



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

THIRTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT
THIRD SESSION
1999

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26 October 1999

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 26 October 1999

THE SPEAKER (Mr Strickland) took the Chair at 2.00 pm, and read prayers.

WORKERS COMPENSATION, PREMIUM RATES

Statement by Minister for Labour Relations

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley - Minister for Labour Relations) [2.03 pm]: The Government is seriously concerned at the insurance industry's lack of commitment to pass on recommended premium rates for workers compensation. The Premium Rates Committee which sets the rates has recommended a 10 per cent reduction for 1999-2000. It wants the reduction to apply from 4.00 pm on Monday, 1 November 1999.

The action of the Insurance Council of Australia Ltd raises the question of whether private insurers genuinely wish to operate in the field. Do they wish to work constructively towards achieving a viable workers compensation system?

The Government recently introduced amendments to workers compensation legislation. The amendments flowed from the Pearson review. They were the first step towards meeting the Government's commitment to restoring balance in the system. They were largely supported by all sides in Parliament. The committee determined that the amendments justified an immediate reduction in premiums. I understand it considered the following factors: The immediate one-off savings which could be passed on to employers as a result of the legislation; the impact of the common law claims built into the rates; and the impact of superimposed inflation which is also built into the rates.

The Insurance Council has put all of these decisions and recommendations at risk. If insurers ignore the recommended 10 per cent cut in premiums, there will be substantial consequences for all levels of business, especially small business. There will also be consequences for employment. The Government will ask the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Commission to monitor and advise on this impact through the WorkCover WA premium rate dispute process. Insurers will be asked to justify their actions. There is still a long way to go to restore balance in the workers compensation system.

A group has been appointed to review medical and other treatment costs and processes under the chairmanship of Mr John Knowles. It will begin immediately. The terms of reference for the review of regulation and practices adopted by insurers and self-insurers are being finalised and will be announced shortly. I have already requested that they take into account the latest statement by the Insurance Council of Australia. I have also written to the council on the issue. Members can be assured it will be pursued vigorously. Restoring balance to the workers compensation system requires the commitment of all parties. If one party does not have that commitment, one must question whether it really wants to be in the system.

FREMANTLE COLD STORES SITE, UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Statement by Minister for Housing

DR HAMES (Yokine - Minister for Housing) [2.07 pm]: Members may have seen in the media that the Ministry of Housing is planning a \$14m, 101-unit redevelopment of the former Fremantle Cold Stores site between Queen Victoria and Beach Streets. The project will be one of the Fremantle region's biggest urban renewal ventures and has been designed by Spowers Architects in close consultation with the Fremantle City Council and local residents. Buildings will be linked by landscaped open spaces designed to engender a sense of ownership and connection with surrounding dwellings. Although most of the units are for aged accommodation, family and one-bedroom units specifically designed for people with disabilities will be also available. Throughout its 100-year history, the site has accommodated a tram station, power substation, foundry, bacon curer, meatworks and motor company. Homeswest bought the site in 1990 for \$900 000 and it is currently leased to a Fremantle sardine producer. The redevelopment will retain and reuse significant heritage buildings including the original Fremantle Cold Storage building and its 1950s extension at the eastern end of the site on Beach Street, the original tramcar barns, and the building at the western end of the site on Beach Street. The former power station's frame will be incorporated into public open space. The redevelopment will begin in the middle of next year and will be completed in between 12 and 18 months. The Ministry of Housing planned the redevelopment in response to the strong demand for low-cost rental housing in the Fremantle area.

This site is ideally located close to Fremantle Hospital, public transport and shops. Traffic, parking, security and the nearby working port were taken into consideration. There will be no traffic through the area and parking will be limited to one bay per unit. The design, which was influenced by passive surveillance principles, has no dead spots and open spaces are clearly defined with appropriate lighting, landscaping and seating. Clear vistas throughout the site allow for casual surveillance. Security screens and doors will be provided in accordance with Homeswest policy. Port-related issues, including noise, risk and odour, have also been addressed. This is a major project that will boost the local economy and greatly improve the Victoria Street-Beach Street gateway to the city, as well as providing much needed public housing.

[Questions without notice taken.]

BILLS - APPROPRIATIONS

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills -

1. Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) 1999
2. Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 4) 1999

WATER SERVICES COORDINATION AMENDMENT BILL 1999*Returned*

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA*Petition*

Ms Warnock presented the following petition bearing the signatures of 1 109 persons -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned residents of Western Australia, request that because the criminal code law in Western Australia is such that suffering people have no legal right to be actively helped to die, no matter what their degree of suffering nor the urgency of their pleas for release by death, the Legislative Assembly, in Parliament assembled, shall pass a properly regulated Bill that makes the right to be thus helped to die a legal option, on the request of adults who are hopelessly suffering more than they wish to bear; and that other persons participating in the fulfilment of such a legal option shall do so willingly and not be subject to adverse legal or professional action.

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

[See petition No 56.]

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD, LABELLING*Petition*

Mr Brown presented the following petition bearing the signatures of 22 persons -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned petitioners call on the State Government to support the proper labelling of genetically modified food so that consumers know exactly what they are purchasing.

We believe consumers are entitled to make a choice between purchasing natural and genetically modified food. That choice can only be provided by the law requiring genetically modified food to be labelled.

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

[See petition No 57.]

WATER AND SEWERAGE PIPELINES, EAGLE BAY*Petition*

Mr Masters presented the following petition bearing the signatures of 34 persons -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, request the Water Corporation to conduct a survey of all registered land owners within the Eagle Bay settlement on the issue of water/sewerage pipeline location. We make this request on the basis of strong community opposition to the destruction of high quality vegetation on road verges proposed to be used for the laying of water and sewerage pipelines. We urge the Water Corporation to locate these pipelines on the previously agreed route or on an alternative route that will not cause unacceptable damage to remnant vegetation.

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

[See petition No 58.]

WONNERUP BEACH, DAMAGE*Petition*

Mr Masters presented the following petition bearing the signatures of 74 persons -

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, being residents and visitors to Wonnerup Beach say that we wish to protest and raise our concerns towards the storage of rocks for the proposed rock wall. We feel this may be causing erosion and destruction of the beach, vegetation and ecology of the area. We would like to request that any works done, be done in such a way that there will be no damage to the beach, vegetation and ecology of the area.

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

[See petition No 59.]

WELLINGTON DAM LAND, PURCHASE

Matter of Public Interest

THE SPEAKER (Mr Strickland): Today I received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition seeking to debate as a matter of public interest the following motion -

That this House call upon the Auditor General to investigate the Water Corporation's purchase of the Wellington Dam land from Worsley Timber and censure the Minister for Water Resources for his failure to properly account to the Parliament about this matter.

If sufficient members agree to this motion, I will allow it.

[At least five members rose in their places.]

The SPEAKER: The matter shall proceed on the usual basis, with half an hour allocated to members on my left, half an hour to members on my right, and five minutes to the Independent members, should they seek the call.

DR GALLOP (Victoria Park - Leader of the Opposition) [2.50 pm]: I move the motion.

This motion goes to the heart of accountability in Western Australia today. It deals with the processes by which this Government disposed of \$9.5m of taxpayers' money and the way in which the minister has accounted to the Parliament for what happened within his portfolio. The Government has failed on both counts. First, it has not followed due process with regard to the sale of this land and serious questions are left unanswered about that process that the Opposition believes demand a proper investigation by the Auditor General. Second, serious questions have been left unanswered about what the minister has told the Parliament regarding the sale of the land. On the basis of the available information, he has seriously misled the Parliament about what occurred.

I will first address the heart of the issue. We are dealing with the purchase of the Wellington Dam land - a sale negotiated by the Chairman of the Water Corporation, Mr Peter Jones, in April 1999 - although, of course, the sale was not settled until 14 May. The sale price was \$9.5m, which is \$2m more than the Valuer General's estimate of that land and \$3.5m more than the Water Corporation said it was willing to pay. These are very serious issues relating to the expenditure of taxpayers' money.

I will deal with the second point first; that is, the way in which the minister has explained this deal to the House. We have the minister's story about the deal and Mr Jones' story about it, and they are two very different stories. In Parliament on 22 April 1999, the minister stated -

The chairman negotiated the deal with the support of the Water Corporation. . . . We did not direct the Water Corporation to buy the land, although we did want the corporation to buy it. It is entirely up to the Water Corporation how it manages its internal dealings and who it gets to negotiate the deal. That is not for the Government to be involved in; that is for the corporation to work out. Frankly, I cannot think of anyone better than Mr Peter Jones to negotiate a decent deal for the Water Corporation to purchase that block of land.

On 20 April, the minister said in respect of Mr Jones' role -

No, he was not flying solo. He, with the assistance of representatives from the Water Corporation - on my request, I add - continued those negotiations.

That is the minister's story and it is the story he told this Parliament - it was all a matter for the Water Corporation.

I refer members to the *Sunday Times* of 24 October 1999. Mr Jones is quoted as follows -

Mr Jones said there was nothing improper about the deal, which was given a tick by auditors. It was not secret because senior members of the Government knew what he was doing.

Mr Jones said he did not need board approval before finalising the deal. He only needed Government approval, which he got.

Is that not interesting? The story told by Mr Jones, the Chairman of the Water Corporation, is totally different from the story told by the minister. The minister told a story along these lines: Firstly, that the chairman negotiated with the support of the Water Corporation; secondly, that it was a matter for the Water Corporation, not the Government; and, thirdly, that it was a deal for the Water Corporation. The story told by Mr Jones is totally different: Firstly, that it was not a matter for the Water Corporation but, rather, for the Government; and, secondly, that he finalised the deal on behalf of the Government.

The minister and Mr Jones cannot have it both ways on this deal. The truth is that they are covering up their positions in this matter. The minister is trying to cover up the actions of the chairman, who acted on his own in this matter and with inadequate care for his responsibilities as a director. Had Mr Jones been a director of a private corporation and acted in the way that he did, he would be in serious trouble. I expect the Government of Western Australia to insist that the directors on its boards, who have responsibility for our taxpayers' money, act in a responsible way; Mr Jones did not, and the minister is trying to cover up his actions.

What about Mr Jones? It is a classic case of Mr Jones trying to shift responsibility from himself by incorporating the Government in his own malpractice in this matter. He was caught out so what did he try to do? He shifted responsibility to other parts of the Government to try to justify his behaviour in the matter. The facts are these, and we know them very well -

Dr Hames: What are you quoting from? Will you table that document?

Dr GALLOP: The *Sunday Times* article of 24 October. The facts are these: Early in 1999, when the Water Corporation and Worsley Timber Pty Ltd were discussing this land, there was no agreement between them on its price. I will quote a file note of 8 April 1999 from the Water Corporation which refers to a meeting held on that day. Present at the meeting were Mr Walter Johnson, the owner of the land; Mr Malcolm French; Mr Peter Loughton from Elders Real Estate; Mr Peter Jones; and Peter D. Moore from the Water Corporation. It is clear from that file note that there was disagreement on the price of this land. It is interesting to look at the final part of the file note, which reads -

There was, however, discussion on timber values on clearing restrictions and the potentiality for compensation should Mr Johnson be restricted in any desire to clear land or otherwise develop it. No comment was made about the clearing regulations as they were issues that could only be dealt with by the Water and Rivers Commission.

There was therefore a disagreement about how to value the land. The meeting concluded with Mr Jones saying he could not take the matter further because the Under Treasurer and the Premier were away and he would take up the matter again when they returned.

What actually happened was this: Mr Jones then went off on his own, unaccompanied by anyone from the Water Corporation, and signed off on the price of \$9.5m. He alone agreed to a price with Mr Johnson without any reference points back to the Water Corporation. It is interesting that he tries to cover himself by writing a letter to the Under Treasurer on 13 April 1999 which reads -

The agreed purchase price was \$. . .

The price has been blotted out to comply with a freedom of information request. The letter continues -

The vendor had a valuation of \$9.95m. with the estimated value of the timber resource being the same as that estimated by the Valuer-General. The main difference was in the estimated land value, with the V-G apparently allowing for a reduced value influenced by possible restriction on clearing and land use; while the Worsley Timber Coy. valuation had apparently estimated a land value which included either allowed use of the land or portion thereof, for normal use, and an element of compensation for the restrictions being placed on the land.

In other words the contentious issue that was not resolved earlier was resolved by Mr Jones. He took it upon himself to resolve that issue in his negotiations with Mr Johnson and subsequently advised the Treasury of his actions.

This memorandum does not indicate whether the Water Corporation, its board or its officers were consulted over the corporation's assessment of the ultimate price. That is confirmed by material the Opposition has acquired under the Freedom of Information Act. What is more, no reference was made to the Water and Rivers Commission about the matter.

I remind members that the point of contention at the meeting in April concerned clearing the land and the potential for compensation. It was made clear that could be dealt with only by the Water and Rivers Commission. Any Government following proper processes would have consulted the Water and Rivers Commission about such an issue. The lack of reference to the Water Corporation and the Water and Rivers Commission raises a big question: On what basis did Mr Jones reach the agreed price? Was it a commercial decision, as required under the Water Corporation Act, or was it a political fix put together by a political operator who is the Chairman of the Water Corporation because he is a Liberal party heavy? That question before this Parliament deserves a proper inquiry.

I hope the minister has examined the Water Corporation Act, because the Opposition has. Section 6(1) reads -

The corporation is not, and is not to become, part of the Public Service.

That is crystal clear. It is a corporatised entity with a board that has responsibility to act in a commercial way unless directed by the minister.

Section 8 reads -

The board is the governing body of the corporation with authority, subject to this Act, in the name of the corporation, to perform the functions, determine the policies and control the affairs of the corporation.

The chairman is not the governing authority; the board is. Section 30 reads -

Corporation to act on commercial principles

- 30.** (1) The corporation in performing its functions must -
- (a) act in accordance with prudent commercial principles; and
 - (b) endeavour to make a profit, consistently with maximizing its long term value.
- (2) If there is any conflict or inconsistency between the duty imposed by subsection (1) and a direction given by the Minister under this Act the direction prevails.

In other words, it is to act commercially unless directed by the minister.

Section 34 reads -

In addition to section 32, the corporation must consult the Minister before it enters upon a course of action that in its opinion -

- (a) amounts to a major initiative; or
- (b) is likely to be of significant public interest.

That is crystal clear. I reiterate that the Water Corporation is not like any other public service body; it is a corporate body with a board. It is required to act in a commercial way and it must consult the minister on any issues that are of major significance to the public.

In each of these cases, Mr Jones failed in his duty as Chairman of the Water Corporation. In defence of his actions he said he was simply acting for the Government. I am sorry, but Mr Jones was not appointed to act for the Government; he was appointed to act for the Water Corporation. The board is the governing body, not the chairman. The board is to act on commercial principles. Any person evaluating the performance of Mr Jones in those final days when he put this deal together on his own with Mr Johnson could conclude only that he was not acting commercially. He was acting on behalf of some assumed government view. He was acting to fix a problem for the Government. He was not carrying out his duties as chairman of that board.

We also find that he should have consulted with the minister on this matter. Let me be absolutely clear on this matter: If there is any self-respect in this Government, and if this Government has any concept of its boards and the way they should act, Mr Jones should be sacked. If he is not sacked, the only conclusion one can reach is that the minister cannot sack him because he is covering up the fact that Mr Jones was actually an agent for the Government in what he was doing. That, of course, could be closer to the truth of what is happening. In other words, his role was not to protect the interests of the Water Corporation. We know from the memorandums that have come through that the officers of the Water Corporation are horrified by what is going on. That is why they make it absolutely clear in these file notes that they had nothing to do with this deal. It was not done properly. They are all saying that the question -

Dr Hames: Are you going to table them?

Dr GALLOP: It was given to us under freedom of information.

Dr Hames: There is nothing that says anything like you just said.

Dr GALLOP: The minister must read between the lines. The officers of the Water Corporation are covering their backsides on this matter. The minister has definitely misled the House about this matter. He has not properly accounted to this Parliament for what happened. He tried to tell a story that it was all part of the normal processes of the Water Corporation. The facts have shown that that is not true. The only problem with the attempted explanation by Mr Jones is that it totally contradicts the job he was given to do as a director of the Water Corporation. Absolutely clearly and incontrovertibly it confirms that he has not acted properly as a director of that organisation. The Government of Western Australia is exposed yet again. There has been no care for due process and no care for the Water Corporation Act. The minister did not even feature in this story. The person given the responsibility under the Act to make sure the Water Corporation acts properly did not even crack a mention in what happened. He was supposed to be informed about this matter under the terms of the Water Corporation Act. This is a serious matter. The public of Western Australia has paid for this land well above the valuation provided by the Valuer General. No justification has been given for that price. In terms of Mr Jones' final negotiating on this issue, there was no reference to the Water Corporation or the Water and Rivers Commission and, as far as we can see, no reference to the Treasury until after the event.

I will conclude on this point, and my colleague will follow-up on it: It is very interesting that the minister said in this Parliament that this deal was done for the Water Corporation. The freedom of information material we have states that that is absolutely wrong. This was done for the Government, which had a particular problem called the Regional Forest Agreement and it was trying to make that agreement look better than it was. That was the bottom line for this issue. If the members of the Government of Western Australia want to appoint their political friends to boards of corporations, they must know that these corporations are governed by laws that are laid down by this Parliament. They must know that the Auditor General supervises the activities of these bodies to make sure that we have proper accountability in public expenditure. On this occasion this is a clear example of the Government not following due process and, to add insult to injury, the minister came into the Parliament and misled the Parliament about what actually happened.

DR HAMES (Yokine - Minister for Water Resources) [3.10 pm]: The Leader of the Opposition is doing his usual trick and trying to make a mountain out of a molehill. He is trying to turn something that is of benefit to the State into something other than what it is. I will go quietly and clearly through the process that led to the sale and clarify some of the issues raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

When the land was put on the market in late 1998, a meeting was held between the Premier, the Minister for Finance, the Minister for Water Resources, the Under Treasurer, the Chief Executive Officer of the Water and Rivers Commission, the Premier's chief of staff and Dr Jim Gill, and the chief executive officer of the Water Corporation to discuss the sale and whether an offer would be put in. The valuation by the Water and Rivers Commission formed part of the discussion. The Leader of the Opposition said that was never discussed. The valuation of the clearing costs of the land was part of the discussion held at the meeting. The Water and Rivers Commission put the value of the compensation for clearing bans at

somewhere between \$2m and \$6m, depending on who purchased it and what the purchaser wanted to do with it. If a tourist developer wanted to buy the land and use it for tourist development, there would be much less pressure on the need to clear the land and therefore the compensation cost would be less, but it could be up to \$6m. We had a valuation from the Valuer General's Office of \$7.3m for the land, including a clearing cost estimated to be \$4m and a land value of \$3.3m. We were aware that the person seeking to sell the land was after \$12m, which was far outside the price the Government was prepared to pay. The Government thought that, as an opening gambit, it was a heavy price.

Mr Wiese: Wasn't it advertised on the open market and in the *Farmers Weekly*?

Dr HAMES: The sale of the land was well advertised and was well known to everybody. The asking price of \$12m was also known. We did not believe that it was a reasonable price and it was decided that a bid for \$6m would be submitted. Questions about where the bid should come from and who should put it in arose. It was decided at the meeting at which senior Water Corporation officers were present that the best option would be for it to come from the Water Corporation because the corporation was in the best position for ownership and future management of dams. It was considered that the ownership of the catchment should be in the hands of the Water Corporation even though there was a general benefit to government from having made the purchase. We requested the Water Corporation to continue the negotiations to purchase the land and that happened. The negotiations were ongoing and staff from the Water Corporation, including the chairman, were involved.

Dr Gallop: They did not reach an agreement, did they?

Dr HAMES: They did not reach an agreement. Those prices were still part of the negotiation process. We wanted to purchase the land for a number of reasons. On the one hand was the water.

Dr Gallop: This is padding!

Dr HAMES: The quality of the water was no longer suitable for drinking; it had become too saline. The assessment of the Water and Rivers Commission was that in 20 to 30 years, the water would be of drinkable quality. It is a great advantage for the Water Corporation to own the catchment. The corporation can ensure that it is properly managed so that the water returns to drinking quality. The value of the water is about \$10m a year - this does not form part of the figures seen by the Leader of the Opposition. Once the water in the dam returns to drinking quality, about 20 gigalitres of fresh water will be available each year. In the future its price will be about \$10m a year, in today's dollars. The land was valued at about \$4m for compensation. However, the Water and Rivers Commission told us it could actually be worth \$6m. It was also valued as part of the negotiations undertaken by the Minister for the Environment during the Regional Forest Agreement process. The Minister for the Environment was able to do two things: One was to lock away areas of forest as part of the negotiations so that those hectares of forest could be preserved.

Dr Gallop: She did that before the land was bought.

Dr HAMES: She certainly had not. The Minister for the Environment will talk about the dates. Those dates are quite clear and are on the record. Those things did not occur. The land was of great advantage to the minister as part of the negotiating process with the Commonwealth Government. Second, the Minister for the Environment was able to put that land aside as part of a national park. The member for Collie had lobbied publicly quite strongly on behalf of her constituents for that. Her constituents were very much in favour of the Government purchasing that land and having ownership for the benefit of the local community.

Over that weekend or on the Monday - I am not sure exactly which day it was - the Chairman of the Water Corporation negotiated with the owner to come to an agreement on the price. The owner wanted \$12m for the land. The Valuer General's valuation was \$7.3m and our office felt that it was well below the value.

Dr Gallop: Who assisted the chairman in his negotiations?

Dr HAMES: As I said in the Parliament, the chairman negotiated that price on his own by phone. I have stated that to the Leader of the Opposition in the Parliament. It is in the *Hansard*. The price was not signed, sealed and delivered. He negotiated the price as an agent for the Water Corporation. The deal then needed to be signed. It was not a deal or a contract until the offer and acceptance document was signed. That constitutes my answer, which the Leader of the Opposition is mislabelling as incorrect. The chairman negotiated a deal that was not consummated until the offer and acceptance document was signed. The chairman signed it with Water Corporation staff in the presence of the acting chief executive officer of the day.

Dr Gallop: Is the minister saying that the chairman did not enter into a contractual obligation?

Dr HAMES: The chairman negotiated the deal. If the Leader of the Opposition wished to purchase a block of land, a real estate agent would act on his behalf. The Leader of the Opposition would tell the agent to negotiate a price, which the agent would do. It would not be a deal until the Leader of the Opposition signed the offer and acceptance. There was no deal until the chairman and staff signed the deal. That is the way things are. I know members opposite have little to negotiate as they are not involved in property development or employment of any kind. However, that is the normal way -

Dr Gallop: Is the minister saying that he is running a business as a minister?

Dr HAMES: I have previously run a business.

Dr Gallop: Is he running one now, as a minister?

Dr HAMES: I have a share in a bakery. So what?

Dr Gallop: Is he working when he is a minister?

Dr HAMES: I am not doing any work. I am a silent partner. My partner does all the work. What does that have to do with the price of eggs?

These deals work that way. It is not a deal until it is signed. The senior officer of Water Corporation was present when it was signed. It was signed up for \$9.5m. The Leader of the Opposition is trying to paint that as a bad deal. There is absolutely no way it is a bad deal. A valuation was done.

Dr Gallop: The chairman instructed the acting chief executive officer to finalise the deal.

Dr HAMES: A valuation was done by a sworn valuer on behalf of the person selling the land. Therefore, I accept that it was not done by the Water Corporation. However, by law, an independent valuer is required to do a valuation that is not influenced by the people for whom the valuation is done. The valuation came in at \$9.95m. A figure of \$9.5m was negotiated by the chairman of the Water Corporation. Therefore, he has in effect, through his negotiating skills, saved the Government and the taxpayers \$450 000 on what a valuation expert says is the true value of the property. However, that does not take into account the value of the water to the Water Corporation of \$10m per annum once that water is of drinking quality standard.

Dr Gallop: Under what section of the Water Corporation Act was he acting? Come on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Dr HAMES: There have been three big winners in this deal. The first winner is the public, which now has a new national park, a protected catchment and a tremendous facility available for the local community. Secondly, the Government is a beneficiary because it does not have to pay compensation for the possible clearing of that land, and, thirdly, the Water Corporation is a winner because it has purchased a block of land that not only protects the catchment but also gives it a valuable asset for the future of something in the order of \$10m per annum.

The Opposition is full of hot air on this matter. The Water Corporation and the chairman have done an excellent job in negotiating this deal. The Water Corporation has done what it and the Government wanted. They are not in isolation. The Opposition is trying to paint the picture that the Water Corporation is totally separate and totally divorced from government. There is only one shareholder in the Water Corporation, and I, as the minister and the shareholder, have the certificate for that on behalf of the public. In its duties, the Water Corporation acts not as a totally isolated organisation, but in the best interests of the Water Corporation and, above all, in the best interests of the people of Western Australia. In this situation, the Water Corporation has acted for the people of Western Australia in purchasing a property which is of enormous value to the people of Western Australia.

DR EDWARDS (Maylands) [3.22 pm]: I support the Leader of the Opposition. In dealing with this motion, the first question I ask this: Where was the minister? He has just told us that he is the one shareholder, but he is notably absent in all the documents we have received. We now know that on Monday, 12 April, the chairman of the Water Corporation concluded the negotiations for this deal alone. We had some trouble obtaining this information from the minister. That certainly was not apparent when we asked questions in April. Indeed, when the minister was asked directly in April, he ducked, weaved, went around the point and did not answer the question.

Dr Hames: It is all in *Hansard*, exactly as I have said today. It is the same story.

Dr EDWARDS: When we asked the question directly of the minister in April, he did not answer the question. He did not answer the question directly until I asked it of him in written form last week. He answered it directly then because he knew that we had finally, after numerous reviews, been successful with our freedom of information request.

I will go back to 12 April. The chairman concluded the negotiations on 12 April. On 13 April, we know that the chairman faxed the Under Treasurer, telling him that the deal had been finalised. He made an interesting comment at the bottom of that fax when he said -

I have advised the Premier and the Minister for the Environment of the completion of these negotiations.

Where was the minister? If the minister was away, why was an acting minister not notified? If he was in the bush, why was he not telephoned? There is nothing in any of the memos about talking to the Minister for Water Resources. Yes, the Premier was contacted and knew about it; yes, the Minister for the Environment knew about it. The Minister for Water Resources is out of the picture. Who is in the picture? The member for Collie is in the picture. One of the memos states that on 13 April, when these people got around to signing bits of paper -

It was raised at that meeting the appropriateness of any external discussion on this purchase especially should the Corporation be contacted by Dr Hilda Turnbull.

That is, the member for Collie. The member contacted the Water Corporation and was informed - because that had been decided in the morning - that the purchase had taken place. However, as would any good local member, the member for Collie wanted to know what she could do about publicising the purchase. The member was told that she would be further contacted on that question. Again, no reference was made to the Minister for Water Resources. What answer was conveyed to the member for Collie later in the day? She was told to talk to the Minister for the Environment. Yet again, the Minister for Water Resources was cut out of the picture. He is the community's shareholder in this \$9m deal which was undertaken

quietly and secretly by the chairman. Despite what we know about the requirement for the Minister for Water Resources to be informed of these actions, these people were talking to only the Premier and the Minister for the Environment. We now know why they were talking to the Minister for the Environment and why she was the appropriate person. The Minister for Water Resources has just told us that this land was becoming increasingly important for the Regional Forest Agreement. When the Minister for the Environment and the Premier released the RFA on 4 May, they made much reference to this 3 000 hectares. We are grateful that it is included in the RFA, but that was no reason to rush through and conclude a deal in secret when there was no other player in the field. It was no reason to pay much more than the first bid made by the Water Corporation. The documentation shows that the Water Corporation did not want to progress this bid.

Then comes the question of funding. It is stated in the RFA documents that the agreement provides \$17.5m for tourism. The documents further state that \$1m is for tourism development at the Wellington Dam, but refer to the purchase, at a cost of \$9.5m, of the land around the Wellington Dam which is now included in the RFA.

The issue of funding is of concern to not only the Opposition, but also the Water Corporation. Throughout these notes it is clearly stated that Water Corporation staff were instructed and directed. When the chairman of the board telephoned the Water Corporation, the staff had to ask how it would be funded. On file are memos from staff who were concerned about the funding. They decided they could put up the 5 per cent deposit required, but they would have to wait for the return of the managing director to sort out the rest of the funding. The chairman of the board concluded the deal over the weekend or on Monday, without anyone from the Water Corporation, and then wrote to the Under Treasurer telling him what he had done and advising him that he had informed the Premier and the Minister for the Environment. The poor old Minister for Water Resources must be feeling really left out. However, that is not the issue. The issue is about accountability and the Act passed by this Parliament in 1995, which neither the Government nor the minister have abided by.

I now refer to the fact that Mr Jones concluded these final negotiations by himself. People in the private sector who have talked to me about this have scratched their heads. They know that under the Corporations Law, directors have huge responsibilities, and that these days accountability is paramount. The chairman of the board was not only negotiating without any of the Water Corporation staff who had been involved in earlier negotiations, but also dealing with taxpayers' money and signing off a deal for \$9.5m, when the clear bid was \$6m. Some of the concerns are noted in the documents; for example, Water Corporation staff emphasise that other than the chairman, no Water Corporation staff had been involved in the final negotiations that led to the finalisation of the purchase of the land.

Another issue arises; that is, the valuation. The minister has said that the valuation which sealed the final part of the deal was provided by Mr Johnson's valuer. One of the issues about which the Opposition is concerned relates to a file note from Mr Moore, general manager of the engineering and contracts division, in connection with the valuation. That file note states -

I received a phone message from the Chairman on Friday 16 April 1999 in which he advised that he had Mr Johnson's valuation and he would forward it to me for inclusion on the file.

On 12 April the chairman finalised the deal. On 12 April the chairman contacted staff and either instructed or directed them to draw up the documentation. On 13 April the documentation was signed. On 14 April it received publicity. According to the minister's answers in this Parliament, the board approved the deal on 15 April, and on 16 April the chairman advised the general manager of engineering and contracts, who is a very important person in the Water Corporation, that he would forward the valuation shortly. That is not good practice. Nobody in the private sector would be happy with that sort of business practice, and shareholders would be asking questions. The shareholder in this situation did not know much about it. The shareholder, who is meant to represent the community's interests, was not notified of what was going on and the contact was made at high levels of government. The Government has not acted in an accountable manner that we need in the 1990s. The minister was not aware of the detail of what was going on in his portfolio, and this matter should be referred to the Auditor General. The Auditor General can inquire into the Water Corporation, and in this case he should. The minister should also consider his role, given the Act and what has happened in this set of circumstances.

MR PENDAL (South Perth) [3.31 pm]: I did not want to take part in the debate, and I tried to attract the minister's attention while he was speaking because I want to know before I vote the answer to three questions. I followed the debate from afar in the *Hansard* and in the media. However, I want to bring myself up to date on three issues. Firstly, is it normal practice that the Chairman of the Water Corporation handles these negotiations? The minister has no obligation to answer me, because that would be inviting him to be disorderly. Secondly, if it is normal practice for the chairman to carry out those negotiations of his own volition, when was the last time that he did that in a major deal? Thirdly, did the chairman act with the prior knowledge and consent of the chief executive officer and the board of the Water Corporation? I will vote according to the outcome of the minister's answers.

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley - Minister for the Environment) [3.33 pm]: I oppose the motion. The value of the Wellington Dam land is enormous and its contribution to the community as a national park and through tourism in the region cannot be underestimated. It is valuable because it will protect native forest and also the water catchment area. The Minister for Water Resources has advised that the community will benefit when the water is returned to them as drinkable water.

The negotiations have not been improper. They were undertaken over a long period, commencing last year when the land was put on the open market. It is well known that the member for Collie, on behalf of the community, and many community representatives, including the local councils and shires, have made representations to the Government that the Wellington Dam site would be a great contribution to that area and could be considered as part of the Regional Forest Agreement. One aspect of the RFA process was to consider what the community wanted. The Wellington Dam land, part of which was owned by the Worsley Timber Pty Ltd, has a number of attractive characteristics. It has a number of streams running into it. It is

in a high rainfall area. Also, lot 104 enjoys a wide frontage to the Wellington Dam and provides a unique opportunity to establish a national park, to which the Government is committed. A considerable reserve of timber such as jarrah, marri and blackbutt is located on the property. Under the Regional Forest Agreement, the Government wants to reserve as much of its pristine area as possible. This land represents an ideal opportunity to commit that area to reservation. Given the strong push by the local community for the Government to purchase the land when it came on the market last year, the Wellington Dam site fitted nicely into the Regional Forest Agreement process.

The other aspect was the Water Corporation's obligation to protect the water catchment area. The purchase of the land provided a good opportunity to establish a national park, particularly given its frontage onto the Wellington Dam. It is ideally located for the inland communities around Narrogin, Wagin and Darkan and its tourism value to Western Australia has been underestimated, given the size of that inland water system in which it is located. Ecotourism opportunities can be established there and linked up with tourism in other areas in the immediate region.

The Department of Conservation and Land Management conducted an analysis of the land based on its criteria for conservation values for flora and fauna. The Government had considered the area in light of that analysis. Once the area's water values were protected, the Government had a great opportunity to not only increase the conservation reserve and protect water values but also promote tourism opportunities, so that we were able to achieve two ends. There was nothing unusual about the deal. The *Collie Mail* broke the news on 22 April.

Dr Gallop: The seller got everything he wanted and the Government did not.

Mrs EDWARDES: The original agreement was signed on 4 May and the deal was negotiated prior to the land being incorporated into the Regional Forest Agreement. The comment by the Leader of the Opposition that the people of Western Australia got nothing is underestimating the value of that land to that local region and to the people of Western Australia, given the size of that inland waterway.

Dr Gallop: Where did I say we got nothing?

Mrs EDWARDES: I thought I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that it was of no value to the people of Western Australia. There was a value, particularly in the protection of that forest and the water catchment area. The idea that the Leader of the Opposition has put forward to undervalue its worth to the community as a new national park will not be accepted. The local community regard it as being particularly valuable. When it is added to the adjoining areas of Davis and Leonard, the total area will be 4 300 hectares, including the 3 000 ha previously purchased.

The establishment of a new national park reflected that the Regional Forest Agreement process took into account the community's concerns and the views of a wide range of organisations which wanted that area included in the RFA process. That included local government, tourism, heritage groups, scientists and the local conservation movement such as the Preston Environment Group, and the WA Forest Alliance, which identified the areas around the Wellington Dam as being important for inclusion into the comprehensive, adequate and representative reserve system. Something for future generations is being achieved. The creation of the Wellington National Park, with the additions to the Lane Poole Reserve between Collie and Dwellingup, will provide a new resource which will develop the tourism sector at Collie. The enhanced protection of the water catchment complements all the other initiatives aimed at increasing the water quality within Wellington Dam. There was nothing unusual and nothing improper in regard to the deal.

DR TURNBULL (Collie) [3.40 pm]: I am very disappointed that, not just the Leader of the Opposition but those opposite, are trying to use the purchase of the land surrounding the Wellington Dam, now designated as a national park, as a political exercise. This Parliament is absolutely sick of the Opposition trying to tear down decisions which are for the benefit of all Western Australians. This area surrounding the Wellington Dam, which I presume most members opposite have not seen, is one of the secrets and treasures of Western Australia. It is magnificent, unique land, on which is located the Wellington Dam which, at the moment, is overflowing. I went there on Sunday, and I can tell members that it is absolutely beautiful. At the moment this Opposition is trying to tear down this concept.

I am a local and I will explain to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, given that you at least are listening and certain members opposite are not, exactly why it was so important that this land be purchased. For many years people in the Collie area have said that the 6 070 hectares surrounding the Wellington Dam, with 90 kilometres of foreshore, should belong to the people of Western Australia; however, it has belonged to one individual, Walter Johnson. Fortunately, up to this stage he has not restricted public access to the land. Everybody goes there to fish for marron and to have picnics. People have used it as if it were a national park.

In 1998 we heard that the land had been placed on the market for sale by tender, and we were quite surprised. Only four weeks were given before the tender closed. Obviously a number of people would be interested in purchasing the land. As the local member, I quickly found out the sorts of people who would be interested in purchasing the land: An international businessman who was seeking an exclusive retreat which would have required exclusion of the public; a charitable organisation buying the land for conservation purposes that would, as it has on a property located on the road to Northam, put a fence around it and charge entry; a timber merchant who wanted the valuable jarrah and blackbutt on the land; and the most threatening being a potential buyer who wanted the opportunity for the lucrative development of rural properties.

The land is zoned as rural by the Collie Shire Council. Nothing has been done to change the zoning. The latter development represents a potentially lucrative rural development. The minimum lot size is 100 acres and the land a prime red loam. It has proved to be very good grape-growing land. A test vineyard is located just down the road from this area. Its first vintage was this year, and tests have proved to be good.

A subdivision of that area could involve 13 different landholders. They would all be able to clear a certain acreage and put in very good vineyards which would rival those in the Margaret River area, and the location is much closer to Perth. The people of Collie and the shire could not raise the \$12m asking price Walter Johnson wanted for this land. There was no other way to purchase the land for the benefit of Western Australians and, in particular, for the south west region, Bunbury and the towns in the shire surrounding the Wellington Dam - Collie Donnybrook and Dardanup. As everybody has pointed out - all members opposite would have to admit this - it has an enormous potential value in ecotourism. Collie, Wellington Dam and Potters Gorge are only two hours' drive from Perth. This puts the area in a prime position to be the centre of ecotourism, recreation and retreats, given its reasonably short distance from the city. With marron fishing in the Stirling Dam being restricted because it is to become a water supply for Perth, everybody from Perth will want to come to Collie to catch marron. If new owners put any restriction on the land, it would be quite devastating from a recreational, tourism and water quality perspective.

The Water Corporation was the logical body to approach in regard to the purchase, and I organised a meeting with Mr Gill and other members of corporation, and the minister. We met with deputations from the shires and put to them that we wanted the land purchased. As has already been pointed out, the tender closed within a very short time. The price of \$6m was a first offer to get the government agency's foot in the door to obtain the land for the benefit of all Western Australians. There was a very short, sharp analysis of the value. Everyone knew that it was miles away from the amount Walter Johnson wanted. Most likely, it would have been different from the amounts submitted in tenders by other people. We had to put in a tender. The value of the land, the value of the timber on it and the value of the compensation to be paid to prevent some clearing, all had to be taken into account. I think the officials from the Water Corporation and the two ministers involved have done a fantastic job.

Mr Kobelke: You paid far too much for it.

Dr TURNBULL: The land, which has been bought for the people of Western Australia at our request, is a magnificent resource. The Opposition is on a loser here in criticising this magnificent purchase.

MR COWAN (Merredin - Deputy Premier) [3.48 pm]: I had been alerted to the fact that this land was for sale, first, by the member for Collie. I recall having some discussions with other ministers about this matter. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has never raised the issue of whether this money was spent wisely. I heard an interjection by someone who said that too much money had been spent, but we can easily refute that.

Dr Gallop: Do it.

Mr COWAN: I will. The Leader of the Opposition has raised the matter of process. With respect to that, the chairman of the board of the Water Corporation is someone in whom we can place enough trust to apply his ability to deal with that matter.

Dr Gallop: Rubbish! He have doesn't even know the Act.

Mr COWAN: I had to listen to the Leader of the Opposition, and I never once heard him quote a provision in the Act with which we might not have complied.

I will go through whether the State got value for money. Everyone knows that some time ago - in fact, in the late 1970s, if my memory serves me correctly - the State passed a law which placed a clearing ban on the catchment areas of those rivers that have the potential to provide potable water in Western Australia. That law also provided for compensation for those people who were not permitted to clear their property. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition knows that the land in question that was owned by Worsley Timber Pty Ltd was within the Collie River catchment area, which was one of the catchment areas that was subject to that legislation, and it was, as a consequence, the subject of a clearing ban. We need to bear in mind that the then owner, Mr Walter Johnson, the proprietor of Worsley Timber Pty Ltd had honoured a verbal agreement that had been made by his father with the late Graham MacKinnon, who was the minister at the time, that he would not clear that land, and I commend Mr Walter Johnson for that. However, that agreement did not preclude Mr Johnson from selling the property, and had he sold the property to another private owner - the Minister for Water Resources has alluded to this fact - that new owner could have easily sought to clear it and we would have had to pay compensation for the value of not only the land but also the timber that was on that land. The combination of those two values was such that I believe the State received an absolute bargain. I commend the Chairman of the Water Corporation Board for taking this initiative, after consultation with the Premier and, I am sure, other ministers, and purchasing that asset for this State.

DR GALLOP (Victoria Park - Leader of the Opposition) [3.52 pm]: On the basis of the information that has come from the freedom of information request and the debate in the Parliament today, we can reach the following conclusions: Firstly, Mr Peter Jones concluded the purchase of this land on his own and then instructed the Water Corporation to draw up the papers. Secondly, in concluding that deal and giving that instruction, Mr Jones acted beyond his authority as a director and chairman of the Water Corporation. Thirdly, in those final days of negotiations on whether it was a proper value for that land, Mr Jones consulted no-one in Government, and, most importantly, no-one in the Water Corporation and the Water and Rivers Commission. Fourthly, Mr Jones did not consult the minister, as he was required to do under the Water Corporation Act 1995. Fifthly, Mr Jones clearly acted in a way that was contrary to his duties as a director of the Water Corporation. If Mr Jones were in a private corporation and his behaviour were subject to analysis, he would fall short of the mark. Today, this Government is defending -

Mr Pandal: It certainly falls short of the behaviour that the Opposition advocated during the many years that I sat in this place in shadow Cabinets. This would have to be labelled, in the absence of answers to my questions, as one of the sleaziest deals imaginable.

Dr GALLOP: There we have it from the Independent member for South Perth! On the basis of the evidence that is before us from the FOI and the parliamentary debate, this is a sleazy deal between Mr Johnson and Mr Jones. Mr Jones acted contrary to his duties as a director of the Water Corporation, and he should be sacked and this deal sent to the Auditor General.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (18)

Ms Anwyl
Mr Brown
Dr Constable
Dr Edwards
Dr Gallop

Mr Grill
Mr Kobelke
Ms MacTiernan
Mr Marlborough
Mr McGinty

Mr McGowan
Ms McHale
Mr Pental
Mr Riebeling

Mr Ripper
Mr Thomas
Ms Warnock
Mr Cunningham (*Teller*)

Noes (28)

Mr Ainsworth
Mr Baker
Mr Barnett
Mr Barron-Sullivan
Mr Board
Mr Bradshaw
Mr Court

Mr Cowan
Mr Day
Mrs Edwardes
Dr Hames
Mrs Hodson-Thomas
Mr House
Mr Johnson

Mr MacLean
Mr Marshall
Mr Masters
Mr McNee
Mr Minson
Mr Omodei
Mrs Parker

Mr Prince
Mr Shave
Mr Trenorden
Mr Tubby
Dr Turnbull
Mr Wiese
Mr Osborne (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr Graham
Mrs Roberts
Mr Carpenter

Mrs Holmes
Mr Kierath
Mrs van de Klashorst

Question thus negatived.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3) 1999

Standing Orders Suspension

MR BARNETT (Cottesloe - Leader of the House) [3.59 pm]: I move -

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would enable the introduction and passage of all stages of the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 1999.

It is the Minister's intention that the Bill will be read a second time, and we will proceed with the remainder of the debate at the start of business tomorrow.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mrs Edwardes (Minister for Labour Relations), and read a first time.

Second Reading

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley - Minister for Labour Relations) [3.59 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The intent of this legislation is to clarify the application of section 32(8) of the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Amendment Act 1999. That section was based on the Pearson review recommendation that if injured workers were in the system at the date of assent, they should be able to elect in accordance with the new provisions. Section 32(8) was intended to provide that if weekly payments commenced before the assent date, all workers wishing to elect to claim common law must make an election no later than six months from the date of commencement of weekly payments, or three months from the date of assent, whichever is the later. The clear intent was that the three-month period applies to workers who have been on compensation for longer than six months.

Doubt has been expressed as to whether the wording in the legislation has this effect. On a clear understanding of what the Government has intended, which the Opposition supported, this amendment clarifies the Government's intent and will be effective as from the assent day, which was 5 October 1999. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Cunningham.

NATIONAL RAIL CORPORATION AGREEMENT REPEAL BILL 1999

Second Reading

MR OMODEI (Warren-Blackwood - Minister for Local Government) [4.01 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The National Rail Corporation Agreement Act 1992 was enacted to approve and ratify a shareholder's agreement between Western Australia, the Commonwealth and other States relating to the establishment of National Rail and to make provisions necessary for it to engage in rail transport services in the State. In preparation for the sale of the National Rail Corporation, the Commonwealth Government sought the States' assistance to remove from National Rail a number of benefits and obligations arising under the National Rail Shareholders' Agreement which are not applicable to other corporations, in order that competitive neutrality would apply. Termination of the agreement at the time National Rail is sold, was also sought by the Commonwealth. The State has agreed to these changes. Members may recall that the National Rail Third Amending Agreement to effect these changes was tabled in Parliament on 20 April 1999.

With the State's agreement to terminate the shareholders' agreement on the date National Rail is sold, the National Rail Corporation Agreement Act 1992 will no longer be required. The National Rail Corporation Agreement Repeal Bill 1999 will repeal the National Rail Corporation Agreement Act 1992 and thereby the shareholders' agreement in Western Australia will be terminated. The National Rail Corporation Agreement Repeal Bill 1999 will be proclaimed on the day the National Rail Corporation is sold. This is likely to occur early next year. I commend the Bill to the House and I table an explanatory memorandum for the Bill for the information of members.

[See paper No 274.]

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Cunningham.

HERITAGE BILL 1999

Second Reading - Cognate Debate

Resumed from 21 October.

MR BARNETT (Cottesloe - Leader of the House) [4.03 pm]: The Heritage Bill is significant. The Minister for Heritage is currently absent but he will return shortly and in the meantime I will listen to the contributions made to the second reading. Heritage is a somewhat vexed issue and there are a number of heritage matters in my electorate.

Mr McGowan: Is this the "speech for all occasions"?

Mr BARNETT: Members may be interested to know that my last newsletter was entirely devoted to the heritage issue.

Mr Pendal: A very strong contribution.

Mr BARNETT: Indeed. A heritage issue which has been of interest to me is that while we all notionally like the idea of preserving old buildings, heritage must be functional - a building must have a use. There are examples in my electorate of old homesteads, particularly on the beachfront, which have heritage orders attached to them but some of the requirements of the heritage management plan can be so onerous that they make it unattractive for people to buy and renovate these properties. My personal view is that heritage should primarily apply to the exterior of buildings. I am talking about private property rather than public property and in the case of private residences, there should be greater freedom to renovate the interior of a house to make it suitable for modern family living. The existence of heritage orders makes it almost impossible, in an almost bizarre way, to buy and internally renovate several properties in the electorate of Cottesloe. There are prospective buyers who will happily restore to the letter any requirement relating to the exterior of a property but do not have the freedom to make the house practical to live in. Anyone who will spend \$1m or \$2m to restore the exterior of these properties clearly values heritage; he will not do anything internally which is absolutely at odds with heritage. These people need greater flexibility. The irony of this situation is heritage legislation and heritage management plans are in place to protect the buildings but they can work in a dysfunctional manner. The owner cannot sell a property - no-one will buy it - so the building is allowed to decline and deteriorate. Several properties in my electorate are exposed to ocean front conditions and are simply falling down. The owners will sit back for two or three years while the houses fall down and then redevelop the land. That is not the intention of the current owners or prospective buyers. They would rather see the properties sold or redeveloped. There are buyers in the marketplace who will buy these properties and restore them beautifully to an extraordinary standard as long as there is some flexibility to make internal alterations. A lot of the buildings have many small bedrooms and pokey spaces and people want to open them up inside. They do not necessarily want to keep a fireplace in every room. They want to put in modern heating and those sorts of things to make the house practical to live in.

Mr McGowan: There is that flexibility at the moment unless the heritage integrity results in something architectural inside or there was some sort of historical event or a significant person lived in the property which makes it inconsistent with heritage values for that to take place.

Mr BARNETT: I know that is there - I do not purport to be an expert on heritage as a concept or this legislation - but in two or three examples in my electorate I would argue that the fabric of heritage administration is contributing to the demise of heritage buildings.

Mr McGowan: Your house may one day be a heritage site.

Mr BARNETT: My house is listed on the Claremont heritage register. It is a famous old house.

Mr McGowan: Do you support John Curtin's house in Cottesloe being listed?

Mr BARNETT: John Curtin House is an interesting example. My good friend, the member for South Perth, gave me several instructive addresses on heritage and John Curtin House. However, as members would be aware, the Commonwealth and State Governments have jointly purchased John Curtin House, which is very modest.

Dr Constable: Is it staying there?

Mr BARNETT: It will stay on the site. A heritage and management plan is currently being developed for the property. A most likely scenario is it will be used for visiting fellows to Curtin University of Technology and will be open to the public over several weekends, probably mid-semester. However, while the house can be lived in, the kitchen and bathroom areas are literally of the 1940s. In my view, it would be preferable if an annex could be built at the back of the house to allow a modern bathroom and kitchen to be constructed to stop the use of some of the building while the living and bedrooms areas could still be used. The plan is currently being assessed.

Mr Pendal: I hope this does not adversely affect your career but I have to say that your intervention and the result for John Curtin House was a superb outcome particularly in keeping it on site. Had those other people succeeded in shifting it off the site, its heritage value would have been almost nil.

Mr BARNETT: The member is overly generous because initially I favoured moving the property to Curtin University. An advantage of that would have been the property could have been restored and all of Curtin's original furniture - which the university has; his paintings, books and records - could have been returned to the house and it would have been a museum in a true sense.

Mr McGowan: Why couldn't that be done at the moment?

Mr BARNETT: I do not believe it is realistic. It is a modest house among what are now larger houses in fairly valuable real estate. It will look a little anomalous but that is fine; it can stay there. However, it is unacceptable to put valuable records and artefacts in it in a non-secure position. I was attracted initially to relocation to Curtin University of Technology, where I believed it could be truly part of the Curtin centre. However, I bow to the experts' opinion - and the member for South Perth had much to say to me about this - that it should stay in its area, and I accept that. Given that it is now staying in Cottesloe - as the local member I am not upset about that, it is great - there is an issue of how to effectively use it, which is not obvious. Curtin University's idea of having visiting fellows live there has much merit, as has the idea of having limited periods for open days which is similar to Gallop House that has regular open-day weekends. It is all right to whack a heritage order on a building to preserve it - certainly John Curtin's house should be preserved - but how to effectively use and maintain that building is another matter, as I cannot imagine people queuing to visit John Curtin House. It is suggested that the Labor Party may want to conduct forums there occasionally; I would support that. I am sure one could find Labor Party members outside the Cottesloe electorate, but not many inside, who would attend those forums!

Mr McGowan: You might like to acquire some neighbouring properties and erect some structures so that we could organise that.

Mr BARNETT: No. The member for Perth is frequently seen in my electorate on Sunday mornings at North Cottesloe Beach.

Ms Warnock: I admire the heritage bathing facilities, the old showers, down there.

Mr BARNETT: The member for Perth should not say that or it will be listed! Does the Opposition have its next speaker ready?

Mr McGowan: We are scintillated by, and loving, your exposition on the Heritage Bill.

Mr BARNETT: I will send the member for Rockingham a copy of my newsletter in which he will find my philosophy on heritage.

MR MARSHALL (Dawesville - Parliamentary Secretary) [4.12 pm]: I challenge this Heritage Bill with its consequential provisions. The house in which the late John Tonkin lived, in Preston Point Road, which has a magnificent view, has come to my attention in the past week. John Tonkin was a neighbour of mine for 20 years, a former Premier of this State, head of the Labor movement and, in my opinion, one of the all-time greats of his profession in this State. The house was sold a number of times in the past five years and the people living in it currently have applied to the East Fremantle Town Council for permission to extend it as they are having a second child. The council has rejected their application on the grounds that the house could receive a heritage classification. I have lived there all my life and I cannot see how the house could be classified as heritage; John Tonkin's garden was certainly capable of classification. He was not only a humane and community-minded person but also the president of East Fremantle Football Club, which made him even more notorious, but his garden was his hobby. I used to see him out in the front yard toying with his roses and his favourite camellias; he was well known for what he did in that garden. He invented a reticulation machine which was dug into the ground about nine inches with a hose going through the instrument which saved water by watering the roots. I believe it was patented and sold around the world. When John Tonkin was in his garden, people going past in their cars would toot their horns.

It is well known in this House that I was a tennis professional at the East Fremantle tennis club, which is directly across the road and below John Tonkin's house. As every car tooted, I waved thinking they were tooting at me, the well-known tennis professional. However, after the tooting had occurred 30 or 40 times, I looked up, realised that honest John was in the garden - a great credit to the man. However, they were not tooting his house but, rather, his garden. Suddenly the East Fremantle Town Council is saying that anything that has been in East Fremantle for a long time can be classified as heritage. I challenge the interpretation of "long" relating to time. His house was not a house of special architecture; it was a normal brick and tile house like all the other houses in that mid-1950s era. It is difficult for me to accept that the council can say to the new owners of the house that as John Tonkin lived there, it may be classified as heritage and they cannot extend the house, even though they are anticipating a new infant and they need an extra room for their family. I admired John Tonkin and, as a hobbyist, it was his garden, not his house, that people tooted at and were proud to acknowledge.

Similarly, up the road, there is a clinker brick house and I am told that the council is looking at that as a potential heritage listing. There is another house that has a letterbox made of crossed racquets. Three months ago the lady who runs the tourist trams in Fremantle rang the proprietors of the house to ask if they would paint the crossed racquets as they were becoming part of the East Fremantle tourist and heritage trail. I could relate to the House for the next 30 minutes about how a letterbox can become heritage. As the minister is not present in the Chamber, I will mention it because it is important. The letterbox is outside my former house. In winter 1958, when I became a professional tennis player, I was jogging around East Fremantle Football Club with Harry Regan. He said, "How are you going?" I said, "I have the bookings but I've been rained out. I can't get a quid, Harry." He said, "You'll be on the side this week, you'll get £8/10/- for playing for East Fremantle and when you play, Con will kick the ball to me, you come down into the back line and I will kick them to you, and we will all be in the 'best players' and we will all get £8/10/-." It worked and I played for the rest of the year with football keeping me alive. A few weeks later, jogging around with Harry, I said, "As soon as your children are old enough, I will give them their first racquet and coach them free of charge." He had 10 children and my son is still coaching his grandchildren free of charge. When I built my house in 1961, he gave me a letterbox of two crossed racquets with a ball in the middle to take the mail. I said, "Harry, you cannot afford that." He gave me a wink and uttered a word with which I am now familiar but with which my father in the goldfields was even more familiar. He said, "She's right mate, it's a foreigny." Of course, the materials were from the firm where he worked and he built it in the firm's time, but I accepted it with great pleasure. About two years later, a car came around the corner and flattened the letterbox. Harry used to train his race horse along Preston Point Road and was the only man I know who had stabled a horse in the metropolitan area, such was the infamous nature of the Regans and the Neeshams.

Mr Barnett: There was a horse stabled in a backyard in Claremont until about two years ago.

Mr MARSHALL: That is another one. One north of the river and one south of the river is a good balance. Harry saw the letterbox knocked down and the next day he rang me and told me he had another one ready for me. I told him that the ball in the middle of the racquets was too small for my business and asked whether he could make a box to take packages, which he did. That letterbox is still standing there and we meet people in the street - and the member for Perth will know - who, as children, went to Perth just to gaze at the clock striking in London Court. There are adults in Fremantle who tell me that as children they used to ride their bikes past John Tonkin's garden, wave to him and then ride past our house to see whether the crossed tennis racquets letterbox was still there. That is something that has heritage value, and I agree with that. Those crossed racquets are symbolic of the biggest tennis academy in Australia - one of the biggest sport educators in the district. However, I cannot understand why the young family in John Tonkin's house cannot get permission from the council to extend, because it "may" be classified as a heritage building when in fact it is just a standard house. The gardens at John Tonkin's house had heritage value, just as the letterbox at our ordinary house now has heritage value. People from the Tourism Commission go by and say, "There is the letterbox. The coach coached Margaret Court on those courts, and there is John Tonkin's house. He was a former Premier of the State and president of the East Fremantle Football Club." Everyone in East Fremantle is very proud in the "one mile square".

Another instance that comes to mind is the Peninsula Hotel in my electorate which has been one of the true landmarks of Mandurah. I can recall in the mid 1950s, as footballers, we would all go down to the beer garden at the Peninsula Hotel on Sundays. In those days we had to go to the country where beer licences were allowed on Sundays as there was no drinking in the metropolitan area. People from the East Fremantle Football Club and the like would assemble there on the Australia Day long weekend. There would be 300 to 400 people at the Peninsula Hotel. They would scoop some crabs and cook them in the car park. It was a wonderful way of life.

The owners have been trying to develop the Peninsula Hotel to complement the new 500 pen marina which is planned just around the corner. Situated a kilometre to the right of the Peninsula Hotel is the performing arts centre, which cost \$1.2m; a cinema with six theatres, which cost \$800 000; and a boardwalk which boasts an ice-cream store, Cicerello's, a coffee shop and a duty free shop - how that got in, I do not know. On the waterfront are four boats which take people to watch the dolphins or go on canal visits and the like. A kilometre to the left of the hotel it is planned to construct the \$220m, 500 pen marina which will provide employment through the hospitality and tourism industries and a tremendous income to the area. However, the Peninsula Hotel had to be altered to a four-star category so that it could be upgraded. For the past two or three years we have been trying to stop a heritage seal on the Peninsula Hotel. It has been holding up proceedings. Sometimes I find that situation too difficult to fathom and that is why I like the consequential provisions Bill. There must always be an edge to life. We cannot just say that it is black and white. Mandurah, which has the highest proportion of unemployment among adolescent teenagers, needs employment. For an untrained, unskilled person, the hospitality industry is one of the easiest areas in which to learn and get employment. It is foolhardy to delay the creation of this precinct that will draw people into the area, by saying that the Peninsula Hotel, which has been the drinking hole for everybody over the years, could be of heritage value.

To their credit, the heritage people have just decided that Stingray Point will be the area of heritage value. Stingray Point is the grassed area that spills out from the Peninsula Hotel to the waterway. People on the waterway can look from the old bridge to the new bridge and right up to the Peel Inlet. It is a beautiful site with trees which have been there for 80 years. It is a picturesque place. Every Australia Day we hold our citizenship awards in Mandurah and 60 or 70 people are made citizens of Australia. It could not be held at a better place than Stingray Point. How Australian can one get? How heritagified can one get? In this instance, the definition of "heritage" is being looked into and it is holding up progress in this area. It is also detracting from tourism, employment and the variety of ways in which we can attract people to Mandurah. It was declared that Stingray Point would become a heritage area and that the Peninsula Hotel could be revamped into a four-star hotel. I still have questions about the definition of "heritage". It cannot be black and white. There are grey areas that need this consequential provision and I am very pleased that this will be discussed in this second reading debate.

MR GRILL (Eyre) [4.26 pm]: Heritage touches us all. It touches nearly every electorate in Western Australia in one form or another. As a consequence, most of us have some sort of interest in it. My interest certainly is not professional and it certainly is not profound.

This is quite extraordinary. I have never spoken to a completely empty set of government benches. Normally, of course, the minister handling the matter is in his seat. However, on this occasion, not one person on the government side is in range of his or her seat.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hodson-Thomas): Thank you for pointing that out, member for Eyre.

Mr GRILL: Having noted that most peculiar situation, which has just been rectified to some degree -

Mr Masters: There was somebody on the government side, but I was just about to leave.

Mr GRILL: The member for Vasse dashed across for a second or two. Certainly, when I spoke a minute ago there was no one on the government side.

As I was saying, heritage touches us all. I do not pretend to have any great knowledge about it, but I have taken an interest in it over the years. I became interested in heritage in 1970 when I went to Kalgoorlie not for the first time, but to live. At about that time the eastern goldfields was experiencing the nickel boom. It was a most extraordinary boom. It garnered the imagination of all Western Australians. I do not know of anyone who did not buy some shares during the nickel boom. No matter where one went or to whom one spoke, there was some mention of shares and the sorts of nickel shares one should buy. A whole range of nickel and exploration companies sprung up. Most of them had no substance in the final analysis, but they all had pretensions of getting out there and getting sniffs of nickel. That created an electric situation in Kalgoorlie-Boulder and one of economic growth. There was some substance to that boom in the sense that Kambalda got off the ground in a short period and a new town was created. A number of big nickel deposits were found in the eastern goldfields from the north to the south. It changed quite dramatically the economic climate in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. Up until that time, Kalgoorlie-Boulder and the towns around it had been in steady decline for 40 or 50 years, probably from the beginning of the century. The gold industry had declined from the heady heights of the 1890s, had taken a real shock during the First World War, had a better period during the 1930s and the Depression when the value of gold escalated, took a further heavy shock during the Second World War and then continued to decline afterwards. The nickel boom really started in 1967, but it was at its height when I and my wife-to-be went to Kalgoorlie in 1970 when I became a partner in a law practice. At about that time, because of the changing economic circumstances, there was a view that the main street of Kalgoorlie could be revamped with a whole range of new buildings.

The Swan Brewery, which was then a big owner of hotels in Western Australia, decided to acquire two hotels in the town. One was acquired before that time and the other at the time. One was called the Oriental Hotel and the other the York Hotel. These two very old hotels were to be demolished and a brand new 1970's style hotel was to be constructed on not only the two lots which were occupied by the Oriental and York hotels but also on several pieces of land in between, which were fairly narrow shopfronts. I did the negotiations on the acquisition of one of the shops and the starting price was \$15 000. Ultimately, I completed the deal for the owner of the shop at \$183 000. That was in the days when one could buy a Ford Falcon for \$2 500. However, it gives us some idea of the sort of economic hubbub and expectations that people had at the time.

The Oriental Hotel was to be one part of the new hotel in the sense that the block it occupied would be the basis of the new hotel and the shopfront that I negotiated for was to have the lift well on it. Further down the street the York Hotel would form the other side of the hotel. All of that was to be demolished and a new huge six or seven-storey, 1970's construction would go up and we would all be very proud of that. By and large that was the case. The Kalgoorlie Town Council, as it then was, welcomed the concept, passed the plans and everything was set to commence. However, a few people in town recognised that the hotels had heritage value and they should be retained and protected. A number of those people got together and at that time, I took the leadership role. There were a number of demonstrations and a march down the main street. We were aided by -

Mr Barnett: Last time I saw you demonstrate you had a sack over your head.

Mr GRILL: I do not know about that. Where was that?

Mr Barnett: When you were demonstrating against the gold royalty.

Mr GRILL: I do not think I did. There might have been some other people, but certainly not me. Nonetheless, we had a march around the time that the demolition contractor was moving in to knock over the Oriental Hotel.

The Oriental Hotel was the most interesting piece of architecture ever put up in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. It was really exotic and from that exotic architecture came the name "Oriental Hotel". It was an intriguing piece of architecture. The York Hotel is still there. It is a less intriguing piece of architecture, but is still a substantial hotel with a fine goldfields flavour to it. It is a two-storey, attractive and graceful building. We had the march and said all the things that we should have said about the desecration of heritage, but the protest went nowhere. We had an anonymous helper that night in true traditional goldfields style. A few sticks of gelignite were used by the anonymous helper to blow up the equipment belonging to the demolition contractor. We never found out who that person was and I was intrigued that the police never interviewed me over the matter, not that I had anything to do with it.

Mr Barnett: How long did they look?

Mr GRILL: What I am saying is that I was not under suspicion! It was a tremendous loss to lose that substantial building from the main street of Kalgoorlie-Boulder. The Oriental Hotel is no longer there and the 1970's monstrosity did not go ahead. We lost the Oriental Hotel, the most interesting building in town. That is to the long-standing lamentation of many people who have any regard for heritage. That awakened my interest in heritage and I have since thought about these matters.

The other matter that struck me at the time was the town of Kanowna, once in full bloom as an operational mining town about 20 kilometres north-east of Kalgoorlie through the 1950's and the early 1960's. When I went to Kalgoorlie to live in 1970, my fiancé and I went to look at the area but there was nothing left. It was bare. A few street signs had been re-erected by the historical society, but there was nothing else. This town, which once had a population of 20 000 people, and several hotels and a brewery, had been totally demolished and carted away when it had been operating only a decade or two earlier. When we first went to Menzies in 1970, there were a number of gracious buildings in the main street, most of which are now gone. One or two are left and there has been a belated interest in heritage. The rather interesting shire building and town hall have been kept in addition to the railway station and hotel. All the other wonderful buildings have gone.

Mr Bloffwitch: Have you seen Gwalia?

Mr GRILL: Gwalia is another matter but it is interesting. It was where the workers lived. It was Leonora's twin city and was where the commercial activity of Leonora-Gwalia was conducted. Gwalia was outside the mining activity. It was a workers' town and most of the buildings were made from corrugated iron. When I first went to Leonora, a number of people were living in Gwalia in those corrugated iron structures, some of which have been retained. It is to the great credit of David and Elizabeth Reid who, in the early 1970's, realised that this was a treasure trove of mining equipment and miners' shacks and they started their heritage work there. Since then a number of people have been involved. The Sons of Gwalia mine has put in a lot of money. A lady called Maxine Cable who used to be a councillor in Boulder but originally came from Leonora now lives there and has done a huge amount of work to preserve the area. There is something left at Gwalia which gives one something of the flavour of how workers actually lived at that time. The majority of buildings have gone. The same applies to so much of the eastern goldfields where at the turn of the century the bulk of the population of Western Australia lived. They looked upon Perth as the government on the coast, but nothing much more than that. The gold rush built the Perth that we know as well as most of Fremantle. Most of Fremantle is still there but it was built as a result of the gold rush. Many of the wonderful residential buildings in Peppermint Grove are goldfields architecture.

Mr Barnett: Some of it is due to the pastoral industry as well.

Mr GRILL: Some of it is due to the pastoral industry but the real catalyst was the gold industry. All of that, lamentably, is not as intact as it should be and much of it is demolished and gone. I looked in Boulder when I first became a member of Parliament, and saw a lovely fence around a property in one of the southern streets. I asked where the fence had come from, and was told by the owner that it was the old fence from the Murrin Murrin cemetery. The man had been allowed to pick it up, without any penalty, and transport it from the cemetery and erect it around his property. That was the mentality that applied in those days. If people moved out of Kanowna, other people moved in and suddenly demolished all the buildings and took them away.

In marked contrast to that is Victoria. It is fabulous in what it has retained in its goldfield areas.

Mr Bloffwitch: Ballarat is an example.

Mr GRILL: Yes, Ballarat and Bendigo are wonderful and gracious cities built on the basis of the gold discovered in the 1850s and 1860s. There are quite a few smaller towns and in many ways they are more attractive, and add a wonderful flavour to the goldfields in Victoria as it stands today. In places such as Maldon, Yackandandah, Beechworth, Castlereagh and Eaglehawk there might be between 1 000 and 2 000 inhabitants. By and large, the towns remain intact; they are still gracious and are monuments to that day and age. In Western Australia very few such towns survive. A member earlier mentioned Greenough where some buildings remain. Some money is being spent in Greenough for heritage restoration and so forth. York and Perth have some heritage buildings, but many have been lost.

In my first year at Collie High School I was taught by a French teacher who always tried to broaden our outlook and inform us that there were other things outside the mundane things we understood in the small mining town of Collie. One day she referred to St Georges Terrace and said that there were some wonderful boulevards in France, but we should know that St Georges Terrace was thought of as one of the great boulevards in the world. That came as a considerable shock to me. It was true, but since then those wonderful low level structures that adorned St Georges Terrace have been demolished. The current architecture is mainly new and shiny, and made of glass, steel and aluminium. St Georges Terrace is a wind tunnel. It does not look much different from the architecture in many American cities and many other modern cities around the world. It does not reflect the heritage of WA and what it has been through to be where it is. On the other hand, in Paris a great effort is made to restore buildings. It has high-rise buildings but it is hard to find them in the centre of the city. Paris, which is probably the most beautiful city in the world - other people may have different opinions on that but it is certainly one of the most beautiful cities in the world - is beautiful because of its planning and the retention of so many old buildings, monuments and things of that nature.

During the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s Western Australia had an ethos that if something was not new it should be pulled down. I remember when the Court Government sanctioned the pulling down of the Barracks.

Mr Barnett: It was the Brand Government.

Mr GRILL: Yes, the minister is right; it was the Brand-Court Government. I could never understand that even then, although I did not have a profound understanding of heritage issues in those days.

I remember my early days as an articled law clerk when the decision was made to bowl over the Esplanade Hotel. Anyone who saw that hotel, or has since seen pictures of it, will recognise that it was an absolute jewel. It was beautiful, and it transported one back to New Orleans with its wonderful architecture using cast iron, wrought iron filigree work, railings and posts. The inside of the building was beautiful. Invariably, the legal profession congregated in a particular bar lined with jarrah from 5.30 to 7.30 pm on Friday nights. It was a wonderful tradition. The hotel was bowled over, and what is in its place? A piece of very square and ordinary aluminium and glass. It does not reflect our heritage and the old building is a lamentable loss.

I can point to more recent examples of the loss of heritage and architecture. This area is one of relative neglect by this Government and previous Governments. Some Governments were absolute wreckers in the philistine way in which they encouraged new development at the cost of old architecture and the graciousness of some of the old buildings.

My colleague Megan Anwyl will speak shortly and will attest to the fact that the Railway Hotel in Kalgoorlie was destroyed in circumstances which were quite unwarranted. The Railway Hotel was built opposite the current railway station. The station is a very old and lovely building, but it was complemented by an equally old and nice building across the road - the Railway Hotel. It had significance as it was part of many of the important events in the initial gold rushes. It fell into the hands of a particular owner who did not have the ability to renovate it after a fire partially destroyed it. It then fell into neglect and was occupied by vagrants, damaged by vandals and was the subject of a second fire. After that second fire the Kalgoorlie-Boulder council obtained an order for its demolition. It should not have operated in that fashion. It spent between \$80 000 and \$100 000 obtaining that demolition order, more out of pique with the owner than the belief that the hotel should be bowled over. It spent that money on lawyers' fees to get a demolition order against that truly historic piece of architecture. The second fire was the catalyst for its ultimate demolition, because it made the building unsafe.

At that time I requested the Premier, Richard Court, and the Minister for Lands to visit Kalgoorlie and see whether they could rescue the hotel. At the end of the day, after receiving advice from their experts, although there was sympathy for the process of restoring the building, they took the view that it could not be done and it was allowed to be bulldozed. I have been to Munich and other places in Germany where the city centres were reduced to rubble during the Second World War. However, today those buildings have been reconstructed with the same bricks they were originally built with, and they look the same as they looked prior to the war, having been reduced to ultimate rubble by bombs during that war. I do not know why we cannot do that. Of course, the Railway Hotel was probably in a dangerous state when viewed by the Premier and Minister for Lands, and it probably was on the brink of falling over. However, if that building had been in France or Germany, it would not have been allowed to fall over and money would have been invested to restore it. People in Western Australia do not appear to want to do that. They have an accountant's view of heritage and its cost. At the end of the day it comes down to a matter of dollars and cents. The cost of renovating the Railway Hotel was probably more than it could have been sold for when restored. That was the abiding concern at that time. Hopefully in the future, the dollars and cents approach will not be all pervasive. I repeat: If that building had been in Europe - in Germany, Italy or France - given its historic nature, it would have been restored and public moneys would have been provided to do that.

I refer to another recent example. When the railway line went in between Kalgoorlie and Leonora during the gold rush period, a whole range of railway stations were built, and some were very attractive pieces of architecture. One was featured in the movie *Nickel Queen*, with Googie Withers and Mr Laws, of 2UE fame, who has been in the media a lot lately.

Mr Thomas: Senator Lightfoot was in that movie, too; wasn't he?

Mr GRILL: I think he was. A lot of the goldfields' characters were in the movie. It was all about the nickel boom and the rush that followed it. The central building around which the movie was filmed was a lovely, old railway station. The film was released and it was a big success. Within a year or two of its making and showing, the railways authority decided it was not prepared to continue the insurance on the building to cover public liability risks, and the building was bulldozed. All the stations up and down the line which were about 90 years old then were bulldozed in the same way. People who wanted to take the masonry, the bricks and stones from the buildings could simply go out and pick them up. I went out and picked up some which was used in my home at that time. What a terrible loss, and all because the then Western Australia Government Railways was not prepared to pay the public liability insurance premiums on the buildings.

Even more recently, as chairman of the Goldfields Tourism Association, at the behest of the association, I wrote to the Minister for Transport about the Goongarrie cottages, which are a remnant of the railway station and the town. Those cottages were left after the railway station was bulldozed and have been used by prospectors and miners ever since. Unfortunately, they are falling into disrepair and the railway authority has not been prepared to put any money into their restoration. We decided to write to the Minister for Transport to request that those historic cottages be transferred to the Menzies Shire in which jurisdiction they were placed. I got a letter from the minister indicating that, although he would be prepared to contemplate a transfer of those buildings, the Heritage of Western Australia Act precluded such a transfer until the buildings were renovated to a suitable standard. I wrote to him again and asked him to do that so the transfer could be done. He responded that he was not prepared to spend the money.

I twisted his arm, and we got a couple of thousand dollars and the assistance of a voluntary group to go up and put a roof on one of the buildings and do some preservation work on another. The minimal amount of work would be done to enable them to be transferred to the Menzies Shire. What a momentarily short-sighted view by the Minister for Transport in this matter. We have irreplaceable pieces of our heritage. On one hand the railways authority is not prepared to pay a small amount each year to cover public liability insurance; on the other, the Government is not prepared to pay a small amount of money - it would have been greater than the \$2 000 given to the voluntary group - to ensure the buildings are in reasonable condition to comply with the heritage Act to allow the transfer to the shire to occur.

This represents an attitude of the Government, government agencies and people within government. The culture is completely wrong, and we must change it. I see the member for Cottesloe looking at me with some amazement, but I assure him this is happening on this very day. I am sure he believes it should not be going on; he is probably not aware of it. Priceless pieces of our history are being lost simply because of the culture within government - much of this heritage comes within government areas at the moment - which is penny pinching, and subscribes to the economic rationalist model: If it does not pay, bulldoze it and pull it down.

In France the attitude to heritage is 180 degrees in the opposite direction. Vast amounts of money are spent on their towns, townscapes, monuments and old chateaux, and they reap a harvest from it. Our architecture is not as old as that; however, it is unique and tells a story. Much of what is left can be a considerable tourist attraction, such as the buildings in towns in Victoria. Quite frankly, as long as the culture remains at it is in Western Australia, we will lose these buildings.

Mr Barnett: I will ask a serious question: What would your attitude be to the old brothels in Hay Street?

Mr GRILL: One has been knocked down. This is a very murky area because it is very hard to say how we get a building permit for something that is illegal. This situation is unfortunate.

MS ANWYL (Kalgoorlie) [4.56 pm]: First, I will make some general comments about the attitude of my constituents to the whole concept of heritage and why it is extremely necessary for the State Government to facilitate and resource a proper understanding by Kalgoorlie-Boulder residents of what the concept of heritage means to individual property owners, business owners and business management committees if their buildings are placed under a heritage order. There is a lot of concern and reservation by those who feel they will have their property rights somehow infringed upon by their property achieving the status of a heritage building. In the long term, those people will realise that the value of their properties will be enhanced by that status. The fact is that there is a recession in the goldfields at the moment and a number of property owners are very concerned that their ability to maintain those buildings will be interfered with.

I will use as an example the recent restoration of some of the buildings at the Kalgoorlie-Boulder Racing Club. A concern has been expressed by members of the racing club committee that the method of maintenance and restoration required was more expensive and onerous and in some ways less efficient because of the requirements of the Heritage Council of Western Australia.

Mr Grill: It wasn't that long ago that the wonderful, old Ledger grandstand was bulldozed.

Ms ANWYL: I endorse the general comments of the member for Eyre that too many buildings have been lost to Kalgoorlie-Boulder. It is very important that people, particularly those with property interests, are assisted to realise the benefits that can be bestowed by a heritage ruling, rather than their seeing the negatives of it. I think the Kalgoorlie branch of the Liberal Party gave some publicity to this matter a while ago. A general report is still under consideration, which talked about establishing precincts within Kalgoorlie-Boulder according to the suburb and the historic significance of different types of dwellings. There is a lot of concern and perhaps misinformation about just what it entails. Until recently there was a full-time position at local council attached to this issue of heritage, but I understand that position does not exist at the moment. There have been visits from the Heritage Council. I have given members the example of the Kalgoorlie-Boulder Racing Club, but recently I was approached by a member of the management committee of the Hannans Club, which is unique to Kalgoorlie-Boulder because it was built as a gentlemen's club, although, fortunately, gentle women are now allowed in the doors and can be members. That club is in a beautiful building, and I hope that building can be preserved and that proper consultation will take place with the management committee so that it will get behind the concept of having a building that is heritage listed.

Heritage is extremely important not only to existing residents and future generations but also because of its economic spinoff, which is tourism. People from around the world and Australia tell me continually that the people of Kalgoorlie-Boulder do not seem to realise what a fantastic asset they have in the streetscape of their main street, Hannan Street, because of the number of old buildings that have been preserved. From time to time I am approached by local shop owners and the like who would rather have different types of facades which they perceive as having greater commercial advantage; for example, with a greater number of advertising hoardings and the like. However, the overwhelming number of the comments are that we must do everything we can to preserve the existing facades. There is a pro-active aspect to that, because we can also encourage people whose buildings have lost that historic advantage to use historic replica facades when they are renovating or rebuilding.

The goldfields has yet to come to terms fully with the concept of heritage tourism, and we could be doing more than we are doing. I recognise the efforts of a number of people who are certainly involved in ensuring that our heritage is preserved. Kalgoorlie-Boulder has a very active historical society and genealogical society, and the tourist association also does a lot of valuable work. Some members may not be aware of this, but in 1938, the then Shire of Kalgoorlie financed the first Olympic swimming pool in Western Australia. That swimming pool was opened in the summer of 1938, and it had hundreds of thousands of visitors in each pool year in those days. There had been a small swimming pool on the site of the Victoria Gardens. Unfortunately, those gardens no longer exist, but the boundary of the old pool is signposted and can still be seen, and it forms part of the Kathleen Day Playgroup. The 1938 pool was a unique specimen of the Art Deco period, and the Art Deco Society is full of praise for the heritage value of that pool. Many swimming athletes and divers and all kinds of water sports enthusiasts travelled from all over Australia to train in that Olympic pool, because it was the only one in Western Australia and only the second Olympic pool in Australia. The first Olympic pool in Australia is at Milsons Point, Sydney, and is now an extremely successful swimming pool and commercial venture. I have had the privilege of swimming in that pool a number of times. It is located underneath Sydney Harbour Bridge and has a wonderful outlook.

Ms MacTiernan: Is that the one on the North Shore?

Ms ANWYL: Yes. That was the first Olympic pool in Australia, but the Shire of Kalgoorlie in those days had the foresight to build this other Olympic pool. That 50 metre pool was closed last season, and while another fantastic year-round facility has been built, it is a source of great regret to me that Kalgoorlie-Boulder will not continue to operate the first Olympic pool in Western Australia. However, as a result of a great deal of active lobbying, the council has agreed to keep the Kingsbury Park aspects of the complex open, which means that a water playground and water slide will be available for children over the course of the next summer. The council has also foreshadowed that it will build another outdoor complex alongside the existing indoor facility. Therefore, it was with some pleasure that I heard recently on the local news that the Government has made a commitment to upgrade the Bunbury outdoor pool complex, because no doubt pledges will come from each of the major parties with regard to the new outdoor pool that is now required in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. I believe that in the long-term we will regret the decision not to keep this pool open. As I have said previously, I recognise that the council is between a rock and a hard place because a great deal of administrative cost is associated with keeping the pool open. However, I believe that we could have looked to alternative funding sources and that we could have raised funds across Western Australia, given that Kalgoorlie-Boulder has such special significance to many families across Western Australia and Australia because they or one of their relatives have spent many years in Kalgoorlie-Boulder in the past.

All levels of government should consider the need to conserve heritage not just by looking at bricks and mortar but also by enhancing the prominence of historic figures by way of statues and other sorts of public monuments. Earlier this week I addressed a group of year 6 students at St Joseph's Primary School, and I was very interested that when I asked some of the students what they thought was lacking in Kalgoorlie-Boulder, a number of the girls mentioned the need for more parkland and fountains. Kalgoorlie-Boulder does not have any fountains, which does seem odd given that there is not much water and it is essentially a desert town, and I was extremely pleased that one of the very bright young people in that year 6 class who at first said she would like to see a fountain with a fish looking out from it then piped up later and said, "I have thought about that. I do not want to have a fish. I want to have something for Mr O'Connor, who brought the water here to the goldfields". I thought that 10-year-old child had a very impressive view and grasp of history, which is something from which adults could learn.

MR THOMAS (Cockburn) [5.08 pm]: I wish to use the opportunity of speaking on the Heritage Bill to raise heritage nature matters which are of concern to me. The first matter is the redevelopment of Fremantle Oval in the electorate of my colleague the member for Fremantle, and I am sure he will not mind if I transgress into his territory in speaking on a matter to which I have some commitment. The second matter is that I believe we in this place should give recognition to those members of Parliament who died while on active service during World War I and World War II; and I will return to that matter in a moment.

On a number of occasions in this House and elsewhere, I have raised the question of the status of Fremantle Oval as a heritage site, in particular the Victoria Pavilion - the grandstand as it is normally known - and the potential for Fremantle Oval to be enhanced as the second home of football in Western Australia. Fremantle Oval is the only football oval of which I am aware that can be described as being in the central business district of a city; that is, in a built-up urban area. As a consequence, Fremantle Oval has an atmosphere that is unique in comparison with other football ovals of which I am aware. In addition, it has significant heritage value in that it is the site of the Victoria Pavilion - a grandstand which dates back to the turn of the century - and has a number of historical connections not only to football but also to other civic occasions associated with Fremantle and the State. I understand from a heritage report commissioned by the City of Fremantle that troops paraded before the Victoria Pavilion as they left Australia for the Boer War; therefore, the grandstand dates back to at least the turn of the century. I also understand that prior to that, the ground was a sports field associated with some barracks and before that it was the garden of Fremantle Prison. The area is recognised as being part of one of the most significant heritage precincts in Australia, including Fremantle Prison and other buildings. Fremantle Oval is currently significantly underutilised in terms of present use and recognition of its heritage values. Heritage buildings can become stale unless they are used. It is all very well to preserve historic buildings but it is so much the better if they have a current use, preferably one which is consistent with their historic value. For most of its existence the historic value of Fremantle Oval has been as a football field. The greater potential for the development and enhancement of Fremantle Oval to recognise its heritage value has come about because the Fremantle Dockers, the second Australian Football League team in Western Australia, has decided to locate its home at Fremantle Oval. That can lead to the oval having a new use and future which will see it well into the next century, its second.

For all of the past 100 years, Fremantle Oval has been the home of the South Fremantle Football Club - an organisation of which I am proud to be a member. That organisation is celebrating its centenary this year. If members visit the oval, they will note that the entrance to the South Fremantle Football Club premises is dated and does not have any heritage value in itself. The area immediately to the south of Victoria Pavilion where one enters the oval is an eyesore and does not provide the appropriate honour to the Victoria Pavilion and the site. I have suggested to the City of Fremantle and the Fremantle Dockers - and I will continue making this suggestion to anyone who wants to listen - that the area opposite the markets which constitutes the entrance to the Fremantle Oval should be redeveloped as a football square; an area which would commemorate the role and place of football in the heritage of Fremantle. I have suggested that the centrepiece of the square should be a statue of the famous mark John Gerovich took over Ray French in 1957. The photograph of that mark is one of the best football photographs ever taken. It has been reprinted internationally - it was in *Encyclopedia Britannica* for a time - and is a splendid piece of photography and artistry. In my view, it would make a great statue and statement at the entrance to that area and could be the centrepiece of what I have designated as football square. I have gone to the trouble of commissioning an architect to design some landscape work on how that area could be developed.

The area could be developed using not only that square but also the adjacent land. The adjacent land fronting out onto South

Terrace is the site of the old Fremantle synagogue and that in itself has heritage value. The leader of the Jewish community in Western Australia in the early part of this century was a gentleman named Elias Solomon. He was one of the founding officeholders of the Fremantle Football Club, as the South Fremantle Football Club was originally known. Mr Solomon is the person after whom Solomon Street in Fremantle is named but he also has an association with this House. He was a mayor of Fremantle in the 1890s and he served in this Parliament as the member for South Fremantle from 1892 until federation in 1901. In that year he entered the federal Parliament and served as the first member for Fremantle of the House of Representatives. He was the leader of the Jewish community in Fremantle. The old synagogue backs onto what I have designated football square which is currently car park No 16 in the City of Fremantle and it is an eyesore. That building could be developed as the headquarters - the office premises and shopfront - of the Fremantle Dockers Football Club. It is presently a restaurant - although from my observations not a particularly commercially successful one - but the building is owned by the City of Fremantle and I hope that in due course it could be made available to the Fremantle Dockers Football Club to be developed as the shopfront, the public front, of the club. The land behind the building and adjoining the South Fremantle Football Club's premises could be developed as a square and the entire area opened up to extend what is known in the vernacular as the cappuccino strip, the recreation area of Fremantle. That district could be extended south of Parry Street and make Fremantle Oval the real attraction it could be. South Fremantle Football Club will continue to have its headquarters and to play at Fremantle Oval which means the oval will be a working football oval and not just a museum or a training track for an AFL team. It would be so much better if the South Fremantle Football Club's premises could be redeveloped as is necessary. That work could be done in conjunction with the redevelopment of Fremantle Oval to recognise its place in the heritage of Fremantle and Western Australia as one of the major football venues in Western Australia and one which should be recognised.

The statue of Gerovich and French would be a great centrepiece. It is a piece of sporting and social heritage. Many members would be aware that John Gerovich played for South Fremantle during the 1950s and 1960s. He commenced his football career at the age of 16 and worked in a clerical position at Fremantle Hospital for most of his working life. He was very much a part of the Fremantle community. Ray French, the person over whom Gerovich took the mark, was an industrial worker in the area and was killed in an industrial accident some years after the mark and photograph were taken. It is sporting and social history which should be recognised through public art in the area. I commend this proposition to the Dockers, the South Fremantle Football Club, the City of Fremantle, the Government and anyone else who could be involved in the realisation of the project. It is one that has merit.

My second proposal concerns the Parliament itself. I am pleased to see that Mr Speaker is in the Chamber because following this speech I will be writing a letter to him to make a suggestion about an aspect of the heritage of this Parliament which should be recognised. Twice this year I have had occasion to attend conferences in the New South Wales Parliament which were held at least in part in its Legislative Assembly Chamber. I noted that in the Legislative Assembly of the New South Wales Parliament there is a plaque which commemorates the members of that House who were killed in active service during wartime. I think one part of the plaque is for the First World War and another for the second; I am not sure of the details. However, many people are not aware that during the world wars it was, I gather from my cursory reading of that plaque and the records of this place, the practice of the New South Wales Parliament and this Parliament to pair members who joined the forces and went off to fight in those wars.

I believe that many people who have visited the Parliament, and many members, would not be aware that members of Parliament of an appropriate age were eligible for military service. The Parliament facilitated their service in the military forces by granting them pairs. Visitors to Parliament should be made aware of this aspect of the heritage of the Parliament and attention should be drawn to that fact. It is therefore appropriate to recognise, in the precincts of the Parliament, people who died on active service. Members would be aware, particularly from living in the community as members of Parliament with roles in their electorates, that it was common for war memorials to be erected in districts to recognise people from those districts who were killed in active service. It was also common practice in workplaces to recognise people who were killed during military service. The Minister for Energy would no doubt be aware that in the foyer of the Western Power building - the old SEC building - there is a plaque containing the names of SEC employees who were killed during World War II and, I think, also World War I. I recall a plaque in the Commonwealth Bank in Perth. Most members could probably recall other workplaces, in addition to districts, where recognition was given to people who served during the war and paid the supreme sacrifice.

Since visiting the New South Wales Parliament this year, I have taken the opportunity to cursorily read the records of this Parliament. I have found that in World War I, Bartholemew James Stubbs, the then member for Subiaco, joined the Australian Imperial Force on 29 January 1916. He was killed in Belgium in infantry action on 21 September 1917 when he was still the member for Subiaco, having been elected to the Parliament in 1911. Recognition of that fact should be given. Mr Stubbs was obviously a very interesting person. He was a tailor by trade. An entry in the biographical register notes that he was active in the foundation of Western Australia's tailors' union, vice president and president of the Trades and Labor Council - obviously a Labor member - and member for Subiaco until he met his end in World War I in 1917. It is fitting that there be an appropriate monument to such a person.

My reading of the records also revealed that a gentleman called John Verdun Newton was, interestingly enough, the Labor member for Greenough. My cursory glance at the records revealed that he was probably the only Labor member ever for Greenough. He was preceded by a Country Party member. As most members will be aware, John Newton was succeeded by Sir David Brand, who was a long serving Liberal member for that area and the State's longest serving Premier. Mr Newton's service is interesting because he joined the Royal Australian Air Force in 1941 and was reported missing over Germany on 14 January 1944. However, he was elected to Parliament only on 20 November 1943. Obviously, he stood for that position and was elected while serving overseas. He was obviously held in high esteem in the electorate that he was

elected to represent. Two months later, presumably having never taken his seat, he went missing in action, presumed dead. From my understanding of the brief notes in the biographical register, a panel was eventually appointed on 28 August 1945 to inquire into whether there was a vacancy in his seat, as he was only missing, his body having never been recovered. The seat was eventually declared vacant on 27 September 1945, obviously after the war was over and a decent interval had followed when it was thought, presumably, that he might be found.

These are two very interesting stories that should be drawn to the attention of people who visit this building. Their attention should also be drawn to the fact that members of Parliament were not exempt from the opportunity to serve in the military and, in particular, that at least those two people paid the supreme sacrifice in those circumstances. I will be writing to the Speaker, in his capacity as the chairman of the Parliamentary Services Committee, to suggest that an appropriate plaque or edifice be placed somewhere in this building so that those two individuals are commemorated, and inform visitors of the fact that serving members of Parliament served in the armed services during those wars.

MR KIERATH (Riverton - Minister for Heritage) [5.26 pm]: I thank all the members who have contributed to this debate. I intend to take into account some of the comments made and to make amendments to the Bill.

[Leave granted for speech to be continued at a later stage.]

Debate thus adjourned.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED FUND) BILL (No. 3) 1999

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED FUND) BILL (No. 4) 1999

Cognate Debate

On motion by Mr Barnett (Leader of the House), resolved -

That leave be granted for the Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) 1999 and the Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 4) 1999 to be debated cognately and that the Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) 1999 be the principal Bill.

Declaration as Urgent

MR BARNETT (Cottesloe - Leader of the House) [5.28 pm]: I move -

That these Bills be considered urgent Bills.

MR KOBELKE (Nollamara) [5.28 pm]: The Opposition will oppose these Bills being made urgent as we must put on the record the problems that the Government is currently having in dealing with legislation. The Government second read these Bills only two weeks ago. Standing Order No 168 requires that three calendar weeks elapse before the resumption of their second reading. The Opposition welcomes the opportunity at any time to debate these Bills; they give members an opportunity to speak on a wide range of matters relating to their particular interests for their electorates. However, these Bills are being brought on now because the Government does not have any legislation with which to deal.

This Government is without purpose or direction. It was elected six and a half years ago because the Labor Government had lost the confidence of the people. However, this Government had no agenda to look after the interests of Western Australia and advance the welfare of the people of this State. It put in place the McCarrey review and, on that basis, set about privatising and contracting out on a wholesale basis. Now that has come unstuck. It has led to a deficit of \$640m in this year's budget. This Government does not know where to turn. It has no agenda. It has no legislation. It is divided internally, lethargic and moribund and cannot bring legislation into this Parliament when a range of urgent issues must be dealt with.

The Government has been promising prostitution law for years. The Government has not been able to do anything about de facto legislation. The Government has promised to bring into this Parliament legislation covering a range of issues, but it cannot get those issues through the party room. Western Australia has the worst record of road traffic fatalities of any State in Australia. However, this Government is simply unable to deal with it because it cannot get the party room to agree to new legislative measures. That is the reason this legislation has been brought on early.

The two pieces of legislation relating to culture, libraries and the arts, which we debated last week and with which the Government does not wish to proceed are on the Notice Paper. That legislation has run into major public opposition. The Government cannot get its act together, and so we cannot deal with those Bills. The Opposition is ready to deal with them, but the Government does not know what to do with them. The member for South Perth moved to send the legislation to a committee, and we are waiting for the Government to respond to that. The heritage legislation has also run into problems. The minister must now draft amendments to it and so the Government is not ready to deal with the Heritage Bill.

Mr Kierath: We are not having problems. I can continue with it if you want.

Mr KOBELKE: We were ready. We were happy to go into Consideration in Detail with the Heritage Bill, but the minister is not ready. The minister must get approval for a range of amendments. The Rights in Water and Irrigation Amendment Bill is still on the Notice Paper. We understood that the Government did not wish to treat that Bill as urgent because it had run into difficulties. The Government has been consulting the respective interest groups on two different issues which have arisen because of this Bill. We are still waiting on a briefing that we were promised but it is obvious that the Bill is not ready to be dealt with. The Parks and Reserves Amendment Bill was introduced in 1998 - over a year ago - and for some reason, the Government does not wish to debate it. The Gender Reassignment Bill (No. 2) 1997 has been around for two years; yet the Government is not ready to proceed with it.

Ms MacTiernan: It is very confused about that issue.

Mr KOBELKE: The Government is very confused. It does not know whether it is Arthur or Martha.

Ms MacTiernan: It is probably both.

Mr KOBELKE: The member for Armadale may be correct. The Government also does not know what to do with the Planning Appeals Bill. Again there is very strong opposition in the community to that legislation. All of those Bills have been on the Notice Paper for three or more weeks. There are also Bills, such as the ones to be declared urgent, which the Government hopes to bring on because it has no other business with which to deal. Other Bills fit into that category. This Government has run out of legislation, with supposedly 18 months to run before the next election. It has lost the will to govern. It is not dealing with the urgent problems that are confronting the people of Western Australia. This Government does not know how to tackle the problems of crime and lawlessness, which we read about in the media every day and which are causing major concerns to residents. It has no legislation to deal with the problems. It does not know what it is doing. It is simply moribund and cannot get matters through the party room. Therefore, the Government must be called to account for its inability to govern this State.

MR MCGOWAN (Rockingham) [5.34 pm]: I join with my colleague, the member for Nollamara, in opposing the motion moved by the Leader of the House. This motion, in essence, has been put forward by this Government because it cannot handle the legislative program. The Leader of the House went away for a while, and all of a sudden, upon his return, everything falls in a heap. The Notice Paper is full of legislation which must be redrafted or legislation to which the Government does not seem to have any substantial commitment. What is even more disappointing for the people of Western Australia is that a whole swag of issues, which have not been dealt with by this Government and with which it is completely incapable of dealing, have been picked up on by the media, the talkback programs and the independent commentators in this State. The decrepit, decayed, lifeless, brainless backbench members of the Government have been spooked by donors to the Government or a constituent who has gone into their offices and told them they cannot introduce legislation that will affect vested interests. There are very important pieces of legislation with which we must deal.

Mr Bradshaw: That is in your opinion.

Mr MCGOWAN: There are leaks in the Press every day. We know what happens in the Government's party room. Because some brain-dead backbench member of the Court Government is controlling the agenda for the people of Western Australia, issues with which we must deal are not being dealt with by this Government. If ever an issue has poked me in the eye as one with which we must deal because people are getting away with speeding and causing danger, the speed cameras issue is it. Everyone from the Road Safety Council down is saying that it must be dealt with; yet this Government is incapable of dealing with it. It is also incapable of dealing with the issue of mobile telephones in cars. That issue has been proved in other countries to be as dangerous as drink-driving; yet, it is not being dealt with by this Government. The Government promised that it would do something about the de facto relationship laws. In this State, a person who wants to bring an action under the de facto relationship laws must bring an action for constructive trusts in the Supreme Court. That does not happen anywhere else in Australia; yet, because there is a few moralistic, nervous Nellies on the backbench, those laws will not be amended by the Government of this State. Before the last election, the Government promised that it would deal with electoral reform, which was referred to by some members of the Government as being a very important issue that needed to be dealt with by the Government. However, it has not been dealt with. The Government is incapable of addressing these extremely important issues. Electoral reform goes to the heart of our system of democracy.

Mr Osborne: Which members of the Government raised the law reform issue?

Mr MCGOWAN: The Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Affairs promised reform before the last election, and he has not delivered on it.

There are dozens of other issues. Last year in the Governor's speech, the Government promised medical care for the dying legislation. Where is it? It is not on the Notice Paper. The Government is not dealing with these social issues and the issues of fundamental democracy that are very important to the people of this State. The Minister for Heritage came in here not knowing anything about his Bill, and he got a lesson on it from me. I gave him that lesson and he caved in, and that is something which I hold quite dear. Because of that, this Government does not have any legislative program for us to deal with. We are sitting in this Parliament with very little to do and the members of the Government are making excuses.

MS MacTIERNAN (Armadale) [5.39 pm]: This is an appalling performance by the Government. I will focus on a couple of potential Bills for which I have been waiting - Bills that have as yet to come into this place. Some Bills, such as the Planning Appeals Bill, are stillborn. That was introduced into this House on 24 June 1999. It was a particularly fine piece of legislation - a vintage from the Minister for Planning - because it managed a rare troika. It is opposed equally by local government, the development industry and the legal profession. This legislation has not one friend and it has been universally condemned. Not surprisingly, this Bill, which was introduced some four months ago, has yet to see the light of day in parliamentary debate.

A number of other Bills are still only twinkles in their respective ministers' eyes; in particular, the Road Traffic Amendment Bill is an omnibus Bill that has been much promised. It has been talked about since 1994, and each year the respective Ministers for Transport pledge to introduce a raft of changes to drivers' licence classifications and driver training, to embrace national road rules, to amend the rules on speed cameras to introduce owner onus, and to introduce other provisions designed to improve road safety. As we know from reports in the Press over the weekend, Western Australia is performing very badly in this area. The Government still promises this legislation, but the minister has yet to deliver in respect of it.

I add to the comment of the member for Rockingham in relation to the owner-onus legislation. One of the very worrying issues is that not only is the Government delaying in addressing the current problem of owners of fleet vehicles and company cars avoiding their speeding fines, but also now that the public understands the way in which this legislation works, there might be a marked drop in compliance and payment of these fines. I want to ensure that the Government understands that at the moment 45 per cent of photographs taken by Multanova cameras are unclear, but the general public was not aware of that and only 3 per cent of people resisted paying a fine for speeding offences. Now that the public is aware that, under the legislative regime proposed by this Government, if the photograph of the driver is unclear, it will be enough for the owner of the vehicle to say he or she does not recognise the person in the photograph and will not pay the fine. There is every likelihood that avoidance will become rampant and the non-compliance will not be held at the 3 per cent level. This failure to deliver will have very real practical consequences in Western Australia, not only for the revenue of this State but also for road safety. The deterrent power of speed cameras will be markedly reduced as a result of the exposure of this issue in public and the Government's failure to act on it.

For three years now the Minister for Fair Trading has been promising amendments to the Builders' Registration Act and the Home Building Contracts Act. Again, three reviews have taken place of these Acts and repeated promises have been made that legislation will be introduced. Once again, another parliamentary year is almost over and nothing has been done.

MR BROWN (Bassendean) [5.44 pm]: I, too, wish to make some observations about the lack of agenda on the Government's part. Indeed, we can see that the Government is wallowing. That situation does not relate only to issues that have arisen since the last election; this Government has not implemented its own commitments to the electorate. At the last election it promised the business community it would put into place a contracts ombudsman to look at contracting, and investigate concerns raised by business about government contracting arrangements. Nothing has happened in relation to that. One can perhaps understand why the Government has failed to take action, having regard to the questions asked in this place last week, in reply to which the Minister for Health confirmed that, on a whim, he agreed, some 18 months after a contract was signed, to increase a contract price by \$850 000. The companies which originally made bids, and which spent a considerable amount of money making those bids for that contract, might feel upset that the company that won the contract by underestimating its costs went back to the minister later and bumped up the price by \$850 000. That was in contravention of the contract and it was done without giving the other bidders for the contract an opportunity to compete. If there were ever a need for a contract ombudsman, it became apparent last week in this place when the minister confirmed that information. During the 1996 election campaign the Government promised to establish a contract ombudsman and it has not delivered.

Let us also consider its failure on business legislation generally. Today I raised the question of retail trading hours with the Minister for Fair Trading. In previous answers to questions, the minister and the Premier have said generally that the Government's position is not to extend trading hours. Why does the Government not make a decision? It has now been four months since the inquiry was finalised. The Government needs guts, heart, intellect and commitment to make a decision and to tell retailers, large and small, what its position is. As every day goes by, new business people are confronted with the option of signing leases which bind them for five years. If the Government agrees to extended retail trading hours, it will have an adverse effect on some small businesses.

Mr Baker: You are dead right, and it will not.

Mr BROWN: The member for Joondalup says the Government will not deregulate. In that case, let it make a decision and we shall know that no legislative change is necessary. At the moment there is uncertainty; small businesses are concerned and their anxiety is mounting. They are asking when this mob will make a decision. Is the Government capable of making a decision?

In the last election campaign, the Government made a weak-kneed commitment about introducing security of payment provisions. Nothing has happened. The Minister for Works said a couple of weeks ago in this Parliament that the Government had introduced a protocol. It has not protected the firms in Bunbury very much. Firms in Bunbury are seeking payment for work already carried out and have not been paid, although the Government has paid the head contractor. There is no commitment to security of payment legislation; in fact, there is no commitment to ensuring compliance with the fairly weak code that has been introduced.

I refer now to the building industry. Subcontractor after subcontractor is coming to me saying that the latest practice in the building industry is for head contractors to tell them not to seek the final payment, and the head contractors will make sure the subcontractor gets the next work available. Where is the Government's commitment to the business community? Those are only four areas of concern. There are many more areas in which this Government is showing it does not have the heart, determination, guts or intellect to make real decisions to protect the business community and the genuine operators in the business community in this State.

Question put and passed.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED FUND) BILL (No. 3) 1999

Second Reading - Cognate Debate

Resumed from 14 October.

MR RIPPER (Belmont - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.50 pm]: The Opposition will not oppose the Bills but will take the opportunity to comment about the way in which the Government has managed its financial affairs. These two Bills seek to appropriate out of the consolidated fund the following sums: \$247.3m for recurrent payments made in 1997-98;

\$348.1m for recurrent payments in 1998-99; \$270.6m for capital payments made in financial year 1997-98; and \$24.3m for capital payments made in 1998-99. We have spent the past 20 minutes arguing that these Bills should not be declared urgent. In our view, the Government's legislative program is very thin. Many important matters which should be on the Government's legislative program, are not.

Mr Court: Under the old standing orders a week's notice was usual before a Bill came on for debate.

Mr RIPPER: The Treasurer is quite right: The trial standing orders provide for a period of three calendar weeks between the introduction of a Bill and the second reading speech, and resumption of the second reading debate. Previously there was a convention that one parliamentary week was allowed as a minimum between the second reading speech and the resumption of the second reading debate. I am not arguing that the Government is not entitled to have those Bills debated. We used the opportunity of the motion to have the Bills declared urgent to raise the question of the Government's legislative priorities. There are urgent social issues to be resolved. The paralysis occurring within the Government's party room is preventing it from finding solutions to those problems and making decisions on various pieces of legislation. That paralysis is particularly evident on social reform questions. The Government cannot conclude a position on prostitution, or bring forward legislation to cover the medical care of the dying or to provide greater rights for those involved in de facto relationships. The reason for that is the nervousness of the coalition backbenchers and the strange structure of coalition decision making, which I understand prevents cabinet ministers having a vote in the party room. Nervous backbenchers in marginal seats can veto the Government's legislative program, especially on questions of social reform.

Mr Court: How does it work in the Labor party room? Do you just ignore the backbenchers?

Mr RIPPER: Everyone in party room has a vote; therefore, the party room is not hostage to those who might be especially nervous about a Labor Government's tackling the questions in the State that must be dealt with.

Mr Court: Do you have a vote in cabinet?

Mr RIPPER: Yes; cabinet ministers have a vote in cabinet. Surely, that should be the case.

Mr Court: We just do not have any votes in cabinet.

Mr RIPPER: We find that somewhat surprising.

Mr Court: I'll bet you do.

Mr RIPPER: Naturally a Labor cabinet discusses matters and attempts to reach a consensus, but, ultimately, if a decision must be made, we will do that on a democratic basis. The Treasurer is sidetracking me. I was explaining why we did not want these Bills to be declared urgent. I will now argue that, although we did not think the Bills should be declared urgent, in some sense they are overdue. These Bills are seeking approval for expenditure for two financial years. The Government is seeking approval for expenditures that occurred in 1997-98 and in 1998-99.

Mr Court: That is why they are urgent.

Mr RIPPER: In effect, the Parliament is being asked to approve unforeseen expenditures which occurred between 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1999. This is a highly unusual procedure. In principle, it is similar to the Government's bringing in two budgets simultaneously. In my memory, it has not occurred previously. In the past, approvals for expenditures from the Treasurer's Advance Account authorization fund have occurred on an annual basis. I am not aware of cases in the past in which the Government has bundled together two groups of Treasurer's authorization account expenditures and sought approval for them in the one Bill. In these Bills, we are approving expenditure that occurred with regard to 1997 and 1998, between 16 and 28 months ago. There has been a very long gap between the expenditure and the approach to the Parliament to approve it. The Government has been tardy in seeking parliamentary approval for this past expenditure. Expenditure from the Treasurer's Advance Account in 1997-98 should have been presented to Parliament in the last half of last year, not the last half of this year. This is not simply a technicality. Obviously, the sooner parliamentary scrutiny occurs after the expenditure, the better from an accountability point of view. For both accountability and financial transparency reasons, legislation of this type should be introduced as soon as possible after the end of the relevant financial year to allow proper parliamentary debate and scrutiny.

The Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) 1999 is seeking approval for nearly \$600m of expenditure: \$247.3m in 1997-98 and \$348.12m in 1998-99. These payments were made under the authority of the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act in 1997 and 1998 and reflect excess expenditures against appropriations, and expenditures for which there were no appropriations during 1997-98 and 1998-99. Contrary to the attitudes expressed when it was in opposition, this Government increasingly relied on expenditures through the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act to manage its finances. In 1990-91 only \$56.8m was sought in additional recurrent funding. Even in 1994-95, the amount sought was only \$82.8m.

Mr Court: Keep going for each year. You have skipped a couple of years.

Mr RIPPER: Have I? The Treasurer might like to give us the figures. Let us look at the figures for the period in government of those opposite: In 1995-96, the figure was \$283.7m; in 1996-97, it was \$199.6m; in 1997-98, it was \$247.3m; and 1998-99, the Government is seeking \$348.12m.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Before the suspension I was running through the Government's use of the Treasurer's Advance Account in recent financial years. The history shows that the Government is relying increasingly on this form of financing. The Opposition regards

this increasing reliance as another example of the Government's poor financial management. Wherever possible, expenditure by the Government should be appropriated through the normal budget Bills. That form of appropriation allows for the proper scrutiny of forthcoming expenditure. The scrutiny is prospective and is also subject to the estimates committee process. When expenditure is made under the Treasurer's Advance Account, the appropriation is retrospective - in this case two years. There is no provision for scrutiny by an Estimates Committee for this expenditure which has already occurred. On these two grounds, expenditure which is made through the Treasurer's Advance Account is not subject to the same level of scrutiny and accountability as expenditure which is made through the usual budget Bills. This was dealt with by the McCarrey report as follows -

The use of the Treasurer's Advance to meet major new expenditures can enable a government to avoid the need for full disclosure to Parliament of the circumstances of the payment until such time as the supplementary appropriations are submitted with the following budget. The practice of seeking after-the-event appropriations as a schedule to the following year's Appropriation Bill could also have the effect of limiting parliamentary debate on the issues.

The Government's increasing use of the Treasurer's Advance Account raises those accountability issues. It also raises questions of financial management. What seems to be this Government's pattern is that the budget brought down in April each year is not sufficient to meet the real needs of the community. Increasingly, the Government has had to inject additional moneys into key service delivery areas, into Health and Education in particular, at later stages in the financial year. This has an interesting political impact. When the budget is brought down, the budget meets the strictures or comes close to meeting the strictures of the financial commentators about fiscal responsibility but does not meet community needs. That becomes apparent later in the financial year. The Government throws in more money to deal with the health funding crisis or an education funding crisis, by which time the financial commentators' focus on the budget bottom line has long passed. In other words, the Government is eating its cake and having it too. It is attempting to get the credit for fiscal restraint and budget responsibility when it brings down the budget but later on it throws in some extra money to avoid an attack on another front; that it might not be meeting community needs.

I make these comments with reference to earlier government budgets. This financial year the Government has thrown away fiscal responsibility. Even at the time it brought down the budget, the Government was running a budget deficit of \$638m. That is the largest deficit in the State's history and the largest of any State at the moment on a comparable basis. The Government is scheduled to run, according to its forward estimates, a budget deficit of \$261m in the next financial year. I return to the question of the difference between the budget as it looks when it is brought down and the final outcome. State budgets brought down in April each year are bearing no resemblance to the end-of-year outcome. The Treasurer made some comments about the issue when he was in opposition. He spoke on a similar Bill in June 1991 and said -

The purpose of this account in the first place was to provide funds for extraordinary expenses, such as paying for the damage caused by earthquakes or when the Treasurer needs funds immediately. This legislation is an important part of the operations of this Parliament. However, it has been abused in the past and we want the Government to take a different attitude to its operations.

That was the Treasurer's view in opposition. It is apparent that his view is different now that he is in government. I have already quoted the amounts that were appropriated following expenditures under the Treasurer's Advance Account. In 1991, the figure was \$58.6m. Amounts in this Bill now total \$247.3m and \$348.12m. That is nearly \$600m of recurrent expenditure being authorised retrospectively by the Parliament long after it has been incurred by the Government and without the benefit of an estimates committee process, contrary to the recommendations of the McCarrey report and the views of the Treasurer when he was in opposition.

The Global Dance Foundation fiasco was an example of the problems that can be associated with the Treasurer's Advance Account. The Premier allocated \$450 000 to a friend of his family for a dance event which never occurred. Western Australian taxpayers have had no return from that investment. The Premier told us at the time -

Mr Osborne: That is not true. He is not a friend of the family.

Mr RIPPER: Is he not a friend of the family?

Mr Osborne: If you are referring to Peter Reynolds, you are wrong.

Mr Kobelke: No longer a friend.

Mr Osborne: He never was a friend. You have made a mistake.

Mr RIPPER: I do not accept that because at the time it was very clearly discussed that he was a friend of at least one generation of the family - perhaps not the current generation but a friend of an earlier generation and I do not recall that being denied.

Mr Osborne: I will tell you what happened. Sir Charles Court gave a reference to Peter Reynolds as he did for many people who were in organisations of which he was the patron. It was only a general reference saying that he knew him and he occupied a certain position. Members of Parliament do that on many occasions for many people and that does not make them a friend of the family. It does not implicate the Premier in any way whatsoever and the public accounts committee's report on that incident made that very clear. You should not misrepresent the facts.

Mr RIPPER: It is hard to judge who is a friend of the family from outside. However, our side of the House is entitled to make that conclusion when something like that is reported publicly and is not denied by the people in question.

Mr Osborne: It was a rubbish report and it was denied.

Mr RIPPER: However, that is by the bye when it comes to the accountability issues. This man was able to get into the Premier's office and present a dodgy proposition for a dance contest.

Mr Osborne: He never got into the Premier's office.

Mr RIPPER: He was able to get \$450 000 from this Government. This man got this money because of the Premier's use of the Treasurer's Advance Account. No money was allocated in the budget for a global dance contest. There was nothing in the budget papers about that. The Estimates Committee had not scrutinised any proposal to fund a global dance event. Someone got in through some mechanism, presumably through personal contact. Someone saw the Premier personally and was able to convince him that it should go ahead. The Premier exercised a considerable degree of influence over all the officials responsible to him.

Mr Osborne: It was the Tourism Commission.

Mr RIPPER: The Tourism Commission went ahead after it knew the Premier wanted this project. The Premier allocated \$450 000 of taxpayers' money for this event, which the Government did not get back. When concerns were raised, the Premier said the contract was watertight. Later on we found there was no prospect of legal action being undertaken.

Mr Osborne: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not know what he is talking about.

Mr RIPPER: I know, and the member's constituents in Bunbury ought to know, that \$450 000 of taxpayers' money has gone with no return. That \$450 000 was allocated through the Treasurer's Advance Account. The member for Bunbury knows there was concern about accountability with the use of that account. The member signed up to a recommendation from the Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee about that accountability issue. The issue was that a minister normally needs approval from the Treasurer if he or she wants additional expenditure beyond the budget. The Treasurer then talks to the Treasury and there is some accountability. There is a check and a balance. The request might not be granted if it does not meet appropriate criteria. On this occasion, the minister responsible was also the Treasurer. This is a key reason why the Global Dance Foundation Inc disaster occurred. The Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee recommended that improved accountability measures be built into the system. Recommendation 3 says that -

Where a Treasurer is also the responsible Minister, applications for supplementary funding for that portfolio should be submitted to Cabinet for approval.

That is a sensible recommendation. I am pleased that the member for Bunbury saw a problem in the system and signed up to implement that recommendation. To implement that, the Financial Administration and Audit Act needs to be amended. Unfortunately, the Premier does not seem to agree. His view is that the Financial Administration and Audit Act requirements for the Treasurer to approve supplementary funds and for the Governor to approve new items have worked satisfactorily for some time. The Premier also argued that adopting the report's recommendations could cause delays when urgent decisions may be required, leading to Cabinet's deliberating on relatively minor issues. There was also an argument that Cabinet might make the same decision as the Treasurer. There has been an abuse of the Treasurer's Advance Account. An accountability flaw has been identified and a parliamentary committee recommended that the system should be altered. However, despite what the Premier said when he was in Opposition, the Government will not tighten the rules regarding the operations of the Treasurer's Advance Account.

I will reveal to the House another aspect of the accountability of this system.

Mr Bradshaw: Has the Deputy Leader of the Opposition ever thought about the positive things the Government has brought to Western Australia, like Rally Australia and the other important things? It cannot pick winners every time.

Mr RIPPER: One of the items of the schedule is a \$190 000 expenditure overrun in additional funding for the Heineken Golf Classic and Rally Australia. Even the positive things the member mentioned are listed as expenditure overruns in this Bill.

I return to the accountability issue. The Leader of the Opposition submitted a freedom of information request to the Treasury seeking all correspondence between relevant ministers and departments and the Treasury about funding requests from the Treasurer's Advance Account throughout 1997-98 and the first half of 1998-99. My colleague advised me that the Premier took 180 days to respond to the request, compared with the legislative requirement under the Freedom Of Information Act of 45 days. When he did respond, the Opposition was refused access to 247 documents and granted only limited access to 60 documents. This Government presents itself as accountable and wants the public to believe it is open and transparent. However, the Opposition met with obstruction when the Government dealt with a freedom of information request such as that. The Treasurer has refused to implement a Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee recommendation to improve accountability and the checks and balances in the operation of the Treasurer's Advance Account.

Mr Bradshaw: If the Opposition ever gets into Government, it will find that freedom of information is not all that brilliant and it will not always wish to release that much information because it is not beneficial for the good government of the day.

Mr RIPPER: The community is moving toward a position where it is demanding more openness. Each Government will find there are more stringent demands for accountability than that required of its predecessor. Members on this side of the House understand they will be required to govern in an open and transparent manner when they come into government.

Mr Bradshaw: They will put black lines through the documents!

Mr RIPPER: From time to time we may find freedom of information difficult, but those demands represent the new political culture. Both sides of the House must come to terms with the way the community continues to view these issues.

There are a lot of different items in the schedules. I will run through some of them now and the Opposition might take the opportunity to deal with some of the items in more detail in the consideration in detail stage.

Mr Bradshaw: Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition realise a recent survey showed that Western Australia has the highest ranked freedom of information process in the country?

Mr RIPPER: Clearly it did not survey opposition members of Parliament, because we could all have produced requests under Freedom of Information legislation that have been delayed or rebuffed or have in other ways received unsatisfactory responses.

I return to the schedules to these Bills. The Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) deals with recurrent expenditure and has two schedules. Schedule 1 deals with 1997-98 expenditure and schedule 2 deals with 1998-99 expenditure. Let us look at what the explanatory memorandum shows in each of those cases. The new standing orders which require that an explanatory memorandum be tabled with each Bill have been a success with regard to this Bill, and the Opposition appreciates having that explanatory memorandum available. We see in these schedules the poor budgeting of the State Government. In 1997-98, the Government injected significant funds into key service delivery areas such as Health and Education. These significant injections of funds were made because the Government had under-budgeted in these key service areas at the time of the 1997-98 state budget. Other interesting expenditure items in this schedule are the payment of \$2.4m to the Police Service to cover its costs in the dispute on the wharves, an expenditure overrun of \$109 000 for the Heineken Classic and Rally Australia, which I have mentioned, an increased contribution towards the operational costs of the Joondalup Health Service of \$13.9m, and an injection of \$200m into the Peel Health Service.

Mr MacLean: Are you suggesting we should not have done that?

Mr RIPPER: That is an interesting question. I expect that the residents of Joondalup would prima facie be interested in having increased expenditure in the hospital which meets their needs, but the rub is that this is a privatised hospital into which the State needs to continue to inject funds, and those funds are being injected into that privatised hospital operation by starving public hospital operations of the funds which they need. Therefore, while at first glance this may result in more expenditure in the northern suburbs, at second glance it is an example of the failure of the Government's privatising and contracting out policies. Schedule 2 of the Bill deals with appropriations for supplementary funding provided to agencies in 1998-99. Again, funds were injected into key service delivery areas such as Health, and, again, the Government under-funded these key areas at the time of the 1998-99 state budget. Some of the individual expenditures were \$200 000 for promotion of the budget, \$139 000 in increased salaries for ministerial offices, \$4.6m to the Anti-Corruption Commission, \$566 000 to the Chemistry Centre WA, which apparently struggles along under the new arrangements which the Government has inflicted upon it, and \$17.7m for the closure of MetroBus. I wonder whether that \$17.7m of expenditure was costed into the comparisons that were made between the original MetroBus operation and the new privatised service.

A further interesting expenditure was \$1.2m in costs associated with the review of the fire service levy. We all know that the fire service levy was supposed to be moved to local government but remained with the insurance companies. Many people in local government were severely inconvenienced by that government decision; or, should I say, by that government backflip. Local governments everywhere had prepared their administrative systems to collect that fire service levy and had accepted the Government's assurance that it would legislate to shift that levy to the responsibility of local government. However, the Minister for Emergency Services came into this place one day and said in a brief ministerial statement that the Government would not proceed with that legislation. The reasons were, at least from his statement, a little unclear, but it became apparent later that he had been chopped off at the knees in the coalition party room.

Mr McGowan: Something happened in that party room!

Mr RIPPER: Something dreadful happened in the party room to the Minister for Emergency Services! Schedule 2 of Bill No 3 allocates \$1.2m for costs associated with the review of the fire service levy. The Government spent this money, told local governments that they would be responsible for that levy, got local governments to spend money to prepare their administrative systems, and then had the Minister for Emergency Services come here and say, "Sorry. The Government is not proceeding with it." That is \$1.2m that the Government wasted because it did not take a census of its party room before it embarked upon this process.

The Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 4) deals with appropriations from the consolidated fund for capital expenditure excesses approved during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 financial years. In 1997-98, capital expenditure excesses amounted to \$270.6m, while in 1998-99, capital expenditure excesses amounted to a much more modest \$24.3m. Schedule 1 of the Bill deals with 1997-98 expenditures. The majority of that \$270m is apparently to cover a \$240m contribution to the state development fund. Some of that \$240m will be used to fund the convention centre. The convention centre is widely regarded as another example of the Premier's poor priorities and fascination with pet projects and as being unnecessary because of proposals from the private sector to build a similar, if not quite as elaborate, convention centre. That will come out of the \$240m which the Parliament is now retrospectively appropriating to the state development fund.

The second expenditure from the state development fund that I want to deal with is the contribution towards computers in schools. The Government intends to spend \$20m per financial year over four financial years to put computers into government schools. That is a very worthy expenditure, and I am certainly pleased to support that aspect of this Bill. However, I point out that we are spending capital on these computers, which have a very short lifetime.

Mr Court: You are not knocking computers in schools, are you?

Mr RIPPER: If the Treasurer had been listening to me, he would have heard me say that I regard the expenditure as very worthy. It concerns me though that he is using capital funds for this expenditure on computers when their technical currency has such a short lifetime. Expenditure on computers should be from the current funds. In four years' time, the first of the computers bought with this money will probably need to be replaced if schools are to maintain parity with what is happening with computing in the rest of the world. We will need, therefore, to continue to spend on computers at the current rate. Unfortunately, the Government has funded current expenditure on computers from the proceeds of the sale of the Dampier to Bunbury natural gas pipeline. What is essentially recurrent expenditure is being funded from the proceeds of the sale of assets. When those proceeds are exhausted in another couple of years' time, this Government, or the alternative incoming Government from the other side of politics, will have to find moneys to keep the computer program running. School principals are saying that they will need new computers every year because they quickly become out of date. There is not much point in trying to have a computer literate generation of school children if they are being educated with obsolescent equipment.

We will come to spend more time on other aspects of this Bill during the consideration in detail stage. Under this Government we are seeing an increasing use of the Treasurer's Advance Account for the management of the Government's finances. That increasing use of the Treasurer's Advance Account undermines the scrutiny that this Parliament can apply to expenditure and the financial accountability of the Government. In addition, the increasing use of the Treasurer's Advance Account represents poor financial management. It indicates that the Government is not getting its budget right when it brings budgets down in April each calendar year. We are increasingly seeing the phenomenon where each financial year the Government needs to provide significant additional injections of funds into key service delivery areas. Moreover, the current use of the Treasurer's Advance Account is contrary to the Treasurer's arguments when in opposition and to the views of the McCarrey commission which he instituted. We do not oppose these Bills but we will use the opportunity during the examination in detail stage to draw attention to various failings in the Government's management of its finances.

MR KOBELKE (Nollamara) [7.33 pm]: I shall address some comments briefly to specific matters covered by these two Bills and then comment on some more general matters relating to the Government and its effects on the citizens of Western Australia. I shall refer to the changes to the workers compensation system and the way in which this Government has totally messed up the workers compensation system in this State.

I shall start by making reference to these Bills and the explanatory memoranda that went with them. They show that in respect of the Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) 1999 which covers recurrent expenditure for the periods 1997-98 and 1998-99, a substantial amount of that money had to go back to government agencies for risk cover. It is not clear if it all related to workers compensation premiums; some of it clearly does, and I suspect that most of it does. However, in the 1997-98 financial year the government insurance fund got \$10.7m for its RiskCover, the Health Department got \$8.4m, there was a carry-over from the 1996-97 year for workers compensation premiums of \$4.2m, and the Ministry of Justice had to have a \$1.8m top-up. Those figures total in excess of \$25m before adding on the \$300 000s, the \$100 000s and the \$10 000s which appear in many of the items in the explanatory memorandum. Clearly, in the 1997-98 year there was a requirement to fund an extra amount that ran into tens of millions of dollars. It would appear that a great deal, if not most of it, related to workers compensation premiums overrun.

This Bill as it relates to 1998-99 contains only one or two references to additional funding required for RiskCover for workers compensation premiums. It seems that for the 1998-99 year the departments had got their budgets in line and had budgeted for the increase in workers compensation premiums. However, if these two budget Bills accurately reflect what happened, a blow-out clearly occurred in 1997-98. I qualify that because sometimes money is shifted around between different accounts and therefore shows up in different Bills. However, I am assuming that the amount in the Bill for 1997-98 implies - the Treasurer will correct me if I am wrong - that a large number of departments could not cover their workers compensation premiums for that year because they had increased rapidly, whereas in the 1998-99 year, such overspending does not show up in these Bills. I am assuming that was not necessarily as a result of a reduction in costs but that the departments had covered themselves in their budgets for that years. I will take that summary as correct unless the Treasurer points out otherwise. It would indicate that back in 1997-98 government departments were very much aware of the escalating costs of workers compensation premiums, yet in that period the Government did not proceed with its Bill which was in the Parliament, which would have fixed up the problems that had been created with the changes in 1993.

All members are aware that the Government made major changes to workers compensation legislation in 1993. The Opposition opposed those changes which occurred across a whole range of issues. I do not wish to enter into a debate on the various aspects of those changes, but one aspect that we opposed and pointed out would cause problems, as did the insurance industry and industry generally, was the removal of lump sum redemptions. The Government was aware that that problem had started to show up in 1995 when it drafted legislation to undo the change made in 1993 and return lump sum redemptions to the system. However, in 1996 the Government failed to put that Bill through the Parliament. The Bill had opposition support. In 1997 the Government failed again to put that Bill through Parliament. Again the Bill had opposition support. In 1998, even though it made major changes to which the Opposition objected, the Government did not put that basic Bill to return lump sum redemptions through the Parliament. I am implying from the figures before me that in the 1997-98 financial year, the problem was directly evident to the Government through the additional premiums that its departments had to pay, yet it failed to put through the legislation that was part of the solution to the problem and which would return lump sum redemptions to the system.

The workers compensation system is totally out of kilter; it is not serving the interests of employers in industry, and at the same time it is being quite unfair and vicious in the way it has withdrawn benefits from many injured workers. The system

is not working. The most recent changes were stopgap measures. The Opposition is still awaiting what the Government will do to address the problem more thoroughly and fairly, and in a way that will meet the needs of injured workers.

The Minister for Labour Relations has today made a statement regarding the workers compensation Premium Rates Committee, which has indicated that average premium rates should be reduced by 10 per cent from the start of next month. The minister is suggesting that the insurance companies should fall into line and reduce their premiums accordingly. I understand from the media that they are not taking kindly to that suggestion. Like the minister, I hope they reduce their premiums by 10 per cent or more, but I understand their reluctance.

The insurers reduced their premiums following the 1993 legislative changes. They did that based as much on the minister's urging as on their commercial judgment about the appropriate level of premiums. That led in part to the problems we are now experiencing. We had major discounting by the insurers. That obviously relates to other issues, including competing to buy market share. However, that marked lowering of premiums meant that when costs increased the insurers were left under funded to meet their liabilities. That has been one of the key causes of the substantial problem we now face, and it contributed to the spiralling cost of workers compensation. I can understand the insurers being conservative and not wishing again to be involved in meeting the minister's political objectives. They might find themselves undercharging for premiums because they are waiting to see the cost history of the changes that have just been made.

Mrs Edwardes: But you will support me, or the Government, in urging the insurance industry -

Mr KOBELKE: The minister could glean from my earlier comments that the Opposition wants lower premiums. However, members on this side want lower premiums that are sustainable, not those that might meet the minister's political objective; that is, to bundle up the issue before the election and not to worry about what happens later. That has happened over the past five or six years. Premiums were brought down by competition - insurers discounted to win market share - by the minister's urging and possibly by other factors of which I am not aware. However, that reduction was not sustainable. Premium rates have rebounded far beyond an acceptable average level.

We must urge the insurance companies to reduce premiums, but the Government should take up the recommendations of the Pearson report, which suggested a change to the independent body that oversees the insurers and greater transparency in the insurers' work and business management to ensure the greatest possible efficiency and competition. That will result in sustainable lower premiums.

Mrs Edwardes: I agree with that. The review into the insurance industry will allow us to explore that even further. I was surprised by the committee's recommendation that premiums be reduced by 10 per cent. However, it was obviously made on the basis of the information available in March, prior to those amendments being passed. We still have a long way to go; this is the initial step. If the insurers do not do the right thing by small businesses and the frail and aged community, the Government will make them justify every premium charged to those bodies.

Mr KOBELKE: The minister has said she is surprised. I do not understand why.

Mrs Edwardes: I am surprised about the proposals and the actuary's views, which would provide a saving of \$70m. The recommendation was to be 9.7 per cent. We changed that position somewhat through negotiations. However, because of the other factors, the committee was still able to recommend a 10 per cent reduction.

Mr KOBELKE: So the Government was surprised that the recommendation was for a 10 per cent reduction.

Mrs Edwardes: I was surprised it was as high as 10 per cent.

Mr KOBELKE: I find that astounding because the minister was making off-the-cuff remarks during the passage of the legislation that she was looking for that 10 per cent reduction.

Mrs Edwardes: We were.

Mr KOBELKE: It was common knowledge that the minister was applying pressure to ensure that the committee made that recommendation. Lo and behold, it makes that recommendation and the minister is surprised.

Mrs Edwardes: The member should not be so facetious. The Government did not get all that it wanted passed by this Parliament. It did not get psychological overlay and it wanted a lower disability threshold. Other changes were also made. The member should not be so facetious and say that, "Lo and behold, she is surprised." I am surprised. The Government did not get all that it wanted and believed would support a 10 per cent reduction. I am very pleased that the committee has seen fit -

Mr KOBELKE: I am happy to take the interjection, but the minister is making a speech. We will have a chance to debate this issue tomorrow in respect of the amendments to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act.

The minister's last interjection reflects the point I made earlier; that is, that she is driving these changes to the system with very short-term goals. Workers compensation is a complex issue that needs stability and a sustainable low-cost system. The minister's comments about wanting to be harsher and to reduce the benefits available to injured workers are counterproductive to a sustainable system. If the system were as harsh as the minister wants it to be, workers would find another way of upholding their rights. Injured workers are driven to suicide because of the pressure they are put under, their pain and their inability to continue the life they had prior to their accident. If they are confronted with an oppressive workers compensation system that gives them no opportunity to rebuild their lives, they will find other ways to get money out of the system. People are adaptable.

Members have seen the atrocious conditions in which the people of East Timor are required to live. We are astounded that they can survive those atrocities, oppression and lack of basic necessities of life. Looking at workers compensation victims is very different, but there is that same indomitable human spirit that surfaces in people who have been subjugated by the system. They will find a way to hold up their heads and to maintain decent lives. If we do not have that basic fairness and decency, the system will not be sustainable. If the minister does not believe the system must be fair, she will not make the rates stay down for any length of time. That is an area of major disagreement with regard to the necessary changes, and perhaps we will have a chance to debate it in more detail tomorrow.

I refer to the second reading speech on the Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 4), in which it is stated -

Capital expenditure transactions in 1997-98 amounted to \$1 444.5m, which was a net increase of \$963.3m from the 1997-98 budget estimate of \$481.2m. The unforeseen expenditure appropriation of \$270.6m sought in this Bill, and increased expenditure of \$721.6m authorised by other statutes, was offset by underspending of \$28.9m against other votes.

That suggests that the Treasurer got it very wrong. However, I suspect that it is an accounting issue or a one-off issue such as the sale of the pipeline. It is incredible that the Government budgeted \$481m for capital works and that that figure was out by nearly \$1b. Was that an accounting issue or capital expenditure that came to account for that year?

Mr Court: When I respond I will provide a list of all the differences.

Mr KOBELKE: I hope the Premier will provide me with a copy when he responds and that during the consideration in detail stage we can tease out some of the specific details.

I refer now to the fire service levy on which the member for Belmont has already commented. In the budget statements under Fire and Emergency Services Authority of Western Australia an additional expenditure of almost \$10m is shown of which almost \$1.2m was for costs associated with the fire service levy. This is a clear example of mismanagement and waste by the Government.

The Government set out to change the way people contribute to the upkeep and maintenance of our fire and emergency services. As most people know, a levy on insurance premiums contributes to the upkeep of our fire and emergency services. However, that method of collection is inequitable. The Government proposed a more efficient and equitable system whereby a surcharge would be applied to local council rates. That proposal has existed since the previous Labor Government was in office. We wished the Government well in pursuing the change. However, at the eleventh hour - almost a minute before midnight - it did a 180-degree turn in the other direction and the proposal was shelved after local governments around the State had spent a great deal of money and effort establishing new systems to be implemented as soon as the rates for the new year were sent out. The legislation had been drafted and was ready to be introduced into the Parliament. Not only this \$1.2m but also costs that would have been met by a number of government agencies, particularly the Department of Local Government which was involved in the development of the scheme, have been wasted. Costs were incurred by 140-odd local government authorities along with the WA Municipal Association. It was a total bungle.

If the Government had managed the issue properly, the problems that caused the backbenchers to balk at the change and the process to be shelved would have been resolved before the Government had announced a commencement date. Local government had been working extremely hard to introduce the system with minimal disruption to households and owners of property, who had to take out insurance and pay the levy. It was a total debacle. The budget papers show \$1.2m, which is part of the cost that the Government has wasted through its ineptitude and mismanagement of the proposed change. I do not know whether the Government has found the issue too difficult and has backed off. Is it still being worked on?

Mr Court: It is possibly being expanded, as the minister said when he made the announcement.

Mr KOBELKE: Does the Premier have any idea when it might be resolved?

Mr Court: I will have to talk to the minister.

Mr KOBELKE: Situations of that nature are becoming almost a mantra because they are repeated time and again. The Government does not act. It pursues a good idea; a press release or statement is put out by the Premier or a minister and nothing happens. When it does proceed, after half the work is done the issue falls over. That is hardly a measure of good government in this State. Time and again, whether it be prostitution laws, improving the safety of residents in their homes and on our streets or road traffic safety, the Government announces a good idea, or half an idea, and fails to implement it. It does not have the political will to tackle the issues that will result in some benefit to the people of Western Australia.

In 1993 the Government had the political will. The trouble was it wanted to take things away from people rather than provide something that was useful to them. The Government was preoccupied with financial management in 1993, but it threw that out the window when it incurred the largest debt the State has ever seen. Part of that fiscal management was to reduce the level of wages to ordinary Western Australian workers. The legislative changes in 1993 and various other industrial changes have reduced the relative wages of people in various sectors of our community. Some have done well in areas that pay good salaries and in growth industries. However, many people in Western Australia are now worse off due directly to the policies implemented by the Court Government.

Under the Workplace Agreements Act there is no adequate floor; it is set by the minister. It is approximately \$3 000 a year lower than the comparable minimum wage under a federal award. A person earning the lowest possible wage for a full week's work earns \$20 000 per annum under a federal award. However, a person working under a workplace agreement based on the minimum conditions imposed by this Government earns \$17 000. That is a huge difference for a low wage earner who must support a family.

This Government claims as one of its achievements reduced wages for the people and their families who have the greatest struggle to survive. That is a despicable achievement that has taken the State backwards. It has clearly impacted far more severely on women as reflected in the Government's own reports, one of which is the Report of the Commissioner for Workplace Agreements, which has been muddled to avoid showing the true picture. It clearly indicates that a greater percentage of women on workplace agreements are paid lower wages than they would be paid under an award. The Government's report entitled "Pay Equity for Women in Western Australia" by Professor A.C. Crockett and Dr Alison Preston is clear, objective proof of the effect of this Government's policies on low wage earners, particularly women.

Women have been segregated into low paid jobs as a result of history and the jobs available to them. A much smaller percentage of women than men move into high paying jobs. The Crockett and Preston report found that in 1996, the latest figures available, women in Western Australia earned 83.7 per cent of male earnings while the national figure was 87.1 per cent. This means that the gap between male and female earnings in Western Australia is 16.3 per cent; whereas nationally it is only 13 per cent. Therefore women in Western Australia have an earnings gap that is 3.3 per cent greater than that of women nationally. As I indicated earlier, in large part, that is driven by workplace agreements under which women in Western Australia earn a much lower minimum wage than if they were paid under a federal award.

That disparity of 3.3 per cent is mentioned in the Crockett and Preston report. Their statement is that women in Western Australia are nearly \$21 a week or \$1 000 a year worse off than women in other States, "simply because they live in Western Australia". That is clearly an achievement of this Government of which it should be ashamed.

In 1993 it had purpose; that is, it wanted to reduce wages and drive down the cost of labour. It introduced workplace agreements which contain the worst conditions in Australia. The federal workplace agreements do not allow overall conditions to be below that of an award. There is a no disadvantage test. That no disadvantage test may not be as good as one would like, but at least it is a better system than we have in Western Australia, because the Court Government provided no such safety net. It simply allowed wages to be reduced to a lower level, which is set by the minister. It is not even set by an independent umpire. The minister takes advice each year, and it is the minister of the day who sets that minimum wage. It is an appalling wage. There is no future for Western Australia and its people in trying to be a low-wage State. We should be driven by high-cost, high-value industries whereby we ensure that our people are educated to the highest possible level and that we have a range of government services and facilities that attract the very best people to live in Western Australia and contribute to innovative growth industries.

Mr Court: Why didn't you do it when you were in government?

Mr KOBELKE: We did, and we did it very well. This Government has ridden on the wave of what the Labor Government implemented. Earlier, a government member pointed out the great benefits to Western Australia of Rally Australia. The member from the government side had forgotten that it was another great Labor initiative that this Government has continued. We congratulate the Government for continuing the initiatives that were introduced by the last Labor Government. When it comes to economic management, the report that the present Government commissioned when it came into government showed that if it continued the economic management that was put in place by the previous Labor Government, everything would be very good. The Access Economics report which the Government commissioned said that all the Government had to do was to follow the economic regime left to it by the last Government and things would soon be very rosy.

This Government has lost its way. The direction it was taking in its early years had huge negative impacts, but at least it had a direction. Now we have a Government that simply does not know where it is going. It is playing pin the tail on the donkey. The Treasurer is wearing his mask, people have spun him around in a circle, he has gone giddy, and he cannot find where to put the pin. Perhaps he should stick it into some of his backbenchers who keep stopping the Government from doing things that need to be done. However, we have the Treasurer playing pin the tail on the donkey; he does not know which way to turn. All he can do is come into this place and make statements that are not true. He plays a game of charades and suggests that somehow we have a balanced budget, when all the commentators from his own side of politics point out that we have a deficit in the order of \$640m. It is the largest deficit in this State's history, yet the Treasurer is trying to deny the facts of the matter. The Treasurer is playing with numbers in his budget figures to try to cook the books so that it looks like he has a surplus. The trouble is that when one looks at comparable accounting standards across Australia, the national standards show that we have the largest deficit in this State's history. What we see in these budget papers is the cost overruns of the two previous years and the money that must be put in to meet those overruns of various government agencies.

I hope that we will have the opportunity to get some answers from the Treasurer about the various agencies and why those cost overruns were incurred. Sometimes it is necessary; at other times it is clearly an example of bad management.

MR THOMAS (Cockburn) [8.03 pm]: I will use this debate to raise a similar matter to those which have been raised by my colleague.

Mr Bradshaw: Continuing the lies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr THOMAS: Is the member suggesting that my colleague was lying?

Mr Bradshaw: I am saying he was not telling the truth.

Mr THOMAS: I do not think that is the case, and anyone who was listening to what he said would know that is not the case. In any event, I do not want to talk about what my colleague has just said. The merits of his argument stand on their own.

I will refer to a specific point. My colleague said that this is a Government that does not do anything. I will draw the attention of the House to a specific matter about which the Government has done nothing, and that is the notion of a Cockburn Sound management trust. Members will be aware that there has been some controversy in recent years regarding the proposal to build a new marine fabrication facility at Jervoise Bay in my electorate, on the shores of Cockburn Sound. That has prompted some concern and has highlighted some environmental considerations which relate to Cockburn Sound. In this House and elsewhere, I have suggested on a number of occasions that a Cockburn Sound trust should be set up somewhat similar to the Swan River Trust, with responsibility for Cockburn Sound.

Mr Court: You are looking for a job.

Mr THOMAS: I have one, thank you.

I have argued that such a body should be established, and the Government has indicated that in a sense it is prepared to accept that. Indeed, it said towards the end of last year that it would establish a management trust for Cockburn Sound. When that was announced, it caused some joy in my electorate. We were able to say that the Government had come some way towards meeting the concerns of residents, and some approval was expressed when the Deputy Premier made that announcement. As far as I am able to ascertain, since then absolutely nothing has happened - not a single thing. If ever a need was demonstrated for a management trust for an area such as Cockburn Sound, it was demonstrated by the fact that there was a major spill into Cockburn Sound recently, which has highlighted the very worst fears of people who live on the shores of Cockburn Sound. There is no specific body with responsibility for the management of Cockburn Sound, and the Government has done nothing during the past 12 months since it indicated that it was prepared to set up a body with responsibility for the management of Cockburn Sound. The Government stands condemned for its inaction in this area. I suspect that action to set up such a body would for the most part be almost cost neutral; at least the cost would be fairly minimal compared with other initiatives that have been taken in that area. However, even that small action was not undertaken. Earlier this year, when we were sitting in the other place listening to the Governor's speech foreshadowing the legislation which would be introduced during the session, I was waiting for an announcement that there would be legislation in relation to the Cockburn Sound trust, and I was bitterly disappointed when the Governor had nothing to say on that subject.

I will deal with the Government's announcements on this subject. An hour or two ago I went to the Parliamentary Library and pulled out the Deputy Premier's statements on this subject to ascertain what had been said. If one goes through the Deputy Premier's speeches, one finds that as far back as 30 October 1998 he made an announcement, in which he said -

Because of this, I will strongly support moves to establish a Cockburn Sound Management Authority under the Waterways and Rivers Commission.

They are important words from the Deputy Premier. That statement was made by him in his capacity as Minister for Commerce and Trade on 30 October last year - almost a year ago. In that statement, he was announcing environmental approval for the Jervoise Bay project and all the conditions that would attach to it. In the middle of that he stated that he would support a Cockburn Sound management authority. When that statement was made I said that it was not good enough, and no doubt I will say it again on many subsequent occasions. We do not want a body set up under the Water and Rivers Commission Act; we want a body like the Swan River Trust with management authority, a role in planning and a policing role with responsibility for the management of Cockburn Sound. In effect, Cockburn Sound is an inland water like the Swan River. Like the Swan River it has many pressures on it from industrial, residential, recreational and military users. Almost one-half of the shores of Cockburn Sound are taken up by the Royal Australian Navy base, HMAS *Stirling*, and it has a major interest in the management of the sound. The sound has major environmental problems with seagrass, potential pollution problems and land use conflicts that go with many-use pressures. We need a body with management authority, policing powers and a planning role that is able to have a say on the uses to which the sound will be put.

Although the Opposition was somewhat pleased that the Deputy Premier had gone some way towards meeting its request by saying a management authority would be set up that was somewhat similar to the Peel Inlet Management Authority and the Leschenault Inlet Management Authority, we said then, and we continue to say, that is not good enough, because we want a body with its own legislation, powers and an office on the shores of the sound. Although opposition members were not entirely satisfied with what the Deputy Premier had to say on 30 October last, we were pleased that the Government had come some way towards what we had to say. Obviously it was a charade, which is demonstrated by the fact that nothing has happened since. A statement was made on 25 March, which is six or seven months ago. The opening paragraph to that statement reads -

Jervoise Bay was chosen as the site for a major new marine industrial complex because it was the only location which met all the project's requirements, Commerce and Trade Minister Hendy Cowan said today.

The Deputy Premier then announced that Jervoise Bay had been chosen as the site for the project and he set out all the reasons it is a desirable project. I support him in that, and I agree that it is a good site and a good project. However, the statement announcing the environmental conditions that would be put on any development was trying to soften up the residents for the announcement in which he says the project will proceed. A fortnight or two before that he announced that a series of regional parks and cycleways and other icing on the cake would be created to make the project more acceptable to the public. Again, the Opposition welcomed that announcement, specifically the upgrade of the Henderson industrial area.

The infrastructure in Henderson badly needs redevelopment. The workers have nowhere to park their cars, and the roads are substandard. It is a disgrace as the premier manufacturing precinct in the State. We take interstate and international visitors to Henderson to show them what industry in Western Australia is capable of. However, the state of the roads, the

lack of an entrance statement and the lack of pride in the area is not fitting for the premier manufacturing precinct of the State. That creates practical problems. A shipbuilder in the area that is located perhaps a half a kilometre back from the sound, must move completed vessels by truck to be launched into the water. There have been occasions when the shipbuilder has not been able to launch a vessel because workers at another shipyard have parked their cars on the access way, because they have nowhere else to park their cars. That shipbuilder has cranes and other gear tied up which costs thousands of dollars an hour and he has to find the workers to move their cars. If they cannot locate the workers, people are grossly inconvenienced.

The infrastructure in the area needs to be upgraded, and that too was announced in this statement. We had the softening-up statements and the unequivocal statement by the Deputy Premier that there would be an upgrade of infrastructure in the area and the construction of parks and all sorts of amenities to make people happy. Then two months ago the Government announced that it might put the project somewhere else. I am not sure whether the statement was made by the Deputy Premier or someone from one of his departments. The Government was considering another site further south in the electorate of my colleague, the member for Peel. Once again it seemed that the whole project was up for grabs and might not proceed, and if it did proceed it would proceed somewhere else. All the other things that went with the project, such as the parks, roads, and the management authority seemed to hang on the fact that the Jervoise Bay project would proceed. In fact, they are independent variables because the roads need fixing, the management authority needs to be established and the parks need to be created. All of those things were offered to soften up the public to make them accept the Jervoise Bay project. In any event, everything went on hold while the proponents of this project and the Government considered whether it might be better to locate it further to the south on land occupied by the Broken Hill Proprietary Co Ltd in the electorate of my colleague, the member for Peel.

I understand that last week the Deputy Premier announced that the Government had investigated the alternative site and the Jervoise Bay proposal would proceed. I say that is great and let us go ahead with it. A lot of people do not want the project to go ahead. The Deputy Speaker would know from a conversation we have had that I do not agree with him on that point, and I want the project in my electorate. I think that it is great and I want the jobs. The major pollution in my electorate is youth unemployment, and I want to tackle that problem, so this project should proceed.

Those people who are concerned about the environment in Cockburn Sound have good reason to be concerned. Once upon a time there were thousands of hectares of seagrass in Cockburn Sound. That has diminished to a much smaller area of about 800 ha. There have been problems in the northern harbour of Jervoise Bay with algal blooms, where polluted ground water has entered the sound from manufacturing facilities and sewerage works inland. That polluted water is entering the sound into contained waters behind breakwaters and that has caused a problem with an algal bloom. As a consequence people react against industry. They say that they do not want industry; they want a clean sound, recreational space and clean water to look upon from their houses and when they are engaged in recreational activities. Who can blame them? That is a reasonable aspiration of people. When they see these problems which have been caused by industry they do not want industry in their area, and that is a natural reaction. Their worst fears are confirmed when events such as the major pollution spill of the month before last caused fisheries to be closed down and statements made that it was not safe to eat shellfish caught in the sound, and people who operated commercial fishing and aquaculture activities in the area had to close up for weeks.

Those events confirm the worst fears of people who are concerned about industrial pollution. The fact that the Jervoise Bay project will operate as a manufacturing and fabricating industry and will not contribute one gram of pollution to the sound is easy to overlook when people are not familiar with the nature of those industries. All industry gets tarred with the brush of the ones that have been careless, for whatever reason, and have seriously polluted Cockburn Sound. If the Government wanted to show the colour of its money and demonstrate to the public that this body of water is under enormous planning and industrial pressure, and under pressure from people for recreation and who want to live alongside it - pressure which is similar to that which has been faced on the Swan River - the Government should set up a properly constituted management authority. Why has the Government not done that? The Deputy Premier said in October-November of last year that he supported the management authority proposal. Given that his statement was not contradicted by the Premier or the responsible minister - presumably the Minister for Water Resources - and given the Deputy Premier's position in the Government, the public is entitled to expect the Government to establish the management authority. Nothing has happened.

The Opposition advocates a body created by its own legislation which will have planning, management and policing responsibilities. The Government at least should have stated in Parliament, some 11 or 12 months later, that it takes time to draft legislation, and that such time has not been available. If that had been said, at least we would have known the Government was on the job. We would have been frustrated, and would have questioned its priorities in taking so long to draft legislation. However, we would at least have understood that parliamentary drafting time was responsible for the delay, and would not believe that the Government had done nothing. That has not occurred. The Government seeks to establish a body under the Water and Rivers Commission, for which legislation already exists. I understand that regulations would be required as delegated legislation, so a new Act of Parliament would not be required and the proposal could proceed.

Some of my constituents have approached me and said that they oppose the Jervoise Bay project. A number of them have said, "I want you to oppose the project." I responded, "I share your concerns about the environment and about Cockburn Sound, but in the wider picture, I am sorry, I disagree and I support the project." I tried to comfort them by stating, "I strongly support the establishment of a management trust for Cockburn Sound; namely, one similar to the Swan River Trust. The Government has not gone far enough, but at least it said it will set up something similar." I feel betrayed and let down. The Government - which, funnily enough, I support in a sense on this matter - has not come to the party. It vacillated on the project. The Deputy Premier said that Jervoise Bay was the only site for this project, and issued a statement with eight

or nine dot points supporting that view. Nevertheless, a month or two ago he had another thought: The Government might put it somewhere else. That makes one wonder about the basis of the eight or nine points outlining Jervoise Bay as the only site. It seems that the original statement now stands and the project will go ahead.

Why has the Government not created the body? Months have passed. If ever an event demonstrated the importance of such a body, it was the major pollution spill in the Sound a month or two ago. If the body had been established as the Government foreshadowed, someone would be on the job dedicated to managing Cockburn Sound. The concerns being expressed in my electorate are reflected in an article which appeared on 15 September 1999 in *The West Australian* reporting a statement by Professor Phil Jennings of Murdoch University. He was acting in his capacity as spokesman for the Conservation Council. Professor Jennings lives in the vicinity. He has been concerned about the project since its inception. He has had a continuing interest in this area for over 20 years, particularly in the wetlands which run parallel to the shore of Cockburn Sound as I am aware through my direct knowledge and my association with him. I do not agree with Professor Jennings on a number of issues, and specifically on the Jervoise Bay proposal. The article is headed "Planned body lacks power", and its opening paragraph reads -

The new management body proposed for Cockburn Sound is unlikely to have the powers to override government agencies or order prosecutions against polluters.

Professor Jennings then made the case that the body the Deputy Premier foreshadowed in his statement of October-November of last year would not be good enough to do the job required at Cockburn Sound. When the Deputy Premier made his announcement last year, the Opposition said that it was pleased that the Government was doing something, but it was not enough. Subsequently, a major chemical spill occurred in Cockburn Sound. Someone of the stature of Professor Phil Jennings saw his case proved correct.

The Premier is sitting opposite. Sadly, the Deputy Premier, who is responsible in most part for the project, is not here. The Minister for Water Resources is not here, even though he will be responsible for a management body established under the Water and Rivers Commission legislation. I ask the Premier: Why has he not acted on the undertaking from the Deputy Premier? This body does not require legislation. It will not require scarce parliamentary time, and its establishment would not require vast amounts of money. The money could have been allocated in the last state budget if the Government were serious about the proposal. Why is it that the proposal announced by the Deputy Premier in October-November last year has not been acted upon? The Premier, through his silence, indicates that he is not prepared to answer the question.

In closing, I turn to the late 1980s, when enormous pressure was on the Swan River - as it still is - from residential, recreational and, to a lesser extent, industrial uses, and from pollution upstream in the agriculture areas resulting in effluent coming into the river. Concern was expressed in the late 1980s about the environmental health of the Swan River. The Burke Government, to give credit to Brian Burke and Barry Hodge, the responsible minister at the time, responded to that pressure and established the Swan River Trust, which was given the powers to manage the Swan River. At the time, local government and many other people jumped up and down saying that the trust, with its planning powers, would infringe on their bailiwicks, and claimed that they should retain planning and management responsibility in this area. It was thought the trust would upset a few empires and interests as it was to have too much power. The Government proceeded anyway. The merits of the proposal were obvious, and it passed the Legislative Council without a government majority there. I ask the local government associations and their successors, and the groups which stated it should not be established, whether today they would attempt to dismantle the Swan River Trust. Does anyone suggest it is not an eminently sensible body to run an inland waterway in the inner city and metropolitan area which is subject to the pressures that that represents?

That being the case, I once again ask the Premier: Why has the Government not acted on the statement of the Deputy Premier of October-November last year to set up a management body for Cockburn Sound? The people I represent in Parliament are justified in being frustrated and angry. The Government needs to realise that because of its inaction on matters such as this, situations will arise where people oppose projects which have merit. The people ask, "How can the Government be trusted?" I tell them that the project is environmentally sound and will not pollute. They say that although that is being said, it is by the Government, which said it would set up a body to manage Cockburn Sound. It has not done that. It also said that other industries would not pollute, and they have. I realise those comparisons are not necessarily legitimate, but the Government needs to understand that its inaction - which seems almost to be studied inaction - on proposals which are practically cost-free in money and parliamentary time, bring the Government and industrial development generally into disrepute. Its inaction leads to community opposition to industrial projects which should enjoy wider support.

MR McGOWAN (Rockingham) [8.31 pm]: The principal subject I will speak on is sport and recreation, some developments and what is happening to some of the better programs set up by government to improve participation and performance levels among athletes at an elite and community level throughout our State. It is some time since I acquired this shadow portfolio area. I am concerned that one reads of an increasing decline in participation levels in sport and recreation throughout the State and nation. This decline appears to come at a time when there is a renaissance in Australia's performance at an elite level in a range of sporting pursuits. It is a paradoxical situation: Elite level sports stars in high-profile sports are doing better than at any time since the 1960s, yet a major decline is being experienced in the level of sporting participation of juniors and young people. People are increasingly attracted to activities which are not sporting or exercise-related. Young people are no longer becoming involved in character-building, discipline-structured community activities, which is what organised sport is. This should be of great concern to all because increased social and health problems will result down the track if this trend continues. There will also be problems with Australia's sporting performance at international and national levels. That level of activity is needed at a junior level to generate the number of elite athletes to maintain a decent elite level of sport. A base load of participation among young people is needed to ensure the participation in elite level sport for time to come.

Since the 1980s, our nation has been well served at an elite level by a number of institutions. The first is the Australian Institute of Sport, which was set up in the early 1980s. It is based in Canberra and its various sporting programs are spread around the country. The institute is designed to take in people who show immense promise in certain sports and to help them develop so they can represent the nation and participate in sport at a high level. The Western Australian Institute of Sport was set up in 1984 under the tutelage of Mr Wally Foreman. This has been a successful addition to high-level sport in allowing potentially elite Western Australian athletes to attend a first-rate, world-class facility in their own State, enabling them to develop to their utmost potential. I have no complaints with either of those organisations. They are excellent and perform a valuable role. One of my earliest sporting memories is of the 1976 Montreal Olympics. I recall that Australia came away with one silver medal in a swimming event and a few bronze medals. Australia did not win any gold medals. There was a national outpouring of grief because Australia, the great sporting nation of the 1950s and 1960s, had done so poorly at the most prestigious sporting event in the world that it won only one silver medal. After that, all sides of politics realised that something had to be done, so the Australian Institute of Sport was created. That was followed in 1984 by the Western Australian Institute of Sport, as I have already mentioned. However, the emphasis in Australia was on elite sport. Although improvements have been made, the level of achievement will drop off in the future if Australia does not have that base load of participation in junior level sport now. We must take positive steps to arrest the decline in sporting participation, particularly among young people.

I address the subject of cuts to elite sporting activities. I indicated that we are well served. When it became known that the Olympic Games were coming to Australia, the Olympic athletes program was set up by the Commonwealth Government. About \$20m a year was provided. Substantial funds were put into the Australian Institute of Sport, and the Commonwealth funded the state institutes of sport to ensure we could produce athletes who did us proud at the 2000 Sydney Olympics. That program will come to an end as soon as the Olympics are over. Western Australia will lose more than \$850 000 a year from the Commonwealth. The Western Australian Institute of Sport will go back to relying on funds that are essentially put in by the Lotteries Commission. Some sponsorship also is required. Western Australia's elite sporting emphasis will suffer a net loss of \$850 000, which will affect a great range of programs. That is a mistake. I know there is not a bottomless pit of money and there are a lot of other priorities. However, encouraging a high level of sporting activity and encouraging young people to aim for that level of activity is a good thing. It also has a corresponding impact on juniors: The better the elite athletes do, the more young people are prepared to participate in sporting activities. The Commonwealth Government's cut to Western Australia's elite athlete program is a mistake. There will be more Olympics. I am confident there will be one every four years after the Sydney Olympics. This cut will mean that after the Sydney Olympics our ability to produce high-level athletes will be diminished.

I will now address the grassroots level of sport. The points I have made about the drop-off in participation and trying to ensure that we have strong grassroots community sport were addressed in a range of reports in the late 1980s and early 1990s. As a result, the former Minister for Sport and Recreation, Hon Graham Edwards, decided that certain areas needed to be addressed because we were not addressing some sporting needs. As Minister for Sport and Recreation, in 1990-91 Hon Graham Edwards established specific bodies which were separate from the Ministry of Sport and Recreation, bodies which did not fall entirely under the ministry's umbrella. These community sporting bodies were designed to encourage participation by certain groups which had not been participating in sport and to meet certain needs in terms of ongoing participation in sport. Three principal groups were established: The Coaching Foundation of Western Australia, the Women's Sport Foundation of WA (Inc) and the Aboriginal Sport Foundation. These groups were designed to meet certain sporting needs throughout the State. There was also the north west academy of sport, Sport International and the WA boxing federation, although I am not sure about that one. The change was designed to meet the needs of the Western Australian sporting community.

The Coaching Foundation of Western Australia's aim was to ensure not only that coaches across a range of sports had opportunities for accreditation and for access to decent programs and good advice, but also that they felt like they were wanted and were able to continue to participate in community sport. This program was an excellent idea, but we now find that as of 31 December this year, all of those groups will be disbanded. The bodies will be abolished and their funding will cease, and it is alleged that their activities will return to the umbrella of the Ministry of Sport and Recreation. The Coaching Foundation of Western Australia, the Women's Sport Foundation of WA and the Aboriginal Sport Foundation will come under the Ministry of Sport and Recreation and there is no guarantee that their activities will continue. The community, grassroots level of sport is being insidiously and deliberately attacked by the Minister for Sport and Recreation, Hon Norman Moore. I am yet to work out a reason for that because every sporting body I have spoken to across the State thinks these bodies are good. They are outside the bureaucracy and they meet certain niche needs. Hon Norman Moore is attacking these groups because he has a pathological hatred of anything set up by a Labor Government. These bodies are very useful, they have good ideas and have generally been lauded by every sporting body I have met, particularly by those at the lower level which do not receive much support from anybody - the people who play sport for the love of it. However, the minister has decided to do away with these bodies with no guarantee of future funding.

The first body the minister is doing away with is the Coaching Foundation of Western Australia. At present that foundation accesses about \$180 000 of public funds. All of that money comes from the lotteries account and \$140 000 goes directly to the coaching foundation to enable it to organise its affairs throughout the State, while \$40 000 is specifically allocated to regional areas. The coaching foundation ensures we have nationally accredited coaching courses for coaches of all sport anywhere in the State. These coaches can participate in subsidised, organised, structured and accredited courses which include such aspects as leadership, psychology and commitment; the things which are very necessary to produce decent people committed to sport. In fact, the statistics I have been given show that on a per capita basis Western Australia has more of these sorts of low-level courses for the everyday coach than any other State in the country. There is a range of sporting groups in every member's electorate. It might be the local baseball club where the coaches are generally unloved

and do the job because they like helping kids and participating in the community. Those coaches have been able to attend and participate in these organised events but they will no longer have that ability. Seventy-five courses were organised by the coaching foundation throughout the State last year, including the \$40 000 put into regional Western Australia. The foundation organised a range of accredited courses and regional programs. This model is the envy of all other States. The other States want this model which is outside the structure of the bureaucracy and in which there are competing demands for funds. There are jealousies and difficulties in bureaucracies in addition to overwhelming ministerial control. This model is the envy of all the other States and, what is more, it gets decent people involved. Mr Ron Tindall is in charge of the foundation and is widely acknowledged as being a decent person who is committed to this field; one who has performed endless extra hours of work outside the ordinary 38-hour week. This foundation is being done away with and there is no guarantee of further lotteries funding; in fact, the Ministry of Sport and Recreation is not eligible for lotteries funding. This foundation is being done away with because of Hon Norman Moore's pathological hatred for any program organised by a Labor Government. He also has an empire building mentality which means everything must be brought under his absolute control and that anything outside his control is no good.

A report was written about these groups by the accounting firm Ernst and Young. There are only two copies of the report and it will not be released to any of the affected bodies. Apparently the minister has the report in his top drawer and will not let anyone else have a look at it. The report apparently made some recommendations about these things but we are not allowed to see it.

The next group is the Women's Sport Foundation of WA (Inc). This body was also designed to assist a niche group - women who had lower participation levels than men and who faced other obstacles to their involvement in sport. The foundation was designed to ensure women had opportunities in sport, to lift their participation rate and to ensure that more women were involved in coaching and community sport. This group was also set up by Hon Graham Edwards and received \$200 000 a year from the lotteries account. The foundation operates out of the same building as the Ministry of Sport and Recreation; it is just down the corridor. The foundation also engenders enormous involvement from volunteers.

That group became aware that it was to be abolished and it attempted to battle on through sponsorship, although as indicated in its annual report, no other groups such as this around the world can survive without some degree of government assistance. It is concerned about what will happen as the jobs of 11 staff members throughout the State will be under threat. All the other activities that occur throughout the State of getting women involved in sport will disappear when Hon Norman Moore manages to abolish this organisation in December this year. I have with me a letter I received from the mayor of the City of Albany, Alison Goode, part of which says -

The Womensport West programme has been of great benefit to many members of our community - from the young to the elderly, with activities such as the Active Achievers School Girls Programme and School Girls Breakfast, to the Seniors Self Defence and Time On exercise classes. The impact of any cuts to the programme will also be felt by local businesses who work in partnership with Womensport West, and could therefore also have a negative impact on local economic development.

Many groups throughout regional Western Australia are concerned about the loss of these organisations and what that loss will do to community sport in this State. In addition to that, the Aboriginal Sports Foundation was designed to involve many Aboriginal people, who feel disenfranchised and disillusioned with the world, in structured, organised, community activities where they can channel some of their raw talent into sporting activities and can play a major role in sport in this State. Unfortunately, again, under the direction of the Minister for Sport and Recreation, this program will be abolished and will go out the door. I have indicated that this is a very bad step, one with which the majority of people involved in sport disagree, and the Government should reconsider it.

I will also talk about the excellent community sporting and recreation facilities fund, which was designed in 1973 or 1974 as a program for communities to apply for grants to build recreational facilities in their areas to meet major community needs. It is a very good program much loved by local governments and sporting and recreational groups. Generally, the program contributes a third of the cost of a sporting facility up to a certain level, with the local government and the sporting group itself each contributing a third of the cost. I have with me a letter from the Western Australian Sports Federation which expresses concern about the prospect that some of the funds from the CSRFF program will go to the Premier's belltower project. The current allocation for this program is in the vicinity of \$1m. It is disconcerting that the Minister for Sport and Recreation will allow this fund to be used for the belltower as it is generally used for sporting projects not only in metropolitan Perth but also in regional Western Australia. The WA Sports Federation believes it is a very bad idea.

Mr Osborne: You know that there will be a swimming pool in the Barrack Square redevelopment?

Mr McGOWAN: Yes, I had heard that.

Mr Osborne: Would that be an appropriate use of the CSRFF?

Mr McGOWAN: No, it would not.

Mr Osborne: Why not?

Mr McGOWAN: I would like to see it go out to regional communities and to places where people live. The Government has a fixation on the central business district.

Mr Osborne: I don't.

Mr McGOWAN: The Opposition does not have a fixation on the CBD. However, that is a problem for the member for Bunbury who needs to go home, have a good hard look at himself and deal with it.

Mr Deputy Speaker, it is a misuse of the community sporting and recreation facilities fund and a very disappointing development. It is also disappointing that the CSRFF lost \$250 000 in its budget allocation last year. It appears that this fund is being used as a slush fund for the Premier's pet projects, with which sporting groups throughout the State are very disappointed.

Mr Marshall: You should retract that statement. A lot of things have been said and that is not right.

Mr McGOWAN: I notice the member for Dawesville did not interject when I was talking about the loss of the coaching foundation and those other groups. I take it from his silence that he agreed with what I was saying.

Mr Marshall: No, I am waiting to reply to you. You are learning your brief but learning it very slowly.

Mr McGOWAN: It is very disappointing that the member for Dawesville can stand up in this place every day, relate every issue to sport and talk about it at length, yet when vicious attacks are made by a senior minister on the community infrastructure of this State, he is absolutely silent and does nothing to defend it.

Mr Marshall: I will look at all your questions on notice. How many questions on notice have you asked? I admire you for asking questions because anyone who doesn't know anything about his portfolio has to ask questions to learn about it. However, when you ask questions such as, "How many points make a goal in a game of Australian rules football?" it shows that you are a slow learner. You must not be so critical of ministers until you learn your subject.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Dawesville will come to order!

Ms McHale: Let us see if the minister knew.

Mr McGOWAN: Yes, the Minister for Sport and Recreation does not know much about sport, member for Dawesville. At least I play sport.

Mr Marshall: Yes, you play under 13s sport.

Mr McGOWAN: I play a great deal of sport. The member for Dawesville can attack sport and recreation in this State, cut out the decent programs and come up with all the little homilies he likes; however, he must realise that the Government is not doing any favours to anyone involved in the sport and recreation industry in this State by what it is doing.

Mr Marshall: You are the only one saying that. The sporting industry is not saying that. Why are you the only one saying that? The sporting industry believes that what is being done is good for the game.

Mr McGOWAN: I have with me a letter from Natalee Fuhrmann, the president of Women's Sport Foundation of WA. She is a well respected person in sport and recreation and her editorial attacks at length the Government's cuts to that group. I have with me also a letter from the City of Albany, not known as a hotbed of revolution, which attacks at length what the Government has done to these programs. I do not think the member for Dawesville can say that I am the only one saying that; however, he can keep defending it because in time to come we will be able to remind all the groups around this State who rely upon these programs that the Government will cut them out from under them and he will agree with that policy. When the member for Dawesville says that he supports the belltower project, he supports money going from the CSRFF into that project.

Mr Osborne: They will not be listening to you because they know that you are a lightweight and an absolute flea.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Bunbury will come to order!

Mr McGOWAN: The member for Bunbury really should know his limitations. He should keep quiet a little more often and he might make it to the ministry. Major sport and recreation issues must be addressed in this State to ensure that we protect existing programs and create new programs to assist sport at the lowest level. If people who participate in sport and recreation at the lower level do not feel loved, we will not do well in the future and the health and wellbeing of people in our State in years to come will suffer accordingly.

MR BROWN (Bassendean) [8.59 pm]: Recently I attended a range of meetings with government agencies to discuss a variety of concerns raised by my constituents. In a number of those meetings, when seeking to advance the views of my constituents, the point was made to me by representatives of government organisations that they need to pursue a course of action in order to raise the maximum income for Government, that the Government does not have adequate funding to meet its needs and, therefore, various actions must be taken by Government in order to meet those needs.

Recently, I have had a similar discussion with officers from the Ministry of Housing over the desired rezoning of a site in Beechboro, which is colloquially known as the Kiara TAFE site. The Ministry of Housing has been arguing that the site must be rezoned to enable housing to go on that site in order for the Government to maximise its return. It is important, in the context of the debates that occur at a local level, to understand where some of the taxpayers' funds are going. To that end, I ask on a relatively regular basis about details of contracts let by government to various agencies. I was startled to receive a response from the Minister for Works, Services, Youth and Citizenship and Multicultural Interests on 12 October. In the answer to question on notice 793, the minister provided a host of information about various contracts that had been let. However, one of the answers astounded me. That answer showed that a couple of contracts which run until 31 July 2001 are for advertising. One contract is a common use contract for advertising non-campaign provision of non-campaign master media advertising services. That contract is for \$48m. Another contract that was let to Media Decisions of Western Australia is a common use contract for advertising campaign provision of campaign master media advertising services. That contract which runs until 31 July 2001 is for \$112m of campaign advertising. I raise that in the context that my constituents

are constantly being told by ministers and by government agencies that government does not have the funds to meet certain obligations that should be met and that there is a need to cut a service, provide a service or sell an asset in order to provide government with the funds it needs; yet, at the same time, we see a combined allocation for media and advertising of \$160m to 31 July 2001.

I believe that some of my constituents would have the view that this Government is wrongly allocating, that its priorities are wrong and that it has lost sight of the real issues that are important to ordinary citizens. I will deal with some of the matters that I have raised with the government agencies. Firstly, I will talk about the site to which I referred earlier - the Kiara TAFE site. Negotiations have taken place between the Ministry of Housing, the Kiara Progress Association and a number of interest groups and organisations about the future use of that site. The history of the site is such that it was originally zoned urban, as I understand it, but was subsequently changed to a site zoned for a TAFE institution. The coalition Government decided it would not use the site for a TAFE institution and sought to rezone the site urban in 1995-96. An appropriate amendment under the metropolitan region scheme was duly tabled in this House and in the other place, but that matter never came on for debate, as the Ministry for Planning decided to pull the application in mid 1996. The application was primarily pulled at that stage because the Government had to face an election within six or eight months and local constituents had signed a petition containing about 600 signatures expressing opposition to the rezoning of the site. Everyone could see that the Government would decide to pull the rezoning application and proceed with it after the election if the Government was successful in being re-elected. Of course, true to form, once the 1996 election was over and the Government was re-elected, it was not long before a similar application came before the Parliament for rezoning. However, the Government's attempts to rezone the site were not successful and the Legislative Council moved the appropriate motion to ensure that approval was not granted for the site to be rezoned. The site has subsequently changed hands and now falls under the Ministry of Housing, which is keen to develop the site.

In the discussions that have taken place, three proposals have been put for the use or the partial use of the site. The first proposal has been that a police station be located on the site, and that would not take a lot of space. Generally speaking, the community was in support of locating a police station on the site. There was some debate about exactly where the police station might be located on this site. However, it was agreed finally that the station should be located on the corner of Bottlebrush and Morley Drives, and I understand that is where it will be located. Secondly, it was proposed by a private school that land be allocated on the site for it to construct a new primary school. The Kiara Progress Association, representing the local community, agreed that a school site could be created on the Kiara TAFE site, and some plans were drawn up by the Ministry of Housing to accommodate that school site. However, the Ministry of Housing also proposed that a large part of the site be developed and used for housing purposes. That has been opposed quite strongly by the Kiara Progress Association and local residents as they are keen to see as much local bushland preserved as possible. In the discussions with the Ministry of Housing, the argument has been raised that, in seeking to sell that site, it has an obligation to seek the best possible return for the State. Of course, my constituents are bewildered about that obligation because they look at, and compare it with, the Sunset Hospital site in Nedlands. That site, which is worth a huge amount of money and is in the Treasurer's electorate, has been left as public open space.

Mr Court: What are you comparing it with?

Mr BROWN: The Kiara TAFE site. Taking into account the relative values of those two sites, if fully developed, the Sunset site would raise a very significant sum for the Government compared with the amount that could be raised from the Kiara TAFE site. My constituents query why it is so imperative for the Kiara TAFE site to be developed in that way to raise less money than could be raised by the full development of the Sunset site.

Mr Court: Do you think the Sunset site should be fully developed?

Mr BROWN: No, I did not say that. My constituents say they do not understand why the Government has decided the Kiara TAFE site must be fully developed in order to give the maximum possible return to the Government when, at the same time, the Treasurer and his ministers have made a decision to reserve substantial portions of land on the Sunset site for community use. My constituents say that if it is good for one electorate, why is it not good for another. They ask what is wrong with them, are they living in the wrong area and do the same rules apply to everybody. It seems the same rules do not apply. It seems to them that there is one set of rules for those living near the river in leafy areas and a different set of rules for those living in the eastern suburbs. It seems those living around the Kiara TAFE site are not allowed to retain that site for their enjoyment, and somehow they are different from people who live in the Treasurer's electorate. I raise that matter because all Governments should treat all constituents equitably, irrespective of where they live. To my constituents that certainly does not appear to be the case.

Mr Court: I do not know the site you are referring to, but the issue at Sunset is that virtually all the buildings are heritage buildings so we cannot clear them and develop the site to its maximum use. The proposal we looked at is to allow the private sector to develop those heritage buildings as a retirement village or nursing home. It is a prime location and, because of their location, we believe if we can structure the lease arrangements correctly, long term significantly more revenue will be gained each year than costs etc. We are deliberately saying the surplus revenues must be spent on seniors' initiatives outside the electorate. The member can criticise it, but it is structured in such a way that long after the member and I are gone there will be revenue. Because it is such a prime site, we have genuinely tried to structure an arrangement so that the surplus revenues from the use of those heritage buildings will go into seniors' programs outside the area.

Mr BROWN: I read the Treasurer's statements and I understand a substantial area will be left for public use at the Sunset site.

Mr Court: All the lands on the riverfront and the escarpment will be left for public use.

Mr BROWN: Yes.

Mr Court: You would not allow it to be developed, anyway.

Mr BROWN: I am not saying that the Opposition would. I am drawing a simple comparison, as a whole number of my constituents see it, between what is happening in an area they cherish and what is happening in an area cherished by constituents in another electorate.

Mr Court: What is on the site?

Mr BROWN: It is bushland. They fail to understand the Government's reasoning.

The second matter I raise concerns the Pyrton site. It is in Eden Hill and, until recently, it has been occupied by the Disability Services Commission. The commission no longer utilises the site and for some considerable time there has been debate about the future uses of that site. The Attorney General has sought approval from the Western Australian Planning Commission to establish a prison on the Pyrton site. It was the subject of an application by the Disability Services Commission to the Planning Commission and the statutory planning committee of that commission. That committee did not give its approval, and pointed to two factors which it said were inadequate in the application by the Disability Services Commission. The local community has voiced strong opposition to the establishment of a prison on that site. People need to visit the site to understand where it is proposed to locate the prison. The area is quite large, but it is proposed to site the prison very close to residential accommodation without any buffers between them. It is proposed to establish the prison in the middle of an established residential area. That is simply unacceptable to residents in Eden Hill, Lockridge, Success Hill and Bassendean. That position has been made clear to the Attorney General and the Government on no end of occasions by petitions, resolutions, public meetings, letters and almost every way it is possible to make the Government take cognisance of the fact that the prison is not acceptable.

Unfortunately, again the Government has simply refused to listen to the views of my constituents on this matter. Nowhere is that more telling than in a response from the Attorney General to a question asked by Hon Nick Griffiths in another place on 23 September 1999. The Attorney General was reported at page 1625 of *Hansard* on 23 September as replying to that question as follows -

As members will probably recall, the State Planning Commission originally indicated its approval in general terms of the use of the site for a number of purposes, including a women's minimum security prison, a number of Aboriginal uses and public recreation or other public use. The development approval submitted by the Disability Services Commission related to only one of those three general broad purposes. The reply from the State Planning Commission was that the other two matters should have been dealt with in the application.

The ministry is currently dealing with the other two matters - namely, the Aboriginal use and the public recreation or other public use, so that the development application will meet the matters noted by the commission and also the matters referred to in the original recommendation from the State Planning Commission. We are currently dealing with the people who would be involved in those other uses and also with the continuing matter of the ethnographic survey. An ethnographic survey has been carried out, but one problem at the moment is the refusal of one person to participate in it. It is difficult to receive that person's views without that person's volunteering them. I am not sure what will happen in that respect. We are persisting with it, especially in light of the fact that the site is ideal for the location of a women's minimum security prison.

At that point there was an interjection from Hon Norm Kelly. The transcript reads -

Hon Norm Kelly: You said that if you did not have approval for a prison within 12 months on that site, you would move on.

Hon PETER FOSS: No, I did not.

Then there was another interjection. Interestingly, the Minister for Justice goes on to say -

We will certainly have one there within 12 months.

In other words, no matter what the community wants or what are its views, or how many petitions are submitted, or how many letters are written, the Government has made this decision and it will happen, and it does not give a cuss about the views of the community, according to the Minister for Justice. He will establish this facility there, and nobody will stand in his way. Indeed, he even gives the community a bit of a backhander on the way through when he states -

I have been disturbed by much of the criticism, which is not related to anything other than people not wanting it in their locality. That attitude is very unfortunate, because I am sure it could be found in all areas.

This is not simply a matter of people objecting, based on the fact that this facility is to be placed near them. The fact of the matter is that this is the only time a prison is to be located in the middle of an established area. I note the Minister for Works is in the Chamber at the moment. He would know that when it was proposed to establish a minimum security prison - I stress the words "minimum security" - in the existing maximum Canning Vale prison complex, which is in his electorate and the surrounding area, there was a furore by residents in the electorate and adjoining electorates. I was then the Opposition spokesperson on justice and attended one meeting at which residents were fuming about that.

Mr Osborne: You went there to stir things up.

Mr BROWN: I was invited to the meeting by the residents, and I did no stirring at all. The end result was that the

Government said that it would not happen - and it did not. Why did it not happen in an area in which there is an existing prison, and in which this minimum security prison would have been in the complex in which the maximum security prison is located? I will tell members the very interesting, unique reason, which was highly researched and very clinically worked out, that it did not happen: It was proposed that the facility be located in a Liberal electorate. That is the one reason that it did not go ahead. The one reason the Minister for Justice is bloody-minded about this issue is because it involves a Labor electorate. That is why he has closed his ears and will not listen. More disappointingly, these constituents who speak to me are also his constituents. He is an upper House member for the East Metropolitan Region. As I said, they are his constituents, too. Does he listen to them; does he hear them; does he see and read the letters and petitions he gets about this issue? He does not. He has a closed mind on this issue.

I put on the record here and now why that prison will not go ahead; it will not happen: The backlash in that community will be such that there will be civil disobedience if there is any attempt to put that prison on that site. I hope the Minister for Works and the Premier, in their consultations with their cabinet colleagues, listen to these words. They should not underestimate strength of feeling within that community. Ordinarily, the people in that area are conservative. Although it is a Labor electorate, in some parts of it the people are very conservative and some of them are hopping mad that the Government has thumbed its nose at them. This area should be preserved, given the history attached to Success Hill in Bassendean; yet the Government proposes to put a prison in the middle of it. It is unacceptable. It will not become acceptable in three months, or six months or 12 months. I ask the Premier and the Minister for Works, who are in the Chamber to think about those words, to talk to the Minister for Justice. If there is a new Minister for Justice after the reshuffle in six to eight weeks, there is an opportunity to say, "Get rid of the woolly-headed thinking of the previous Minister for Justice". It is an opportunity for the Government members to score some points. Quite often a Liberal trick is to get a minister to say that he will do something that is unpopular. The local member, who is often a Liberal member, will campaign against it. The minister then says that he will not do it, and the local member claims the credit. Nothing has been achieved, but the standing of the local member has been enhanced. That Liberal trick has been used time and again. Here is an opportunity not to use the trick, to be genuine in listening to community views. The Government can listen to the community's views this time and say that, irrespective of whether the proposal is put up by a Liberal member or a Labor member, or it is in a Liberal electorate or a Labor electorate, it will do the right thing, listen to the community, tell the Minister for Justice that he is wrong and that he must rethink the position. I certainly hope that that will be the case.

On one hand, the Government is claiming that it does not have any money, that things are tight, that things cannot be any more difficult. On the other hand, in his answer to a question on notice the other day, the Minister for Works told me that the Government has signed contracts with two companies for the next two years that will be paid \$160m for advertising - I repeat: \$160m for advertising. This is from a Government that claims it does not have any money, and that it must raise \$3m from the Kiara TAFE site or from the Pyrtton area to place a prison there. It simply does not ring true when we see the Government is prepared to spend \$160m on advertising, of which \$112m is to be spent on a campaign to soften the electorate before the next State election. Taxpayers' money is being used for blatant political purposes. No-one can tell my constituents there is no government funding, when \$160m of taxpayers' money is going into advertising for one purpose - for the Government to try to get itself re-elected.

MS MacTIERNAN (Armadale) [9.30 pm]: I am concerned that we are asked to approve these appropriations without any reasonable detail being provided. We are basically asked in the Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) to approve expenditure of \$247m for 1998, and \$348m for 1999, on the basis of two flimsy, typed sheets of paper of the second reading speech. The Bill contains a little detail in the schedules, but this simply outlines the bulk sums set against the department in which the expenditure was incurred. No attempt was made to provide any idea of the emergencies requiring this expenditure. The second reading speech states that these payments are of an "extraordinary and unforeseen" nature. Will the Treasurer provide the detail of a couple of these "extraordinary and unforeseen" circumstances?

My particular interest with Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 3) is the circumstances which saw the Minister for Transport require an extra \$32m for the Department of Transport, and an extra \$610 000 for the WA Coastal Shipping Commission, which is particularly intriguing as the commission no longer runs any ships. We will certainly be interested to know the exceptional and unforeseen circumstances in the 1998-99 year which required the injection of \$610 000. I hope we do not hear the rejoinder that we never provided any further information when we were in government.

Mr Court: Earlier in the debate I said we would provide all the information requested.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I wonder, Treasurer, whether we should be given, as a matter of course, a more detailed explanation by way of clause notes to give some insight to these expenditures. I asked the Leader of the House whether any such document existed, and it appeared it did not. If this information is to be provided, I am particularly interested to know the reasons for the \$32m extraordinary expenditure for Transport. I suspect that it may relate to Main Roads' cost blowouts, but who knows?

Mr Court: It is to do with the closure of MetroBus - that is, \$17.7m - and funding provided for the enhanced traffic enforcement project of \$12m, which is part of the road safety program.

Ms MacTIERNAN: What is that enhanced traffic enforcement project?

Mr Court: It is additional cameras and the like, I understand.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Is that money not provided by the road trauma trust fund?

Mr Court: It must go through these Bills when money was not appropriated in the budget when released. They were not appropriated in the budget. They are the two areas involved.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Given that it was a conscious government decision to close down MetroBus - a cyclone did not wipe it out - why was this an extraordinary and unforeseen circumstance?

Mr Court: I will explain when I reply to the debate.

Ms MacTIERNAN: A smaller expenditure in Appropriation (Consolidated Fund) Bill (No. 4) is an additional \$400 000 - which could buy a few couches - in capital expenditure by the Ministry of Fair Trading, incurred in the 1998-99 year. What is that for? I am pleased, obviously, that the Treasurer will provide the information, which should be provided as a matter of course. My other inquiry relates to the moneys required in the 1997-98 financial year for each of the port authorities set down under the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet.

MS ANWYL (Kalgoorlie) [9.37 pm]: I refer to the areas of funding for which the Government must charge these extra amounts, and I will make specific remarks regarding lack of priority in government spending and the way it manifests itself in my electorate.

The Treasurer gave an explanation a moment ago to the member for Armadale regarding the Transport appropriation. It is interesting - correct me if I am wrong, Treasurer - that one allocation related to MetroBus.

Mr Court: Yes, it was under Transport.

Ms ANWYL: Am I correct in assuming that it relates to redundancies?

Mr Court: It probably does. I said I would provide the information. I outlined all the information I have in front of me, and I will get the breakdown.

Ms ANWYL: I will not pursue it, but I assume some of that money relates to that issue.

I now turn to an issue in my electorate: The jobs of 28 school cleaners employed by the Education Department, some on a full-time, some on a permanent part-time and some on a casual basis, are to be contracted out at the commencement of the new school year. This is not a new scenario. Major privatisation of school cleaning jobs has occurred in the metropolitan area and some other country areas. Interestingly, the Minister for Education has announced that two of the jobs in the Kambalda schools are not to be privatised at that time as the change will be delayed for 12 months. It was well known that the privatisation of these jobs by the Education Department was on the cards virtually since the election of this Government, certainly with the presence of the current Minister for Education, who has made this policy clear in a variety of avenues. One of the most recent was the vacation swimming privatisation fiasco.

Mr Osborne: It was not privatised.

Ms ANWYL: What was it?

Mr Osborne: The management was to be removed from the Education Department to be given to the Royal Life Saving Society.

Ms ANWYL: Who now employs the vacation swimming teachers?

Mr Osborne: That does not mean the program is privatised. It is still controlled by the Education Department but is managed and run by the Royal Life Saving Society.

Mr Court: Do you not support the change to the swimming program? You are a champion swimmer. You must have respect for the Royal Life Saving Society.

Ms ANWYL: I do. The Labor spokesman for Education, the member for Willagee, gave a very able exposé in which he detailed with a great deal of relevance the steps to which the Minister for Education had gone, whereby he had ignored advice from his department and from accredited accountants, which suggested it was not in the public interest to privatise, and went ahead and did it. I have absolute respect for the Royal Life Saving Society as a charitable organisation. I can emphasise that because one of the features of the opening of the new swimming facility in Kalgoorlie-Boulder is that the Royal Life Saving Society no longer has open access to a swimming facility to provide free lessons. I have been advocating to the current managers of the facility, the YMCA, that the Royal Life Saving Society should continue its traditional activities.

I object to the shedding of core business, to use the jargon. The scheme was successfully operated by the Education Department and it has been shed for no good reason.

Mr Osborne interjected.

Ms ANWYL: It may not have been in Bunbury, but it was in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. I took the time on the weekend while I was waiting to play water polo for my team to talk to a large number of people who were present about not only Vacswim but also in-term swimming. The Education Department has effectively engaged a contractor for in-term swimming. One woman I spoke to also comes into my office to photocopy. I was told that the Education Department does not allow her to photocopy the in-term swimming notices, so she must come to my office to do that. What is going on here? The in-term service is still supposed to be part of the Education Department services, but for reasons I do not quite follow but about which I will inquire, having discovered this only on Sunday, the Education Department is contracting out that service, so the person must go off and photocopy documents in an office other than in an Education Department facility. I accept that in some cases it may be appropriate for government to provide services other than by way of direct employment. I can wear

that. However, if, to refer to the Vacsuim example, the department and private independent accounting and auditing agents provide clear evidence that it is not good business sense and economic sense or in the public interest, I certainly will not accept it.

To return to school cleaners, it is a fundamental issue. The concern is that we will find ourselves in a situation in which the standard of cleaning will drop. This is pretty straight forward to me. Someone may have been employed as a school cleaner for up to 20 years. The Government will replace that cleaner with a contractor. The Minister for Planning knows all about this sort of thing because he used to do it for a business. The number of hours of school cleaners will be reduced. The same stable staff will not be providing that service over a period. To take an example, as it was explained to me recently by one of the school cleaners in Kalgoorlie-Boulder who wishes to keep her job, if a child is ill and vomits on the schoolroom floor, the teacher does not clean it up; someone gets the cleaner to clean it up. For the most part a school cleaner will not be present in that situation. I have used a rather graphic example. It is not a case of the teacher being unwilling to do it, but one must ask whose job it is? Is it the job of the teacher or the job of the school cleaner?

Is it not preferable to have a school cleaner who is known to the whole school community and who can keep tabs on what sort of maintenance might be required and what children are doing; someone who knows the children and their families in a lot of detail? I remember in my school days that the school cleaners at my high school, which had some 700 or 800 students, were valued and respected members of the community. They were called in before and after hours. They were dedicated and had a lot of pride in their jobs. Members opposite do not seem to understand this: If the hours available are reduced and the link that has existed between a school cleaner who may have worked at a school for many years is replaced with contractors who are coming in and out - in Kalgoorlie-Boulder those sorts of jobs are held by a very transient work force - the community bond that exists will be completely destroyed. I do not know what sort of price members opposite put on that. I understand the Minister for Education's ideological reasons for doing this but it makes no economic sense.

Mr Barnett: I do not have an ideological reason.

Ms ANWYL: In that case, perhaps the minister will again enlighten me on why it is occurring.

Mr Barnett: I want the focus of the Education Department to be on the education of children. Therefore, activities like cleaning and gardening in most cases can be contracted out, so they become simply a service to the school. I want to relieve principals of a lot of the administration of that task. In most schools in regional centres and the metropolitan area, it is possible because a range of service providers are available. In some country areas and some small towns, it is not practicable. Education Department employees will probably always be involved. There has always been a mix between Education Department employees and contractors; this is nothing new. We are changing the balance but there has always been a mixture.

Ms ANWYL: My understanding of the proposal is that no permanent full-time staff will be engaged in cleaning in the goldfields, with the exception of Kambalda. My understanding is that the minister has quarantined Kambalda from what is to happen in the rest of the goldfields. Before the minister came in, I was making the point to the Premier that the part of the expenditure on MetroBus presumably relates to redundancy and so forth. I freely acknowledge that some school cleaners are happy to take redundancy; it is a fact. However, the funding of the redeployment and redundancy of cleaners who do not wish to leave will also be a burden on the public purse. In a couple of cases that have been brought to my attention, it seems to me - not that I would be giving any legal advice of course - that some cleaners should be categorised as permanent part time or permanent full time, but are being treated as casual. Some injustices are occurring because the benefits differ according to their employment status. That is an example in which I cannot see any real benefit; in fact, I can see many downsides, not the least of which is the large turnover of cleaning staff at goldfields schools, particularly those in my electorate.

The Minister for Education has received some correspondence about the Eastern Goldfields Senior High School and an undertaking he gave that one full-time equivalent teacher would be employed at the school under the local area education planning process. However, that position will now be based at the district education office, not the high school, and the incumbent will be required to cater for the needs of the Kambalda schools and the eastern goldfields education support centre. Therefore, less than one full-time equivalent will be devoted to the planning associated with the high school. That matter has upset the chairman of the school council and the president of the parents and citizens association. A letter was sent to the minister on 27 September 1999 referring to a meeting at which I was present. The letter states -

At that time, clarification was sought by the President of the Parents and Citizens Association, Irene Montefiore, that you were in fact offering a position additional to the FTE for Local Planning. You assured the group that this was the case. All of the school community, the Member for Kalgoorlie, Irene and I left the meeting with no doubt that you were offering another FTE position, that is two additional FTE positions as a result of your recognition of the unique needs of our school.

At a subsequent meeting with the Acting District Director, Neil Darby, on Tuesday 7 September this understanding of an additional two FTE positions was confirmed by all those present at the District Office, including Mr Darby.

We in Kalgoorlie believe that we have been deliberately misled regarding this staffing matter and I am asking that the promise you made very clearly at that meeting in August be upheld in order to both honour the commitment and allow the school to proceed with the excellent job being done.

In clear terms, I request two additional FTE positions to be dedicated wholly to the school to enable it to operate in a more realistic way with the transition to the Senior Campus and the retention of those two very good programmes being run.

The letter is signed by David Kennedy, the chairman of the Eastern Goldfields Senior High School council. I am not aware whether the minister has responded, or whether he has any intention of doing so. Suffice to say, some parents feel very upset at the way this has panned out.

I am always the first to acknowledge that something positive has been done. I acknowledge that an extra teacher has been provided to ensure the fast track and youth support programs can continue. However, less than was promised has been provided and concern is being generated. I look forward to a response from the minister.

I note that the Justice portfolio has been allocated almost \$5m. That leads me to mention the courthouse and the regional prison in Kalgoorlie-Boulder. The history of these facilities is very unsatisfactory. The responsibility for that lies at the feet of the former Attorney General as well as the current Attorney General. A promise of \$16m has been made to upgrade the prison. It is one of the busiest regional prisons in the State and the courthouse is the busiest in the State. It is particularly alarming to see -

Mr Bloffwitch: Do you have that much crime?

Ms ANWYL: Yes, we do. We have 4.5 times the state average of intravenous drug use. The experts say that areas in which there is significant intravenous drug use also have significant crime.

Mr Bloffwitch: So there are many burglaries.

Ms ANWYL: We have many types of crime. However, we do not have a prison that can house medium-security prisoners. Removing prisoners to the metropolitan area creates major problems. Many of them are Aborigines who are already far removed from their homes, and removing them to Perth creates even more difficulties. It is not uncommon for a mother with a couple of children to appear in my office on a Friday afternoon asking for help because her husband has been moved to Perth and she must follow.

Mr Bloffwitch: You go to Homeswest and get them a home.

Ms ANWYL: They go off to Perth or somewhere else. They are incredibly mobile. The children are often moved around the countryside and it is not in their educational interests for that to occur.

Mr Bloffwitch: It makes me wonder what sacrifices they must make for their families. They miss school and everything else.

Ms ANWYL: It does not make for consistent schooling or place of residence. I have a women's refuge and a primary school in the same street as my electorate office. At any one time, 30 to 40 children at the school are very mobile. Women's refuges apply a 30-day residence limit. It is very difficult for educational facilities to cope with these transients. We must address this problem.

The member for Geraldton mentioned Homeswest. One of the significant reasons for this high rate of mobility is that Homeswest accommodation is not available for the mothers of those children. In many cases they are avoiding domestic violence. They stay in a refuge for a month and then move to another refuge in another city or town.

Mr Bloffwitch: At least they are safe in the refuge.

Ms ANWYL: They are, but it makes it difficult for the children and their educational future. The far better solution would be proper short to medium-term Homeswest accommodation. Such accommodation must be appropriate to ensure their safety. I am pleased that a new women's refuge is under construction. By the good grace of the Salvation Army, a home - not a purpose-built facility - is being used as a refuge in Kalgoorlie because the last heavy flooding caused the roof of the old refuge to collapse. It is more economic to build a new centre to cater for short and medium-term residents.

It is important to appreciate just how much a \$5m overrun in Justice spending is associated with spending on the victims of crime. That, in itself, can lead to some difficulties. It is also important to examine the Government's general spending priorities in country areas. It is interesting to see that a significant number of expenditures are on port authorities. Perhaps in his response the Treasurer will explain that. It seems odd that all of the port authorities listed have experienced significant cost overruns. I am curious to know the reason for that.

Mr Court: I will provide all that information.

Ms ANWYL: Schedule 2 of the Bill outlines an expenditure overrun by the Gascoyne Development Commission of \$1.5m about which I would be interested to hear.

Perceptions exist in some country areas that other country areas do rather better. Those perceptions may not always be well-founded. However, it is well accepted in Kalgoorlie that Bunbury is something of a four letter word and we do not have to go too far back to see that Governments of both persuasions have treated Bunbury favourably when making and fulfilling some election promises.

There is also a perception in the goldfields that there is a degree of favouritism particularly towards the Geraldton area. I am referring to infrastructure for transport, particularly the linking of the Geraldton port to the northern goldfields. The member for Geraldton is nodding his head.

Mr Bloffwitch: It is a very good idea.

Ms ANWYL: Sometimes he should listen before he nods his head. In this instance I am suggesting that there is a perception in Kalgoorlie-Boulder that the Geraldton port is receiving some preference over the Esperance port.

Mr Bloffwitch: It is closer, so why would it not receive preference? It saves about \$30 000 in shipping costs. We would have to be mad not to use the Geraldton port.

Ms ANWYL: It is true that all roads lead to Geraldton!

Mr Barnett: In the medium to longer term, the prospects for the north eastern goldfields depend on that link being developed through to Geraldton. It will be to the benefit of the goldfields and the Midwest.

Ms ANWYL: That is all very well. It is not my suggestion we shut down the port of Geraldton. It is a shame the member for Roe is not here because Esperance relies very heavily on its port. There is potential for the rail line between Leonora and Esperance to be developed. If it is not "looked after" by the Government in the context of the Westrail sell off, all the fears of people in the goldfields will be well founded.

Mr Barnett: Esperance port is limited in the size of vessels it can take and in the availability of industrial land next to it. Esperance is a small coastal tourist town. Some of the projects being discussed would not be compatible with its environment.

Ms ANWYL: When the minister refers to projects, is he referring to the north eastern goldfields?

Mr Barnett: I am referring to north eastern goldfields projects.

Ms ANWYL: Such as?

Mr Barnett: I will not speculate now, but they would be large projects that could be located either in the goldfields or have part of their processing done at a coastal location. Oakajee has land available. We could not put a large mineral processing operation in the port of Esperance.

Ms ANWYL: I acknowledge that. However, the point of my comments was that it is interesting to see in a document such as this items of expenditure, for which there may be good reason, but which lead to the perception that certain other regions are promoted ahead of the goldfields in relation to their future infrastructure.

It was interesting when a dorothy dixer was asked today by one of the National Party backbenchers of, I think, the Deputy Premier about perceptions. The perceptions are not mine; they are held by a development commission, which consists largely of government appointments; a board and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia, of which it is fair to say a significant number of the members lean to the minister's side rather than my side of politics. A view exists that the goldfields is missing out, particularly on the development of infrastructure.

It is interesting to examine the expenditure on the ports and the Gascoyne Development Commission. It may be for a very good reason, but it is a large amount of money. It is more than the budget of the Goldfields-Esperance Development Commission so naturally people will ask questions about it and whether there is some potential for the Goldfields-Esperance Development Commission to have large capital expenditures attributed to it. I ask the Premier to address that matter in his response.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett (Leader of the House).

House adjourned at 10.05 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN, CREDIT CARD EXPENDITURE BY MINISTERIAL OFFICERS

157. Mrs HOLMES to the Minister for Disability Services:

- (1) Will the Minister advise what the total expenditure on Government credit cards was in the Minister's office for the following financial years -
 - (a) 1990-1991;
 - (b) 1991-1992; and
 - (c) 1992-1993?
- (2) For each individual credit card holder in the Minister's office will the Minister advise -
 - (a) the name and position of the card holder;
 - (b) the credit limit on the card; and
 - (c) the total expenditure on that card in -
 - (i) 1990-1991;
 - (ii) 1991-1992; and
 - (iii) 1992-1993?

Mr OMODEI replied:

- (1)-(2) The records in question were administered by 3 separate administrations and portfolios. The information sought is not readily available and would be difficult to retrieve from archival records held by various host agencies.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, REGIONAL ACCESS PLANS

256. Mr BROWN to the Minister representing the Minister for the Arts:

In relation to the Government's election commitment that all Government agencies will develop and publish an affirmative action program (the Regional Access Equity Plan) to improve delivery of services to regional Western Australia will the Minister table the Regional Access Plans that have been published by agencies for which they are responsible?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

On July 7 1999 a draft Regional Development Policy for Western Australia was released for public comment. The draft policy includes strategies to ensure equitable access to an appropriate range and mix of services across the regions. The draft policy will require government agencies to include as part of their reporting requirements details of their achievements in delivering services to regional customers. This reporting would be consolidated under the Government's Customer Focus Policy. In addition, the draft policy suggests the development of a State of the Regions report that would include information on all aspects of regional living including levels of service delivery, economic performance, demographic details and quality of life measures. The draft policy is open for public comment until 3 September 1999. Implementation of these initiatives will meet the Government's commitment to monitoring the level of service delivery to regional Western Australia.

CYCLEWAYS, NUMBER OF DUAL-USE PATHS

519. Ms WARNOCK to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many kilometres of dual-use bicycle path are there in the Perth metropolitan area?
- (2) How many kilometres of bike lanes (or sealed shoulder lanes suitable for cyclists) are there in the Perth metropolitan area?
- (3) How many kilometres of dual-use paths and lanes for cyclists have been constructed by State and local authorities since January 1993?
- (4) What proportion of the existing dual-use paths are shown in the current Department of land Administration StreetSmart street directory?
- (5) What proportion and how many kilometres of the 1993 Coalition election promise to construct a network of cycleways has been completed so far?

Mr OMODEI replied:

The Hon Minister for Transport has provided the following response:

- (1) Data input to base-plans in 1999 record 1 096 kilometres of dual-use paths in metropolitan Perth. The actual dual-use path length will exceed this current record.

- (2)-(3) This information is held separately by some 30 local government authorities in Perth.
- (4) StreetSmart is the base data source that is being used by Transport. StreetSmart is updated annually by inputs from government agencies. Streetsmart compiles the data provided by agencies. Bikewest's observation is that major and regional paths are recorded, but local paths are not.
- (5) Sixty-seven percent consisting of 478 kilometres of Stage I of the Perth Bicycle Network have been completed comprising 28 kilometres of the new major paths, 425 kilometres of on-road routes (joined by sections of local path) and 25 kilometres of sealed road shoulders. The program is on target for practical completion in 2001.

SOUTH WEST COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, MEMBERSHIP

588. Dr EDWARDS to the Premier:

Who are the members of the Premier's South West Community Consultative Committee, and what body does each member represent?

Mr COURT replied:

The members of the Regional Forest Agreement Consultative Committee and the bodies they represent are:

Hon Paul Omodei	Chairperson (Member for Warren Blackwood)
Mr Steve Fewster	Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet
Mr Vern McKay	CEO Shire of Manjimup
Councillor Peter McKenzie	Shire of Manjimup
Mr Dean Freeman	CEO Shire of Nannup
Councillor Lester Dickson	President Shire of Nannup
Councillor Brian Kavanagh	President Shire of Bridgetown/Greenbushes
Mr Rob Walster	Manager Shire of Bridgetown/Greenbushes
Mr Collin Jeffery	Member Warren Blackwood, Business Assistant Centre
Ms Denise Jenkins	President Manjimup Chamber of Commerce
Ms Jeanette Sturis	Vice President Manjimup Chamber of Commerce
Mr Zoran Panzich	Community representative Manjimup
Mr Nick Oaks	Australian Workers Union
Mr Phillip Bombak	Member Pemberton Progress Association
Mr Max Eastcott	CEO Shire of Augusta/Margaret River
Mr Don Punch	CEO South West Development Commission
Mr Jeremy Threlfall	Regional Manager, South West Development Commission Manjimup

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND TRADE, GRANTS AND LOANS

593. Mr BROWN to the Deputy Premier:

In relation to Government grants and loans given to industry through the Department of Commerce and Trade for the years 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99 -

- (a) what was the total amount provide in grants;
- (b) what was the total amount provided in loans; and
- (c) what was the total amount converted from a loan to a grant?

Mr COWAN replied:

- (a) (i) 1996/97 - \$ 16.62m
(ii) 1997/98 - \$ 14.372m
(iii) 1998/99 - \$ 19.081m
- (b) (i) 1996/97 - \$ 2.733m
(ii) 1997/98 - \$ 2.773m
(iii) 1998/99 - \$ 6.264m
- (c) (i) 1996/97 - \$ 0.283m
(ii) 1997/98 - \$ 0.378m
(iii) 1998/99 - \$ 2.947m

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX, IMPACT ON REGIONAL WESTERN AUSTRALIA

650. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Regional Development:

- (1) Has the Government carried out an assessment on the impact of the Goods and Services Tax on regional Western Australia?
- (2) Given the added cost of acquiring a range of services and goods outside the metropolitan area, will the Goods and Services Tax add an additional 10% onto the cost of goods and services in the regions?
- (3) Will the difference between certain goods and services in the Perth metropolitan area compared to regional Western Australia increase in money and/or percentage terms?

Mr COWAN replied:

- (1) For businesses, including those outside the metropolitan area, costs are expected to fall as they can claim credits for GST paid on inputs. To the extent that prices rise for consumers, this will be offset by income tax reductions.
- (2) In general, prices of goods and services will not increase by the full 10% of the GST due to cost reductions from the abolition of wholesale sales tax, some State taxes and a reduction in fuel taxes.
- (3) It is expected that under the New Tax System the reduction in the diesel fuel excise from 43 cents per litre to 20 cents per litre for regional transport vehicles over 4.5 tonnes will result in reductions in the general cost of goods and services in regional Western Australia.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, CONEY STEVENS PROJECT MANAGEMENT PTY LTD

654. Ms McHALE to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Commerce and Trade; Regional Development; Small Business:

- (1) How many contracts were awarded to Coney Stevens Project Management by agencies and departments under the Deputy Premier's control in -
 - (a) 1996-97;
 - (b) 1997-98; and
 - (c) 1998-99?
- (2) For each contract, will the Deputy Premier state -
 - (a) the project that the contract was awarded for;
 - (b) the date that the contract was awarded;
 - (c) the expiry date of the contract;
 - (d) the value of the contract;
 - (e) did the contract go to tender; and
 - (f) how many companies or individuals submitted tenders?

Mr COWAN replied:

- (1) (a)-(b) Nil.
(c) One, by the Great Southern Development Commission.
- (2) (a) Vancouver Waterways Project.
(b) 15 July 1999.
(c) 31 December 1999.
(d) \$120 000.
(e) Yes.
(f) Eight.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, GRANTS, LOANS AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

742. Mr RIEBELING to the Minister for Local Government; Disability Services:

Will the Minister provide the following details of all grants, loans and any other form of financial assistance, offered within the Minister's portfolio -

- (a) the name of the financial assistance;
- (b) the purpose of the assistance;
- (c) the eligibility criteria for assistance;
- (d) the actual expenditure in -
 - (i) 1997-98;
 - (ii) 1998-99; and
- (e) the budgeted allocation in 1999-2000?

Mr OMODEI replied:

Department of Local Government

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)		(e)
			(i)	(ii)	
Community Facilities Grants Program	Provide funding for public toilets, nursing rooms, playgrounds, Roadside rest areas, Information signs and litter bins	Available to local governments, incorporated community groups and businesses	\$964,054	\$1,038,503	\$1,000,000
Community Security Program	Provides funding to local governments to conduct security audits, security patrols and other community security related initiatives			\$757,954	\$1,000,000
Local Government Development Fund	A proportion of the funding is provided to all local governments on a per capita basis and the remainder is made available through a grant process to local government development projects	Available to all local governments. Grants are provided for projects directed at structural reform; improving efficiency, accountability and performance management; and improving training and development in the local government sector		\$830,000	\$1,800,000
Local Government Financial Assistance Grants	To provide general purpose assistance grants to enable local governments to provide a wider range of services and to provide equity between local governments and certainty of funding	An annual allocation is made to every local government in accordance with the relevant Commonwealth legislation	\$138,290,108	\$141,579,631	\$145,780,647
Other:					
Keep Australia Beautiful Council	Assist with operating Costs	Annual funding	\$194,000	\$339,000	\$314,000
Ruby Benjamin Foundation Grant	Assist with operating Costs	Annual funding	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500
Australian Building Codes Board Grant	Annual contribution	Commonwealth State Agreement	\$95,017	\$100,003	\$86,596
Local Government Scholarship Fund Grant	Provides management scholarships to local government officers	Senior local government officers are nominated by their respective local governments	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000

Keep Australia Beautiful Council

(a) Environmental Education Scholarship.

(b) To allow a person doing their Honours Degree to view the efficacy of Keep Australia Beautiful Council – School Education Program.

(c) Honours Student at Murdoch University – Environmental Science (Murdoch University made selection).

(d) (i) \$5,000
(ii) \$5,000

Metropolitan Cemeteries Board

(a)-(e) Nil.

Fremantle Cemetery Board

Not applicable.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, GRANTS, LOANS AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

745. Mr RIEBELING to the Minister for Works; Services; Youth; Citizenship and Multicultural Interests:

Will the Minister provide the following details of all grants, loans and any other form of financial assistance, offered within the Minister's portfolio -

- (a) the name of the financial assistance;
- (b) the purpose of the assistance;
- (c) the eligibility criteria for assistance;

- (d) the actual expenditure in -
 - (i) 1997-98;
 - (ii) 1998-99; and
- (e) the budgeted allocation in 1999-2000?

Mr BOARD replied:

The Office of Citizenship and Multicultural Interests provides various grants and sponsorships to a number of incorporated bodies and Commonwealth/State/Territory bodies. These are addressed separately below:

1. Citizenship and Community Relations Grants Program
 - (a) The Office of Citizenship and Multicultural Interests administered the Community Relations Grants Program in 1997/98 and the Citizenship and Community Grants program in 1998/99.
 - (b) This program aims to assist and encourage the involvement of all Western Australians in events and projects which promote pride in being a citizen of a diverse society.
 - (c) An application from non-profit making, community based, incorporated organisations or groups are eligible for consideration. Individuals and private-for-profit groups are ineligible to apply.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$70,000
(ii)	1998-99	\$68,820
 - (e) \$300,000.
2.
 - (a) Grant to the Ethnic Communities Council of WA Inc.
 - (b) To provide a representative advisory/consultative service to the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests on policy and service issues concerning ethnic communities in Western Australia.
 - (c) Provided for under the Funding Agreement between the Ethnic Communities Council (WA) and the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$80,000
(ii)	1998-99	\$80,000
 - (e) \$80,000.
3.
 - (a) Grant to the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI)
 - (b) To provide Western Australia's contribution to the development of interpreting and translating policy on a national basis.
 - (c) Provided for under a Commonwealth/State/Territory agreement.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$35,000
(ii)	1998-99	\$35,875
 - (e) \$35,000.
4.
 - (a) Grant to Oz Concert Inc.
 - (b) The purpose is to assist the Oz Concert Inc. to stage the Oz Concert on Australia Day. This is presented free as a gift to the people of WA and encourages all Australians to celebrate and express their contribution to and place in Australian society. Using the medium of the performing arts, Oz Concert aims to bridge the diversity of Australia's multicultural communities and promote unity and harmony through bringing together, sharing and honouring the rich cultural heritage, traditions and contributions of each community.
 - (c) Provided for under the Funding Agreement between the Oz Concert Inc. and the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$30,000
(ii)	1998-99	\$30,000
 - (e) \$40,000 plus \$20,000 one-off grant this year for the 2000 Concert.
5.
 - (a) Dept. of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA) – Research Grant
 - (b) To undertake research into immigration and multicultural issues.
 - (c) Provided for under a Commonwealth/State/Territory agreement.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$5,000
(ii)	1998-99	\$5,000
 - (e) \$5,000.

6.
 - (a) Celebrate WA Inc.
 - (b) To enable Celebrate WA to foster pride in Western Australia and celebrate being Western Australian.
 - (c) Provided for under the Funding Agreement between Celebrate WA and the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	Nil
(ii)	1998-99	\$326,000
 - (e) \$371,400.
7.
 - (a) Sponsorships – Perth Glory Soccer Club
 - (b) To promote the Living in Harmony Anti-racism strategy.
 - (c) To meet OCMI's strategic objectives in Multicultural Interests.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$3,000
(ii)	1998-99	Nil
 - (e) Nil.
8.
 - (a) Sponsorships – International Business Council of WA.
 - (b) To introduce the "Excellence in Cultural Diversity" Awards and the overall promotion of IBCWA activities.
 - (c) To meet OCMI's strategic objectives in Multicultural Interests.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$3,000
(ii)	1998-99	Nil.
 - (e) Nil.
9.
 - (a) Sponsorships – Austcare.
 - (b) To educate the public about the plight of refugees during Refugee week.
 - (c) To meet OCMI's strategic objectives in Multicultural Interests.
 - (d)

(i)	1997-98	\$2,000
(ii)	1998-99	Nil
 - (e) Nil.

OFFICE OF YOUTH AFFAIRS

- (a)
 - (1) Youth Grants WA;
 - (2) Community Service Grants;
 - (3) Cadets WA Program;
 - (4) Youth Advisory Councils' Establishment Grants; and
 - (5) Youth Co-ordinating Networks' Establishment Grants.
- (b)
 - (1) To assist individuals and community organisations with funding for the provision of youth services and participation initiatives, including the establishment of skateparks.
 - (2) To assist community-based organisations to provide youth related services and to undertake youth development programs.
 - (3) To assist with the establishment and the administration of school-based cadet units and the provision of equipment and training opportunities for young people involved in the Cadets WA program.
 - (4) To assist the local government authority with the establishment and the provision of administrative support to the Youth Advisory Council established in their area.
 - (5) To support Youth Coordinating Networks established throughout the State improve the level of coordination and cooperation amongst youth service providers in the region. YCNs operate with the support of the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Training and Youth Affairs.
- (c)
 - (1) Formal eligibility criteria have been developed for the Youth Grants WA program which are available, along with an application form, in a Grants Information Kit. Generally, individuals, youth groups, community organisations, special interest groups and not for profit organisations are eligible to apply. Organisations and groups submitting applications are encouraged to include young people in the development of the application and the management of the project or activity.
 - (2) Community-based organisations with a specific interest in youth. Grants are provided by way of a three year Service Agreement with the organisation.

- (3) Any government or non-government high school or college in the State is eligible to participate in the program. Cadet units established prior to the Cadets WA program are eligible to receive grant funds by affiliating with the program.
- (4) Youth Advisory Councils (YACs) must be established in conjunction with the local government authority in their area to qualify for establishment assistance.
- (5) An annual grant is available to each Youth Coordinating Network to assist in convening meetings and for secretariat support.
- (d) (i) 1997/98
 (1) \$916,248
 (2) \$723,000
 (3) \$1,167,000
 (4)-(5) Not applicable.
- (ii) 1998/99
 (1) \$1,114,464
 (2) \$1,240,557
 (3) \$1,940,645
 (4) \$148,000
 (5) \$65,000
- (e) 1999/00
 (1) \$1,144,000
 (2) \$1,200,000
 (3) \$2,050,000
 (4) \$36,000
 (5) \$70,000

STATE SUPPLY COMMISSION

(a)-(e) Not applicable.

CONTRACT AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

(a)-(e) Not applicable.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, GRANTS, LOANS AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

749. Mr RIEBELING to the Minister representing the Minister for the Arts:

Will the Minister provide the following details of all grants, loans and any other form of financial assistance, offered within the Minister's portfolio -

- (a) the name of the financial assistance;
- (b) the purpose of the assistance;
- (c) the eligibility criteria for assistance;
- (d) the actual expenditure in -
 (i) 1997-98;
 (ii) 1998-99; and
- (e) the budgeted allocation in 1999-2000?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

ArtsWA

- (a) Grants, loans and other form of financial assistance offered within the Minister's Portfolio (ArtsWA)

Panel-assessed Investment Program

- (b) The panel-assessed investment program involves three panels in the assessment of applications from individuals, groups and organisations wishing to undertake activity in any art form area other than film, television and radio. The assessment panels are:

The Aboriginal Arts Panel
 Young People and the Arts Panel
 Arts Development Panel

The purpose of the assistance is to invest in artistic and cultural product and experiences for the people of Western Australia.

- (c) To be eligible for assistance through the Panel-assessed Investment Program, applicants must:
- be Australian citizens or have permanent resident status in Australia;
 - have resided in Western Australia for at least 12 months prior to making an application; and
 - not have any outstanding acquittals from previous ArtsWA funding.

Annual or multi-year funding is also available to arts organisations with a demonstrated track record. For further details as to eligibility for assistance, please refer to the accompanying ArtsWA Arts Investment Handbook Western Australia and Guidelines for multi-year funded organisations. [See paper No 262.]

Artflight

- (b) Artflight is a travel program designed to assist Western Australian arts practitioners to attend events or undertake activities of strategic significance to their arts practice.
- (c) The base eligibility criteria for Artflight are the same as for eligibility to the Panel-assessed Investment Program. Artflight is only a program for WA-based artists and cannot be used to bring artists into WA from elsewhere in Australia or overseas.

For further details as to eligibility for assistance, please refer to the accompanying ArtsWA Arts Investment Handbook Western Australia. [See paper No 262.]

Arts Venture Capital

- (b) Arts Venture Capital support arts projects and companies that, with adequate resources and effective management have a reasonable expectation of expanding arts markets and earning commercial revenue.
- (c) Individuals, incorporated associations, companies limited guarantee, registered partnerships etc, that are either artists, or arts related are eligible to apply to Arts Venture Capital on the basis that the proposed venture serves the objectives of Arts Venture Capital.

The objectives of Arts Venture Capital are:

- to encourage the expansion of markets and maximise the self-sufficiency of the WA arts industry;
- to increase the amount of commercial revenue generated by the WA arts industry, by supporting arts ventures that are capable of making a return;
- to assist the WA arts industry to build up sufficient capital to enable it to invest in research and development projects, to take risks in the future and develop reserves of capital;
- to supplement and expand traditional arts industry support by encouraging the development of pools of capital from commercial arts ventures; and
- to provide assistance for good commercial ideas which may not have access to ordinary commercial funds.

For further information, please refer to the accompanying Arts Venture Capital program description and Investment Guidelines. [See papers Nos 262 and 263.]

Exchange Programs

- (b) ArtsWA invests in a range of national and international exchange programs, and directly manages the Western Australian Performing Arts Exchange.
- (c) The principal host company or institution must submit Exchange proposals to ArtsWA for the visiting interstate or overseas arts practitioner. A list of the eligible principal exchange hosts is contained within the Exchange Proposal Form.

For further details as to eligibility for assistance, please refer to the accompanying ArtsWA Arts Investment Handbook Western Australia and Western Australian performing Arts Exchange Proposal Form. [See papers Nos 262 and 264.]

Cultural Planning for Country WA

- (b) ArtsWA administers the Cultural Planning for Country WA Program, which supports arts and cultural activities in country areas in conjunction with local government, and helps ArtsWA and the Ministry for Culture & the Arts to deliver its services to country areas.
- (c) Regional Local Government Authorities are eligible to apply to the Cultural Planning for Country WA Program. For further details as to eligibility for assistance, please refer to the accompanying Cultural Planning for Country WA Information Pack. [See papers Nos 262 and 265.]

Triennial Funding for Arts Agencies

- (b) Triennial funding is designed to allow Arts Agencies to forward plan, enter into contracts with greater security, take a more sophisticated approach to financial and artistic planning in general and offer staff greater security of tenure.
- (c) Arts Agencies are eligible to receive General Purpose Triennial Funding to support their core activities. [See paper No 266.]

Incentive Funding

- (b) Incentive funding is intended to reward initiatives with outcomes linked to good management practices, expanded markets and greater self-sufficiency. The outcomes of such initiatives must be clearly defined and their outcomes measurable and based on an agreed eligible income to incentive funding ratio.
- (c) Incentive funding is available for the five theatre companies. These companies are Perth Theatre Company, Black Swan Theatre Company, Barking Gecko Theatre Company, Spare Parts Puppet Theatre and Deckchair Theatre Company

For further details as to eligibility for assistance, please refer to the accompanying ArtsWA Guidelines for Triennial Funding. [See paper No 267.]

Publishing Assistance

- (b) The objectives of the Publishing Assistance Program are to support living WA writers by enabling their work to be published and distributed, to foster excellence in WA writing and publishing, to advance the community's appreciation of WA literature and to advance the professional interests of WA writers and publishers.
- (c) Only publishers registered with ArtsWA are eligible to apply for publishing assistance.

For further details as to eligibility for assistance, please refer to the accompanying guidelines for the ArtsWA Publishing Assistance Program. [See paper No 268.]

Memorial Sculptures

- (b) The purpose of these funds is to promote the commissioning of statues by WA artists/sculptors to celebrate the achievements of those who have made an outstanding contribution to a community.
- (c) Joint submissions are required from a Local Government Authority and an artist/sculptor. [See paper No 269.]

Centenary of Federation

- (b) Funding is available towards projects celebrating the Centenary of Federation.
- (c) Arts Agencies and applicants eligible for the Panel-assessed Investment Program are eligible to apply. [See paper No 270.]
- (d) (i) The actual total expenditure in 1997-1998 was \$12,109,665.

For further detail, you are referred to the accompanying lists of all ArtsWA funding in that period. [See paper No 271.]

- (ii) The actual total expenditure in 1998-1999 was \$12,948,456.

For further detail, you are referred to the accompanying lists of all ArtsWA funding in that period. [See paper No 272.]

- (e) The budgeted allocation in 1999-2000 is \$13,893,055.

Library and Information Service of Western Australia

- (a) Royal Western Australian Historical Society.
- (b) To assist the Society in meeting administration expenses and costs associated with maintaining the historical museum and library at the Society's Stirling House headquarters.
- (c) The Royal Western Australian Historical Society has to forward its previous year's audited financial statements before payment is made.
- (d) (i) 1997/98: \$20,000
(ii) 1998/99: \$20,000
- (e) Budget allocation in 1999/2000 - \$20,000
- (a) Royal Society of Western Australia.
- (b) To provide for an annual contribution towards the cost of printing the quarterly scientific journal produced by the Royal Society of Western Australia. With the privatisation of the State Printing Office in 1994/95, the Royal Society of Western Australia lost its printing subsidy to print its quarterly scientific journal. This funding replaces that subsidy.
- (c) The Royal Society of Western Australia has to forward its previous year's audited financial statements before payment is made.
- (d) (i) 1997/98: \$16,000
(ii) 1998/99: \$16,000
- (e) Budget allocation in 1999/2000 - \$16,000

Note: Both grants to the Royal Western Australian Historical Society and the Royal Society of Western Australia were previously administered by Treasury from the Miscellaneous Services Division No.47. These grants were taken over by the Ministry for Culture & the Arts from 1 July 1997.

- (a) Association for the Blind.
- (b) The subsidy is paid to the Association for the Blind in recognition of its ability as a specialist library to meet the needs of Western Australians with print disabilities more effectively than LISWA can through the Alexander Library Building and public libraries. The subsidy helps in the maintenance of the Braille and Talking Book Library which is part of the statewide network of public libraries.
- (c) Expertise in provision of library services to Western Australians with print disabilities.
- (d) (i) 1997/98: \$160,404
(ii) 1998/99: \$162,488
- (e) Budget allocation in 1999/2000 - \$140,614
- (a) Regional Subsidies.

- (b) The subsidy is paid to the 11 regional libraries within Western Australia to allow them to provide regional services to the smaller public libraries within their region. These services include providing support and assistance, annual visits to the libraries, an inter library loan service, regular regional communication, organisation of an annual meeting of public library staff within the region and selection of some stock for the libraries. The subsidy includes a salary component and funds to cover travel and subsistence costs.
- (c) A regional library as approved by the Library Board of Western Australia.
- (d)

(i)	1997/98:	\$194,264
(ii)	1998/99:	\$194,264
- (e) Budget allocation in 1999/2000 - \$194,264

Western Australian Museum

The WA Museum has not offered any grants, loans or other form of financial assistance in the financial years 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

Art Gallery of Western Australia

The Art Gallery of Western Australia has not offered any grants, loans or other form of financial assistance in the financial years 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

Perth Theatre Trust

- (a) Write off bad debt owing on the production "Annie" to the Perth Theatre Trust.
- (b) Production moneys were unable to be recovered
- (c) Provided \$22,000 for Bad Debt in 1997-98
- (d) Wrote off \$27,000 in 1998-99 (including the \$22,000 provided in 1997-98)
- (e) Not applicable.

ScreenWest

- (a) ScreenWest provides the following forms of financial assistance:
 - Project Development Loans
 - Project Marketing Loans
 - Production Funding
 - Producer Enterprise Packages and Business Planning Grants
 - Filmex Grants
 - New Screen Writers Loans
 - New Docs Loans
 - Practitioner Development Travel Grants
 - Professional Placements
 - Special Event Funding
 - Funding to Screen resource organisations
- (b) The purpose of the assistance is to foster the development and production of quality, marketable film and television projects, extend the creative and professional development of Western Australia's film and television program makers, and promote Western Australian screen culture.
- (c) ScreenWest's priorities for project funding are in the areas of drama (including children's and animated drama) and documentary. Projects can be either series or one-off programs but must be designed for theatrical release or television transmission. ScreenWest's support for individuals is restricted to established professional film makers who have embarked on a serious career in the screen industry in this state. They are expected to be Western Australian residents and working or aiming to work predominantly in the drama and documentary production sector of the industry.
- (d) The actual expenditure in
 - (i) 1997/1998 was \$1,352,242.
 - (ii) 1998/1999 was \$3,031,427.
- (e) The budgeted allocation in 1999-2000 is \$2,500,000.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, BREACHES OF PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT ACT

770. Mr RIEBELING to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Justice:

I refer to the answer to question on notice No 530 of 19 August 1999, and I ask for each of the 15 breaches of section 8 of the Public Sector Management Act 1994 -

- (a) when did the breach occur; and
- (b) what was the nature of the breach?

Mrs van de KLASHORST replied:

Date of Breach	Standard		Compliance Requirement Breached
January 1998	Recruitment Selection and Appointment	1.8	Decisions are capable of review
March 1998	"	1.3 1.7	Skills, knowledge and abilities are fairly assessed Decisions and processes embody the principles of natural justice
April 1998	"	1.3	Skills, knowledge and abilities are fairly assessed
April 1998	"	1.3	Skills, knowledge and abilities are fairly assessed
April 1998	"	1.1 1.3 1.4 1.7	Bias free documentation describes the job to be performed and specifies the relevant selection criteria Skills, knowledge and abilities are fairly assessed Selection methods and their application are free from bias, patronage and nepotism Decisions and processes embody the principles of natural justice
May 1998	"	1.3 1.4 1.7	Skills, knowledge and abilities are fairly assessed Selection methods and their application are free from bias, patronage and nepotism Decisions and processes embody the principles of natural justice
June 1998	"	1.6 1.7 1.9	Policies are documented, equitable, applied consistently and accessible to all employees Decisions and processes embody the principles of natural justice Appropriate confidentiality is observed
July 1998	"	1.2	The job is advertised as widely as appropriate
July 1998	"	1.6 1.7	Policies are documented, equitable, applied consistently and accessible to all employees Decisions and processes embody principles of natural justice
July 1998	"	1.6 1.7 1.9	Policies are documented, equitable, applied consistently and accessible to all employees Decisions and processes embody principles of natural justice Appropriate confidentiality is observed
December 1998	"	1.1 1.8	Bias free documentation describes the job to be performed and specifies the relevant selection criteria Decisions are capable of review
March 1999	"	1.3 1.6 1.9	Skills, knowledge and abilities are fairly assessed Policies are documented, equitable, applied consistently and accessible to all employees Appropriate confidentiality is observed
May 1999	"	1.2 1.6	The job is advertised as widely as appropriate Policies are documented, equitable, applied consistently and accessible to all employees
July 1999	"	1.1 1.4	Bias free documentation describes the job to be performed and specifies the relevant selection criteria Selection methods and their application are free from bias, patronage and nepotism
August 1999	Grievance Resolution	9.2	The process is not subject to unnecessary delays

The Ministry advertises several hundred positions each year. The number of recruitment and selection processes found to have breached any of the nine compliance requirements relating to the Recruitment, Selection and Appointment Standard is therefore extremely small. Additionally, the majority of confirmed breaches were found not to have materially affected the outcome of the process. In no case did a reviewer find that any deliberate manipulation of the process had occurred. Generally, findings of a breach resulted from either:

Differing interpretation of the Ministry's guidelines by selection panels, but were all applicants in any given selection process had been assessed in a consistent manner; or

Documentation of the process not containing the level of detail expected by the Office of the Public Sector Standards Commissioner.

MENTAL HEALTH MUSEUM COLLECTION, ACCOMMODATION AND MANAGEMENT

923. Ms McHALE to the Minister representing the Minister for Arts:

(1) Has the Minister for Health referred the matter of accommodation and management of the Mental Health Museum collection to the Minister for the Arts?

- (2) If so, when?
- (3) What did the Minister for Health request the Minister for the Arts do in his referral?
- (4) What is the Minister for the Arts going to do about the collection?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Minister for Health referred correspondence received regarding the Mental Health Museum collection to the Minister for the Arts on 3 September 1999
- (3) The Minister for Health's letter included various enclosures with the background to the issue, copies of correspondence received from concerned parties and contact details for the Chair of the Mental Health Museum Committee. The Minister for Health's letter set out two main points which the Minister for Arts was asked to consider:

The Graylands Hospital Campus is no longer in a position to house the Mental Health Museum

Due to the historical value of items in the collection, the Minister for Health believed that they fall within the responsibility of the Arts portfolio.

- (4) The Minister for Arts referred the matter to the Western Australian Museum and passed on advice to the Minister for Health that if the Mental Health Museum is not able to relocate to a site at Heathcote, that the collections be assessed by the appropriate state institutions, vis-à-vis Western Australian Museum and Battye Library. The Minister understands that earlier in the year the members of the Mental Health Museum of WA (Inc) declined to accept a proposal to amalgamate with the City of Melville's Museum at Heathcote. The Chair of the Mental Health Museum Committee has declined to meet with staff of Battye Library and the Museum of Social and Cultural History to discuss the question of assessing the collections. The Museum Assistance Program has had discussions with both the City of Melville and the Chair of the Mental Health Museum to encourage options other than amalgamation to be considered for storage of the collection and displaying it in part at the Heathcote site. The Museum Assistance Program has also offered to provide advice to the Mental Health Museum Committee with a proposed temporary display at another venue with whom the Mental Health Museum Committee have been in contact.

SOUTH WEST HEALTH CAMPUS, CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

973. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Works and Services:

- (1) Was the Department of Contract and Management Services contacted by subcontractors involved with the construction of the South West Health Campus expressing concerns about the management of the project?
- (2) If yes, when was contact made and what were the nature of the concerns?
- (3) What action did the Department take as a result of these complaints?

Mr BOARD replied:

I am advised that:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A building subcontractor contacted CAMS earlier this year regarding access to documents about contractor claims. A Consultant subcontractor contact was made in early 1998 to inform CAMS of the difficulty being experienced in the management of the contract between themselves and the Contractor and to seek CAMS assistance as a facilitator to help resolve the difficulties.
- (3) For the building subcontractor he was informed that the information he was seeking could not be released other than through an FOI process. This information has recently been released. For the consultant subcontractor CAMS facilitated meetings with the parties in an attempt to reach a resolution with their difficulties.

SOUTH WEST HEALTH CAMPUS, LUMP SUM PAYMENT TO HEAD CONTRACTOR

974. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Works and Services:

In relation to the construction of the new South West Health Campus -

- (a) was the head contractor paid a large lump sum in at the conclusion of the construction;
- (b) if yes, how much was this lump sum; and
- (c) was the Department of Contract and Management Services presented with a number of unpaid subcontractors accounts by the head contractor to support a claim for this payment?

Mr BOARD replied:

I am advised that:

- (a) Yes. The contractor was paid a lump sum as an agreed final settlement.
- (b) The payment was for \$2,809,856.99 out of an agreed settlement amount of \$3,000,000. A sum has been held back pending the completion of mandatory items and minor building finish defects. The mandatory items were completed prior to occupation and commencement of operation of the hospital. Only minor defect items are still outstanding and these will be completed in the very near future.
- (c) No.

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, INTERNAL INVESTIGATION FUNCTION REVIEW

1000. Mr RIEBELING to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) When was the review of the Ministry of Justice's Internal Investigation function completed by Mr Bill Mott?
- (2) Was the report accepted by the Director General?
- (3) If so -
 - (a) when;
 - (b) who was responsible for the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report;
 - (c) why has there been a significant delay in the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report; and
 - (d) were the staff of the Internal Investigation Unit fully advised of the recommendations contained in the report and the Ministry's proposed actions?

Mrs van de KLASHORST replied:

- (1) 27 November, 1998.
- (2) Yes, but not all of the recommendations were accepted.
- (3)
 - (a) May, 1999.
 - (b) The Executive Director Offender Management.
 - (c) The recommendations necessitated careful consideration and consultation.
 - (d) Yes.

CASUARINA PRISON, SECURITY UPGRADE APPROVAL

1005. Mr RIEBELING to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Justice:

- (1) When did the Director General of the Ministry of Justice approve the security upgrade works at Casuarina Prison?
- (2) When did Treasury approve the security upgrade works at Casuarina Prison?
- (3) When were tenders let for the security upgrade works at Casuarina Prison?
- (4) Were the tenders for the security upgrade withdrawn or amended?
- (5) If so, why?

Mrs van de KLASHORST replied:

The Minister for Justice has provided the following reply.

- (1) Final Scope of Works approved 9 March 1999.
- (2) 30 March 1999.
- (3) Three separate tenders were let for security works:
 - Units 2 to 6 Management Fencing/Movement Control – 3 May 1999
 - Units 1 to 6 Workstation and Secure Lines Upgrade – 5 May 1999
 - Unit 1 Management and Movement Control – 29 July 1999
- (4) All tenders closed without amendment. No tenders were withdrawn.
- (5) Not applicable.

ATTORNEY GENERAL, USE OF OFFICE FOR AIUS CONSTITUTIONAL LAW CLASSES

1007. Mr McGINTY to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Are the Minister's office and staff used to present private constitutional law classes for students enrolled externally in the University of London Australian Institute of University Studies (AIUS) course?

- (2) As the fee charged by AIUS is \$800 per semester, what payment is made by AIUS for the use of staff or facilities?

Mr PRINCE replied:

- (1) The person is a member of the Crown Solicitor's office who through successive governments has tutored students from the University of Western Australia, Murdoch University and the AIUS all of whom charge fees. The officer conducts the AIUS classes outside of office hours for part time students in my office. This is at no cost to the State and is consistent with the practice of major law firms in having students attend tutorials in their buildings.
- (2) I regard this work as beneficial to the official work that the officer carries out which has a large constitutional law component. It is easy when involved in ministerial offices to lose contact with current legal developments and this work helps the officer avoid that and is itself beneficial to government. I would hesitate to do anything which would lose this benefit.

MR CLAUDE GIORGIO, DEFECTS IN HOUSE AT 68 DUKE STREET, EAST FREMANTLE

1008. Mr McGINTY to the Minister for Fair Trading:

- (1) Has the Builders Registration Board received a complaint from Mr and Mrs Smythe regarding Mr Claude Giorgio, director of Building Corporation (WA) Pty Ltd in respect of their home being built at 68 Duke Street, East Fremantle alleging that Mr Giorgio threatened Mr Smythe in the following terms "I guarantee you (Mr Smythe) that it would take up to two years before you move into your new house" if Mr Smythe took his complaints against the builder to the Disputes Committee of the Builders Registration Board?
- (2) If yes, what action is the Minister taking in regard to this matter?
- (3) Did the Builders Registration Board on 12 August 1999 order Mr Giorgio's company to remedy hundreds of building defects in the Duke Street house within 28 days?
- (4) If yes, what action is the Minister taking to ensure that that order is complied with?

Mr SHAVE replied:

- (1) The Registrar of the Builders' Registration Board has advised that the Board has not received a complaint from Mr and Mrs Smythe regarding an alleged threat made by Mr Claude George, of Building Corporation (WA) Pty Ltd, to Mr Smythe. However, the Registrar of the Building Disputes Committee has advised that the Building Disputes Committee has received a complaint from Mr and Mrs Smythe regarding unsatisfactory building work on the home being built for them.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) As a result of Mr and Mrs Smythe's complaint to the Building Disputes Committee, the Registrar of the Building Disputes Committee ordered the remedy of approximately 180 items at the home.
- (4) If the order to remedy the items is not complied with, then the provisions of the *Builders' Registration Act 1939* relating to the enforcement of orders made by the Building Disputes Committee are able to be relied upon.

GLOUCESTER PARK REDEVELOPMENT

1024. Ms MacTIERNAN to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Has the East Perth Redevelopment Authority (EPRA) or any of its officers undertaken any assessments of the viability of redeveloping Gloucester Park for residential and/or commercial purposes?
- (2) If yes -
- what were the anticipated costs and financial benefits of this redevelopment under all proposals assessed;
 - how many lots could be created, and what size lots were assessed; and
 - does EPRA anticipate developing Gloucester Park in the near future for residential and/or commercial purposes, and if yes, when?

Mr KIERATH replied:

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

BELVIDERE SUBDIVISION, OIL LEAK CLEAN-UP

1026. Ms MacTIERNAN to the Minister for Planning:

What was the cost to the East Perth Redevelopment Authority's insurers of the clean up of the oil leak in the Belvidere subdivision in East Perth?

Mr KIERATH replied:

\$17 200 to date.

EAST PERTH REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, INSURANCE EXCESS FOR BELVIDERE SUBDIVISION OIL LEAK

1107. Ms MacTIERNAN to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Was the East Perth Redevelopment Authority (EPRA) liable for any insurance excess for the clean up of the oil leak in the Belvidere subdivision in East Perth?
- (2) If yes, what was the amount of the excess paid by the EPRA?

Mr KIERATH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Nil.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX, STAMP DUTY

372. Dr GALLOP to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware that the federal Assistant Treasurer, Rod Kemp, has refused to retract his criticism of the Western Australian Government's decision to impose stamp duty on GST-inclusive prices?
- (2) Is the Premier aware that Senator Kemp is standing by his claim that this move is nothing more than a money grab?
- (3) If so, why did the Premier claim on Saturday that the Federal Government had admitted that it was wrong to criticise the Western Australian Government's money grab?
- (4) Was the Premier deliberately misrepresenting the Federal Government's position on this matter?

Mr COURT replied:

- (1)-(4) No. My office had discussions with Mr Kemp's office on Friday. His office apologised for the comments and accepted that the stamp duties have always been applied on top of commonwealth indirect taxes. The Treasurer in New South Wales - an Australian Labor Party Treasurer - has also made it clear that that has always been the practice.

Dr Gallop: What about Queensland? Is it not considering the issue?

Mr COURT: I have not asked Queensland.

Dr Gallop: No.

Mr COURT: The Leader of the Opposition says no. As I understand, all the Treasurers, who are predominantly Labor Treasurers, will comply with this principle because that is the way it has always been handled.

Dr Gallop: Will you not change your position?

Mr COURT: No, I will not change my position.

Dr Gallop: We will just have to look at the upper House then.

Mr COURT: None of the Labor Treasurers will.

HEARING IMPAIRMENT, EARLY DETECTION

373. Mrs HODSON-THOMAS to the Minister for Health:

Given that 25 babies are born each year in Western Australia with profound hearing loss, what steps are being taken by the State Government to increase the early detection rate of hearing impairment?

Mr DAY replied:

I thank the member for notice of the question. It is correct that approximately 25 babies are born in Western Australia each year with a profound hearing loss. It is also now known that if such a problem is detected early in life, particularly within the first three months, and if action is taken to deal with the problem within the first six months of life, a significant improvement can be made in the development of a child, particularly in language and learning skills.

Recognising that situation, the Government is funding a major new program for Western Australia whereby next year 11 000 newborn babies in this State will receive screening for hearing loss as part of a new universal neonatal hearing screening program. The scheme has been trialled at King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women, but it will be extended next year to other hospitals, initially in the metropolitan area but later in other parts of Western Australia. The other hospitals at which it will be introduced next year include St John of God Hospital at Subiaco, Joondalup Health Campus and Woodside Maternity Hospital. We expect that it will also be introduced at one or two other hospitals in the metropolitan area.

The procedure will involve an audiologist, or another appropriate clinical staff member, conducting a simple hearing test prior to discharge of the baby from the hospital. If the test is failed, it will be repeated six weeks later, and, if necessary, the baby will be referred to a specialist audiologist. The cost of the test is about \$18 per child. That equates to about \$200 000 that will be expended in the first year of the operation of the scheme. It is a worthwhile initiative to ensure that babies born in Western Australia have an even better chance of a good start in life.

GILLEECE, MR JACK, MONGOLIAN TRIP

374. Mr RIPPER to the Premier:

Some notice of this question has been given.

- (1) Did Jack Gilleece apply for government expenses of any kind before or after his trip to Mongolia in 1997?
- (2) If yes, did he receive any expenses?

Mr COURT replied:

(1)-(2) The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is getting soft. He has left out the flowery words before -

Mr Ripper: I think by now you know he is your disgraced former adviser.

Mr COURT: I am just saying that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition left them out; that is all.

No, Mr Gilleece's trip was in a private capacity, and the Government did not meet any costs associated with the trip.

Dr Gallop: Did he apply?

Mr COURT: I said no.

MEENAAR INDUSTRIAL PARK, RARE EARTH PROJECT

375. Mr TRENORDEN to the Minister for Regional Development:

I refer to the Ashton Mining Ltd and Lynas Gold NL rare earth project's objective of establishing the Meenaar Industrial Park. The member for Kalgoorlie is reported in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* as stating that it is important to note that the project has fallen within the National Party electorate. Will the minister inform the House -

- (1) Which minister of what Government approved the purchase of the Meenaar site, and on what date?
- (2) Which minister signed the environmental approval of the project?
- (3) Is the Ashton Mining and Lynas Gold proposal to establish this park at Meenaar a dastardly National Party plot or the natural selection of industry?

Mr COWAN replied:

I thank the member for Avon for enough notice of the question to acquire the following information -

- (1) I understand that the processes for purchase of the Meenaar Industrial Park were undertaken by the Department of State Development during the period of Labor Government when the former member for Kalgoorlie, Hon Ian Taylor, was minister.
- (2) The report and recommendations of the Environmental Protection Authority report "Proposal to establish an industrial park at Meenaar, 18 kilometres east of Northam" was brought down in *EPA Bulletin 645* dated 2 August 1992. The responsible government minister at that time is the now member for Fremantle who signed the relevant documents for environmental approval on 30 November, 1992.
- (3) In September 1991, Ashton Mining Limited released the document "Mt Weld Rare Earth Project (Sites Evaluation Study Extract)". This document outlined the site requirements and site evaluation criteria as well as environmental and social considerations for each site. This provided comparative rationales for sites in Collie, East Rockingham, Kalgoorlie, Kemerton, Geraldton, Northam - and by that I mean the Meenaar site - and the Northam-Wundowie site. The report noted at page 59 that the State Government has recently announced that Meenaar is proposed to be developed as an industrial site. In November 1991, Ashton Mining released a document "Proposed Meenaar Industrial Park; Flora and Fauna" produced by Kinhill Engineers who assessed the flora and fauna of the proposed Meenaar Industrial Park. In May 1992, Ashton Rare Earths Limited released the Public Environmental Review (Overview) of the Mt Welds rare earths project. This review incorporated both the process of mining and beneficiation of Mt Weld and secondary processing at Meenaar.

NUGENT, MR EMU

376. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the minister aware of media reports that a self-confessed paedophile by the name Emu Nugent has been working as a storyteller in Western Australian government schools and that the same man lives only metres from Langford Primary School?
- (2) If so, what action has the minister taken to determine whether these reports are true?
- (3) Can the minister reassure the House that his department has not employed a self-confessed paedophile as a storyteller in government schools?

Mr BARNETT replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(3) I am aware of the media reports. I heard them this morning. The Education Department is acting on them. There have been similar incidences of people who have a record, if one likes, or are suspected of being engaged in paedophiliac activity who have located near schools. I had one in my own electorate which the department dealt with, and we are dealing with this one, too. However, we must deal with it within the law. At all times we will ensure that the children are not exposed to risk in any way.

As to the employment of this person, it was not my understanding that he was employed by the Education Department of Western Australia, but I will check that.

FOREST MANAGEMENT, FERGUSON COMMITTEE REPORT

377. Mr MASTERS to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Has the Ferguson Committee report on improving forest management in the south west been received by the Government?
- (2) If so, is the minister in a position to indicate when it will be released?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(2) The report from the ministerial advisory group on karri and tingle management was delivered to me on Saturday. The individuals who made up that group were Professor Ian Ferguson, Dr Steven Hopper, Mr John Gardiner and Dr Joanna Young. Given the volume of the work it has covered, all members of the committee deserve our thanks for their efforts to help chart the future direction of forest management in Western Australia. The Government is in the process of considering the implications of the report and it will be released shortly. It will be released in full so that the community can see the extent of the work that was carried out. The committee was established as an independent assessment as part of the Government's desire to ensure that all the decisions on the future of our forests are open and accountable. As part of that process, the committee held a number of workshops in Walpole, Pemberton, Manjimup and Perth. We want to see the good relationship that has been established through this process continue and we will release that report shortly.

ROAD SAFETY AUDIT REPORT, NARROWS BRIDGE

378. Ms MacTIERNAN to the minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Can the minister confirm that the road safety audit report has identified the interchange north of the Narrows Bridge duplication as substandard and not adequate to cope with the projected traffic levels?
- (2) Who prepared the road safety audit on the Narrows Bridge interchange?
- (3) Will the minister table the report of that audit?

Mr OMODEI replied:

The Minister for Transport has provided the following response -

- (1) The road safety audit report did not identify the interchange north of the Narrows Bridge duplication as substandard, nor did it find the interchange unable to cope with projected traffic levels.
- (2) Robert Morgan, of the traffic engineering and road safety division.
- (3) I table the report. [See paper No 273.]

WESTAR RULES FOOTBALL CLUBS, FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

379. Mr BAKER to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

I refer to the financial difficulties encountered by several clubs participating in the Westar Rules football competition. Does the Government provide any ongoing financial assistance to the Western Australian Football Commission aimed at helping these clubs?

Mr MARSHALL replied:

I thank the member for Joondalup for the question. I know that he has an even stronger interest in Western Australian football since West Perth, a club in his electorate, unexpectedly took out the premiership this year over South Fremantle, a club which is propped up by the Dockers. It was a good win for the game.

The minister has advised that the State Government provides \$803 000 to the Western Australian Football Commission by way of a three-year business agreement to conclude in 2000. In return for this investment the WAFC has as one of its goals the priority of ensuring that the Westar competition is relevant to the community and that support for the competition is sustained. The WAFC is currently undertaking a review of the Westar Rules competition. It is expected that at the conclusion of this review no additional financial assistance will be provided to the WAFC by the State Government.

OLD-GROWTH KARRI AND TINGLE COUPES**380. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for the Environment:**

- (1) Have any old-growth karri and tingle coupes been logged in the past three months?
- (2) Have the Department of Conservation and Land Management's revised logging plans been finalised for old-growth karri and tingle?
- (3) If yes, can the minister advise which forest coupes will be logged in the next three months?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(3) Yes. Some old-growth karri and tingle have been harvested or removed during the past three months. I do not have that list available.

Mr Ripper: Can you make a statement to the House later?

Mrs EDWARDES: I am happy to do that. One role of the Ferguson committee is to talk about what will happen between 2000 and 2003. Obviously, the issue now is what we will do until the end of this year. I will make a public statement on that when the Government releases that report and its response to it, so that members of the community are fully involved.

PEEL INLET AND HARVEY ESTUARY, FISHING LICENCE BUYBACK PROGRAM**381. Mr MARSHALL to the Minister for Fisheries:**

Negotiations between the professional fishermen of the Peel Inlet and Harvey Estuary have been ongoing regarding the buyback program of fishing licences.

- (1) Has Fisheries WA been successful in buying back any of the professional licences?
- (2) What compensation has been paid to these professional fishermen?
- (3) What kind of self-preservation is envisaged by having fewer professionals fishing in the inlets?

Mr HOUSE replied:

- (1) A total of 11 licences have been bought back from professional fishermen.
- (2) The total amount of money involved in those transactions is \$940 000.
- (3) The shift in effort is yet to be determined. However, the aim of the program is to shift the resource, so that recreational fishermen can take greater advantage of fish in the inlet.

REGIONAL FOREST AGREEMENT, MINISTER'S LETTER TO SCIENTISTS**382. Dr EDWARDS to the minister for the Environment**

I refer to the minister's action in writing to the 500 scientists, who she claims were involved in the Regional Forest Agreement, to seek their consent for their names to be released.

- (1) How many scientists have responded to the 6 August deadline referred to in the minister's letter?
- (2) How many have consented to their names being released, and how many responded negatively?
- (3) Will the minister now table a list of all of scientists who consented to their names being released?
- (4) If not, when will the minister table that list?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question.

- (1)-(4) By the end of September 1999, 284 people had responded, either by consenting or not consenting to the release of their name in the list of scientists and experts who agreed to the Regional Forest Agreement process. Of those, 220 have consented; 64 have not. I give a commitment to table that paper either later today or during question time tomorrow. The list I have been given is not complete.

Dr Edwards: It is rather short of 500.

Mrs EDWARDES: I wrote to all of them, but only 284 have responded. Although the number who responded might be small, that is not to say all the people were not involved in the reports. I reiterate to the House that many of the scientists are documented in the references and bibliographies in all of the 43 reports which have been published and are available on the Internet.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE VEHICLES

383. Mr MASTERS to the Minister for Emergency Services:

State Emergency Service volunteers in my electorate advise me that just as the State Government is having to pay more for its leased vehicles, so they are being forced to pay double, or higher, premiums for their leased four-wheel drive vehicles. Is the minister investigating whether it is possible, and even desirable, for the arrangements of some years ago to be reinstated, whereby State Emergency Service groups bought their vehicles, rather than leased them?

Mr PRINCE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. I have had the issue investigated. All vehicles leased by the Fire and Rescue Service and the Fire and Emergency Services Authority, FESA, comply with State Government's vehicle policy. The State Emergency Service provides one vehicle to most, not quite all, SES volunteer units throughout the State, and at no cost to any of those units. A number of units have purchased a second vehicle for their purposes, and it may be that some of those are leased. My understanding is that most of them have been purchased by those units. As far as I am aware, they are not leased. The funding has come from a number of sources, including the Lotteries Commission; the commonwealth vehicle subsidy scheme; often through local government authorities with their support, but that is not always the case; and almost always through a lot of fundraising activities by the volunteers, their families and supporters. To my knowledge, there has been no change to that system. If the member wishes to obtain more detail from his sources, I will have the matter investigated in more detail to find out why they feel they are paying more.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION REGISTRY, LETTER ABOUT MISMANAGEMENT

384. Mr KOBELKE to the Minister for Labour Relations:

- (1) Did the minister receive correspondence from a judicial officer of the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission drawing his attention to mismanagement problems within the registry of the Industrial Relations Commission?
- (2) When did the minister first receive such correspondence?
- (3) What has the minister done to investigate and address mismanagement within the Industrial Relations Commission?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(3) To my knowledge, I have not received correspondence from a member of the commission. I will check through my office to see whether a letter came in. The allegations that have been reported in the media, as well as those raised in questions on notice by the member in that regard, have been referred to the Public Sector Management Office, where it is under review. Its report will go to the Premier, to whom it is responsible, and, in turn, I will be advised as the minister who has responsibility for the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission.

PYRAMID BEACH, ACCESS TO SWIMMERS

385. Mr MARSHALL to the minister representing the Minister for Transport:

It has been alleged that the sand bypassing operation used at the Dawesville Channel will prevent swimmers from accessing the much-used Pyramid Beach in that area. Can the minister confirm whether this is true, what time schedule is being adopted for the sand bypassing, and which area of the beach is available for surfers, swimmers and sun-loving families?

Mr OMODEI replied:

The Minister for Transport has provided the following response: Transport has no immediate plans to close public access to the sand trap beach to the south of the Dawesville Channel. Transport will continue to allow public access to the sand trap beach unless the safety of the public is put at risk. Should public safety become an issue, Transport will endeavour to limit any closure of the sand trap beach to the immediate area of the works if this can be done without affecting the bypassing operation; even then, the closure will be for only the period of the works.

The next bypassing session at Dawesville is likely to commence in November-December 1999. At present, bypassing operations are scheduled for weekdays only to allow uninhibited use of the beach during weekends. There are no immediate plans to change this procedure. However, it is possible for unusual weather conditions to produce excessive sand flow into the trap. If such a situation should occur, operations may be necessary for seven days a week for several months to avoid siltation of the channel and the erosion of the beaches to the north.

PLANTATION REVIEW

386. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Can the minister confirm that the Government's plantation review will now examine the resource potential of the existing private plantation estate?

- (2) Was the tender document for this review, which required an examination of only plantations managed by the Department of Conservation and Land Management, altered to include private plantations?
- (3) If no to (2), will the minister reopen tenders and rewrite the tender documents to include private plantations to ensure that consultants tender on the basis of review of both the public and private plantation resource?
- (4) If no to (3), why not?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(4) As I indicated in this place last week, term of reference No (3) of the review refers to how the existing plantations can meet the current and future needs of the industry. As such, the review incorporates what is available through the private sector.

Dr Edwards: The advertised tender referred to only plantations on CALM land.

Mrs EDWARDES: I refer the member to terms of reference Nos (3) and (4).

GREENOUGH, HERITAGE GRANTS

387. Mr MINSON to the Minister for Heritage:

In view of the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that this Government is concerned only with matters affecting the central business district of Perth, will the minister inform the House of any heritage grants allocated to the Greenough area?

Mr KIERATH replied:

I thank the member for his question. I am pleased to inform the House, and the Leader of the Opposition particularly, that Greenough has an admirable reputation for heritage conservation, and this Government is proud to assist people to maintain this reputation. The mid west region has received the bulk of heritage grants - namely, some \$191 600. The following sites in Greenough were the recipients of funding: The government buildings, Hackett's Cottage, the outbuilding behind St Peter's Church, the road board office, St Catherine's Hall, the Glengarry Stables Complex and Our Lady of Mt Carmel Church in Mullewa.

PINE PLANTATIONS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

388. Dr EDWARDS to the Minister for the Environment:

I refer to the minister's statement in this place last week that the Government had just received information from the private sector on its private plantations, and that some 18 000 hectares of such plantation may exist.

- (1) Can the minister explain why the database manager of the national forest inventory said last week that information on the breakdown of Western Australia's pine plantations into public and private ownership was provided by the Department of Conservation and Land Management?
- (2) Is the minister aware that this information was provided by CALM for the 30 June 1998 inventory, which was more than a year ago?
- (3) Can the minister explain why she said that the Government had just received this information when it has had the information for at least a year, and probably longer?

Mrs EDWARDES replied:

- (1)-(3) The information on the national database is not complete, and I think that was the matter referred to with regard to the debate last week. I further use this opportunity to explain that obviously in the course of doing the negotiations for Greenbushes, we were able to get far more information from the private sector, particularly about not just the number of hectares under cultivation but also the age, which allows people to schedule out for the long term to support a particular project.

ILLEGAL WEAPONS

389. Mr MASTERS to the Minister for Police:

A fairly recent report from New South Wales shows that illegal concealed weapons are still being confiscated from offenders at a high rate, suggesting that the supply routes for such weapons should also be targeted. Can the Minister advise whether the Western Australian Government is planning to put more effort into restricting the supply routes of illegal weapons?

Mr PRINCE replied:

I am pleased to say that the Weapons Act was proclaimed on 1 September, and it will come into operation, in the sense that it will be enforced strictly, on 1 March next year. That period of grace will allow people who otherwise have had legitimate possession of some of these articles to dispose of them. There will also be an awareness-raising campaign, which is part of the answer to the question. The Act will prohibit the export or import into this State, and the carriage, possession, manufacture, sale and purchase, of a stack of articles that are listed in the first schedule to the Act, some of which are controlled and some of which are prohibited. The Act is specifically designed and structured so that non-firearm weapons that have no peaceful purpose cannot be possessed, used or traded by people. Many of these weapons have been prohibited

imports into Australia for many years and include blowpipes, butterfly knives, flick knives, catapults or slingshots - and the member for Avon is distraught, because he had one when he was a bit younger - electric shock weapons, knuckledusters, switchblades and a lot of other stabbing or cutting weapons of that nature.

Control over supply routes occurs in two ways. Within the State and between the States, there is good cooperation among the police, and the police are pretty effective in using the information that they get to try to stop the carriage and supply of these things across state borders and also within the State; and I expect that as the Act is more strictly policed from 1 March next year, a greater number of these items will be removed from society. Australian Customs Service controls the importation of prohibited weapons and has been doing that for a long time. There are fairly strict penalties for moving prohibited weapons around the State or bringing them into Australia, the maximum penalty in each case being \$8 000 or two years' imprisonment.

NARROWS BRIDGE DUPLICATION, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STUDY

390. Ms MacTIERNAN to the minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is Main Roads WA reviewing an independent traffic management study into the Narrows Bridge duplication?
- (2) Does the report warn of traffic queues on Mounts Bay Road and Riverside Drive of up to five kilometres in length at any time that the Northbridge tunnel is closed?
- (3) Who prepared the traffic management report?
- (4) Will the minister table that report?

Mr OMODEI replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The Minister for Transport has provided the following response -

- (1)-(4) I am advised that Main Roads is not aware of any report that draws that conclusion. It would be appreciated if the member would provide additional information.

LESCHENAULT-BUNBURY AREA, MOSQUITO CONTROL

391. Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Can the minister detail the estimated extent of state assistance in 1999-2000, financial or otherwise, towards the control of mosquitoes in the Leschenault-Bunbury area?
- (3) What projections have been made of the incidence of mosquitoes in this area during the coming summer months, and what level of health risk can residents expect?

Mr DAY replied:

The Health Department has estimated that it will spend the following amounts on mosquito/Ross River virus surveillance and control during 1999-2000 in the Leschenault region -

Chemical larvicides for mosquito control - amount requested by the Leschenault Contiguous Local Authority Group under a formula for 50:50 funding for larvicides agreed to by Cabinet in 1990)	\$2 700
Funding for installation of runnelling at Knapps Channel wetland, Shire of Harvey	\$4 000
Helicopter for larviciding as necessary	Approximately \$5 000
Mosquito and Ross River virus surveillance	Approximately \$50 000
Total	\$61 700

Bureau of Meteorology predictions are for higher than average spring rains in the south west of Western Australia, which will facilitate high levels of mosquito breeding. High levels of Ross River virus activity are likely during the spring and summer of 1999-2000 in the south west of WA, including the Leschenault region.

Mr Kobelke: You should rely on the Bureau of Meteorology for hospital funding; it would be more reliable.

Mr DAY: One thing that happens with the funding of our hospitals is that it just keeps going up, but temperatures go up and down. I do not think I will take that advice.

RETAIL TRADING HOURS

392. Mr BROWN to the Minister for Fair Trading:

I refer to the Government's review of retail trading hours.

- (1) Has the Government made a decision on retail trading hours?
- (2) If so, what decision has been made?
- (3) If not, does the Government intend to make a decision before Christmas 1999 on trading hours, given that that decision will have a major impact on a considerable number of small retailers and small retail property owners?

Mr SHAVE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) We will make a decision when we have fully considered the report. The Government made a commitment prior to the last election that it would not be further deregulating trading hours during this term of government.

Dr Gallop: You also told us there would not be a gold royalty.

Mr SHAVE: I did not say that.

Dr Gallop: Your Government did.

Mr SHAVE: At this time I do not see any reason that the Government would not commit to the undertaking it gave.

Mr BROWN: A supplementary, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: I will wind up question time. I commend all members. I believe that we have had a good question time, with 21 questions in 33 minutes. Perhaps we learnt something last week.
