

Legislative Council

Thursday, 22 September 1988

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon D.J. Wordsworth) took the Chair at 2.30 pm, and read prayers.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT ACT

Report Tabling - Extension of Time

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have been informed of the following ministerial approval for an extension of time for the presentation of annual reports in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1985 -

The Minister for Conservation and Land Management -

Department of Conservation and Land Management;

Environmental Protection Authority;

Forest Production Council;

Lands and Forest Commission;

National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority; and

Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre Trust.

I table the relevant correspondence.

[See papers Nos 441, 442, 443A-443C, and 444.]

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS

Report - Extension of Time

HON B.L. JONES (Lower West) [2.34 pm]: I am directed by the Select Committee on Charitable Collections to report that important information which will greatly assist the committee in formulating its recommendations will not be available for several weeks. The committee therefore seeks an extension of time for several weeks until Thursday, 27 October. I move -

That the House grant the extension sought and that this report do lie upon the Table.

Question put and passed.

[See paper No 446.]

SPENT CONVICTIONS BILL

Second Reading

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Attorney General) [2.35 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In recent years the Government has taken a number of initiatives to strengthen the provisions of the criminal law and to substantially increase penalties. More recently, the "Beat Crime" campaign has addressed the need for preventative measures as well. There is a third element required in a comprehensive law enforcement package; namely, some positive encouragement and incentives for previous offenders to refrain from further unlawful conduct. While I have referred to this third factor last, that is certainly not to reflect on its relative importance. The appalling incidence of recidivism among offenders is a clear indication to the contrary. Part of our recent amendments to the Offenders Probation and Parole Act was specifically directed to encouraging good behaviour by former offenders. This Bill takes that process a significant step further by providing for the expunging of old criminal records under appropriate conditions and safeguards. The Bill establishes two categories of convictions with different requirements which need to be met before a conviction is spent.

A category of serious convictions is defined as one where the sentence imposed is -
 imprisonment for more than one year or for an indeterminate period; or
 a fine of \$15 000 or more.

A serious conviction can only become spent by order of a District Court judge. An application for such an order cannot be made until 10 years after the date of the conviction plus the period of imprisonment imposed, not the period of imprisonment actually served. In deciding whether to make such an order, the Bill requires the judge to have regard to the following matters -

- (1) The length and kind of sentence imposed in respect of the conviction;
- (2) the length of time since the conviction was incurred;
- (3) whether the conviction prevents or may prevent the applicant from engaging in a particular profession, trade or business or in a particular employment;
- (4) all the circumstances of the applicant, including the circumstances of the applicant at the time of the commission of the offence and at the time of the application;
- (5) the nature and seriousness of the offence;
- (6) the circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence; and
- (7) whether there is any public interest to be served in not making an order.

It should be noted that where a penalty is or includes life imprisonment, the conviction cannot be spent. The second category of convictions are referred to as lesser convictions and these arise where the sentence imposed is imprisonment for less than one year, or a fine of less than \$15 000. If a person who has a lesser conviction incurs a serious conviction, the lesser conviction, for the purposes of this legislation, becomes a serious conviction. A lesser conviction becomes spent when the Commissioner of Police issues a certificate that the conviction is spent. That will occur 10 years after the expiry of any period of imprisonment imposed. The role of the commissioner is simply to examine the application for a certificate and the applicant's criminal record to ensure that the conviction is entitled to be spent. If it is, the commissioner must issue a certificate. This procedure, which has been adopted in preference to a system which could allow a conviction to become spent automatically, will remove any doubts about the precise time when a conviction becomes spent. It will also enable notices to be given to affected persons making clear to them the legal effect of their conviction being spent. In respect of both serious and lesser convictions the 10 year period plus the imprisonment period recommences in full from the date of any subsequent offence. A conviction cannot become spent - other than a conviction for which no penalty or a fine less than \$100 is imposed - if there is a subsequent conviction during the period prior to which an application can be made to a District Court judge or the Commissioner of Police. Where an order or certificate is issued, it must be accompanied by a notice explaining in general terms the legal effect of a conviction becoming spent. The limitations of that effect, for example, the position where an affected person moves to or visits another State, will be brought to attention.

Apart from specified exceptions, the Bill will make it unlawful for employers, professional and trade associations, licensing boards or authorities and employment agencies to discriminate against a person because of a spent conviction. The provisions of the Equal Opportunity Act will apply in such cases. There are, of course, occasions when criminal records are explicitly taken into account in employment situations and by licensing and registration bodies such as the medical, dental and barristers' boards. The Bill therefore provides that regulations may insert a schedule or schedules into the Act, specifying situations in which a spent conviction can, without constituting an unlawful discrimination, be taken into account in employment situations or by licensing boards or authorities. Possible examples where this might occur are provided in the table to section 9A of the Queensland Criminal Law (Rehabilitation of Offenders) Act 1986. This refers, among others, to police, prison and school personnel and to the employment of persons who have the care and control of children.

The Government has decided and undertakes that it will not proclaim a date of operation for

this Bill for at least six months after its passage through Parliament. During that period it will be open to individuals and organisations to make representations for the inclusion of particular categories in the exemption schedules. The Bill stipulates that references to convictions in Western Australian legislation do not include spent convictions. It also provides that questions or Western Australian laws requiring disclosure or acknowledgment do not require disclosure or acknowledgment of a spent conviction or the charge to which the conviction relates. Where a State law permits consideration of a person's character, fitness or propriety to be taken into account for the purpose of that law, the Bill requires that no regard should be paid to the spent conviction.

Exceptions in the Bill to these requirements relate to judicial proceedings, including bail decisions, and the Commissioner of Police when granting a spent conviction certificate. As previously indicated, other exceptions can be included in a schedule to the legislation by regulation. The Bill also creates an offence of unlawfully obtaining from an official record information about a spent conviction. The Bill does not require the destruction or sealing of official criminal records. Those records are important for criminal investigations and, after a much longer time, for statistical and historical purposes.

There are two other matters of detail which require some reference. In the first place, the expungement provisions of this Bill are expressed to apply to convictions incurred before the commencement of the legislation. Secondly, convictions against the laws of other States or the Commonwealth will become spent only on the basis of legislation in those jurisdictions. When that occurs the Bill provides that the conviction will also be recognised as spent for purposes of Western Australian law. At present, Queensland is the only jurisdiction in Australia which has spent convictions legislation.

Mr Deputy President, the Government remains committed to the fundamental proposition that criminal offenders must be appropriately punished. However, it is also believed that people should have the opportunity to be relieved of the social stigma and other consequences of a criminal record where that is justified by blameless conduct for a lengthy period. That is in the interests not only of the offenders concerned but also of the general community as well.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon John Williams.

ACTS AMENDMENT (SPENT CONVICTIONS) BILL

Second Reading

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Attorney General) [2.42 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the Child Welfare Act, the Juries Act, and the Offenders Probation and Parole Act. The amendments are consequential upon the Spent Convictions Bill. The amendments to the Child Welfare Act and the Offenders Probation and Parole Act indicate that the consequences attaching to a spent conviction under the Spent Convictions Bill are also to apply to convictions referred to in sections 20 and 40 respectively of those Acts. The amendment to the Juries Act provides that a person otherwise qualified to be a juror will not be disqualified by virtue of a spent conviction.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon John Williams.

EVIDENCE AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Attorney General) [2.43 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill implements the second part of a model scheme for evidence on commission as

adopted by the Standing Committee of Attorneys General. The first part of that scheme, which was enacted by the Evidence Amendment Act 1987, provided for the taking of evidence in other States in both criminal and civil matters for use in Western Australian courts. This Bill provides for the examination of witnesses within Western Australia to enable their evidence to be used in other Australian and overseas courts.

The Bill will enable -

- (1) the taking of evidence in Western Australia on behalf of other States and New Zealand in both criminal and civil matters; and
- (2) the taking of evidence in Western Australia on behalf of overseas jurisdictions - other than New Zealand - in civil matters only.

When it receives an application from a court outside Western Australia, the Supreme Court of Western Australia will have the authority to order that steps be taken to obtain evidence for the purpose of proceedings in that requesting court. The Supreme Court may, for example, order the examination of witnesses, the production of documents, and the taking of samples. Any such order, however, cannot require anything more than could be required for the purposes of a proceeding initiated in this State.

The Bill also expressly provides that a person cannot be compelled by virtue of such an order to give evidence which he could not otherwise be compelled to give in similar proceedings in Western Australia or in the jurisdiction of the requesting court. The procedure provided for in this Bill will not exclude any other laws in Western Australia which enable the taking of evidence in Western Australia for use in other jurisdictions.

The United Kingdom legislation specified in the last clause of the Bill will be repealed. That legislation has already been repealed in the United Kingdom, but the repeal did not affect those Statutes as they applied in Australia.

This Bill, in conjunction with the 1987 amendments and reciprocal measures in other States, will provide a comprehensive, Australia-wide scheme for taking evidence on commission.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon John Williams.

TAXATION (RECIPROCAL POWERS) BILL

Second Reading

HON J.M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan - Minister for Budget Management)
[2.46 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill has been prepared following extensive consultation between officers of the taxation authorities of all States and the Territories and the Commonwealth Taxation Office to develop legislative proposals which would allow State and Territory taxation authorities to undertake investigations outside their own boundaries, and to enable State and Territory taxation authorities to make investigations on behalf of taxation authorities of other States.

State and Territory taxation authorities already have wide investigative powers, including certain powers of entry, search and seizure, but they have no power beyond that of any citizen to carry out investigations outside the jurisdiction of their own States. Neither is the taxation authority of one State able to exercise its own statutory investigation powers for the purposes of the taxation laws of another State. To ensure that everyone carries his proper share of the taxation burden it is essential that taxation investigators are adequately supported in their efforts to uncover tax evasion. To the extent that individuals do not make their correct contribution to taxation revenue, other members of the public will be called on to carry more than their fair share.

In this modern age documents, records and the like dealing with State taxation issues are not always held in the State to which they relate. Investigations by our own State Taxation Department have occasionally been frustrated because important information has been located outside Western Australia. Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and the Northern Territory have already enacted new legislation to provide reciprocal investigation

powers in accordance with the scheme settled between all the States and the Territories, and I understand that South Australia is presently finalising a Bill for the same purpose.

One of the features of the scheme is that investigation powers may be extended by one State only to those other States which have similar legislation. Unless this Bill is passed, therefore, Western Australia would not be able to take advantage of the legislation which has already been passed in the three other States and the Northern Territory. This Bill is also based on the scheme which was settled between the States and the Territories and, accordingly, is complementary to the legislation which has already been enacted in the other jurisdictions.

The provisions in this Bill are based on the following principles -

- (1) They will apply only to those States or Territories which themselves have enacted similar legislation.
- (2) The Commissioner of State Taxation in Western Australia may give approval for another State or a Territory which does have similar legislation to conduct an investigation in Western Australia subject to such conditions as he may impose or, alternatively, he may carry out an investigation on the other State's or Territory's behalf.
- (3) An investigation officer from another State or Territory taxation authority, and the Western Australian Commissioner of State Taxation, will be authorised to exercise only those investigation powers which are expressed in the Bill. These powers are in keeping with those presently specified in the various Western Australian taxing Statutes.
- (4) Information obtained by the Western Australian Commissioner of State taxation under the provisions of this Bill or the provisions of any State taxation Act may be conveyed to the Commonwealth Taxation Office or to the taxation authority of any State or Territory. In the interests of orderly legislation, the common provisions in respect of the disclosure of taxation information which are presently contained in existing State taxation Acts are being transferred to this piece of legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMENDMENT BILL (No 2)

Second Reading

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [2.50 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

It is with particular pleasure that I bring before the House a new Bill to amend the Local Government Act. It is not often that a Minister of the Crown is given the opportunity to introduce legislation that will bring to fruition a product which has involved such extensive discussions and consultations between States, Territories, local governments and industry and which will have nationwide application and benefits. I refer to the introduction of a standard building code for Australia. In introducing this enabling legislation, the opportunity will also be taken to introduce several minor, but nevertheless important changes to the Local Government Act.

State and Territory Governments in Australia have long supported the notion of a uniform approach to the technical basis for building regulations throughout Australia in the interests of economy and the rationalisation of research and administrative resources. In 1964, the Local Government Ministers' Conference established an ad hoc committee as the first step in achieving this objective. This committee produced the Australian Model Uniform Building Code - AMUBC. Since then, its successor, the Australian Uniform Building Regulations Coordinating Council has, in consultation with the States, local government and the building industry further developed the AMUBC to a point where all States and Territories are now ready to adopt a standard building code. The code, to be known as the Building Code of

Australia - BCA - represents a major advance in establishing a uniform set of technical requirements and standards for the design and construction of buildings and other structures throughout Australia. Its introduction will ensure for the community, acceptable standards of building safety, health and amenity well into the future. It should not, however, result in significant changes to existing building laws in this State or impose needlessly onerous or costly new requirements on builders or developers. The BCA is intended to replace existing uniform building bylaws in January 1989. To this end, it is necessary to provide suitable enabling legislation.

Under the proposed legislation, the concept of uniform general building bylaws will be removed and replaced by a regulation making power. Regulations will be required to formally adopt the BCA and also provide for the establishment of administrative procedures and deal with some technical matters. They will also provide the means to rationalise a variety of subordinate legislation relating to building matters which will assist in the understanding and interpretation of building laws in this State.

The Bill also contains three other amendments, each of which has arisen as a result of legal advice from the Crown Law Department. The first of these concerns the counting of votes at local government elections by electronic means. In recent times several local governments have employed computers to assist in the counting of votes. It is a practice which will continue to grow as more local governments acquire these machines. However, the legality of this practice has been questioned. It seems that as the Local Government Act presently stands returning officers cannot use electronic means to assist in the counting of votes nor should they be using other electoral officers to assist with the count. Clearly, this is a situation which needs to be remedied. Accordingly it is intended that the Act be appropriately amended while still ensuring that the returning officer is in control of the count at all times and that counting is done under his or her direct supervision.

The grading by local governments of private airstrips in remote areas of our State has been a common practice. These works have been justified on the basis that the strips are used for emergency or community purposes such as the Royal Flying Doctor Service. However, recent Crown Law advice has cast doubt on the ability of councils to expend funds for this purpose. Accordingly it is proposed to amend the relevant provisions of the Local Government Act to clarify the legality of such expenditure on airstrips which councils have not necessarily established.

Finally, an anomaly has been found in the Local Government Act in respect of the recovery of rates from the lessees of properties for which rates are in arrears. The relevant provision of the Act limits such recovery to "premises" which is usually interpreted as meaning the buildings. However, it is considered that the principle of recovery should extend to all types of rateable property and for this reason it is intended to amend the Act to reflect this.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon P.H. Lockyer.

VETERINARY SURGEONS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [2.55 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Veterinary Surgeons Act provides for the registration of veterinary surgeons and regulates the practice of veterinary surgery in Western Australia. The Bill deals with professional matters. It seeks to amend certain activities relating to the Murdoch School of Veterinary Studies, and provides for the registration of veterinary specialists. It also increases the disciplinary options available to the Veterinary Surgeons Board. The opportunity has also been taken in this Bill to tidy up some sections of the Act bringing these into line with more modern drafting format where this is appropriate. I will outline the main amendments.

Section 20: A new section 20AA provides for the honorary registration of veterinary surgeons of high standing within the profession who are either over the age of 65 years or of

very long standing. It is intended that this be extended only to those who wish to remain registered but are no longer actively practising in the profession. The amount of money forgone is small and the honorary registration is seen as a small gesture to highly regarded older members of the profession. Honorary registration is available along similar lines in some other States.

A new section 20AB provides for the registration of veterinary specialists. Increasingly, veterinary surgeons are specialising in certain areas, for example, surgery, or ophthalmology, or radiology. They gain the necessary postgraduate experience and formal qualifications and practice in the specialist area by direct access to the public or by referrals from other veterinary surgeons. The public will benefit by this amendment as in future they will be able to recognise which veterinary surgeons have particular specialist expertise. The amendment provides for the prerequisites to be prescribed. The registration of specialists is being carried out in liaison with other States so that there will be a high degree of national uniformity.

Section 23: The present section 23(2a) provides for a range of disciplinary actions which the Veterinary Surgeons Board may impose on a veterinary surgeon who has been found guilty of unprofessional conduct. The amendment will increase the flexibility of the board in dealing with such cases, by permitting the board to impose conditions on the guilty veterinary surgeon's registration or his practice of veterinary surgery. Such restrictions could, for example, limit certain of his professional activities for a time, until he has re-established himself and is able to regain full, unqualified registration. This new power is seen as beneficial in protecting the public.

Section 24A: An addition to section 24A(2)(1) ensures that it is legal for a veterinary student to perform certain limited procedures while at veterinary clinics or hospitals. The current legislation is not clear on this matter.

Section 26A: A new subsection 26A(6) ensures that it is legal for a university to conduct a registered veterinary clinic or hospital. Legal opinion is that the current registration may not provide for the legal operation of the Murdoch Veterinary Clinic. This amendment will put that beyond doubt.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon W.N. Stretch.

ACTS AMENDMENT (STOCK DISEASES) BILL

Second Reading

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [2.58 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill principally seeks to amend the Cattle Industries Compensation Act 1965, in order that the cattle tuberculosis eradication campaign may be carried out more effectively in the pastoral area. The opportunity has also been taken to make minor amendments to the Stock Diseases (Regulations) Act 1968. These two Acts provide the legal power to control and eradicate serious infectious animal diseases and to pay compensation to owners for cattle destroyed as a necessary part of an eradication campaign. This legislation, which has been successfully used widely in the national brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication campaign - BTEC - in the agricultural areas, has been found to be inadequate for tuberculosis eradication in pastoral situations such as the Kimberley. These amendments will overcome these deficiencies.

An amendment to the Cattle Industry Compensation Act seeks to extend the power of the chief inspector to order the destruction of cattle which have been in contact with diseased cattle even though they have not been individually tested for disease. The present legislation permits destruction only where each animal has been diagnosed as being infected. In a pastoral situation where many cattle are uncontrolled individual testing is frequently not possible and all the cattle in some locations may have to be removed.

The Bill will also permit the chief inspector to arrange for the destruction or removal of

infected cattle at the owner's expense where the owner fails to comply with a destruction order. Under these circumstances compensation is still payable to the owner. The Bill provides for the costs incurred by the Crown in destroying cattle, where an owner fails to carry out a destruction order, to be deducted from compensation payable. Thus the owner receives compensation less the costs incurred in destroying the cattle.

New sections contained in the Bill make it an offence for persons to move or trade in cattle which are infected and which are, or have been, subject to a destruction order. This is necessary to prevent the movement of infected cattle and hence the spread of the disease. The amendments to the Stock Diseases (Regulations) Act are to tidy up the present Act by deleting references to the position of assistant chief inspector, as this position no longer exists.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion Hon W.N. Stretch.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 1 September.

HON JOHN WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [3.02 pm]: The complexity of this Bill is reflected in the voluminous notes kindly provided by the Attorney General for the perusal of members interested in the legislation; I thank the Attorney General for that assistance. In truth, this is not a Bill to be debated at the second reading stage; it is a Committee Bill. In the main the 49 clauses in the Bill present no difficulties for the Opposition, which agrees with them for the most part. However, the reforms proposed in the Bill present all members - not just the Opposition but the Government members also - with a number of difficulties. The first attempt at codification of the law was by the Roman Justinian and perhaps before that another book. The work was initiated by the previous Attorney General when he appointed Mr Michael Murray, QC to oversee this review, which the present Government has assiduously followed. Mr Murray has done a remarkable job and is to be commended by this Parliament and particularly by me. Certain elements within the Criminal Code appear to be archaic or overtaken by circumstances. One in particular is the protection of the mail. That is now a Federal matter and I guess we can pass that over.

I advise the Attorney General that the Opposition will propose two or three amendments to clauses 7 and 8 in the Committee stage and these will appear on the Notice Paper before the next sitting of the House. The Opposition will move to include two additional items in clause 7, on page 4, which details the matters which the court shall consider when imposing imprisonment as a sentence of last resort. It will be a cosmetic amendment but the Opposition considers it necessary to include before proposed subsection (1)(d) the words "interests of community" and "interests of the victim". The proposed paragraph (d) would subsequently become paragraph (f). The Opposition considers that the proposed amendments are extremely relevant. Obviously, if I went through this Bill clause by clause in the second reading debate, it would defeat the object of a Committee debate; however, I am advising the Attorney General of the amendments that will be moved.

The Opposition has strong objections to the repeal provisions in clause 8. This clause deals with many things, including sovereignty of the State, which will be swept away. Also, this clause will have the effect that duelling will become legal, since it repeals that section of the Criminal Code; I say this rather facetiously, but perhaps the Attorney General wishes that to be the case. It means that I can challenge the Attorney General to a duel at any time, with the full knowledge that it is legal so long as I do it in a closed atmosphere.

Hon J.M. Berinson: That particular case is a risk I am prepared to take; the general case is adequately covered elsewhere.

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: In amending certain provisions in this way the Opposition will seek the guidance of the Attorney General. Although he said that the duelling aspect is covered in another way, the Opposition doubts that that is the case, unless the clause is reworded.

I note that Mr Michael Murray had some hesitation about deleting the provisions relating to

piracy. Unfortunately, in this day and age although we thought that piracy had disappeared - certainly the cutlass, black patch, and "Yo ho ho" have disappeared - in the South East Asian region closely associated with Australia piracy is a thriving occupation. I do not think that is covered by the provisions relating to robbery in chapter III of the Criminal Code. Some people are currently invading the sovereign waters of Western Australia, and although they are not piratical at the moment, there is no guarantee that boats from South East Asia will not commit robbery or violence against people. We have heard about acts of terrorism which occurred in the Greek Islands, and there has been a revival of piracy in other parts of the world. With modern communication networks piracy could well spread into this part of the world. Already Indonesian fishermen are robbing Australians of trochus shells and whatever else they can lay their hands on. Therefore, the Government must be careful when deleting these provisions. The deletions may perhaps be necessary from a strictly legal, clinical sense, but sometimes such provisions have an important effect if left in place. For example, I have investigated the laws of divorce in five countries in central Europe. They have divorce courts, yet the crime of adultery has remained on the Statute book. In some of those countries the crime of adultery is punishable by death. That penalty is never invoked but it serves to act as a moral reminder to the community that adultery is still an offence; yet it is pleaded here as a defence every day in the Family Court.

Hon J.M. Berinson: That surely means it does not serve any purpose.

Hon JOHN WILLIAMS: I think at times it does to someone who might be wavering and weighing up the odds; it might be a moral check on certain people. I assure the Attorney General that I will not go to the barriers about any of this, but I just want to point out these things.

We also have difficulty with clause 20 with regard to defending religious services. That still presents some difficulties in this day and age. I think the experience in New South Wales of the desecration of places of worship by graffiti experts is well known, and as we become more of a multicultural society some of these clashes may occur in the future. We are in a little doubt about whether we should say that religious services can be catered for in another part of the Criminal Code.

The final difficulty we have is with the question of corroborated and uncorroborated evidence in cases of treason and sexual offences. We see it as a difficulty that a person may be convicted on the testimony of a single person. In a lot of cases where that occurs, scientific evidence is brought to bear to corroborate the evidence given by the single witness. I have a difficulty with one section of the Bill, where it is left entirely to the judge to decide whether he will direct the jury on the question of uncorroborated evidence and whether it can convict on that evidence.

I do not intend to make a meal of the Attorney General's second reading speech. I have said there are 49 clauses in the Bill, which I know will go through the Committee stage. During the recess period I will ensure that the Attorney General gets the amendments we are proposing, and we would seek his cooperation in highlighting some of the difficulties in the Bill which we do not necessarily want to amend but about which we would want to have some reasoned legal argument to convince us that the Criminal Code should be amended in the way the Bill suggests. I think that is the fairest thing I can say to the Attorney General at this stage. The Bill is a great advance, and it tidies up a lot of archaic and unnecessary things, but we must ensure we are not throwing out the baby with the bath water. I know I can get those assurances from the Attorney General because he is a fair minded man, and I promise him I will give him more detail so that when we come to the Committee stage he will be able to either refute or support the arguments put forward by the Opposition.

HON H.W. GAYFER (Central) [3.15 pm]: The Criminal Law Amendment Bill seeks to carry on further the implementation of the Murray review of the Criminal Code. The Bill has nine main features. First, it inserts new provisions into the Criminal Code to strengthen the criminal law and law enforcement procedures against official corruption by either State or local government officers. Second, it seeks to institute a new crime of bribery, which will be created to apply to public officers accepting or soliciting bribes, as well as any person offering or promising a public officer a bribe. Third, public officers will be liable to conviction for the crime of corruption if they improperly gain a benefit for any person or cause any person monetary or other damage. Fourth, it creates the crime of corruptly

falsifying records, certificates and returns of information. Fifth, the offence relating to the administering of extrajudicial oaths has been clarified to make subject to criminal sanction the administration of such oaths without lawful authority. Sixth, the crime of corruptly bargaining for appointment or employment as a public officer is also included in this Bill. Seventh, in conjunction with these measures, the Bill deals with offences against the Governor, Ministers of the Crown and members of Parliament. The Bill also strengthens the provisions relating to bribery of members of Parliament. Eight, measures are introduced to reduce the rate of imprisonment; that is, legislative expression is given to the principle that imprisonment must be the sentencing option of last resort. Nine, the Bill deletes from the Criminal Code a number of provisions which no longer have any practical effect as a result of overriding the Commonwealth legislation or any other specified reasons.

Those nine provisions broadly condense the Bill into its subject matter. There are a couple of points about which I am a little perturbed. The first is to know and understand from the Bill to what extent the proposal deals with the tampering of a witness who is due to appear before a Select Committee. Where is the dividing line between hindering the giving of evidence and advising a witness about how to give evidence? We have seen an example of that in recent times, and I do not intend to go on to elaborate this. I think the Minister knows to what I am referring, without having to draw any great barbs within the House.

The second thing that comes to my mind when I read the Bill is whether it prohibits in any way the intimidation of members of Parliament by their own parliamentary machines; in other words, what about the contract that some members of Parliament are required to sign to tie them to the party line? This Bill aims to prohibit the intimidation of a member of Parliament, yet the people who do this most often are the party numbers men and the lobbyists. So let us be frank. We are supposed to be clearing up these things so that there is no attempt at bribery or coercion, yet there does not seem to be a provision in the Bill whereby a member of Parliament can be protected against intimidation by his own party machine. There is no doubt that wise counsel will be able to answer this.

I am interested also in the point raised by Hon John Williams about the deletion of the requirement for corroborating evidence for sexual offences. Let us not forget the conviction of the so called "30 second rapist" under the new sexual assault laws. Can we be assured that the change here proposed will not have unintended consequences? Cases of sexual assault are very difficult because of the nature of the offence. Under current practice, the accused is normally identified in the media before the case is proved, and the claimant is not identified, even if the case is not proved. We have to be extremely careful that the trial is seen to be conducted fairly. I am not too sure this Bill will allow that to happen. As Hon John Williams said, the judge can virtually direct the jury and that worries me a great deal. Again, assurances from the Attorney General in this respect would be most welcome.

I will conclude by mentioning bribery of members of Parliament, because everything else in regard to protection seems to be mentioned but there does not seem to be anything in the Bill that specifically deals with cases of bribery of members of Parliament. For example, I refer to *The Australian* of 20 September, wherein it states on the front page -

Election campaigns may never be the same again after the new definition of bribery produced by Mr Justice Needham in the NSW Court of Disputed Returns.

His decision, if applied generally, would cost most politicians their parliamentary seats.

It will force all major political parties to reconsider what their candidates can do and promise during an election campaign.

Certainly there are provisions within this Bill to deal with offences against the Governor, Ministers of the Crown and members of Parliament, and the Bill also strengthens the provisions relating to bribery of members of Parliament, but does it cover the situation to which I referred, where a member of Parliament was found guilty of using Government money as bribes during the 19 March election in New South Wales? Members will recall there were dire consequences following those bribes being made.

Another point of extreme interest to me is the police inquiry into Pinkerton's investigations agency. Mr Geoffrey Duncan of that agency was quoted as saying that -

... police and politicians sold information, and his employees - referred to as detectives - "hacked" into computer systems.

This is the sort of thing we are facing today but I am not too sure, even with the amendments proposed by the Attorney General, that these last two points in particular are fully covered so that not only are public officers seen to have to carry the baby but also members of Parliament should be responsible, if they are indeed selling their information to others such as this private detective agency, or if they are accepting moneys or promises to do with elections with the intent of winning elections.

The Bill is awfully imposing, to say the least. I have never professed in this place to having any more than a layman's understanding of law. I apologise for that.

Hon T.G. Butler: That is all you need.

Hon H.W. GAYFER: Hon Tom Butler is himself going to speak eloquently, as I have done, showing some interest in the Bill the Attorney General has brought to this House. Indeed, it is my right to do that. In my unqualified manner I put forward the fact that if we in this place are not very careful, if we continue to frame legislation that gets at everybody else, to put it in common parlance, but absolves the actions of members of Parliament - that gets to the public officers but not to members of Parliament; that tries to put members of Parliament on a different plane from everybody else regarding bribery and corruption; that takes their degree of protection by being members of this place beyond that which is experienced by the ordinary public - then it is time we had a look at the total Bill and not just parts of it. It may well do that, but I am very worried about it. I read the article in *The Australian* before I read the Attorney General's Bill - I must confess that. I do not see that the problems in the case referred to, the Robert Martin case in New South Wales, are covered or guarded against by this Bill.

I would appreciate the Attorney General's answering some of the points I have raised.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Fred McKenzie.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 August.

HON N.F. MOORE (Lower North) [3.27 pm]: Like most members of the House, at the completion of the debate on the Residential Tenancies Bill in December last year I was only too glad to see the end of it. Little did I know that some six months later we would be debating another Bill dealing with residential tenancies. Members will recall that the debate on the original piece of legislation was very long and drawn out and at times very tedious. My final comments in the third reading debate were that the Bill was a disgrace, was badly drafted, should have been taken back and redone, and in fact should never have been passed by the Parliament. We now have another Bill before the House to change one of the major aspects of that piece of legislation. If I were a cynical, unstatesmanlike parliamentarian -

Hon T.G. Butler: Which, of course, you are not.

Hon N.F. MOORE: - which, of course, I am not, I would be inclined to suggest that the Government has quite deliberately delayed the implementation of this legislation; that in fact it has found a reason for delaying it, that reason being the supposed difficulty with the appeal procedures - the supposed difficulty of using the Small Claims Tribunal as opposed to the Small Disputes Division of the Local Court.

During the original debate it was quite clear to me and to most other people who took an interest in the Bill that it was full of all sorts of problems for all sorts of people, and that the day the Government tried to bring it in and implement these provisions would be the day it received an enormous amount of criticism, as many people in the community would be very upset. The community would find out just what was contained in the Bill and what a dreadful piece of legislation it was, and would advise the Government accordingly in electoral terms. That Bill, which was passed in December, has not yet been implemented.

The Government has now found a supposed problem with it and has had to bring a new Bill to the House to change the first Residential Tenancies Act. By the time we finish with this legislation it will be too late to implement it before the next election. People outside this place will not have the chance to judge this Government's new Act in operation.

One needs to look briefly at the history of this Bill and why it has been brought here today. The original Residential Tenancies Bill, which was introduced in the Legislative Assembly in 1987, contained a provision for the small disputes division of the Local Court to be used as an arbiter of disputes relating to the Act. During second reading debate in the Assembly the Opposition spokesman, the member for Albany, supported the idea that the small disputes division of the Local Court was the most appropriate arbiter for disputes under this Bill. The second reading of the Bill was, however, opposed by the Liberal Party, and if one cares to look at the vote in the Assembly at that stage, one will find that the Liberal members of the Assembly opposed the second reading whereas the National Party and Government members supported it. When the Bill reached the Committee stage in the Assembly, the Liberal spokesman, Mr Watt, supported the continuation of the small disputes division of the Local Court in the Bill whereas the Government and the National Party together agreed to insert an amendment which provided that the arbiter would be the Small Claims Tribunal. The second reading speech for this Bill says on the first page -

During debate on the Residential Tenancies Act, the National Party objected to residential tenancy matters being dealt with in the Local Court while the Small Claims Tribunal was available to deal with such disputes. Amendments to the Bill were therefore made which provided for disputes under that legislation to be heard and determined by the Small Claims Tribunal.

The amendments to the Bill at that time were made by the Government and supported by the National Party, so the decision to change from the small disputes division of the Local Court to the Small Claims Tribunal was made by the Government and the National Party. The Liberal Party spokesman, Mr Watt, opposed that amendment. One of the problems in Opposition is that even though we may oppose legislation the temptation is to try to make it better anyway. The view that the Liberal Party took at the time was that Mr Watt argued what is now contained in this current Bill; that is, that the Small Claims Tribunal would not have the facilities and resources to make this Bill work on a Statewide basis. He argued, quite rightly, that the Local Court was best placed for disputes to be heard because the Local Court is situated right across the State. But, for some reason, the Government and the National Party decided to change the original Bill and when the Bill eventually came to this House the small disputes division of the Local Court had been removed and the Small Claims Tribunal had been inserted. No debate took place in this House on that matter in view of the fact that an arrangement had been made between the Government and the National Party in respect of that matter.

I would add here that the Liberal Party in this House was not all that anxious to go out of its way to make the Bill work, in view of the fact that we basically opposed it and had voted against it in the Legislative Assembly. The suggestion has been made to me that if the Opposition were to defeat this Bill today then we could make the Residential Tenancies Act unworkable. That proposition has been put by people who are strongly, and quite rightly, opposed to the provisions of that Act.

Hon Graham Edwards: It could still work.

Hon N.F. MOORE: I am making this speech, and I am saying that the suggestion has been made to me that if we defeat the Bill we could make the whole Act inoperable. If that was the case, I would argue we should defeat the Bill, but because the Small Claims Tribunal could still be used to hear disputes in the metropolitan area, all we would do would be to make the Act inoperable outside the metropolitan area. It would not have the effect, as I would like, of making the Bill inoperable throughout the State. Considerable persuasion has taken place to bring me around to that course - and members will remember the tedious days at the end of the last session - because the Act is a disgrace and should not be on the Statute book. If there was anything I could do to get rid of it, I would do it. But I find it would be to nobody's benefit to have an Act which would work in one part of the State but not in the remainder; that would seem to be unfair to some people, depending on where they lived.

Therefore, the Liberal Party has taken the view that it will not oppose this legislation. We will be consistent with the arguments of the then shadow Minister for Consumer Affairs, Mr Watt, in the Assembly debate and support what this Bill seeks to do; that is, to have the small disputes division of the Local Court inserted into the Act as the arbitration mechanism. Some people will take the view, and promote that view in the community, that in fact had we

defeated this Bill today, we would have travelled some way down the path of getting rid of the obnoxious parent Act. I say to those people they should desist from promoting that argument. To the members of the National Party I say that if they were to consider going to the landlords and saying that they are opposed to this Bill today, and that the Liberals and the Labor Party together passed it - and in that way they were looking after the interests of the landlord - then I ask them to consider also that there would be no Residential Tenancies Act had the National Party supported the Liberal Party when the original Bill came before the Parliament.

One only needs to read, as I have pointed out, the debates in both Houses to find that some deal - to use that four letter word - seems to have been done between the National Party and the Government to have the legislation passed in the first place. To anybody who might be tempted to take on board the view that somehow our support of this Bill today is in any way support of the original legislation I would say that is not the case at all. We have given a commitment as an Opposition to totally review the whole question of residential tenancies as soon as the next election is out of the way and we are running the State again. I guess if there is any degree of comfort which the landlords could take from my comments, it is that no doubt exists in my mind that this Residential Tenancies Act will not be implemented before the elections. The Government has been able to defer for nine months now the implementation of the Act, even though as the Government admitted it could have implemented it in the metropolitan area and used the Small Claims Tribunal. The Government has not implemented the Act because it knows darn well it is electorally unpopular. It is my belief that it will not be proclaimed before the next election, so people can take some comfort from the fact that by changing the Government they may change the circumstances relating to residential tenancies, because a Liberal Government would review the situation and provide for a much fairer arrangement between the two parties to residential tenancies.

Hon P.G. Pendal: It seems to me to be a bit like the hypocrisy of random breath testing all over again.

Hon Fred McKenzie: Have you never had residential tenancy laws before?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I do not know what the National Party's view is, but the Liberal Party will not oppose this Bill, and will vote for it to go through, not because we derive any satisfaction from that happening, but because we are in a position where we need to be consistent with the argument we put forward before that the Small Disputes Division of the Local Court will enable the Act to work. However, I repeat so that nobody misunderstands me, if I thought for one fleeting half second that by defeating this Bill today we could make this Act inoperable, I would be recommending to my colleagues that we do just that. That is not what would happen, so it would be a worthless exercise to go down that path. While we are not supportive of anything in this legislation, we will not oppose the Bill.

HON GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan - Minister for Consumer Affairs) [3.42 pm]: I accept the statements made by Hon Norman Moore in speaking on this Bill, and I certainly understand that his position has not changed. I understand his opposition to the parent Act and I accept that his party is acting in a consistent manner. Let me also say that if this Bill did not get through Parliament I would move to implement residential tenancies legislation on a restricted basis, applying only to the metropolitan area.

Hon N.F. Moore: Why haven't you done that before now?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: Because we want the Act to operate across the whole State. It was one of the options that I considered and, as I said, if this legislation were to be defeated I would move immediately to implement that Act in the metropolitan area. It seems to me that this is not an appropriate thing to do when we have the avenue that is open to us here today.

The debate on the original legislation may well have been long, drawn out and tedious. It was also a very difficult debate and a very difficult Bill to shepherd through the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. The difficulty for the Government is that if we come to Parliament with a Bill with a closed point of view, in a situation where we are not prepared to consider amendments, we are castigated. We came to Parliament with a difficult piece of legislation which we attempted to have passed because it would be of real benefit to the people of the State. We came with an open mind and a sense of cooperation, and

willingness to listen to different points of view and, from time to time, to act on those points of view. That is exactly what happened. Indeed, when this amendment was put in the Legislative Assembly the then Minister for Consumer Affairs said that he thought there would be some difficulty in implementing it. Certainly that has been the case. To proceed and implement the parent Act would be cumbersome, costly and inefficient. Because of that I felt there was no course open to us but to bring this Bill to Parliament and seek to put the dispute mechanism back into the area where we initially felt it should be, with the Local Court.

I cannot turn Hon Norman Moore away from his cynicism; all I can do is to say that we have not delayed the implementation of the Act. We have had difficulties with it. It was not intended to be implemented until June or July so we are not far behind our initial target. I think Hon Norman Moore must recognise that -

Hon N.F. Moore: You must expect to have trouble with that Act because it is such a terrible piece of legislation - it is very badly drafted.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: I expect there will be difficulties when the Act is first put up and running, but I also expect those difficulties will sort themselves out within a fairly short time.

The other thing I should remind members is that this is not legislation just for tenants, but also for landlords.

Hon N.F. Moore: It favours tenants.

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS: It is certainly with that in mind that we have addressed the whole subject. I appreciate the frank remarks of the member opposite, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 pm

[Questions taken.]

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from 21 September.

HON W.N. STRETCH (Lower Central) [4.08 pm]: During this debate on the Estimates of Expenditure I would like to address several factors which affect my electorate. I had not intended to but decided to do so after listening to the speech in the adjournment debate last night relating to a newspaper editorial. I have no criticism of the Opposition's treatment by the Press. As in a football match, people play by the rules, they know what the rules are and they may not agree with them but they follow those rules when they play the game. In view of the fact that a member has been selective about reading an editorial, I refer members to an editorial which appeared in the *Sunday Times*, indicating that voters would make their own decision on WA Inc. It stated -

While the State Government merrily plays monopoly with real money, West Australians can only stand as distant and baffled spectators.

It went on at great length, concluding with the following sentence -

Governments are not elected to wheel and deal. They are elected to govern.

Hon Graham Edwards: I wish you would remember that Governments are elected to govern when we are trying to put legislation through this House.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The Minister for Consumer Affairs cannot complain about the treatment given to legislation in this House. I very much regret the headlines in this morning's newspaper, and I think that if more people listened to the debate in this House rather than in the Legislative Assembly they would have a better opinion of politicians than is reflected in the article.

Hon Graham Edwards: We must all share the blame in some way; if we keep saying that it is the other person who behaves badly, we shall never get anywhere. The standing of politicians in the community is very low and we must all accept responsibility for it.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I am not arguing with that point. I agree with the editorial in the *Sunday Times* that Governments are not elected to wheel and deal, but are elected to govern. That is exactly the point Mr MacKinnon was pursuing in his remarks.

Hon D.K. Dans: Your Government has done more wheeling and dealing since the beginning of time in the local, national and international arenas.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: On a minor scale perhaps.

Hon D.K. Dans: On a worldwide scale.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: That is a far cry from a billion dollar petrochemical works which is considered to be worth \$750 000. Those are the sorts of deals that we are pursuing.

Hon Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I do not know what the member is talking about. I could not understand why he brought it up last night, and I cannot understand him now.

Hon Graham Edwards: He did not bring it up. It was in the paper.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The member should read *The Australian* of 17 August 1988, which states under the heading "WA Inc operations cause for alarm" that -

FAR from justifying its business activities, the purported profit of the main arm of WA Incorporated, the State Government Insurance Commission (SGIC), raises new questions.

One can be as selective as one likes, and it makes the quotation last night quite absurd. There is a balance in all these things. Members of Parliament have always disagreed with the way they have been represented or, as I said, misrepresented in the Press, and nothing has changed, but it was a very peculiar action to bring it up last night.

Hon Garry Kelly: Do you not think it was worth noting?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: It might have been of interest to the member but it was of no interest to anyone else and was treated with the contempt that it deserved.

Hon T.G. Butler: What - the editorial?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: No; what was behind it.

Hon T.G. Butler: We know what was behind it - the innuendo of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: We also know what was behind it.

Hon Graham Edwards: What was behind it? I do not know. I am a bit naive.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The Minister would not know. We know members opposite are all snow white. What it leads to is the desire by general populace to question what has happened to government in Western Australia in the past five years.

Hon D.K. Dans: What you are really saying is the Liberal Party machine cannot any more manipulate the Press in this State.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: That is a scurrilous thing to say. That is an absurd statement.

Hon Garry Kelly: That is the truth.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I am concerned about where the power of the people has gone in all of this. The fact is that under the Labor Government - which purports to be the people's Government - the people have lost total control of the Executive; it has moved further and further away. We now have Government departments dealing in high finance and not being responsible to the Parliament.

Hon T.G. Butler: Successfully dealing in high finance.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I will get to that success in a moment. People are losing control of what this Government is doing with their money. It is not the Government's money. The

Government does not have money, and everybody seems to now understand that with ever increasing clarity, except perhaps the Executive arm of this Government. What concerns me is that since 1983 the people have lost control. They do not know what is happening because they are not being told, and the Government has no intention of enlightening them. They are fed with controlled Press releases, which is the only side of the story they get. The Opposition has been branded as whingeing, whining and generally being negative, and the people have been misled by this Government to believe that the Opposition has no role except to say how marvellous the Government is.

Hon Graham Edwards: That is the root of the problem. Where is the evidence?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: There is a ton of evidence. This is exactly the point: When the Opposition mentions anything, members opposite are like a mob of parrots, sitting on a fence, saying it is all innuendo and smear, and asking us where are our facts.

Hon T.G. Butler: Where are the facts?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Try a cheque for \$5 000 from the Teachers Credit Society to the Labor Party.

Hon T.G. Butler: What about it?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Is it not a fact?

Hon T.G. Butler: Yes; as it turned out it was.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: It was not a smear, nor was it innuendo; it was a fact.

Hon T.G. Butler: So what?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The member asked where are the facts. We have presented the facts. We have a pack of evidence, and we will bring it forward, but instead of that all we get when we try to raise an issue is this namby-pamby nonsense about smears and innuendos and facts. We will give the facts.

Hon T.G. Butler: You have not hoodwinked *The West Australian*, which was quite clear on the position of innuendo.

Several members interjected.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: My concern is, where do the people of Western Australia come into all of this?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon D.J. Wordsworth): Order! I believe the speaker on his feet can handle one or two interjections at a time but they are now coming from four or five directions.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Members opposite are like a flock of cockatoos flying overhead; one tends to ignore it after a while. I am concerned about where the people of Western Australia fit into this. They have been totally ignored by this Government. They have been used as pawns and to raise funds in this financial game of the Government. Hon Tom Butler raised the question not long ago about wheeling and dealing. This matter was raised with me fairly recently when I was door knocking. A wage earner made the same sort of comment as the one made by Hon Tom Butler. He said, "If Governments are turning \$1 into \$2 I suppose it is not a bad deal." I asked, "What if the Government turns \$1 into 20c?" This has happened in several instances, and I will not go into the Danbury deal because it is a question which is being adequately handled in the other House.

Hon Graham Edwards: That is a joke too.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: It was a joke.

Hon Graham Edwards: It was 57 questions, was it not, and what was behind the questions - nothing!

Hon W.N. STRETCH: A very severe loss to the taxpayers. I go back to the people I was speaking to when I was door knocking. I asked, "What about these losses? Would you be happy if your Government took your money to the race track or to Kalgoorlie and was prepared to put it all on a horse or on the two up?" I was told, "Hang on; that is not on. We know that Governments are not there to gamble." So I asked, "Will you be happy if the Government puts money on the Stock Exchange and into companies that fail?" I was told, "No way. We only like it when the Government turns \$1 into \$2." I said, "Yes, exactly."

I regard Parliament and the Government as the custodians of taxpayers' money. The Government is not here to gamble. If it can make only 12.5 per cent or 13 per cent on the daily rate money market, so be it. It is not moral for Governments to go chasing high interest rates. It is not the Government's money to gamble with. It is the people's money and should be kept in trust and used for their benefit. This brings me to another question asked of me when I was door knocking: "What is the Government to do with the money?" I have a simple suggestion: Rather than raising taxes by 19 per cent last year, the Government should have left the money in people's pockets for them to decide how to spend it.

Hon Graham Edwards: How did you work out it was 19 per cent?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Quite easily. The taxation take of the Government last year increased by 19 per cent.

Hon Graham Edwards: What about the increase in business activity, and all that sort of thing? What percentage did you allow for that?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I accept that, but the fact is if the Government is generating surpluses, for whatever reason, be it to bail out companies of whatever nature, those funds should go back into the community to work for people who like to work for themselves. Let us not hear any more of this capitalist and worker nonsense. Every capitalist is a worker - that is why they become capitalists - and every worker is a capitalist. We are all working for everything we make. We all have our own schemes and little investments. That is a fact of life. That is progress and part of the improvement in the standard of living that we have all worked for and achieved.

Hon Graham Edwards: The difference is that we do not mind sharing it.

Hon G.E. Masters: Sharing it with whom?

Hon Graham Edwards: I do not mind sharing it at all.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I will leave that question hanging in the air. It is a beauty - sharing it with whom!

My concern is that the people are being left out of all this. I hope they will be well enough informed to decide. "Let the people decide" has been a great Government catchcry. I hope the people are given the facts of what this Government has done and what it has not done, and how it has built up incredible surpluses from high taxation to gamble with those people's money.

On several occasions I have had cause to express concern at the amount of road funding coming into Western Australia and the way in which it is being spent. Those members who have had time to read the *Daily News* this afternoon will note the virtually full page feature on page 8 headed "Outrage as death stalks our horror roads". The article commences -

Bad roads played their part in the death of 800 Australians last year.

There is nothing surprising about that. We know that has been happening; we have sounded the warning bells in this House many times before. I appealed in an earlier speech for the Minister to go to Canberra when the funds were being allocated and to put the case very strongly for Western Australia because of its absolute dependence on its road system. Hon Jim Brown then said that we really had nothing to complain about because road funding to rural areas had increased. That is not what I had been told so I did some further checking and I am able to lay that assertion to rest right here and now. A media statement of 2 August 1988 said -

Transport Minister Bob Pearce said today that Western Australia's share of Federal road funds in 1988/89 would be \$153.9 m.

And a little later -

Mr Pearce said that the reduction in funding for roads was disappointing . . .

The Government's own Minister said it was disappointing, but then we come to the saver. In a later paragraph the media statement continued -

Local Government had gained.

What a joke! Members opposite should go down the Terrace and tell the Country Shire

Councils Association just how local government has gained. The media statement then gave one of those masterpieces of journalistic artistry, not by the accredited media but by one of the Government's media writers. It said -

Local Government had gained. Though total road funding would decrease in 1988/89, the funding for local roads would be increased to maintain spending in close to real terms.

Members opposite should analyse that - it says funding would be increased in close to real terms. In real terms it dropped by 2.2 per cent, so we had an increase of minus 2.2 per cent; that is really what is being said. This is what concerns me about the whole of the Government's operations. We are being governed by a media Government, we are not getting the facts, as any person with an ounce of intelligence and time to study these statements will understand. We are being fed these media releases which talk about losses as being increases or close to it in real terms. They are blatantly losses in real terms, that is the hard fact.

I have extracted from the Federal Budgets the total road funding figures from 1982-83 to 1988-89. There was a very large increase in 1982-83 because that was the year in which the Australian bicentennial road development program started. The figures relate to total road funding for Western Australia. In 1982-83 we had an increase of 29.1 per cent; in 1984-85 an increase of 1.7 per cent - this is when the Labor Government in Canberra really got going; in 1985-86 the Labor Government really got into swing and dropped the funding to a decrease of 4.1 per cent; in 1986-87 there was a decrease of 9.2 per cent; in 1987-88 a decrease of 7.2 per cent; and the projected figure for 1988-89 is another decrease, this time of 2.1 per cent. So there has been a steady drop, except in 1986-87 and if my memory serves me right that just happened to be an election year.

Let us now look at local road funding, where Hon Jim Brown said we had had fantastic increases in real terms. In real terms in 1983-84, the first year of the ABRD program - which was planned by the Fraser Government, the money put aside and the program implemented by that Government and, to its credit, carried on by the Labor Government - local roads received an increase of 35 per cent. In 1984-85 when Labor was getting going again the figure was minus 8.2 per cent; in 1985-86 it was minus 1.8 per cent; in 1986-87 it was minus seven per cent; in 1987-88 it was minus 7.1 per cent; and in 1988-89 the projected figure is minus 2.2 per cent. So when they say we have had an increase, what the media officers of the Government mean is that really we have had a nominal increase in money. So we have, but in real terms - in real dollars, in purchasing power - we have had a steady list of cuts ever since the Labor Party came to power. The Government's own Minister acknowledges this; he is concerned, and rightly so. I do not think the Government can be dinkum about rural roads. We know the voice of country people has been diluted considerably. We know that under the new electoral reform Bill - if it can be called such - our electoral clout will be even less.

Hon Garry Kelly: It is about 3:1 in this place.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: That 3:1 does not go anywhere near addressing the injustices that have been inflicted on country people by the Government.

Hon Garry Kelly: Oh, rubbish!

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Hon Garry Kelly can come wandering in here like a lost cow -

Hon Garry Kelly: You are speaking like a lost cow.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Maybe so, but I happen to have a list of figures, which the member did not take the time to listen to, which prove that this Government has cut road funding to country areas ever since the Labor Party has been the Federal Government. That is not looking after rural areas.

Hon Garry Kelly: I have seen figures quite to the contrary with regard to country road funding.

Hon N.F. Moore: He thinks Midland Junction is the country.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Or anything over the Darling Range; it is quite incredible. I will not go over those figures again, even for Hon Garry Kelly's benefit. I rely on him to read them

in *Hansard*. Rather than read releases from his Government's media officers he should look at a few of the facts that I have set forward. He will see that funding for rural roads in real terms has steadily dropped. It is a disgrace, and this trend must be arrested. If Hon Garry Kelly says that a 3:1 ratio is still a gerrymander or a misrepresentation, I would say that it will have to be much more than that before this Government takes any notice.

It is not only in the area of road funding that country people are being disadvantaged. I have been very concerned, as have all rural members, at the downturn in country towns and the difficulties that those towns face in keeping their populations. There are many reasons for it, all of which have been canvassed fairly well before, but one of the major reasons is that it is very difficult to find employment for our younger people to keep them in those areas. It is not just a question of the lure of the bright lights, because they go there to find employment.

In Wagin a local fellow came to me and we worked out a scheme where we had apprenticeships lined up with companies. The young people were ready to commence work; and a meeting took place between parents and an advisor from the Department of Employment and Training. The meeting on the Monday night was very constructive and useful. On the Tuesday night we heard the state Budget presented and I could not believe my ears when I heard the Treasurer - the former Minister for Employment and Training before the reshuffle - announce that he had cut out the 50 per cent subsidy on workers' compensation for first year apprentices. This may be a small charge but it does discourage businesses taking on apprentices. On the Monday night before we had listened to the officer from the department explain how certain schemes help employers, and the employers had not realised those schemes existed. Then within 24 hours they had lost one of the incentives for country industry to retain people in the work force. I was angry because this represents a raw deal for country areas. In talking with the Minister for Employment and Training we were told that apprenticeships are being undertaken in areas where people are not needed. That is not valid because I believe that a well designed apprenticeship scheme can be targeted to particular areas where the need exists for apprenticeships. We could have a graduated scheme, and I call on the Minister to consider this proposal.

A widespread feeling of goodwill exists within country towns together with a genuine concern for young people. There is a genuine willingness to take on apprentices where possible. Unfortunately interested companies are hampered by red tape and the difficulties involved in training young people. Group apprenticeships are a good idea in some major regional towns but they cannot work in small towns where quite often only one major business operates and where groups of smaller employers such as one man painting businesses may be 50 or 100 miles apart.

Hon T.G. Butler: Why is that a problem? A single component employer can send an apprentice to Perth; why cannot an employer in Wagin do the same?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: We are aiming to keep young people in the towns. We do not wish to send them away. The group apprenticeship scheme, as I understand it, does not apply where towns are 80 or 100 miles apart.

Hon T.G. Butler: Block release courses operate for technical training with a provision for apprentices to come to the city for a couple of weeks a year.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Yes, exactly; but what does the single businessman painter who has taken on a young man, together with enough work to keep that person in an apprenticeship, do when the apprentice goes to the city for weeks? The difficulty is continuity of work. The business needs to have enough work to take on an apprentice, and having taken him on the employer finds that he cannot do without the apprentice.

Hon T.G. Butler: The requirement is within the apprenticeship system. The employer knows that when he takes on the apprentice. I do not disagree that the system should be refined.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I am glad that the member agrees. Hon T.G. Butler has the opportunity to bring considerable influence into a reasoned debate such as this and to take the matter up with the Government. The apprenticeship scheme is designed for larger towns; I think the member would agree with that. We should attempt to find a system to keep the young people in their home areas for training, a system which will maintain employment within towns. The problem is a major one and gives rise to the high degree of boredom and vandalism in country towns. A reasoned approach should be taken to overcome the problem.

Hon T.G. Butler: I agree that a different approach should be taken to the training of young people.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: That is the plea I am making. This matter may even come within the umbrella of the member's organisation. The training of young people in rural areas should be a separate entity.

Wagin falls within the Rockingham area for the purpose of employment and training, and we do not have anyone to come to us from the employment and training area. An officer came across from Bunbury for discussions. He was very helpful and informative and an instructive evening followed. Our conclusions have been forwarded to the Department of Employment and Training and I hope that some action will come out of that. The reason I raised this matter was my disappointment that the Government has taken away the small incentives to employers. The Minister should be informed of our concerns and ensure that these sorts of anomalies are addressed.

The more perceptive members of this House would have noted my question in respect of the demise of forests in the south west. The planting of hardwoods and pines on private land has been a very sore point in the Shire of Manjimup, which covers Pemberton, because that is a rapidly developing horticulture district. Fourteen per cent of the land in the Shire of Manjimup is rateable; the rest is Crown land and predominantly forest country. The community has supported the new vegetable processing plant, and that in itself is a major industrial fillip for the entire south west region. The throughput of potatoes will increase four times in the next five years, placing a major strain on the availability of land in the shire. Land is a finite asset in any shire but particularly in a shire with such areas of unavailable Crown land. I call on the Government to consider some action to meet that need. At present much of the horticultural land is being planted with pines and hardwood forest so it would seem sensible for emphasis to be placed on a change from planting those trees on horticultural land to degraded available land. Many areas could be utilised in making up the supply of timber stock for industry in the future without any raids being made on scarce resources. I am concerned that we are still planting pines when such large areas of diseased trees are showing up in some already established plantations. That was the reason for my question and I do not believe enough emphasis has been put on research. One can drive between Balingup and Nannup, between Greenbushes and the back route to Bridgetown, and see large areas of dead pine trees through the forest. An estimated 10 to 30 per cent of the forest is affected. We will have a huge loss of resource in those trees. Surely we should call a halt to other plantings until we know what is killing the trees as they reach maturity. From talking with the local people I found out that there seems to be no pattern to the death of the trees. Some of the trees near the rivers are dying; some trees on the top of mountains are dying; and some trees halfway up the mountains are dying. There is no reason for the disease and we do not know how it spreads or the rate at which it spreads. There is some doubt about the commercial use of the trees which have died or are in the early stages of death. I urge the Government to undertake early research into this area. Until we understand what is happening to the existing forest it does not make sense to plant pines and to use land that is desperately needed for other uses.

I will touch briefly on the immigration debate to put it into some perspective. I do not think many members have read Hon John Howard's policy on ethnic affairs and immigration. I do not intend to read from it, but I refer members to the introduction in which he said that one Australia means that whether a person is a fourth generation Australian - like him - or somebody who came from Vietnam five years ago, or Italy 40 years ago, we are all entitled to the same equality of opportunity in this country. That is the nub of the policy, which has been totally misconstrued and misunderstood. I thought the point that would have concerned members of the Labor Party regarding the immigration debate is that we have a large core of unemployed people in this country. We are not training our young people, for whatever reasons; and I hope I have outlined some of them in pointing out the anomalies in our apprenticeship and trainee schemes. It does not make sense to encourage an increase in the pool of unemployed people by bringing in more people from other countries. We cannot cope with the people already in this country. I do not think any Australian wants to see more Australians, of whatever origin, joining the ranks of the unemployed or underemployed. Everyone in this country is entitled, as the policy says, to the same equality of opportunity. We cannot give them an opportunity if the only thing we can offer is a place in the unemployed ranks. That is the nub of the immigration debate as far as I am concerned.

It is most unfortunate that the immigration debate has been taken up hysterically by the Labor Party. When the Labor Party takes up issues in the way in which it has regarding this debate, it loses its head, screams and yells and makes outrageous Press releases. When that occurs we know we are on the ball and that we are telling the truth and that the truth hurts. The Labor Party's immediate reaction to the truth is to embark on a massive slur and innuendo campaign.

Hon Doug Wenn: You are good at that. *The West Australian* said that.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I do not know what the member is talking about - is he the what, the when or the why?

The point I have made is what is concerning most Australians and that is the reason for intelligent comment coming from the Liberal Party in the coalition side of politics -

Hon D.K. Dans: As I recall, the other side of the coalition you mentioned would not join in something the other day in the other House.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: That is quite likely.

Hon D.K. Dans: You should be careful. You use the word "coalition" rather loosely.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I think that Hon Des Dans, like most of his colleagues, has difficulty coming to grips with the freedom of expression and freedom of choice within the conservative parties. We are not dragooned and we are not caucused.

Hon D.K. Dans: I did not say that.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: As members of coalition parties, we are free.

Hon D.K. Dans interjected.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I did not hear the member.

Hon N.F. Moore: He is lowering the tone of debate.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: That is an old tactic he often uses.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Garry Kelly): Order! Members will listen to the member on his feet.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The sort of comment made by Hon Des Dans is exactly what I was getting at. When members of the Liberal Party are getting near the truth of the matter the ratbags start screaming. It is exactly what happened in the immigration debate; it is exactly what happened in the referendum. If members opposite want an exercise in cynicism, let us look at the referendum for a moment.

Hon B.L. Jones: Misinformation and scare tactics.

Hon N.F. Moore: Do you think the Australian people were conned?

Hon Graham Edwards: They will not be conned at the next election.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The thing about the referendum is that the Australian public finally woke up to what the Labor Party is about. I will not spend much time on this subject.

Hon D.K. Dans: I thought the constitutional recommendations came from the Constitutional Commission on which sat many prominent Liberal members, including the former Premier of Victoria.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: A very well chosen commission. The honourable member has been in this House long enough to know -

Hon D.K. Dans: You are misrepresenting the situation. The questions were put to the Australian public as a result of that commission. If you cannot tell the truth, forget about it. You are not telling the truth.

Hon P.G. Pendal: That is the longest speech you have made in two years.

Hon D.K. Dans: Shut up!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Members opposite will have to take their colleague home.

The Australian people were asked to make 38 changes to the Constitution on the basis of four inane and innocuous questions which had no bearing on the changes which were proposed. The Opposition parties were only part of a large ground swell of opposition - it was not just the Liberal Party or the National Party opposing the referendum; it was a huge ground swell of people who realised the wool was being pulled over their eyes; they were counted and were not going to be conned.

Hon B.L. Jones: The Local Government Association wanted changes to local government.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The Australian people chose to ignore what local government thought it wanted. I assume that the Local Government Association -

Hon D.K. Dans: That is why you are in Opposition, you assume too much on behalf of the people of Australia and particularly the people of Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

Hon D.K. Dans: A whole generation of people have passed you by and you still cannot understand it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon W.N. STRETCH: That just shows, Mr Deputy President, that you have the wisdom never to confuse noise with numbers. I am assuming -

Hon D.K. Dans: Don't keep on assuming. If you stop assuming, you will get back into Government more quickly.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Why don't you read what you said in the paper this morning?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I was saying, when I was joined by some very loud supporters - at least I think they were supporters - that if local government had been serious about the issues and been professional in its approach, it would have done some polling instead of taking a straw vote within its own councils. By that means it could have ascertained public opinion. There is no doubt that the Labor Party did some polling. At least a fortnight before the referendum was held, the Labor Party knew that it would be done like a dinner, that none of the referendum questions would be passed, that the people had woken up to its little game and that there was no point in pursuing the matter further.

The Labor Party has a great deal of money available if it wants to promote a cause in which it believes, such as buying the Government benches. The quality of the Labor Party literature that went out in support of the referendum questions was absolutely woeful.

Hon D.K. Dans: The same amount was allocated to the Labor Party as was allocated to the Opposition parties in the Federal sphere - I think it was \$2 million.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: In strong Labor seats the Labor Party could not get enough people to man the polling booths to support the referendum.

Hon B.L. Jones: They were all manned in my area, but not by the Opposition. There were no Opposition members at some of my polling booths.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Is the member's seat a strong Labor seat?

Hon B.L. Jones: It certainly is.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I said that in strong Labor seats the Labor Party could not man the booths.

Hon B.L. Jones: In strong Liberal seats they could not get them either.

Hon D.K. Dans: It was not a political question, Mr Stretch. How much did Mr Hawke, the Prime Minister, engage in the referendum campaign? Ask yourself that.

Hon G.E. Masters: How much did he pay, ask yourself that?

Hon P.G. Pandal: You got done like a dinner.

Hon D.K. Dans: He did not want to politicise it. It is not going to win you the next election federally and it is not going to win you the next State election.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon W.N. STRETCH: For one such as Hon Des Dans, whom I regard as having a great deal of political nous, to say that the referendum was not a political question from the Labor Party's point of view is to display complete and utter naivety.

Hon D.K. Dans: Any sensible person in this country, given the track record of referendums in this country, wouldn't get himself boiled up over it.

Hon B.L. Jones: I think you should let him have his moment to gloat; the Opposition has little enough to gloat about.

Hon D.K. Dans: To get up and make a speech about a referendum when you are trying to win an election is pathetic, absolutely pathetic. You have nothing else to go on.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! It is a very good debate across the Chamber, but we are listening to Hon Bill Stretch.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I am having my battles, but it is all right. I have a little time remaining. The point is that the referendum result demonstrated a resurgence in the power of the people to decide.

Hon D.K. Dans: The votes you got in the referendum won't count in the next election.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The people decided that they would not be conned into listening to this sort of nonsense any more.

Hon T.G. Butler: What were they going to be conned about?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The 34 changes to the Constitution.

Hon T.G. Butler: All through that referendum campaign you people were asked to point out where the 34 changes were and you went mute.

Hon P.G. Pandal: You little no hoper.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The House will come to order.

Hon T.G. Butler: How can you call me a no hoper, you goose?

Hon D.K. Dans: Hey, that's the gutless wonder.

Hon T.G. Butler: It certainly is.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I can see that passions on both sides of the House have been aroused by this question. Hon Bill Stretch is on his feet and I think we should hear him in silence for the next five minutes, by which time he will no doubt have concluded his speech.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I think we should adjust the clocks while we delete the time that was taken by the invisible Hon Des Dans. Now that he has departed, I am quite sure that we will get on a lot better.

Hon D.K. Dans: He has gone back to the French Riviera.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The referendum result was indicative of the resurgence of the power of the people and there is a stark warning in it for the Labor Government. It will no longer get away with the types of media releases it has put out to cover up the facts of matters that are of direct and serious concern to the people of the State. The people have had enough; they are suspicious of what is going on. They are suspicious of WA Inc and want to know what is going on. They want to know what the Government is doing with their funds. They have been hoodwinked into believing that they were contributing taxation to maintain the status quo when in fact the Government was building up a slush fund in excess of \$200 million. That money should have been left in the pockets of the Western Australian taxpayers. It is up to them to decide how they want to spend it for the betterment of their families.

Hon Graham Edwards: How has the Government built up the \$200 million?

Hon W.N. STRETCH: They have had enough of the paternalism or maternalism of this Government.

Hon Graham Edwards: Tell us how the Government built up the \$200 million.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I do not have the time, Minister. The Deputy President informed me

that he wants me to close my remarks by five o'clock. A study of taxation receipts shows that an excess has been built up. The Government admits it. The Treasurer, despite his questionable accounting ability, admits it.

Hon Graham Edwards: Good business practice.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: I would be surprised if the taxpayers of Western Australia thought it was good practice to rip an extra \$200 million off them and invest it in various companies with dubious track records in the belief that it would be for the benefit of the taxpayer and the people of Western Australia. The people would prefer to have a little bit of brass in their own pockets to invest how they will.

Hon B.L. Jones: They had little enough of that under your Government.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: Under this Government, the people have been stripped of their powers. The Parliament has been ignored. We have seen a curious reluctance on the part of many organisations to bring their reports forward to Parliament and to give an account to it because they do not want the people to know what they have been doing with their funds. The people have had enough. They are sick of Government by media release. They are now looking for hard facts.

Hon Graham Edwards: When they look to the Liberal Party they cannot find any facts. It is fiction.

Hon W.N. STRETCH: The people will not buy the sort of Press release from which I quoted earlier which said that the increased road funding allocation was an increase in real terms when it was actually a straight out loss of 2.2 per cent. They were losing money, but were told that they were not. They will not believe that any more. The game is up. The referendum should have proved that to the Government. This Budget is not a good Budget, but the Government will get away with it. It is a highly selective Budget on which the Government will be tried and found wanting. The people deserve to be taken into consideration with respect to how their money is being spent. They will not believe the sort of approach fed to them by the Government over the last five years.

HON TOM STEPHENS (North) [4.59 pm]: It is distressing to see that after the cautionary remarks made by the Leader of the National Party in the other place, the previous speaker has chosen to adopt the same style of negative, carping criticism that brings these chambers into disrepute, particularly in the context of the question before the House: The Budget Papers. This Budget follows a tradition of five years of excellent Budgets that have made for rapid economic growth in this State, that have taken into account the needs of the broadest cross section of the Western Australian community, and have seen an advance within that Western Australian community unparalleled in the history of this State. The various indicators one can look at that flow from good economic management in this State are indicators that cannot be argued. Some of those indicators in fact cause problems for the State in other areas because of the very nature of the rapid growth that has come from sound economic management. The State Government's attention, for instance, at this very moment is being addressed to the issues and difficulties facing home buyers in this State because of the rapid demand for land and homes within the Perth metropolitan area and throughout the country areas of this State, as a direct response to the rapidly expanding economic conditions of the Western Australian community. As well, the employment levels and opportunities that have now permeated throughout the Western Australian community are levels of which we all as parliamentarians, and particularly those on this side of the House, should be very proud.

Hon T.G. Butler: And that they are envious of.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: That the other side is, indeed, envious of. I would not usually put a preposition at the end of a sentence, Mr Butler, but having fallen into that trap I will stick with that. My electorate of North Province encompasses the spectacular regions of the Pilbara and the Kimberley. The growth and development of those two regions is a terribly exciting experience. The last five years have been a real joy for those of us associated in particular with the Kimberley region. I think in the period before I came into the Parliament I did not have clearly focused before me what opportunities would come for a remote region with rapid growth and sound economic growth within that remote part of the State. I suspect that that blinkered vision I admit to having had was shared, and is perhaps still shared, by

many of my constituents who, perhaps like me, in the past have hankered after the way things were or preferred things to stay as they were rather than rushing headlong into too much economic growth.

[Quorum formed.]

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I cannot let this incident pass without making some comment on it. While I admit that within our Standing Orders it is entirely within the rights of any member to call the attention of the President or Deputy President to the state of the House, I say that this Government team would have no quibble with keeping the numbers in this House if the team opposite had ever allowed us to get in this Chamber our legitimate entitlement in terms of the votes that we gain within the electorate and the entitlement that should produce within this Chamber. Members on the other side of the House swamp the Chamber with their numbers as a result of the gerrymander they have succeeded in maintaining in this House and have the cheek, with one of our members presiding over the House and only one member on the Opposition benches, to call for a quorum. The members of the Press gallery should have noticed - I hope they did, and, if they did not, I take the opportunity to draw their attention to this fact - that after the quorum was called some members opposite left the House. I can well appreciate that after the drivel of Hon W.N. Stretch and his pathetic performance just delivered to the House, which made me very cross and which made me respond a bit more vigorously than I generally would, many of his colleagues were bored out of their brains and left the place. They now have an opportunity to hear of the sound economic opportunities that have been delivered to the State of Western Australia as a result of five years of sound economic management of Labor Governments.

I was saying to the House before I was rudely interrupted that within my electorate there are economic opportunities that come with growth, and that growth, as I have said, has come from sound management and attention to opportunity. People have the chance to see within that remote community of the Kimberley the benefits that flow from that growth and development. Within the township of Broome, for instance, there is, I guess, two almost diametrically opposed views of the world; some hankering after the way things were and some anxiously looking for the way things might be. That divergence of viewpoint is juxtaposed against a commonality of interest in seeing facilities arrive in the town that look after all of the community. For instance, in this Budget paper, for the township of Broome we now see the allocation of resources towards the education system that will see the establishment of an additional primary school within the town boundaries to be known, I am told, as Cable Beach Primary School. That, in turn, will be part of an allocation of resources to the Broome area that will lead to the establishment of a senior district high school in the township of Broome, the first within the Kimberley region catering for years 11 and 12.

Hon N.F. Moore: What is a senior district high school, a district high school with a years 11 and 12 component, or a senior high school as such?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It will cater for years 11 and 12 as a senior high school.

Hon N.F. Moore: A district high and a senior high are different things.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: A senior high school. This Parliament seems to be filled with many people with a speciality in education, so I can admit that I should be a little embarrassed, but it is not my speciality, and the shadow Minister has picked me up correctly.

Hon N.F. Moore: I am not trying to embarrass you, I just want to know what you are doing. Is it a senior high school or a district high school?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It is a senior high school which will provide for years 11 and 12. It is the first in the Kimberley region, and a long awaited first. It will come to the township within the next two years and we will for the first time see families able to live within that region and stay united with their children throughout the process of the education of those children. People who have not had to experience the trauma and dislocation associated with the loss of young students from the family home and from the immediate environment to go to school in the metropolitan area may not fully appreciate the tremendous boon which comes from the announcement of a facility such as this in the township of Broome. That particular development for a small population centre, which the township really is - it has round about 6 000 people - is a great development which comes from the economic growth and the growth of population in that area. It is part of many additional facilities that this

State Government has been able to allocate to that region of Western Australia. Even the critics of growth and development, who sometimes get a disproportionate share of the media attention -

Hon N.F. Moore: Who are they?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Sometimes it is the member's own colleagues who are knocking growth and development; anything the Government tries to do for economic growth or development will draw incessant opposition. The Opposition seems opposed to development. Everywhere we turn we find the Opposition knocking development and growth in this State. Every time the Government has tried to bring Western Australian economic growth forward we have had the Opposition attacking us.

Hon N.F. MOORE: At great expense to the taxpayer.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: They are the opponents of and detractors from the economic growth and development that Labor Governments have been endeavouring to bring to this State.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is wrong.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It is sad to see the State so poorly served by an Opposition which cannot see the opportunities and benefits in human terms for even the smaller towns in Western Australia such as Broome.

Hon N.F. Moore: How do you feel about the petrochemical plant being located in the Pilbara?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The honourable member has raised an interesting point. I cannot get it clear from the Opposition; does it want the petrochemical plant or not?

Hon Fred McKenzie: They never tell you.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It seems to me that if this crowd were ever in power -

Hon N.F. Moore: Do you want it in the Pilbara?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Garry Kelly): Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It seems to be a peripatetic one. It would move around from town to town before any election, or from region to region, on the basis of where the Opposition thought it might be able to rake up a few more votes.

Hon N.F. Moore: We say we want it in the Pilbara; you say you want it in Kwinana. I am asking what you want.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: First and foremost I want value added produce coming out of Western Australia. If the only way for the Government and industry in Western Australia to achieve value added in that area is by locating the petrochemical plant in the south of the State, then so it shall be. I will not allow any petty provincialism to intrude into it. Let us hear from the honourable member. Is he saying that what he is encouraging this Government to do is to allocate additional resources and additional compensation to a developer in order to move it into that part of the State and to compensate for the additional cost to make the thing viable? Is that what Mr Moore is saying? I understood the Opposition was opposed to any allocation of resources.

Hon N.F. Moore: You asked me to say something.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I thought the Opposition was opposed to any allocation of resources which could make this project viable.

Hon N.F. Moore: That is not true. We were responsible for the gas pipeline which you criticised.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I am finding Mr Moore's contribution very interesting.

Hon N.F. Moore: I would like to see some development in the Pilbara, unlike you and your colleagues, who are opposed to it.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: There are two points to this. I have been fascinated to watch the

divergence of viewpoints in the lower House between the aspiring Leaders of the Opposition. Not only are there two divergent views in the other place where they are constantly fighting it out, but also we now have a third view from another potential Leader of the Opposition in this place.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This chap is saying to us that not only does he dissociate himself from the criticism of people down that end, but also he is complaining about the allocation of Government resources, effort and energy to ensure that this petrochemical plant comes to Western Australia. He is not only objecting to the allocation of Government support for that -

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This is very germane to the argument.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I think the speaker should address his remarks to the Chair.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Mr Deputy President, I hope you will encourage members opposite to listen to this. In the process of ensuring that this project goes ahead, the State Government has investigated every avenue to ensure that it goes ahead now. That has meant having to rule out uneconomic options such as putting it into the remote parts of the State where additional support would have been required from the State Government in order to make the project viable. No Government has spent more time than this Government in trying to attract the whole energy of industry into downstream processing of our produce.

Hon P.G. Pendal: You will supply your own Press statements.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: In all areas of our activity we have looked at our produce. We have looked at our gold, at our gas, at our iron ore, and even at some of the smaller industries like pearling in the north. We must find ways of adding value to our produce so that we do not remain, as we did in the Court years, as the quarry of Asia, where produce was simply mined out of this place and jobs were created elsewhere as a result of our produce being taken to far flung parts of the world. This Government, as did the Burke Government before it, has focused enormous amounts of energy and great talent to ensure that industry has been attracted, not to the easy solutions but to solve the problems ahead of us.

Hon N.F. Moore: Using lots of taxpayers' dollars.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: A challenging future will come -

Hon N.F. Moore: To Kwinana, where Mr Parker is.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It will come from adding value to our produce, whether it is agriculture, mining or any area of the produce of this State.

Hon N.F. Moore: Give us some examples.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I will. Another area of Government activity which often comes under attack is GoldCorp. Look at what GoldCorp has done under the Premier's inspired leadership.

Hon N.F. Moore: No. It is the rising gold price.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Look at what has been done. GoldCorp has been taking our gold and converting it into nuggets.

Hon N.F. Moore: Into coins.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It is value added produce from Western Australia. It is tremendously exciting. Its officers are not resting on their laurels. Look at platinum. They are currently in Japan and in North America with the Koala coin. That is tremendously exciting for Western Australia. We have taken elements such as gold and established an industry providing saleable items, instead of doing what the Liberals did for years, when we saw the stuff exported out of the State with never any attention to what we could do to create jobs and value for Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: We and the State Government -

Hon N.F. Moore: And now you are going to have a tax on gold.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: We are seeing exciting developments as we focus our attention - not only ours but also that of our colleagues in the Western Australian community in private enterprise - on finding ways of attracting attention to gold and other produce to which value can be added to the benefit of the entire Western Australian community. Western Australia is ideally placed for that sort of effort.

Hon Fred McKenzie: Do not forget the trade centre which went broke.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: So many of the efforts of members opposite when in Government were characterised by trying to prop up unsuccessful economic activities. They tried to pork barrel those areas of the State which needed it.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Even Goebbels would have been proud of you!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Members should listen for a little more.

Hon N.F. Moore: When are we getting the silicon plant and the aluminium smelter?

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I wonder if I could persuade members opposite to listen to a couple more things.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Direct your comments to me and they will not interject.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. Hon Norman Moore is one of the members of this House who shares with me the joy of representing the northern part of the State. It is terribly exciting to be able to see within that area products such as diamonds, pearls and gold produced from resource projects, which, as a result of the enormous effort made by the State Government, will have value added to that produce. Look at those three items. Members ask me to tell them what this Government is doing about value added; my answer is that they should look at those three areas - diamonds, pearls and gold. Western Australia is eminently suited to involve itself in ensuring that value is added to that produce before it is shipped off and carted away from the State.

Hon P.G. Pandal: What about the town at Argyle?

Hon Fred McKenzie: More jobs for Western Australia.

Hon P.G. Pandal: You blokes sold it down the drain.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections will cease for the time being.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The activities of GoldCorp have focused not only on the increased value of gold through the marketing exercises it has been involved with - very successful marketing exercises that auger enormously well for that industry - but also on the activities of the diamond industry. Just look at what has happened as a result of the foresight of the Burke Government in that area.

Hon N.F. Moore: It was started in our time.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It is an extraordinary -

Hon P.G. Pandal: What about the town at Argyle?

Hon N.F. Moore: When we were in Government, you were going to have the Wagyl stop the project from going ahead.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I am trying to be kind to the Opposition but without chastising it for its obvious ignorance, it was the Burke Government which took the very important step for the diamond industry of ensuring that we had a window into that market and mine through the "five per cent" equity. The Labor Government ensured that Western Australia was involved in the marketing of that five per cent. It is a tremendous opportunity. The Opposition told us that the diamond industry had to be left in the hands of a cartel and that

the entire produce had to be sent off to the Central Selling Organisation, to be dealt with, processed and entirely handled in London. What has the Labor Government done? It has taken a slice of the action for the people of Western Australia. We have seen technology transfer, where technology is transferred into Western Australia. Diamonds are being worked on and processed just around the corner; jobs are being created within our own city. There are some exciting opportunities.

Hon P.G. Pendar: You closed it down.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Enormously exciting opportunities have come as a result of the energies and attention of our Government to fine detail; detail which the Opposition missed when in Government. No doubt if Western Australia ever has the misfortune to have the Liberal Party attain Government again, it is detail it will miss again. That is, the economic opportunity that comes from focusing on value added products. The State Government has focused on ensuring that people's training and employment opportunities are enhanced dramatically. With economic growth, more jobs are created. That is what we have seen within this State, but sadly our predecessors did little in the preparation of our work force; that is, towards ensuring that our young people could move into the jobs created with the arrival of the exciting period which has come with this Government. Let us take the particular areas of gold, diamonds and pearls.

Hon P.G. Pendar: Laurie Connell, Laurie Connell and Laurie Connell.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: That has created the opportunity for people involved in a very simple industry such as jewellery design and manufacture -

Hon P.G. Pendar: Your own people are upset. You know that.

Hon T.G. Butler: Are you trying to tell us that our people would bother talking to you?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! There is one speaker on his feet, that is Hon Tom Stephens. Let us hear him in silence.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: With those three rare and precious commodities comes the opportunity for artisans - people with skills and training - to move into that field and create works of great craftsmanship and beauty. That is an attraction for people throughout the world. Sadly, in the past within Western Australia there have not been opportunities to train people in this particular field, and to lead young people into that industry to ensure produce, such as those three rare commodities I referred to, could be incorporated into fine jewellery which could be sold to people throughout the world. This State Government has devoted energy, effort and resources towards ensuring that training opportunities are available in all sorts of fields, including that one. A very exciting thing is happening within Broome. With this growth of economic activity in the north - with its rapid growth in population - there is a greater focus on the tourism market. We are seeing many more people being attracted to Broome. An exciting dynamic is being established in Broome where people, as they say, "Come into Broome and slip into Broome time." They poke about in Chinatown and investigate the jewellery shops, finding themselves attracted to purchasing vast quantities of Western Australian produced jewellery. It is an interesting dynamic. In Perth people experienced in jewellery retailing say that one of the biggest problems when it comes to selling high value jewellery items is that they can rarely get into their shop the necessary combination to effect a sale. That is, they need the combination of both the husband and the wife. However, in Broome we have attracted vast numbers of tourists with the right combination - men and women who have plenty of spare time on their hands. They wander into the jewellery shops and it is no surprise to the jewellers to find themselves selling items of enormous value. Two or three times on a Saturday morning jewellery worth \$30 000 or \$40 000 is sold. That is produce which comes from my electorate. The tradesmen take those items of enormous value and make them beautiful objects of great attraction to adorn women throughout the world. At the same time in that process of selling that produce, they have created jobs and employment opportunities in Broome for our youth.

Hon B.L. Jones: Men like jewellery too.

Hon N.F. Moore: It was a very sexist remark.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Indeed, I think that is one area of activity that the industry will have to move dramatically towards in the future. They will have to create the demand among the

other half of the population for commodities that come out of Western Australia and have value added to them. I am sure there is an enormous growth potential available by promoting that exact thing. There is a demand within the male population for items such as those which can be produced from the produce of this State. Last Friday I had a group of young school children come down to Parliament House to have lunch with me. I was delighted to be able to ask this group what they were going to do when they left school. Too often the vision of children from the north is blinkered and limited in scope and opportunity; and I was particularly delighted when a young lad - a mixed race lad of Broome with an absolutely classic background of Aboriginal, Chinese and Malaysian in his heritage - said, "I want to be a jewellery designer." I thought, "Look, there you have it." These people have had their opportunities enhanced by the Government's focusing its attention on these areas. The Government has encouraged growth in the areas by encouraging tourism which, in turn, creates demand for the produce of Western Australia, and jobs for our young people. I have been led away from making my speech by red herrings in the form of interjections from Hon Norman Moore. He asked me what we were doing about value added and what was available. I have given him a microcosmic insight into our area that is leading to value added results for our produce.

Hon W.N. Stretch: Tell us about the peripatetic submarine contract that Mr Hawke is encouraging at Exmouth?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Talking about peripatetic contracts, last night we heard a speech in this House by Hon Phil Lockyer. He said that the patrol boats should be based at Exmouth. Talk about peripatetic facilities! I was shocked when I saw the *Northern Guardian* which carried a front page story of Phil Lockyer advocating that the patrol boats should be based at Shark Bay. Where will they be based if Liberal Party members have their way?

Hon N.F. Moore: Where do you think it should go, Mr Stephens?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I have expressed my view already. I spoke to Hon Norman Moore in the corridor. My strongest belief - it is one that I will support against the tyranny of numbers from Port Hedland or the pressure that might even come from Broome for which I have very deep feelings - is that it should go to Exmouth. I have been convinced that it should go there by my colleague, the ALP candidate for Northern Rivers, Kevin Leahy.

Hon N.F. Moore: He would not know where Exmouth is.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I will tell members how he persuaded me.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Garry Kelly): Order! Members should listen to the explanation carefully.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: He persuaded me against the tyranny of numbers from Port Hedland and against my deep empathy for the township of Broome. I am convinced by the logic of the argument that says that the patrol boat facility should be at Exmouth. I am not sure which view Mr Lockyer finally adopted as his own; whether it is the one appearing on the front page of the *Northern Guardian* or whether it is the one that he expressed in the House last night. Talking about peripatetic facility, that is certainly one.

Unfortunately, I have not been given the chance to get onto the speech that I thoroughly prepared. I have been waylaid by these red herrings. I have a spiral bound folder here which contains the text of my speech.

Hon P.G. Pandal: Mr Berinson wants you to wind up and we can all understand why.

Hon J.M. Berinson: I was asking him to unwind his spiral.

Hon P.G. Pandal: We will not take that any further, Mr Berinson.

Hon B.L. Jones: I have never known the House to listen so intently to a speech by a member from the opposite side before.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The speech will be finished much more quickly if the member is given the chance to commence his speech.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Sometimes I am amazed by people in this House because I do not speak very often for which I am chastised and when I do I am still chastised. I am never sure what the people sitting opposite want.

Hon P.G. Pendal: You don't have anything to say even if you do say something.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I wish to tell members something about speech. Even if they do not want to listen to me I will still tell them. Speech is a beautiful gift. It is a gift akin to the gift of love. It is a gift that should be used sparingly; not wasted and not thrown out thoughtlessly, carelessly, or uselessly. I have been totally convinced in this place of the futility of sharing my perceptions, my views, my aspirations with members opposite. I have been convinced of the futility of bothering to try to attract members opposite to reasoned and good argument because I have seen the finest arguments put forward by some of the finest minds in this State totally rejected by the Opposition. Our leader in this House has put arguments to the House which have been treated with complete disdain by members opposite. How can we mere mortals expect that our contributions to a debate will be taken any more seriously. I wonder what is the point if the very finest intellectual minds from our side are not listened to, what chance do I have with my limited skills and fairly modest talents.

Hon T.G. Butler: Even then, you are better than the best on the other side.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I thank Hon Tom Butler. It does not matter what proposals are put forward, members opposite adopt that carping, negative and critical attitude of the Government. We have copped unfair and unjust criticism, and criticism that has ignored the benefits that have flowed to so many parts.

I was about to begin the main body of my speech, but I can see that time has got away from me. Perhaps I will leave it to the adjournment debate. I commend the Government for its Budget. It will be remembered for its enormous foresight. In particular, I have taken the time to look at the advances that have been made in the vast region of the north of this State as a result of this Government's policies. I was pressed, by my colleague, the ALP candidate for Northern Rivers, Kevin Leahy -

Hon T.G. Butler: A very impressive person.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Yes, he is impressive. He asked me to have a good look at the Budget as it related to the proposed electorate of Northern Rivers. I was stunned by the generosity of the State Government to that area. Obviously that generosity has nothing to do with the energies or efforts of Liberal Party members who have represented that area for the last five years. It is fascinating the allocations to the area have gone completely unheralded and unlauded by the Opposition. Even though money has been allocated to police stations in the electorate, the lower House member for the area, the member for Gascoyne, indicated in remarks to the media in the area that there had been no allocation of resources to fight crime in the area. He was wrong. What about the allocations to police stations? He did not even read the Budget. I happen to have with me comments made by the member for Gascoyne made in the other place. He said -

People have come into my office and said that they cannot get anything done through me. They have gone to see the endorsed Labor candidate who makes a phone call to the appropriate Minister and things are fixed just like that.

There members have it. The member, by his own admission in the lower House -

Hon Doug Wenn: Is not doing his job.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: He is unable to.

Hon N.F. Moore: You should remember, Mr Stephens, that every dog has his day, and if you want to pull this sort of stunt in Government you will find that everybody can play the same game. It is disgraceful Government, the way you are carrying on. It is scandalous.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I was only quoting Hon Norman Moore's colleague in the lower House. I was not doing anything scandalous.

Hon N.F. Moore: The activity of your Government in making sure that Mr Leahy announces everything he does in the Gascoyne is scandalous.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon N.F. Moore: Mr Maslen works like hell to get everything done, and your Government deliberately ignores him.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: When the Budget papers were delivered to this House Mr Leahy asked me for a copy. I said of course he could have one; it is a public document and Mr Maslen has probably got a copy. I sent one up to Mr Leahy. The next thing we saw was a flurry of activity on the part of Mr Leahy. He studied the document and told the people in the electorate what was being done by the Government of Western Australia for them.

Hon N.F. Moore: You give him the information before it is publicly announced.

Hon P.G. Pental: You pour it out before it is announced, and you know it.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: We have just heard an absolutely scandalous allegation from the members opposite.

Hon N.F. Moore: It is true. You read the latest edition of *The Northern Guardian*.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I challenge the member to produce one skerrick of evidence of that fact.

Hon P.G. Pental: We don't have to, the people up there voted for him and threw your bloke out.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I assure the member that that allegation fits in with the pattern of activity in this place and in the other place of absolute untruths being articulated and pronounced.

Hon N.F. Moore: You wouldn't know it, if you saw it. What you are doing in Northern Rivers is grossly unfair and wrong; a misuse of what Governments are all about.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I commend this Budget to the House. It is a Budget which will commend itself on its own merits to the people of Western Australia.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Barry House.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - SPECIAL

On motion by Hon J.M. Berinson (Leader of the House), resolved -

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 11 October.

House adjourned at 5.42 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WATER CONSERVATION - SOUTH WEST

Land Owners - Government Incentives

228. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the Government provided incentives for land owners to conserve and sell water in the south west?
- (2) If so, what are they?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1)-(2)

The Government is investigating financial incentives to assist private land owners.

WATER AUTHORITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - WELLINGTON DAM

Recreational Use - Environment Study

229. Hon A.A. LEWIS to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Water Resources:

Has the Western Australian Water Authority had an environmental study done on the effects of the recreational use of the Wellington Dam?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Water Authority is participating in the Wellington Dam and Collie River Gorge tourism and recreation development plan and an environmental assessment is to be carried out by the consultants, Dames and Moore.

ROAD SAFETY EDUCATION - MITCHELL FREEWAY

Give Way Problem - Freeway Courtesy

314. Hon P.G. PENDAL to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the problems that motorists experience when changing lanes on the Mitchell Freeway because other drivers are reluctant to give way to them?
- (2) Has any educative program ever been considered to encourage motorists to show courtesy to other drivers signalling to change lanes?
- (3) Would he consider approaching TV stations asking for their cooperation on a community relations film on freeway courtesy?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) In 1985, with the assistance of the media, an extensive public awareness campaign code named "Road Hogs and Snails" was implemented and targeted towards lane changing and slow driving on the freeway. The Police Force's Community Affairs Branch is liaising with the Main Roads Department to produce a publication on freeway driving which encompasses changing lanes. This topic is presently included in the Police Department's handout information.
- (3) Yes.

PLANTATIONS - SHIRES

Softwood - Hardwood

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

With regard to the Shires of Nannup, Manjimup, Bridgetown-Greenbushes, Boyup Brook and Collie -

- (a) what areas are -
 - (i) under softwood production;
 - (ii) under hardwood production; and
- (b) what is the total area of freehold land the Government intends to have under plantation either with softwood or hardwood in these shires?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (a) The total production areas shown are land under the control of the Department of Conservation and Land Management which is proposed as multiple use or production forest as described in the forest region management plans published in December 1987. No distinction can be made as to what area is available for hardwood or softwood production. The areas of softwood plantations shown below are part of the total production areas.

Shire	Total production area (ha)	Area of softwood plantations as at 31.12.1987 (ha)
Boyup Brook	45 000	-
Bridgetown- Greenbushes	63 000	1 500
Nannup	201 000	5 200
Manjimup	339 000	1 500
Collie	102 000	1 300

- (b) I cannot answer the member's question without knowing the time scale sought.

GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL - STUDY ABROAD

348. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are two groups of eight Government employees each soon to leave for overseas study tours?
- (2) Will the Minister advise whether the two groups each contain representatives of both TAFE and the Department of Employment and Training.
- (3) Will the Minister advise the names and status of the personnel selected for the study tours?
- (4) Will the Minister advise the countries to be visited and details of the planned itineraries for the two groups?
- (5) Would the Minister advise the selection criteria for the study group personnel chosen?
- (6) Will the Minister advise the aims of the study tours?
- (7) Will the Minister advise the departure and return dates of the study tours, and indicate whether the tours have been arranged to coincide with TAFE vacation periods?
- (8) Will the Minister advise the total anticipated costs for all expenses of the study tours?
- (9) Will the Minister advise how the size of the two touring parties was determined, at a time when there is a shortage of funds for essential activities in the TAFE system?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister assisting the Minister for Education with TAFE has advised me that -

- (1)-(2) Yes.

(3) EUROPEAN -

Mr Tim McDonald - Mission Leader
Assistant Executive Director (Strategic Planning)
Office of Technical and Further Education

Dr Janette Hartz-Karp
A/Director of Industrial Training
Department of Employment and Training

Mr Neville Davis, Head of Department, TAFE
Chairman, TAFE Committee of State School Teachers' Union

Mr Doug Lambert, Director, Labour Relations Division
Confederation of Western Australian Industry

Mr Kevin Woods, Director
Great Southern Regional College of TAFE (Albany)

Ms Ellen French, A/Head of Department, Secretarial Studies
Leederville College of TAFE

Mr Tom Higgins, Superintendent of Education
Office of Technical and Further Education

Ms Kath White, Lecturer, TAFE External Studies College,
Office of Technical and Further Education

SOUTH EAST ASIAN -

Mr D. Russell (Mission Group Leader), Assistant Executive
Director (Operations), Office of TAFE

Mr Greg Philip, A/Director, Labour Market Analysis &
Research Division, Department of Employment and Training

Mr Nick Gara, Deputy Principal, Carlisle College of TAFE

Mr Geoff Hawke, Principal, Mount Lawley College of TAFE

Dr Bob Innes, A/Manager, Curriculum, Office of TAFE

Mr Cedric Woods, Superintendent, Office of TAFE

Mr Lyn Girdlestone, Representative of the Confederation of
Western Australian Industry

Mr Lindsay Smith, Education Officer, TAFE and
Representative of the State School Teachers' Union.

- (4) (a) United Kingdom, Paris, Sweden, West Germany, Singapore.
Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore.

(b) Itineraries -

Europe -

United Kingdom - 28 September to 2 October 1988

Paris - 30 September 1988

Sweden - 2 October to 6 October 1988

West Germany - 7 October to 14 October 1988

Singapore - 15 October to 20 October 1988

South East Asia -

Japan - 28 September to 6 October 1988

Hong Kong - 7 October to 9 October 1988

Taiwan - 10 October to 14 October 1988

Singapore - 15 October to 20 October 1988

- (5) TAFE and DET representatives were selected by the A/Executive
Director, after consultation with the TAFE directors. The
confederation and Teachers Union representatives were nominated by
their organisations. The criteria used were determined by the
objectives of the mission.

- (6) To provide the TAFE system in Western Australia with first hand knowledge of the latest overseas developments in vocational education and training.
- (7) The departure date for the European mission is 27 September 1988 and for the Asian mission, 28 September 1988. Both missions will return on 20 October 1988. The tours were not arranged to coincide with TAFE vacation periods.
- (8) \$167 000.
- (9) In determining the size of the missions each person's role and responsibilities were examined to enable the missions to complete their objectives. These missions are considered an investment in the quality and improvement of the TAFE system in Western Australia.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - TEACHERS FINANCIAL SOCIETY
Miscellaneous Services Payment - 1987-88

357. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

With regard to the Miscellaneous Services payment of \$18 797 056 to the WA Teachers Financial Society Ltd - under administration - in 1987-88, will the Minister provide full details of the payment and, if appropriate, the names and amount of each bad debt, interest and administration fee payable to the R & I Bank?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The payment of \$18 797 056 comprises -

(a)	advance to meet the net identified loss of the society as at 31 October 1987	\$ 4 400 000
(b)	consultancy fees	361 500
(c)	legal expenses	35 556
(d)	retirement of indemnity to the Rural and Industries Bank with respect to losses on Teachers Financial Society loans purchased by the bank in January 1988	3 500 000
(e)	creation of reserve account in the books of Teachers Financial Society to fund losses on commercial loans as they crystallise	<u>10 500 000</u> <u>18 797 056</u>

ESTIMATES - HOMESWEST
Miscellaneous Services Payment - 1987-88

359. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What was the reason for the "Miscellaneous Services" payment of \$6.2 million to Homeswest in 1987-88 as disclosed in the 1988-89 Budget estimates?
- (2) Why was this amount not budgeted for in 1987-88?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Payment of \$6.2 million was made to assist Homeswest in meeting the Government's objective of maximising home ownership among potential first home buyers on lower incomes. The grant was applied mainly towards the establishment of a land pool and to reduce interest rates on funds lent to low income first home buyers.
- (2) The decision to provide financial assistance to Homeswest was taken after the Budget was presented to Parliament.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - EVENTSCORP
1986-87 Allocation

360. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What are the full details of the 1986-87 Budget allocation of \$550 000 to EventsCorp?
- (2) What are the full details of the actual expenditure in 1986-87 of \$349 197 and the reasons for the variance?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The 1986-87 vote of \$550 000 for EventsCorp comprised \$350 000 - including 1985-86 arrears of \$132 500 - for reimbursement to the Western Australian Development Corporation for expenses involved in managing EventsCorp and \$200 000 for America's Cup events.
- (2) An amount of \$349 197 was paid to the Western Australian Development Corporation for the expenses involved in managing EventsCorp. Expenditure in respect of the unexpended balance of \$200 000 of the vote was accounted for under item 105, America's Cup.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - EVENTSCORP
1987-88 Allocation

361. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What is the breakdown of the \$444 000 allocated to EventsCorp in the 1987-88 Budget?
- (2) What are the details of the amount expended in 1987-88 - \$3 084 644 - and the reason/s for the variance?
- (3) Is EventsCorp self-funding for international sports events?
- (4) If not, why not?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The 1987-88 vote of \$444 000 was for the reimbursement of the Western Australian Development Corporation for expenses involved in managing EventsCorp.

- (2) Details of 1987-88 expenditure are as follows -

Reimbursement to the Western Australian Development Corporation for expenses involved in managing EventsCorp	\$ 318 644
Expenditure associated with the underwriting of Western Australia's participation in World Expo '88	<u>2 766 000</u> <u>3 084 644</u>

The variance from budget of \$2 640 644 is attributable to the cost of Western Australia's participation in World Expo '88 offset by savings of \$125 356 against the Budget allocation.

- (3)-(4)

As far as possible, EventsCorp endeavours to recover costs. However, the sponsoring of major events often involves an underwriting by the host Government should targeted attendances, sponsorships and donations not be achieved. That underwriting has regard to economic factors such as the benefits to local business of the associated increases in visitors and favourable media exposure for the State.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - WA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
Miscellaneous Services Payment 1987-88 - 1988-89 Allocation

363. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What was the reason/s for the "Miscellaneous Services" payment in 1987-88 of \$1 953 072 to the Western Australian Development Corporation, a statutory authority?
- (2) What are the reasons for the 1988-89 Budget allocation of \$2 422 000?
- (3) Were similar amounts paid in 1987-88 to the Urban Land Council or Landbank?
- (4) Was the payment in 1987-88, and the Budget allocation in 1988-89, subsidies for the authority?
- (5) Is the authority self-funding?
- (6) If not, why not?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The payment of \$1 953 072 to the Western Australian Development Corporation comprises a management fee for consultancy work associated with the Government's land management policy, and for ongoing commitments in respect of the activities of the former Landbank transferred to LandCorp and the East Perth project.
- (2) The 1988-89 Budget provision of \$2 422 000 provides for the annual management fee of \$2 million and other expenses of \$422 000.
- (3) Although funds were not specifically appropriated to Landbank, commissions accrued to Landbank from land sales in respect of land development activities undertaken on behalf of Government.
- (4) No.
- (5)-(6) Like any other commercial or business undertaking, WADC-LandCorp strives to achieve a profit on its total operations. Government payments are made on a fee for service basis.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD
Miscellaneous Services Payment - 1987-88

364. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) What were the reasons and full details for the "Miscellaneous Services" item of \$4 952 572 in 1987-88 to the Totalisator Agency Board?
- (2) Was the payment made as a non refundable grant?
- (3) If so, why should it not be repaid?
- (4) If the payment was not made as a non refundable grant, what are the terms of the loan in respect of interest and repayment?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

The expenditure of \$4 952 572 represents the Government's contribution towards the TAB's acquisition of Western Broadcasting Services Pty Ltd, otherwise known as 6PR, in order to ensure that ownership of the station remained in Western Australia and that the benefits of a full race broadcasting service remained available to the State's racing industry, its supporters and the public.

The payment has two components -

a non repayable grant of \$4 million to the TAB towards the acquisition cost of 6PR; and

payment of principal outstanding of \$952 572 on a loan advanced by the Totalisator Agency Board to the Greyhound Racing Association. The State is to recover this amount, together with interest payable of five per cent per annum, from the Greyhound Association over the remaining period of the loan.

- (3) It is in the interest of both the Government and the community to maintain a viable and well supported racing industry. If the \$4 million grant were repayable the amount of funds the TAB distributes to the racing industry would be correspondingly reduced but the Government decided that it should be non repayable in view of the significant contribution being made by the racing industry to the community and to State revenue.
- (4) See (1)-(2).

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - SMASH HIT MUSICAL PRODUCTIONS *Miscellaneous Services Payment - 1987-88*

366. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) With regard to the "Miscellaneous Services" payment of \$60 000 in 1987-88 to "Smash Hit Musical Productions", what was this event?
- (2) Who organised the event, and why was this amount contributed by the Government?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) "Smash Hit" is a musical show to promote road safety. It was adapted from the successful "Roadshow" which toured New Zealand in 1983.
- (2) The event was organised by the "Smash Hit" committee chaired by Dr T. Hamilton and was supported by the Government to reinforce the road safety message to young drivers.

AIM INDUSTRIES AUSTRALIA PTY LTD - INQUIRIES *Tilli, Mr*

372. Hon NEIL OLIVER to the Attorney General:

- (1) Has any investigation been undertaken into AIM Industries Australia Limited and the activities of their board of directors?
- (2) If yes, is any action contemplated by Corporate Affairs Department into the activities of the directors of the company, in particular Mr Tilli?
- (3) What is the relationship between the executive chairman Mr Tilli and the Teachers Credit Society?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1)-(2) It is against the policy of the Corporate Affairs Department to comment on its investigations.
- (3) This is not a matter relating to my ministerial responsibilities.

GOVERNMENT GARAGE *Personnel*

374. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

What is the number of drivers and other personnel involved in the Government Garage -

- (a) as at 30 June 1983; and
- (b) as at 30 June 1988?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (a) Seventeen.
- (b) Thirty. The increase in the number of employees at the Government Garage reflects the expanded demand for services generally including the expansion in the size of Cabinet and the allocation of a group of drivers to service the requirements of the Opposition, Speaker and President.

STATE PRINTING DIVISION

Works Report - Private Printers

376. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works and Services:

- (1) Has a report to the Government on the State Printing Division recommended that more or all printing be done by private printers?
- (2) Will the Minister table the report?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

(1)-(2)

If the member is referring to the report of the Functional Review Committee, then it is part of the internal process of advice to Government and information concerning specific reviews and actions thereon remain confidential.

STATE PRINTING DIVISION

Personnel

377. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works and Services:

How many people were involved in the State Printing Division for the year ended -

- (a) 30 June 1983;
- (b) 30 June 1984;
- (c) 30 June 1985;
- (d) 30 June 1986;
- (e) 30 June 1987; and
- (f) 30 June 1988?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The following are the number of employees of the State Printing Division for the years requested -

- (a) 460;
- (b) 472;
- (c) 459;
- (d) 471;
- (e) 424; and
- (f) 359.

STATE PRINTING DIVISION

Tenders - Private Sector

378. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works and Services:

What is the value of the printing tender supplied by the private sector during the years ended -

- (a) 30 June 1983;
- (b) 30 June 1984;
- (c) 30 June 1985;
- (d) 30 June 1986;
- (e) 30 June 1987; and
- (f) 30 June 1988?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

The following represents work subcontracted from the State Printing Division and does not include direct contracting between Government agencies and private sector printers -

- (a) \$3.7 million;
- (b) \$3.4 million;
- (c) \$4.5 million;
- (d) \$6 million;
- (e) \$6.2 million; and
- (f) \$5.8 million.

All figures include the original tender price submitted by private contractors, plus contract variations for changes in specification, quantities, author's corrections, etc., allowed after tenders let. The 1987-88 figure comprises the original tenders plus an estimate only of contract variations.

It should be noted that the 1987-88 figures do not include that work subcontracted to private printers by the State Printing Division, which has been directly invoiced to the department incurring the expenditure.

STATE PRINTING DIVISION
Capital Investment

379. Hon G.E. MASTERS to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works and Services:

- (1) What was the capital expenditure on the State Printing Division for the years ended -
 - (a) 30 June 1983;
 - (b) 30 June 1984;
 - (c) 30 June 1985;
 - (d) 30 June 1986;
 - (e) 30 June 1987; and
 - (f) 30 June 1988?
- (2) What is the proposed capital expenditure on the State Printing Division for the year ending 30 June 1989?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1)
 - (a) \$1 284 521;
 - (b) \$2 370 232;
 - (c) \$ 522 498;
 - (d) \$2 342 669;
 - (e) \$ 833 391; and
 - (f) \$ 390 853.
- (2) \$4 482 000. The member should note that the expenditure proposed for the year ending 30 June 1989 will be funded from the sale of obsolete and unwanted equipment identified in the review process.

GUARDIANSHIP - PARENTS

Head Injured Persons

386. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Attorney General:

Even though the parents of head injured persons over the age of 18 years are still the guardians and carers of these people, is it correct that they are no longer their legal guardians?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

Parents of persons over the age of 18 years are no longer the legal guardians of those persons. Parents of head injured persons over the age of 18 years are in no different a position. It may be that in an exceptional case, and for good reason, the Supreme Court may appoint a parent the guardian of his or her head injured child who is over 18 years of age. I am further advised that the particular issue is being addressed by the Minister for Health during preparation of guardianship legislation.

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Discount and Expenses on Conversion Loans - 1987-88

392. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

What are the full details of the Miscellaneous Services payment in 1987-88 of \$3 826 056 under "Discount and Expenses on Conversion Loans"?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

Details are -	\$
Discounts	3 553 399
Loan flotation expenses	<u>272 657</u>
	<u>3 826 056</u>

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Interest and Instalments - 1987-88

393. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

What are the full details of the Miscellaneous Services payment in 1987-88 of \$230 951 under "Interest and Instalments" - not otherwise provided for?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

	\$
Debt charges on loans taken over by the Government in 1973 as a result of variations to the original sale agreement of the Wundowie charcoal iron and steel industry to Agnew Clough Ltd.	66 187
Debt charges on loans raised by the Western Australian Teacher Education Authority in 1974 to finance construction of college buildings	66 741
Debt servicing costs on WA Meat Commission loan liabilities	<u>98 023</u>
	<u>230 951</u>

STATE GOVERNMENT BUDGETS - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Loan Management Expenses - 1987-88

394. Hon MAX EVANS to the Minister for Budget Management:

What are the full details of the Miscellaneous Services payment in 1987-88 of \$456 889 under "Loan Management Expenses"?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

Loan management expenses are initially met by the Commonwealth Government in respect of borrowings that are raised on behalf of the State. Expenses are then met by the State and these amounted to \$456 889 in 1987-88.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

Employment - Pay Concern

409. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

I draw the Minister's attention to a letter in the *Daily News* of Friday, 9 September 1988 headed "Concern on TAFE Salaries", and ask -

- (1) Will the Minister identify the three young women in their early twenties referred to, the qualifications of each and the salaries of each?
- (2) Will the Minister list the temporary, six month positions created and filled since 1 January 1988?
- (3) Will the Minister identify the persons filling those positions, listing their qualifications to justify temporary appointment, and the salary of each?
- (4) Will the Minister advise how the positions in part (2) were advertised, whether the appointees were seconded from other Government departments and, if so, which departments?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister assisting the Minister for Education with TAFE has advised me that the information required will take some time to collate and will be provided in writing to the member in due course.

NON GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

School Prices Index - Costs

411. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

What costs are taken into account in determining the school prices index (SPI) which is used to determine per capita funding of non Government schools?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

Administration	Salaries 'Clerical' Expenditure
Instruction	Teacher Salaries School Admin Salaries Transport Stores Scholarships
Building Operation and Maintenance	Wages - Males (50 per cent) Wages - Females (50 per cent) Fuel and Water
Fixed Charges	Pensions and Superannuation Payroll Tax Interest on Commonwealth Loans Rents

WITTENOOM
Future - Government Policy

412. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for The North West:

- (1) Is it correct that the Minister for The North West has given local residents in Wittenoom an assurance that the town will remain indefinitely?
- (2) If so, what services will the Government continue to provide in Wittenoom?
- (3) If (1) is no, what is the Government's policy with respect to the future of Wittenoom?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

(1)-(3)

Action on Wittenoom by Government since 1978 has been in response to the presence of a significant health hazard. This health risk is associated with the presence of crocidolite - blue asbestos - which is a carcinogenic substance linked to mesothelioma. A number of Government programs have led to a significant reduction in the number of permanent residents but it is acknowledged that some residents will remain in Wittenoom despite the health risks. Essential services such as power and water will be supplied but in recognition of the health risks no new connections and no reconnections of previously disconnected services will be made. Efforts will continue to be made to advise residents and visitors of the health risks.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Commonwealth Youth Support Scheme - Workers' Compensation Liability

415. Hon NEIL OLIVER to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Who accepts workers' compensation liability for persons employed under the Commonwealth youth support scheme being engaged by local government?
- (2) What claims, if any, are outstanding from the project and, if there are any, what amount of payments are outstanding?
- (3) In the long term, who will accept liability for future claims?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

This question should be referred to the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training, which administers the Commonwealth youth support scheme.

HONEY POOL OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Profits - 30 June 1988

416. Hon NEIL OLIVER to the Minister for Consumer Affairs representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the profit for the Honey Pool for the year ended 30 June 1988?
- (2) When will the annual report be made available?
- (3) What tonnages were handled by the Honey Pool for the year ended 30 June 1988?
- (4) What distribution has been made to growers for the financial year ended 30 June 1988?

Hon GRAHAM EDWARDS replied:

- (1) Under the Honey Pool Act (1978) the Honey Pool of Western Australia is not permitted to make a profit. At the end of each pool it distributes all earnings to the prescribed participants in that pool.

- (2) The report for the year ended 30 June 1988 has been submitted to the Auditor General's Office in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act (1985). It will be delivered to the Minister for Agriculture for his assessment and tabling in Parliament as soon as the Auditor General has completed his assessment.

- (3)-(4) This information will be made available when the annual report is tabled in Parliament.

LAND ACQUISITION

Treasure Road, Kemerton - State Government

418. Hon BARRY HOUSE to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Economic Development and Trade:

- (1) Are owners of rural holdings in Treasure Road, near Kemerton, being approached to sell through real estate agents on behalf of the State Government?
- (2) Are these properties being purchased to increase the size of the buffer zone around the new Kemerton industrial area?
- (3) If so, why?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The Industrial Lands Development Authority has engaged Baillieu Knight Frank, real estate agents, to offer to purchase certain land by voluntary agreement on behalf of the Government in the Treasure Road area.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The increase of the buffer strip to include this land is perceived as a desirable extension to the buffer area currently owned by the Government.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION - PARKER, MS E.M.A.

Qualifications

428. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

What qualification does Ms E.M.A. Parker hold which qualifies her to hold the position of Acting Director, Human Resources Management, TAFE?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

The Minister assisting the Minister for Education with TAFE has advised me that Ms E.M.A. Parker holds a Diploma of Teaching and has experience in primary and secondary teaching. She has 10 years' experience in the industrial relations field and five and a half years with the State School Teachers Union, including extensive experience in dealing with TAFE matters and counselling TAFE lecturers. Ms Parker has been seconded from the senior position of assistant director in the Office of Industrial Relations to assist in the restructuring of the Office of TAFE.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

SCHOOLS OF THE AIR

Activities - Centralisation

193. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it intended to centralise the activities of the schools of the air?
- (2) If so, what will such centralisation involve?
- (3) Have the teaching staff and parents of children at schools of the air been consulted on these proposed changes?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

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

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - EMPLOYMENT LEVEL

Full Time Equivalents - 1986-87; 1987-88

194. Hon N.F. MOORE to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many teaching staff, expressed as full time equivalents, were employed in 1986-87 in each of the following categories:
 - (a) Preschool centres;
 - (b) preprimary and primary education;
 - (c) secondary education;
 - (d) educational services; and
 - (e) guidance and education support?
- (2) Were the estimated numbers of Ministry of Education employees shown in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1987-88 expressed as full time equivalents?

Hon KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) These figures are published in the annual report - 1986, table 4:12 on page 73, for July 1986, and in the Education Statistics Bulletin No 7/1987, table 3.04 on page 51, for July 1987. Copies of the two tables are provided for the member's information.
- (2) The Estimates of Expenditure reflect the approved average staffing levels for 1987-88 expressed as full time equivalents.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Appointments and Retirements - 1982-87

195. Hon W.N. STRETCH to the Attorney General:

- (1) How many justices of the peace have -
 - (a) been appointed; and
 - (b) retired from duty as justices of the peace for whatever reasons in Western Australia in each of the years from 1982 to 1987?
- (2) Has the numerical balance between metropolitan and non metropolitan commissions been maintained during this period?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) (a) 1982 - 167
 1983 - 194
 1984 - 164
 1985 - 123
 1986 - 120
 1987 - 75; and
- (b) 1982 - 16
 1983 - 24
 1984 - 11
 1985 - 20
 1986 - 16
 1987 - 23.

Figures relating to deceased justices are not available, nor are figures available on those justices who resigned when the commission was reprinted in 1983 and 1985.

- (2) Appointments are made on a needs basis, not on the basis of maintaining a numerical balance.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF - PRISONERS

Employment Services

196. Hon MARGARET McALEER to the Minister for Corrective Services:

What services, if any, does the Minister's department provide to help prisoners obtain employment after their release?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

An effort in this respect is made even before release by officers attempting to locate employment opportunities; that applies in particular to prisoners who are placed in the work release centre in West Perth. In the latter case efforts are expected to be made by the prisoners themselves who are on work release for that purpose. In addition, the department recently has attracted a number of volunteers to join with its own non-custodial corrective services staff to assist prisoners in an orderly return to the community. An important part of that group's work also relates to searching out employment opportunities for former prisoners.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF - PRISONERS

Employment Services - Regional Prisons

197. Hon MARGARET McALEER to the Minister for Corrective Services:

Are the services also operative in regional prisons, or are they confined to the metropolitan area?

Hon J.M. BERINSON replied:

They are certainly more readily available in the metropolitan area. With regard to outlying prisons, I would prefer to take that question on notice and provide the member with a written answer.
