece.

Hon GEORGE CASH: It is regrettable that people are still at it. Additional rangers are needed in that area, something which, I trust, the Government is addressing. These are particular amendments I have marked for information from the Minister and they certainly do not represent the only areas in which I shall be inviting comment from the Minister. With regard to the State Housing Commission Capital Works Program, an amount of \$3.7 million has been set aside for crisis accommodation for this year. I ask the Minister in due course to provide the House with information on how that money will be spent.

Members will be aware that the various port authorities in Western Australia are listed in the Capital Works Program and most will have capital works carried out during this financial year. One matter of interest to me is the recent dredging of the Fremantle harbour. That dredging was recently completed in time for the arrival of the USS *Midway*, the huge American aircraft carrier, which was able to berth inside the Fremantle harbour for the first time. I note an additional \$11 million will be provided this year for dredging and the construction of the commercial boat harbour in the Fremantle area. The dredging of the main harbour area, including some reclamation work for the commercial boat harbour, has cost in the order of \$30 million. I am interested to hear from the Minister how that money is being funded. Is it being funded by commercial loans and, if so, what interest rate is applicable to those loans? Also, will the deepening of the harbour costing about \$30 million be an economic proposition? I understand that the increased cargo volumes likely to result from the recent deepening of the harbour will not commercially justify that additional expenditure of \$30 million. That in itself raises the question of the justification for the Minister for Transport's agreeing to the deepening of Fremantle harbour. More than that, it raises the question of how much more money will be spent on that area of Fremantle harbour currently under the control of the Fremantle Port Authority.

It seems we are fast approaching decision time with respect to the Port of Fremantle. A decision must be made whether to continue spending money on the existing port authority land or to relocate the port site to the Catherine Point area and construct a new harbour that will take us well and truly into the twenty-first century. It is true that some members will be aghast at the thought of constructing a new port, but the water in the Catherine Point area is sufficiently deep to take the various container ships visiting Fremantle, and a modern facility could be constructed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the new port. In addition, shifting the existing Fremantle harbour facilities to the Catherine Point area would free a huge amount of very valuable land which could be put to more significant commercial use than being the site of a port. If a decision were made to consider Catherine Point as a new port for Western Australia, its development would not happen overnight. It is the sort of decision the Minister for Transport, the Government generally, and the Parliament must give consideration to if the port is to remain a viable trading organisation into the next century. In due course a decision must be made on the relocation of the existing Fremantle port. Given the fact that very few passenger ships of an international standard call at Fremantle today, Victoria Quay is rarely used for passenger purposes. A tremendous opportunity exists for the redevelopment of Victoria Quay as a commercial complex with waterfront shops for developers, shop owners and businesses, while retaining the existing passenger terminal for the rare occasions when passenger ships call at Fremantle.

It is probably not appropriate at this stage to comment, as I have before, that as a result of the industrial disputations at the port in days gone by, Western Australia was fast approaching the time when Fremantle would become the first ship-free port in Australia. Plenty of people have talked about nuclear-free ports, and at one stage Fremantle appeared certain to become a ship-free port. There are tremendous opportunities to consider for the future with the potential relocation of the port facilities to the Catherine Point area. It would be of great benefit to the live sheep exporters, who from time to time suffer the wrath of business houses and residents of the Fremantle area when the huge semi-trailers carrying sheep, cattle and

stock generally are required to travel through the existing City of Fremantle to discharge their cargoes at Victoria Quay. Any redevelopment of the Catherine Point area would enable the live sheep and stock trade generally to relocate in that area, and benefits would accrue not only to the carters of that stock but also to the residents and commercial businesses operating in the Fremantle area.

In the proposed Capital Works Program for the Joondalup Development Corporation, an amount of \$6.993 million has been allocated during this financial year for a city centre project. All sorts of promises have been made over a number of years in respect of the development of the Joondalup city centre; however, very little has come to fruition. Many people in the northern corridor are very keen for a city centre development in the Joondalup area, and would also like various State Government and Commonwealth Government departments to be relocated there. I noticed in a newspaper report the other day that the Royal Automobile Club intends to build a substantial building at Joondalup, no doubt in the Joondalup business area, where it will relocate some of its activities. It is to be commended for that action and I hope that the Government will honour its earlier commitment to transfer some Government departments to that area. I would be obliged if the Minister would explain what that \$6.9 million is for.

Each year the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board puts forward a capital works program to the Government. Much of that program involves an extension to existing facilities. A significant amount is for the motorised equipment it needs to fulfil its requirements. This year an amount of the order of \$2.4 million will be expended on its motor fleet. It is clear to me that over the past six years the fleet of the Fire Brigades Board and of some of the volunteer organisations which rely on the hand me downs, so to speak, from the board have been deteriorating at a significant rate. The Government has clearly not been keeping up the replacement program to the degree it should have. Therefore, a massive contingent liability is building up in respect of the fire brigade fleet. If we were to attempt to bring that fleet up to the standard that many people in the fire brigade believe is necessary for a 100 per cent efficient operation a huge amount of money, in the vicinity of \$15 million to \$20 million of capital expenditure, would be required rather than the \$2.4 million or thereabouts allocated, which is a drop in the ocean in respect of its motor vehicle fleet.

GoldCorp has had a chequered career since its creation by this Parliament about two years ago. I see that an amount of \$5 million is set aside for new works. I have no idea why GoldCorp requires an additional \$5 million for new works. I understand that the Mint at Perth Airport has been completed but is not occupied by the WA Mint. As GoldCorp has some relationship with the Mint, I wonder whether that \$5 million is destined for any of that work. That remains to be seen. I would be pleased if the Minister explained what the \$5 million for capital works is all about.

Hon J.N. Caldwell: Perhaps they are going into the goldmining business.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Either that, or are striking a medal to mark Mr Berinson's retirement.

Hon GEORGE CASH: If it is to strike a medal for Hon Joe Berinson's retirement, I will raise my hand high to ensure that, firstly, the vote is carried and, secondly, that Mr Berinson retires.

Hon John Caldwell mentioned that GoldCorp might be entering into goldmining. I do not know whether it is, but I hope it is not because members will recall that when we considered the Kaltails legislation a year or so ago there was considerable dissent in the Parliament when there was any talk of GoldCorp entering into the mining business. As I said earlier, the matters I have raised so far do not by any means cover all areas in the General Loan and Capital Works Fund Estimates of Expenditure. However, they will give the Minister an indication of the areas I would like further information on during the Committee stage of the Bill.

It seems to me that we will almost be taking this Bill line by line so that we can seek advice from the Minister on particular expenditure programs and on the various items in those programs, which clearly cover all electorates in Western Australia, so I expect that all members will be asking questions to enable them to understand what capital works will be taking place in their electorates. Clearly the Government uses underspending in one year to carry forward amounts to prop up its capital works program in the next year; it has been

doing that for some time. As a result of underspending one year and carrying funds forward the Government is able to prop up the capital works program in any year knowing that the figures set down as estimates of expenditure for the year are inflated before we ever begin and that there will be no chance that all moneys will be expended. The Government is able to issue Press releases claiming it will do all sorts of work knowing full well that much of the work proposed will not be completed during a particular year. I have looked at some graphs and note that the carrying forward of sums of money for work not completed during any year is not unique to this Government and has occurred during the office of other Governments. However, having looked at the underspending and the amounts carried forward there is no doubt that those graphs indicate that this Government has mastered the art of carrying forward something like 20 per cent of its capital works program from any one year to prop up the next year's program knowing that it will again carry forward probably an equal amount or more the following year. This is something that all members should be aware of because this Government, as I said before, has got this down to a fine art and carries forward money every year.

With those comments I indicate support for the Bill and look forward to its Committee stage.

HON MAX EVANS (North Metropolitan) [9.49 pm]: I support my leader's comments. I will start from where he left off on the underspending of amounts set aside for capital expenditure. All members would recall the first time we heard of underspending of capital expenditure amounts because it was at this time last year that the Leader of the House explained how he was to finance the losses of Teachers Credit Society. I, in my naivety, thought that underspending meant less would be spent because things would be cheaper. However, he explained that underspending meant that one deferred the spending until the next year. Less is not spent; more is spent because the cost invariably goes up. Members often overlook the fact that if one underspends by \$50 million this year when that work is done next year it may cost \$55 million or \$60 million - although the Minister may say that interest was accrued on that money. It worries me how the Government ever knows what is its true position because it rolls over these amounts one year after another. The State Housing Commission has a major carryover each year, but I will not go into that as it is a different subject.

I thank the Minister for Budget Management most sincerely if he had anything to do with expediting the tabling today of a copy of the Treasurer's Annual Statements 1988-89. I requested this on Thursday of last week, because it makes a big difference to how we can understand the Budget.

This year the General Loan and Capital Works Fund Budget was \$405 540 000. There was a carry forward of \$71 777 000, and it was intended under the appropriations to spend the total amount of those moneys, but the Government spent only \$301 million, an underspending of 25 per cent. The closing balance for the carry forward at the end of 1989 was \$160.45 million on an expected appropriation of \$405 million; about 40 per cent of expected capital expenditure has been underspent. That is a serious indictment of the Government because last year, prior to the election, it made up a big story about all the things it was going to spend money on for the benefit of the State - to catch votes, or engage in pork barrelling - but then underspent by 40 per cent.

The Treasurer said in his annual statement -

There was a net increase of \$58,909,916 in estimated receipts due mainly to supplementary borrowings of \$60,000,000 approved by Loan Council in 1988-89 to meet works in progress commitments at 30 June 1989.

It is interesting that \$60 million was brought in for works in progress that did not even take place at the end of the year because we already had an underspending of \$100 million at that date. The statement continues -

Expenditure on the other hand amounted to \$303,990,516 a net decrease of \$101,549,484 when compared with the budget estimate of \$405,540,000.

The underspending against the General Loan and Capital Works Fund reflects in the main, delays in project commencements during 1988-89 as a result mainly of more rigorous scrutiny and justification of project expenditure in accordance with the procedures and guidelines established for Capital Works Project approvals.

Nevertheless, the carry-over funds of \$160,459,400 are fully committed to projects approved in the 1988-89 Capital Works Program and will be submitted for appropriation to finance works-in-progress during the 1989-90 financial year.

The statement that there will be "more rigorous scrutiny and justification of project expenditure" sounds very worthy, yet we were told in December last year by the Minister for Budget Management - the Minister responsible for these figures - that the Government would underspend \$30 million to pay for the Teachers Credit Society losses. So instead of there being a carryover of capital works programs from last year into this year, \$30 million of underspending has gone into meeting the TCS losses, without there being rigorous scrutiny and justification of project expenditure.

I will look now at where the underspending occurred during the last financial year. Corrective Services had a vote of \$41 million, but underspent by \$17.3 million. That is a very big error in judgment; the Minister may be able to tell us why there was that underspending. The Health Department had a vote of \$47 million, but underspent by \$19 million. Did the department overestimate what it was capable of doing in a year, or was it the aim of the Government to give a good projection of State expenditure in the health area? The Education vote was \$51.9 million; the actual expenditure was an additional \$1.8 million. I would expect that overspending in view of the increased costs in country areas, but that four per cent overspending is only a fraction of the total Budget, compared with the 40 and 50 per cent underspending that I have mentioned in other areas. The vote for the Office of Government Accommodation was \$28.7 million, an underspending of \$8.5 million. I would think the Office of Government Accommodation would have the expertise to predict what would be its level of capital expenditure.

The Treasurer's report may contain a list of explanations on items where there has been overspending and underspending, but I have not yet been able to pick that up. The Department of Resources Development had a vote of \$18.5 million, and underspent by \$4 million; about 20 per cent. That is a very large under expenditure. The vote for the Technology and Industry Development Authority was \$9.7 million, and was underspent by \$6.29 million; nearly 66 per cent, on a very small budget. It may be that the Government has reduced its expenditure on that authority. The expenditure of that authority is interesting and alarming. The accounts of that authority for 1987 are available, but the accounts for 1988 and 1989 have now been absorbed into the department.

In 1987-88 an amount of \$3 million was provided in financial support to the Scitech Discovery Centre in West Perth. That was news to me; perhaps the Minister can explain that. I do not know on what basis the Government has invested in that centre. The vote for advances to independent schools was \$25 million. The actual expenditure was only \$16.2 million, so there was an underspending of \$8.7 million. It is amazing that the Government has not been able to get the figures right for its grants to schools. I do not know whether the Government was not able to get up its works programs -

Hon J.M. Berinson: I will check that. I think they are fully committed funds.

Hon MAX EVANS: It could be that they have not been omitted, or have been changed around.

It is interesting to see what has happened to the guarantees and indemnities listed in part (C) of the report. The guarantee by the Government for WA Government Holdings Ltd was \$239.8 million. I hope the Minister will be able to reconcile this, because I thought the amount might have been more in light of the answer given by the Minister in respect of the estimated \$277.5 million losses for the petrochemical project. We find somewhere else an estimate of \$20 million for damages or claims resulting from the project. Note (9) says in respect of the \$239.8 million guarantee that the first part of \$9.8 million is drawn down on a \$US24 million facility negotiated by WA Government Holdings Ltd to fund the WA Diamond Trust. That change is probably because of the exchange rate. The next point is the guarantees in respect of the \$175 million debentures issued in WA Government Holdings to enable the company to take up an equity position in the petrochemical project at Kwinana. Thirdly, we have \$55 million under the terms of bill acceptance facilities to provide interim finance for the petrochemical project, and they total \$239.8 million.

In a debate on the petrochemical authority Bill some months ago we were talking about an

advance of \$100 million to the petrochemical project. It was to be guaranteed by WA Government Holdings. Then it was to be a loan from WA Government Holdings to the petrochemical authority. Can the Minister give us more up-to-date figures in respect of this guarantee of the losses, or the guarantee to WA Government Holdings Ltd, because it should be more than that at this stage?

The report says that the Treasurer, on behalf of the State, holds 14 999 995 \$1 shares in WA Government Holdings Ltd, of which 8 million shares are paid to 1¢, rendering the State liable to a future call-up of \$7.92 million. I notice that has not been included as a contingent liability, as it should have been, according to accounting standards.

We have the guarantee of the Western Australian Development Corporation and the WA Diamond Trust, which has gone down \$20.8 million to \$15.6 million. The Gold Banking Corporation's guarantee on the gold facility agreement is down \$54.3 million to \$6.1 million. It has been transferred to the R & I Bank, but the guarantee by the R & I Bank does not appear to have been changed at this stage.

I was very pleased to see these reports because I wanted to read the Treasurer's annual statements and the auditor's report. What prompted me was that last week papers from the Under Treasurer in respect of Rothwells Ltd's indemnity payment were tabled in this House. The report reads -

As you are aware Executive Council, on 30 May, approved a requisition for supplementary funds amounting to \$33.5 million. \$33 million was paid to the provisional liquidator on the same day. . .

The Treasurer's Advance is very heavily committed for this financial year, notwithstanding an increase to \$285 million, and our capacity to meet necessary payments up to 30 June might be inhibited. We are therefore seeking ways to reduce the pressure.

We were obviously being tipped off about problems Treasury was having balancing the books. We have only a certain allowance on the Treasurer's Advance account. The report goes on -

You will recall that, provided all the necessary agreements are obtained to the provisional liquidator's scheme of arrangement, we can expect to receive \$10.5 million from the National Australia Bank in about mid June. Under present funding arrangements this money would have to be credited to CRF revenue, leaving the full \$33 million as a charge against the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation.

We now look at the \$10.5 million, which will be very material to keeping the books balanced in the Treasurer's Advance account. The Under Treasurer is a man with a lot of initiative and guile. He said -

An alternative is available, under the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Act . . . to split the funding so that the \$10.5 million is treated as a temporary advance recoverable from NAB while the net \$22.5 million (plus further expenses) remains as supplementary funding. Under this arrangement the \$10.5 million, when received, can be used to distinguish the temporary advance, thereby reducing the overall impact of the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation at the year end to \$22.5 million.

I have a question on notice asking what happened to that \$10.5 million. It should be somewhere in the accounts because it has not been repaid.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Yes, it has.

Hon MAX EVANS: It would have to be paid in December.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Yes.

Hon MAX EVANS: This was in June; it should have been shown in the Treasurer's Advance or in a supplementary advance, but I cannot find it.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Right.

Hon MAX EVANS: We understand the money might have been for some other purpose and has been credited for that amount. I look forward to the Minister's answer on that matter.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I am not clear what you are asking.

Hon MAX EVANS: The question on notice is about the \$10.5 million which is shown as a debit balance at 30 June, because it is not repaid by National Australia Bank until this month. It is taken out of the Treasurer's Advance Account; it comes from \$33 million down to \$22.5 million. There is still \$33 million out at 30 June, because the other \$10.5 million is a supplementary advance account. I cannot find where that is recorded. If the Minister could tell me I might learn a new trick about keeping the books of the State.

Reading this report, I wondered where the Treasurer's Annual Statements were. We found they had not been lodged, but we now have them.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I think you have noted that the fault was not with the Treasurer but with the Auditor General. Treasury completed the accounts a few days earlier than it did last year, but the Auditor General took a month to complete his work.

Hon MAX EVANS: The Minister is right; three days early. The accounts were signed on 28 August last year, and this year they were signed on 25 August. The Auditor General was exactly one month later - 28 November as against 28 October last year.

I quote from the Auditor General's report here -

The Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Act specifies the monetary limit up to which the Treasurer is authorised to withdraw sums from the public bank account for the purpose of making advances charged to the Treasurer's Advance account. The authorised monthly limit of the Treasurer's Advance account for the financial year commencing on July 1, 1988 was \$285 000 000, comprising original authorization of \$200 000 000 established by the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act 1988, and a supplementary authorisation of \$85 000 000 under section 6 of the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act 1989. Prior to the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act monetary limit for 1988-89 financial year being increased to \$285 000 000 from April 20, 1989, the original authorised monetary limit of \$200 000 000 was exceeded on the following occasions -

Not by much. The pens slipped in drawing cheques; there must have been a lot of pressure on Treasury. The following occasions were - by \$1.187 million on 5 April 1989; by \$2.118 million on 6 April 1989; and by \$6.625 million on 7, 8 and 9 April 1989.

We start worrying with a lot of pressure on the Treasurer's Advance account which had limits on it. Perhaps the Treasury will be able to say, "We did not get the limit until 20 April. The Government should not have been spending before Parliament passed the increase to \$85 million."

Hon J.M. Berinson: Have you had a chance to look at the Under Treasurer's response which I also tabled today?

Hon MAX EVANS: No, I have not.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You will see a detailed response on each of those items and the reasons for them. There were seven or eight pages of papers tabled with that report. It was with the tabled papers.

Hon MAX EVANS: I shall get the explanation in due course. Auditors are used to getting explanations; we do not always agree with them but they are obtained because the boss wants to read them.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You will agree with these.

Hon MAX EVANS: The report goes on -

General Loan and Capital Works Fund - As reported in the Notes to Statement No. 7 - General Loan and Capital Works Fund - Receipts, the item Western Australian Treasury Corporation (\$202 860 000) includes an amount of \$63 361 000 advanced to the Treasurer by the Western Australian Treasury Corporation on July 3, 1989 and brought to account in the 1988-89 financial year, as the amount formed part of the 1988-89 global borrowing program approved by the Commonwealth.

What we are saying there is that the Government has always operated on a cash accounting basis so if the Government received the money on 3 July it should have gone into the next year's books, but to suit its purposes the Government decided to change to accrual

accounting and carry that amount back into the previous year's books. The Auditor General's report continues -

The bringing to account of this amount in the Treasurer's Accounts in the 1988-89 financial year is contrary to the accounting policies adopted in the preparation of the Treasurer's Annual Statements. The Treasurer's Accounts are maintained on a cash basis, which requires revenue to be recorded when received during the financial year and expenditure to be recorded when payments are made during the financial year. This departure from the cash basis of accounting has resulted in

- (i) -total receipts in the General Loan and Capital Works Fund in 1988-89 (\$392 672 421) reported in Statements No.6 and No.7 being overstated by \$63 361 000;
- (ii) the balance of the General Loan and Capital Works Fund at June 30, 1989 (\$160 459 400) reported in Statements No.1 and No.6 being overstated by \$63 361 000.

The Auditor General is telling us there - and this is his job - that the Government is fudging the figures on general loan and capital works by \$63 million, making it look \$63 million better off last year than it otherwise would have looked; or was it negligent in some manner in that the money was not banked until 3 July? I cannot believe that. I believe the money came in on that day. The Government's accounting system depended upon keeping a system of cash expenditure from one year to the next. If the Government had followed the recommendation I made a long time ago it would have been working on an accrual accounting system on exactly this basis, but it must make up its mind whether it wants a cash or an accrual system.

Later in his report the Auditor General says -

Government of W.A. Bank Account - Section 22 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act provides that no officer shall cause the Public Bank Account in the name of the Government of Western Australia to be overdrawn, except with and subject to the prior approval of the Treasurer. The Government of W.A. Bank Account at the Reserve Bank of Australia was overdrawn by an amount of \$133 058 015.35 on June 7, 1989, exceeding the overdraft limit of \$20 000 000 approved by the Treasurer in January 1988 by \$113 058 015.35, -

Imagine that, \$113 million over budget on a \$20 million Budget allowance! That is nearly 5.65 times over budget. I will continue to quote from the Auditor General's report -

- and resulting in an interest charge of \$69 930.53 by the Reserve Bank. The overdrawing of the bank account beyond the approved overdraft limit arose because of an over-investment of funds from the account.

I hope the Minister will give us some details of the over-investment of the funds at that date. Has it anything to do with the Government's waiting for funds to come back from Rothwells or the State Superannuation Board to the Treasury? Has it anything to do with the advance payments on the petrochemical deal? I repeat that in his report the Auditor General says -

The overdrawing of the bank account beyond the approved overdraft limit arose because of an over-investment of funds from the account.

An overdraft of \$113 million on a limit of \$20 million! I will tell members a story about something I learnt very early in my married life when I was in Singapore. A Syrian Jew said to me, "You must learn this lesson early in life. When you borrow \$2 000 from a bank you worry when the bank manager rings you, but when you borrow \$20 000 from the bank the bank manager worries when you ring him." In this case it is a wonder the Reserve Bank was not worrying about the Western Australian Government when its overdraft limit was exceeded by that amount.

I will read one final piece from the Auditor General's report; I could read much more but time is running out. It says -

Superannuation liability of the State - The Financial Administration Regulations 1986 do not require the Treasurer to recognise or disclose the full superannuation liability of the State, contingent or direct. This represents a significant liability to the

State and should, in my opinion, be required to be disclosed. I have not been able to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence as to the valuation of this liability.

In New South Wales, upon the change of Government last year, one of the first things Premier Greiner did was to have actuaries calculate the immediate liabilities of all statutory authorities and Government departments so that he knew the true cost and liability of the State in regard to superannuation. The Auditor General is making a similar statement here, and I hope the Treasurer will take these comments on board before next year and do some calculations. I believe any State Government should know its position in that regard.

I look forward to reading the comments of the Treasurer on the Auditor General's report because I believe it is a damning report and the Treasurer of Western Australia, who has a big staff and knows all the rules, should not have this number of anomalies in a Treasury audit report. Perhaps it is symptomatic of the problems of this Government at the moment, with its financial involvement in business deals.

I turn now to the Capital Works Program. As a result of a question asked a few years ago, the details given in the General Loan and Capital Works Fund Budget enable us to more accurately assess the future capital commitments of the State than we were able to do previously. I want to relate these figures to some of the losses the Government has suffered in recent times. The Government lost \$278 million on the petrochemical deal, or so we were told last week. The total capital expenditure on all Government departments last year was only \$233 million, and the total capital expenditure on all departments - from Agriculture down to Treasury - next year will be \$290 million. We have lost almost that amount by a mere stroke of the pen on the Rothwells deal and by investing in the petrochemical deal.

Hon P.G. Pendal: And still people over there sit and giggle and think we are talking about five bob.

Hon MAX EVANS: That is right. I wonder if they understand the magnitude of the figures. I do not think they do, and that is why I am putting the figures in this context. The \$278 million lost on the petrochemical deal will never be recovered - it has gone forever, and that must affect the future capital expenditure of all Government departments.

The actual capital expenditure in 1988-89 for the Department of Corrective Services was \$23.8 million; for the Ministry of Education \$53.7 million; for the Health Department \$41.4 million; for the Office of Government Accommodation \$19.7 million; for the Office of Technical and Further Education \$21.7 million and for the Police Department \$2.4 million. All of those amounts were part of the \$233 million total actual expenditure on capital works last year. When members add up some of those figures they will find that the loss on Rothwells of \$22.5 million is roughly equivalent to the \$21.7 million total capital expenditure for TAFE last year, and more than the actual capital expenditure on the Office of Government Accommodation. That sum has been wiped out by just one bad decision which should never have been made by any Government or anyone who understands legal matters.

The Government arranged the payout of \$150 million to the National Australia Bank knowing - and it must have known, because it was making moves to rescue Rothwells even in the last couple of weeks in October - that Rothwells would crash even after paying out the bank. As a result of that the liquidator put pressure on the National Australia Bank for undue preference to pay back the \$150 million. As a result of the deals between the liquidator, the National Australia Bank and the Government, the Government had to put \$33 million back in, on the basis that the bank paid back \$150 million and received a distribution from the liquidator. So \$33 million went out there, of which the Government received \$10.5 million back from the National Australia Bank.

The remaining \$22.5 million can be measured against the \$23.8 million actual capital expenditure on the Department of Corrective Services last year - that is, the total amount spent on building the Casuarina Prison and so on. That sum has been completely wiped out by a bad decision, which should never have been made, to pay out the National Australia Bank and not consider the undue preference to be called upon by the liquidator. Any liquidator would have had to do that.

Capital expenditure under State Housing Commission for last year totalled \$269 million compared with the loss on the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd project of \$277.5 million. That amount wipes out the total capital expenditure for the State Housing Commission. It

must be lost somewhere along the line. The actual expenditure for the Government Employees' Housing Authority was \$18.4 million compared with the allocation to the Swan Building Society of \$16.5 million. I could go on and on. However, I will quote only a few more figures because they are relevant to the total amount.

The total capital expenditure for the State Energy Commission during last year was \$248 million compared with the \$277 million spent on PICL; the loss for PICL was greater than the total capital expenditure for the State Energy Commission last year. The Water Authority of Western Australia actually spent \$180 million last year. The Western Australian Government Railways Commission - Westrail - spent \$69 million which is about half the total loss of the Teachers Credit Society. The Western Australian Water Authority's expenditure of \$180 million is not much more than the \$130 million allocated to the Teachers Credit Society. That amount has also been lost. The Metropolitan Market Trust spent \$24.6 million. It has built a new market at Canning Vale. This compares with the \$23.2 million loss by Rothwells. The Capital Works Program will be in a very serious situation because of these losses. Last year, \$30 million from the Capital Works Program was used to pay off the Teachers Credit Society losses. A large part of these losses will be recouped by the underspending of total expenditure which will be carried forward to future years. With inflation any further delays will only add to the cost of the ventures three or four years down the line. The public will not have the benefits then of the Capital Works Programs and costs will rise because of the losses caused by the Government that will be picked up by capital works. The Minister may be able to give us some idea of how the losses will be picked up. Very little is left of the interest earned on short term investments. We took in about \$170 million from last year to pick up these other losses and we would like to know how they will be funded.

I did not have time to deal with some items the other night. The expected contribution in lieu of tax from the R & I Bank is estimated at \$40 million. The accounts at the R & I Bank show only \$6 million. GoldCorp shows a contribution of \$29 million in lieu of tax. The accounts show only \$4.1 million - an overstatement of \$25 million in that case and of \$34 million in the case of the R & I Bank. I hope the Minister can give us an explanation of those amounts which I believe are worse than we first thought. The Western Australian Exim Corporation had its figures altered by the overvaluing or increased value of livestock which brought in interest of \$4.2 million to make a profit of \$280 000. That caused the demise of Exim because it did not make profits. I revealed those losses and I believe the Government will become confused if it is not aware of the actual figures. I look forward to the reply to the Minister.

HON J.N. CALDWELL (Agricultural) [10.25 pm]: The previous two speakers have covered this matter well. I will not hold up the House for too long. The Capital Works Program for this year totals \$1 606 368 000. It is amazing that \$168 million was underspent last year. I presume that is carried on into this year's programs which makes the amount substantially more.

I draw the Government's attention to the lack of capital works spending in country areas on housing, and particularly Homeswest housing. Recently, I visited a very small country town - Newdegate, which is east of Lake Grace - which has prospered over the last couple of years as wool and sheep prices have increased. Consequently, various land-holders have been able to afford to take on more labour. Unfortunately, housing cannot be found for these people. When the workers arrive in the towns they find work, probably go to the local hotel where most people congregate, and discover there is nowhere to live. Of course, most of them want their families with them.

Three people placed applications for homes with Homeswest and when I inquired about them at the Katanning Homeswest centre I was told that three applications were not many and that one of the applications was made the year before so that, really, there were only two. High priority was given to areas such as Mandurah, which has probably the highest priority. There were approximately 300 applications for accommodation in Mandurah. It is obvious, therefore, why the Newdegate people have not progressed. Housing will not be provided in that town because of the small number of applications. Perhaps Homeswest could allocate homes on a percentage basis. If Newdegate had three applicants and Mandurah had 300, accommodation could be provided on a ratio of 1:30.

Hon Mark Nevill: I thought they allocated homes on the length of the waiting list, not on the number of applicants.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: No doubt there are different ways of allocating those houses, but when I inquired at the Katanning office I was assured that the application that had been lodged in the previous year had lapsed. Perhaps the applicants should reapply each year. Nonetheless, the lack of housing in small towns needs to be addressed. It seems that demand for homes in country areas is not high and in most cases the two or three that are lodged are not given a high priority. Families move into these towns and find a job, but because of lack of housing they are unable to stay. Sometimes the wife and children move back to, say, Mandurah, and live in a caravan while the breadwinner remains at work on a farm. However, eventually, because of the family separation, the breadwinner leaves his job to return to his family and finds a job in the coastal areas where the population is increasing rapidly.

Hon Bob Thomas: The number of Homeswest homes has increased by six per cent this year.

Hon J.N. CALDWELL: The number of Homeswest homes in country areas has not increased greatly, although in my hometown of Katanning, where approximately 120 homes were for sale about 12 months ago, there are now only 40. That is pretty gratifying for a town the size of Katanning. The population there has increased. I feel that generally there is a drift from the city area to the country area because people can undoubtedly buy their homes far more cheaply there than they can in the metropolitan area; they also have quite a tidy sum left over. In some country towns the population has increased; however, I am concerned that in these smaller areas accommodation of this sort is unavailable.

I will also mention accommodation for hospital staff and school teachers, as well as schools in general. It is apparent that in some schools facilities do not come up to scratch. Teachers come into those schools, find that they are not what they are used to and invariably leave after 12 months. That is very disappointing for the community involved and it is unsettling for the children involved because they have no continuity with their teachers. Some 60 per cent of teachers in some country areas are all first year teachers, and 40 per cent of them leave after one year. That is unsettling not only for the children but also for the headmasters in their attempts to control their teaching staff. This needs to be addressed. The accommodation for school teachers needs to be upgraded to encourage teachers to remain in country areas.

There is an estimated increase of \$30.2 million in works to be undertaken by the Water Authority of Western Australia. That work is an absolute must. In this country water is at a premium. I get a kick out of listening to Hon Ernie Bridge talking about the water supply and how it is everybody's right to have a nice clean drink of water. I take this opportunity to support fully his theory of getting water from up north in some way. I think a feasibility study ought to be done into the possibility of obtaining water from the north. I know that a number of feasibility studies have already taken place and that one or two private people have looked at bringing water from the Ord River. I do not know whether any of these people have engineering qualifications, but I am told by them that it is quite feasible. One gentleman told me that if we could get the water halfway, getting it the rest of the way was all downhill. I had not looked at it that way myself but the man suggested that if we could get the water about halfway from the Ord River to Kalgoorlie, that would be the only section where one would need to have pumps. Once the water reached Kalgoorlie, it would be downhill all the way. I am not too sure about the ups and downs of that, but he assured me it was quite readily accepted that the water would run down the enormous distance between Kalgoorlie and Perth. I am sure there would need to be a pump or two somewhere along the way.

This State needs to look at the water situation extremely thoroughly. Western Australia is a very thirsty State and unfortunately all of the areas which have reasonable amounts of water are along the coastal strip. Those supplies are beginning to dwindle. Hon Sam Piantadosi assures me that underground water is getting further away from the pumps. When people put a pump down they have to go 10 metres further to reach the artesian water supplies. I guess everybody fears that one day the water supplies will run dry. The population of Western Australia is growing and the more people who put bores down the less underground water there will be. Water supplies should have a very high priority; water is a must if Western

Australia is to survive. As a result of the increased salinity apparent on the land, fresh water is terribly important. We must do all we can to conserve it and make it available to everybody.

I refer now to hospitals, which are an absolute necessity to everyone. Some regional hospitals in the area I represent are deteriorating. Hon M.S. Montgomery made me aware tonight that the Pemberton Hospital is so run down through lack of repairs and lack of new additions that it is becoming increasingly hard to get staff to work there. Probably the doctor is even thinking of leaving, and if he does leave it will not be long before the local community is told, "We had better close down your hospital because it is not being used and is no longer viable." I have had some experience with the Gnowangerup Hospital, which is also not being well utilised by patients. I hope the Government makes sure that hospitals in regional communities are adequately serviced and updated in order to attract the required nurses and doctors to serve in them.

I support this Appropriation Bill, but in wrapping up my comments I stress that country areas are extremely important to Western Australia. The Government needs to make every endeavour to keep people in country areas and that will only be done through upgrading the buildings which they live in and the buildings which are assets to those communities.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Fred McKenzie.

PERTH-JOONDALUP RAILWAY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 30 November.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [10.38 pm]: This Bill consists of only two pages. In fact if one looks carefully at it, one finds it consists of only two half pages. I have heard it said that Bills of only a few words are sometimes insignificant. However, on other occasions I have heard it said that Bills of this size generally are very significant and one should be extremely careful to make sure that one understands completely what they are about. The Perth-Joondalup Railway Bill represents a fairly momentous decision to construct a new railway line for Perth, the first new passenger railway line for many years. The Bill is to authorise the construction of a railway from Perth to Joondalup; to give the Government the authority to construct and maintain a railway with all necessary, proper and usual works and conveniences in connection with the railway along the alignment that was the subject of a plan tabled during the delivery of the Minister's second reading speech.

The Opposition supports the Bill but I qualify that support by saying that one of the reasons for our support is that we recognise that the northern suburbs of Perth are desperately in need of a rapid transit system. The proposition before us tonight at least will provide that rapid transit system into the northern corridor. The proposed passenger railway to the northern suburbs has in more recent times had a very interesting history. About October 1988, just over a year ago, I was discussing during the Budget debate on the transport item in the other place the idea of the Government's organising the establishment of an alignment for a passenger railway system from Fremantle to Rockingham and from Rockingham through to Mandurah. At that time I suggested that we should have a forward-looking vision, because without question and in due course the existing rail service would need to be extended to Rockingham and Mandurah; whether it was one which would come off the Perth-Fremantle line or off the Perth-Bunbury line was not decided at that stage but the general idea of providing a line to the southern suburbs was a matter, I believed, that the Government should have addressed.

At the same time, I suggested a passenger rail service for the northern suburbs should be considered and that Yanchep should be considered the most northern railway station for the time being. I suggested that as there may be some difficulty in proceeding from Perth to Joondalup and then from Joondalup to Yanchep - because of the problems of using the existing freeway median strip - it may be necessary to consider deviating from the Perth-Midland line at around Bayswater or Bassendean heading out north through what is basically open country, up into the Gnangara-Wangara areas, taking in the industrial area of Wangara and working across to the existing Mitchell Freeway system, picking up the freeway and

using the median strip to head north. The purpose of my general comments was that I had envisaged some difficulty in linking the Perth-Fremantle line into the existing Mitchell Freeway system.

The interesting point at the time was that the then Minister for Transport, Bob Pearce, made the point during the debate that he had everything under control; not only would there be a rail service to Rockingham and Mandurah in due course but also he suggested that about October or November 1989 there would be a passenger service to the northern suburbs of Perth. He was bold enough to suggest that the passenger service would be constructed and operating by then and would be able to carry the first passengers on the proposed Perth-Joondalup line - which he later described as having an alignment along the median strip of the existing Mitchell Freeway. At that time in the other place, I interjected by saying that I thought that was rubbish. The Minister for Transport challenged me and asked whether I was supporting the idea of a railway service from Perth to Joondalup. I made the point that I was a very strong supporter of a Perth-Joondalup passenger rail service but that I did not believe in a fit that it would be constructed and would be carrying passengers prior to the end of 1989.

As it turned out, of course, the idea that Bob Pearce grasped at was nothing more than recognition that an election was around the corner, that the Government was in trouble and needed to promise some sort of rapid transport system into the north metropolitan areas so that it could talk up the idea of that service. Soon after, I made the point that I thought Bob Pearce had grasped the prickly end of the nettle, that he had made mistakes, and perhaps his predictions were to come true, but in principle the Opposition strongly supported a rapid transit system into the northern suburbs.

As a matter of qualification, I will read from a Press release I put out on 5 January 1989 during the build up to the February election. The Press release reads -

WA Liberal Transport spokesman George Cash said today the Liberal Party was committed to providing a high quality rapid transit system to the Northern Suburbs, by the earliest possible date.

But, Mr Cash said, even by the most optimistic estimates, an electric railway could not be fully operational until 1992.

Mr Cash said a priority scheme would be initiated to construct a 'bus only' lane between the Warwick bus station and Hutton Street to enable buses to bypass heavy traffic congestion.

"This scheme could be constructed on a 'priority' basis for about \$2 million," Mr Cash said.

I went on to say in the Press release that the scheme would enable bus users to get immediate relief from the congestion that exists on the Mitchell Freeway early in the morning and around four to six o'clock during peak periods; that if there was a bus priority lane, buses at least would get a clear run. I believed that that would attract greater custom and we could relieve some of the pressure from the freeway system. I also made the point at the time that while I believed it was important to construct a 'bus only' lane we did support the idea of a more substantial rapid transit system into the northern suburbs; I recognised at the time the Government was very keen to talk about an electric train system into that area.

I commenced my comments by saying that the Opposition supports a rapid transit system into the northern suburbs. We will support the Bill but I hasten to add that we are talking about spending a considerable amount of taxpayers' money. With the Government's agreement that a rapid transit system should be constructed into that area, and with the February election finished and decided, the Government now has the opportunity to review the exact mode of transport proposed for that route. I say that in a constructive way because three estimates have been made of the general costs for the system proposed by the Government. Originally, Travers Morgan, the consultants to the Government, considered a transport system on the Perth-Joondalup route and came up with an estimate of \$145 million for that system. It originally proposed that the system should be serviced by buses, but its quotation of \$145 million was based on a rail option. While the Government did not accept the bus option, it made it clear that it was considering a rail system at that time. As Travers Morgan came up with a bus option as its priority, the Government decided that it must

approach other consultants. A small group of people headed by Peter Newman, a well qualified transport consultant, and a consultant to the Government in matters general, was invited to consider the Travers Morgan report and to produce his own report and make recommendations to the Government. The Newman committee came up with proposals for a Perth-Joondalup rail system to be constructed for approximately \$124 million, and came firmly down on the side of a passenger rail service.

Hon Garry Kelly: Do you agree with rail?

Hon GEORGE CASH: I certainly do not agree with the \$124 million. In a few moments I will refer to the various modes of transport available to the Government. I do not know whether the Government is totally committed to one mode of transport, and we now have an opportunity to consider the best possible mode for the future.

The Newman committee came up with a figure of \$124 million for a rail system in the northern corridor. It is interesting to see in the second reading speech that the Minister has reviewed the estimate for the construction of the line and indicated that it is likely to cost in the order of \$175 million in today's dollar terms. I have taken the opportunity to speak to some transport consultants and they have said that Parliament should be very aware that the system currently proposed by the Government is likely to cost in the order of \$250 million and not \$175 million. That will probably come as no shock to members because it is fair to say that these big, multimillion dollar projects tend to blow out in cost terms.

Hon Fred McKenzie: It is now \$220 million -

Hon GEORGE CASH: Already!

Hon Fred McKenzie: - but additional patronage which was not envisaged has been anticipated, and this will include additional rail carriages in the \$220 million figure; the estimate has blown out, but these are contributing factors as well.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I appreciate the comments of Hon Fred McKenzie; the \$220 million he mentioned related to additional facilities provided for the anticipated additional patronage and that figure is closer to the figure mentioned by the consultants I spoke to. However, I am not sure whether the consultants were referring to the additional facilities. I accept the figure of \$220 million or \$250 million as the likely cost for the line on completion rather than the \$124 million, Travers Morgan's estimate of \$145 million or the \$175 million referred to in the second reading speech.

The Government is considering a steel to steel model, but - having agreed that there should be a passenger rail service between Perth and Joondalup - the opportunity exists for us to slow down the process a little. We will not be able to pick up passengers on the service by the end of this year, so there is no rush to finish its construction. Therefore, the opportunity exists for the Government to take some advice from transport consultants who are skilled in this area and look at some other facilities and modes of transport. Systems other than the steel to steel rail transport systems are operating in other parts of the world. I do not say that in a negative way; I say that in a constructive way because people around the world may be able to provide advice to the Government, and in the long term the State may be better served with other modes of transport. If the Government decides that a steel to steel system is the way to go, I raise with the Government the possibility of not having an overhead wire service such as exists with the Perth-Armadale, Perth-Fremantle and Perth-Midland lines. I urge the Government to reconsider the possibility of establishing an electrification system on the Perth-Joondalup line which uses a third rail concept. In that case we would have no overhead gantries or lines.

Hon Fred McKenzie: It would be much more expensive.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I recognise the member's comments.

Hon Graham Edwards: It would not necessarily be practical.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Hon Graham Edwards is probably referring to some comments made in the other place by Mr Bob Pearce, which astounded me, when he referred to the practicalities or otherwise of a third rail system. He talked about the fact that level crossings would be on the Perth to Joondalup route, but this route does not have level crossings as it goes up the middle of the median strip on the freeway. It is generally bounded by fencing and would not involve the pedestrian problems we have on existing lines in Perth. While I

recognise it is certainly a more expensive proposal, it is a possibility that the Government should consider for its aesthetic qualities - we have the time to study such things. Even if it cost more dollars, I believe the community would be better served with a third rail system of the type used overseas.

Clearly, I will run out of time in this debate even though I am the Opposition spokesman on transport; however, there will be other opportunities to continue my remarks regarding the Perth Joondalup line, perhaps in the Budget debate. Given the fact that we will finish at 11.00 pm - this is firmly fixed in the minds of all members - I signify that the Opposition supports a rapid transit system in the northern suburbs. The Perth-Joondalup railway system will be a reality, whether it is a steel to steel system or some other mode. I urge the Government to consider the other modes of rail systems available around the world, and I do so in a positive way. We do not have to rush the process because, as people would be aware, considerable engineering problems are associated with clearing the Perth to Fremantle railway line and crossing the new line from Roe Street into the median strip of the Mitchell Freeway; this is a massive engineering problem which is yet to be solved.

As the freeway system winds its way past Lake Monger we recognise that the Government has some significant civil engineering problems with that section of the proposed line bounding Herdsman Lake - it will take some time to sort this out. Therefore, an opportunity exists for the Government to reconsider the type of system to be used for the Perth to Joondalup line. We look forward to working with the Government in a very positive way to make this proposition a reality. My comments tonight have been directed towards the long term economic savings which I believe are available to the State. With those comments and given the time, I will raise further points which I wanted to raise during this debate at other opportunities that will present themselves during the Budget debate.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon M.S. Montgomery.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [11.01 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Adjournment Debate - Wetlands - Protection Planning

HON SAM PIANTADOSI (North Metropolitan) [11.02 pm]: I refer to an item in today's paper which I am sure members would have read. However, following the comments I made last week in respect of this State's water supplies, I feel it is incumbent on me to bring this matter to the attention of the House. The article reads -

Water-wasters are squandering scarce bore water and putting wetlands at risk a research scientist warned today.

And the scientist appealed to householders and major institutions to take more care.

Dr Lloyd Townley, senior research scientist with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation Division of Water Resources said wetlands throughout the metropolitan area were deteriorating.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind honourable members that a member is addressing the House and I certainly cannot hear him. I ask members to refrain from audible conversations and from any other noise.

Hon SAM PIANTADOSI: The article continues -

"We have a limited resource and we need to take care of it. We could do better than we are," he said.

"While the CSIRO and the Water Authority and the Environmental Protection Authority were working together to head off further problems the public could help.

"And planning authorities should also ensure that housing developments were not allowed in areas where wetlands could be affected," he said.

About half the water used in Perth comes from the underground supplies over which there is no control. There are about 80,000 bores in the metropolitan area.

"Wetlands are increasingly being affected by overuse of the underground supply by private and public bore operators.

"There is no doubt the water quality in wetlands is declining."

Previously I have mentioned to the House the cost involved and the danger that could be posed to the future growth of not only the city, but also the entire State. The article from which I have quoted provides further evidence that more secure and forward-thinking planning should be considered in relation to new developments. The article further reinforces the points I made last week that we should be planning to protect the wetlands. The problem is more evident in the north metropolitan area than in other areas.

Adjournment Debate - City of Belmont - Roberts, Mr John - Injustice Case

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan) [11.04 pm]: I would like to draw to the attention of the House before it adjourns a situation which occurred some years ago in the City of Belmont and which has led to an injustice which has been protracted over a period of time. It relates to a Mr John Roberts, a senior citizen of the City of Belmont who was a member of the Belmont Senior Citizens' Association which operates out of premises owned by the City of Belmont and over which the council has some control. The association had the unusual situation of having a board to which members from the association could appeal - a subcommittee of the City of Belmont which heard the appeals and which had a supervisory function.

Mr Roberts, in 1984, went to one of the councillors of the City of Belmont because he was concerned about what he thought was a misapplication of funds by the association. It concerned the chairman of the association and the son-in-law of the chairman of the association. The next thing that happened after his raising this matter quite properly with his local councillor, Cr Parkin who is now the mayor, was that she raised the matter with the management committee of the Belmont Shire Council. She said she was quite happy that the matter had been properly dealt with by the association and here was no basis for the complaints by Mr Roberts. However, Mr Roberts then received a letter from the senior citizens' association charging him for making allegations to councillors of the City of Belmont and threatening to have him removed from the association. He asked who made the allegations and for the particulars of the allegations. He received a further list of allegations, none of which was particularised, and he was not told what he was actually charged with. He was removed from the club and he then appealed to the committee which was run by the City of Belmont.

Prior to the appeal being heard he tried to have himself represented by a solicitor, but he then found that the committee would not allow him to be represented by a solicitor and would only allow the solicitor to be present during the appeal hearing. Prior to the appeal being heard Cr Parkin said she did not believe Mr Roberts should be dismissed from the club for any of the charges which were laid against him, but that he should be dismissed because of his contempt for the club's constitution and the rules for making a complaint to a councillor instead of making his complaint to the club. That was the basis on which the appeal was held against him. In the end the man was charged with a breach of the rules of the club; he was not given the full particulars even though he asked for them and to know his accusers; he was given further charges within a shorter period of time than provided by the rules; he was dismissed from the club; when he appealed in accordance with the rules the appeal was heard by many of the same people who heard the original determination and may well have been his accusers in the first instance; the appeal board included a person who had made up her mind before he was even charged that the matters for which he was charged were baseless; it was decided, before the appeal was heard, that he was not guilty on any of the grounds for which he was charged, but on a totally different ground from that which he was charged; he had a solicitor, but was not allowed to use him and, not surprisingly, his appeal was dismissed. For good measure the committee banned him from the premises owned by the City of Belmont.

Mr Roberts was denied the ordinary principles of natural justice. The matter was decided before he was charged. He was finally convicted on a charge that was not proffered against him and he was not given the basic rights one would expect. Mr Roberts has fought this case over some years and he went to the Ombudsman and, as a result, was granted permission to enter the premises of the City of Belmont, but he was not to attend the association's

functions. He has tried, by other means, to have this matter brought to a proper resolution, but being a very elderly man and not a rich man, he does not have the opportunities to overcome this injustice.

I have raised the matter with the Attorney General because I believe the senior citizens' association is a charity and, therefore, comes under his supervisory capacity. The Attorney is only prepared to take a very minor role over certain irregularities under the Associations Incorporations Act. I am concerned that we have an association which has been set up for the benefit of the public and which has a close association with the City of Belmont which has taken a supervisory role in the association. This man has been denied the basic rights of natural justice and, despite trying for four years to reach a solution, he has been unable to do so. I hope that the fact that this has been brought to the attention of the House may cause some people to re-examine their conduct and to ascertain whether it is proper that a person be deprived of his rights as an aged person; be deprived of his rights to be a member of a senior citizens' association purely because he made a complaint to a councillor of a supervisory body about perceived irregularities in the conduct of its affairs. The events which followed from that were almost Kafkaesque in the way they proceeded: A person was expelled from an association on a ground on which he was not charged and which was decided against him before he entered the room in order to make his appeal. Some doubt still remains as to whether the people who heard his appeal were those who laid the charges against him in the first place and whether they allowed him a proper hearing.

I hope the Attorney General will feel inclined to act in this case and to use his best endeavours in his supervisory power over charities. I sincerely hope that the Minister for Local Government will also feel inclined to exercise her good services in order to help this man be restored in his old age to the Senior Citizens' Association of Belmont, which is a very important association to him.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.11 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

EDUCATION - COLLIER PRIMARY SCHOOL

Library Resource Centre, Assembly Area Request

865. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the Collier Primary School's request for a library resource centre/assembly area?
- (2) Will the school's request be given the highest priority?
- (3) Is it correct that -
 - (a) it is the only school in the Perth "south region" which does not have a suitable library resource centre; and
 - (b) it is one of a small group of schools in that region which is unable to house its students in a covered assembly area?
- (4) Is the Minister aware that the school P & C association sees the need for these facilities as so great it has already raised \$15 000-\$20 000 over the past two years towards the project?
- (5) Given that student numbers are increasing steadily, and it is envisaged that the small room, used currently as a library, will be needed as a regular classroom, will the Minister give a date for the commencement of work on the library resource centre/assembly area?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Education has provided the following reply -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. However, the school's request will be given due consideration in the formulation of the 1990-91 Budget.
- (3) (a) No;
(b) yes.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) No. See (2).

LAND CONSERVATION DISTRICT COMMITTEES - MALLEE SUMP

Report Completion

883. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Racing and Gaming representing the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to my question 305 of 29 August 1989 -

- (1) Has the report on the mallee sump been completed?
- (2) Has the report been printed?
- (3) Has the report been circulated and made available to the Jerramungup land conservation district committee?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Agriculture has provided the following response -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) The report will be distributed to the Jerramungup land conservation district committee and to affected farmers when it is printed. A draft version will be made available to the committee before Christmas.

HOUSING - MOBILE HOME, YANCHEP
Erection - Ministerial Approval

884. Hon R.G. PIKE to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has the Minister recently approved the erection or placement of a mobile home in Yanchep which the City of Wanneroo had previously rejected several times?
- (2) If yes, what are the reasons for this approval?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that this decision is causing considerable disquiet in this area to the owners of conventional high quality double brick homes?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

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

FAMILY - COOLOONGUP FAMILY CENTRE
First Public Announcement Date

891. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for The Family:

Further to the Minister's media statement on 29 October 1989 which referred to the proposed Cooloongup Family Centre -

- (1) What was the date of the first public announcement of this proposed centre?
- (2) What was the original date of completion?
- (3) What are the reasons for the delay between the original announcement and the Minister's subsidiary statement made on 29 October 1989?
- (4) What is the estimated cost of this facility?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) 24 November 1988.
- (2) There was no stated original date of completion. Building was originally expected to begin late April 1989.
- (3) Construction of the Cooloongup centre was postponed until the 1989-90 financial year due to cost overruns with the first six family centres. This was caused by unexpected high demand and increased prices in the building industry.
- (4) \$336 660.

EDUCATION - SERPENTINE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Asbestos Roof

896. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Serpentine Primary School has a royal blue asbestos roof on a building used as a classroom and canteen?
- (2) Has the Building Management Authority inspected the roof and recommended its replacement?
- (3) Given the known health hazard of asbestos building products, will the Minister give urgent priority to the removal and replacement of the roof at the school?
- (4) Will the work be completed before the commencement of term 1, 1990?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Education has provided the following reply -

- (1) I am aware that the school has a blue asbestos roof on a building used as a classroom.

- (2) The Building Management Authority has inspected the roof but has not recommended replacement. The P & C association arranged for the health surveyor of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale to inspect the roof. As a result of his inspection the shire has written a letter of concern to the Health Department.
- (3) The possible health hazards associated with asbestos products are currently being determined by an expert committee. Until investigations are complete and recommendations are made no further action will be initiated.
- (4) No.

PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES CO LTD - GOFAIR

Representatives - Treasurer's Dealings

897. Hon PETER FOSS to the Leader of the House representing the Treasurer:

- (1) Has the Minister had any dealings with any persons purporting to be acting on behalf of Gofair - the former PICL manager?
- (2) Who are those persons and when did the Minister have dealings with them?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See (1).

PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES CO LTD - PROJECT MANDATE

Government Negotiations

898. Hon PETER FOSS to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) With whom did the Government deal when negotiating the mandate to the PICL project?
- (2) Were any of these persons representing Gofair and, if so, whom?
- (3) Who were each of these persons representing?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following reply -

The question is unclear. If the member has any specific concerns he will have to be more precise.

PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES CO LTD - GOFAIR

Management Experience - Government Measures

899. Hon PETER FOSS to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Did the Government take any measures to determine the experience or skill or expertise of Gofair to manage the PICL project?
- (2) What were those measures?
- (3) Did the Government take any measures to ascertain the actual people who would provide the services on behalf of Gofair?
- (4) What were those measures and who were the persons so ascertained?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following reply -

- (1) No.
- (2) See (1).
- (3) No.
- (4) See (3).

GOFAIR - MANAGERS

Beneficial Owners - Treasurer's Information

903. Hon PETER FOSS to the Leader of the House representing the Treasurer:

- (1) Has the Minister received any information which may indicate who are -
 - (a) the managers; or
 - (b) the beneficial owners of Gofair?
- (2) What is that information?
- (3) Who was he led to understand were the -
 - (a) managers; and
 - (b) the beneficial owners of Gofair?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2)-(3) See (1).

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BELL GROUP SHARES - BOND CORPORATION

State Government Insurance Commission - Invalid Indemnity, Additional Losses

610. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) Has the Minister for Budget Management prepared an estimate of the additional losses the Government faces if the Bond Corporation has the indemnity between the State Government Insurance Commission and Bell declared invalid?
- (2) If yes, will the Minister indicate the likely estimate of the moneys involved?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No. The Government has no reason to believe that its position on that matter will not be upheld.
- (2) Not applicable.

JOURNALIST - BARRASS, MR TONY

Prison Release Powers

611. Hon R.G. PIKE to the Minister for Corrective Services:

Will the Minister, if he has the power - and if not, will he ask the authority that does have the power - release journalist Barrass for the balance of the days he has to serve, particularly because of the matter of high principle involved?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I do not have the power to release any prisoner before the completion of a sentence, as modified by the provisions of the Prisons Act or the Offenders Probation and Parole Act as the case may be. No-one else has the authority to release prisoners either. If I may say so, it is highly desirable that a discretion of that sort should not be available. We have seen some sorry experiences in other jurisdictions where that discretion exists.

PRISONERS - LEAVE

Minister for Corrective Service's Powers

612. Hon R.G. PIKE to the Minister for Corrective Services:

My understanding, of which I am not now certain, is that the Minister for Corrective Services has power on a compassionate basis to allow a prisoner leave for two or three days. Is that correct?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

It is incorrect.

SPORT AND RECREATION - SUBIACO OVAL

Negotiations - Ministerial Responsibility

613. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Lands:

Would the Minister please advise which Minister is handling the negotiations between the Subiaco City Council, the Western Australian Football Commission and the Government?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister carrying the prime responsibility in the negotiations is the Minister for Sport and Recreation.

SPORT AND RECREATION - SUBIACO OVAL

Negotiations - Progress

614. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) What progress has been made in negotiations between the Subiaco City Council, the Western Australian Football Commission and the Government?
- (2) Is it the Minister's intention to produce a written agreement between the three parties involved concerning the vesting of Subiaco Oval before new clause 30 in the Reserves and Land Revestment Bill currently before this House is considered?
- (3) If not, why not?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(3)

I am not quite sure where the Subiaco City Council stands at this stage. I understand the council had a meeting either late yesterday or this morning, and that from that meeting the council would be conveying some information to my office. I am not sure whether that information has yet been conveyed, but I understand that the current thrust of the council is to maintain the vesting with it and that the council be given the power to lease the oval to the Western Australian Football Commission for a period of 99 years. That is very much the position of the Government. What I do not know in this equation is the position of the Opposition.

JOURNALIST - BARASS, MR TONY

Nolle Prosequi Consideration

615. Hon R.G. PIKE to the Attorney General:

In regard to the journalist Barrass, reference the non-prosecution of J.J. O'Connor from the Transport Workers' Union of Australia, in view of the industrial trouble that may result from the prosecution of Barrass, did the Attorney General give any consideration, as he did in the case of Mr O'Connor, to entering a nolle prosequi?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

What an extraordinary proposition! First of all, as I understand the position, Mr Barrass has not been charged on indictment or had not been charged on indictment or at all. In any event, the matter on which he was called to give evidence was a Commonwealth matter and not a State matter. Hon Bob Pike is again comparing apples with pears and he is not making a better fist of it on this occasion than he has on others.

ROTHWELLS LTD - STATE SUPERANNUATION BOARD

\$50 Million Deposit - Documents Tabling

616. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Leader of the House:

Will the Leader of the House tell the Chamber when the documents contained

in my request to him of Thursday last - and indeed requested by him - concerning the \$50 million State Superannuation Board funds deposited in Rothwells Ltd will be tabled?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I have asked for attention to be given to the collation of those documents. My present intention is to produce them no later than on my reply to the second reading debate.

SPORT AND RECREATION - SUBIACO OVAL
Negotiations - Written Agreement Tabling

617. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

Will the Minister ensure that a written agreement between the Subiaco City Council, the Western Australian Football Commission and the Government is tabled in this House before clause 30 of the Reserves and Land Revestment Bill is considered?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I would like to be able to do that but the member is asking me to do something over which I do not have control, and that is to get the Subiaco City Council to sign an agreement.

Hon R.G. Pike: We can wait.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: It may be that Hon Robert Pike can wait, but I doubt very much whether he understands what the Government is trying to do in this matter.

Hon R.G. Pike interjected.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Perhaps the member who is interjecting should explain why he hates sport and in particular football.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: The amendment on the Notice Paper - which will be competently dealt with by my colleague, the Minister for Lands - seeks to give us the opportunity to continue negotiations. The Subiaco City Council fully understands that position. That mechanism will give us time if matters have not been resolved when Parliament rises. Two things need to be considered: firstly, that fair and long consultation has taken place and the council has had a long time to decide on its position; and, secondly, the next football season is not all that far away. Indeed, the end of the calendar year is not all that far away.

Hon George Cash: Table the documents to enable us to get on with the job. The Minister is making it difficult.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I understand that the documents we need to get on with the job are the amendments which are on the Notice Paper. I am not sure what agreement it is that the member is talking about; I do not know if it is the lease agreement that will have to be eventually negotiated between the Minister for Lands and the Subiaco City Council. I am a little in the dark as to exactly what it is that the member is talking about.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS - COMMISSIONER APPOINTMENT
Deliberate Delay Allegations

618. Hon FRED McKENZIE to the Leader of the House:

Has he had the opportunity to inquire into the allegations by Hon Phillip Pental last week that the appointment of the new Commissioner for Consumer Affairs -

(a) has been deliberately delayed until after the current session of Parliament; and

(b) is to go to an applicant on political grounds only and not on merit?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. I have taken the opportunity to check on the allegations that Mr Pental made. Less than a week ago I had occasion to sympathise with Mr Pental.

Hon P.G. Pental: I knew I was in strife then.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Mr President, you will recall that I expressed some sadness that a man so young should have such a poor memory -

Hon P.G. Pental: Because of running around with you blokes.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: - that he could not recall the explosion of Press secretaries under the past Liberal Government at the same time as the member was one of their number. Today I have to sympathise with him on different grounds, namely that he has obviously been the victim of an informant who is either entirely ignorant of the true position in respect of the appointment of the new commissioner or is an outright and unmitigated liar.

Hon George Cash: Don't speak about your members like that.

Hon P.G. Pental: The Leader of the House had the gall to ask me to retract my words when I called the Government a corrupt Government.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I did not say that Mr Pental lied; I would never say that he lied. He should recall I withdrew a comment last week. I am saying that Mr Pental's informant -

Hon P.G. Pental: A very good informant.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I am sorry that Mr Pental thinks he has a very good informant because the fact of the matter is, as I have already indicated, the informant is either entirely ignorant or an outright liar. I am sorry that Mr Pental's judgment should still lead him to say a person with those poor standards one way or another is in fact a good informant. I would have thought he would be regarded as a very poor informant.

Hon P.G. Pental: Who have you appointed?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Last week Mr Pental made an allegation based on what he had been told - and I stress that again - that is, that the Government was waiting for Parliament to rise before announcing the appointment of a new commissioner. The reason that we were said to be holding back this appointment until after the rising of Parliament is that the appointment had already been predetermined in favour of a political appointee -

Hon P.G. Pental: Correct!

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I wish the member would stop saying "Correct" when it is absolutely wrong. Why does he want to make an idiot of himself?

Hon P.G. Pental: It is misleading Parliament, that is why.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If members wish to have question time it will be carried out in the proper manner. If I hear any more interjections from either side I will stop questions without notice immediately.

Point of Order

Hon R.G. PIKE: When the Leader of the House is answering a question, he should answer the question and not indulge in rhetorical argument.

The PRESIDENT: The member has not made a point of order. I suggest that he leave the running of the operations of this place to me. I repeat: If question time is not carried out with decorum and decency, I give an absolute guarantee that this question and answer will be the last one for the day.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Hon J.M. BERINSON: The allegation that was retailed to us by Hon Phillip Pental

last week had two limbs to it - firstly, that we had deliberately delayed announcing the appointment of the new commissioner because the appointee was to be a person appointed on political grounds only and not on merit; secondly, the argument was that the appointment had been made by the Government in the face of and contrary to the recommendations of the selection panel with which, as I understand it, Mr Pental had no disagreement. I think I am right in saying that the panel was acceptable to Mr Pental.

Hon P.G. Pental: There was unanimity between the panel and the outgoing commissioner.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: The fact of the matter is there was no delay on the Government's move to appoint a commissioner. In fact, on the Government's recommendation an appointment was approved by Executive Council on 17 October; the appointment was of a Commissioner for Consumer Affairs from another State. The reason that that appointment did not proceed following Executive Council approval was because the applicant then withdrew for what was expressed to be personal reasons.

Hon P.G. Pental: Because of the belief that you had cooked it up; that is what I am told.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Mr Pental is being told by somebody he should not rely upon.

Hon P.G. Pental: Who is getting the job?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Mr Pental is going from one extreme to another. He has now become quite impossible to understand. I am explaining to him that a recommendation of the panel -

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the Leader of the House that he is answering a question from Hon Fred McKenzie not from Hon Phillip Pental.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Thank you very much for that, Mr President. I would like to stress to Hon Fred McKenzie that Hon Phillip Pental is going over the edge. Let me give the facts of the matter as briefly and as concisely as I can. On the basis of a recommendation by the panel to the Government, the appointment of an applicant was agreed on and put through Executive Council.

Hon P.G. Pental: In October.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: The date was 17 October. That proposed appointee was not Mr Ross Harrison who was the target of Mr Pental's most unfair comments the other day, but was a commissioner in another State who withdrew the application for personal reasons. Thereafter, the Minister asked that the selection panel reconvene. It did reconvene and unanimously made a recommendation of another person who had appeared on its original short list. The appointment of that person has now been approved but I will not disclose the name of that person as the matter has not yet gone before Executive Council. However, I can say that that unanimous approval as accepted by the Government was not of Mr Ross Harrison.

Hon P.G. Pental: Was it last Friday that you made that decision?

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Hon P.G. Pental is too smart by half.

Point of Order

Hon GEORGE CASH: This answer to Hon Fred McKenzie has now taken just over 10 minutes and I do ask the Leader of the House to bring his answer to a close to enable other members to ask questions.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member cannot ask the Leader of the House to do anything. He can ask the Chair to ask the Leader of the House.

Asking questions in Parliament is a very important feature of a parliamentary sitting and the provision for doing that has to be guarded very jealously. In this place plenty of articles are available for members to read which describe the facility for asking questions, and I suggest that some of the members read them. The idea behind asking questions is to receive some information in return. Honourable members cannot have things both ways; they cannot expect that on one side they can make allegations and statements and then think that people on the other side cannot take advantage of an opportunity to counter them. I know how this Parliament works, better than anybody in here; whether members agree or not, I am telling them I do and I am rapidly getting sick and tired of question time being used as a smart Alec time when somebody tries to outsmart somebody else. Again, whether members agree with me or not, for the rest of my time in this Chair, when I think that question time has got out of hand, I will be curtailing it; I will not be waiting for the Leader of the House to do so. Members can question whether or not I have the authority to do that, but I can assure them I have. Will the Leader of the House answer the question. I am also getting sick and tired of the answer.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I am sorry I am not being as entertaining as I usually am. I am sure the President will concede that my answers are generally very brief indeed, but on this occasion it has been necessary to elaborate to some degree, if only because of the constant interjections questioning what I am saying. I will draw my answer to a conclusion by saying that I have made the position perfectly clear; the recommendation which has been adopted is again the unanimous recommendation of the selection panel and the successful applicant is not Mr Harrison. I cannot complete this comment however, without deploring the most unfair way in which Mr Harrison's name has been bandied about as though he was an officer not worth greater respect. Mr Harrison is a first class officer who has not only served the present Government in various capacities but has served previous Governments under the premierships of Sir Charles Court and Mr O'Connor, and he deserves better than the treatment he received from Mr Pendal last week.

BURSWOOD CASINO - FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

619. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Can the -

Hon Tom Stephens: Is this to apologise?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: No, because I was right. Can the Minister clarify the Government's intention of conducting an inquiry into the foreign ownership of the Burswood Casino by saying -

- (a) whether the current agreement prohibits foreign ownership;
- (b) whether the current ownership structure actually contravenes that agreement; and
- (c) whether the Cabinet has expressed any provisional view on the matter?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The member read the second part of his question out a little bit too quickly. However, he seems to be asking for an opinion. The Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Act gives the Minister the power to make certain exemptions in relation to foreign ownership. I suggest he either refer to the Act or put the question on notice and I will give it consideration.

INQUIRY - MINISTER FOR RACING AND GAMING

Newspaper Article

620. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Who will conduct the inquiry that the Minister spoke of in *The West Australian* this morning?

(2) What are his terms of reference?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

(1)-(2)

I have referred the applicant to the Gaming Commission of WA which will be responsible for the inquiry. I have not given terms of reference; the Act is fairly clear in this regard.

LAND - "VESTING ORDER"
Length of Tenure

621. Hon D.J. WORDSWORTH to the Minister for Local Government:

Will the Minister tell the House what is meant by a "vesting order" and is it usual for such an order to have a length of tenure?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I am not sure how technical the honourable member wants me to be, and as he is a former Minister for Lands I am surprised at the question. The vesting orders generally do have a length of tenure associated with them. I understand the term to mean the vesting of Crown land in the care of another body.

UNIVERSITIES AMALGAMATION BILL - FEDERAL MINISTER'S VIEW

622. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for Education:

Does the Minister share the view expressed by the Federal Minister Mr Dawkins on television last night that it does not matter much whether or not the Universities Amalgamation Bill passes or fails?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

This question should be directed on notice to another Minister, but I personally think it would be a good thing for those institutions in our State if the merger did take place.

BURSWOOD CASINO - FOREIGN OWNERSHIP
Restrictions

623. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Would the Minister advise the House of the restrictions on foreign persons having equity or owning shares in the Burswood Resort Casino complex?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I am surprised that the member should ask that question. I am tempted to refer him to the Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Act. However, to short cut that process, the Act gives the Minister power to exempt foreign ownership over an amount of 40 per cent.

BURSWOOD CASINO - FOREIGN OWNERSHIP
Japanese Consortium - Act Agreement Variation

624. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Does the proposed sale of shares of the Burswood Island casino to the Japanese consortium constitute a variation of the agreement with respect to section 5 of the Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Act?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Once again the member is asking me for an opinion; I am simply not prepared to give an opinion on these matters.

INDUSTRIAL LANDS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY - ANNUAL REPORT
TABLING

625. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Economic Development and Trade:

With reference to the answer to Legislative Assembly question on notice 1647 of 1989, will the Minister table the annual report of the Industrial Lands Development Authority for the year ending 30 June 1989?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I thank the member for some notice of that question, and I am advised by the Minister as follows -

Yes, within 21 days of the receipt of the Auditor General's report in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1985.
