

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 24 August 1988

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

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

Salaries and Allowances Tribunal

THE PRESIDENT: Honourable members, you will recall that earlier this year I advised you that Mr W.F. Willesee, who was the representative appointed under section 10(4)(a) of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal to assist the tribunal in matters relating to remuneration of members of Parliament, had resigned. I now advise that Mr Speaker and I have nominated Hon A.A. Lewis, MLC, to replace Mr Willesee. Therefore, any comments or suggestions members may wish to have placed before the tribunal should be directed to Hon A.A. Lewis.

BILLS (2) - INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Offenders Probation and Parole Amendment Bill.
2. Parole Orders (Transfer) Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Hon J.M. Berinson (Minister for Corrective Services), and read a first time.

ACTS AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (FAIR TRADING) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Consumer Affairs), and read a first time.

Leave to Proceed to Second Reading

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [2.37 pm]: I seek leave to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

HON G.E. MASTERS (West - Leader of the Opposition) [2.38 pm]: Could the House have an explanation as to why this Bill should be read a second time now. I have no doubt there is a good reason, but it is necessary that it is put on record.

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [2.39 pm]: The reason is contained in the second reading speech. Members will be aware that the Golden Aeroplane game is being played, and a number of people within the community are being exploited by what I would call very sharp, shrewd operators, who are basically con men.

Several members interjected: Hear, hear!

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I simply want this Bill to be introduced into the House as quickly as possible. I will be seeking the cooperation of the House in quickly processing the Bill through this Chamber.

Leave granted.

Second Reading

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [2.40 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In the spring session of Parliament of 1987 the Fair Trading Act was passed. That Act contained provisions regarding codes of practice, conditions and warranties and mirrored part V of the Trade Practices Act at a State level. In addition, it updated and modernised legislation relative to false advertising and other unfair trading practices which were the subject of a number of Acts. As a consequence of the passage of the Fair Trading Act, the following Acts should be repealed -

Clothes and Fabrics (Labelling and Sales) Act 1973;
 Pyramid Sales Schemes Act 1973;
 Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act 1936;
 Unsolicited Goods and Services Act 1973.

In addition, part VIII of the Factories and Shops Act 1963 is to be repealed.

The Bill also increases the statutory monetary limit from \$5 000 to \$40 000 in section 18 of the Consumer Affairs Act. That section allows the commissioner to institute or defend legal proceedings on behalf of consumers.

In recent weeks it has become apparent that the Golden Aeroplane game is being played in the north west of the State. The Golden Aeroplane game is not illegal under the existing Pyramid Sales Scheme Act but will become illegal under the relevant sections of the Fair Trading Act. However, before the Fair Trading Act can be proclaimed it is necessary to repeal the Pyramid Sales Scheme Act. As soon as this legislation is passed by Parliament the relevant sections of the Fair Trading Act will be proclaimed; thus it is likely that the Golden Aeroplane game will become illegal in the very near future. On that basis I would urge anyone wishing to join the Golden Aeroplane game to reconsider. They will not only lose the opportunity to make profits, but they will lose their contributions and face charges. The chances of anyone making a profit other than those people who originate the games are practically nil. Those people who organise the games take the money and run and the ordinary people who are conned into playing will once again lose out. To prevent this from occurring I would ask the House to give consideration to the speedy passage of this legislation.

The Ministry of Consumer Affairs and the Police Department will actively investigate instances where the game is being played and I would expect prosecutions to follow once the game is illegal. Apart from losing substantial amounts of money, participants in the Golden Aeroplane game will soon make themselves liable to charges involving penalties of up to \$20 000.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon G.E. Masters (Leader of the Opposition).

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Consumer Affairs), and read a first time.

MOTION

Preschool Education

HON N.F. MOORE (Lower North) [2.44 pm]: I move -

That this House:

- (a) condemns the State Government for failing to meet its 1983 and 1986 election promises to provide all parents with the option of a place in preschool education for their four year olds; and
- (b) regards the Government's plan to develop Family Centres as an ill-conceived, hasty attempt to solve a multitude of child care problems which it has failed to address during the last five and a half years.

I commence my remarks by reading to the House the ALP's 1983 election platform in respect of early childhood education. It reads as follows -

Provision for teachers' and aides' salaries to enable pre-school education for all four year olds whose parents desire it will be phased in on the basis of two half day sessions a week for each four year old child.

That was the ALP's policy position when it went to the polls in 1983. In the ALP's policy

document of 1986 entitled "Education - a Programme for Excellence" under the heading "The Next Three Years", it states -

During the next three years the Burke Government will:

Provide all parents with the option of a place in pre-school education for their four-year-olds.

Commence the introduction of optional full day schooling for all five year olds.

That, in very clear unequivocal language, is the Labor Party's election promises for the last two State elections in respect of four year old children. Nothing could be more clear than those two promises. They are not qualified in any way and they were the bald statements of the Labor Party's intention.

The simple fact of the matter is we now find a considerable number of parents in the community asking the Government why it has not delivered on either of those election promises. There is a group which is particularly vocal these days on this issue, known as the Playgroup Association. I will explain to the House, particularly for the benefit of the Minister for Community Services and the Minister for Education why this group is taking the position it is. It is my belief that both Ministers involved fail to realise where they fit into the scheme of things. The group to which I have referred comprises a number of mothers working in a voluntary capacity who have come together, with assistance from the Government, to provide play groups for young children. These play groups are set up and operate often in small community halls and in various premises that are available and the mothers come together to provide an opportunity for their young children to mix socially with children of their own age. It also provides an opportunity for the mothers to get together in a community atmosphere and be involved in the children's activities.

In fact, some play groups have employed, at their own expense, teachers with early childhood qualifications to provide some form of structured instruction for children who attend the play group sessions. Normally, the employment of a teacher relates to the number of four year olds - children who are three years old, going on four. When one talks about four year olds in this context one is talking about children who turn four in the year in question. Many four year old children attend play group sessions. Approximately 3 500 children are looked after in this way. Some preschool centres are operated by the Kindergarten Association and preprimary centres are operated by the Ministry of Education which also provides a kindergarten year for four year olds. The problem is that something like 65 per cent of four year olds do not get a place in a preschool or preprimary centre, even though the bottom line of the 1983 and 1986 ALP election promises were that such places would be provided for all four year olds.

The Playgroup Association is very annoyed at the Government's failure to deliver on its promises because it is carrying the burden which it believes rightfully belongs with the Government. It is carrying the burden of providing some form of kindergarten instruction to 3 500 four year olds. The association does not believe that is its role even though it has said to the Government, "We will continue to carry out this function for another 12 months in the hope that you will deliver on your promises." I suggest that the Minister for Education and the Minister for Community Services fail to understand that the mothers concerned are not looking to the Government to provide child care; they are looking to the Government to provide a kindergarten facility for four year olds. By that I mean a year of very modestly structured education for children in the year in which they turn four. That year is often described by people as a kindergarten year. This facility is available to approximately 35 per cent of four year old children in Western Australia already, so the Playgroup Association is simply asking the Government to provide, as it promised, this kindergarten year for all four year olds. The association would then go back to doing its job; that is, providing playgroup facilities for children between zero and three years old, and for four year olds during the periods they are not at a kindergarten session. I might add that the kindergarten year merely involves two half days' instruction a week. These parents are asking the Government to deliver on its promise to provide two half day sessions a week for children in the year in which they turn four. Had the Government not made the promise I read out, those people would not be in a position to complain. In my view their complaints are perfectly legitimate even though they are probably a bit late, bearing in mind that they have given the Government five and a half years in which to deliver on its promise, and it still has not done

so. Perhaps that is a reflection of the attitude of people in the community; they are prepared to wait, to do their own thing, and to make their own contribution. However, eventually they expect Governments to deliver on their promises.

In the context of this debate it is interesting to look at the history of preprimary education in Western Australia in recent years. Prior to 1975 the bulk of kindergarten tuition was carried out by the Kindergarten Board, and the Community Kindergartens Association (Inc) provided an excellent kindergarten year for students in the year in which they turned five and, in some cases, for students in the year in which they turned four. In 1975 it was decided by the then Court Government to ensure that all children in the year in which they turned five would be given a place in a kindergarten establishment. The decision was made - with hindsight I would have decided differently - that the Government would build preprimary centres at primary schools, that these centres would be attached to the primary schools for administration purposes, and that the teacher in charge would be part of the staff of the primary school. The Government built a large number of preprimary centres on school sites, but at the same time it took over a large number of existing kindergartens or preschools and they came under the auspices of the local school.

For a number of years a dual system developed providing a preschool year for five year olds; some were operated as preprimary centres under the Education Department and attached to schools, and some were called preschool centres and were under the auspices of the Community Kindergartens Association. At the same time that it decided to provide that facility for all five year olds the then State Government provided funding for the staff at the preschool centres operated by the Community Kindergartens Association.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Was that when you abolished the board or was it later?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Yes, the board was abolished as part of that exercise. The Government also decided to establish these preprimary centres in as many places as it could. In some small communities which did not have enough five year old children to fill the centres, it was agreed to allow four year olds to take part in the school program. However, parents of four year olds in other communities saw this happening and began agitating for places for their four year old children, even though at the time there was no room in their communities. As the Government had not yet provided places for all five year old students, it decided not to make a commitment for four year olds until all five year olds had been catered for. That was the situation by the time the then O'Connor Government was defeated in 1983.

The Labor Party at the time, seeking to make political mileage particularly in what is commonly referred to as the mortgage belt area, came out strongly with promises related to the provision of child care centres, places in preschool centres, and a range of other promises relating to the difficulties of families living in the mortgage belt. History records for all to see that the Labor Party won the 1983 election because it overwhelmingly won seats in the mortgage belt with very large swings - in some cases up to 20 per cent. Those swings were partly a result of the promises made in respect of preschool children. It must be understood that these days in many families both parents work, and many mothers want to do other things in the community and appreciate the opportunity to send their children to a child care establishment or to a kindergarten for some of the time so that they can become involved in other activities. That is a fair and reasonable position and as it should be.

Hon T.G. Butler: You will have trouble selling that to Hon Eric Charlton.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am not trying to sell it to Hon Eric Charlton; I am trying to sell it to the Government because I hope that in its Budget it will deliver the goods it has failed to deliver in the past five Budgets.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Wait until you hear what I have to say.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am always waiting to hear what the Minister has to say, just as the people have been waiting for five and a half years for the Government to deliver its promises. If the Minister is prepared to say today that the Government made a mistake and did not mean to give these children those places, that would be an honest response. Alternatively, if she says that the Government will deliver on its promises between now and February - when the election is expected to be held - it can be said that the Government will have delivered on its promise. However, if the Minister says that after the next election the Government will provide places for four year olds everybody will laugh at her and say that

she has no credibility whatsoever in this area. The Minister is totally lacking in credibility.

Hon Kay Hallahan: We shall see.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Minister should hear the people telling me that she has no credibility.

Hon Kay Hallahan: I am sorry you are not with me when people tell me we have loads of credibility.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Thank goodness, because I could not stand to hear such people. It would be like hearing Government members last night saying that the Minister would go down in history as a great reformer - it made me want to throw up.

Hon Tom Stephens: She is a great Minister and we are very proud of her.

Hon N.F. MOORE: She is leading the Government to defeat because of the silly nonsense now going on. Members opposite should look at the latest opinion poll results published on page three of *The West Australian* to get an indication of where the Government stands.

Hon Tom Stephens: What do your polls show?

Hon P.G. Pandal: They confirm that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Exactly right. In fact they show we are further ahead than that one does.

Hon P.G. Pandal: We hope you will make another attack on the Catholic bishops today.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon P.H. Lockyer): Order!

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon Tom Stephens will help us considerably by making the same speech on the adjournment debate tonight as he did last night, in case some people did not hear what he said. It should be front page news in *The West Australian* tomorrow that Hon Tom Stephens regards the Catholic bishops of Australia as idiots for taking a particular point of view.

Hon Tom Stephens: That is not true.

Hon N.F. MOORE: If the member did not call them idiots, he was certainly roundly critical of what they said. That is beside the point.

Hon Tom Stephens: I did not use the words you have chosen, and you should not put words in my mouth.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest that Hon Norman Moore should address himself to the motion before the Chair.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Minister interjected by saying that I should wait to hear what she has to say; I am sure the people who have been asking the Government for a long time to deliver on its promises will be interested to hear the Minister's comments. I expect the Minister to say that all the problems of those people who are upset will be solved by the establishment of the family centres. I understand in the order of 15 will be built in the immediate future and I am not quite sure how many will be built later - I could not find it in the glossy pages - it may be 25. It is 25 and 15, which makes 40. We will have 40 family centres in Western Australia. That - if I can be presumptuous enough to suggest what the Minister will tell us - is going to solve the problem of four year olds, the problem of day care, the problem of respite care, the problem of play groups, and the problem of mothers who have nowhere to go on Wednesday mornings.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Do you not understand what I am saying? You really are a sausage.

Hon T.G. Butler: Tell us what you are going to do.

Hon N.F. MOORE: There is always someone who sits on the backbench and says, "Tell us what you are going to do."

Hon T.G. Butler: You only need 30 seconds to explain your policy because there is not one.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I can assure members that I will not need 30 seconds to tell them that the member on his feet has the attention of the House, and I would like it to remain that way.

Hon N.F. MOORE: If I did nothing and promised nothing, I would still be able to stand up

here and quite legitimately pour a bucket on members opposite because they are the ones who made the promise in quite unequivocal terms in 1983 and 1986 that they would do something, and they have not done it. Members opposite could have said at some time during those five and a half years, "Look, providing a place in preschool centres is no good. It is not the way to go. We should do it some other way."

Hon Kay Hallahan: It is part of the way.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Members opposite could have said that three years ago, instead of promising it again. They could have said it four years ago or two years ago. It is only now, when people have the Government on the hook, six months before an election, and are putting pressure on it to perform, that members opposite are saying, "That is not the way to go; we are now going to spend all these millions of dollars on family centres." That is some grand new idea, some grand new part of our society, which members opposite have just discovered, called the family. The way this Government is operating, one would never have known that families existed until the new Premier, Mr Dowding, came along and said, "We have to stop talking about all these economic problems we have got around the place. We have to start talking about the social issues. We have to start putting a human face on the Government." So they put Mr Dowding's face up as a human face - would you believe, Sir? That fellow, who spent some time here, and who was an absolute disgrace as a member of Parliament, is now the Premier. I cannot believe that a person of the capacity and calibre of Hon Peter Dowding should now be the Premier of Western Australia. I find that extraordinary. If that man can become the Premier it means anybody can become the Premier.

Hon Tom Stephens: He is held in higher regard by some of your colleagues than you are.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That may be so. We all have our problems.

Hon Kay Hallahan: You have more than most.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The proof of the pudding will be in the eating, and we will see in February next year - if that is when the elections occur - who is right and who is not. I can tell the Minister now that there is a large group of people out there who voted Labor in 1983 and 1986 because the Labor Party promised it would do something about assisting them in looking after their children by providing places for four year olds for two half days a week. That is not day care; it is some form of structured kindergarten instruction. That is what was promised, because the Labor Party knew that was what people wanted. Not only did the Labor Party do that - and I have not put this in my motion, but it is important in the context of what was promised at the time - it also promised full day schooling for five year olds. Those members who have five year old children - and I had one last year - know that with the present half day structure of preschools and preprimary centres, mothers or fathers, depending on who does the job, each day at lunch time must either pick up their children or take them to school. That is very inconvenient for some people, especially those who have a job, as do many of the member's constituents, both husbands and wives. They find it very inconvenient to have to pick up or deliver their children themselves or organise for someone to do it for them, and at the same time provide some sort of day care for their children for the half day that they are not at the kindergarten or preschool centre.

People wanted something done about that, as the Government's research would have revealed. So the Government promised to commence the introduction of optional full day schooling for all five year olds. I do not believe there is one five year old child who is getting full day tuition in a preprimary centre. The Government has not delivered on that promise.

Hon Kay Hallahan: That is rubbish.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is not rubbish. It is true; it is a fact of life. There might be three or four per cent of five year olds who receive full day tuition because they are in a country town and go to school on the school bus and cannot go home at lunch time. The Government said it would provide places for all five year olds, and it has not done so. What the Government did in 1983 and 1986 was to go out to those people in the mortgage belt to find out what they really wanted and what was causing them aggravation. The Government promised to overcome that aggravation, but has not done so. The Government conned those people into voting for it. Those people are saying now they are not going to vote again for this

Government, regardless of what the Government says it will do next time, because they do not believe any longer what this Government says.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Some people do not believe that you could govern either.

Hon N.F. MOORE: This Government cannot say that it has delivered, because it has not. It is as simple and straightforward as that.

Let us have a look at the family centres. There are not many to look at after five and a half years - about two or three.

Hon Kay Hallahan: What are you talking about?

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Minister should wait, and I will tell her.

Hon Mark Nevill: We have been taking your advice and cutting Government expenditure.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Is that the excuse? I can tell members opposite that the total amount of taxation raised by the State Government in 1982 was \$450 million. In 1987 it was \$917 million. During the five years that this Government has been in office, it has doubled State taxation. The Government has brought in a FID tax, which did not exist before. The Government has tripled the tobacco tax, which brings in something like \$60 million a year. The Government has doubled the fuel levy, which brings in another \$50 million a year. So the Government has doubled State taxation during the five years it has been in office, yet Hon Mark Nevill says it has taken our advice and has been cutting expenditure. The Government might have been cutting Government expenditure but it has not been cutting taxation. The Government has been raising more and more money to pay for things like petrochemical plants. Can members opposite tell us how much they are paying for the petrochemical plant? How much will it cost the taxpayers for that petrochemical plant?

Hon Tom Stephens: How much did you pay for the pipeline to Karratha?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am not standing up here and saying we are refusing to spend \$30 million on preschool children, after making that promise. The Government has raised an extra \$450 million during the last five years just in State taxation. The Government has reneged on a promise which it reckons will cost \$30 million, in its own terms, and is now committing us as taxpayers to \$200 million, or thereabouts, give or take \$100 million.

Hon Kay Hallahan: You do not know how much that will cost.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Of course I do not because the Government will not tell us.

Hon Kay Hallahan: That is how sloppy you are.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Tell the House how much it will cost for our commitment to the petrochemical plant.

Hon P.G. Pental: The Minister would not know.

Hon Kay Hallahan: I have never heard such rubbish.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Minister just told me I would not know. I do not know. That is why I am asking the question.

Hon Kay Hallahan: We put it in the papers. Can't you read?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Was it \$150 million or \$200 million? Let us just say, for the sake of mathematics, it was \$210 million.

Hon Kay Hallahan: You can say what you like. That is impressive, whatever you say.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Make it \$150 million. If it was \$150 million that would represent five times the amount of money required to honour its election promise, using its own figures. It could have done that five times for one petrochemical plant which, if it were so good, the private sector would provide anyway. But the Government is using this device to get itself off another hook onto which it has got itself; namely, to bail out Rothwells Ltd. That is part of the deal.

Hon P.G. Pental: For the second time in a year.

Hon N.F. MOORE: And now we find the Government is to spend \$120 million, going up every day, to bail out Teachers Credit Society.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Would you not have done that?

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government could have got four lots of education for four year olds for \$120 million.

Hon Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon Kay Hallahan interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon P.H. Lockyer): Order, please! I will not have members shouting across the Chamber. I do not mind the odd interjection or two but members should not shout across like that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The simple fact of the matter is that a competent Government would not have allowed the Teachers Credit Society or any other institution to get into that situation. Incompetent government is what it was all about. We would not have had to do anything about it because it would not have happened, but if we were as stupid as the Government was we would have bailed it out - of course we would. Any Government would have done so, but we would not have been so stupid and incompetent as to have been in that position. The Government did nothing about it and let it go by. I heard about it two years before the society collapsed.

Hon Tom Stephens: Why didn't you do something about it then, Mr Moore?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I was not in the Government and I am not now.

Hon Tom Stephens: But if you were a responsible individual you would have.

Hon N.F. MOORE: If I had told everybody to take their money out of the Teachers Credit Society the member would have accused me of starting a run on it.

Hon Tom Stephens: You should resign now for such a scandalous admission.

Hon N.F. MOORE: This Government has raised several hundred million dollars in additional taxation this year over what was raised prior to its coming into power; the Government has doubled State taxation revenue. It all boils down to simply a question of priorities, as I said to the people at the front of Parliament House at lunchtime.

Hon Kay Hallahan: You don't have a policy - you said that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I will tell the Minister about that in a minute.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Good.

Hon N.F. MOORE: This Government's priority in 1983 and 1986 was the votes of those mothers and fathers out in the mortgage belt, and the Government was clever enough to win their votes. But now the priority of the Government for the education of their children is at the bottom of the heap, not the top.

Hon Kay Hallahan: That is not true.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Just like families - the bottom of the heap.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The proof is there, with groups of mothers coming to Parliament House to tell the Minister for Community Services and the Minister for Education that they expect the Government to honour its promises. They have given the Government five and a half years to do it yet the Government still has not done it. Now we are going to hear all about family centres.

Hon T.G. Butler: What is your policy?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I will come to that, but I am talking about the lack of delivery of the Government's promised policy. Members opposite are in Government - what I say or do makes no difference. I cannot come up with \$30 million tomorrow to solve this problem. Where would I get \$30 million tomorrow to do that? We are talking about members opposite as the Government now, and since 1983. In five and a half years the Government has not delivered on two of its unequivocal policies.

Hon Tom Stephens: You will make a very interesting Leader of the House in the Legislative Council next year.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Will he?

Hon G.E. Masters: He will be on that side.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Does Hon Tom Stephens know something I do not?

Hon Mark Nevill: It depends how the numbers stack up.

Hon N.F. MOORE: We all know about numbers. They tell me the member for North Province is thinking of doing a Peter Dowding and seeking a seat elsewhere.

Hon P.G. Pental: That is understandable, given his record up north.

Hon G.E. Masters: I thought he was trying for the Whip's job.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Leader of the Opposition must be joking. But let us get on to the matter of family centres. The other day, with great fanfare and at great expense to the taxpayer, the Premier and the Minister for Community Services launched this document called "Putting Families First". It is a very glossy and expensive document.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Is that all you have to say?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Could I continue? It has beautiful coloured photographs in it, with the usual photograph of the Premier at the front. It says it is putting families first, and talks about the Western Australian Family Foundation and investing in our future, then there is another photograph of the Premier. The Government has suddenly discovered all these wonderful things after reading my colleague's policy.

Hon Kay Hallahan: What?

Hon P.G. Pental: That's right.

Hon N.F. MOORE: After reading our policies on the family and law and order, what has the Government done? It went straight out into the community -

Hon P.G. Pental: It ran out of the Parliament.

Hon Kay Hallahan: You are a maniac.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon P.H. Lockyer): Order! Honourable members, please! There are far too many interjections.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government went and found out - as is its wont, by using public opinion surveys and so on - what people were thinking and came to the conclusion that the Opposition was on the right track in respect of law and order and that something had to be done about it very quickly, otherwise the Government would go down the gurgler. So now we have all this media hype, with the Premier and Commissioner Bull appearing on television telling us how together we can beat crime. It was brought about by a Government that has come to realise that the Opposition is on the right track and is saying what the people were saying, and that the Government was out of touch. So it spent a large amount of taxpayers' money to try to shore up its flagging public approval in respect of law and order.

It found out at the same time that the people in the community felt the Opposition was on the right track in respect of family matters - that the Liberal Party's attitude to the family was what the people in the community also believed. The people also said to the Government that its record in respect of the family is abysmal, and the Government has decided to do something about it. And what did it do? It was the same old story - the glossy brochures with colour photographs of the Premier, which said the Government would build family centres.

Hon Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The member should not worry, the time will come.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am prepared to admit Hon Tom Stephens' speech last night was the best speech I have heard in this House in years and I hope he makes it again tonight because a couple of Catholics did not hear it - only a couple, though. They will probably read about it in *The Record* on Sunday. The Government's glossy brochure on family centres says in respect of four year olds -

A primary function of each family centre will be to provide a venue for sessions of supervised activity for four year olds.

That is not what people are asking for; they are asking for a kindergarten year for four year olds - a children's garden, a place with some structured tuition.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Does that exclude it?

Hon N.F. MOORE: Why does not the Government say what people want? If one cannot believe what is in the glossy brochures, if one has to stretch one's imagination to understand what the words mean, why does the Government go to the expense of putting them out?

Hon Kay Hallahan: They will have a kindergarten year. We will provide staff to do exactly that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The family centres will be under the control of the Department for Community Services.

Hon Kay Hallahan: They will be under the control of a management committee.

Hon N.F. MOORE: They will be under the Department for Community Services.

Hon Kay Hallahan: They will not.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Minister will have direct control over them and she should not argue about that. The alternative is that they could go under the education system, and the Government has not provided for that. It is saying all children from zero to four years old will come under the Department for Community Services - that welfare department which in my view should be looking after people in the community in dire straits and not moving like an octopus into areas which are not its concern.

Hon Kay Hallahan: So that is what you understand about our policy on community services.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government's policy is like the proverbial octopus. The department is getting its tentacles into every area it can. It is an empire building exercise on behalf of the Minister. The Minister is saying that for four year old children the kindergarten year in Western Australia will come under the family centres, which ultimately will come under the Department for Community Services. That is what it is all about. Everywhere else in Australia the four year old kindergarten year comes under the education system because kindergarten has a very significant educational component. That is the point the Minister is missing with these family centres: They will not provide what four year olds need -

Hon Kay Hallahan: That is not true.

Hon N.F. MOORE: - because they are going to be centres which do a whole range of things. They will try to cover over a whole range of problems the Government has not been able to solve.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Rubbish! What problems?

Hon N.F. MOORE: It is the Government's answer to all of the problems that relate to child care, to day care, to occasional day care, to respite care, to all those sorts of problems that people in the community are talking about all the time.

Hon Fred McKenzie: All of those things when you were in Government.

Hon N.F. MOORE: Hon Fred McKenzie knows - because he attended a meeting which I attended - that there is a can of worms in this area - the area where he got his votes in the last election. The people in those electorates, the mortgage belt suburbs, are saying the Government has not delivered. The Government has come up with family centres, of which 40 will be built in the next couple of years.

Hon Kay Hallahan: In two years.

Hon N.F. MOORE: And how much will they cost?

Hon P.G. Pandal: The Minister did not know when I asked her last night.

Hon Kay Hallahan: The member did not ask me.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Look at the *Hansard*, you silly woman.

Hon Kay Hallahan: You did not ask me, you silly man - if you like that sort of language.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The glossy document talks about pilot family centres at Whitfords, Geraldton, Karratha and Eaton funded in 1987-88. We could find out the cost if we went

through the documents. Perhaps the Minister can tell me later what the 40 centres will cost.

Hon G.E. Masters: That depends how much the Government will fork out on other activities.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That is true. The Government has six months before an election - if it is six months - but in August this year has decided to try to overcome a whole multitude of problems which it has brought upon itself by failing to deliver what were very good election promises. I cannot work out why the Government did not abide by its promise because it was a good promise and people wanted it. About 30 per cent of children have this facility anyway through the Community Kindergarten Association. All the Government had to say was that it would spend the money over six years; that is, \$5 million per year, which is not a lot of money. The stage could have been reached where in 1988 even I would have been applauding the Minister had she said, "We have delivered on our 1983 promise."

Hon Kay Hallahan: I do not think it would be possible to have the member applauding but it would be almost worth it.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Minister is now saying six years down the track that the promise was wrong and she has found something better. Why did the Minister not find something better long before now? Why did she not start by providing a couple of thousand dollars a year back in 1983?

Hon Kay Hallahan: Does the member not believe that some people do not want it?

Several members interjected.

Hon T.G. Butler: The Opposition gets its policies from Greiner.

Hon N.F. MOORE: We will talk about that if we ever debate the education motion which I have had on the Notice Paper for about three months. As usual the Government will not debate that motion. The Opposition brings up a motion, I make a speech, and then the motion sits on the bottom of the Notice Paper. We never hear what the Minister has to say about it.

Hon Kay Hallahan: It will give me great pleasure to let you hear what I have to say.

Hon N.F. MOORE: The Government is in charge of the Notice Paper. If the Government is game to debate these things, it will bring them up. Most of the time they are left on the bottom and they fall off ultimately.

I hope this motion does not fall off the bottom of the Notice Paper but I would not be surprised if it did. The bottom line is that the Government made a promise to do something in 1983; it has not done it, and now in a pre-election environment it has decided to try to get itself off the hook by building family centres. Family centres will go nowhere near providing facilities for four year olds but on the other hand they will go somewhere towards solving some of the other problems that exist, such as day care and places for people to meet.

Hon Kay Hallahan: The member does not understand what has happened in the day care field.

Hon P.G. Pental: Neither did the 200 women out there today.

Hon Kay Hallahan: That is inflation for you!

Hon P.G. Pental: Two hundred and fifty.

Hon Kay Hallahan: Any takers for 5 000?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon P.H. Lockyer): Order!

Hon N.F. MOORE: Is the Minister saying that the ladies outside today were not representative of an area of concern?

Hon Kay Hallahan: I would say that is true; I am saying they are not broadly representative of what I have had put to me.

Hon N.F. MOORE: So the Minister is saying the women who stood on the steps of Parliament House today were not representing a legitimate argument?

Hon Kay Hallahan: I did not say that.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It was close to what the Minister said - she says they do not represent what people are saying to her.

Hon Kay Hallahan: I said that they are not broadly representative of the arguments being put to me.

Hon N.F. MOORE: That is close enough. I will tell those ladies what the Minister said, just as she and the Minister for Education told them yesterday - that they should get off and find out what they really want, that they had no legitimate complaints.

Hon Kay Hallahan: That is not true. They were not spoken to like that at all.

Hon N.F. MOORE: They were stunned at the reaction of the Minister and the Minister for Education towards the deputation. Without any request from me they told me what happened. They are very competent and community minded citizens who are working free of charge for the association, not like people who run the Minister's department and all the other things which will now be foisted upon us at great public expense. Those people are doing the job voluntarily and putting a legitimate argument and are being told by the Minister that they have their facts wrong - their argument is not broadly representative of all parents involved in the Playgroup Association. The Minister will find out next February, or whenever it is, that they will turn on the Government in droves.

Hon Fred McKenzie: You said that in 1982.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I did not. I said about six months ago that the Government was starting to sound like us when we were in Government. We lost touch as the Government is losing touch now.

Part (a) of the motion condemns the Government for failing to meet its promises - that is obvious and is there for everyone to see. Those promises should be emblazoned on the Government members' minds.

Hon Kay Hallahan: More importantly, they should be emblazoned on your mind.

Hon N.F. MOORE: People know that the Government has not delivered. Finally, the Government's new discovery of the family will not solve the problems facing the Government. The concept of family centres was hastily conceived and brought about to solve a multitude of problems not solved before. Enough of these centres will not be built before the elections to solve half the problems which the Government thinks will be solved. The Minister should tell us what the centres will cost anyway. I hope that the Minister will respond to this debate and that we can take a vote on it before the day is finished; if not, that at least it will be debated some time before the elections.

I commend the motion to the House.

HON KAY HALLAHAN (South East Metropolitan - Minister for Community Services) [3.28 pm]: Mr Deputy President, I reject the motion before the House and ask the House to vote against it. Needless to say I think the motion is a frivolous one that is born of expediency and a run-up to an election in which we see the Opposition bereft of ideas, condemning the Government for the activities it has undertaken on behalf of the community. Hon Norman Moore should pay attention and listen to this figure because it will be a surprise to him. We have made progress from a very low base, but a 586 per cent increase has occurred in the number of four year olds in preschools. How does that figure grab the member?

Hon N.F. Moore: What was the population increase over the same time?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: An increase from what it was in 1983.

Hon N.F. Moore: But that needs to be seen in the context of the increased population in four year olds. The figure cannot be used in isolation.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: There has not been a 586 per cent increase in the population in the past five years, for God's sake!

Hon N.F. Moore: Where are the four year olds, in preprimary centres or preschool centres? Are they in Government centres?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am talking about Government centres.

[Resolved, that business be continued.]

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: At the outset I advise the House that I believe the members -

Hon N.F. Moore: Can you translate that into numbers?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I said it was a very low rate; something less than 600 and now it is nearly 4 000.

Hon P.G. Pendal: You have been found out again.

Hon N.F. Moore: Just give us the numbers.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon P.H. Lockyer): Order! The previous speaker was given a free go and while interjections do help the debate, on this occasion it would be better if the Minister addressed the Chair and members listened. They may not agree with what the Minister is saying, but they will all have the opportunity to have their say in due course.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I come back to the figures which seem to be a galling factor, but nevertheless the Government has honoured its undertaking and has not walked away from it. The Government wants to provide for all four year olds. I make the point again that in Government centres the increase is 586 per cent since 1983 - that comes from a very low base.

Hon N.F. Moore: Can you give us the base figure?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I said it was less than 600 children in 1983 and in 1988 it is just under 4 000. That is the figure on which we are working.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is a pretty poor argument.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am sorry, but it is an impressive figure which members opposite do not like. However, it is true and the Government is not walking away from this matter. We all like to do things with figures, but there is just under 40 per cent of four year olds in a program and it is a significant number. We have a problem -

Hon N.F. Moore: It is a lot less than 100 per cent.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am saying it is 40 per cent of 100 per cent, but we do not know whether all parents want their children involved in a program. It is clear that members of the Playgroup Association do want their children involved in a program and their wishes must be respected. As Hon Norman Moore said, some of the parents involved in that association do not have young children now and that was evident from the deputation I received yesterday. Generally, they are parents of young children and they give of their time in a voluntary capacity in an effort to improve their community and to provide an opportunity for their children, and they are to be applauded for that.

I certainly reject any suggestion made by Hon Norman Moore that those parents who met with the Minister for Education and me yesterday were treated in any other than a very courteous way. We have extended an invitation to the association to appoint a representative to serve on an advisory committee which will incorporate other members with educational expertise and which will provide advice to people drawing up programs in family centres for four year olds. We have yet to receive a response to our invitation and there was certainly nothing careless in the way in which they were treated at the meeting yesterday. I am absolutely staggered that they would have represented that in the way Hon Norman Moore said. Indeed, I will check it out because it means that either they are not honest or Hon Norman Moore is not honest. It is a very disturbing factor because whatever Hon Norman Moore is, I do not think he is dishonest.

Hon N.F. Moore: They were stunned at what you told them and they could not believe it.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I do not understand what aspect had such an effect on them.

Hon N.F. Moore: They were surprised at the intransigent attitude that you and your fellow Minister had.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: There was no intransigent attitude on the part of the Minister for Education or me.

I want to refer to the family centres because they are a great concept. In recent times I have been approached by people from both the metropolitan and country areas who want community facilities in which they can have a program for four year olds plus other programs. That is understandable because historically we have not had good facilities for children's activities. The family centres will provide that and I will refer to my notes to

explain to members what occurs at the Eaton family centre to give members an appreciation of the program which operates at that centre.

The Eaton centre has been in operation for only eight weeks and during the last school holidays the centre provided a holiday activity program for children aged between four years and 10 years. The centre holds family playgroups in the mornings, it has a kindy gym, youth group and on Sunday evenings a church uses the facility. In addition to that the centre provides craft activities which brings older people to the centre. I am pleased about that because we need an intergenerational mix. In many cases young children do not know any older people and older people do not enjoy the enthusiasm or exuberance of young people. We have a great opportunity to develop vibrant and dynamic family centres for the community. Such centres have been lacking in the past.

I want to correct some points made by Hon Norman Moore in regard to child care. We are talking about two separate things. We have a great mix of activities in the preschool years. There are playgroups and activities for four year olds and younger aged groups and there is also child care, which is a different program. The Government also provides educational programs for the four and five year olds. The Government is developing an enormous diversity of programs for younger children.

I can quite understand that a member of the Liberal Party would not understand about the day care problem because that party did not face up to the problem when it was in Government. I am proud to be able to say that, in concert with the Federal Government, this State Government has made an enormous contribution in the area of child care. There is no need for this Government to develop an ill conceived plan to cover up any problems in the child care area. Admittedly, there is an enormous demand for child care and in every centre I visit there certainly is a waiting list. The family centres will not overcome the problem of the demand for child care; it can only be overcome by the next Commonwealth/State agreement which we will enter into. Last night the Commonwealth Government announced a child care program and the Premier has written to the Prime Minister advising him that this Government will enter into another agreement with the Federal Government in order to increase the number of child care centres in this State. There is a condemnation on the Liberal Party for its failure to recognise the need for child care in Western Australia.

Hon N.F. Moore: We have not been in Government for five years.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The need for child care has not developed in the last five years. The problem was there long before that and was ignored by the Liberal Government.

Hon P.G. Pental: We have not been in Government for six years. I suppose you blame Sir John Forest for not fixing the problem.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am telling members opposite that when they were in Government they did not recognise the needs of families.

Hon P.G. Pental: Women's participation in the work force has skyrocketed since those days.

Hon N.F. Moore: They need the money to survive under your economy.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The pressure was there and the Liberal Government chose to do nothing about it. Families in Western Australia should be very careful about supporting the Liberal Party because they will receive no support in the area of child care.

Hon P.G. Pental: Those ladies outside do not believe you.

Hon N.F. Moore: When we tell them what we are going to do, we will do it.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The ladies out there can vote for the Liberal Party and the others can vote for the Government and I will tell members who will romp in.

Hon P.G. Pental: We will. You should have seen last night's "A Current Affair".

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I saw some of that program last night.

Hon P.G. Pental: They were asked whether they would vote for the Labor Party again and they said no. They were then asked why and they said that they could not trust it.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Hon Phil Pental should tell me who was stimulating that little group in Kingsley.

Hon P.G. Pendal: I do not know.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I do and if the member does not he is not very smart. I certainly know who is behind the group at Kingsley.

Hon P.G. Pendal: The next member for Kingsley.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: No, the next hopeful member for Kingsley.

Hon P.G. Pendal: She will massacre you.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Are members opposite admitting that it was a party political stunt?

Hon P.G. Pendal: No.

Hon N.F. Moore: Are you saying that the Playgroup Association is a party political stunt?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I am saying that there are some people in that organisation who are in cahoots with Hon Norman Moore and I do not suppose -

Hon N.F. Moore: They invited us to discuss their issues with them.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I heard that Hon Norman Moore went down like a ton of lead because he became involved in a political debate about the State Government Insurance Commission and a whole lot of other things. The Opposition did not exactly win itself friends at all, as I understand it. It missed a golden opportunity to win friends today, on the front steps of Parliament House, when the member for Lower North said, "We do not have a policy".

Hon N.F. Moore: Our policy has not been announced.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The member for Lower North stood up and had nothing to say.

Hon N.F. Moore: I do not want our policy coming out of one of your glossy documents with the Premier's photograph on it, like every other good idea we have had.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I do not know that the Premier would want his photograph on such a document.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister will direct her comments to the Chair, please.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: There seems to me to be an inappropriate division in this debate between what is care and what is education. It is clear that children do their learning in a wide range of places - at home, in playgroups and wherever they are being stimulated by their environment and their peers. They need a program which will prepare them for more formal schooling, but the message I have clearly been given is that while parents do want a program that provides stimulation and the coordination of development in four year olds, that often means that we are talking about three year olds, and a lot of people feel it is inappropriate to have three year olds in a formal education structure.

Hon N.F. Moore: Nobody is asking for formal education structures at all. You do not understand what kindergartens are, do you?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I do, because I have been along to see them.

Hon N.F. Moore: The sort of kindergartens we are talking about are not what you think they are.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Hon Norman Moore is very clever, but he cannot say what I think a particular thing is. It would be very nice for him if he could make that deduction.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Returning to the family centres, we will provide a wonderful community facility. Looking at it in the longer term, at present, in some of the older suburbs, school rooms are sitting empty - they cannot readily be used by the community; but a family centre will have a prolonged life by recycling the building for various needs. There will be a demand for before school care, after school care and, certainly, vacation care. As the population gets older, parents get older, and there will be many older people with no community facility. Family centres have an enormous flexibility, and within that flexibility they have a real practical application.

I find the Opposition's position difficult to understand; perhaps it does not like the

Government coming up with good ideas. It is bewildering that the Opposition does not endorse this concept. Of course it may be because this issue is a vote winner, and there is conflict in the community with one group seemingly supporting the Opposition.

Hon N.F. Moore: We are not arguing in favour of ourselves, we are arguing against you.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: It is nice for the Opposition to find a home with a particular group because it seems to me -

Hon N.F. Moore: I am saying there is a group which is arguing against you.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: - the Opposition has been lacking that for some time.

Hon P.G. Pental: It is not what the polls say, Mrs Hallahan.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Perhaps we should swap polls some time.

Hon P.G. Pental: I am quite happy. Those dodgy ones which you conduct - we would be quite willing to see them.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I do not want to unnecessarily prolong the debate. I return to the position that just under 40 per cent of four year olds are in an educational program, in the way that has been asked for by the group that was here today. There is a mix in community management, there is flexibility in the structure, and a stimulating environment and qualified staff are provided. Funding is provided for each family centre to have a qualified person and a support person, and the local management committee can make the selection of who it wants for that job. We are providing the components that community kindergartens and the Playgroup Association have asked of Government. I find the negative reaction - or maybe it is disappointment about not understanding a concept which will provide what has been asked for - difficult to understand. Perhaps we need to do more to get the message across to people. It certainly cannot be said that the Government is not sensitive to and responding to the needs of those groups.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I have already made a number of points in this debate, and would like to make a few more in summing up. The first is that when the Liberal Party was in Government, it failed to take up the Commonwealth's offer of funding for those preschool years for children. That is a legacy with which we are still living, and we have to make up from a very low base those services for children in that pre-six year old period. I suggest to members opposite that they examine their own part in some of the problems faced by families in Western Australia by not having sufficient -

Hon G.E. Masters: You have had five and a half years. You have been spending money like water, and you are now just making excuses.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: We have been doing a splendid job in this State, and I make no excuses for the amount of work we have done. We have no need to make excuses, but members opposite need to examine what they did, because they did nothing. What worries me is there is still a commitment on the part of members opposite to do nothing.

The family centres will be a great boon to the communities in which they are placed.

Hon G.E. Masters: You have left it too late.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: When we look back we will think that the program of providing these centres, which will play a part in communities, and in which there will be a whole range of activities, should be applauded. These family centres will have the benefit of being very flexible in the way that groups can use them. This program is a response by the Government to the need that has been brought to the attention of myself and other members of the Government for places in which playgroups can meet.

We will be establishing an advisory committee which will have on it people with educational expertise to provide advice on the program development for four year olds. The family centres will be coordinated under the newly established Office of the Family, which will come into being very shortly. That will be an important coordinating and facilitating office for those centres as they go through their important establishment phase.

In case there is any doubt, I can say that the Western Australia Government supports the Playgroup Association. It does a very good job. Members may not be aware that the

Commonwealth Government provides \$75 000 a year to the Playgroup Association. The State Government last year provided \$84 000, in its family package, in \$200 grants, to get that money out to the grass roots groups, where it is needed to buy equipment, because such purchases are a drain on the fundraising activities of the parents in those associations. We will be providing a staff person to the association, and an additional education adviser will be made available to the Playgroup Association in its work with playgroups. The Government has also been assisting and has said it will assist them to overcome their relocation problems and will support their application to the Lotteries Commission.

With regard to the children's services facilities program - which, as members may remember, was in the last Budget on a dollar for dollar basis, with either local government, churches, or community groups - of the \$300 000 that went to groups in the community, \$225 000 went to groups that were running playgroup activities. So there has been substantial support given by this Government for the activities of the Playgroup Association and its member bodies, and for other playgroups which are not necessarily members of the association.

The requests which have come into my office for the establishment of family centres in localities after last week's announcement have been overwhelming. There has been a ready response by people in the community, who can see the value of such a facility in their neighbourhood. I guess the difficulty will be in choosing where those 25 new centres are to go. There is certainly a recognition by people in the community - if not by the Opposition - that the program will answer many of the needs faced by people at the local level. There has not been a winding back in the current program for four year olds.

Hon N.F. Moore: You have not started. How can you wind back? If you were to wind back, you would be going backwards.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Does not the member listen to what I have said, or does not he want to listen? I said earlier that 40 per cent of that four year old cohort is already being accommodated in educational programs.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is only 4 000 out of 23 000.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: There are altogether 4 000 youngsters being accommodated. I made the point also that the family centres will add probably another 10 per cent. It is clear that not 100 per cent of the four year old cohort will be looking for that sort of activity because not all parents want to have their children in those programs. It may well be the ceiling is about 65 per cent -

Hon N.F. Moore: How do you know? Why do you not go and find out?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: - and that we will be two-thirds of the way to the total.

Hon N.F. Moore: You can just make up any figure that you like. Why do you not say that only 40 per cent want it, and then you can say you have done it.

Hon T.G. Butler interjected.

Hon N.F. Moore: I would at least go and find out before I opened my mouth.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: We have been trying to meet the needs of families and children.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If Hon Norman Moore and Hon Tom Butler want to have a discussion about it, I suggest they make arrangements to use one of the committee rooms adjoining the Chamber. In the meantime, they should permit the Minister, who is the only person properly addressing the Chamber, to continue her argument.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: One of the problems that the Playgroup Association has with the family centres program is its worry about the educational component. We have tried to meet that concern by saying that we will establish an advisory committee on which there will be educational expertise, and by the Ministry of Education supplying an early childhood adviser who can assist in the development of a program for those sessions for four year olds in family centres.

Hon N.F. Moore: But they want qualified teachers, not CCCs.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The local management committee will have the money made available by the grant from the Government to employ a qualified teacher, if that is what it

wants. Not everybody thinks that a teacher is the be all and end all of a learning experience. The management committees can make that choice.

Hon N.F. Moore: Who is advising you?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The community advises me. I have no doubt the member will think that is a very silly thing to say, but I get loads of feedback. In other funding areas the Government has entered into there is a partnership between the Government and the community, and a very great deal of our funding now goes to community groups and community management. I must say that I have not been disappointed with the local communities' view about this and I cannot imagine that we are going to have any different experience. At Eaton and Whitfords the community management committees are highly successful, with the most motivated, dedicated, experienced and sensible community management committees that anybody could wish to meet.

Hon N.F. Moore: Most of them don't want to manage these centres.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I challenge Hon Norman Moore on that whole question. I do not know of any community which has been offered a facility not wanting to provide the management for that facility. Members should hark back to the old, dark days when the Liberal Party did nothing to create or facilitate community cohesion or community management.

Hon N.F. Moore: Most of them don't want that - they are too busy raising their children without managing centres like this.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: There are hundreds of them operating out in the community and if the member does not want to get out and broaden his contacts with the community and meet such people, God help this State if, by any weird, queer quirk the Opposition ever becomes the Government of the day.

I utterly reject the motion and the sentiment of it. It contains a severe lack of information - in every line I look at, when I come to look at it.

Hon N.F. Moore: You must admit you have not met your promise. Why not just admit it?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I will say until I go blue in the face that 40 per cent of the four year old cohort is accommodated, the family centres are a further meeting of that commitment, and there is a commitment to provide for four year olds.

Hon N.F. Moore: But you have not provided for all of them as you promised. You have acknowledged 4 000 have a place, but there are 23 000 children of that age.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I did not give that figure - I said 40 per cent.

Hon P.G. Pandal interjected.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: What is Hon Phillip Pandal's problem? Does he not like the truth? Does the truth spoil a good story?

Hon P.G. Pandal: No, 4 000 out of 24 000. The figure is about 16 per cent.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I was talking about those in the Government centres. It went from less than 600 to just under 4 000. That was in the Government kindergartens, not the community kindergarten association area. If the member had asked for that figure I would have given it to him, but I cannot find it at the moment. I know members opposite do not much like the figure, but a 586 per cent increase is not walking away from a promise. We are not walking away from it, neither are we withdrawing from it. We are putting more resources into it and we will continue to do that.

Hon N.F. Moore: Even the Minister for Education has acknowledged you have not fulfilled your election promise, but you cannot even bring yourself to say that.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: In terms of 100 per cent fulfilment, that is technically correct.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Technically correct!

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: We have to accept that, but I am saying that 40 per cent of the four year old cohort have been accommodated and the family centres will provide another significant -

Hon P.G. Pandal: Bit of PR.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Hon Phillip Pandal really gets to the point where he is worth ignoring, so valueless are his contributions.

Hon N.F. Moore: How do we know you are going to deliver on the family centres? We could be sitting here in three year's time, if you get into office again, asking where the family centres are.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: That will not be the case.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! I do not know how many times I have to say it. I suppose there is a silver lining to every situation, and if Hon Norman Moore will not be seeking the right of reply I guess that at least is a saving grace.

Hon N.F. Moore: I will certainly be doing that, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: The member can only do it once, and it seems to me that we are having a parallel discussion. I do not know of any provision in the Standing Orders that allows two people to talk at once. I suggest that the Minister refrain from allowing herself to be diverted by the rude interjections, and ignore them. If she addresses the Chair, as I said before, she can be assured she will not get any interjections from this quarter.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr President. I will wind up my remarks. You were quite right to give that advice, Sir, and in my view the interjections have not enhanced the level of debate. At lunchtime today we had the spectacle of Hon Norman Moore making a very odd speech on the steps of Parliament House and then saying he did not have a policy in this area at all.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is not what I said at all.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Tell the truth.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: It is extraordinary that he should come into the Parliament to condemn a State Government which has -

Hon P.G. Pandal: Totally failed.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: - an extraordinary record in providing for children and their parents in a way that has never been done before in Western Australia.

The last comment I will make, as it came in for such denigration, is about the social strategy "Putting Families First". It is the first time that Western Australia has had a comprehensive document setting out Government direction and commitment and a number of undertakings to improve the quality of life of Western Australians.

Hon P.G. Pandal: But everything you have done up to now has been anti family, and you cannot get out of that.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I reject the interjection just made. One day I will give Hon Phillip Pandal a speech on the enormous support and commitment that this Government has made towards the wellbeing of Western Australians.

Hon N.F. Moore: It will be the shortest speech you ever make.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Hon Phillip Pandal does come from a party which did nothing to support the family when it was in power, so he has difficulty in recognising it when he sees it. I ask the House to vote against the motion put forward by Hon N.F. Moore.

HON NEIL OLIVER (West) [4.18 pm]: It was interesting to listen to the Minister's pathetic speech endeavouring to defend the Government's inactivity - a Government which has failed to take into account the circumstances that surround the education system and the preprimary program that it put forward to the electors in 1983 and again in 1986. Much is made of the fact that the Liberal Government failed to recognise this aspect of education in the preschool area, but I submit that we now live in very difficult times compared to the early 1980s. In fact there has been a very serious decline in the disposable income available to families - that is well and truly recognised across the nation. I challenge any member of the Government to tell me that is not so. Of course, this has now created a greater problem, and greater demand for preprimary schooling.

Many mothers in the community enjoy working as a challenge. They are highly skilled and

make a great contribution to the work force. Due to the serious decline in the disposable incomes of families some mothers unfortunately have to seek employment, and that is a very difficult proposition. Those mothers have aspirations for their children and they seek employment to enable their children to have the advantages they may not have had themselves. They do this out of care for their family and children. The Government says it recognises the problem and has decided a requirement exists for the introduction of preprimary education. This type of education has been available in Victoria since the early 1920s, if not earlier, and certainly since the 1930s. In this State the Government made a commitment and five and a half years later has failed to meet that commitment. In addition, if the Government attempted in any way to meet the commitment the resources of the teaching profession, capital works and so on would be such that the Government would be incapable of implementing the policy. The Government has misled the electorate with that promise, and the people have received nothing.

The Minister has endeavoured to convince us in a very weak manner saying that 40 per cent of children in this State already attend preprimary centres. After five years, if that figure is correct, this is a damning statement by the Minister. By way of interjection we heard that only 4 000 children out of a possible 23 000 were attending those centres.

Hon P.G. Pental: That is 16 per cent.

Hon NEIL OLIVER: I would like that figure cleared up. Perhaps the Minister could do that. The 40 per cent figure is not good enough. I repeat that if the Government wished to expand on its policy the necessary resources would not be available to do so. The Government has made promises which it cannot fulfil and if that is not pork barrelling and misleading the electorate, what is?

I turn now to the pilot family centres. I presume the Minister will tell us how many family centres will be provided.

Hon Kay Hallahan: I have done that; there are two in place.

Hon NEIL OLIVER: What amount will be allocated in the Budget for these centres? Will there be a 100 per cent commitment to this policy and will we have family centres scattered around the countryside? The point was made by interjection that the Government's decision - after research and canvassing the electorate - met grave concerns in the electorate. We have seen the Government's wonderful glossy document, but this arrives too late because the electorate has already suffered under this Government. The glossy document makes no difference. When we were in Government our policy was to issue a document which set out our achievements. It also contained our policies, what had been implemented and what had not. Our policies enunciated prior to an election were produced on one side of the document and the other side showed whether they had been implemented or not. In those days the Opposition said that this was a waste of public money. Those comments appear in *Hansard*. In those days the type of glossy document of today did not appear on our desks.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I find it difficult to relate those comments to either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) in the motion.

Hon NEIL OLIVER: Mr President, I make the point because mention has been made in the motion of the failure by the Government to implement its policy. Now the Government has come up with another dream story called the family program as an alternative to its failures over the last five and a half years.

The former Minister for Education is a walking disaster; we know it and everyone in the electorate knows it. The Labor Government knows it and has moved that Minister which has resulted in a sigh of relief in the electorate. The people in the electorate hope that Dr Carmen Lawrence will do better. That is the way that this Government's policies are viewed - specifically the preprimary school policy. The Government is insensitive to the needs of families, and I do not care what the proposal is for family centres because more than likely, as in the past, only token implementation will occur, which will represent another unfulfilled promise by the Government. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Fred McKenzie.

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT (RANDOM BREATH TESTS) BILL*Receipt and First Reading*

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

Second Reading

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [4.30 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend the Road Traffic Act by affording the police an extra weapon in their fight to reduce the road toll; that is, random breath testing. For a long time the police have conducted a de facto form of random breath testing by stopping vehicles and conducting roadworthiness inspections and citing drivers' licences. Resulting from this, if a driver is found to have consumed alcohol he is dealt with in accordance with the drink-driving laws. The Commissioner of Police is of the opinion, and the Government shares his view, that this testing procedure is both an effective enforcement and deterrent measure; however, it is extremely time wasting both to the police and to the public. This Bill will remove the time consuming practice of inspection by allowing the police to demand a breath sample simply because a person is driving a motor vehicle. Therefore, more time will be available for the police to get on with their job and detect drivers who have been drinking. Further, the deterrent factor should be enhanced as people will not know when they may be stopped and tested.

It is unfortunate that the police have been made to suffer attacks on the legality of their operations, especially as this belief of illegality is not shared by the Supreme Court. The Government does not believe that the police should be subjected to unwarranted attacks, and this Bill will silence all but the opponents of law and order. The Government considers that it is proper that the police be empowered to stop vehicles for the sole purpose of requiring drivers to undergo preliminary roadside breath tests. This power is not a new one; it has been exercised for many years in relation to licence and vehicle inspections. This is not to say that every person stopped will be tested. To do so would be counterproductive as far as manpower is concerned. To this end the Commissioner of Police has indicated his intent to issue instructions to his police officers as to how the law is to be applied. Such instructions will be binding on police officers by virtue of section 9 of the Police Act 1892. Briefly, the instructions will require that where a person is stopped solely for a random test, then that person is not to be required to supply a sample unless the member of the Police Force first suspects that the person has consumed alcohol.

It will be seen that the terms of this Bill are wide. This is intentional as the authority to stop vehicles and test drivers for alcohol should not be fettered as it is in some other places by unnecessary conditions; for example, "booze buses". In this way as little inconvenience as is reasonably possible will be endured by the innocent majority and greater time will be available for vehicles to be stopped and offending drivers detected.

Under the legislation a single police officer may stop vehicles at random or a number of officers may set up a road block. It is not, therefore, believed that there will be any drain on police manpower resources as, in operation, this legislation will not greatly differ from the current practice followed by the police. The degree of flexibility and the removal of the time wasting procedures will permit the police to combat the evil of drinking and driving which is daily killing and maiming innocent people, and those who are too ignorant or naive to believe that are putting themselves and others at risk. It can be said, and it has been said, that random breath testing is an infringement of civil liberties - that is the right of the people to go about their business without hindrance. Yet, this is what random testing is all about; allowing the people to exercise their rights without being exposed to the danger of being maimed or killed by an irresponsible few. Certainly, some will be inconvenienced by being stopped, but this is nothing to the inconvenience of having to identify a loved one who has been mown down by a drunken driver. Some people have intimated that it is the right of people, especially those in the country because of their isolated situation, to drive after drinking. While it is acknowledged that these persons endure unusual circumstances, the

Government would be sadly failing if it were to take notice of such arguments and not push for this legislation on this issue alone.

Research conducted by the Alcohol Advisory Council indicates that the police licence checks saved 31 lives and reduced the nighttime casualty rate by 13 per cent in a '2 month period. When one takes into account that a fatal traffic accident costs about \$300 000 it is plain that any measure to reduce the road toll, as long as it is reasonable, must be tested. The Government is aware of those in the community who say that random breath testing is effective in reducing the road toll for only a short time. To these people we say that if random testing, during any period, saves one life or even one hour of suffering by an accident victim, then it has achieved its aim.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon John Williams.

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL

Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon P.H. Lockyer) in the Chair; Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Consumer Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title -

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: In order to save the time of the Chamber I wonder whether the queries raised during the second reading debate could be replied to now by the Minister. This would prevent members on this side of the Chamber raising questions clause by clause and would expedite the passage of the Bill.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Obviously I took a note of the questions raised by members during the second reading debate and I am happy to deal with them at this early stage of the Committee proceedings.

Hon John Williams asked whether a cart or sulky drawn by an animal is a vehicle. A vehicle, as defined under section 51 of the Road Traffic Act, includes every conveyance and every object capable of being propelled or drawn on wheels or tracks and, where the context permits, an animal being driven or ridden. The first schedule of the Act defines a cart or sulky drawn by an animal as a trailer. The member also asked what sort of third party insurance is attached to these vehicles. I advise him that there is no change from the current status. The Motor Vehicle Third Party Insurance Act 1943 is a relevant Act and allows for the issue of policies only in relation to motor vehicles defined in section 31 of the Act. This section excludes vehicles propelled by animal power and, therefore, there is no change with regard to third party insurance. The member also asked what sort of provision had been made in the Bill to ensure that persons involved in such accidents have adequate resources should compensation be claimed. Once again, there is no change to the current situation and such persons would negotiate privately for compensation.

Hon John Williams referred also to the question of contamination. Urine samples will be collected by a medical practitioner and I expect that he would be fully aware of all the medical requirements in the collection of such a sample and would take the appropriate precautions as dictated by the situation. The member also raised the question of a person being able to choose his own medical practitioner. A person can request a doctor of his or her choice. However, if the doctor of their choice is not available for a number of reasons - perhaps he is on holiday or cannot be contacted - obviously another doctor would be required to collect the sample. Unfortunately, we cannot provide that a male will always be attended by a male doctor. In some situations a male may be attended by a female doctor, but people will find themselves in that sort of situation from day to day in any hospital with which they become involved.

The point was also raised about whether doctors attached to the Health Department would be available. It would not be possible to use doctors attached to the Health Department in all cases because they are not available at all locations and at all times. That is why the legislation states that the sample, whether blood or urine, must - not may - be given to the medical practitioner. That safeguard is clearly included. Also the police can demand a urine sample in only two circumstances: Firstly, where a breath test result fails to explain a

person's manner - I think that is self-explanatory; and secondly where a person opts for a blood test in lieu of providing a sample for breath. A doctor must be present at the collection of the sample and, in fact, the term used is "provide the medical practitioner" - rather than "provide the police officer" - with a sample of his urine for analysis.

A question was also raised with regard to road damage and I was asked what guarantee is there that two vehicles which collide did not do so because of a deficiency in the road. There is no way the Government can cover that situation by legislation. I was also asked whether the motor vehicle driver would automatically be covered for damage caused to roads when he takes out vehicle insurance. I am advised that the Royal Automobile Club does not cover that, but the State Government Insurance Commission does. Therefore, it is a matter of making a decision when taking out an insurance policy. Another query related to a driver attempting to protect himself in court at a later stage and levelling the defence that a hole appeared before the accident occurred and actually caused the accident. That could be a problem because the matter of liability arises in damages for negligence. That is something for the Main Roads Department to set out to prove.

In relation to the question of replica licence plates, under current legislation no person is prevented from manufacturing or distributing number plates that are identical to, or sufficiently similar to be confused with, number plates issued by the Traffic Board. This legislation sets out to prevent that. Obviously it is of concern to the police and the community that this can occur. A further point relates to the great plate auction which was held in this State a couple of years ago; certainly someone who has paid \$70 000 for a plate should have that investment protected. This clause seeks to achieve that. A question was asked about a plate which may be framed in embroidery and displayed on the wall and whether that would be confiscated. That is putting a fine point on the legislation and it certainly is not the intention of this Bill.

A further question raised was in relation to the figure of \$1 000 applied to damage caused in an accident, and it is argued that this is perhaps not a realistic figure. Certainly accident data relies on the compilation of accident reports, from which determinations are made on whether engineering changes are necessary to roads. It is estimated that the rise to \$1 000 will reduce the rate of reports by up to 20 per cent. Therefore, to further raise the amount may deprive the Main Roads Department of valuable information. On the one hand the Government is seeking to do away with reports of a minor nature - despite the fact that the repair bill may be a reasonable amount - and on the other hand it does not want to deprive the MRD of the information and the data collected as a result of accidents. It is a matter of a judgment made having taken both points into consideration. The figure is kept constantly under review. It perhaps needs to be looked at by the Minister so that it is not necessary to come before the Parliament when a change is necessary. I will bring this matter to the Minister's attention.

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: I have perhaps created some form of new ground, but following recent rulings and directions of the Supreme Court, it is now essential that when a case is presented in court the intent of the legislation is made clear. That is sometimes a point for people in the court. That is why I asked the Minister about the number plates. The intent is to preserve a certain aspect and, therefore, if something went to court the intent of this Chamber would be known to the judiciary. I will deal with other points as we come to them in the clauses and I thank the Minister for his replies. The Opposition will not seek to amend the legislation.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I refer to the point raised about negotiating privately. What does that mean?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: The present situation is that people using these vehicles on the road are not covered by third party insurance. So in order to protect themselves and anyone else who may be riding in that vehicle, the onus is on them to negotiate with an insurance company to ensure they have adequate private coverage.

Hon G.E. Masters: I thought you meant that if there was an accident, both parties would have to negotiate privately.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: No; it related to a commercial decision being made as to which company they were going to seek the relevant insurance from.

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: Perhaps to clarify that for the record, it would seem to be then incumbent upon the person who hires out the vehicle to notify the people who are going to hire it that there will be an extra charge - such as a nominal amount of \$10 - to cover the insurance which has been negotiated. I think the tourist agencies and the hirers of these vehicles, particularly in the south west, should notify people that they are not automatically covered by third party insurance and that they should pay X amount of dollars in case of accident. An arrangement could be made that if there was no accident, that amount, or a portion of it, could be refunded at the end of the holiday, or whatever. If that intention was made clear, it would help my leader to understand that term "subject to negotiation".

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I am not sure what the situation is but it seems to me it would be quite foolish if a person did not have some coverage for himself and for the people who are hiring a horse drawn vehicle. As I said, the current status quo is not going to change.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 5 amended -

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: I just want to confirm that it is the Government's intention that this section will apply only in certain cases and there will not be raids on places selling miniature licence plates or which have souvenirs hanging on the walls. I thank the Minister for clarification of that because people have been ringing me up and saying they are in the business of producing souvenir number plates, and asking for guidance. The only guidance I have given them since the Bill came into the House is to say that if the number plates are not of the same size or colouring as our present issue of licence plates, in my opinion they are quite legitimate. I am talking, for example, about something that is two inches by one inch, and one would never get away with having that on a motor vehicle.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: That is certainly the way the regulation will be framed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 15 amended -

Hon G.E. MASTERS: This clause says, "A vehicle licence is not required for a vehicle that is drawn by an animal." I think at some stage the Minister said that the vehicle drawn by a horse would be classified as a trailer, in which case I would imagine there would be a requirement for that trailer to be roadworthy, as would apply in general terms to trailers drawn by a vehicle.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: There are specific provisions in the vehicle standards section which relate to trailers, so that protection is there. I understand that to mean that a person would not be able to use a vehicle on the road which was of a substandard nature or which did not meet those standards.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I can imagine there would be some difficulties with indicators and the like because horse drawn carts do not tend to have electrical appliances for indicators. The section says that a licence is not required for a vehicle that is drawn by an animal, but does the driver need to hold a licence?

Hon Graham Edwards: No.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: If the drivers of horse drawn vehicles do not need to have a licence, there must obviously be a requirement for them to observe the rules of the road. If a horse drawn vehicle was going down the wrong side of St George's Terrace, or if its driver was under the influence of alcohol, what would happen? The driver does not have a driver's licence, yet he is breaking the rules of the road, or he is drunk in charge. How could he be penalised? We cannot take away his licence.

Hon T.G. Butler: Take his horse off him!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I have not yet got around to the horse being tested. I was just going to ask about the driver. This question must be raised because these conveyances are going to be used more and more, and people who are on holidays tend to enjoy themselves a bit more than at other times.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: This can still be dealt with under the Road Traffic Act.

Hon G.E. Masters: By way of a penalty? You cannot take away their licence if they do not have a licence.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Yes, but they can still be fined where a licence does not exist.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: If persons who are under the influence of alcohol are driving a horse drawn vehicle, and cause an accident, I imagine they could be given a breathalyser test, arrested, and taken to the police station, and suffer the same sorts of consequences as the drivers of other vehicles. This might sound like a frivolous question, but this is likely to occur, and I do not understand how it will be possible to apply some of the penalties that are currently being applied to drivers who are under the influence, or breaking any other of the rules of the road, when the driver does not hold a licence. How could such a person be effectively penalised?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: The present situation is not going to change. As I understand it, a person who is driving a horse is not subject to a breathalyser test. That does not mean to say that such a person could not be charged with driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, except that one would be relying on visual evidence or on observation of the person. So the opportunity still exists for the person to be charged if drunk or under the influence of drugs.

Hon G.E. Masters: So they can be taken to the police station?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Yes, and the courts still have the option to disqualify such persons from riding or driving that vehicle.

Clause put and passed.

[Questions taken.]

Clauses 6 to 11 put and passed.

Clause 12: Section 66 amended -

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: I thank the Minister for his explanation about urine and blood analyses, how they should be taken and why. Blood can be demanded to be taken from the alleged offender. This is the subject of debate on another Bill at another stage. The Minister's explanation is that someone may be acting in a manner which might arouse the suspicion of an officer; he may have blown into a breathalyser which has registered zero. Either the instrument is faulty, or the person is not under the influence of alcohol, but he was seen driving in such a manner as to cause concern. One may assume the officer is now looking for drugs. This will pose certain difficulties in country areas, although not much of a problem in the metropolitan area. Some direction will have to be given to the officer that it is not just a case of reasonable doubt, but when the officer is absolutely sure something is wrong he could ask for a urine analysis.

I speak now from experience. As members will be aware, drugs remain detectable for a considerable time in animal flesh. After all, we are only animals. We have been reading lately that drugs administered to horses can be detected five days later. It was brought to my attention at lunch today that a football player may play in the grand final and be taken off because of some pain. A quick touch of cortisone sometimes puts him back on the field, but he will have to be careful in future because that drug is detectable and he could be up for goodness knows what.

My point is that firm direction should be given to officers in the bush. They must be absolutely sure. Take Marvel Loch. A police officer sees a person acting in an erratic fashion, he gives him a breathalyser test and finds nothing wrong. The nearest doctor would be at Southern Cross, which is a fair distance away. An officer should be instructed to use a little wisdom and judgment, because in the bush distances to doctors are long. If a person is asked to provide a sample of urine and he is 150 kilometres from a doctor, will the policeman be responsible for driving him there or will he allow that person to compound his offence by saying, "All right, I can find nothing wrong but I want an analysis. You have to drive to the doctor"? It is a little point which I hope the Minister and his adviser can clarify because it is one of those things which could become very important although we as legislators never intended it to be so horrendous.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I understand that the police officer would take the person to

the station and the doctor would either be brought to the station, or, if necessary, the person would be taken to the doctor. I guess it is one of those things which is dealt with under an operational procedure and is reliant on the policeman's judgment at the time.

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: I will not badger the Minister on this but to me so much of what we do here appears to us to be simple and explained logically. The Minister and his adviser would agree that the intent of what we are trying to do is simple but firm direction in cases like this should be given to the officer concerned to prevent any slip ups or any sort of litigation going on for years and costing God knows how many thousands of dollars in the Supreme Court on appeal.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: It is something that needs to be directed to the Minister's attention. I guess he would then need to take it up with the Commissioner of Police.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I wish to follow up remarks made by Hon John Williams in respect of clinical diabetes. When a person is in a hyperglycaemic condition, he can exhibit symptoms similar to drunkenness. If a person has such a medical condition, I presume this would be taken into account by the arresting officer. Are the police alerted to this so they can take it into consideration? I would not want it to be an excuse for drunken drivers but it is something which needs to be addressed. If it is not there, it should be brought to the attention of the Minister, who could bring it to the attention of the police.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: The police would only seek a urine sample where the person is acting in an erratic manner without any sort of explanation. It appears to me that if a person advised the police officer that he was a diabetic, that would be a reasonable explanation which covered that person's behaviour.

Hon W.N. Stretch: So long as they did not smell like a brewery.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 put and passed.

Clause 15: Section 84 amended -

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I have just a quick point to make on the clause dealing with damage to roads. We had a celebrated case near my home where a person carting an agricultural implement along the road had the hydraulics fail. The equipment fell down and ploughed up a nice section of water sealed road which was awaiting its final sealing. The story had a happy ending because as the water seal was damaged the shire had to fix it immediately and put the final coat on, which meant that the district had the road finished more quickly than was intended. However, if this sort of thing happens by accident, does negligence have to be proved? Is the person liable only if negligence is proved when the shire takes him to court or something like that?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Yes, some fault would have to be proven on the part of the person in that situation.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 put and passed.

Clause 18: First Schedule amended -

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I refer to paragraph (b), which refers to tractors other than prime mover type and tractor plant. I applaud the simplification of that clause because it is a very long and somewhat involved section in the parent Act. The splitting up of this clause makes it simpler in all cases. Could the Minister explain why paragraph (c) is added? It reads -

is designed to be driven or controlled by a person carried in or on the vehicle.

In both cases that refers to a tractor other than a prime mover and tractor plant. We are still a little bit away from robotics and I would have thought that tractor plant would always need a driver. Could the Minister explain why that has been put in? Does it have any implication for trail implements hauled behind such tractors? In other words, this covers the ones for drivers but not those without. The earlier type of line marker on the highways was just a trailer carriage with a guy steering it with a bicycle wheel. While we have gone past that now there could be other types of development.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: It relates to lawnmowers. We are trying to exclude

lawnmowers that a person would use around the home on a Sunday morning. That is the differential there.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 19 to 23 put and passed.

Clause 24: Various penalties amended -

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: The Chamber would not be insensitive to the fact that clause 24 provides an escalation - and I have no trouble with that - in the amount of fines. Previous clauses dealt with terms of imprisonment, which are similarly increased. Has the Government in its wisdom and in the reformation it is carrying out in the criminal justice system taken into cognisance the fact that the courts should also have some powers granted to them whereby in cases where the penalty says this or that, the discretion should be allowed for community work orders and things of that nature? I think it is mentioned somewhere in the Bill. However, I draw attention to it so that we do not increase fines and imprison people under one piece of legislation while another Minister is rightly trying to empty the gaols. I have no quarrel with the severity of fines and options for imprisonment. However, I hope that accommodation can be provided for work orders and those types of sentences rather than handing down the maximum in each case.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I am only too happy to draw the member's remarks to the Minister's attention.

Clause put and passed.

Title -

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: When discussing the Bill, we did not pay sufficient regard to people over 75 years of age who have to apply for a licence each year. Some people over 75, while being physically well and still able to handle a vehicle, have vision disabilities. People who drive with spectacles have no problems but anybody else with that sort of disability should have his licence endorsed accordingly. However, many people over 70 suffer from a condition which, at dusk, renders them blind. I believe that the Parliament has to reconsider seriously making people read sight cards in order to renew their licences because roughly three out of 10 people are born with monocular vision but, from birth, learn to accommodate that defect. Hon Tom Butler who has had a lot of experience with unions will tell us that it would be fatal to license a crane driver who had monocular vision and therefore lacks stereopsis. I do not think it would be too costly for optometrists or ophthalmologists to examine people before they are issued with licences.

I do not have figures to back my assertions, but I believe that many traffic accidents happen because of eye defects about which people are not aware. As a further protection I believe an applicant for a licence should have to present to the licensing authorities a certificate from a qualified person stating that the applicant suffers from a certain defect. Many eye diseases can lead to bad judgments while driving and consequently accidents happen.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I am happy to draw those comments to the Minister's attention. I cannot provide detailed answers at this stage, as I am sure the member understands.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Consumer Affairs), and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS AMENDMENT BILL

Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon John Williams) in the Chair; Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Consumer Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 3 amended -

Hon MARGARET McALEER: I regret that the Chairman of the Grants Commission, after sitting in the President's Gallery all afternoon and showing sufficient interest in listening to our debates, had to leave before this matter was dealt with. However, I believe it is an example of his dedication to the job that he was interested enough to sit and listen to further comments that might have been made in the debate.

I reiterate that Western Australia is disadvantaged by this Commonwealth legislation. I am surprised that the Government has accepted the proposal without protest because nothing in the second reading speech suggests that the Government has found anything to disagree with. It is ironic that an Act which claims to seek to equalise the standards of local government in a general way should confine that process to individual States by this Commonwealth legislation, and the new system should mete out unequal treatment to the different States. Western Australia, being the largest State with a very highly centralised population in the metropolitan area and a very sparse, scattered population in the rest of the State, separated by very large distances, has very distinct disabilities compared with most of the other States. A further disability in respect of the raising of rates is the fact that we are so dependent on primary industries and this affects rating. In former times Western Australia enjoyed a greater allocation of funds than was due to it on a per capita basis, but under the present system we are distinctly disadvantaged and there is no attempt to equalise our position with that of other States.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I will convey those remarks to the chairman. It is pleasing that this Chamber should recognise the dedication of the chairman and it is a reflection of the fact that we really do have someone with ability working in this area.

It should be recognised that this State did object to the thrust of the Commonwealth's argument at the time. Our arguments, however, were not listened to. Hon Margaret McAleer would be aware that this matter will be reviewed in about 1990 or 1991. Certainly, we will strongly voice our opinion again.

I think Hon Margaret McAleer may have confused my remarks during the second reading stage. I was simply saying that as much as we can we need to apply some equality within our State in the distribution of the moneys that are provided to us by the Commonwealth. That was the point I was making then. Certainly in a whole host of areas the State both benefits and loses out because of its isolation and its special needs. The sheer size of our State is not always taken into consideration. The member can be assured that we will reframe our arguments and fire them back at the Commonwealth at the time of that review.

Hon MARGARET McALEER: I thank the Minister. It is quite true that I misunderstood his remark in the second reading speech. I felt that he brushed aside the problems associated with the allocations to different States.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6: Part III substituted -

Hon P.H. LOCKYER: I refer members to paragraph 14 of clause 6 which deals with consideration of the commission's recommendations. Is the Minister bound to accept the commission's decision after the second recommendation comes back to him?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon Graham Edwards (Minister for Sport and Recreation), and passed.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS

Appointment

Debate resumed from 19 May.

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [5.35 pm]: The motion that has tended to languish on the Notice Paper for a long time seeks to do a number of things by way of a Select Committee, but perhaps none more all embracing than that contained in paragraph 1(a) of the terms of reference whereby a committee would inquire into the general law applicable to de facto relationships in Western Australia. It goes on to see that in a variety of different lights. In a very real sense Parliament today is being asked to take the first steps - even if they are tentative ones - to give a protection to people which in reality is already there. If people in a de facto relationship are concerned about their rights, be they property or other, it is possible for them to protect those rights under the existing law. The resort to the laws of contracts is something that apparently few people in that situation avail themselves of.

The best evidence that the Government sees itself as being lumbered with a hot potato is the fact that it has chosen in the first instance to refer the matter to the Parliament. I guess it is fair to say of most Governments - not just this one, but certainly including this one - that they tend to ignore Parliament when they can get their way without it. They tend to resort to Parliament when they have an embarrassing political problem on their hands which they do not know how to handle. The second piece of evidence for that is in the reporting date contained in the motion itself. I refer to the opening words, which indicate that a Select Committee is to be appointed to inquire into and report on the matters listed not later than 16 May 1989. It would not come as any surprise to anyone to learn that that reporting date is well and truly safely beyond any possible date for a State election. I suppose, to some extent, Opposition parties can take refuge in that point as much as Governments can.

To move on to more substantial matters, I put it to the House that the motion for a Select Committee on de facto relationships has really been overstated by the mover, in this case the Attorney General. I think it is fair to say that he hinted at a very large problem that confronts the community because, in the Government's view, it has not come to grips with the law on de factos. I put it to members, however, that it may well be another case of giving more weight to the argument of a minority than would otherwise be warranted. In 1982, for example, it was estimated that 4.7 per cent of people in Australia were living in de facto relationships. I am the first to concede that that percentage is rising.

Hon B.L. Jones: Dramatically.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is not "dramatically" at all, and that was to be my next point. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, by 1986 the number of people in Australia who were in de facto relationships was put at somewhere between 6.9 and 7.1 per cent. I repeat that that figure compares to the 4.7 per cent reported in 1982. By no stretch of the imagination could Hon Beryl Jones, or anyone else, say that that is rising at a staggering rate. Therefore, I put to the House that it does not justify the action of the Government in asking the Parliament to take the steps that it is taking.

Let me hasten to add that it is my intention, and I understand the intention of Liberal Party members generally, to support the establishment of this Select Committee. That is not to be taken that there is any enthusiasm on the part of members here to support the motion of some widespread recognition of de facto relationships. However, what it is intended to be is an acknowledgment that at least the Government has brought the matter to the Parliament. I repeat what I said earlier that so often Parliament is ignored when it suits the Government of the day to ignore it. I imagine that the move for the Select Committee has come about as a result of the same people approaching the Government as approached Opposition members. I have certainly been approached at one or two functions hosted by the Opposition at Parliament House by people who have been bitten, if you like, as a result of being part of a de facto relationship. Interestingly enough, the people who approached me - and I repeat that they are the same people who approached the Government - have made the point that they do not want, nor do they expect, that there would be the same level of recognition conferred, even under any changes in the law, on people in de facto relationships as exist for those in orthodox or traditional marriages. If that is accurate, as those people tell us, and

they do not want de facto relationships put on the same basis, then what is it that they are seeking from the law and from the Parliament? In a word, it is "property". I do not think there is anything unhealthy about that. I suppose any one of us is inclined to protect the property in our possession. However, therein lies the kernel of what the lobbyists in this case want. To that extent, at least, I support their arguments.

Let me repeat so that it is understood perfectly: I do not think de facto relationships should be given parliamentary sanction so they are on the same footing as orthodox or traditional marriages. Equally, the people who have approached us do not want that either; they do not believe that de factos should be put on that basis.

Hon B.L. Jones: It depends on who you talk to, doesn't it?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I am again presuming that the Government is responding in this case to the same lady who approached the Opposition. I am the first to admit that she was a very impressive individual and one who put a case very well, but one who argued that her real concern was particularly for women who entered into a de facto relationship and then found at the end of the day after the breakdown of that relationship that their property rights had never been protected. I repeat that I think that is a reasonable and valid complaint on their behalf.

The irony, of course, to all of that is that what those people are desiring is the protection of their property rights which at law is only given as a result of a traditional marriage. I think that that is a huge irony, given that without an orthodox or traditional marriage those people in the main do not have the same protection of their property rights.

Hon B.L. Jones: They were just chattels.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: In many respects their argument goes beyond that. They would argue that having spent three, five or 10 years in a de facto relationship - and in this case the lady was the partner of a farmer, the relationship soured and was severed and the woman and her child were left with no part of the property, the farm - they have contributed as a result of the non-working relationship to that property.

It is a good point to pause on and to remember that even those people are not seeking recognition of de facto relationships in the same way as ordinary marriages and it is certainly on that basis, and only on that basis, that I am prepared to accept that a Select Committee should go ahead. In summary, therefore, I say that as a personal view I do not believe that de facto relationships should be put on the same legal footing as formalised marriages. Secondly, and I think importantly, couples that do enter into de facto relationships already have the protection of the law, if they want it, by entering into a formal contract. Thirdly, and as an extension of that argument, no de facto couple need be left without protection in terms of their property. They have already open to them the chance to enter into a formal contract on property matters. Fourthly, any children born of a de facto union are not the problem in this debate and I think it is important to realise that that is not mentioned anywhere in the terms of reference. I repeat that children born of a de facto relationship are not at the heart of what we are discussing here because those matters are already covered by existing State and Federal laws.

We are therefore left with the real nub of the problem centring around not only the property but also the non financial contributions towards the property which are made by one or both parties. I have outlined the situation which has been brought to my attention. I repeat, for fear of having my support misconstrued, that the solution already exists for these people to enter into a legal contract under our system of law. The fact that they do not do so is a matter of some puzzlement to me. It seems that what they are asking the Parliament to do is to give them a level of protection which they are quite capable of giving to themselves under the present law.

Hon B.L. Jones: They might not necessarily be in a position to marry.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: That is the point I am making. If they are not in a position to marry, they are at least in a position to enter into a normal contract at law. It allows them to live together, as they begin that de facto relationship, to come to an agreement in writing, with the blessing of the law, about what they will do about property, and what will happen in the event of the dissolution of the de facto relationship; what will happen to the house or to the car, particularly in the case of a woman who makes a contribution of a non financial kind.

That is the point I have spent a lot of time labouring, and that is the nub of the question, which Hon Beryl Jones has identified. That is already provided for, if people want to use it. It is an odd thing about human nature that notwithstanding the fact that it is in the law at the moment, people simply do not avail themselves of it. That may mean that people entering into a de facto relationship, like those entering into a marriage, generally and genuinely believe it will not end. That has been the experience of all the counsellors in the field. People who enter into a formalised marriage know that if it fails there is some recourse in law for both of them; their protection is the marriage laws themselves. Just as they know that, so too should a de facto couple know that it is quite within their capacity in entering that relationship to draw up a contract to cover the eventuality should that relationship end. It is a great pity we are going down this track. Indeed if I had any influence on these events, that is what I would be pushing, because it is a reasonable way out. Nonetheless, the real issue is that the Government is dead scared of the issue, and as a matter of convenience it has handballed the matter to the Parliament and asked the Parliament to set up a Select Committee. For those reasons and with those qualifications I am prepared to support the motion, and I understand many of my colleagues would do likewise.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - ORDINARY

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [5.53 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Address-in-Reply - Motion as Amended

HON T.G. BUTLER (North East Metropolitan) [5.54 pm]: I apologise to members for taking up their time, but I do not intend to be very long. I want to bring to the attention of the House my concern over a matter which arose during the presentation of the Address-in-Reply motion as amended. I do not offer this as any criticism of the person who moved the amendment, because I appreciate that he had the right, within the Standing Orders, to move that amendment. But that person's amendment, in the sense that it was attached to the Address-in-Reply, served no purpose other than to embarrass all those persons present, not due to the content of the amendment, but basically because of the embarrassment we all felt at the time for you, Sir, and in particular for His Excellency the Governor.

Hon P.G. Pendal: Funny; we did not pick that up!

Hon T.G. BUTLER: The member was embarrassed himself.

Hon P.G. Pendal: I was not embarrassed at all. I shall move it again if you are not careful.

Hon T.G. BUTLER: There was a look of embarrassment upon the member's face and upon the face of everybody else present. The member knows it.

Hon P.G. Pendal: We will continue to amend the Address-in-Reply.

Hon T.G. BUTLER: It is no good the member trying to defend the action. The fact of the matter is that he is entitled to do what he has done, and I am not criticising him for that. He would have been much wiser to have done it as a substantive motion, as is his wont.

Hon P.G. Pendal: You are reflecting on a decision of the House.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon T.G. BUTLER: I am not reflecting on a decision of this House at all. This is just political naivety, which seems to stem from the member minute by minute.

Hon P.G. Pendal: It gets up your nostrils.

Hon T.G. BUTLER: The member does not get up my nose.

Hon P.G. Pendal: That is why you are on your feet. You are a nonentity over there.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to cease their interjections and allow the honourable member to use up his remaining few minutes.

Hon T.G. BUTLER: Thank you Mr President. I intend to wind up, because it appears there is no sensitivity from Hon Phil Pandal on this matter.

Hon P.G. Pandal: You are right.

Hon A.A. Lewis: He does not like his nostrils being got up.

Hon T.G. BUTLER: He was quite happy, it appears, to inflict that embarrassment on those present. It seems to me it was a futile political exercise, because as those present will realise, a lot of meaningless rhetoric came forth which sounded like gobbledegook. The lists of numbers and percentages were meaningless, and were probably moved in the wrong place. Nevertheless, I draw that to the attention of the House. We should be very careful about what we do with an Address-in-Reply motion. If we are to amend it, it should be to strengthen our feelings towards His Excellency the Governor, who performs his office with a great deal of dignity. We should not move amendments such as the one moved.

HON G.E. MASTERS (West - Leader of the Opposition) [5.59 pm]: I am sorry that the honourable member stood up and made the sort of speech he did at this time. I suppose we must put it down to his lack of experience, because he is a relatively new member, plus his background, which suggests that he is not used to any sort of criticism and in most cases would not tolerate it.

Hon T.G. Butler: That is a bit unfair; you were embarrassed yourself.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Wait a minute.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I was one of those present, and I certainly was not embarrassed. It was an amendment to the Address-in-Reply moved by the Opposition. It is not the first time an amendment to the Address-in-Reply has been moved, and it probably will not be the last. It is the duty of the Opposition to bring these matters up if it feels there is serious concern about the operations of the Government. We were concerned, and still are. Not only that, but the whole community is concerned. Let me make it quite clear that we have the utmost respect for His Excellency the Governor, Professor Gordon Reid, and his wife, and for the magnificent job they are doing; but that does not prevent us from carrying out our duty as an Opposition. If we feel a necessity to move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply we must do that, and we should do it.

Hon Fred McKenzie: It was never done before.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I cannot remember when, but there was one.

Hon P.G. Pandal: It was two years ago.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: It might have been three years ago. Nevertheless, there was certainly no disrespect to His Excellency, nor was any intended. Indeed we have such respect for him that we would like to see him employed for another three or four years. That is how we feel about his appointment.

Hon Robert Hetherington: The respect belongs to the office, not to the man.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I stand corrected. The respect stands for His Excellency and the office he holds, and he attends to the duties of that office exceptionally well. I hope that whichever party is in Government next year appoints him for another term of office. I am upset to read in the newspapers that he may be going.

Hon T.G. Butler interjected.

Hon G.E. MASTERS: I understand it is perhaps not his wish, but that is only conjecture.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: It was sad, as far as I was concerned, to see a most inexperienced member make that sort of speech. It is as though he feels we have no right to criticise the Government or amend the Address-in-Reply.

Hon T.G. Butler: You know that is not what I said.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon G.E. MASTERS: We will continue to do whatever is necessary, and point out to the public the disgraceful performance of this Government.

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [6.02 pm]: I speak as the one who has offended the born again monarchists - because that is what the Government members are. Those members have the temerity to say that we delivered some sort of an insult to the Governor.

Hon T.G. Butler: I did not say that at all.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: It is only seven years ago that the Australian Labor Party wrote into its national platform the abolition of the office of Governor General and the abolition of the office of Governor.

Hon T.G. Butler interjected.

Hon D.K. Dans: We never said anything of the sort.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: Firstly, the member indicated that I was somehow embarrassed at having moved the amendment. Not only am I not embarrassed, but if I got the opportunity to do it again, I would. Secondly, I find it extraordinary that the Government has become preoccupied with being protective towards the Governor and his establishment when it would, with a stroke of a pen, get rid of it.

Hon T.G. Butler: Why do you continue to make a fool of yourself?

Hon P.G. PENDAL: The Government is portraying a trumped up interest in the Governorship and Government House as an establishment. Hon T.G. Butler was so ignorant that he did not know, and I checked this by interjection, that it is only two years ago that this House amended the Address-in-Reply. He said a few minutes ago, "But you didn't pass it." I have got news for him, we did pass it.

Hon Graham Edwards: You should be absolutely ashamed.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: I have no reason to be ashamed at all. Only a few years ago members on the Government side of the House were attempting to do exactly the same thing.

Hon N.F. Moore: Time after time after time.

Hon Graham Edwards: Did we ever do it?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon P.G. PENDAL: We have seen, in recent weeks, people in the Labor Party doing a 180 degree turn from being republicans one minute and grabbing and grovelling to get into Yarralumla on the eastern seaboard, as Mr Hayden has done, the next. Mr Hayden has put aside all of those objections -

Hon D.K. Dans interjected.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: - that he had to being Governor General. I repeat, if the opportunity arises again where I get the chance to move an amendment -

Hon T.G. Butler: You are embarrassing the Governor.

Hon P.G. PENDAL: - to the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech I would be proud to do it if the Opposition asked me to. What is more, I would hope that, as on the last two occasions, it would be successful. That is really what gets up the nose of the members opposite, not the substance of their complaint.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.05 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LOTTERIES

Raffle Permit Fee

212. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Is it correct that a raffle permit fee of \$30 has been recently introduced?
- (2) If so, what is the reason for the fee's introduction?
- (3) From what date is the fee operable?
- (4) How much revenue is expected to be raised per year from this new fee?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Only where the retail value of the prize exceeds \$5 000 and the permit is of a continuing nature.
- (2) Section 7(2) of the Gaming Commission Act requires the Gaming Commission to be self-funding as far as is practicable.
- (3) 2 March 1988.
- (4) Approximately \$75 000.

TIMBER - CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF

Legislation - Sector Integration

236. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Is the department contemplating legislation to integrate all sectors of the timber industry to provide an overall plan for infrastructure and support facilities?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT - CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF *Planting Programs*

237. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Have local authorities been consulted about the planting programs in their areas?
- (2) If so, which authorities and have they all agreed to the plantings?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The question is not sufficiently precise to allow an accurate answer.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF *Interpretation Centres*

238. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

How many interpretation centres does the department have and where are they situated for -

- (a) forest areas; and
- (b) national parks?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Department of Conservation and Land Management does not have any interpretation centres in State forests but it contributes towards two

community visitor centres. It has an interpretation centre in Cape Range National Park and three office information centres for national parks and nature reserves. In addition there are nine and 32 unmanned information shelters in forest areas and national parks respectively.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF
Jarrah Dieback Research Committee

239. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Is the jarrah dieback research committee still operating?
- (2) If yes, how often does it meet?
- (3) If not, when was it disbanded?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(3)

The research division of the Department of Conservation and Land Management is carrying out ongoing research into dieback. However, the dieback research fund management committee last met in December 1987 when it was agreed further meetings would not be necessary.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT - INDUSTRY
Impact Studies - Legislation

244. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to establish procedures for impact studies into industry so that economic and social benefits are taken into consideration as well as environmental problems?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

No.

TOURISM - ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS
Forests - South West

247. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Has the tourism industry had any drastic environmental effect on forests or national parks in the south west?
- (2) If so, which areas are those most affected?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

There is no "drastic" environmental impact caused by the tourism industry in State forest or national parks. However, all human activity in such areas has some environmental impact and is subject to management by the department.

TOURISM - SOUTH WEST
Tourist Commission - Product Booking System

248. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Tourism:

Is it intended that the Tourism Commission set up a product booking system for tourism in the south west?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Western Australian Tourist Centre located at 772 Hay Street, Perth, is a reservation point for the product in the south west as it is indeed a reservation point for product throughout Western Australia.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION - HOLIDAY
ACCOMMODATION
Farms - Promotions

249. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Tourism:

Has the Tourism Commission started a promotional campaign to highlight the potential of on farm accommodation?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Western Australian Tourism Commission has not started a specific promotional campaign to highlight the potential of farm accommodation, although it does represent such facilities through the tourist centres and in its own tourist literature. Financial assistance is also provided to regional travel associations to undertake marketing activities and in this regard the Central South and Midlands Travel Associations are already considering the promotion of farm stay in their current marketing plans. In addition, private consultants have undertaken a number of research studies on farm stay and other country based accommodation, and the Tourism Commission and the Western Australian Tourism Industry Association will be discussing their findings with a view to realising the potential this form of tourist accommodation offers.

HOMESWEST - STATE GOVERNMENT FINANCE
Industrial Housing

255. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

Is the Government intending to allocate money to Homeswest for industrial housing?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

No.

HOUSING - SOUTH WEST
Shortage

256. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

Is the Minister aware of the acute shortage of housing in some parts of the south west, in particular Nannup, which is holding back industrial growth?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Housing demand in the south west has been considered in the formulation of the proposed 1988-89 State-wide housing program.

There is insufficient registered demand to justify a building program in Nannup.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF - RIVERS
South West

257. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Is it the department's intention to identify the rivers throughout the south west whose proximities are environmentally sensitive?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

There are many initiatives under way which relate to the rivers of the south west whose proximities are environmentally sensitive. These initiatives involve a range of Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, WA Water Authority, Conservation and Land Management and Environmental Protection Authority.

**CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF - NATIVE
VEGETATION**

Control - Legislation

260. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Is it the Government's intention to introduce legislation to obtain control over significant areas of remnant native vegetation?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

No.

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES - HAWKE BLOCK

262. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

Is the Government intending to create all or part of Hawke block as a national park?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Yes.

WOOD CHIPS - SOUTH WEST

Approval

263. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

When is it expected that approval will be given for the continuance of wood chipping in the south west?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I am presently considering appeals against the report and recommendations of the Environmental Protection Authority with respect to an application by WA Chip and Pulp Co Pty Ltd to continue its operations. No decision making with respect to the company's proposal can take place while appeal determinations remain outstanding.

**NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES - WALPOLE NORNALUP NATIONAL
PARK**

Draft Management Plan

267. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

When is it expected the draft management plan for the Walpole Nomalup National Park will be completed?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Late 1989.

HOUSING - AIR CONDITIONING

Retirement Units - Exmouth

278. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Minister reconsidered her decision not to air condition retirement units in Exmouth?
- (2) If so, can prospective residents look forward to installation of appropriate air conditioners in the near future?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. Homeswest's policy does not include air conditioning to its accommodation, due to the high cost.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

COMMUNITY CENTRES

Assistance Centres - Justice Centres

125. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Community Services:

I think it is appropriate to ask the Minister this, as it is within her portfolio.

- (1) What progress has been made with the introduction of community assistance centres? The Minister will recall that she made a comment on this during the last election when the Liberal Party said it would establish community justice centres. She is reported to have said that the Government was already providing this sort of facility.
- (2) If that is the case, has she any knowledge of how these community justice centres are operating?
- (3) Is there a large number of them, or not very many?
- (4) How are the councillors who are handling these justice centres or running them being trained? What sort of training programs are being provided?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(4)

I have to advise the honourable member that they do not come within my portfolio.

COMMUNITY CENTRES

126. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Attorney General:

I apologise for directing the question wrongly. I assumed, as the Minister made the comments during the last election, she was involved. May I ask the Attorney General whether it comes within his portfolio? I am not sure whom I should ask otherwise. Perhaps he could let me know.

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I have some difficulty with the nature of the question. There are community legal aid facilities provided in various centres, and a number of those are assisted through the legal aid vote. However, I am not sure about the nature of the statement on which the Leader of the Opposition is basing his question. If he could undertake to provide me with a little more background information I will make it my business to obtain the appropriate information.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - MINISTER FOR BUDGET MANAGEMENT

Miscellaneous Services Division Payments

127. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Budget Management:

Can the Minister confirm that an item "Miscellaneous Services Division payments" is in fact administered by him as the Minister for Budget Management?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

Yes, I do make the final authorisation for payments under that vote.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - LOUIS ALLEN COLLECTION OF ABORIGINAL ART

Berinson, Hon J.M. - "Miscellaneous Services"

128. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Budget Management:

Will he confirm that the \$2.1 million for the purchase of the Louis Allen art collection came out of the Budget item entitled "Miscellaneous Services" under his control?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

I am responsible for hundreds of payments. As I indicated yesterday, I believe that this is a matter best left for answer to questions-on notice. The questions which the member raised yesterday are now being examined and comprehensive replies will be available very shortly.

BUILDERS REGISTRATION BOARD OF WA - EDWARDS, HON G.

Powers

129. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Does he have the power to direct the Builders Registration Board? I assume it would then be required to carry out his directions.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I am not entirely sure that that is the situation. I have not been in the position to give any directions of that nature to the Builders Registration Board. If the member places that question on notice I will answer it accurately for him.
