

Legislative Council

Thursday, 30 May 1991

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

CONDOLENCE MOTION - MENSAROS, THE LATE HON ANDREW

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [2.34 pm]: I move -

That the House records its deep regret at the death of the former member for Floreat, Hon Andrew Mensaros, and extends its sincere sympathy to his family and friends.

It is only two weeks since Hon Andrew Mensaros was forced by illness to retire from the Parliament. Last night we learnt of his death and I am sure that all members would want to record our deep regret at his passing. Mr Mensaros spent 23 of his 69 years in the service of the people of Western Australia as a member of the Legislative Assembly. He came to Australia from Hungary, and it has often been remarked that he was the first non-British migrant to be elected to an Australian Parliament and then become a Minister. Frankly, I have never been sure whether that was right but, right or not, his reputation did not rest on his background but on his distinguished service to the Parliament and Government of this State. Andrew Mensaros was a member of the Legislative Assembly from 1968 to 1991, and held a number of senior Government portfolios from 1974 to 1983. From 1983 until June last year he was shadow Minister for the Opposition in various capacities, and that included a lengthy period as shadow Attorney General. Like other Ministers, I found him in those roles to be a thoughtful contributor to public affairs, and certainly a tireless worker. Andrew Mensaros learnt several years ago of his serious illness with cancer, but right until his last days he remained active in his duties in a way which would have done credit to any member who was in good health and half his age. On behalf of all Government members, I extend sincere sympathy to his family and friends in their loss.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan - Leader of the Opposition) [2.37 pm]: I join the Leader of the House in this motion of condolence in respect of the passing last night of our former parliamentary colleague, Andrew Mensaros. Andrew Mensaros was born on 25 November 1921 in Budapest, Hungary. He was educated in Hungary, and having matriculated with distinction, graduated in law and political science at the Universities of both Budapest and Vienna. During the period 1942 to 1944 he received the degree of Doctor of Law, *summa cum laude* at Budapest University. Members would no doubt be aware that Andrew tutored at the university and was a member of a delegation which represented Budapest University at the International Court of Justice at The Hague. He has many publications to his credit on various aspects of the law, and he also practised law in Hungary for a number of years, specialising in company and taxation law. Andrew acquired a Diploma in Accountancy in 1947.

During World War II, Andrew was active in anti-Nazi organisations, and after the war he took a strong anti-Communist line. This compelled him to leave Hungary in 1949, and after spending a year in Vienna he moved to Perth in 1950. On his arrival in Western Australia, Andrew initially worked as an accountant, but later established the well known building construction firm of Mensaros and Thurzo, having passed all the prescribed examinations in building construction, surveying, and accountancy in this State.

In 1967 Andrew Mensaros gained preselection as the Liberal Party candidate for the seat of Floreat from a field of 13 candidates, which subsequently led to his becoming the first Australian citizen of non-British European birth to be elected to an Australian Parliament. On 23 March 1968, Andrew entered the Western Australian Parliament as the member for Floreat, a seat which he held until his resignation on 16 May 1991.

On 8 April 1974, with the election of the Court Government, Andrew Mensaros was appointed Minister for Industrial Development, Mines, and Fuel and Energy. In addition, on 1 May 1974 he was appointed Minister for Electricity. He was appointed Minister for Industrial Development, Mines, and Fuel and Energy on 5 June 1975. On 5 March 1980, on the re-election of the Court Government, Andrew was appointed Minister for Works, and Water Resources, and Minister assisting the Minister Co-ordinating Economic and Regional

Development, and Housing. On 12 February 1981 the Housing portfolio was passed to Hon Peter Jones, I would suggest in an effort to relieve part of the very heavy workload that had been borne by Andrew for some time. He was appointed Minister for Works, Water Resources, and Education, and Minister assisting the Minister Co-ordinating Economic and Regional Development on 25 January 1982. Apart from the Education portfolio, which he relinquished on 14 May 1982, he held these positions until the defeat of the O'Connor Government in 1983.

As Minister for Industrial Development Andrew was responsible for fostering resource development and negotiating major international project agreements, and helped to promote such projects involving an investment of more than \$7 billion in mid-1970s dollar values. Investment in Western Australia during the time Andrew was a senior Minister in the Court Government averaged more than \$3 million per day. He was responsible for saving the future of Australia's largest developmental venture, the North West Shelf gas project, by extending the offshore exploration permits despite the Whitlam Government's opposition. Subsequently he negotiated the project with the then joint venturers to the memorandum of understanding stage, which was the basis of the gas flow and the following liquefied natural gas development. As Minister for Industrial Development, he travelled extensively over the world promoting resource and export projects, resulting in record levels of per capita export income for Western Australia.

As an Opposition member of Parliament, Andrew held various shadow portfolios, including Works, Water Resources, Environment, Justice, Constitutional and Electoral Matters, Federal Affairs, Employment and Training, and Parliamentary and Electoral Reform. He relinquished his shadow portfolio responsibilities on 17 June 1990.

As members would well know, Andrew Mensaros was a loyal member of the Liberal Party who was held in the highest esteem for his fine intellect and his ability to see the most complicated issues in a clear and concise manner. He served on many of the party's policy subcommittees, taking a keen interest in the development and implementation of the Liberal Party's policies. As a Minister of the Crown he was highly respected by all those who came in contact with him.

Andrew had a keen interest in community affairs and was patron of or an active participant in school, sporting, youth, religious, service and other organisations, both within the electorate of Floreat and around the Perth metropolitan area. In his youth he enjoyed athletics, swimming, sailing and skiing. He was also a recipient of the Queen's Jubilee Medal. Andrew Mensaros is survived by his two brothers. To his family and to Mrs Yvonne Vianna, who was his electorate secretary from 1983 until his very recent retirement from the Parliament, we extend our sincere sympathy on his passing.

HON E.J. CHARLTON (Agricultural) [2.44 pm]: On behalf of the National Party and my colleagues in this place I endorse the comments made by previous speakers about the late Andrew Mensaros. Over and above what has already been said, his involvement as a member of Parliament and of the Liberal Party was an example of honesty in the real sense, and of dedication to democracy. If each member of Parliament based his or her own performance on the example of Andrew Mensaros, I believe we all would be viewed with greater respect.

In my experience as a member of a couple of committees on electoral reform with which Andrew was associated in another place, he always demonstrated a burning desire to see fair play and a just result for the people whom he represented, which in this case were not just those in his electorate of Floreat but people right across the State. I convey our sympathy to his family and friends.

HON MARGARET McALEER (Agricultural) [2.46 pm]: Together with other members, I mourn the passing of Andrew Mensaros. I had a long political association with him and I greatly admired his principles and integrity and respected his acumen and wide experience. When, as sometimes happened, my point of view differed from his on some legislation or course of action, I always felt that I must suspect a deficiency in my own judgment and look at such matters again.

Early in the 1970s I served on the Liberal Party education policy committee under the chairmanship of Lady Sandover and with Jim Clarko, then not a member of Parliament, as our leading spirit; and Andrew Mensaros was our liaison man with the parliamentary party.

He was the newly appointed spokesman for education and I well remember how much he delighted in his responsibility and in the confidence which Sir Charles Court was then showing in him and which produced from him even more work and enthusiasm for the task. Andrew used to take his responsibilities as shadow spokesman seriously and did his best to curb our exuberant policy making by asking searching questions about the practicality of our projects and, above all, the cost of implementing them. At that time, he looked forward to becoming Minister for Education with our return to power, but in fact he never was Minister for Education; although, as we have heard, he shouldered other great State responsibilities. I believe he had a very fulfilling parliamentary career, because both in and out of office he was a true parliamentarian. He believed in the parliamentary system and he thought and worked hard to make the system function more in accordance with its potential. Also, of course, he was a great upholder of the bicameral system of Parliament and he upheld also our own Legislative Council, although, there again, he took a progressive view and thought that it also could be improved.

It is sad for members of Andrew Mensaros' family that he died so quickly and so far away from them, but I am glad that he was able to do the work for which he had so much capacity and appetite almost to the last. I feel his loss diminishes this Parliament.

HON J.M. BROWN (Agricultural) [2.49 pm]: I join the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Opposition and other members in this motion of condolence for Hon Andrew Mensaros. It is rather strange to be supporting the motion, when, for the first three years of my association with him, on every division we were on different sides and never agreed once on the activities that took place during the time of the Tonkin Government. However, I recognise that he was the first and only member for Floreat, and having served successfully for 23 years, he has earned every tribute paid to him. We recognise, in this House and the other place, the great service he gave to the people of Floreat and Western Australia. He served as a Minister of the Crown for nine years, and as a shadow Minister for seven years; therefore, for 16 of his 23 years' service he made a contribution in a position of increased responsibility. It should be recognised that even before 1974, the then Mr Mensaros, MLA for Floreat, displayed the attributes necessary for members of the Opposition to indicate that ministerial ambitions could be fulfilled. This happened to Andrew Mensaros during the years of the Court Government.

At all times I found him to be a great friend and colleague within the Parliament. He would never hesitate to offer counsel or listen to one's point of view, irrespective of from which side of politics one came. About a fortnight before he resigned from the Parliament I had the opportunity to meet him in his office and discuss matters about which we were concerned. We referred to the factions within the Australian Labor Party, and he said that something like that needed to happen within the Liberal Party. Even in those final hours, I continued to have an association with him. As a result we could participate in discussions with understanding to the benefit of all the people of this State. I join the previous speakers in expressing condolences on the passing of Mr Mensaros and express sincere sympathy to members of his family.

HON D.J. WORDSWORTH (Agricultural) [2.52 pm]: Having been a colleague of Hon Andrew Mensaros for 20 years, and having been a fellow Cabinet Minister for seven years, I am saddened at his death. Andrew was a sincere, hardworking and very intelligent person, but above all he was an utter gentleman and honest to the core. Although he was quietly spoken, he had a very good sense of humour. Andrew was not married, lived alone and allowed himself very few pleasures; work was what he lived for. However, he would spend an hour swimming each morning at Beatty Park. As an indication of the thorough way he went about his work, I hear that when swimming Andrew would lay down a thong on a tile by the first steps and move it along to the next tile with each lap so that he knew when it reached the next steps that it was time to leave the pool. I do not know whether that is true, but it is an indication of the meticulous manner in which he did his work. If members of Parliament followed the standards set by Andrew Mensaros, we would be held in higher esteem in the community. He made a remarkable contribution to Western Australia, which is even more remarkable when considering that it was his adopted State and country.

HON MAX EVANS (North Metropolitan) [2.54 pm]: I first became good friends with Andrew Mensaros in 1968 just after he was elected as a member of Parliament. We worked

to form the Mt Claremont branch of the Liberal Party; I am still a member of that branch of the party, from which I came into the Parliament. We worked closely with Beau Parker and Ken Rosenthal to establish that branch. Hon David Wordsworth referred to Andrew Mensaros' intelligence. His wide knowledge and experience was something to listen to; whether he was referring to Europe, finance or business, it was evident he had a terrific depth of understanding of so many subjects, and it was a lesson in life to be with him. I sat next to him in our party room meetings as we had been friends for a long time. I enjoyed his company. He will be a loss to the Parliament and particularly to the Liberal Party. For example, the work he did on the electoral reform Bill was extensive. At the time, people did not realise that he had had a cataract operation and should have been resting at home. This indicates his dedication and the time and effort he applied to the work he did. I extend my condolences to his brothers and to Yvonne Vianna, who is distressed by his loss. It is a credit to the man that he worked in the Parliament almost right to the end. He will be deeply missed by everybody in the Parliament and by the people of Western Australia.

HON REG DAVIES (North Metropolitan) [2.55 pm]: On behalf of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation, and in recognition of the work Andrew Mensaros did for that committee, I record that it is with sincere regret that we heard of the sudden passing of a former member of that committee. Andrew Mensaros earned respect from both sides of the Parliament. Many have said that his great ability was underestimated; however, his ability was never underestimated by the Delegated Legislation Committee members. We found that he had the ability to look at the wider implications of the legislation. He never looked for short term political gains or answers; he always searched for what was best for the people and the State of Western Australia.

I found that he was always willing to provide guidance and counsel to new members. I went to him on many occasions for advice and he was happy to provide very good advice. Andrew Mensaros was a man who was committed to the private sector and private enterprise, and he was very devoted to the Constitution and the Westminster system of parliamentary government. He was a man of very high principle who believed that too many decisions were being made by the Executive; he was a strong critic of that trend. Personally, and on behalf of the Delegated Legislation Committee, I extend sincere sympathy to the family of Hon Andrew Mensaros.

HON DERRICK TOMLINSON (East Metropolitan) [2.57 pm]: It was often asked whether Andrew Mensaros had a private life outside of politics. Of course he had such a life, but it was a very private life. I was never one of those privileged to be invited into Andrew Mensaros' private life. However, several years ago I was invited to join a group of people who shared common political interests; Andrew Mensaros was a member of that group. When I first joined the group I was in awe of the man. That was because of not just his age and his reputation, but also the power of his intellect. Andrew always encouraged me to say what I thought; sometimes he agreed with my ideas, and sometimes he challenged them. However, every time he spoke, the power of what he had to say caused me to pause and consider my position.

I grew to respect him even more and to be fond of him as a man. The last time I met with Andrew was at a meeting of the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs and Statutes Revision some two weeks ago. As was his characteristic fashion, Andrew sat quietly and said little; however, when he did speak what he had to say was apt. When he rose to leave I noticed that he moved slowly. I followed him out the door of the room in which the meeting was held and I noticed that he held himself stiffly as he walked. I asked Andrew whether his back was playing up and, in characteristic fashion, he quietly said, "Yes; on these cold mornings it is a little stiff." The next day he delivered himself to St John of God Hospital. His condition deteriorated rapidly and last night he died. I will miss him as a friend, as a colleague and as an example of all that is dignified in our calling.

HON P.G. PENDAL (South Metropolitan) [3.01 pm]: I too want to pay a brief tribute to Andrew Mensaros. As a journalist, I first met him in 1973, by which time he had been a member of Parliament for well over five years. As history would have it, within a short time he became a Minister in the first Court Government. I was the journalist who gave him part of the title on which Hon Joe Berinson today cast some doubt. At that time I based my story on research which indicated that he was the first person of European heritage to become a Minister in the Western Australian Parliament. As is a journalist's wont, someone later

added to that, giving Andrew the distinction of being the first such person in any Australian Parliament - I suppose that made the story sound better. To that extent, the Leader of the House is accurate, but the claim at the time was limited to the Western Australian scene and was based on a close examination of the parliamentary record to that time.

My acquaintance with him progressed from knowing him when I was a journalist to knowing him in an intervening period of my life. The following year I became one of Sir Charles Court's press secretaries. About six weeks after my appointment I travelled to Japan with the then Premier and Andrew Mensaros, who had become the Minister for Industrial Development a short time before that. While I was in Japan with him I did two things, I began, firstly, to appreciate the intellect of the man and, secondly, to understand the enjoyment one could gain from social contact with him. I spent a number of evenings with him during which time I learnt of his fondness for a good steak and some nice red wine, which he enjoyed for many years after that. That was the year he began to carve out a reputation as someone who could successfully negotiate for Western Australia in the international scene. He returned to Japan on a number of occasions and his reputation is still remembered by people in the Japanese community here who were familiar with Western Australian-Japanese relationships in those days.

Finally, many people have commented on his capacity to continue taking an interest in matters to the very last moment. In recent times I have been developing a policy for the Opposition on Federal-State affairs. That is a subject in which Andrew Mensaros had an abiding interest. It came as no surprise to me, nor to other members, that when one submitted a paper to someone like Andrew Mensaros only then did one discover how much one had neglected to say or that one had said less than professionally. He was always of a mind to take one to task in the most mild and gentle way possible. The final conversation I had with him before telephoning him in hospital was, I think, on the last Thursday he spent in Parliament. He gently chided me for saying one or two things on the federalism policy which he thought contradicted a stance the Liberal Party had taken only a few months ago concerning Australian Securities Commission legislation. Although many people thought the decision was inevitable, he was greatly saddened by it and thought it a retrograde step for Western Australia. He let me know in the gentlest of terms that he thought what I was saying in the document was contrary to the way I and other people had acted a few months before. He was active to the last. I remember him with great affection, as do other members, and I mourn his passing.

HON W.N. STRETCH (South West) [3.07 pm]: I also wish to be associated with this motion. Hon Andrew Mensaros' greatest gift, particularly to new members of Parliament, was his immense sense of logic, his clarity of thought and his willingness to help people in a very genuine way. However, they had to seek his help first; he never pushed his intellect on people. Another of his great strengths was that he had not only an immense intellect but also the wisdom which balanced that intellect and allowed him to direct it to help the people in Western Australia. Previous speakers have mentioned Western Australia's great strides in investment and development which took place under his stewardship. Even today, the State is benefiting greatly from his wisdom and his thoughtfulness and the strength of his personality from those days.

It should be remembered that Andrew had personal experience of the extremes of the right of politics and of the left of politics. He had learnt to balance the evils of those and to help all his colleagues, both in the Liberal Party and in other parties, to forge a real democracy. While making great steps forward in development and investment, he considered the real needs of what is commonly called the common man. He was a man of honesty and integrity and had the great intellect and wisdom to which I referred earlier. I found him always extremely courteous and, as I said, very helpful. Above all he always showed tremendous dignity.

There was a lesson in his decorum to all members of Parliament. During a television interview I saw him come under extreme pressure from an aggressive young journalist who was hammering away at him to concede a point of view. The journalist asked him, "Don't you think the average person might think this of you?" to which he nodded his head quietly and said, "Admittedly." That was all he said. No matter how he was needled from then on, that was his final word. He would not consider the matter any more. The lesson I learnt was that when one knows where one is, when one is satisfied with one's statement, it does not

matter what is thrown at one. That was a great demonstration of the integrity and wisdom of the man. We in the Liberal Party will certainly miss his wise counsel.

So many times, in the heat not so much of a debate, but in other situations, we could turn to Andrew, who would pick up the telephone and speak to industrialists, political leaders and people in all walks of life around the world and he would give us a totally new perspective on what we were trying to do. So many times he saved us from an abyss, as he also saved the current Government from the odd abyss, simply with his knowledge and experience of things that other countries had tried and found wanting. Not only will the Liberal Party miss Andrew Mensaros; as has been expressed by members of the Government of both Chambers, he was a friend to all and a servant to so many bipartisan committees. The Parliament of Western Australia will greatly feel his loss.

To his family and to his staff, particularly Yvonne Vianna, we extend our sympathy.

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan) [3.11 pm]: I also want to be associated with the condolence motion. One point that has not been mentioned is that Andrew Mensaros knew, from experience and instinctively, what was proper. The subject of what is proper in Parliament and in Government has been engaging our attention a lot lately. One could always get an answer by asking Andrew because he had a deep love of the system, a deep love of law and a deep love of propriety. As well as that, he had many years of experience in this Parliament and in Government. We would be labouring on what was the right way to do things or the right way to get answers and he would give us the answer because he knew from his experience the correct thing to do. He will be a great loss to this State because he was one of the few people who had that experience and instinctive knowledge of what was proper at a time when our society needs people such as him.

He was also an extremely engaging person. He was often difficult to understand because he spoke extremely quietly and with a fairly strong accent. However, I will remember him because he asked me to drive him to a party meeting in Albany. That was a fairly brave action because the previous time that I had driven to a party meeting, I wrote my car off. However, he was not fazed. During that long journey he offered to drive on occasions but we engaged in a long conversation. The breadth and depth of his knowledge on the subjects that he was able to discuss, including politics, science, law, the arts and the classics, and his ability to traverse every single topic was astounding and, even though it was a long trip, travelling with Andrew and being able to engage in a lively two way conversation was one of the most enjoyable experiences I have had.

We lost an intellectual giant and, more importantly, a moral giant in our Parliament when Andrew died last night.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Clive Griffiths): I also wish to be associated with this motion moved by the Leader of the House and supported by the Leader of the Opposition and others in regard to the late Andrew Mensaros. I was one member who was here when he was first elected. His contribution, as has been expounded by most of the speakers, was a great contribution not only to the Parliament of Western Australia, but also to the people of Western Australia. One of Andrew's very nice attributes that I will always remember was that, while he was a very vigorous supporter of the free enterprise system and the proposals that were submitted to the Parliament from time to time, Andrew never found it necessary to denigrate the character of his opponents in the arguments that he put forward in support of his views. He never looked towards tomorrow's headlines to seek to make his views known to the public. In other words, he was a very compassionate and realistic person. He knew that the comments he was about to make would be positive comments directed to doing what he believed was the right and proper thing for the people of Western Australia, as distinct from being of benefit to Andrew Mensaros.

Question passed, members standing.

MOTION - SELECT COMMITTEE ON STATE INVESTMENTS

Foss, Hon Peter, Discharge - Cash, Hon George, Appointment

HON R.G. PIKE (North Metropolitan) [3.19 pm] - by leave: I move, without notice -

That Hon Peter Foss be discharged from the Select Committee on State Investments and that Hon George Cash be appointed in his place.

At an early meeting of the Select Committee, Hon Peter Foss informed the committee that the legal firm of which he is a partner had acted or was acting for a number of persons or companies that might be required to give evidence to the committee.

Point of Order

Hon J.M. BROWN: The member is referring to matters that are before the Select Committee and which have not been before the House.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not consider that is a point of order.

Debate Resumed

Hon R.G. PIKE: The question of whether this constituted an interest disqualifying Hon Peter Foss was raised at the committee and, after consulting with the Clerk of the House, I ruled, as chairman, that it did not.

Hon Peter Foss subsequently advised me that, despite the fact that he was not disqualified from sitting on the committee, from a private, professional point of view he intended to observe the following rules -

- (1) If a client appeared before the committee he would decline to participate in the examination of that witness.
- (2) If a client became the object of an inquiry by the committee, he would resign from the committee.

In due course Hon Peter Foss absented himself from the committee when it dealt with certain transactions which involved a purchase by clients of his firm, even though at that stage his clients were neither called before the committee, nor were they the subject of the investigation. At that stage I advised the committee of the statements by Hon Peter Foss, referred to previously.

Upon receiving a copy of my draft report Hon Peter Foss immediately advised me that he did not believe he could participate in deliberations on what are now paragraphs 84 to 95 of my draft report. He told me this was the case, even though the report made no findings adverse to his client and even though it did not deal directly with his client. On the other hand, he advised me that he felt it would be improper by voting against the paragraphs, or even abstaining from voting on the paragraphs, to cause them to be lost. In the circumstances, he asked that he be discharged from the committee before those paragraphs were put, and he asked me to put them last so that he could participate in discussions on the rest of my draft report. I have, therefore, postponed dealing with those paragraphs until all others have been dealt with. I have today moved that Hon Peter Foss be discharged from the committee and that Hon George Cash, the Leader of the Opposition, be appointed in his place. In conclusion, an important point to note is that Hon Peter Foss has not participated, either affirmatively or negatively, in those paragraphs with which he may have a concern, and he is discharged at his own request.

HON J.M. BROWN (Agricultural) [3.23 pm]: I oppose the motion and express my disappointment at the way in which it has been introduced and its timing. The committee has been operating since October 1989 and it presented its first interim report in April 1990. On the eve of presenting a report, which in many ways could have been the final report, it is strange to learn of these circumstances. It is also disturbing for a number of reasons, which I am not in a position to relate to the House at this stage.

I am unaware of the earlier meeting, when this question was raised, at which the mover of the motion said he had set his own rules. Nobody sets rules affecting the conduct of Select Committees except this House.

Hon R.G. Pike: Are you saying you are unaware or aware?

Hon J.M. BROWN: I am aware of the part I played from the beginning of the appointment of the Select Committee, and that will become evident in due course. However, I am unaware of any commitments made by the chairman of that Select Committee or by members of the Liberal Party or National Party in any deliberations on the question of disqualification. For 19 months the committee has been deliberating at length on these matters. These matters have been raised from time to time in this House and in the other place, and they have been the subject of media comment and speculation. It was also suggested that at the conclusion

of our inquiry some of these matters could be considered by the Royal Commission. It was arranged that the committee would meet yesterday morning to discuss the draft report, which includes paragraphs 83 to 95. For reasons unknown to me, several of the items raised in those paragraphs have not been debated previously by the committee. It is absolutely beyond my comprehension that the chairman of the committee, at the eleventh hour, should move a motion that Hon Peter Foss be discharged from the committee. I will explain that statement. I know that all members of the committee are aware of the Standing Orders relating to this matter and I drew to their attention Standing Order No 371, which states -

No Member who is personally interested in the inquiry before a select committee shall sit on such committee.

Point of Order

Hon PETER FOSS: The honourable member is suggesting I sat on this committee contrary to Standing Order No 371. That is definitely not the case.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is not suggesting that. The honourable member is advancing an argument in opposition to the argument submitted by Hon R.G. Pike. Hon J.M. Brown is not responsible for what other people read into the argument he is submitting.

Debate Resumed

Hon J.M. BROWN: That Standing Order was brought to the attention of members of the committee and all members were aware of their responsibilities in such a wide ranging inquiry. I have in front of me a copy of the terms of reference and they should be considered in conjunction with the first interim report presented in 1990, which was tabled in this House. That report clearly sets out the areas canvassed, the annexures to the report, the documentation the committee considered, the truckloads of documents the committee subpoenaed, and the investigations and discussions that took place on this matter. It is mind boggling that in the concluding stages of the committee's investigations a member of that committee should resign of his own volition, as the chairman of the committee, Hon R.G. Pike, has indicated is the case with Hon Peter Foss. He has chosen this eleventh hour to resign from a committee which is giving its attention to a report. The committee has been deliberating for in excess of 20 months. Furthermore, all members of the committee were entitled to more than being told at four o'clock on Tuesday evening that the meeting would not be held the next morning at 8.30. This is a properly constituted committee which had resolved to hold its next meeting at 8.30 on Wednesday morning, 29 May 1991. At four o'clock or five o'clock the previous evening we were advised that the meeting was not on. This was a regularly constituted meeting, and we were advised in this haphazard way that it was not on. At ten o'clock or eleven o'clock at night we were told that a member would be discharged. Such a thing has not occurred before in a committee at this stage of its deliberations. It is expected to show propriety.

[Resolved, that the motion be continued.]

Hon J.M. BROWN: The committee was to meet yesterday morning, and we should at least have had the courtesy of some consultation. The Leader of the National Party in this House, Hon Fred McKenzie and myself are all involved, but we were not advised of the reason for the cancellation of this meeting. We were not given even that courtesy. We could have conducted the meeting ourselves, but knowing the other members, that was impossible. Surely we were entitled to the common decency of being given an explanation of why a member wished to withdraw. It is the right of any member to be discharged from a committee, in the same way as the House has the right to replace that member, but there has been no consultation. It would be obligatory upon any member to tell the committee that it would not be proceeding. I know it is not essential that that be done, but any member of any Select Committee should expect at least that courtesy; it should be the obligation of any member of this House who understands decorum and what is required in a Select Committee, especially a member with the qualifications of the member who is now asking to be discharged from the committee.

It is mind boggling; it is shocking; it is disturbing to the processes of Select Committees that anyone would want to do this sort of thing. But what is even worse, having done what has been done, is the suggestion to replace him with another member at this eleventh hour, a

member who has not been involved - and quite rightly so - with any matter before the Select Committee. He has not been involved in a single issue.

Hon T.G. Butler: That is the argument they put up before.

Hon Doug Wenn: It is all right for them but not for us.

The PRESIDENT: I cannot hear what the interjectors are saying, but whatever it is it is out of order.

Hon J.M. BROWN: It is even more disturbing to want to replace the member with another member, and I intend no reflection on Hon George Cash or on any member opposite. We have an entitlement in this matter, we can nominate somebody; make no mistake about that. The suggestion is to place a responsibility on a member who has not been associated with any of the investigations of the committee; he has not been associated with any of the interrogation of the witnesses. He has not been involved in any of the discussions. He knows nothing of the documents which have been presented to us and the reports of the advisers to the Select Committee. Those advisers are Mr Steggall, Mr Pringle, QC, Mr Oi - and that is not an "oi" for any joy; he was a great asset during the short period he spent with the committee. I would not like to show any disrespect to that gentleman who made such a valuable contribution to the committee. We have another adviser with us whose services are still being utilised.

A new member would not have the experience of association on this committee, which has been meeting for more than 20 months. Many deliberations have taken place, and there are volumes of evidence, documents and subpoenas. One must have a feel for the committee in order to understand how a witness feels during his presentation. It is not right to ask a member of this House to be a part of that committee at this eleventh hour, irrespective of his ability. What the committee will be discussing is the direction given to us in the amended terms of reference which require the committee not to call further witnesses and to make representations. The direction says the committee is to complete without undue delay its second interim report without calling for further witnesses, the necessary exception to this being to reissue and enforce the summons directed to the Attorney General and which, at the day of the prorogation of Parliament, had not been complied with.

Hon Peter Foss: I cannot hear you.

Hon J.M. BROWN: If the member cannot hear me he can come to the Table; that is his right.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is not his right.

Hon P.G. Pendal: You are a bit niggly today.

Hon J.M. BROWN: I am reading the terms of reference setting out what the committee is to do. This is the third time we have been to the House to ask for alterations to this committee so that we can finalise our report and have it ready not later than 5 July 1991. I take exception to what Hon Phillip Pendal said, that I am rather niggly. Who would not be upset about this move at the eleventh hour while the Select Committee is deliberating and its the report is being finalised, with no explanation of why the member should be retiring? There has been no explanation to the committee, no consultation; merely a motion in the House which complies with Standing Orders which state that a member may be discharged and replaced by another member. I am concerned that this should take place at a time when the Select Committee has reached the final stages of its operations. It is beyond comprehension that we should ask a member to come in and take part in our deliberations at such a stage. It is not fair to the member.

Amendment to Motion

Hon J.M. BROWN: Recognising fairness, I wish to move an amendment. I move -
To delete all words after "investments".

Point of Order

Hon R.G. PIKE: Since the Standing Orders and the rules of the House provide and the House by a motion and direction has determined that it shall be a Select Committee of five members, it is not within the prerogative of the House within the context of the motion to move a motion as a consequence of which we will have four members.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. The House can subsequently determine to appoint whoever it wants; it does not have to agree to the appointment of Hon George Cash. In other words, it will be the prerogative of the House, if it agrees to Hon J.M. Brown's foreshadowed amendment. The House will then be required to entertain a further motion either to alter the numerical strength of the Select Committee or indeed to nominate someone else other than Hon George Cash.

Hon R.G. PIKE: Will Hon George Cash be precluded should the amendment be accepted by the House, and would that create the situation that any other member of the House could be nominated other than Hon George Cash?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure what the member said, but if he asked whether the amendment precludes Hon George Cash, I say no. If he said something different, I would ask him to say it again. The amendment does not preclude Hon George Cash; it precludes him from being the one and only nomination for replacement. The House may subsequently determine from a number of candidates that Hon George Cash is the replacement. The amendment, as I said, gives an opportunity for other nominations to be received.

Debate Resumed

Hon J.M. BROWN: I wish to dispel any thoughts that this amendment is a reflection on Hon George Cash, or on any member. If we dispose of the question of replacing Hon Peter Foss with another member, appropriate steps can be taken in due course if any matter does not comply with the orders of the House. I understand that my amendment is in conformity with Standing Order No 372 - that is, members may be discharged and added.

I have canvassed the area of my concerns in a very brief time. I do not wish to add to what I have said except that I am concerned about the value of the committee, as I was before, and for the operations of all Select Committees in this Parliament. I cannot stop any member who chooses to resign from a Select Committee, and Hon Peter Foss has chosen to resign.

Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.00 pm

[Questions without notice taken.]

Hon J.M. BROWN: I will be interested to hear the views of National Party members on this sudden change in committee membership as they must be just as disturbed as I am. They are in a position to speak for themselves, as are my colleagues, and no doubt they will. It is a disturbing feature to see a change in a Select Committee at such a late time in its sittings, right on the eve of its proceedings being finalised. This dramatic change is not on. I am strongly against the motion and even more against any committee member being replaced at this time and that is why I moved my amendment.

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Leader of the House) [4.32 pm]: I am staggered that no member on the other side appears to be interested in responding to this serious matter.

Point of Order

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: The Leader of the House has said he is staggered that members on this side have not responded to comments made by Hon Jim Brown. We are talking about the amendment. The comments of the Leader of the House were about the motion, not the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is not a point of order. As I have said before, it does not matter whether what people say is right or wrong as long as they are able to say it. Other members get an opportunity later to tell them how wrong they are.

Hon E.J. Charlton: He is wrong.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is the prerogative of the Leader of the House to be wrong.

Debate Resumed

Hon J.M. BERINSON: It is a rather sad reflection on the approach of Opposition members that they attempt to deal with a serious issue such as the one raised by this motion and the amendment to it with quite peripheral objections. I repeat that it is staggering that no-one from the Opposition side is prepared to respond to the comments of Hon Jim Brown in support of his amendment.

Hon N.F. Moore: Mr McKenzie looked like he was going to speak when he seconded the amendment.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Members opposite really cannot get out of it as easily as that. Mr McKenzie merely formally seconded the amendment to the motion.

Hon N.F. Moore: And remained on his feet.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Did Hon Fred McKenzie remain on his feet?

Hon Fred McKenzie: No.

Hon N.F. Moore: Hon Fred McKenzie stood up again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The call for somebody to address the Chair is one of the very few decisions that members leave to me. This is a serious situation. If there is a suggestion that I gave the call to the Leader of the House instead of Hon Fred McKenzie, that is a suggestion that I dealt with Hon Fred McKenzie unfairly. The fact is that when I gave the call to the Leader of the House I did so because he was the first to his feet at that time. He is therefore entitled to the call. If he misses out next time, he will not get the call.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: One of my many failures is that I do not have eyes in the back of my head. I had the strong impression that nobody was rising to speak on the matter on the other side because they were not interested in speaking. The last thing I would want to do is preempt any comment by Hon Fred McKenzie, especially as he is a member of the committee and is accordingly well placed to advise the House on how to proceed on this matter. Accordingly, I seek leave to discontinue my comments in favour of Hon Fred McKenzie with a view to being permitted to contribute at a later stage of the debate.

The PRESIDENT: The situation as I see it is that any member can seek leave to do anything in this place and if no dissenting voice is heard, that is tantamount to giving approval to what the member seeks to do. The Leader of the House still has the call even though he has asked for leave. I find that a strange request for him to make, but heaven forbid that I say it is unusual. The Leader of the House was entitled to speak because he received the call as Hon Fred McKenzie was not the first member to his feet. I wonder where this will lead if people start to ask for leave to interrupt their comments after they have made part of their speech; however, it may be that that is the way to go. Is leave granted?

Several members: No.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I find on consultation with Hon Fred McKenzie that he had precisely the difficulty that I had; that is, he too was waiting in the full expectation that at least one member of the Opposition would be prepared to stand and defend their motion.

Hon N.F. Moore: You should just reflect on that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the House is entitled to say whatever he wants and give his opinion on what happened. Members on the other side, or any member, when he finishes can rise and tell him how wrong he was, if he is wrong, or even if a member thinks he is wrong, because a member of this place can say that he is wrong even if he is right. However, to embark on interjections that do not make a contribution to the progress of the debate before the House seems to be a futile exercise. I do not know how many times I must say this, but the Leader of the House has the call.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Considering the fact that I have not started I think I may leave my preamble and await with great expectation the contributions of Opposition members when opposing the reasonable amendment moved by Hon Jim Brown. Frankly, I would have thought they would be anxious to do that. I am prepared to wait as long as it takes to hear from them.

The members of this House who are not members of the committee are obviously at a disadvantage in addressing the detail of the background to this motion. However, the principle involved is surely crystal clear; that is, if it is necessary for Hon Peter Foss to be discharged from the committee then, of course, he should be discharged. However, how on earth can he be replaced by a new member who has not participated in the deliberations of the committee for the 20 months of its activity, who has not heard the witnesses who have appeared before the committee in its 20 months of activity, and who has not examined the documents, which Hon Jim Brown indicates came in truckloads, which the committee has been able to examine during the 20 months of its activity?

We have heard that the committee was planning to finalise its report yesterday; that can only mean that most of the report must have been approved already. What can a replacement member on the committee do about that? Is it seriously suggested that he can inform himself of the details of 20 months of meetings in the next two or three days? No-one obviously could believe that could be done. That, Mr President, leaves only one alternative; that is, if the Opposition proceeds with its move to appoint Hon George Cash as a replacement for Hon Peter Foss, Hon George Cash is expected to become a member of the committee to rubber stamp the decisions already made by the committee. One can only anticipate that Hon George Cash would also be in a position of rubber stamping decisions which Hon Peter Foss would have made on the very questions on which he and/or Hon Robert Pike regard him as disqualified.

Point of Order

Hon PETER FOSS: My position is being misrepresented. I am not saying I am disqualified, I am asking to be discharged for the reasons given by Hon Robert Pike.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order, it is a debatable matter that can be dealt with subsequently in the debate.

Debate Resumed

Hon J.M. BERINSON: The basic fact remains, and the Opposition cannot hide from it, that to allow one member to be on a committee for 20 months, right to the eve of the finalisation and presentation of the report, and to allow that member to be discharged and another member to be appointed - not at the eleventh hour as Hon Jim Brown so generously expressed it, but at one minute to midnight - is expecting too much. It is not exaggerating the position to say that it amounts to a scandalous and unacceptable abuse of the committee system, and nobody could reasonably suggest otherwise. Committees of this Parliament are supposed to provide a reliable means of genuine inquiry and report. We all knew that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to actually achieve that on this committee chaired by Hon Robert Pike, if only because Hon Robert Pike was the chairman.

Withdrawal of Remark

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest to the Leader of the House that that is a reflection on the honourable member and he should perhaps consider his comment and withdraw it.

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Hon J.M. BERINSON: I come back to the basic proposition that it was always going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to achieve with a committee of that type, the sort of reasoned and genuine inquiry and report which Select Committees of this Parliament are meant to pursue. Fundamentally, that was because of the highly contentious nature of the terms of reference given to the committee. Above all, it was because of the intransigence of the Opposition in the face of a proposal by the Government for equal numbers on each side to be represented on the committee. It was a practice which would have continued the position well established in the last Parliament. It has been jettisoned here and, if it should have been retained on one committee above all others, to have any expectation of fair dealing and a proper inquiry and report, this was the committee.

Members of the Opposition are fond of talking about what is proper, and one must ask what is proper about the course they are now proposing. There is absolutely nothing proper about it. The Opposition should be ashamed to propose it, and it should have the decency not to pursue it. It is seriously asking this House to accept that Hon George Cash should become a member of that committee a couple of days before the presentation of a report, based on 20 months of activity, subscribe his name to the report and expect the report to attract any respect at all. It would be impossible for a report with that background to attract any respect, and it should be recognised by members of the Opposition, as in the interest of their own self-respect, that they do not lend themselves to that sort of abuse. The long and short of it is that the amendment should be accepted by the House, and we should then leave the balance of the committee to exercise judgment as to where it goes from here.

HON R.G. PIKE (North Metropolitan) [4.47 pm]: I would like to deal very quickly with the furphy proposed by the Leader of the House. Let it be clearly understood from the outset

that the concluding remarks of the honourable leader proposed that the committee membership should remain at four. I will tell the House and the people of Western Australia -

Hon J.M. Berinson: You are proposing to elect a rubber stamp.

Hon R.G. PIKE: If that happens, then paragraphs 84 to 95 inclusive will never see the light of day.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Perhaps they should not.

Hon R.G. PIKE: If we believed the claptrap of the Leader of the House about equality of numbers, which he has also been talking about, we would have the sort of quivering blancmange we have had from the Labor Party for the past eight years, which adds up to absolutely nothing.

Hon J.M. Berinson: What about paragraphs 1 to 83?

Hon R.G. PIKE: I did not shout when the Leader of the House was speaking. I could shout him down if I chose to.

Hon J.M. Berinson: You should be ashamed of yourself.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want honourable members to stop the interjections. Let us make some progress. If Hon Robert Pike addresses the Chair, he will get no more interjections at all.

Hon R.G. PIKE: This WA Inc committee is the bete noire of the Leader of the Labor Party in this place. With equality of numbers this committee would be gelded, and the WA Inc inquiries, the tabling of documents and the proper functioning of a bicameral system would be as nothing. This man is all about camouflaging, evading and preventing the proper supervision of this House by that which calls itself the Government in the other place. If the House goes down that path of deciding to have equality of numbers - which this amendment is all about - it means that the Leader of the House, unusually for him, does not understand that in the terms of the resolution of the House someone must be appointed. He sees a glimmer of hope, in that perhaps these paragraphs will not be published if we have equality of numbers on the committee. That is what all the loud noise and shouting was about. The Leader of the House was heard in silence, but then endeavoured to prevent the argument against his proposition being heard. His loud voice is no substitute for the logic and the facts of the matter.

I will now deal with the essence of the argument. Let it be clearly understood that this motion is designed in its entirety to avoid a conflict of interest. There is no question that Hon Peter Foss has taken the correct path of propriety in regard to this matter. Had the same propriety and the same correctness been observed by the Labor Government in this State since 1983 -

The PRESIDENT: Order! The amendment that the member is addressing is about whether Hon George Cash should be appointed to the committee. It has nothing to do with the merits or otherwise of the remainder of the motion, and we will reach a conclusion much sooner if all members remember that when they are addressing the amendment.

Hon R.G. PIKE: I conclude that comment by saying that if the same propriety had been displayed elsewhere, we would not have had the debacle of WA Inc, which is what the committee was looking at.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member has, in the face of what I have just said, blatantly proceeded to say what I was suggesting he ought not to be saying.

Hon R.G. PIKE: I apologise, Mr President; I misheard you.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry that you misheard me, but I thought it was reasonably simple, and I will say it once more. All members need to have their attention directed to one of the basic rules in this place; that is, there is a time during the substantive motion when members can talk about it, and there are times when they cannot. One of the times that they cannot is when the House is dealing with a specific amendment. This specific amendment ought to be addressed by saying why Hon George Cash ought to be appointed or why he ought not to be appointed; nothing else.

Hon R.G. PIKE: Mr President, I ask you to stop me if I transgress again. I will direct myself particularly to the comment made by the leader of the Labor Party -

The PRESIDENT: Order! He is the leader of the Government.

Hon T.G. Butler interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Tom Butler should just remember that while on previous occasions in our lives he has been able to be helpful to me, he is certainly not being helpful at the moment.

Hon R.G. PIKE: The leader of the Government said, by way of a false and obtuse argument, that it would be quite wrong to expect that Hon George Cash, who is proposed to be the replacement member, could come in at this time, pick up 20 months of - to use Hon Jim Brown's words - truck loads of documents, and be an instant expert. I remind that member of the content of the speech I made when I moved the motion. That was, from memory, that the committee had concluded the totality of its report and its incredibly thorough investigation in great detail, with the exception of paragraphs 84 to 95 inclusive. The nub of the question, therefore, is whether it is beyond the capacity - and certainly it is not - of Hon George Cash to come in at the concluding stages of the preparation of a report and acquaint himself with the paragraphs which deal with particular subjects. It is totally relevant to say to the House at this stage that evidence is not available to the committee as a consequence of witnesses called but rather as a consequence of documents subpoenaed, and none of the members, except the adviser and me, would have been aware of them unless they had taken the trouble to access them. That is why I included it in my draft report, and that is why Hon Peter Foss was not aware of it until he read the copy of my draft report. The Leader of the House is arguing that where the issue of parliamentary privilege arises in such a way that a member finds that to observe the proper rules which he has imposed quite properly upon himself, and to avoid a possible conflict of interest, he should not participate in those discussions, the replacement member would have to read the truck loads of documents, and the evidence of the witnesses.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I said he could not.

Hon R.G. PIKE: It is typical of the Leader of the House that he gives us a concoction of half truths and half facts, with an apparent conviction of delivery, which add up to nothing. That is what his proposition is all about, and he knows it. Should this House choose Hon George Cash as the replacement member, he will have a responsibility to deal with those paragraphs and to acquaint himself with those matters. Were we to accept the argument of the Leader of the House, we would preclude for all time prospectively a person who has been on a committee for a period of time, and who finds through no fault of his own that he has an interest, being able to be replaced, because that does not suit the politics of the Government. This amendment is a detour. It neither adds to nor takes away from the proposition that Hon Peter Foss should be replaced by the Leader of the Opposition.

HON E.J. CHARLTON (Agricultural) [4.56 pm]: I was not going to speak on the amendment because I thought we would simply return to the original motion, and I was going to reserve my comments until that time. However, as a consequence of the debate which has taken place, I want to register my comments at this time. I am doing so because I am a member of this committee. I view this debate extremely seriously because what has to be taken into account is the fact that this committee was set up to inquire into and report on State investments, in accordance with the terms and conditions laid down, at the time when there was no Royal Commission. I, along with other members, have been involved in that inquiry, in the production of those documents, and in seeking that information. I certainly do not want to see what has taken place during that period now degenerate into a political debate about who may or should be on this committee when it delivers what could be its concluding determinations. It is unfortunate and extremely disappointing that Hon Peter Foss has made the decision and taken the action which he has taken. I say that for two reasons: First, because he has been a member of the committee from the outset; and, second, because the debate which has taken place and is now taking place is putting into question the credibility of the findings of the committee.

I do not want to see any discredit brought upon this committee or this House as a result of the committee's report on a number of events which have taken place. It is not for anyone to

allocate so much importance to this controversy that it overshadows the reason for the committee's formation in the first place. Members should not forget why this committee was set up. We must not forget that it is there to present a report. So that members are clear where I stand, I consider it both disappointing and unfortunate that Hon Peter Foss has made this decision - and I respect his decision. I wish that decision had not been made. I wish he were in a position to stay on the committee. I would have appreciated hearing his reason for feeling that he could not continue. Be that as it may, I do not think it is in the best interests of the committee to have Peter Foss discharged from it and not replaced. It may be that with four members on the committee no report will be made on the remaining aspects, and that would not be acceptable or right. A great deal of research and inquiry has taken place, and I am concerned about the ramifications of the decision. However, I am left in the position of not agreeing with the amendment; I simply support the original motion. We must have a determination, and I want to see that report tabled as soon as possible.

I was very much in favour of this committee's reappointment because I believed it had a responsibility to the people of Western Australia to prove its credibility and hand down a report. A number of people were saying that we should not reach that stage; we should now dissolve the committee and let the Royal Commission take over. I was not of that opinion, and while I will not canvass the reasons for reappointing the committee at this stage, I make the point that we must have a replacement to make sure that we have a report. It is morally wrong and financially wasteful to go through the exercise of bringing a number of important people to give evidence and then not produce a report so that this House will know what has taken place and the people of Western Australia can make a judgment. I emphasise the fact that these are important people in view of their role in State expenditure.

I am happy to be judged on the report. I do not want to go through an exercise where, for whatever reason, the report fizzles out and it is locked away in a box in this building, which may happen if we do not make a determination. I am disappointed. It is extremely unfortunate that this decision has been made because it will put a question mark on our determinations.

Hon J.M. Brown: That is right.

Hon E.J. CHARLTON: However, having said that, we have no alternative but to replace Hon Peter Foss with another member

HON FRED McKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [5.05 pm]: I support Hon Jim Brown's amendment. Perhaps I shall speak in support of the motion, but it depends on how much I shall have to say about the amendment. I have some restrictions there, but I shall have to use my judgment. Mr President, you were quite correct when you gave the Leader of the House the call, because I seconded the motion and sat down, which is the correct procedure. Then I looked around to see if someone on the other side would respond. Had a member opposite risen I would have remained seated. That is a tactic one is entitled to use in this place.

Hon Eric Charlton speaks about the credibility of the committee. I have never favoured the committee. Irrespective of whether Mr Cash or anyone else is on it, it will not have any credibility.

Hon George Cash: The public will be the judge of that.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Let us be honest about this exercise; the committee will not cease to operate if Mr Foss is discharged. It still has a quorum, does it not? Members know that. The difference is this: If Mr Cash is put on the committee, we will be back to the old caper. Let us be honest.

Several members interjected.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: It is Opposition numbers versus Government numbers. That is really what it is all about. The proper place for this -

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon FRED McKENZIE: The committee should have finished long ago; it should never have been re-formed. What chance has the Government of matching the Royal Commission?

Several members interjected.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I know I cannot tell the House what the committee has been discussing, but members should use their imagination. How can we match the Royal Commission? We have been going for 20 months and we are almost ready to report, as Hon Bob Pike says. Paragraphs 84 to 95 are left. Hon Peter Foss has a conflict of interest and he has, quite properly, declared it. We keep putting this thing off. We should have discussed the matter long ago. The opportunity has been there. We tried to discuss it and we were blocked from discussing it when there was ample time. I wonder why!

As has already been mentioned, Wednesday's meeting was cancelled. I did not know the reason. Do members know the reason? The reason is that the Opposition must have another member on the committee, because if it does not, paragraphs 84 to 95 are likely to be defeated. This is a party political committee. There is no place for that sort of thing in this House. I said that in an article in the *Sunday Times* when I was interviewed the other day. This sort of thing brings no justice to this House. When will members learn? I am leaving.

Several members interjected.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Do not ever appoint this type of committee to this House again. Outside this Parliament is where such bodies belong, not here. What are members opposite doing? The Opposition has the numbers here. We could have had these inquiries before, but when Labor Governments are in power they are subject to whatever this House wants to do.

Several members interjected.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: When the Liberals are in with the National Party in Government, the Labor Party has no chance. The Labor party cannot have papers tabled because the coalition Government will not allow it.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Perhaps Hon Fred McKenzie will let us know what he thinks about Hon George Cash's appointment.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: I think I should, Mr President. Hon George Cash should be appointed, if members opposite want to crunch the numbers; but if they do not want to crunch the numbers they will agree to Hon Jim Brown's amendment.

Hon R.G. Pike: You will crunch them the other way.

Hon George Cash: Because you can stymie it.

Several members interjected.

Hon J.M. Berinson: A rubber stamp.

Hon FRED McKENZIE: Exactly, Hon Joe Berinson has said it. If members opposite want to make fools of themselves we can still bring down a report; Hon Peter Foss does not have to be there.

I have no doubt that, in the end, members opposite will defeat the amendment and vote for the motion; but if they do, any semblance of credibility the committee has left will disappear. Members opposite cannot expect the public or the Press, which will be conveying the message to the public, to take this report seriously when it comes out. Twenty months' work is a great deal of work; members will say how hard it was and how much work we did. Twenty months is a long time after which to bring in a new committee member, when all of the report has been dealt with and the Government members of the committee, Hon Jim Brown and I, are doing an alternative draft - and members should make no mistake about it; that is what we are doing.

Members should understand that I am very fond of Hon George Cash and I would not mind his being on the committee; there is nothing personal in my objection. I have nothing personal against Hon Peter Foss either, but I believe he should not have been appointed to the committee in the first place and I think he has made an error. He is an honourable gentleman, there is no doubt about that. I have faith in his integrity and honesty but he made a dreadful mistake and now we find ourselves in this situation. We all look silly as a result of it, but it is crystal clear that it is a party political matter.

In time, members will find out about the committee, and they will find out some things that I cannot tell them now. I am sure the report will indicate to members once and for all that we

should not have a bar of this type of committee. They do not do us any justice. The atmosphere of such committees is extremely unpleasant, and if Hon George Cash is appointed as the motion seeks, I believe the friendship I have with him and our bipartisan relationship will be somewhat destroyed; but only while we are in the committee room.

I implore members to support Hon Jim Brown's amendment and not appoint Hon George Cash to the committee. There is no point. We are in dispute on only 12 items; namely, paragraphs 84 to 95. Members should think about that. I have said to people, and I will say it publicly now, that I do not have a stamp collection or any gold bars, but I do have a bank overdraft and I am sure many other members in the House have the same. I ask members to vote for the amendment moved by Hon Jim Brown for the reasons I have outlined.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (12)		
Hon J.M. Berinson	Hon Kay Hallahan	Hon Doug Wenn
Hon J.M. Brown	Hon B.L. Jones	Hon Fred McKenzie
Hon T.G. Butler	Hon Garry Kelly	(Teller)
Hon Cheryl Davenport	Hon Sam Piantadosi	
Hon John Halden	Hon Bob Thomas	
Noes (13)		
Hon J.N. Caldwell	Hon Peter Foss	Hon R.G. Pike
Hon George Cash	Hon Barry House	Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon E.J. Charlton	Hon N.F. Moore	Hon Margaret McAleer
Hon Reg Davies	Hon Muriel Patterson	(Teller)
Hon Max Evans	Hon P.G. Pandal	
Pairs		
Hon Tom Stephens		Hon P.H. Lockyer
Hon Graham Edwards		Hon W.N. Stretch
Hon Mark Nevill		Hon D.J. Wordsworth
Hon Tom Helm		Hon Murray Montgomery

Amendment thus negated.

Debate Resumed

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan) [5.17 pm]: I have been waiting for this amendment to be dealt with so that I could inform the House of the reason for my decision, because there has been some uninformed comment and perhaps it would help if I made some remarks so that people can understand my decision.

First, I regret that Hon Jim Brown referred to Standing Order No 371, because my reason for seeking discharge from the Select Committee on State Investments is not that I have an interest in any matter, that is not the reason at all. In fact it is not for a parliamentary reason that I am seeking to be discharged but for a personal reason, of which the committee was informed a considerable time ago, should the event occur. So the committee was advised of the circumstances under which I would seek to be discharged.

Perhaps the reason the Government has been taken by surprise by the move is that I think when this report comes out people will wonder what it was in the report that caused me some concern. It is not that really, strictly speaking, I believe there is any great conflict of interest; it is not that any client of mine is being criticised or is the subject of any close examination. None of those things has occurred, but arising out of documents given to the committee, and documents which were drawn to the committee's attention only at the time of the report's being presented to me, there were remarks in the report about a transaction in which a client of mine was involved. That, simply, is what it is about. There is nothing in there, I believe, which would cause any concern to any client of mine. All I wished to avoid was any suggestion that the nature of the report was in any way softened by virtue of my presence on the committee.

Hon Fred McKenzie: You excused yourself on something other than the documents; it was on the evidence.

Hon PETER FOSS: That is not the part being reported upon.

Hon J.M. Brown: Why did you excuse yourself?

Hon PETER FOSS: It is not the part being reported on. The member knows perfectly well what I said to the committee at an early stage.

Hon J.M. Brown: I know what I said to the committee at an early stage.

Hon PETER FOSS: If anything, I am being overscrupulous. I must say that I regret the opportunity that has been seized by the Government to criticise me; rather I would have hoped it would commend my scrupulousness.

Hon J.M. Berinson: No-one is complaining about your withdrawal from the committee.

Hon PETER FOSS: I think it is important that people realise - and they will realise when they see the report - that there is nothing in the report to which personally I would have had any problems in agreeing, nor do I believe that there is anything in the report to which my client would have concerns about my agreeing. That is not the point. There would have been no conflict of interest in my agreeing to the report. Let us understand all those things. What I seek to do, and what I hope I have done, is remove the doubt from any person's mind that the final form of the report so far as it dealt with that matter was in that form because of something I had done with regard to it.

Hon J.M. Brown: You created that doubt at the start.

Hon PETER FOSS: From the beginning, I indicated to the committee, as one would possibly expect, that many people who may be called to give evidence to the committee were people who were clients of my firm. I made that clear, and it was appropriate that I should do so.

Hon T.G. Butler: Why did you go on the committee in the first place?

Hon PETER FOSS: We are dealing with a vast quantity of evidence. I did not see, and I still do not see, any conflict of interest. When the committee's report comes down people will see that I am correct. What I am seeking to do, and I hope it will be respected by both sides - and if that cannot be respected it is a sad thing for this House - is to remove the suggestion that the chairman of the committee would in any way, due to any inference on my part, modify the report. I say that because it is not a matter of mere concern on my part but I understand that there was a rumour given to the Press that I was seeking to influence the terms of the report. This happened after I had indicated my concern to the chairman.

Hon J.M. Brown: I am concerned about that because it certainly did not come from Hon Fred McKenzie or me.

Hon PETER FOSS: The member can take my personal assurance that I believe it did not come from either member. Please be absolutely certain about that. The fact is that that was said to me, and I wish that to be understood. If there are any doubts about it, the member has my sincere confirmation that I do not think for one moment that the rumour was spread to the Press by either Hon Fred McKenzie or Hon Jim Brown. However, it was spread to the Press, and I do not believe that is something I can allow to pass. The fact is that it was being said; that is, that there were bits to be removed from the report on my insistence.

Hon J.M. Brown: I have never heard that.

Hon PETER FOSS: It came back to me, and that concerns me because the suggestion that I would use my position not so much to put things into the report but to remove things from it reflects on my integrity. I am sure members would understand I was concerned about that reflection on my integrity - that I would use my position to remove things from the report. I would not do that, and I do not wish it to be seen that I had the opportunity to do so. I am putting that opportunity completely out of the way so that people know I had nothing to do with taking anything out of the report which otherwise might be in it.

Hon J.M. Brown: Perhaps the member should look to his colleagues. It certainly did not come from this side.

Hon PETER FOSS: I would not like to speculate; but I am quite convinced that no member of the committee was in any way involved. Let us return to the important point: This was a concern I had, quite apart from the rumour, and I was justified in acting when I heard the rumour. It is important to me that it not be thought that the committee's report has in any

way been modified to make it easier for any client of mine purely because of my presence on the committee; I am sure that other members of the committee will vouch for the fact that I have been quite keen to ensure that I have not influenced this part of the report in any way whatsoever. That is important. I believe when this report comes out, if it is in the same terms as the draft, people will wonder what on earth I was concerned about. I believe that if I had stayed in the committee and had voted on it people would not have noticed the fact that I had participated; in fact until such time as I raised this matter people would not have seen any problem in that respect. It is in an endeavour to be seen to be not participating in it that I have asked for this discharge.

Hon J.M. Brown: You condemn yourself by withdrawing; that is a fact.

Hon PETER FOSS: I do not agree. Perhaps we should look at what the committee has done over a considerable time. I would like the public to realise that I have participated in all other paragraphs of the report. I felt that I owed that to the committee so that it could not be said that they were rubber stamps; those paragraphs have passed the committee and unless they are recommitted they are the decision of the committee as at the time I was on it.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Roughly how many paragraphs are there other than paragraphs 84 to 95?

Hon PETER FOSS: A large number. This is a minuscule part of the essential part of the report.

Hon J.M. Berinson: Over 100?

Hon PETER FOSS: Yes. The important thing is people should realise the paragraphs have been put and unless they are recommitted they are the paragraphs passed by the committee when I was a member of that committee. Therefore, it is only these paragraphs in which Hon George Cash will participate, not those in which I participated. It is important that people understand that.

Hon J.M. Brown: I do not think you can make a determination of the committee.

Hon PETER FOSS: They cannot say that the remainder of the report has been rubber stamped by Hon George Cash; the remainder has been passed by the committee of which I am a member. I was taken by surprise by Hon George Cash's capacity to participate in the committee being questioned. I believe that the remarks are obtainable from the documents rather than from the evidence, and that it is only a very small part. Hon George Cash will have no difficulty in acquainting himself with that small part and with the documents. I must confess that we had difficulty on many of the other parts because of the vast quantity of information from the documents which we had not individually scrutinised. We are very much indebted to the work of the research officer in putting that forward and presenting it in that way. Hon George Cash will have no greater difficulty than the remaining members of the committee in dealing with that part of the report. What I seek to do by the action I have taken in asking the chairman to move that I be discharged is to preserve the position of the committee, and to preserve the position of all the members of the committee as to what happened in this part of the report. I hope it will be understood in that context.

I also firmly believe that when the report is released people will look at it and wonder what it is that caused me concern. I am probably being overscrupulous, but it is better to be that way than the opposite. It is unfortunate that as a result of what I have done people are seeing some sort of a sinister concern. I would prefer that this had not happened, but when people look at the report they will not see any problem with it. I hope that my motives are understood and the problems I faced realised. I felt that I would have influenced the report whether I participated in or abstained from voting; if I had merely abstained, the clause could have been lost, therefore the effect of abstaining would have been the removal of the clause. That is why I have taken this action.

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Attorney General) [5.32 pm]: Hon Peter Foss has asked us to accept his reasons for withdrawing from the committee. I for one have no difficulty with that; in fact, I think I am correct in saying that no complaint has been made about his decision to withdraw. The problem arises from Hon Bob Pike's move to have Hon George Cash appointed to replace Mr Foss. In that respect Mr Pike has condemned his argument out of his own mouth. At the point where he accused me of exaggerating the amount of work that the replacement member would be expected to do to avoid the status of

a rubber stamp, Mr Pike assured me that I was quite wrong. The reason he gave for me being so wrong was that I really thought that the committee was to have Mr Cash consider the whole report. That was wrong, according to Mr Pike. He said that all Mr Cash had to do was to consider a few clauses, although I have no idea what is in them and what that will involve. I was told that paragraphs 84 to 95 would be considered, yet we have heard from Mr Foss that over 100 paragraphs are to be considered.

Hon Fred McKenzie: One hundred and seventy-three!

Hon J.M. BERINSON: Indeed. In other words, Mr Pike is saying that all Mr Cash will have to do is the not particularly onerous job of considering paragraphs 84 to 95. That carries with it the very clear statement that Mr Cash will not be expected to, and in fact will not, consider paragraphs 1 to 83 or paragraphs 96 to 173. However, when the report comes out he will be expected to add his name as endorsing the findings of the committee. That is our case in a nutshell, and Mr Pike has given it to us!

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (13)

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

Hon Peter Foss
Hon Barry House
Hon N.F. Moore
Hon Muriel Patterson
Hon P.G. Pental

Hon R.G. Pike
Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon Margaret McAleer
(Teller)

Noes (12)

Hon J.M. Berinson
Hon J.M. Brown
Hon T.G. Butler
Hon Cheryl Davenport
Hon John Halden

Hon Kay Hallahan
Hon B.L. Jones
Hon Garry Kelly
Hon Sam Piantadosi
Hon Bob Thomas

Hon Doug Wenn
Hon Fred McKenzie
(Teller)

Pairs

Hon P.H. Lockyer
Hon W.N. Stretch
Hon D.J. Wordsworth
Hon Murray Montgomery

Hon Tom Stephens
Hon Graham Edwards
Hon Mark Nevill
Hon Tom Helm

Question thus passed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Condolence Motion - The Late Hon Andrew Mensaros

HON MARGARET McALEER (Agricultural) [5.38 pm] by leave: In my remarks on the condolence motion for the late Andrew Mensaros I said that Mr Mensaros was never the Minister for Education. Unfortunately, I was wrong; he held the Education portfolio for a few months in 1982 during the time of the O'Connor Government.

SUPPLY BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

Second Reading

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Metropolitan - Attorney General) [5.36 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks appropriation for issue and application as Supply to Her Majesty of

\$2 900 million for the services of the year ending 30 June 1992, pending the passage of Appropriation Bills for the next financial year during the Budget session. The Bill seeks an issue of \$2 700 million from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$200 million from the General Loan and Capital Works Fund.

The purpose of this Bill is no different from the Supply Acts of previous years. It is an integral element of the Westminster system of government, and successive State Governments and Parliaments in Western Australia have accepted and understood that the intent of Supply is to give authority for expenditure from the commencement of a new financial year pending the passing of the Appropriation (Consolidated Revenue Fund) Bill and Appropriation (General Loan and Capital Works Fund) Bill.

The Bill can be regarded as providing votes on account. It appropriates the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan and Capital Works Fund in aggregate pending the subsequent detailed appropriations. The Supply Bill reflects the Government's commitment to the Westminster system of parliamentary control of the public purse and the associated accountabilities. It does so in clearly specifying the purposes for which expenditure can be made. In particular, clause 4 limits to two categories the purposes for which these moneys may be issued and applied. These are to the works, services and purposes -

for which the Consolidated Revenue Fund and General Loan and Capital Works Fund were appropriated by the Parliament for the financial year ending 30 June 1991; or

in respect of which payments of an extraordinary or unforeseen nature were charged against either the Consolidated Revenue Fund or the General Loan and Capital Works Fund in respect of the financial year ending 30 June 1991 under the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act and the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

As members would now be well aware, the Bill prescribes a general monetary limit on the drawings against both the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan and Capital Works Fund. By so doing it overcomes the problems which otherwise could arise by prescribing monetary limits in respect of the individual items of the 1990-91 appropriations which were detailed in the Estimates of Expenditure. For example, and of necessity, the rates of expenditure on individual projects and programs will vary between financial years. Some capital works which were under construction during one year may be brought to completion early in the next year. Others on which work commenced towards the end of the first of these financial years, with relatively minor expenditures, could require substantially greater expenditures during the Supply period in the early part of the second year.

A similar situation could apply to new programs introduced in the previous Budget, or programs of an extraordinary or unforeseen nature met under the legislative arrangements relating to the Treasurer's Advance. Some of these programs may have started to gain momentum only during the last few months of the current financial year and require increased expenditure thereafter, including the six months or so of the next year which have traditionally been covered by Supply, pending the passing of the Appropriation (Consolidated Revenue Fund) Bill and the Appropriation (General Loan and Capital Works Fund) Bill.

Mr President, that covers the purpose of the Bill, and I will conclude by commenting briefly on the current year's budgetary position and the financial outlook for 1991-92. So far as 1991-92 is concerned, the Budget presented to Parliament last year provided for a balanced result with expenditure and revenue estimated at \$5 072.5 million. As is always the case, given the size of our Budget, there will be significant variations to some of the revenue and expenditure estimates. In particular, the impact of the economic downturn has been much more severe than was allowed for when the Budget was passed. Indeed, and in common with all other States and the Commonwealth, the recession has had a serious adverse impact on our revenue collections which was not anticipated. The most recent review by the Treasury Department indicates that taxation collections are expected to be below estimate by about \$80 million, generally reflecting the continued impact of the prevailing adverse economic conditions. Receipts from rail operations are also expected to be below estimate, by about \$22 million, largely as a result of depressed economic conditions for the rural sector impacting adversely on the carriage of wheat and wool.

The depressed market for property will also mean that the Asset Management Taskforce will

fall well short of its budget target of \$57 million in revenue. One of the reasons for this is that it is not this Government's intention to dispose of redundant or surplus assets at any price. Assets identified will be disposed of in an orderly and commercial manner having careful regard to the state of the property market. While the latest consumer price index figures are indeed welcome news on the economic front they will be translated into lower Commonwealth general revenue grants to Western Australia than was originally expected.

As members would no doubt recall, the austerity measures which I announced in February 1990 enabled estimated recurrent outlays during 1990-91 to be contained to an increase of just 4.8 per cent, a significant reduction in real terms. Treasury's latest review of expenditure indicates that the necessary expenditure discipline to meet this tough target is being maintained. Indeed, outlays for the year seem likely to be below the estimate although it will not be easy to achieve our goal of a balanced Budget faced with the revenue shortfalls I have just outlined. Nevertheless, we are sparing no efforts to minimise the potential deficit even though only two months remain in which to take further corrective action to contain expenditure. I have instructed all Ministers and chief executive officers that expenditure planning and management over the remainder of the financial year should be focused on meeting essential and locked in obligations. At the same time, I have asked Ministers to liaise with their agencies to ensure that this expenditure containment is targeted so that it does not impact adversely on the provision of essential services to the community.

Looking to the year ahead, the Government and its agencies again face a challenging task in bringing down a balanced Budget. Estimating revenues at any time is fraught with difficulty, especially for 1991-92 given the uncertainty as to when the economy will turn and how strongly it will improve. At this stage, however, the outlook for a number of our major revenues remains subdued and the Commonwealth is likely to take a hard line at the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meetings in respect of both recurrent and capital allocations to the States. Clearly the budgeting task will not be easy, but while the required adjustment processes may be painful they are necessary as the public sector must play its part in solving Australia's economic problems, thereby ensuring soundly based and sustained economic growth. An integral part of this process is to make the public sector more efficient and this Government has moved, and is moving on many fronts, to achieve that goal. Some of these initiatives include -

- ongoing reviews of Government agencies aimed at eliminating duplication and rationalising service provision;

- establishment of a Cabinet subcommittee on microeconomic reform to escalate and improve the coordination of the reform process and to ensure active and continuing review of all the State's economic institutions, policies, attitudes and practices;

- the announced intention to implement a corporatisation policy for the State's public trading enterprises to ensure that they operate as efficiently as possible for the benefit of all Western Australians;

- implementation of fiscal targets which require Government expenditure as well as taxation and debt to fall as a proportion of the economy over the current term of office;

- improved asset management through the establishment of the Asset Management Taskforce; and

- improved Government purchasing through the State Supply strategy.

In addition, and to assist in delivering Government services and programs at the least practical cost, we have introduced and implemented program management principles. The ultimate result will be the identification of programs that are no longer necessary or consistent with Government policy objectives or priorities. These will be eliminated while others which are underperforming will be scaled down. I should stress, however, that essential services to the public will not be cut. We will be looking to reduce the overall cost of delivering Government services while minimising the impact on the public. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon George Cash (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 5.45 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

BURKE, MR TERRY - GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

320. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Does Mr Terry Burke occupy any position on behalf of the State Government, its departments, agencies or instrumentalities?
- (2) If so, will the Minister provide details of such positions?
- (3) Is Mr Terry Burke entitled to any secretarial or clerical assistance or other facilities associated with any position held?
- (4) If so, will the Minister provide details?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

Mr Burke holds the position of Chairman, Overseas Relations Committee.

(3)-(4)

Mr Burke is provided with secretarial support and assistance as required in his role as Chairman of the Overseas Relations Committee. This includes the use of basic office facilities, telephone and car parking bay.

COMMUNITY SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES FUND - STATUS

349. Hon MURRAY MONTGOMERY to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) Is the community sporting and recreational facilities fund still operational?
- (2) If the answer is yes, what grants has it made so far in the current financial year?
- (3) If no to (1) when did it cease to be operational and under what authority was it disbanded?
- (4) Has the Lotteries Commission taken over all or any of the CSRFF's responsibilities?
- (5) If yes to (4), what grants has it made so far this financial year?
- (6) Is money from the lotteries community group fund being used for purposes that were previously within the funding responsibility of the CSRFF?
- (7) If the yes to (6), what grants have been made so far this financial year?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Yes, although no new applications have been invited in the 1989-90 and 1990-91 years other than for women in sport child care facility grants.
- (2) A list of the grants made from the community sporting and recreation facilities fund since 1 July 1990 follows. It is in two parts; part A lists those grants made by the Women in Sport Council for child care facilities, and part B lists other miscellaneous grants. Grants in part A were made in response to formal applications to the Women in Sport Council. Their availability has been advertised by the council in various forms of the media since late 1989. There is no specific closing date for receipt of applications. All applications received have been funded with the exception of one application which was for consumable equipment rather than for capital works.

PART A

ORGANISATION	AMOUNT APPROVED
City of Gosnells	7 387
City of Melville	9 000
Quairading Golf Associates	450
Condingup & Districts Recreation Assn	15 000
City of Gosnells	15 000
South Suburban Badminton Assn (Inc)	5 320
Shire of Roebourne	2 625

Shire of Harvey	15 000
Shire of Menzies	20 000
Scaddan Country Club	10 000
Willetton Basketball Association	15 000
Shire of Leonora	22 000
Derby Rodeo & Horseriders Assn	14 200
Perth Netball Association Inc	10 000
Busselton Tennis Club	1 000
ACRA WA Inc (Armadale Rec Centre)	3 000
YMCA - Eastern Goldfields	2 293
Town of Kwinana	15 000
City of Wanneroo	15 000
Floreat Park Tennis Club (Inc)	13 208
City of Wanneroo	15 000
Gingin Tennis Club Inc	1 128
City of Cockburn	12 970
Town of Narrogin	15 000
City of Stirling	3 000

PART B

ORGANISATION

AMOUNT APPROVED

Shire of Manjimup \$4 000

This grant was made as a result of a specific request from the Shire of Manjimup for savings from another project in the south west region, to be redirected to this project.

(3) Not applicable.

(4)-(7)

I understand that the member has received the requested information from the Minister for Racing and Gaming in response to question 350.

EXMOUTH - HAROLD HOLT JOINT COMMUNICATION BASE

Future Discussions

391. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Leader of the House representing the Deputy Premier:

- (1) What discussions has the State Government initiated with the Federal Government with regard to the future of the Harold Holt Joint Communication Base at Exmouth?
- (2) Does the Western Australian Government support the Federal Government's stance in Australia taking over the running of the base?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Deputy Premier has provided the following reply -

- (1) At Australian/United States ministerial talks in October 1990 it was agreed that the Naval Communications Station at North West Cape would, over a seven year period, become an Australian owned and controlled facility with some US participation. There are indications that the program may be accelerated. The Premier and Prime Minister have had preliminary communications on this matter. More information is currently being sought.
- (2) The Western Australian Government sees it as desirable that the base should be under full Australian control. It also accepts that this is inevitable given the intention of the United States Navy to greatly reduce its presence at the facility and the importance to the Australian Navy of maintaining this vital communications capability. The State Government sees its role as helping minimise disruption to the local community during the transition period. Further it is my intention to visit the Shire of Exmouth in the near future to discuss this matter.

POLICE OFFICERS - REMOTE POLICE STATIONS
Training Adequacy

413. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Police:

In his report of the inquiry into the death of John Pat, Commissioner Elliott Johnston expressed concern about the adequacy of the in-service training of the officer-in-charge before he took up duties at Roebourne Police Station. Can the Minister advise what measures have been adopted by the Police Department since the incident at Roebourne to ensure that there is appropriate induction of officers posted to rural, and in particular, remote police stations?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The current policy is that wherever possible officers in charge of remote police stations demonstrate prior operational experience and special skill or abilities in the policing of Aboriginal people. Training is provided to officers during recruit training and continues through to senior management level.

POLICE OFFICERS - CORONIAL INQUIRIES
Attendance and Evidence Direction

414. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Police:

In view of the similarities between the decision of members of the Police Force refusing to answer questions and therefore not being called to coronial inquiries into the deaths of John Pat and Stephen Wardle, will the Minister instruct his department that police officers have a duty to attend and give full evidence at coronial inquiries?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

I do not have power in law to direct police as requested and it is not appropriate for me to comment on coronial practices. However, that matter will be considered as part of the Government response to the Royal Commission recommendations.

POLICE - INJURED PRISONERS
Medical Treatment Guarantee

416. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Police:

In view of the evidence in both the Stephen Wardle and John Pat cases that proper medical treatment was not rendered to those two individuals in custody, can the Minister advise what measures have been taken to guarantee that injured persons are given medical treatment when taken into custody?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

Instructions to police officers direct that ill or injured prisoners are to be referred for medical assessment and/or treatment. An order to this effect has been issued in the Lockup Management Manual. To assist police officers identify prisoners in need of medical treatment, a lockup admission record form has been introduced. Training programs for operational officers concerning custodial care, assessment and supervision of prisoners, first aid and resuscitation have been implemented in recent years. At the East Perth Lockup a welfare officer is now employed on a continuous basis to ensure that prisoners receive necessary medical attention. Another initiative is that a trial program with trained nurses has been carried out at East Perth and is currently being assessed.

**R & I BANK OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA LTD - WESTERN
 AUSTRALIAN CRICKET ASSOCIATION DEBTS**
Government Guarantee

425. Hon MAX EVANS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister assisting the Treasurer:

(1) Can the Treasurer advise if the Government has given any guarantees to the R & I Bank in respect of any debts owing by the Western Australian Cricket Association.

- (2) What is the amount of the guarantee and when was it given?
- (3) If no guarantee has been given, is it intended that the Government will give a guarantee?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister assisting the Treasurer has provided the following reply -

- (1) A surety has been approved for issue by the Treasurer on the recommendation of the Treasury.
- (2) \$5.9 million as yet to be issued.
- (3) Not applicable.

STATE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR

Appointment

445. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to Hon Tom Stephens representing the Minister for State Development:

- (1) Who is the current Communications Director of the Department of State Development?
- (2) When was the appointment made, at what salary and under what conditions of service?
- (3) Was the appointment made according to Public Service Commission procedures of application, selection and appeal?
- (4) If not, why not?

Hon TOM STEPHENS replied:

The Minister for State Development has provided the following reply -

(1)-(4)

There is no position of communications director in the Department of State Development.

LAND - CORAL BAY

Brogan, Dr Bill - Lease Arrangements

459. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What lease arrangements have been arranged with Dr Bill Brogan with regard to land at Coral Bay?
- (2) Have arrangements for the release of further land for housing at Coral Bay been completed?
- (3) What conditions apply to the release of this land?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Lands has provided the following reply -

- (1) Through his company, Coral Bay Amalgamated Holdings Pty Ltd, Dr Brogan presently holds a special lease over Mauds Landing Lot 50 for the purpose of "Sewerage pond and pipe access" for a term expiring 31 March 2002. Two other special leases with 21 year terms, one for "Caravan park" and one for "Chalet park" have recently been surrendered with the intention that two new leases for "Caravan park" and "Tourist accommodation" be issued. Both leases will be for a term of 50 years.
- (2) No. As the Coral Bay strategy plan proposed by the Department of Planning and Urban Development is still being considered.
- (3) Not applicable.

BURKE, MR TERRY - OVERSEAS RELATIONS COMMITTEE
Chairman Appointment - Expenditure Details

467. Hon R.G. PIKE to Hon Tom Stephens representing the Minister for State Development:

- (1) When was Mr Terry Burke appointed to the position of Chairman of the Overseas Relations Committee?
- (2) What are the details of the total expenditure of this committee since it was established?
- (3) When was the committee established and on whose recommendation?
- (4) What business is Mr Terry Burke currently carrying out for this committee?
- (5) Where is Mr Terry Burke currently located and where and for what period of time has he been previously located in the carrying out of his duties since his appointment?
- (6) What are the details of the total amount of money and services that has been spent directly and indirectly by and on Mr Terry Burke including air fares, all transport, allowances, accommodation and gifts?

Hon TOM STEPHENS replied:

The Minister for State Development has provided the following reply -

(1)-(6)

I refer the member to the answer to Legislative Assembly question 422, copy of which is tabled. If the member requires further information in addition to that supplied, I will consider his request.

STATESHIPS - FREMANTLE-SINGAPORE ROUTE
Refrigerated Fruit and Vegetables

484. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Police representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does Stateships carry refrigerated fruit and vegetable produce from Fremantle to Singapore?
- (2) Has the volume of this trade increased or decreased in the past two financial years?
- (3) Are Stateships' freight charges for 20 foot and 40 foot refrigerated containers comparable to other shipping companies plying the Fremantle/Singapore route?
- (4) What is the average number of days taken by Stateships' vessels northbound from Fremantle to Singapore?
- (5) Which ports do the vessels call at on the northbound voyage to Singapore?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

The Minister for Transport has provided the following response -

- (1) Yes.
- (2) In 1989-90 Stateships carried 34 refrigerated containers and in the 1990-91 year to date, 27 containers have been carried.
- (3) Stateships does not provide 40 foot refrigerated containers. The Stateships rate for 20 foot refrigerated containers from Fremantle to Singapore is some seven per cent less than overseas shipping lines to maintain downward pressure of the Western Australia/South East Asia regional rates and to compensate for the longer transit time.
- (4) Ten to 14 days dependent on intermediary ports.
- (5) Cocos Island, Christmas Island, Jakarta, Surabaya, and other ports on inducement; e.g. Balikpapan.

GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION ACT 1990 - PROCLAMATION

498. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Attorney General:

When will the Guardianship and Administration Act 1990 be proclaimed?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The date of proclamation has not yet been determined.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY - MINING COMPANIES

Wastewater Ponding Systems - Synthetic Liners Installation Policy

501. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Mines:

Is the Minister aware that the Environmental Protection Authority is drafting a policy to require mining companies to install synthetic liners in all their waste water ponding systems, regardless of ground water quality?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister for Mines has provided the following response -

No.

POLICE DEPARTMENT - MOTORISTS' UNPAID FINES

Collection Directive

513. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Attorney General:

Has there been any directive from the Minister's office or Crown Law Department to the Police Department to collect unpaid fines by motorists regardless of how many years the fines have been outstanding?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

No.

STAMP DUTY - BUSINESS SALES

Goodwill Component

520. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

- (1) Is it correct that stamp duty is now levied on the goodwill component of a business upon sale?
- (2) If so, when did such a move come into effect and by what method?
- (3) Is the provision retrospective?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Treasurer has provided the following reply -

(1)-(3)

I am advised that duty has always been payable on goodwill where its transfer was the subject of a dutiable instrument. However, in 1989 the Stamp Act was amended to make the transfer of goodwill liable to duty even where it was not the subject of a dutiable instrument, provided that consideration was given for it. Under the amending legislation, which was assented to on 21 December 1989, the provisions in respect of goodwill were deemed to be effective from 1 December 1989.

FISHING - EXMOUTH

Export Licence

528. Hon P.H. LOCKYER to Hon Mark Nevill representing the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Has a licence been granted to any persons or companies to take fish from the Exmouth area for use overseas?
- (2) If the answer is yes -
 - (a) when was the licence granted; and
 - (b) to whom was the licence granted?

Hon MARK NEVILL replied:

The Minister for Fisheries has provided the following response -

- (1) It is not clear from the honourable member's question as to which person or company he is referring and the particular fishery concerned. If he could supply further details I would be happy to answer the question.
- (2) Not applicable.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

FIRE BRIGADE - HEAVY RESCUE SALVAGE TENDER *Salvage Operation - Specialised Heavy Lifting and Salvage Equipment*

282. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Emergency Services:

- (1) If the proposed heavy rescue/salvage tender is involved in a salvage operation what other specialised heavy lifting and rescue equipment can the Western Australian Fire Brigade provide to the public immediately?
- (2) How many pumpers does the brigade intend to dedicate to the rescue role during the summer bushfire season?
- (3) As the equipment generally referred to as the jaws of life will not be carried on all 20 pumpers as nine of the machines will be carrying the controversial combi-tool, should the combi-tool be proved to be unsuitable how long will it take the brigade to replace them?
- (4) The current emergency tenders carry essential equipment as a back up; that is, alligator spreaders, air chisels, lifting equipment for well rescues, pneumatic lifting equipment for confined spaces and soft ground and extension lines and stretchers for cave rescue. What back up equipment are the 20 pumpers designed to carry?
- (5) Will the brigade be turning out the heavy rescue/salvage tender as a precaution to all rescue incidents or will it be a wait and see situation?
- (6) Nine of the pumpers will be carrying crash-lites of very large candlepower designed specifically for rescue work, but according to the brigade plan the other 11 will use the lighting system currently provided which consists of one 100 watt globe on a stand, three dolphin torches and a hand-held spotlight attached to the vehicles, and as the WAFB is responsible for lighting at the scene of an emergency when will the 11 pumpers be fitted with crash-lites?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister for Emergency Services has provided the following reply -

- (1) If the heavy rescue/salvage tender were involved in salvage and a call was received requesting specialised heavy lifting equipment, it would be appropriate to immediately respond with the heavy rescue tender to the primary incident. Salvage is only secondary and can generally be provided by other crews. Rescue equipment is also available on pumpers throughout the metropolitan area.
- (2) It is not intended to dedicate any pumpers. Statistics reveal that the rescue role will be satisfactorily handled by the brigade's current mobilising strategies.
- (3) The combination tool has undergone considerable testing and since it was introduced there has been no adverse comment. The equipment is being used in at least 36 brigades throughout the world and it is anticipated that the combination tool will be found to be satisfactory.

- (4) The equipment to be carried on pumpers will do the functions outlined in this question except for well rescue equipment, which the board has agreed can be carried on appliances where there may be a need for this type of equipment; for example, Spearwood.
The brigade has also advised staff that if it is established specific equipment is needed every attempt will be made to carry it on the pumpers.
- (5) No. Normal mobilising procedures will occur; that is, the first reporting officer will determine what other resources are required.
It is an unsafe practice to have appliances responding under emergency conditions if they are not required.
- (6) The Fire Brigade is not responsible for lighting at traffic accidents. Under normal mobilising procedures two pumpers respond to an incident. The nine pumpers with crash-lites are strategically located. This will ensure that adequate lighting will be available when required.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING - UNEMPLOYED CONSTITUENT *Plumbing Apprenticeship Assistance*

283. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Employment and Training:

I refer the Minister to a dilemma faced by a constituent who is 23, unemployed, married with one child, and who receives approximately \$320 a week on unemployment benefits. He has had the chance to begin a first year plumber's apprenticeship on \$240 a week.

- (1) Does any scheme exist whereby such a person can be given support to allow him to take the apprenticeship but retain his present income level of \$320?
- (2) If not, will the Minister consider all options that might be open to a person clearly desirous of returning to the work force but who cannot maintain a wife and child on the \$240 a week offered?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) I thank the member for giving some notice of the question. A first year apprentice plumber receives approximately \$235 per week, including tool and travel allowance. The adult minimum wage under the building and construction award is \$248.80 per week and that amount would be payable to the member's constituent. The Commonwealth Department of Social Security administers a family allowance supplement scheme to assist families on low incomes. Under this scheme, and if the member's constituent is renting accommodation from a private source - that is, not Homeswest - he is entitled to claim up to a maximum of \$36.20 a week in rent assistance. In addition, his wife is entitled to claim \$26.20 per week for one child under the family supplement allowance. This would raise the family in question's income to approximately \$312 per week; however, the exact allowance would be subject to application to the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. The State Department for Community Services offers financial assistance to applicants with dependant children who qualify for a health care card. The assistance is for an extraordinary crisis or special needs and is considered on individual merits.
- (2) I recommend that the member's constituent make inquiries with both the Commonwealth Department of Social Security and the State Department for Community Services to establish his entitlements under his changed financial circumstances.

DEFENCE - RESTRUCTURING
Western Australian Effects

284. Hon REG DAVIES to the Leader of the House:

Has the Leader of the House been informed of what effect the restructuring of the defence forces will have on Western Australia?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

No.

BUSES - SCHOOL BUSES
Perenjori - Bus Route Changes

285. Hon MARGARET McALEER to the Minister for Education:

I refer to a deputation comprising members of the Shire of Perenjori and the Perenjori Parents and Citizens' Association which appeared before the Minister for Education on 13 March 1991.

(1) Is the Minister aware that neither I nor the representatives of that deputation have received a written response to the requests made by that deputation concerning the proposed changes to bus routes in that area?

(2) Has a written response been made; and, if not, will the Minister find out the details of the matter for me?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

Yes, I did meet with that deputation in Geraldton. Rather than request that the member put the question on notice I undertake to follow up this matter. I would have hoped that the matter had been settled and agreement reached with the local bus committee.

SOBERING UP CENTRES - POLICE CELLS DETENTION
Drunken Persons' Legal Status - Question Out of Order

286. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Attorney General:

I refer to the answer supplied by the Minister for Education to question on notice 481 concerning sobering up centres in Western Australia. The Minister for Education, representing the Minister for Health, indicated in her reply that a purpose built sobering up centre would be operational in Halls Creek by the end of 1991 and that the negotiations with the community in Fitzroy Crossing indicate that a sobering up centre would be operational in early 1992. If police apprehend drunken persons in those places and then hold them in police cells, what is their legal status while detained?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

To the extent that I am being asked for a legal opinion, I think this question is out of order. However, I take the opportunity nonetheless to refer the member to the fact that the question of the status of drunken persons held in prison cells without being charged, pending the availability of sobering up centres, was dealt with exhaustively in the debate on the decriminalisation legislation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That question was out of order because it was seeking legal opinion.

UNDERWATER WORLD SENTOSA, SINGAPORE - GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT
Question on Notice 322 - Answer

287. Hon GEORGE CASH to the Leader of the House:

When may I expect an answer to question on notice 322 addressed to the Premier on 30 April 1991 which sought information on the Government's involvement in Underwater World at Sentosa Island, Singapore?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier has provided the following reply: The member can expect an answer to question 322 on the next sitting day of Parliament.

SCHOOLS - OPENINGS

Members' Invitations

288. Hon REG DAVIES to the Minister for Education:

(1) When the Minister opens a new school, are members who represent the area in which that school is located normally invited to the opening of that school?

(2) If so, who is responsible for issuing the invitations?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(2)

I have opened only one school since I have been Minister for Education.

Hon Reg Davies: That is right. I saw your photograph in the newspaper.

Hon N.F. Moore: And the Government is about to close 27.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Usually a question implies some criticism and I do not know whether that is the case with this question.

Hon P.G. Pental: It is just that you are touchy.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I just hope an omission has not been made.

Hon Barry House: You are suspicious.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: No; I am sensible and base my comments on experience. I presume the member has some reason for asking this question.

Hon E.J. Charlton: He wants an answer.

Hon Reg Davies: I was not invited to the opening of that school.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Was that school located in the member's electorate?

Hon Reg Davies: Yes; it was at Ballajura.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: The lower House member who represents that area was present. I do not think any upper House member was present. However, I do not know which members were formally invited. I am sorry about that. I will thoroughly investigate the matter.

Hon Reg Davies: It is rare to see a new school opened.

SCHOOLS - SCHOOLS RENEWAL PROGRAM REPORT

Closure - South West Schools

289. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Education:

Can the Minister name any schools in the south west which are earmarked for closure as recommended in the schools renewal program report?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I have made it clear on many occasions that the schools renewal program report has been released for public discussion. I have written to all members and asked them to contribute to it. It will be a contentious report to implement in some cases, but in other cases it will not be.

Hon P.G. Pental: Just do not close down schools in my area.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Some schools may welcome amalgamation. The member should not commit himself too quickly.

Hon P.G. Pental: Just as long as it is not Carson Street.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: There are more schools than the Carson Street School in the member's electorate.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister will perhaps agree with me that if I could keep members quiet she would be able to answer the question.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Mr President, it would be uninteresting, but I will do my best.

It is necessary for people to understand the process involved with the schools renewal report and that community involvement will be required. If the member has schools in his electorate that he thinks will benefit from the schools renewal process, I will be pleased to hear from him. I do not have a list of targeted schools. As I indicated previously, the initiation of such a process could come from the local community, the district education office or the central office of the Ministry of Education. If that is what the member would like instituted in some parts of his electorate, I would be happy to discuss that with him.

SCHOOLS - BENDER, BALINGUP SCHOOLS, SOUTH WEST
Future - Community Consultation

290. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Minister for Education:

When will consultation take place with the communities on the future of the schools at Bender and Balingup in the south west?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I reiterate that the report is out for public discussion and that that is an important phase in this process. As soon as the Government has assessed the responses to the report it will be in a position to make a determination on the way it will proceed with this program. I am presuming that the member has identified schools with falling enrolments.

Hon Barry House: I am referring to schools which feel they are under some sort of threat.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: It applies to schools which have a very low student population and there is a question about the breadth of the educational experience of those students. We would expect in those circumstances that parents might wish to initiate such an action. Certainly there is no program of initiating the debate at present. We need to go through this period of public comment on the report. If members are concerned about it I would like them - especially Hon Eric Charlton, who has mentioned it on more than one occasion - to forward a submission on the report. It is important that members do that. I will advise the House of the Government's position on the report and the matter will proceed along those lines. There is no timetable or list of targeted schools. Perhaps members know of some schools in their electorates which might benefit from the proposal.

I spoke with a group of teachers the other day and I reflected on my education experience and, to some extent, I experienced the same process we are foreshadowing under schools renewal. As a youngster I attended the Muchea school which, like the Bindoon and Chittering schools, was subsequently closed. The students were transported by bus to Bullsbrook District High School. I suppose that is the same process as schools renewal.

Hon George Cash: Did it affect your education?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: It exposed me to a fuller and more interesting education. Instead of having children from all grades in the one class we had students in standards 7, 8, and 9 in the one classroom and we were taught by the teacher and the principal. I would not have had that education experience in a small school. A number of people I have spoken to believe that schools renewal is a process we should have.

Hon E.J. Charlton: The travelling will be greater for the students under this proposal, but Hon John Halden did not have the capacity to understand.

Hon John Halden: Rubbish! Read the report and do not make stupid comments.

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: Hon John Halden has a great capacity to understand, regardless of whether the member agrees with him.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members must understand that not only do members who ask questions have to conform with the rules, but also so do Ministers who are answering them. It starts to get one sided when I suggest to the member that his question is out of order and in the next breath the Minister provides a long winded answer which has little, if anything at all, to do with the question. The Minister may make funny noises, but we have to be fair about it.

SCHOOLS - BENDER, BALINGUP, WOODANILLING SCHOOLS, SOUTH
WEST

Future - Community Consultation

291. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Education:

My question follows on from the question asked by Hon Barry House. Schools such as those at Bender, Balingup and Woodanilling were recommended to the then Minister for Education to be closed in 1989, but a decision was deferred until the schools renewal review was completed. Will those schools be advised about their future before the end of the 1991 academic year?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

If some schools are feeling a degree of uncertainty or anxiety about their future, I will ask staff in the Ministry of Education to monitor that situation so they will be in a position to indicate to those schools, before the end of the year, whether there is a proposal to change their status in 1992. Would that assist?

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Is the Minister saying there will be consultation this year?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN: I do not want ministry staff consulting with every school throughout Western Australia, because most of them will not have their status changed. There are two processes whereby that will happen. The first is through the classification process and the second is through the schools renewal program. If members are aware that school communities are feeling somewhat anxious about their future standing I ask them to advise me and I will ask the ministry to monitor the proposals for those schools. The ministry will be able to gauge the situation and be in a position to advise those schools so identified what their standing will be in 1992, and that will be done before the end of 1991.

SCHOOLS - BENDER, BALINGUP, WOODANILLING SCHOOLS, SOUTH
WEST

Future - Community Consultation

292. Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON to the Minister for Education:

The schools I nominated - Bender, Balingup and Woodanilling - went through the process of consultation in 1989 and a recommendation was made to the then Minister and the schools were advised they would be closed. A decision was subsequently taken to defer the closures until after the schools renewal report was completed. I now ask the Minister whether those schools which were earmarked for closure in 1989 will be advised about their future before the end of this year?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I thank the honourable member for being more specific. I am happy to have the three school communities reviewed and to indicate to them before the end of this year what their future might be.
