

Legislative Council

Thursday, 8 December 1983

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 11.30 a.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. Margaret McAleer, leave of absence for six consecutive sitting days was granted to the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) on the ground of ill health.

ACTS AMENDMENT (ASBESTOS RELATED DISEASES) BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.44 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 10.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 20 December.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.45 a.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MICKLEBERG BROTHERS

Surveillance

773. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Is a police surveillance being kept on the residence of Raymond Mickleberg's wife and children at 1 Leach Street, Marmion?
- (2) If "Yes", why?
- (3) Has Detective Sergeant Hancock been authorised to conduct a person surveillance on that residence?
- (4) If not authorised, why was he so occupied?
- (5) Was Detective Sergeant Hancock conducting the surveillance alone or in company?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (5) It is not considered proper that these questions be answered until outstanding matters presently before the courts, involving Raymond Mickleberg and Detective Sergeant Hancock, are concluded.

HOUSING: LAND

Sale: Smith Corporation Pty. Ltd.

795. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Housing:

Further to my questions 731 of Wednesday, 23 November 1983, and 760 of Tuesday, 6 December 1983, will the Minister advise whether the contract referred to is between the Government and Mr Smith personally, or between the Government and Smith Corporation?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Arrangements are between the Government and the Smith Corporation.

HEALTH

Tronado Machine

796. Hon. TOM KNIGHT, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Health:

Further to my questions 702 of Wednesday, 16 November 1983, and

759 of Thursday, 1 December 1983, with reference to the Tronado machine—

- (1) Has the Minister received a reply from his Federal counterpart, Hon. Neal Blewett, with regard to health funds for cancer treatment by the Tronado machine?
- (2) If not, is the Minister aware that a spokesman for the Federal Minister gave the *Albany Advertiser* a departmental release on the subject last week?
- (3) Will the Minister institute a departmental inquiry into the use of the Tronado machine following the approval of the Tronado treatment in America recently by the Bureau of Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Part 4 of my answer to the member's question 759 on 1 December 1983 was quite specific. The Minister for Health has not received a reply to his request to review the decision to reduce benefits for Tronado treatment. A communication outlining how benefits will apply has been received. There is no change in that position to date.
- (2) No.
- (3) The Minister's advice from the United States is that the sale of microwave apparatus to induce hypothermia in the treatment of cancer was for research purposes only, although it is understood a system will be given a general licence at an early date. The Government has and will continue to support the Cancer Foundation's proposals to conduct clinical trials into the use of hypothermia in the treatment of cancer in Western Australia.

ELECTORAL

Provinces: Area

797. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

Will the Minister please supply a list showing the area in square kilometres of all the Legislative Council Provinces in Western Australia?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The Minister will answer in writing.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Parking: Heirisson Island

798. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the answer to question 758 answered in the Legislative Council on 1 December 1983, and ask—

- (1) Is it correct that arrangements are in hand to permit a parking area on Heirisson Island?
- (2) If so, at whose request is the parking area being arranged?
- (3) Why is it not considered that parking facilities already installed on the Perth side of the Swan River, adjacent to the island, are adequate for the island's purpose?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (3) From inquiries made with the City of Perth, I understand that there is presently no intention of providing for parking on Heirisson Island.

However, the council is examining proposals to provide easier access to the island.

NOXIOUS WEEDS

Caltrop

799. Hon. W. G. ATKINSON, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

Recent heavy rains in areas affected by the weed caltrop will mean prolific growth of this weed in railway reserves, road verges and areas unable to be grazed by stock.

Will the Minister consider as a matter of urgency—

- (a) the continued protective spraying in these areas by officers of the Agricultural Protection Board;
- (b) using APB officers in a supervisory capacity to oversee spraying conducted by the Main Roads Department and Westrail;
- (c) the spraying of areas along the standard gauge railway with particular emphasis in the Cunderdin Shire?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (a) Where caltrop is proclaimed a pest plant the Agriculture Protection Board will undertake contract spraying of local authority or Government land when requested;
- (b) supervision of pest plant legislation is the responsibility of local authorities;
- (c) the standard gauge line can be treated on a contract basis if requested by Westrail in areas where caltrop is proclaimed a pest plant.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Wards of the State: Caine Family

800. Hon. TOM KNIGHT, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

Following a letter to the Department of Community Welfare addressed to a departmental officer, Mr Renay Grech, from Mr and Mrs A. M. Caine, will the Minister answer the following questions which to this date have been left unanswered by his officers—

- (1) Why did the Department of Community Welfare extend the period of wardship for a further three years from 1 June 1983 when the children were only in care?
- (2) Why was this decision made 10 months prior to the court's order of release?
- (3) Why was there no consultation with Mr A. M. Caine before applying for a so-called extension of care?
- (4) Who attended the case conference on 18 August 1982, at which it appears the above decision was made?
- (5) Does the DCW consider a family's relationship and stability can be generally improved when visits to the children are—
 - (a) for the older three children limited to two hours every two months (12 hours a year);
 - (b) for the younger two children limited to two hours every four months (6 hours a year);
 - (c) that there is no contact between the two younger children and the three elder children between the once every four monthly visits, when the children's visits coincide?

- (6) If so, please explain why?
 - (7) Why have the visits of the two youngest children to their relatives and grandparents been discontinued?
 - (8) Why, in the letter of 12 October 1982, to Mr Caine from Mr P. N. Gorton, is it stated "It is pleasing to note that there has been progress made and I can assure you that my officers will continue to assist you in enhancing the relationship between you and the children", when the details of question (5) are contained earlier in the same letter?
 - (9) Upon whose assessment did Mr Gorton base the following remark—"I am satisfied however that it is not yet appropriate for the children to be returned to your care"?
 - (10) As Government departments and your own office recognise Jane Caine as Mr Caine's present wife, why does the welfare officer at Midland DCW, Mr Renay Grech, take the attitude that "He will not discuss any matter regarding the children with Jane, because she has not got any children of her own and Jane could not possibly be a fit mother for this reason alone"?
 - (11) Why did Mr Grech not refer the Caine's request to have the children for an Easter church camp, to somebody of higher authority?
 - (12) Does a welfare officer have the power to make such decisions without consultation with senior DCW officers?
 - (13) Is it correct that the DCW supervised Mrs Caine's first visit with the children from behind a two-way mirror and also taped the meeting.
 - (14) Is it correct that all the children are being encouraged to call their many care givers Mum and Dad?
 - (15) Will the DCW confirm that the statement made by Mr Caine in his letter to Mr Grech dated 12 April 1983, paragraphs 9, 10 and 11, are correct?
 - (16) Is it correct that the children continually clamour to be allowed home?
 - (17) Will the DCW give specific reasons why—
 - (a) the children are not being allowed home immediately;
 - (b) why visiting for all the children is not on a more frequent basis; and
 - (c) why there is no intention by the DCW to return the two younger children to the family by Christmas 1983?
 - (18) Why is the DCW apparently loath to take any notice of the professional assessment of Dr Gerald Tewfik?
 - (19) As Mr Caine has made a determined endeavour to improve himself by studying various courses on child care, how much cognisance does the DCW take of this change in attitude?
 - (20) Why has the DCW stopped the visits of the three older children to their relatives?
 - (21) Why did Mr Grech tell the child, Debbie, that the two younger children would not be returning home for six years?
 - (22) If this is not correct, could an independent person talk to Debbie in order to ascertain the facts?
 - (23) How did the children become wards when they were placed by the court *in care only with the recommendation to be returned to the parents forthwith*?
 - (24) Can the parents see the welfare department's file on their children and themselves?
 - (25) Why is it that the welfare department can break written contracts with regard to visits with all five children, only a few days prior to the planned visit?
 - (26) Under what Acts and what sections of those Acts can the welfare department retain hold of the five children?
- Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:
- (1) to (26) The member will be advised in writing in due course.

TRANSPORT: ROAD

Deregulation: Kojonup

801. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Minister yet made a decision on the deregulating of transport south of the closed Katanning-Boyup Brook railway line in the Kojonup area?
- (2) If not, when can a decision be expected?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) The Minister assumes that the member is referring to the situation raised in question 395 of 15 September. If his assumption is correct, the answer is "Yes". I understand the Minister advised the member of the decision in writing on 31 October.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

MINING

Exploration: Landsat

199. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is he aware of any particular instances of mineral exploration in Western Australia being held up because Australia is unable to receive Landsat D signals?
- (2) Has he made representations to the Federal Government for it to complete the station at Alice Springs as originally agreed so that these signals can be received in Australia?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
