

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 8 May 1990

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett) took the Chair at 2.15 pm, and read prayers.

SENATE VACANCY

THE SPEAKER : I have a message from the Governor transmitting to the Legislative Assembly a copy of a despatch which he received from the Honourable the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia, notifying a vacancy in the representation of the State of Western Australia in the Senate. The letter from the President of the Senate is as follows -

Pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution, I notify Your Excellency that a vacancy has happened in the representation of the State of Western Australia through the resignation of Senator the Honourable Frederick Michael Chaney on this day.

On motion by Dr Lawrence (Premier) resolved -

That Mr Speaker be requested to confer with the President of the Legislative Council in order to fix a day and place whereon and whereat the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly, sitting and voting together, shall choose a person to hold the place of the senator whose place has become vacant.

PETITION - GRAYLANDS HOSPITAL

Prison-Forensic Unit - Establishment, Opposition

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [2.20 pm]: I have a petition which reads as follows -

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

We, the undersigned respectfully sheweth:

That the community is extremely concerned about Government plans to establish at Graylands Hospital a prison/forensic unit for mentally disordered offenders and persons who have committed serious offences but have been found "not guilty" by reason of insanity, particularly because such unit will now be in the heart of a residential area and close to a public primary school and private college and therefore your petitioners humbly request that:-

1. Plans to establish the prison/forensic unit be abandoned forthwith; and
2. Any future plan to open a prison/forensic unit within a populous suburb and next to schools and playgrounds be fully discussed with and justified to the community and all relevant authorities and interests before such future decision is made.

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

The petition bears 646 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 9.]

PETITION-RENAL DIALYSIS UNIT

Fremantle Hospital

MR KIERATH (Riverton) [2.22 pm]: I present the following petition -

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

We the undersigned hereby petition that a renal dialysis unit be established at Fremantle Hospital, thereby allowing patients ready access to extra life-saving

medical services. The Unit centred at Shenton Park is not easily accessible to patients south of the Swan River.

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

The petition bears 14 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 10.]

PETITION-WATER POLLUTION

Sand Patch West of Albany-Effluent Discharge Opposition

MR CUNNINGHAM (Marangaroo) [2.24 pm]: I present a petition as follows -

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

We the undersigned oppose the discharge of effluent and industrial waste into the water off the Sand Patch West of Albany.

With these waters being a major tourism, recreational and fishing area we feel that to pollute the waters with any discharge will adversely affect the livelihood of people connected with the above industries.

We ask that the Parliament ensure that there will be no water pollution on local beaches such as Mutton Bird, Torbay, Cosy Corner, Shelly Beach, Dunsbies and Nanarup to Cheynes Beach.

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

The petition bears 1 124 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 11.]

PETITION-EDGEWATER PRIMARY SCHOOL

Demountable Classroom Improvements

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley) [2.25 pm]: I have a petition which reads as follows -

To: The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, request your attention and assistance in improving the conditions in the Demountable Classrooms at Edgewater Primary School, which accommodate one third of the enrolled students.

We believe we are in an unusual situation in that we have seven permanent demountable classrooms, some of which have been at the school approximately 5 years, and it is envisaged that they will remain for approximately another ten years.

We feel that, bearing the above points in mind, Edgewater Primary School should be in the first group of Demountable Classrooms to be air conditioned under the Governments proposed scheme.

Although this is our major consideration, we also feel that the following matters should be rectified:-

1. No covered walkways between buildings.
2. Many buildings lack flyscreens.
3. Ablution facilities insufficient for the number of children.
4. No withdrawal areas to enable cross groupings.
5. No curtains or blinds to reduce sunlight, heat or glare.

6. Insufficient trees to offer shelter, although some trees have been supplied at our own expense.
7. Insufficient grassed areas for outside activities.
8. Walkways need a non-slip surface.

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

The petition bears 847 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 12.]

A similar petition was presented by Mrs Watkins (623 persons).

[See petition No 13.]

PETITION-POLICE STATION *Roleystone Area Establishment*

MR FRED TUBBY (Roleystone) [2.28 pm]: I have a petition couched in the following terms -

To: The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned hereby petition that a Police Station be established within the Roleystone area and so increase the safety and well being of the residents in the community.

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

The petition bears 598 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

[See petition No 14.]

STATEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Hansard - Distribution of Uncorrected Daily Copies

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnet): I advise members that late last year it was drawn to my attention that uncorrected copies of *Hansard* were being distributed. If that has occurred, I view the matter with concern. I remind members of the rules relating to distribution of uncorrected speeches and the daily *Hansard*. Members may obtain a copy of another member's speech as soon as it is available from the Hansard office on condition that the uncorrected speech may not be quoted or circulated. It is purely for the member's information. The daily *Hansard* is a proof issue only and is for the information of members and should not be quoted or distributed. It is not a corrected copy and therefore is not the official record of the parliamentary debates. Considerable legal ramifications may flow from such distribution.

I take this opportunity to remind members that corrections must be returned to the Hansard office by 4.00 pm on the following day. Corrections returned later than that will not be included in the final version of *Hansard*.

Point of Order

Mr LEWIS: Could you, Mr Speaker, for the benefit of the House advise at what time it would be opportune for members to use *Hansard* in the normal course?

The SPEAKER: Quite simply, members may utilise and circulate corrected copies of *Hansard*. That, in my view, is the yellow weekly *Hansard* and is certainly not the daily *Hansard*.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper

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

That a message be sent to the Council requesting that consideration of the following Bills be resumed -

1. Criminal Code Amendment (Incitement to Racial Hatred) Bill
2. Government Railways Amendment Bill
3. Mines Regulation Amendment Bill
4. Mining Amendment Bill (No.2)
5. Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Bill
6. State Employment and Skills Development Authority Bill
7. Tobacco Bill

MOTION - JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

Constitutional Reform

MR PEARCE (Armadale - Leader of the House) [2.38 pm]: On behalf of Mr Kobelke, I move -

- (1) A Joint Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council be appointed -
 - (a) to create opportunities for community discussion concerning possible areas of constitutional reform and to provide the Parliament with a reasoned summary of proposals for reform;
 - (b) to give consideration to consolidating the law, practice and Statutes comprising the Constitution of Western Australia; and
 - (c) to make recommendations concerning making this body of law and practice more readily accessible by the citizens of this State.
- (2) The Committee consist of six members of whom three shall be appointed by the Legislative Assembly and three by the Legislative Council.
- (3) The Committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from time to time and from place to place, and, except as hereinafter provided, to sit on any day and at any time.
- (4) The Committee shall not sit while either House is actually sitting unless leave is granted by that House.
- (5) The Committee shall report by 21 October 1990.
- (6) A quorum for a meeting is four, provided that each House is represented at all times.
- (7) A report of the Committee shall be presented in writing to each House by a member of the Committee nominated for that purpose.
- (8) That in respect of matters not provided for in this resolution, the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly relating to Select Committees shall be followed as far as they can be applied.

This motion relates to the reappointment of a joint Select Committee established last year by this House. It lapsed with the prorogation of Parliament a week before Parliament sat. As the centenary of responsible government in Western Australia will occur soon, the Government proposes to reconstitute this committee to consider questions relating to the Constitution and to report to Parliament.

Mr Blaikie: It is a pity the member for Nollamara wasn't here to present the motion himself.

Question put and passed.

MOTION - JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

Constitutional Reform

MR PEARCE (Armadale - Leader of the House) [2.42 pm]: I move -

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting it of this resolution and requesting it to agree to the appointment of a Joint Select Committee and to appoint members accordingly.

In response to the interjection by the member for Vasse, the member for Nollamara discussed with me whether we should proceed with this motion today, having given notice of it last Thursday, or whether we should leave it on the Notice Paper until he returned. I believe matters should be dealt with at the time they appear on the Notice Paper; if that means that someone else will move them - if they are only procedural - so be it. The member for Nollamara was perfectly happy to have the motion left on the Notice Paper until he could be present. However, if the member wishes to have it deferred for a day or two, I will acquiesce.

Mr Blaikie: I heard what you said, and you will live to eat those words when you defer matters on the Notice Paper to suit your purpose when you find they are sensitive.

Mr PEARCE: The work of this committee is too important to be left on the Notice Paper until the member for Nollamara returns. If the committee wants less time to work, the Opposition has only to say that. The way this matter is being dealt with is fair. However, it is not fair to reflect on the member for Nollamara because the decision to deal with this motion today was mine. If the member for Vasse wishes to reflect on anybody, he should reflect on me.

Question put and passed.

PROMPT PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Lewis, and read a first time.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR TROY (Swan Hills - Minister for Productivity and Labour Relations) [2.43 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Government, with the full support of the Tripartite Labour Consultative Council, has undertaken a review of the legislation and administration of workers' compensation in Western Australia. Based on extensive consultation amongst the memberships of the bodies represented on the tripartite council and 25 responses to a discussion paper circulated to relevant interested parties, recommendations for reform of both the legislation and administrative arrangements have been developed.

This Bill represents a major initiative by the Government to reduce both the suffering of injured workers and costs to employers. I believe that the reforms have set new directions for workers' compensation in Western Australia and will receive widespread acceptance and support from interested parties. The review represents a further example of how the tripartite consultative processes established by the present State Government can identify important labour relations issues and generate constructive solutions. The Government will continue the process of consultation to ensure that the Workers' Compensation and Assistance Act, when amended, provides a responsive and responsible workers' compensation system best suited to the needs of the Western Australian community.

The need for reform: Workers' compensation premiums in Western Australia currently cost employers \$323 million a year and constitute a major component of labour on-costs. Reforms which can control workers' compensation costs, while making the system more responsive to the needs of workers, will therefore improve productivity and profitability of Western Australian enterprises.

The tripartite council identified the following primary areas of concern regarding the current workers' compensation system -

1. The lack of reliable data on the operation and performance of the system;
2. the predominant emphasis on the payment of compensation rather than returning the injured worker to gainful employment;
3. the barriers to more active participation by employers in their insurance cover and claims management;
4. the prolonged delays in the resolution of disputed claims, and
5. the lack of incentive to all parties to minimise the number and duration of claims.

These concerns, against a background of repeated piecemeal amendments to the Act, led to the implementation of the wide-ranging review of the legislation and its operation. Government support for a general review of workers' compensation was based on an examination from first principles.

In undertaking the review, the tripartite council recognised that effective strategies of prevention can have a major impact on the number and severity of occupational accidents and diseases. It noted that responsibility for development for such strategies rests with the Department of Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare and that the workers' compensation system can play an important and supportive role in this context.

The initial and subsequent review by the tripartite council was based on the following broad principles -

1. The maintenance of reasonable living standards for the injured worker which involves both income replacement and covering medical and like expenses arising from the injury or disease;
2. giving major emphasis to the return of the injured worker to gainful employment through coordinated rehabilitation programs;
3. providing incentives and information support or prevention, and
4. the efficient administration of the scheme to the benefit of employers, workers, insurers and service providers

The reforms arising from the review cover the following major areas: Claim and dispute procedures; information; rehabilitation; and system control and administration. Further to this, the tripartite council recommended the establishment of a program of ongoing review to monitor and evaluate the impact of the proposed reforms which this Government has accepted. An ongoing review will ensure that the workers' compensation system remains fair and equitable to workers and employers and is responsive to developments in the workplace.

I turn now to the specific features of the Bill. The Bill specifies a clearly defined procedure and time frame for the processing of claims and contains measures to expedite the resolution of disputed claims. The employer will be required to forward a claim to the insurer within three working days of the worker giving notice of a claim to the employer or as soon as practicable thereafter. Within 14 days of the insurer receiving the claim from the employer, the insurer is either to accept the claim, or notify the Workers' Compensation Board that the claim has been rejected, or that more time is required to decide the claim. This requirement will counteract a significant area of delay and will provide for involvement of the board as soon as a dispute or possible delay arises. The Bill proposes to confer on the existing non-legal members of the Workers' Compensation Board the status of commissioner with power to hear disputes pertaining to rehabilitation, health care expenses and travelling expenses. It is anticipated that this initiative will result in more expedient dispute settling in these areas.

Importantly, in determining appeals against an insurer or an employer who has served a notice of intention to discontinue or reduce weekly payments, the board will have the power to take account of the efforts of the employer and the worker in respect of rehabilitation. This provision reflects the Government's concern that such notices at present can be issued in the absence of any rehabilitation effort by the worker, the employer or the insurer.

Comprehensive, reliable and timely information on the operation of the workers' compensation system is essential to its effective management and continuing improvement. The Government, therefore, has accepted tripartite council's proposal that a database be established to register details of individual claims and individual policies. Work on this project has already been commenced by the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Commission. Provisions in the Bill will enhance the commission's ability to collect timely and accurate data from insurers and self insurers. This is to be combined with the introduction of a new scheme for the approval of insurers which gives major emphasis to their responsibility to provide information to the commission.

Rehabilitation: A range of reforms is to be introduced which will broaden the options for injured workers and reduce both the economic cost and human suffering associated with work related injury and disease. Each claim notification to the commission will require an estimate of whether the injured worker is likely to be off work for more than four weeks, with the intention that the employer will give immediate consideration to rehabilitation, if this is deemed appropriate. At present, there is no requirement for any action to be taken before 12 weeks of lost time. Earlier effective intervention with rehabilitation processes will significantly reduce unnecessary delays and costs associated with protracted claims. At present, only five per cent of lost time claims run for longer than six months, but they account for more than 60 per cent of lost time costs. This highlights the potential for early intervention and the appropriate use of rehabilitation programs. Powers are to be introduced to enable the commission to appoint a rehabilitation advisory committee to advise it on all rehabilitation matters. Among other duties, the committee will advise the commission on the formal accreditation of public and private sector rehabilitation service providers. The Bill requires all providers of vocational rehabilitation to be approved, thus ensuring that costs and quality of service are closely monitored in the rehabilitation area.

To encourage increased use of approved rehabilitation services, new specific funding for vocational rehabilitation will be introduced. Payments under the Act for these services will be identified separately and will be subject to a maximum of seven per cent - which currently represents \$5 600 - of the prescribed amount, to help ensure that vocational rehabilitation is properly targeted and to avoid excessive cost blow-outs, which are a feature of some of the Eastern States' schemes.

The Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Commission has already established a high quality, multi-disciplinary vocational rehabilitation service which will operate in open competition with the private sector. Through competition, cost effective vocational rehabilitation will be available to assist disabled workers. The injured worker will have complete freedom of choice of rehabilitation provider and may select either the commission or an approved rehabilitation provider.

To facilitate the development and implementation of vocational rehabilitation schemes, the commission will be empowered to assist in and promote the establishment of employer-based and group rehabilitation services, the latter providing a means for small business to access appropriate forms of rehabilitation. The commission will also be required to promote the establishment of employer-based rehabilitation policies and vocational rehabilitation guidelines.

System control and administration: The Government has consistently acknowledged that the key parties with an interest in workers' compensation are employers, workers and the Government. To this end the Government has decided that membership of the commission is to be enlarged by adding a further employer and a trade union representative. Further, the medical practitioner on the commission, who currently is required to be a public servant, may in future be drawn from either the public or the private sector. With these changes, it is considered the commission will more appropriately represent the interests of all the parties involved in workers' compensation. In recognition of the direct interest that employers and workers have in all aspects of the workers' compensation system, the reforms provide that the setting of medical and other health care fees is to involve the commission.

Amendments to the procedure for recovery of avoided premiums, and greater flexibility for inspectors to conduct written and telephone inquiries, will help to reduce under-insurance by some employers. In addition, it is proposed that the Act will require self insurers to demonstrate that they possess sufficient financial and material resources in the State. This

will ensure consistency with the conditions for approved insurers and will enable the commission to implement new guidelines for self insurers in the areas of prevention, rehabilitation and claims handling. These changes should reduce significantly the unfair burden on those employers who are properly insured.

The Government further recognises that successful reform of the scheme is vitally dependent upon increasing the awareness of all the parties of their rights and responsibilities under the Act. This fundamental but important aspect has been addressed through the recent establishment of an advisory services branch in the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Commission. This branch has responsibility for the more effective distribution of information to employers, workers, service providers and the community.

In conclusion, the reforms contained in this Bill have been developed on a consensus basis and represent a major achievement of the Government in the area of labour relations and improving the State's productivity. Unlike the reform of workers' compensation undertaken in some other Australian States, the tripartite consultative processes in Western Australia have achieved reform in this important area on a consensus basis. In addition to amending the legislation, the Government will be working to ensure that the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Commission improves the administration of the Act. Various recommendations by the Tripartite Labour Consultative Council on administrative matters, as indicated previously, have been referred to the commission for implementation.

I make special mention of the significant contribution of the Tripartite Labour Consultative Council, and, in particular, thank Brendan McCarthy, Tony Cooke, Martin Broad, Neil Bartholomaeus, Peter Wilkins and Harry Neesham. I believe these reforms set a new direction for workers' compensation in establishing rehabilitation as a primary focus and involving employers and workers more closely in the effective administration of the scheme.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Kierath.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 3 May.

MR DONOVAN (Morley) [2.59 pm]: My contribution to this debate will focus on the progression of the State Government's orderly and planned program for the development and implementation of its social justice policy. Although the concept of social justice is extremely important to members on this side of the House and to our typical constituency, it is a concept that has been quite poorly understood in many parts of the community, including the political and parliamentary community. That is notwithstanding the quite major initiatives made federally in the area of social justice policy and the concrete steps towards its implementation that the Federal Government has taken since 1986.

This afternoon I want briefly to canvas what social justice means in principle and in practical terms; what is its value and ethical basis; how one measures it, because that is important from a parliamentary point of view; what Government is doing about the development and implementation of social justice policies; and finally, to look at Parliament's role, which will grow in connection with social justice in parallel with the Government's rate of implementation of its social justice program.

The first thing to try to make concrete is the question of what social justice means as a public policy and as a Government strategy. Perhaps I can best express it in these terms: Social justice until now in this State has often been talked of, certainly among conservative circles, in the context of welfare. Social justice is seen as yet another Labor Party welfare measure. Welfare traditionally is about caring for victims of unfair and unjust resource distribution practices based on ideas of redistribution which have been institutionalised in politics and in society until very recent times. Its value base is charity. Social justice, on the other hand, is about fairness and justice; it is about responsibility, specifically social responsibility, in the way we go about distributing resources and responsibilities in economic, social and political fields. It is about what Australians have called for many years "a fair go". It is what Ben Chifley meant by "the light on the hill". Whereas traditionally welfare has been about

poverty relief, social justice is about resource redistribution, and so quite different concepts with quite different consequences in political and administrative terms apply.

Social justice is a very practical concept. Social justice has to do with fair outcomes and fair shares, not just fair rights and fair opportunities, although obviously it includes those. For example, as my colleague the member for Pilbara pointed out in this debate last week, it is not just about equal rights for access to the law. It is not just that, as a result of one citizen's economic means, he or she cannot gain access to the legal process over the same issue as can a more resourced person or a corporate body in our community. That may well be a question of opportunity but it is certainly not an application of justice.

That brings me to the value basis of social justice as a political strategy and as an administrative measure. Social justice rests on four fundamental principles or key objectives, the first is the notion of equity. That is access to and distribution and receipt of resources of all kinds, which are distributed on an equitable basis; not simply on the basis of one's ability to get something, but on the basis of one's social and political right to something. The second principle is one of equity of access. I mentioned this in the law example. I understand my colleague, the member for Belmont, will be making some reference to this question in a subsequent statement about the medical area. The question of equity of access has to do with the facility with which one citizen can avail himself or herself of public resources as against the facility with which others can do likewise. That leads to the third principle of social justice, which is the question of access itself.

We have had some fine examples in this State over the last couple of years where, for instance, access to housing has been made in concrete terms much more readily available to large sections of the less wealthy in our population than it has ever been in the past. The principle behind that policy of this State Government is one of access. Access to basic fundamentals like housing, food, medical care and so on should be available on the basis of need and right rather than on the basis simply of ability to pay. The principle of access applies also to decision making resources. Access to a departmental or other authority is important for every citizen's ability to live his daily life and meet his daily needs; it is not simply for those who are well equipped to gain access to those authorities and departments.

The fourth principle upon which social justice is based is one of participation. It is an important principle of social justice that people everywhere are able to participate actively and effectively in their communities in public life and in social life, and are able to do that and are indeed encouraged to do that in effective ways rather than, for instance, the principle which has often applied in the past where, almost by definition, participation in decision making and in community life is exclusively the province of a privileged few.

The value basis of social justice is one of social responsibility rather than private privilege. How do we measure the application and the development of social justice principles? The first way is one of reviewing existing policies and programs at a Government level to assess what impact those programs are having in terms of those four key objectives. Secondly, it is important to establish a data base across all portfolios eventually, but certainly in the short term across human resources or human service portfolios so that social justice impact indicators can be developed to enable us to measure the rate of progress of that policy. Thirdly it is necessary to develop specific and general targets for social policy. This State Government can be seen to have developed some of those targets in certain key human service areas, particularly those of health, housing and social welfare.

Finally, an important step in the measurement of social justice principles is the Budget and Cabinet submissions that occur in the context of annual Budgets. These Cabinet and Budget submissions would need to include social justice impact statements.

To summarise so far, as a policy social justice offers a planned and systematic framework for political decision making based on four principal objectives that are underpinned by a value of social responsibility. An important departure in public administration terms, therefore, in the application of a social justice model for Government administration is the departure from the marketplace philosophy and from the bureaucracy based philosophy. That is the key to a social justice approach to administration.

An obvious question to ask now is, "What is the Government doing about it?" The major early initiatives of social justice have occurred at a national level. In 1986 the National

Conference of the Australian Labor Party set out its agenda for a social justice program in Australia. That has since been established within the Office of the Prime Minister, and there are portfolio guidelines for implementation across all the human service portfolios of the Federal Administration. They include databases and indices and, more recently, members will be aware of publications that have been sent out from the Office of the Prime Minister touching a whole range of portfolio areas and adjudging them on the basis of their social justice impact.

At a State Government level the Australian Labor Party in this State, at its State Conferences in 1988 and 1989, set out a similar agenda for the achievement of social justice in Western Australia. That has been reflected very largely in this Government's Budgets, over the last two years particularly; indeed, I have mentioned those in another debate. At a parliamentary level we have established a caucus committee with the specific responsibility of looking at social justice in Western Australia. More recently the Premier, herself a lifetime supporter of the principles of social justice, has alluded to that policy both in the Governor's Speech and, before that, in her recent speech to the Western Australian Press Club. More practically, the Government has now set about developing a strategy for implementation over the next few years. The Minister for Justice, under the Premier, has been delegated responsibility for a ministerial working party to consider the development and implementation of a State Government social justice strategy. Indeed, it is my privilege to have been invited to chair that working party, to report to Government, through the Minister, on progress, and to make social justice criteria concrete, measurable and accountable within the State Government in Western Australia.

That brings me to the role of Parliament in social justice and monitoring the Government's performance in social justice terms. My Federal colleague, Hon Robert Tickner, made this point last year when he was then Chairman of the Federal Public Accounts Committee. His view was that it is certainly Parliament's role to consider the policies upon which a Government has been elected, but to go one step further and to scrutinise and adjudge that Government on the basis of its performance in those policy areas. Hon Robert Tickner applied the same criteria to the development of social justice at the Federal level. He regarded it as quite central to the parliamentary process through all of its facilities to monitor, scrutinise and evaluate the Federal Government's movement towards social justice. I would take his point and recommend that to this House as a practice that it ought to adopt. That seems to me to be central to the accountability argument that has been made much of in this House, and of course it is central to the question of legislation as and when - or if - legislation is needed from time to time to improve or cement the implementation of social justice in Western Australia.

In drawing to a close that part of my speech, what I have attempted to do is to suggest to the House that social justice, first of all, is not a welfare concept; it is much more than that. It is not an abstract idea that simply preoccupies members on this side of the House when they have little else to do but perhaps debate the finer points of ideology. It is very much a concrete and practical administrative framework which takes us, in the public level of Government administration, away from the marketplace into a level of social responsibility. The challenge in this House is really to the Opposition parties and, indeed, to the Parliament as a whole to attempt to understand and come to terms with a policy of social justice to which this Government appears to be committed, to attempt to understand and come to terms with the way that policy will be implemented across a range of portfolios, and to make that attempt in at least as enthusiastic a way as they attempt to scrutinise and monitor the Government's economic and administrative performance.

It is not, in my view, an issue that the Parliament should take lightly. I agree firmly with the position put by Hon Robert Tickner in the Federal House that it is an issue that Parliaments ought to take most seriously, at least as seriously as they take their responsibilities in scrutinising the Government's performance in other areas. I would hope that in doing that - in coming to terms with social justice strategies as a means of public administration - we will see better from this Parliament than we have seen, certainly over the last week and, indeed, over the last year in its performance in other areas. It is very difficult for the public, and certainly it is difficult for me, to get a sense of seriousness about this Parliament and about the way it is or is not scrutinising the Government's performance and application of policy when we see the Parliament reduced to something of a plaything, to an arena in which the

opposing parties particularly joust and rival with each other for the right to be recognised in a leading role, and we see parties in this Parliament effectively taking strike action rather than taking seriously the question of legislation and legislative review. To see Parliament reduced to those terms certainly does not fill me and, I suggest, members of the public with great confidence in its ability to take on something as complex and as important administratively as the development of a social justice approach to Government and administration.

Mr House: I will tell you what the public would like before they want what you want to give them. They want to know what this Government has done with a whole range of taxpayers' money which has not been accounted for. When you make accusations like these, why do you and your Government not deliver to the people of this State a responsible answer to questions about the money that has gone down the WA Inc gurgler? When you do that, we will be in a position to consider other legislation.

Mr DONOVAN: That sounds like the sort of reasoned interjection for which the Deputy Leader of the National Party has become known in this place. However, it is not a reasoned interjection because it suggests that those things are not being done when clearly they are being done. The interjection is unreasoned because it suggests a level of credibility and importance being given to changing demands for different things in the other place and in this place over different weeks and over a year in this Parliament.

I do not know how a Parliament can be taken seriously when it presents to the public the evidence which has been presented in some of the charades conducted here. What is being overlooked and therefore, in my view, risks being ignored further is the systematic and orderly way in which this Government has gone about shifting the emphasis of the Government and the Administration from privilege to social responsibility, and from economic issues alone. Certainly in its first few years the Labor Government of this State had to be preoccupied with developing economic goals, since so much had been lost or ransomed by earlier Administrations. Over the past couple of years, having achieved those economic goals, the Government has moved along the path of achieving its important social goals, and the rationale for that is a fundamental principle of social justice. As I said before - indeed as former Premiers have said before - the whole purpose of economic development at the State level is for the distribution of resources and benefits of development to the population as a whole. That is a new concept in Western Australia; it has been around only since February 1983.

That is what is different; that is the challenge which is being taken on. This Government has moved to its next orderly step, its next progressive stage, which is to cement those social objectives into a concrete framework of social justice. That is a pattern which is being taken up by other Parliaments of the Commonwealth, certainly at the Federal level. Outside this place moves are being made every day of the week towards the application of social justice in Western Australia. At local government level, in non-Government organisations and in community groups around the metropolitan and country areas, people are playing a much greater role than previously in the development and delivery of a range of services and support systems of both economic and social kinds. Certainly the mood is ripe in the community and the challenge is now much more concrete; that challenge is being taken on. The Labor Party in this State and elsewhere has a very strong commitment to the principles of social justice; the Labor Party in this State and elsewhere has called upon its Government wings to implement the social justice policies which have been thought out. It is the case that the Government wings of the Australian Labor Party in Australia are implementing those principles. What is not the case is that conservative parties in Australia - and particularly in Western Australia - have not come to terms with the reality of social justice as a policy. There has not yet been a development in the Oppositions in our Parliaments - not just in this Parliament - of a concrete commitment to scrutinise, monitor and evaluate Government on its commitment to social justice policies. The Labor Party does not shirk from that view. Indeed even in its preselecting measures we can see the same policy applied. If I may take a liberty, Mr Speaker, and refer members to the ALP candidates in the forthcoming by-elections in Maylands and Fremantle, both of them have very strong backgrounds in and commitments towards this policy of social justice. That will be seen and heard in both those electorates and will be a very important basis upon which electors in those electorates will judge those candidates. It will certainly be the hallmark of the activities of both those candidates when they end up in this place, as they both surely will.

In conclusion, the concreteness of social justice as a policy applies in principles of equity, equal rights, access and participation. Those are concrete ideas which have been turned into a concrete framework by progressive Labor Governments, and not just in this State. The challenge to Parliament is to understand and come to terms with those concepts because increasingly they are the criteria upon which Budget decisions will be made. It seems that in this Parliament Budgets at least have become important areas for scrutiny. I hope that in 1990 and subsequent years the Opposition will be able to look at those Budgets and budgetary submissions from the point of view of the way in which they go about achieving social justice objectives. If Parliament is able to do that, a lot of confidence will be restored in its processes and we will move on to better and more progressive days.

MR HOUSE (Stirling) [3.28 pm]: I wish to take the opportunity in this Address-in-Reply debate to canvass a number of issues which directly affect my constituents. I am sorry that the Minister for Fisheries is not here and I hope that if he is in the building, he will come into the Chamber because I wish to bring to the attention of the Parliament issues relating to the salmon fishing industry.

The Minister for Fisheries last year imposed a quota system on the south coast salmon fishing industry. That industry was established many years ago and a number of families have fished those beaches in the southern region for a long time. In his wisdom, the Minister decided that the industry should have a quota imposed on it, and that has brought a great deal of hardship to many people down there.

The Minister decided that the south coast beaches would be given a quota of a total catch of approximately 1 200 tons of salmon per annum on the west coast. The Minister stated that not enough fish were coming around the corner at Leeuwin for the amateur fishermen to catch; therefore, something had to be done to ensure the continuation of amateur fishing on the west coast. I have no argument with that. Indeed, as someone who enjoys amateur fishing, I am pleased that steps have been taken to protect the amateur fisherman. However, the action of the Minister has been totally misplaced because it will not affect the number of fish caught by amateurs.

The average salmon catch on the south coast over the last 26 years has been 1 536 tons; the 20 year average has been 1 350 tons. Historically, it is clear that there is not a great deal of difference between the quota set by the Minister and the number of fish caught. Over the years variations have occurred in the number of fish caught because salmon fishing is an opportunistic industry; in other words, the fish must come to the fisherman as he waits on the beach; it is easy for fish to escape being caught as they have the added advantage in that the fisherman cannot fish at night, and if the weather is rough, the fisherman cannot pull his net. In some years - as the data indicates - the catch is as low as half the average and in other years it is double that average; therefore, this balances itself out over the years.

When the Minister imposes a quota, as he did this year, the quota may be caught by the end of March yet many hundreds of tons of salmon may be available. Obviously, this is a disadvantage to the professional fisherman. Also, this affects the team working with him, the people who transport the fish and those working in the processing industry. The number of people affected can be determined by multiplying the number of fishermen by a substantial figure.

Mr Gordon Hill: Will you acknowledge that flexibility is provided in that the Director of Fisheries can increase the quota of the catch?

Mr HOUSE: Yes, I will mention that later.

I have information which indicates that approximately 30 per cent of the salmon that are in our waters are caught every year. Therefore, we do not need quotas.

Mr Gordon Hill: Where did you get that data from?

Mr HOUSE: It came from the WA Marine Laboratory Research Institute. It states that 30 per cent of all salmon are caught by professional fishermen.

Mr Gordon Hill: Your figure is wrong. Thirty per cent of the total catch is caught by amateur fishermen.

Mr HOUSE: It states that 30 per cent of all salmon out there are caught by professional fishermen - however, the Minister can argue that point if he wishes.

It is not the case that too many fish are caught on the south coast, as the current in the area fluctuates with warm and cold currents. The warm current dissuades the salmon from turning the corner and entering the fishing beaches. At the moment the currents are cold and these are bringing plenty of fish with them. That fact will not change irrespective of whether a quota system exists. Plenty of salmon are there to be caught by professional and amateur fishermen and a quota system is not necessary to restrict the catches of professional fishermen. The catches are determined by factors such as the weather, the inability to fish at night and the fact that the fish must come to the beach. The tuna industry is different as it uses modern technology to identify and catch the fish.

The Minister indicated by way of interjection that he wished me to acknowledge that he will review the quota system. I urge the Minister strongly to remove the quota on the salmon fishing industry as every indication is that the quota has made no difference to the number of fish available to amateur fishermen. Also, the livelihoods of many professional fishermen, the people who fish with them, the people who work in the processing plants and the people who transport the fish are at risk as a result of the system. The historical data regarding catches indicates that on average 1 536 tons of fish were caught 20 years ago. At that time seven more beaches were being fished by 13 more teams of fishermen. A significant reduction has come about as a result of economic factors in the industry. So, in effect, the industry has a system of self-imposed quotas.

Mr Taylor: I nearly caught a salmon at Rottneest the other week!

Mr HOUSE: The Minister has too much time on his hands; he should have been working.

Mr Gordon Hill: I gave authority to the Director of Fisheries to increase the allowed catch this season if necessary. We are implementing a thorough review of the salmon fishery this year. I gave the Director of Fisheries the authority - independent of any decisions I have made, or will make in the future - to increase the total allowable catch this year in each area. In fact, it was increased from 1 200 tons of salmon on the south coast to somewhere in the vicinity of 1 500 tons of fish.

Mr HOUSE: That was as a result of the fact that when the 1 200 ton limit was reached no fish at all had been caught at some beaches.

Mr Gordon Hill: We wanted to ensure that there was equity across the beaches with the different fishermen.

Mr HOUSE: While some beaches do not catch fish until April, others such as Cheynes and Bremer Bay have been consistently catching fish; figures which have been kept since the 1960s - all fisherman do so - which indicate that this is so. Other beaches can fluctuate by 150 tons in the amount of fish caught each year. That is another reason why the quota system will not work. The control should be left to the natural factors because the catch has not really changed over 20 years.

Mr Gordon Hill: The main purpose of introducing the quota was in response to requests from the south coast fishermen who wanted me to lift the limit on the sale of salmon for bait purposes. I lifted that limit from eight to 18 tons of fish. I thought it was appropriate to impose a quota on the catch at the same time to protect the fishing industry, although I had to take the various sectors into account. However, this was a temporary measure for this season.

Mr HOUSE: The increase in the bait quota did not increase the tonnage of salmon caught, and it never will. Does the Minister acknowledge that?

Mr Gordon Hill: I acknowledge that it would if there was a better price for salmon caught for bait purposes.

Mr HOUSE: The fish available at the beach are caught. Whether or not they are sold for bait purposes depends on the price, and not the number caught.

Mr Gordon Hill: Professional fishermen argue that if they get a better price for salmon caught for bait purposes, they will put more effort into that, and historically that has been the case.

Mr HOUSE: I have indicated quite clearly that it does not matter how much effort is put in, it is such an opportunistic fishery that it has not changed during 20 years despite the fact that

technology has changed. The Minister has intimated that the south coast fishermen approached him with a request to impose quotas.

Mr Gordon Hill: No, I did not. They approached me with a request to lift the limit on the sale of salmon for bait purposes. When that was increased it was felt appropriate at the same time to impose this year a total allowable catch on the fishery. After lengthy discussions with the professional and recreational fishermen and members of the processing industry, I thought it was the best course of action as a temporary measure.

Mr HOUSE: I want it clearly on the record that the south coast fishermen did not request the Minister to impose quotas. I repeat my call to the Minister to reconsider the whole quota system. As I have indicated to him privately, I am more than happy to discuss this matter with him and to detail the situation of some of those fishing teams. I am sure the member for Albany would like to be part of those discussions because he was present at a meeting of fishermen in Albany a couple of weeks ago, during which between 30 and 40 fishermen expressed concern about their welfare and future. Some of the younger fishermen are particularly concerned.

Mr Gordon Hill: I am happy to discuss the matter with you. I am equally open minded on the issue; I want to ensure the continuation of that fishery for the professional fishermen, and a sharing of the resources between all sectors.

Mr HOUSE: I turn now to a matter that is near and dear to my heart; that is, the Fitzgerald River National Park which was so badly devastated by fire last summer. I have lived adjacent to that park all my life; I have camped in the park, I have travelled through it to go fishing, and I have enjoyed all the benefits it has to offer, including the many rare flora and fauna and its rugged beauty. It saddened me greatly when I flew over it in February to see the devastation caused by the fires which had raged out of control in the park. That devastation is so enormous that one must see it to believe it.

Mr Taylor: What is it like now?

Mr HOUSE: I have not seen it from the air since it has rained and I imagine that it is now starting to recover. I do not know whether the Minister saw the national park immediately after the fires occurred. It was a dreadful sight and any person with any concern for conservation, particularly in that park, could not help but feel saddened at the condition of the park.

The Waychinicup reserve, which is closer to Albany, was completely burnt and every hectare was destroyed in a separate fire which occurred at the same time. The severity of that fire falls into the same category as the fire at the Fitzgerald River National Park. I bring this matter to the attention of the Parliament and the Minister because it is my considered opinion, after talking to the people involved in fighting the fires, and the Department of Conservation and Land Management officers responsible for the management of the park, and having attended a public meeting at Mt Barker a few weeks ago to discuss management of national parks, that CALM must change the way it is supposedly protecting our national parks. I do not want to go overboard in my criticism, but I want to achieve a practical solution to the problem we are facing. If the current policy is not changed and if something is not done about it quickly, it is possible that the other half of the Fitzgerald River National Park will burn next year and other parks will face similar problems.

One of the reasons for the present problem is that CALM has set itself impossible goals. The Department of Conservation and Land Management was born from the amalgamation of a number of Government departments, including the former parks, forests and reserves board. Since that time a number of plans have been formulated to manage the national parks but many of them have been impractical in their application. For example, the plan to burn the Fitzgerald River National Park was drawn up using a square grid system. Anybody who has fought a fire knows that it is absolutely impossible to burn off using a square grid system. While all the theory on the conditions necessary before dropping the match may be correct, the practical effect is that those conditions will never be achieved, with the result that the fuel building up in the park will never burn in such a way that it will act as a protective barrier. I suggest that a system of strip burning is needed, allowing the fire to run in peaks and strips, as it naturally does. If that were done over a number of years - bearing in mind that half the park will regenerate after the next rain - on a five or seven year cycle, when the next natural

fire hits those strips that have been burned in the first, second or third years, it will stop. One of the fires that occurred in the park this year was so severe that nothing would have stopped it but under normal circumstances the system I have outlined would work. People with the necessary expertise, such as Keith Brighard who works in one of the ministerial departments and has lived and worked in Hopetoun most of his life, would be of great help to the Minister. We cannot continue fooling ourselves with the thought that a plan has been put on paper. There are reams of such plans, but we should be doing more than write about the problem. A workshop of the Department of Conservation and Land Management was held at Busselton and a document entitled "Fire Management on Nature Conservation Lands" contains excerpts from papers presented by people from around Australia. It is interesting to note that not one farmer or local fire control officer is included in the four-page list of acknowledgments of people who presented papers. I do not think farmers have all the knowledge about fire management, but many farmers have a great deal of knowledge which has been built up over a lifetime of fighting natural fires in their natural environment. Many CALM officers do not know a good fire from a bad one. We must solve this problem and also determine who will be in charge of fires when they occur. The unenviable situation occurred last year when some of the good-hearted and good-natured firefighters refused to fight fires in the park because they believed they were being put in a dangerous position by people who did not understand the fire. The iniquitous situation also occurred of people refusing to allow burning back on their properties because nobody knew who was in charge of the fire and who would give the orders. I ask members to imagine a farmer's pastures, which are part of his livelihood, being burned as early as January; with the fire approaching the property there is no time to sort out the priorities. Those priorities must be sorted out quickly by the Minister in a way which solves this problem. We must reach a practical solution or more of our national parks and beautiful nature reserves will look like the Fitzgerald River National Park looked at the end of February. I am certain that people do not want to see the death and destruction not only of plants and trees but also of birds and animal life, as that is sad to see.

I turn to a matter near and dear to your heart, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt), and as you are in the Chair at present you will not be able to interject on me even if I steal your ideas. I refer to the problem of pollution in the Princess Royal and Oyster Harbours at Albany. This problem needs to be addressed much more quickly than presently is the case. Most people in the region are aware that the principal agricultural officer researching this problem resigned not long ago and has not yet been replaced. I am sure that all members interested in that area hope that somebody will be placed in that position as soon as possible so that research work can continue.

A number of theories have been espoused about the way in which pollution in these harbours can be reduced. Most people would agree that a number of things are now being done. It is important that we protect the industry in that area which creates the employment on which Albany and its hinterland feed. To that end your suggestion, Mr Acting Speaker, that a pipe be installed at Government expense to take effluent from those industries along the harbour foreshore is an excellent one which has my support. I understand that the Minister for Water Resources intends to visit the Albany region to consider this proposal in the near future because of your initiative. I hope he sees the sense of this suggestion and sees his way clear to have the Government provide funding for this effluent pipe.

There is a definite need to speed up the construction of a sewage treatment plant to replace the Point King plant servicing the Town of Albany. On a number of occasions I have called publicly for a tertiary treatment plant for Albany. I do not think that any other sort of treatment plant would be good enough for that area, which is environmentally fragile. It is time that Western Australia established its first tertiary treatment plant for sewage. It should be used as a pilot plant for other areas of this State; it is time that the Government acknowledged that if such a plant costs more, so be it, because it is necessary. I understand that a study into tertiary treatment plants is proceeding, so I urge the Government to speed up that process to get that treatment plant in place as quickly as possible.

We also need the Albany waterways management authority up and running so that it can play its part in recommending to the Government what is needed for the streams, rivers and harbours in the Albany region. It is vitally important that that authority be established quickly as we know it has been talked about for some time. I hope that the Government will have it put in place as soon as possible.

I turn now to road funding, which is of concern to all country members. The Muir Highway runs between Manjimup and Mount Barker and a fair section of it is in my electorate. It has claimed four lives in the past few weeks, which saddens everybody aware of this problem. It seems to me that while much funding has been directed by the national road program towards highways, some of the major secondary roads have been forgotten. The Muir Highway is a good example of that. It has been in its present state for many years and needs a major rebuild. In the short term, it is in need of maintenance work. It carries a great deal more traffic nowadays than it did previously. A lot of that is interstate traffic involving large trucks hauling timber from the Manjimup region to the Eastern States. They have become a hazard. Because of the loss of those four lives, priority road funding should be directed to this region.

Similarly, a section of Highway 1 running between Walpole and Denmark is nothing short of disgraceful even though it is a major highway. There are few places on that road where motorists can pass with safety. Denmark won the Western Australian tourism town of the year award and is obviously now attracting a great many interstate and intrastate visitors. Therefore, to have a road servicing it which is plain dangerous is not good enough. It is up to the Minister for Transport to direct funding to these roads and to ensure adequate resources are expended on country roads generally. It is of concern to country people that although major highways have been upgraded considerably - and I acknowledge this - many major and minor secondary roads seem to have been forgotten. It should be a priority of this Government to urge its Federal colleagues to direct more funds towards these roads.

I will now touch briefly on an issue raised by the Minister for South-West, Hon D.L. Smith, who stated publicly last week that he thought farmers should give up their right of veto of mining on agricultural lands. At the moment agricultural freehold land comprises a small percentage of the total land mass in this State. A process is in place which allows farmers and miners to negotiate mining agreements relating to their properties. To my knowledge there has never been a need for farmers to give up that right of veto as there has never been a mine which did not proceed because a landholder vetoed the right to mine. Until that time comes, the call by the Minister - and therefore I presume by the Government - to remove that right of veto will not have my support or the support of my party. The Government will have our support for a proper, negotiated procedure. That offer has been made by the National Farmers Federation and the Pastoralist and Graziers Association. That is right and proper, and is what should happen. The removal of that veto right and giving miners the right to simply move onto agricultural land is not the right way to go.

MR COURT (Nedlands - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.59 pm]: It was my intention during this debate to concentrate on some of the serious issues related to the problems of industrial development being experienced in this State and the energy crisis the State will face in the next few years. However, I have decided to attempt to find time during a later debate, hopefully this week or next week, to discuss those important issues because I believe it is proper I spend my time today on what I consider to be the most important issue facing this Parliament at present; that is, the fact that there is still a large black cloud hanging over this Parliament because of the failure to appoint a Royal Commission into the scandalous dealings of WA Incorporated. I had hoped that the new team headed by the new Premier and Deputy Premier would try to clear up the cloud which has been hanging over this House so that the State would be able to start rebuilding its financial reputation within Australia and overseas.

The first week of Parliament was quite extraordinary. At the end of it I realised that this Government has not changed. There have been three leadership changes in recent years. Two years ago the Government was led by Mr Burke, and the Opposition knows how he bullied and bluffed his way through the WA Inc morass. While he was Premier he made sure that the media was not sidetracked into discussing the Opposition's agenda. Members of the Opposition who dared to criticise the transactions which took place during Brian Burke's era were humiliated. The power of an effective media machine was concentrated on the Opposition to try to discredit it. The Government raised trivial points to divert attention away from serious issues.

There was no difference with Mr Dowding's B team. Instead of clearing the decks and admitting that what had happened was wrong, his team became further involved in the dealings, and particularly in the petrochemical project. That Government's biggest scandal

was the deceit it practised. It became bogged down in a quagmire of dishonesty, with many of those involved still here today. There is now a seemingly endless list of legal actions being taken against the Government. Last week, when the Opposition hoped that the decks would be cleared and we would have a chance to rebuild the State's financial reputation, we were faced with the same agenda.

We now have a new team. The first thing it did was to defend the actions of the previous team. It is clear that there will not be a Royal Commission unless the Government is pressured into it.

Mr Kierath: Is that the C team?

Mr COURT: Yes, that is the C team. It says there will be a Royal Commission only if enough pressure is brought to bear down the track. It is ludicrous for the Government to procrastinate on this issue. If ever there was a time to clear the air for the good of everyone in this State, it is now. The Government should have spelt out clearly in the first week of this Parliament what it would do to establish a Royal Commission.

Mr Pearce: The Government's position has been made clear.

Mr COURT: What is it?

Mr Pearce: It is not necessary or desirable at the present time, and the Premier is to be advised on that issue. That is a very clear position.

Mr COURT: How serious do things have to become before the Government thinks a Royal Commission is warranted?

Mr Pearce: It will be time to make a judgment when the particular inquiries and court actions which are currently under way are concluded.

Mr COURT: That will be taken care of shortly. Under the Leader of the House's definition, a Royal Commission will be established in 10 years' time.

Government members should remember that they were elected by only a handful of voters at the last election. The Rothwells and petrochemical fiascos will go down in history as the greatest acts of dishonesty carried out by a Government in this State. That has been confirmed since the last election by the report of the National Companies and Securities Commission and by the Lloyd trial which resulted in convictions. A Premier and Deputy Premier have resigned with no explanation. To this day not one member of the Government has expressed his or her thanks to them; they have not been mentioned by the Government. Is there a reason for their not thanking the two members for their services? After all, they served the Labor Party for a long time.

Mr Taylor: The member has no idea at all of what happens in our party room. He does not have a clue.

Mr COURT: In the eight years that I have been a member it has been the practice of members opposite to thank members who have served in the Parliament.

Mr Kierath: There have been no gold watches or chains.

Mr COURT: Not in this case.

Mr Pearce: When did that happen? It did not happen when the previous Premier and Deputy Premier resigned.

Mr COURT: It happened when Brian Burke left Parliament. Members opposite still tell us what a great Premier Brian Burke was and what he did for the State. How many times have Ministers said that they or their advisers have never tried to influence the R & I Bank? It is interesting that court cases have revealed that it was common practice for the Government to place pressure on the R & I Bank. This Parliament has been told that that was never the case.

Mr Pearce: There is no proof of that. You are not speaking the truth. You are repeating hearsay evidence before a court.

Mr COURT: The Leader of the House wants to know why it is necessary to have a Royal Commission now. There are plenty of reasons why we should have one now. It is shameful that the National Party and the Liberal Party have to keep pressuring the Government to get it to take proper action. That should be unnecessary. As a so-called "clean" team, the new leaders should clear the decks.

Mr Kierath: Does the member mean the dirty dozen?

Mr COURT: Yes, that is right. The Premier does not have a mandate to say that it will be her decision when a Royal Commission is warranted.

Mr Taylor: The Opposition has not been given a mandate to say anything about it, either.

Mr COURT: The Government was elected by a handful of votes. The Deputy Premier and the Premier became leaders in what can only be described as a bloody coup. That is how they became the leaders.

Mr Taylor: How did you get there?

Mr COURT: It certainly did not happen in a bloody coup. There have been so many changes of leadership since that took place.

Who made the decision to put the photographs in the stairway?

Mr MacKinnon: The Speaker did.

Mr COURT: When the decision was made to put those photographs up - and it was only a couple of years ago - I recall my father's photograph was at the bottom of the stairs. Now his photograph is almost at the first floor. What will happen to the photographs at the top of the second floor?

The Opposition will not accept a Clayton's Royal Commission. If the Premier says finally that, for political reasons, it is now time to set up a Royal Commission, the Opposition will accept its decision. However, if the Royal Commission is not established with the terms of reference specified in the Opposition's proposed legislation, and if it covers only Rothwells and the petrochemical deal, it will not be acceptable to the Opposition. The Opposition does not intend to stop applying pressure until a Royal Commission, covering all of WA Inc's dealings, is established. Those dealings should include the deals involving the Western Australian Development Corporation, the Exim Corporation and WA Government Holdings Ltd since 1983.

Mr Pearce: That is a very significant statement you have made, because you are making it quite clear that you are not seriously pressing for a Royal Commission. No matter what the Government might agree to, you will say it is not enough.

Mr COURT: We will watch these people squirm. If they bring in a Royal Commission which is restricted in what it says -

Mr Pearce: You are not sincere in this.

Mr COURT: I am very sincere and I will tell members opposite why we must go back to 1983. It is because scandalous deals were done in 1983 about which this Parliament has never been told the truth, and it is only by a Royal Commission that we will be able to find this out.

Mr Pearce: From Milan Brych to Midland Brick - that would be the history of the Liberal Party.

Mr COURT: We will talk about the Midland abattoir shortly. One of the deals that is happening right at this very moment, which I believe the Government should come clean about, concerns something I raised in this House last year; namely, Underwater World International. We have two Underwater Worlds - the one in which the Government has an interest here at Hillarys, and the one currently under construction in Singapore. This is the Government which is trying to help tourism in Singapore. It does not worry about tourism in Western Australia but tries to do something about it in Singapore. I will briefly run through the background of Underwater World International because some things are happening right now which this Government had better start explaining.

Underwater World International started in November 1987 when Western Australian Development Corporation and Holk Star Capital announced they were forming a company to market and develop Underwater World complexes internationally. In 1989 the Government, through WADC, bought 100 per cent of this company. Underwater World International entered into an agreement with a Mr Ian Mellisop, a gentleman from New Zealand, whose company, Sea Structures Limited, provided the equipment and design expertise at Hillarys. Mr Mellisop was the successful tenderer to build an Underwater World at Sentosa Island, Singapore and he paid approximately \$250 000 for that right.

The information I am giving now is information I gave in the House last year and it has not been disputed by the Government. If in fact I have some of these details wrong, I hope the Government makes sure it spells out exactly what is the deal with Underwater World International.

When Mr Mellsoy signed the agreement with WADC he received a signing on fee of \$500 000. Mr Mellsoy put forward an agreement whereby if he offered a project to Underwater World International and it was accepted, Underwater World International would pay his overheads at an agreed monthly figure of approximately \$60 000 plus all disbursements including international air travel and accommodation, and he would receive a 20 per cent free carriage interest in the project and would then have the right to sell key components such as the acrylic tunnel. This agreement was renegotiated several times. Mr Mellsoy has had his overheads paid since the end of 1988, ranging from approximately \$30 000 to \$65 000 a month plus other outgoings, and consulting fees for the Sentosa project were also paid. In addition to the original \$500 000 fee he has since been paid a further \$300 000 to \$400 000.

An interesting and very important point is that when Mr Mellsoy won the tender with the Sentosa Development Corporation - that is, the Singapore Government - he had to be the majority owner, and so the Sentosa structure is Mellsoy 51 per cent and Underwater World International 49 per cent. However, Underwater World International takes all the risks and has an option to buy all of Mellsoy's shares for \$1 when the project is completed. That enables it to meet the conditions laid down by the Singapore Government. WADC tried to arrange a third party to take it out of the deal on completion, the idea being to put the deal together, onsell it, make some money and get out, and then say, "Here we are, we are pretty good developers." However, those deals have fallen through.

We were told last year that this development would be completed by now; we were told that it would be put on the market. The former Premier and now the current Premier have said they will sell this development. This development has had large cost overruns. We were told the development would be built with a total budget of \$A16 million, but I am told now that it will end up costing about \$S30 million, which is about \$A25 million. When I raised this subject last year the Government did not spell out to me or to this House just what arrangements it had gone into, or whether I was correct in saying that this was the deal it had with Mr Mellsoy. Now I am told that Mr Mellsoy is running out of money and has come back to the Government saying, "I now want more money." I am told he is asking for an additional \$1 million as a part of his fees, or consulting fees, or whatever, otherwise he will go into receivership.

Do members opposite understand the seriousness of this? We do not own the project. We paid all the bills but we own only 49 per cent of the project and, under this agreement, we cannot pick up the rest of the project until it is completed. So the position is, as I understand it - and this is what I want the Government to confirm - that we do not take ownership of this project until it is completed and that means we must pay out all the money. We are in an at-risk position; we can be held to ransom. Therefore I want the Government to tell me just what is the latest state of negotiations with Mr Mellsoy.

I am also told that WADC has sent another officer to Singapore. This Sentosa project has been a terrific opportunity for many people in WADC to fly backwards and forwards to Singapore, but I am told that since these big cutbacks the corporation has sent another person up there, who is living in a house which I am told costs \$S4 500 a week rent, and all the other expenses that go with it. It is about time we had a proper, accountable explanation to this Parliament about what is happening. That development is about 70 or 80 per cent complete and will not be completed until the end of the year, it has big budget overruns, and the Government does not have a buyer for it.

This has been going on for some time. It is about a year since I raised this matter last and the situation is just getting worse. If the Government would do us a favour, it would be prepared to spell out just what is happening with Underwater World in Singapore because we are not talking about tens of thousands of dollars but about millions of dollars. The people in this State have had enough of our taxpayers' funds being used to build a tourist attraction in Singapore. I received an answer today to a question about the effect of the pilots' strike on the tourist industry in this State. I have been told the losses amount to tens of millions of dollars; yet here we are promoting tourism in another country.

Mr Pearce: It is not tourism - we are exporting technology.

Mr COURT: What absolute nonsense! What technology has come from Western Australia?

Mr Pearce: You cannot tell me that people who might have come to look at the Hillarys Underwater World will now go to Singapore and look at that Underwater World.

Mr COURT: Does the Leader of the House know where the technology comes from?

Mr Pearce: It is a Western Australian company.

Mr COURT: No, I am telling the Minister that Mr Mellisop is from New Zealand. We have been paying Mr Mellisop literally millions of dollars but no technology is coming from this country. He was paid for what he did at Hillarys Marina, and the Leader of the House knows what is happening there. That project was budgeted to cost \$5 million and it blew out to \$8.5 million. That is just one of the deals where a Royal Commission could get to the truth.

Mr Hassell: Where are the Treasurer and the Minister for Finance and Economic Development? They are treating Parliament with contempt.

Mr COURT: What the member for Cottesloe said is interesting. In the first week in this House the Premier sat in the House reasonably well. It was okay during the afternoon tea period for those people not to be in this House, I accept that. But it is now 4.20 pm and still they are not here. I am making serious allegations about the way the Government spends taxpayers' money, and they are not here.

Mr Pearce: I will bet that the member is about to move an amendment to the motion; we will respond to that amendment.

Mr COURT: I think we have just received a warning by the Leader of the House that the Government will establish a Royal Commission with limited terms of reference. A lot of little deals have been done involving little people who want the truth to come out. I will give the Leader of the House some examples. A gentleman came to see me yesterday about a case which involved his working a tailings dump. Someone else complained because he believed he had the right to be treating the tailings dump. The case went to the Warden's Court where a decision was made giving the rights for the tailings dump to the person who had complained. The interesting point is that the person who lost out - the person who came to see me - stated that he believed the matter was fairly decided. He began negotiations with the other people to see if he could make an arrangement whereby they could treat the tailings in a joint venture. He was told by a lawyer not to worry and to carry on because the lawyer would speak to people in Government. The lawyer said to wait and see what would happen. The person who spoke to me did not ask the lawyer to do any deals; the lawyer just went off and did deals. Blow me down, if the lawyer did not then say to keep working the tailings dump because the Minister had reversed the decision.

When I was told about this case yesterday I asked the man, because he was not adversely affected by the outcome, why he was bringing this matter to my attention. He said he was so disgusted by what the Government had been doing and the sorts of things he had heard about which involved both the Dowding and Burke Governments that he wanted someone to know what took place.

Mr Pearce: Was he so disgusted that he stopped working the tailings dump?

Mr COURT: Hang on! A few months later that man received a telephone call asking him to contribute to a certain person's election campaign because of the favour that had been done.

Mr Pearce: What is your precise allegation?

Mr COURT: Well, who would have thought after the warden's decision, when both parties had basically agreed to that decision, they were simply able to talk to a contact who asked the Minister to overturn the decision?

Mr Pearce: Why talk to a contact if they were satisfied with the decision?

Mr COURT: They were asked to chip into the campaign funds.

Mr Pearce: This story does not add up. It sounds like a crooked story.

Mr COURT: I will tell the Minister about a crooked story: I asked the person who came to see me whether he was prepared to tell his story publicly. He said that he would tell the story word for word about all the people involved to a Royal Commission.

Mr Pearce: Will the member answer one question?

Mr COURT: The Leader of the House knows why that person will go only to an independent party - because he does not trust the Government.

Mr Pearce: Why did that person go to a contact, if he agreed with the decision, to get that contact to approach a Minister?

Mr COURT: Is the Minister saying I made up the story?

Mr Pearce: I am asking for an explanation. It is not logical, if two people are satisfied with a decision, to go to a contact and ask for an approach to a Minister.

Mr COURT: It was common knowledge. I will not name the person because he is sitting in this House. At the time, the person was not a member of Parliament, but he is now. He said to me, "I will tell the whole story to a Royal Commission."

Mr Pearce: That is rubbish!

Mr COURT: The point I make to the Leader of the House is that these people feel that only a Royal Commission will enable them to reveal this information and be protected.

Mr Pearce: The member has people who want to make outrageous claims and who will not do so unless completely covered legally. They are wild allegations!

Mr COURT: When have I made an outrageous claim which I cannot prove?

Mr Pearce: Just then - that very second.

Mr Hassell: Was the \$5 000 donation claim outrageous?

Mr Taylor: No names!

Mr Pearce: Give us the details.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr COURT: I have always backed up allegations. The person about whom I am talking is only too willing to give evidence to a Royal Commission. I know why this person would not trust the Government.

Mr Pearce: The story does not hang together. That person made an approach to a Minister - even when he was satisfied by the decision.

Mr COURT: The Minister can relax. I will give a hint: That Minister involved can relax.

Mr Pearce: I want to know more about it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COURT: The Opposition believes that the Government has made a major mistake by not establishing a Royal Commission with proper terms of reference.

Amendment to Motion

Mr COURT: I move -

That the following words be added to the motion -

But we regret to advise Your Excellency that the Premier and her Government wilfully and persistently refuse to appoint a Royal Commission with adequate terms of reference to enquire into and report upon the business dealings of the Government comprising what is now commonly known as WA Inc, including -

- the Argyle Diamond scandal
- the Fremantle Gas and Coke scandal
- the Midland Abattoir scandal
- the Rothwells scandal
- the Petrochemical Industries scandal
- the Tony Lloyd/SECWA scandal
- the Kevin Edwards/ALP cheque - Teachers Credit Society scandal

the SGIC Bell Group purchases scandal
the State Superannuation Board property deal scandal
the Burswood Casino scandal

and the Premier's grounds for refusal of Opposition requests and public demands for a comprehensive Special Royal Commission are specious and false leading to concern that the Government is both attempting to protect its political friends and allies and to allow time to run out under criminal law limitation periods so that guilty parties can no longer be prosecuted and therefore in the opinion of this House the Premier and Government should at once agree to a Special Royal Commission as proposed by the Liberal and National Parties.

MR MacKINNON (Jandakot - Leader of the Opposition) [4.28 pm]: I am happy to support the amendment. The Opposition has taken a lot of time in approaching the question of a Royal Commission. We have not entered into the call for an inquiry lightly, neither did we prepare the draft legislation, which has been circulated, lightly. We have discussed both matters with many people. We take both matters very seriously as we take very seriously the criticism levelled at the Opposition by the Premier - criticism which on close examination has little basis. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has stated in his amendment, that criticism will be seen to be both spurious and false.

The first claim made is that a Royal Commission is not necessary because other matters are under way, such as the McCusker inquiry and Hon R.G. Pike's Select Committee. I will not take long to debunk that argument because it has been debunked by Mr McCusker himself. On 26 February Mr McCusker said -

The WA Government's participation in the "rescue" of Rothwells and in the PICL transaction and the economic or political prudence of its actions is not and never was within the scope of my inquiry.

Any comment made by the Premier regarding the McCusker inquiry is, as the motion says, both specious and false. A Royal Commission in the format we have proposed would not cut across anything in that inquiry. Mr McCusker said that he was not inquiring into those aspects. If an overlap occurred between the Royal Commission and other inquiries, clause 8 of our proposed legislation allows the commissioner to prohibit any other inquiry. Therefore, this is already accommodated in the legislation. In addition, in the event of a comprehensive Royal Commission - not a "Clayton's inquiry" - the chairman of the Select Committee in another place, Hon Bob Pike, has indicated that he would recommend that the committee be put on hold and that all its evidence be passed to the Royal Commission. Therefore, the Premier on both counts has struck out. Her first claim is that a Royal Commission is not necessary because other inquiries are under way in the form of the McCusker inquiry and the Pike committee. However, Mr McCusker is not looking at these aspects and Mr Pike has said that if a proper inquiry is set up, he will put his committee on hold.

Let us look at the Premier's more serious criticism that a Royal Commission will cut across the existing court cases and be in contempt of court. Given the Premier's academic training, I thought she would have researched this matter more clearly before making such a statement. Not being a legal person, I sought advice on behalf of the Opposition and have received a legal opinion.

Dr Lawrence: Did you go to the original source; that is, a judgment of the Supreme Court?

Mr MacKINNON: Just listen to the opinion which I will be happy to table at the end of my speech - it is very enlightening.

Dr Lawrence: Whose opinion is it?

Mr MacKINNON: It is from Terry O'Connor, QC.

Dr Lawrence: He does not have a few interests in these matters, does he?

Mr Lewis: Are you impugning his integrity?

Dr Lawrence: No, not at all.

Mr MacKINNON: The Premier states that he does not have a fair interest in these matters but, for the information of the Premier, I approached the firm Mallesons Stephen Jaques which sought a QC to draft an opinion. The firm chose Mr O'Connor, not me. Like the Government, which has entrusted him with work before, I have the highest regard for Mr O'Connor.

Dr Lawrence: You are being unduly defensive; I asked whether he had an interest in the matter.

Mr MacKINNON: There is no doubt about the credibility of Mr O'Connor, and any attempt by the Premier to discredit him will be seen for what it is - that is, an attack on the individual and not on the argument. It was the Premier a couple of weeks ago who said in this Parliament that she hoped we would seriously debate the issues and not the personalities. Here is the test for the Premier!

I refer now to the legal opinion. Let us see what he has to say because I sent him all the information I had, and the questions answered in this Parliament by the Premier, and I sought his opinion as to whether the Premier's claims were true. Page 2 of the opinion states -

In my opinion, the view expressed by Dr Lawrence reflects a misunderstanding of what was said by Latham CJ.

At the outset it should be noted that there cannot be any contempt of court in respect of proceedings which have not yet been instituted. Of necessity, the proceedings must have been commenced before there can be any contempt of court . . .

The Premier is clearly wrong in her assertions in which she queried the court cases which might arise out of the McCusker inquiry. Clearly, Terry O'Connor, QC, states in unequivocal terms that there can be no contempt of court regarding proceedings not yet instituted. Further, he states the following -

It is certainly the case that in a number of decisions, the High Court has indicated that there may be a contempt of court associated with a royal commission. It is clear that this can only arise where the commission was appointed by executive government as opposed to appointed by all of Parliament.

Therefore, Mr O'Connor is saying that if the Government appoints a Royal Commission under the Royal Commissions Act, there may be some contempt - although he makes further comment about that later in his opinion - but there is no doubt that if the Premier follows the course of action proposed by the Opposition in endorsing the special Bill, the question of contempt will no longer apply. Mr O'Connor then states -

Even then as will appear later, it is only in limited circumstances that commissions appointed by executive government could be in contempt of court. It is perhaps also worth noting what was said by Mason J. (as he then was) in the BLF case at page 95, namely that "there is no reported case in which the proceedings of a commission had been held to be a contempt".

I repeat that because the Premier relied heavily on quoting Justice Mason last week when answering questions. I challenge the Premier to read those points out again. I will quote from Justice Mason -

Dr Lawrence: Latham!

Mr MacKINNON: The Premier referred to Mason in her answers, and I can quote it for her.

Mr Taylor: You have the wrong one!

Mr MacKINNON: Members should read the answer to question without notice No 1 - I apologise to the Premier as it was question without notice No 22 to which I refer. The Premier stated -

I reiterate the words I spoke on 1 May. I indicated then that Latham's decision was a very significant one. It has been backed up by former Chief Justice Gibbs of the High Court of Australia and by the present Chief Justice Mason.

On page 95 of the BLF case Justice Mason said -

There is no reported case in which the proceedings of a commission had been held to be a contempt.

The Premier comes into the Parliament and says that we cannot have a Royal Commission as it may be in contempt of court. There is no possibility of that and there never has been a reported case in which that has occurred. I ask the Premier to give us one example. I am debating the issue and not attacking the person. I will continue quoting parts of the report that are relevant. It is stated on page 7 that -

The only commission which could be in contempt of pending proceedings are those set up by the Executive under the royal prerogative or under a general act of Parliament such as the Royal Commission Act 1968.

That statement is categorical and quite clear to me. It is straightforward and makes an absolute nonsense and joke of the comments made by the Premier last week. Clearly, her argument was both specious and fogged. The conclusions of Terry O'Connor, QC, are -

On the basis of the authorities it seems to me that the following propositions can be advanced -

1. there can be no contempt in respect of civil or criminal proceedings which have not yet commenced.

That is not a doubtful proposition, it is a categorical statement. The conclusions continue -

2. it can never be a contempt of court for the Parliament to constitute a commission to enquire into a specific matter . . .

Therefore, it could not be a contempt of court for Parliament to set up a commission to enquire into WA Inc. In particular, it could not be a contempt for the Parliament to pass the Bill proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

I had forwarded a copy of the Bill to Terry O'Connor. The conclusion continues -

This would hold true even if the commission was to enquire into matters already the subject of pending proceedings.

That is a straightforward opinion from a leading QC in Western Australia. It continues -

3. it may be a contempt of court if, rather than set up a commission by a specific statute as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, the Governor, acting under the Royal Commissions Act or pursuant to the royal prerogative, were appointed a royal commission to enquire into a matter already the subject of pending proceedings.

That is the only way that it could perhaps be a contempt of court, but the conclusion continues -

However, in considering whether the appointment of a commission would be a contempt of court, it must be remembered that public interest in the proper administration of justice must be balanced with the public interest in enquiring into matters of public concern.

Point 5 of the conclusion states -

5. a royal commission could always defer or hear in camera evidence on any particular matters which happen to bear upon legal proceedings.

I will comment on that aspect in a moment. It is clearly set out that evidence could be heard in camera if any problem arose in this area. He concludes -

From the foregoing, it is obvious that I believe the Honourable the Premier has misapprehended the state of law relating to contempt of court.

The Premier's comments were specious and false. My case rests on the second point; the Premier said that she did not quote Latham, although she did. Clearly the Premier's second claim is categorically knocked out by this opinion which is neither unclear nor doubtful; that is, there can be no contempt. The best way to proceed is through a Royal Commission endorsed by an Act of Parliament and the Opposition has introduced a well-researched, properly drafted, special Bill for that purpose. The Premier claimed that evidence given before a Royal Commission would cause "prejudice of the public mind, and this includes judges". The comments of Terry O'Connor clearly debunk the Premier's claim in that regard. It is an insult to the judges in this State to suggest that any public comment of this type with regard to a Royal Commission would prejudice their minds.

The Premier also claimed that the publication of evidence by the commission may prevent people from coming forward. Quite clearly, the Premier has not read the Bill, or has selectively read it, because clause 7 states -

Where the Special Commission is of the opinion that the enquiry to be carried out by it shall be best served by so doing, it may under the hand of the Commissioner grant to any witness or prospective witness a certificate which shall free that person from all prosecutions . . .

Clearly, it allows for immunity from prosecution to be granted by the commissioner and that is much more likely to encourage people with important evidence, particularly public servants and people in similar positions, to come forward. It must be remembered that crucial evidence such as this was presented to the Fitzgerald inquiry in Queensland by members of the Police Force who were given exemption and this evidence proved the most damaging at the end of the day.

Finally, the Premier claimed that civil and criminal cases would be prejudiced if somebody gave evidence under immunity. Clearly, the opinion of Terry O'Connor negates that claim once and for all.

There can be only one reason for the Government's not heeding the calls for a Royal Commission; the Premier wants to protect her friends. The Opposition will not rest until a special Royal Commission is held to inquire into all aspects of WA Inc, starting from 1983 when the former Premier, Brian Burke, implemented WA Inc. I will not rest until the Ambassador for Ireland is in Western Australia appearing before a special Royal Commission and answering those questions. He has a lot to answer for. I will not rest until I see Peter Dowding, David Parker or anybody else that the commissioner wishes to call before him similarly standing before that special Royal Commission.

I have no doubt that the course of action proposed by the Opposition is right in law and Terry O'Connor's opinion endorses that unequivocally. Secondly, I have no shadow of doubt that the Opposition is acting in the interests of the majority of people in Western Australia. This Premier can stonewall and follow the same course of action as her predecessor did and she may also be tossed out of this Parliament unceremoniously at the end of the day. Alternatively, she can take the honourable course of action which is to listen to the people of Western Australia, make sure that she implements and supports the special Royal Commission Bill introduced by the Opposition, provide the Message required, and allow for debate in this Parliament. If she has any serious objections to the legislation, let us debate them. Let us hear no more of the spurious, rubbishy nonsense about contempt of court, which Terry O'Connor has demonstrated is a fabrication of the worst order by the Premier of Western Australia.

[The paper was tabled for the information of members.]

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe) [4.49 pm]: We must ask ourselves why the Premier opposes an adequate Royal Commission - a special Royal Commission. We must bear in mind that the Premier has made a public commitment to attempt to restore confidence in Government. We must remember that there is a clear public demand for a Royal Commission, an adequate Royal Commission of the kind proposed by the Opposition. The opinion poll published in *The West Australian* last Saturday is evidence of that public opinion. It does not conclude the issue - opinion polls never do - but, I repeat that the opinion poll was evidence of the clear public demand for a Royal Commission. It is up to the Premier to say if she thinks there is not a public demand for a Royal Commission. The Premier said she wanted to clean up Western Australia. When she came to office with high ideals she said we must restore confidence in Government and it is a new ball game. We have seen no evidence of that. Last week we saw the Deputy Premier leaping to the defence of the State Government Insurance Commission, rather than saying to the public, "We acknowledge that there was wrongdoing, and we will clean it up." The Opposition has been demanding a Royal Commission because of its examination of dealings by the Government over a long period. The Premier has advanced two reasons for refusing a Royal Commission: First, interference with existing inquiries would occur if there were a Royal Commission; secondly, interference with legal prosecutions would occur if there were a Royal Commission.

Today, the opinion of Mr Terry O'Connor, QC was given to us, but before that opinion was obtained, and before I saw that opinion, I had written these notes, "Interference with existing

inquiries is a nonsense because the great volume of work of a Royal Commission would relate to matters not the subject of any existing inquiry." I refer here to matters such as the SGIC, the R & I Bank and the Government Employees Superannuation Board deals, for which we are now paying so dearly. Does the Premier not want to know why this State has been brought to its knees financially? Does the Premier not want to know where the money has gone? Does the Premier not want to know whether we can get back some of the money so that the burden of taxation and of cutbacks in services can be reduced?

The Premier talked about interference with legal prosecutions, but in the majority of the areas which should be examined by a Royal Commission, no legal prosecutions are being undertaken. No legal prosecutions are being undertaken in relation to the Midland abattoir deal or the Fremantle Gas & Coke Co Ltd deal. Why does the Premier not want to get to the truth through an adequate or special Royal Commission? Why does the Premier not tell us why she does not want to get to the truth of these things? It is no good her saying they are all in the past because they are not in the past. The Premier knows that the former Premier and three Ministers have resigned because of the disgrace and scandal associated with these dealings. The Premier knows that she is now sitting in the seat she is in because of the scandals of WA Inc. Yet she says we cannot have a Royal Commission to inquire into why the State is in this financial hole, and why we are missing out in so many areas in terms of the provision of services, and taxation. It is important to find out the truth of the situation, not as an historical exercise, not to look backwards, but because these issues affect us today, and the problems have not been solved. In some cases the same people who did the deals with the Premier's former colleagues are still in place.

The SGIC sold its shares the week before last, not under the Government of Mr Dowding but under the Government of the Premier. It sold its shares in a most extraordinary way. There are very serious questions about whether the SGIC would not have been better off to have kept the shares in Bell Group because these shares have a real asset backing. What the SGIC has now is a claim, as an unsecured creditor, against a company which disputes that claim, and if and when the claim is -

Mr Taylor interjected.

Mr HASSELL: I remind the Deputy Premier that his Premier wants the Parliament to behave in a better way, and it does not help if the Deputy Premier keeps shouting me down.

The Premier is not interested in why the SGIC sold off those shares and put itself in the position of being an unsecured and disputed creditor of Bond Corporation when it could have retained the shares that had a real asset backing. The Bell Group shares had an asset backing which was more than half a cent, by a long shot. It was a questionable transaction. Last week, when this matter was put to the Deputy Premier, he stepped back and said, "I knew about it but it is nothing to do with me. The SGIC is operating independently." That would be an acceptable argument if we had an established record of the SGIC's operating independently and commercially in its dealings, but we have not. It would be acceptable if the SGIC had new personnel at the top, but it has not. Ollie Rees is still there, and he is the man who did the big deals, along with the Government's political operators, such as Kevin Edwards. He is the man who did the St George's Terrace property deals with Robert Holmes a Court. He is the man who, with Bond, purchased the Bell shares from Robert Holmes a Court, which transaction was investigated for impropriety by the National Companies and Securities Commission. The Government cannot wash its hands of the responsibility for the SGIC's actions when it has in place the very people who have failed those institutions. Ollie Rees has failed the SGIC. He was involved in the political dealings. He caused the SGIC to lose the balance of its investment portfolio and to have the extraordinary investment strategies about which the Auditor General commented so scathingly in his report.

The Premier should listen because she has said she wants to clean up the Government, but she cannot clean up the Government if she leaves in place these failures and the same system. Why does the Premier not want to get to the truth of these dealings through a Royal Commission?

Mr Kierath: She is not allowed to!

Mr HASSELL: I wonder very seriously if Mr Burke is not the person behind the present situation. Why would Mr Burke spend \$16 000 on telephone calls from one telephone if he

were not still manipulating the politics of Western Australia? The Premier is in a position where she must operate independently if she is to establish the truth of what she said, which is that she wants to clean up the Government of Western Australia and restore confidence in Government in this State. She will never restore confidence without a Royal Commission.

I return now to the Argyle diamond deal, which was one of the earliest deals of WA Inc. It is very clear that the same person acted for both parties in that deal and was paid by both parties. One of those parties was the Government. Why does the Premier not want to get to the truth of those dealings? Why does she not want to know the truth about why we are bankrupt as a State today? The Fremantle Gas & Coke Co Ltd deal, the purchase of the company operation by the Government, was a scandal at the time it was done and it remains a scandal. The price paid was far too high. It enriched the interests of Yosse Goldberg, the man who now will not appear in Western Australia. Gas prices in Fremantle rose substantially as a result of the Fremantle Gas & Coke Co deal. Why does the Premier not want to know the truth about that deal?

The R & I Bank is perhaps the biggest scandal of all. Its performance record has been appalling and it is expected very soon to announce another bad result. All the indications are that the R & I Bank's result for the year ended 31 March will be at least as bad as last year's, despite all the efforts of the people involved. Where does that record stem from? Other banks in Australia have been doing well, but I ask the Premier where the record of the R & I Bank stems from. Very clearly it stems from the political use of the R & I Bank by the Burke and Dowding Governments.

The Teachers Credit Society deal is not the only deal on which evidence of the activities of Burke, Edwards and former Minister Grill have been exposed. The evidence given yesterday -

The SPEAKER: Order! I have been very careful to try not to stop any of the debate which members wish to embark on in respect of this amendment to the motion, and I have carefully looked at the portion of it which refers to a matter which we all know, is before the courts currently. While on consideration I am prepared to accept it in the amendment to the motion, I think it is very wrong of any member in this House to canvass the issues in respect of that particular part of the motion. While I am prepared to leave it in, I do not think we should canvass the issues in it until the matter has been decided in the court. I am prepared to take advice and guidance. If somebody thinks that is not sub judice they can tell me, but it would appear to be so to me.

Mr HASSELL: Certainly the case is sub judice, Mr Speaker, and I do not want to talk about the case. All I am suggesting is that the evidence published today from that case is not the only occasion on which it has been publicly suggested that there was political interference in the R & I Bank. What I ask the Premier is: Why does she not want to get to the truth of these dealings? If she wants to clean up WA Inc, if she wants to restore confidence in the Government, she must have a Royal Commission.

Let us take the fifth example - the Government Employees Superannuation Board. The state of its investments and its appalling record of performance are today's problems. Let us take but one example - the Anchorage development in my electorate in North Fremantle. It was conceived in corruption and was stillborn.

Mr Grill: It was your idea.

Mr Taylor: You were one of the Ministers - admit it.

Mr HASSELL: The land lies there today, costing the State -

Mr Taylor: Go on, admit it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HASSELL: The Deputy Premier is talking nonsense. The land is costing the State's taxpayers money every single day. Why does the Premier not want to get to the truth of these dealings? Why does she not want to find out about the things that came out in the trial of Martin and Brush - not the things they were not convicted of, but the very admissions they made about the backhanded payments?

Mr Grill interjected.

Mr HASSELL: Is the former Minister suggesting that I advocated backhanded payments?

Mr Grill: You, and you alone, brought those developers to the Government in respect of the Anchorage deal; that is what I am saying.

Mr HASSELL: This former Minister - this disgraced man - has the gall to try to associate me -

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr GRILL: Mr Speaker, that particular reference - and no doubt it was meant for me because the member was pointing his finger at me - was entirely unparliamentary and should be withdrawn forthwith, and I request that it be withdrawn.

Mr HASSELL: There is nothing unparliamentary in saying he is disgraced. He is disgraced; that is why the Government got rid of him. Members opposite know very well that it did. They could not have a Government with him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre has taken offence at the statement made by the member for Cottesloe and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr HASSELL: Mr Speaker, do you rule that the words are unparliamentary?

The SPEAKER: If you wish me to rule in the context used, yes, I do.

Mr HASSELL: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr HASSELL: I will get on now with the issue.

Mr Grill: The issue is that you brought the Anchorage deal to the Government.

Mr HASSELL: The member for Eyre should be quiet. He resigned. This man resigned because this Premier could not run a Government with him in it; she knows that is true and he knows that is true. So let us not get into any rubbish about the disgraceful Anchorage development and what went on. The point is that that development ended up in criminal proceedings. People were not convicted but their own admissions were of terrible activities. Does the Premier not want to know the truth of those? Does she not want to find out through a Royal Commission? The indisputable facts are on the record. They are not invented by the Opposition, they are exposed in the official reports - the report by the Burt Commission on Accountability and the Auditor General's report. One by one the Auditor General goes through the deals and questions what was done, but he does not explain the motives; he does not explain the political interference that took place in the SGIC, the R & I Bank and the Government Employees Superannuation Board. The facts are exposed in the interim report of the Pike Select Committee, and even in the report on parliamentary standards, which refers to the way in which this place operates. There are endless questions but few answers. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been lost and the people of this State are paying the price now - reduced services such as hospital services, taxes which could be much lower were it not for the losses, taxes which the Government itself has signalled will rise, business taxes in particular - yet the State's Premier refuses an inquiry or an investigation that is adequate to cover the comprehensiveness of the scandal.

The things that we have been talking about in this House for the past three, four, or five years were not isolated acts but results of policies deliberately pursued over a period of years. They were the results of the policies and philosophies of Mr Burke and Mr Dowding, proudly supported by the Leader of the House who quoted books on how good it was to go on in this four-on-the-floor, high finance, fast money men way. Interwoven with every facet of the scandals were political acts and decisions of Premiers and Ministers. We know this Premier's difficulties. We know the realities of political parties, alliances and friendships; but the Premier has dedicated herself to a cleanup, to the restoration of integrity, has she not? She has said that is what she wants, so that must encompass cleaning up the wrongdoing and the wrongdoers, including the Premier's own colleagues where it is just and proper. The Premier must restore honesty to Government - and that means making an honest, clean breast of what is wrong and not continuing to defend, as her deputy is doing, everything that was done wrongly - and she must restore the integrity of the parliamentary process. There is only one way it can be done; that is, through a special Royal Commission with adequate terms of reference and a truly respected commissioner. What the Premier is

doing now is like putting hand lotion on a deadly melanoma. While the cancer of wrongdoing and decay remains in and spreads through the body politic there will be no cure.

Madam Premier, an adequate Royal Commission must be established, one which covers all matters and gets to the truth.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

DR LAWRENCE (Glendalough - Premier) [5.10 pm]: We have already been told the name of the Royal Commission that the Liberal Party would want to appoint. In discussions this afternoon, the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition speakers have suggested that should we have a Royal Commission it should be a Clayton's Royal Commission. I was interested to listen to debate, and I heard all of it.

Clearly, the Opposition will not be satisfied with any inquiry, Royal Commission or investigation, that does not entirely meet the extravagant proposals contained in Opposition legislation before the House. Indeed, the member for Nedlands went so far as to say that the Opposition would not consider any Royal Commission - Clayton's or otherwise - unless the terms of reference were those that the Opposition is specifying. The Opposition would not accept any other version and would not be satisfied that the Government was serious about any inquiry unless it was as a result of the Opposition's Royal Commission Bill. I wonder, for instance, if that view is shared by the National Party which seems to have at least indicated in the public arena it might contemplate variations on that.

Let us look at that proposed Bill before I look at the question of the Leader of the Opposition's legal advice. The Bill - which we have not had a chance to examine in detail, but I presume it is the one which is in the public arena - purports to be a serious piece of legislation, a vehicle by which, as the member for Cottesloe has just told us, wrongdoers and wrongdoing will be brought to justice. This is an outcome which I would like to achieve in relation to matters in this State, but -

Mr MacKinnon: You are not in a rush. Under the Government's terms and conditions we will still be waiting in the year 2000.

Dr LAWRENCE: I argue that that is not the Opposition's goal at all. It is not interested in achieving improvements in Parliament, Government, the behaviour of members, or the behaviour of business. The Opposition is certainly not interested -

Mr Hassell: Get to the substance of your control of a Royal Commission.

Dr LAWRENCE: The Opposition is not interested in those things, as the member for Nedlands has indicated again. It is not interested in bringing wrongdoers and wrongdoing to justice. If it were it would not have brought this Bill before Parliament.

Mr MacKinnon: Read Terry O'Connor's opinion.

Dr LAWRENCE: I will deal with that matter in time; I have 20 minutes. I do not need to cover all arguments in the first few seconds.

I will look at the Opposition's Bill and at the question of whether the Opposition is serious about bringing wrongdoers and wrongdoing to justice. The Opposition Bill is clear. Whenever the matters to be inquired into by the special commission are or are likely to be the subject of any inquiry, directly or indirectly, by any court, tribunal, warden, coroner, investigator, justice or other person, and thereafter named a tribunal, such tribunal shall not continue or proceed with that inquiry whilst the order remains in force.

The member for Cottesloe has indicated that he believes that the Government is stalling on this question in order to protect individuals within the statutory limitations period. In other words, we will delay until such time, in his view, that these people could not be brought to justice. The Opposition's Bill would prevent the wrongdoers and that wrongdoing being investigated.

Mr Hassell: The Premier has misunderstood the law again.

Dr LAWRENCE: Not at all.

Mr Hassell: Two speeches, and two wrong.

Dr LAWRENCE: Not at all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: Another point I make about the Bill, apart from the fact that it deals with matters that have been thrown together, is that it represents the Opposition's wish list - the particular matters into which the investigations would inquire.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: I listened to the member for Cottesloe, the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with very little comment at all.

Mr Hassell: The Deputy Premier spent half my speech time shouting.

Mr Taylor: I apologise.

Dr LAWRENCE: If the Opposition is serious about debate on this matter - and it claims to be - it will pay some attention to the arguments that I might mount, even if it disagrees with them. I suggest to members of the Opposition that the Bill is not a serious one. Its scope is so extravagant that one might ask why it stops at 1983. Why not look at certain business matters, deals and arrangements entered into by previous Governments? Would the Opposition agree to an extension beyond 1983, back to 1980 or 1977? No-one was absolutely insistent on the view that the Labor Party should not govern because we were not in Government at that time.

The second weakness of the Bill is the scope of the inquiry. The third weakness is very important indeed; that is, that members of this Parliament would seek to have a Royal Commission, a judicial body, override the Parliament and override the questions of Executive privilege and Cabinet secrecy. The Bill states that Executive and Cabinet secrecy shall not be grounds - and so on. The Opposition would seek to place above Parliament a Royal Commission with the most extravagant powers ever contemplated in this State.

Mr MacKinnon: Parliament endorses the legislation and puts it in place.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: The Opposition's Royal Commission would be a Clayton's Royal Commission because it would not succeed.

Mr Hassell: We would accept a Clayton's Royal Commission. The Government should bring up a Bill and we will accept it in two minutes.

Dr LAWRENCE: As I have indicated earlier, if it is the Opposition's intention to bring the wrongdoers and the wrongdoing to justice, it is a Clayton's Royal Commission.

A number of matters have been raised by the Opposition to counter legal arguments to the one which I put earlier in the parliamentary session. I note that the legal opinion which the Leader of the Opposition has tabled confirms the principal statement that I made in relation to contempt.

Mr MacKinnon: It does not.

Dr LAWRENCE: It is important that members opposite recognise that it does. They should also recognise that the Leader of the Opposition's argument fails to take account of the fact that whatever the case on contempt - and I will go through that in a moment - the critical argument in relation to the holding of a Royal Commission is that it would severely prejudice the bringing to justice of those wrongdoers and the wrongdoing that it so absolutely wants to pursue.

Mr MacKinnon: O'Connor debunked that.

Dr LAWRENCE: Not at all.

Mr MacKinnon: The Premier has not read his opinion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: I would think that the Opposition would regard this matter as serious enough to allow me to put a point of view. Clearly that is not the Opposition's intention. It wants to prevent any argument being heard in Parliament. This is the way in which the

Opposition has dealt with this matter since time immemorial. The Opposition has not been interested in matters of fact, the proper behaviour of Parliament, or bringing wrongdoers and wrongdoing to justice. It is interested only in scoring political points at any price.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: Mr Speaker, the level of interjection from the Opposition benches simply confirms my view that those members are not serious about this matter.

I turn now to the specific arguments mounted by the Leader of the Opposition around the opinion given by Mr Terry O'Connor, QC. The Leader of the Opposition began by misquoting the source of the judgment and needs to be corrected. It was *McGuinness v Attorney General (Victoria)* (1940) which expressed the view that if a prosecution for an offence were taking place - and I was not talking about the future - the establishment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the same matter would almost certainly be held to be an interference with the course of justice and consequently constitute a contempt of court.

Mr MacKinnon: Can the Premier give us an example of where this has occurred?

Dr LAWRENCE: It does not change the matter of fact, the opinion or law in that matter. It is important that the Leader of the Opposition realises that the fact there has not been a particular case is not an impediment to the argument. Otherwise, why would we pass the legislation in this House? Mr Justice Latham's view is based on the consequent judgment of Chief Justice Mason in the BLF case. The critical thing in all of those cases is that the reason prejudice might exist is partly a contempt question and also it is a matter of the wrongdoers not being brought to justice. An individual brought before a Royal Commission - be it the Opposition's Clayton's commission or one established through the Act - could not be caught. These people would stand before a Royal Commission and when a person has committed a wrongdoing, he would speak only before the Royal Commission and what he said could not be used against him in any court. The Opposition's Bill would prevent the wrongdoers being caught; it would prohibit the courts from even hearing the matter.

Mr Kierath: If it were possible to overcome that, would you agree to a Royal Commission?

Dr LAWRENCE: It cannot be done because the Opposition's Bill - the only one it says it will accept - would not allow that to proceed or allow wrongdoers and wrongdoing to be punished. The Opposition's Bill is not a serious piece of legislation.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you saying that Mr O'Connor's advice is wrong?

Dr LAWRENCE: Mr O'Connor's advice does not relate to the Leader of the Opposition's legislation. If the Leader of the Opposition had asked Mr O'Connor to comment on his Bill, he would have given an unflattering description of it regarding its terms of reference.

Mr MacKinnon: He said that it would not be in contempt.

Dr LAWRENCE: He did not; he said that Bills introduced into the Parliament may not be in contempt, and anyway, he is not the sole authority on that matter.

Mr MacKinnon: I suggest that the Premier read the opinion - he specifically refers to the Opposition's Bill.

Dr LAWRENCE: There are two important points to be made about that opinion: Firstly, it does not relate specifically to the legislation proposed by the Opposition, and, secondly, the opinion advanced by Mr O'Connor is not the only opinion on that matter. It is possible to quote the contrary legal advice which states that a Royal Commission set up by an Act of Parliament would not prevent it from being in contempt. I am more than happy to provide the evidence for that argument.

Mr MacKinnon: Have you read Mr O'Connor's opinion?

Dr LAWRENCE: How could I have read the opinion at this time?

Mr MacKinnon: I tabled it almost an hour ago.

Dr LAWRENCE: The Leader of the Opposition is not interested in the argument regarding wrongdoers being brought to justice or hearing about why that is the way to proceed.

Mr Hassell: Why do you not want to know the truth?

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not my intention to stop interjections. I point out that if members are in breach of Standing Orders, they are highly disorderly. Interjections add flavour to the debate and assist in the decision-making process, so I will continue to allow them to occur from time to time. However, I will not allow them to occur incessantly. A member on his or her feet in this place, whoever it may be, has the right to advance a point of view without two or three interjections in every sentence. I ask members to cooperate.

Dr LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Opposition's Bill is not a serious Bill. The opinion given regarding contempt is a disputable opinion, as most legal opinions are.

Mr Court: You have not read it, so how do you know?

Dr LAWRENCE: I listened to the opinion as the Leader of the Opposition read out part of it. What I heard of the Leader of the Opposition's report of Mr O'Connor's opinion - unless he is not capable of reporting it accurately - suggests to me that the contrary legal advice I have is equally equivocal in its view. A large number of investigations and inquiries are proceeding. The member for Conesloe incessantly asks why we are not investigating any of these matters, and why the Government is complacent about them. He asks why the Government does not want to bring wrongdoers and wrongdoings to justice. These are rhetorical questions because the member would know that a substantial number of investigations are proceeding, many of which deal with the matters that the Opposition wishes to have investigated. Since 1987, more than 760 replies have been given to questions on notice and questions without notice. Information has been put before the Parliament. Part of what the Opposition is suggesting in its legislation, and by its call for further investigation, is to place above the Parliament a judicial system which may not, and desirably should not, place itself above the Parliament. The investigations to which I have referred are continuing - they are many and varied. The McCusker inquiry alone has resulted in the placing of 208 charges against individuals in matters relating to the collapse of Rothwells. That investigation has yet to conclude. In addition, a National Companies and Securities Commission inquiry is investigating aspects of Bond Corporation's activity.

Mr Hassell: Who is investigating the Ministers?

Dr LAWRENCE: That, surely, is the business of this Parliament. Unless and until evidence is before a properly constituted inquiry of wrongdoing, the Opposition's claims that the Government has something to hide frankly fall on deaf ears. It is critical that this Parliament exercise its prerogative through debates, motions and questions to bring matters of fact before the Parliament so we may all see them. That is the proper role of Parliament. The judiciary investigates matters laid before it by the civil and criminal courts. A large number of those matters are being investigated at the moment and many of them relate to matters described by the Opposition. In addition, investigations pertaining to the liquidation of WA Government Holdings Ltd and Rothwells are taking place; information placed before the people in the Parliament and in the courts constitutes an enormous weight of evidence which members opposite have not been prepared to contemplate. The Opposition wants what we saw in the "interim report" of the upper House committee under the chairmanship of Mr Pike; that is, that members opposite do not want some clarification of matters relating to Ministers, corporations and individuals; members opposite are not interested in having individuals brought before courts for wrongdoings as its own Bill will prevent that from happening; members opposite are trying to do what they have been trying to do since 1983 - that is, to bring down the Labor Government. Members opposite have never accepted that they are sitting on the Opposition benches. The Leader of the Opposition claimed earlier that we were in Government by a handful of votes. I thought that we lived in a democracy. I thought that a handful of votes was sufficient to form Government in the eyes of this Parliament and in the eyes of the law. In 1983, 1986 and 1989 the Opposition lost elections by the democratic processes in which both Houses of Parliament are elected. The Opposition lost in 1983, 1986 and in 1989. Recently, the Opposition lost a Federal election at a time -

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not convinced that some members of this House understand that it is my role in this place - at least as I see it - to try to maintain order. One of the most effective methods I have to achieve that goal is to be able to call "Order", and to have members take notice. There is a growing band, small as it is at the moment, which thinks I call "Order" to listen to the sound of my own voice. I can tell them that I do not. It is

starting to make me very angry and Standing Orders allow me to take some action against members who wilfully disobey the authority of this Chair. When I call "Order", order should last for longer than half a second. Again, I ask for members' cooperation.

Dr LAWRENCE: I want to reinforce the Government's view that elections in this State have been properly conducted. They were properly conducted in 1983, 1986, and 1989, and the Federal elections conducted in this State were also properly conducted. Earlier this year when the Opposition sought both locally and through its Federal colleagues to make an issue of the very matters for which it now calls to be the subject of a Royal Commission, that had little or no effect on the result of the election in this State. That outcome can hardly give the Opposition confidence that its views on these matters are shared by the public at large. The Liberal Party in Opposition has continually sought to destabilise the Government, to undermine the economy of this State and to indicate to the Parliament and the people that there is something rotten in Western Australia. It has continually sought to prejudice the minds of the people against the Labor Party and the Labor Government. The Government has taken the most extraordinary step in relation to certain matters which it admits were ill judged. There is now before the Parliament clear evidence of the fact that the Government has taken those steps; that is, the former Premier, former Deputy Premier and a former Minister resigned under the Westminster system -

Opposition members: Why?

Dr LAWRENCE: To take responsibility -

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Court: Why did you not resign from the Cabinet also?

The SPEAKER: Order! That did not last too long. I take this opportunity of thanking members for the limited amount of cooperation they have given, and to indicate that it lasted for two minutes. That is a lot better than at other times, but it is still unsatisfactory.

Dr LAWRENCE: The Opposition does not want to hear it because it is the most important statement about Westminster responsibility it is likely to hear. I doubt that Opposition members understand it. Critical steps taken by the former Premier, the former Deputy Premier and the former Minister should satisfy the Opposition that without the protection of Parliament they have exposed themselves to investigation not only by the "committee" in the upper House but by any other court in the land. The Opposition cannot ask for more than that.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr Pearce (Leader of the House).

[See page No ??.]

STATEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Questions on Notice

THE SPEAKER (Mr Barnett): I apologise for the time this statement will take from question time but perhaps the questions and answers will be correspondingly short. Last Thursday during the Address-in-Reply debate, the member for Floreat referred to the rules and procedures for placing questions on notice. Subject to the will of the House, the Speaker is the final authority as to the admissibility of questions.

While it is incumbent on members to ensure that the questions they ask are in order, the Clerks have a responsibility on my behalf to check the questions to ensure that they comply fully with the Standing Orders and rules of this House. Questions which are not in order should not be placed on the Notice Paper. Questions which are irregular, or infringe the Standing Orders, may by the Speaker's authority be amended by the Clerks, or may be reserved for the Speaker's consideration. If the alterations go to substance, they will be referred to the member who submitted the question. Should a member be dissatisfied with the manner in which any question on notice has been amended, he or she should ask for the matter to be referred to the Speaker. If, on being advised of the Speaker's decision, the member is still dissatisfied, he or she may see the Speaker to argue the case further. If the member is still dissatisfied, the matter may be dealt with in the House by way of motion. In my view, this procedure works to the advantage of all members of the House.

Although questions with and without notice are subject to the same rules, it is often impractical for the Speaker to refer to minor breaches of the rules during question time in the House, as this may unduly interfere with the time available for questions without notice. The general matter of the rules relating to questions is on the agenda of the Standing Orders Committee, and a meeting of that committee will be called soon to discuss the matter.

[Questions without notice taken.]

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY - FOURTH DAY

Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR COWAN (Merredin - Leader of the National Party) [7.31 pm]: I support the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and supported by the Leader of the Opposition. I indicate from the outset that the National Party supports any debate which will make it clear to the Government that a Royal Commission is really the only option to pursue. It is about time the Government recognised that fact and began the serious negotiations on the terms of reference of such a Royal Commission. The Government should enter into consultation with a number of people - including the Leader of the Opposition, and perhaps me - on just who the commissioner should be. We are long past the time to defend the need for a Royal Commission.

All members accept that we do not run this State on opinion polls, but people take these polls into account. A recent poll indicated - I would like to have seen the questions asked - that an overwhelming majority of Western Australians favoured the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Dr Alexander: Did you frame the questions?

Mr COWAN: I did not frame the questions. *The West Australian* has no sympathy for me, my party or the Liberal Party. That fact was borne out by the support it gave to this Government during the 1989 election campaign.

Mr Pearce: You are being unfair to *The West Australian*. During the last election campaign it gave you a few front page headlines.

Mr COWAN: That is what I am complaining about! People cannot claim that *The West Australian* has shown any degree of bias towards the Opposition parties. Although I have not seen the questions of this opinion poll, I suggest that they were reasonably explicit and gave a fairly accurate assessment of public thinking. The time for discussion about whether there should be a Royal Commission is long past. It is a matter for the Government to begin the delicate negotiations around the terms of reference which will be satisfactory not to the Liberal or National Parties, but to the people of Western Australia. The Government should seek somebody who can be regarded as impartial to take the position of commissioner. That is the task in front of this Government.

Some speakers in this debate referred to whether the opinion of a QC was correct in law as to whether a Royal Commission would be in contempt of any litigation that may come before the courts. I will not enter that debate. It would be a waste of time as I do not have the professional expertise. However, it is not appropriate for the Government to say that because the prospect of a contempt of court exists, or that a Royal Commission may prejudice a trial or court case, a Royal Commission should not be established. I remind the Government that Western Australians have no interest whatsoever in whether contempt or prejudice may occur in a pending trial. Any public inquiry conducted by a commissioner would undoubtedly do both of those things. Contempt will occur in some areas and in other instances it may be that some evidence to a public hearing may prejudice the prospect of a successful trial in a case in which the Government, in its wisdom, may decide to lay charges in an attempt to recover its money.

The Western Australian public are not interested in points of law or facts before the law; they are interested in simple issues such as where has the money gone, who was responsible for losing that money and whether there is any prospect of recovering it. Unless and until the

Government recognises that the majority of Western Australians want a Royal Commission to clear the air, we in this Parliament will continue to take the issue right up to the Government. Whichever way the Government looks, it will not get out of this lightly. It got itself into this situation and now it has a choice: The Opposition parties can continue to pressure it to reveal information about past business dealings or it can hand matters over to a body - I do not mean any disrespect to my colleagues as I include myself - which is less prejudiced than members of the Opposition parties. This body will be more impartial in the extraction of evidence. People want to know about three main issues: Who was responsible for the decisions that lost the money, how much money has been lost and is there any prospect of recovering it? That is all they want to know. If the Government wishes to leave the matter in this arena, by all means it should do so. But I suggest that the Government should agree to the continued call for such a commission, not just through the Parliament, but also by the media and the public.

As I said last Thursday, the Liberal and National Parties are moving down different paths towards a common objective. I assure this House that the objective to have a Royal Commission is a common one. As I said, we might move down slightly different paths, but we will eventually get to that position.

Mr Pearce: You are like the gingerbread man with the Liberal Party; you will go across the creek and they will eat you up.

Mr COWAN: I am quite prepared to take that risk and I am prepared to defend myself. I am prepared also to have a small wager outside this House with the Leader of the House on our ability not to be snapped up. We will see what comes from that because that leads me to my next point upon which I will conclude. The option for the Government is very clear: It should appoint a Royal Commission. As I said at the beginning, it should begin the process of drawing up the terms of reference that would be satisfactory, not only to us, but also to the people of Western Australia. It should also begin the delicate process of finding out who is available to serve as the commissioner now because time is running out.

Notwithstanding the fact that the two parties on this side of the House are travelling down different paths to get to the same objective, that objective will be reached and I suggest that if the Government is not prepared to establish a Royal Commission ultimately, it will be forced to an election. The easiest choice for it to make is to establish a Royal Commission and get on with it.

MR TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie - Deputy Premier) [7.43 pm]: The Premier made it clear today that a Royal Commission has been neither ruled in nor ruled out.

Mr MacKinnon: You will get a stick up your backside doing that.

Mr TAYLOR: That is a crass remark.

Mr MacKinnon: That is what happens when you sit on the fence.

Mr TAYLOR: We are waiting to hear what Mr McCusker has to say at the conclusion of his inquiry. Already that investigation is resourced to the tune of approximately 30 people, and approximately 208 charges in relation to Rothwells and the like have been laid. The Government has indicated that it will continue to deal with these matters.

Let me inform the House of what the Government has dealt with in the last couple of weeks. The member for Cottesloe referred to the Auditor General's report and the operations of the State Government Insurance Commission. The Auditor General made it clear in his report that he has related the history of these matters to the Parliament. Since then, the SGIC, as indicated by the Auditor General in his report, has got things back on an even keel. The member for Cottesloe can try to put words in my mouth as to what I said about defending the past. We should not be in any doubt about what I said last week. I made it clear to the SGIC when I became the responsible Minister that its job was to get on with running what I consider to be one of the best insurance companies in Australia. That is exactly what the Auditor General indicated in his report. He has noted that policies have been put in place to make certain that some of the mistakes made in the past are not repeated and they will not be repeated. In addition, the Auditor General made the same comments in relation to the Government Employees Superannuation Board. He said that the Board should act to ensure that some of the difficulties it faces currently on investments and some of its decisions will not be repeated. I assure the House that they will not be repeated by this Government as we have made clear.

Let me deal with the SGIC and the Bell shares because it is nice to be able to go back in history every now and again. Members know that, over the past year or so, the SGIC has been criticised by the Opposition for daring to buy those shares because that indicated that, supposedly, through the SGIC, the Government had an interest in West Australian Newspapers and could make some editorial direction in *The West Australian*. We have been told time and time again by the Opposition that the SGIC should rid itself of those shares. What happened today? The member for Cottesloe said that the SGIC should not have sold the shares. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot, on the one hand, tell the SGIC to rid itself of those shares, and, on the other, tell it, after it has sold the shares, that it should not have sold them. Of course, it should have sold the shares. It had to sell the shares by 1 May to crystallise its loss. The view of the member for Cottesloe was that the sale of those shares could have benefited no-one but the Bond people because they were aware that if the SGIC did not sell the shares, it would not have crystallised the loss and it would not be able to turn to the indemnity clause in the agreement. No-one but the Bond people could have benefited from the sale of those shares in the view of the member for Cottesloe.

Opposition members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! As we have only just resumed, I will make this my last request. This is the last time I will ask for the cooperation of members to be quiet when I call for order. The very next person who refuses to comply with my request will be rejected from this place. It is not fair, it is unparliamentary, and it is unsatisfactory in the extreme.

Mr TAYLOR: The Opposition referred to the Government's enemies today being friends tomorrow and vice versa. To explain that, I again refer to the member for Cottesloe and the Anchorage development. He said that development was conceived in corruption. Who conceived the Anchorage development? Who was the father of that development? It was none other than the member for Cottesloe who approached the member for Eyre in this House and told him that he had been approached by a Mr Garry Jones who had a grand proposal for the land known as the Anchorage land. He said he thought it was a good idea and asked the member for Eyre who was then a Minister whether he would be prepared to meet with Mr Jones and talk to him about the issue. The member for Eyre has always said to me that if people ask to meet with one then one should talk with them to hear what they have to say. The introduction and conception of the Anchorage development was fathered by the member for Cottesloe.

Mr Hassell: That is a stupid statement.

Mr TAYLOR: It may be stupid, but it hits home - the member for Cottesloe made the introduction.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre should come to order, or he may feel the wrath of the statement I made.

Mr TAYLOR: I turn to the comments made about WADC and Exim, which we are in the process of winding up. Legislation will come before this House to do that.

Mr Hassell: Will we see accounts?

Mr TAYLOR: I am happy to show the member for Cottesloe audited accounts. We will ensure that Treasury is responsible for the operation and winding down of WADC, as I have indicated to it. Part of the wind down process will involve Underwater World in Singapore referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. That operation will be sold at an opportune time. It was possible that it could be sold prior to construction, but logic dictated it be sold on completion, and at the best possible price. The member for Nedlands sought to indicate that WADC or Underwater World would end up buying the other 51 per cent of the project after paying the full construction cost.

Mr Court: I said, for \$1.

Mr TAYLOR: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should listen to what I am saying; or is he trying to mess up things a little bit?

Mr Court: I have not tried to mess it up at all.

Mr TAYLOR: It is for \$1.

Mr Court: That is what I said.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to listen carefully to whatever the Deputy Premier has to say. He can then take part in this debate and use the time available to him to make his comments.

Mr TAYLOR: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also had the hide to stand in this place and talk of the Premier being anointed for her position as Premier of this State; anointed from God knows where! Who in this House could talk more about being anointed and taking over a position in this House better than the perfect example of it, the member for Nedlands, who was anointed by his dad to take his place in the seat of Nedlands. If anyone wants to know about someone's being anointed, he is the perfect example of somebody saying, "There you are son, move in."

I turn to the opinion obtained by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to a Royal Commission.

Mr Hassell: You are a poor imitation of Brian Burke

Mr TAYLOR: If the member for Cottesloe wishes to measure me against Brian Burke I will gladly be so measured because I have much time for him. I ask whether the QC who gave this opinion is the same person who is associated with Bevan Lawrence and People for Fair and Open Government?

Mr MacKinnon: I do not know.

Mr TAYLOR: Come on, tell us! Is it the same Mr O'Connor who is associated with People for Fair and Open Government?

Mr MacKinnon: Is the Deputy Premier saying that Mr O'Connor is not a well qualified man who is able to prepare a paper?

Mr TAYLOR: Is it the same Mr O'Connor who is associated with People for Fair and Open Government?

Mr MacKinnon: Is the Deputy Premier attacking his credibility?

Mr TAYLOR: I am asking a question.

Mr MacKinnon: I do not know. What if he is?

Mr TAYLOR: That opinion contrasts greatly with the opinion we received from Crown Law Department on this matter.

Mr MacKinnon: Table it.

Mr TAYLOR: If I am to take advice on these sorts of matters I will take it from Crown Law Department, an independent authority.

Mr Court: Your advice comes from Julian!

Mr TAYLOR: Is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition telling me in relation to these issues -
Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the right to stand in this place and make a speech without being shouted down. I hesitate to take action against members for interjecting. My current request is that all interjections cease for a period, let us say five minutes, which is not unreasonable. Standing Orders state that members should not interject at all during debate. Therefore, I will not entertain an interjection for five minutes. That does not mean that after five minutes members can let loose with all the interjections they have withheld for that five minutes.

Point of Order

Mr MacKINNON: I do not want to canvass your ruling, Mr Speaker, but ask you to take into account the fact that the Deputy Premier has asked me a question directly. I hope you will give direction whether we can answer direct questions during this debate.

The SPEAKER: I will give direction in respect of that matter. However, the Deputy Premier is unlikely to ask any questions because he will be addressing all his remarks to me.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr TAYLOR: The interesting thing pointed out by the Minister for Health is that even if I ask such questions Opposition members are not willing to answer them, so it is a waste of time asking them.

I turn now to the matter of a Royal Commission. As I said at the commencement of my speech, it has neither been ruled in nor ruled out. My personal view is that if we were to have a Royal Commission into the affairs of this State and the Government's activities it should certainly not start in 1983 when this Government was elected. I know Opposition members find it difficult to sit on the Opposition benches because they hold the view that they have a right to be on the Government benches and that any election that does not give them that right is not a proper one. I know how difficult it must be for them to not be serving on the Treasury benches. However, we were properly elected in 1983 and again in 1986 and 1989.

Prior to 1983 a number of issues related to Government in Western Australia were never examined properly. Nobody has had a good look at the origins of, or who was involved with, Bunbury Foods, or at what went on in relation to the deal associated with Halls Head. Nobody has had a good look at why a particular Korean company gained a contract for half the pipeline, yet was shown in Korea to be dishonest. It told the Government it would build an aluminium smelter in Western Australia. Nobody has had a good look at why those decisions were made, or at some of the matters associated with the building of a certain hotel in this metropolis and the suggested involvement of a member of the upper House. I can assure Opposition members that if ever we have a Royal Commission it will not start from March 1983 but will go further back. If I had my way, it would go back to the matter talked about by the former member for Ascot, Mal Bryce, involving sticky fingers in Cherita and right back to those sorts of issues.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are some two minutes to go, and the request in respect of interjections relates to members in the House; it does not relate only to members of the Opposition. If members were not here, I advise them there are two minutes left and they must be quiet.

Mr TAYLOR: As far as I am concerned, a Royal Commission should deal with a whole range of things associated with Governments of the past. I see no reason why that should not be the case. Matters which have been dealt with in this House over many years should be the subject of any Royal Commission on the basis of what the Opposition suggests - that they have not been properly explained. As far as I am concerned the Royal Commission would deal with many of those issues. It may be a long Royal Commission and an expensive one. If it is ever suggested to us by those undertaking the current inquiries that we should investigate these sorts of matters further, that is exactly what we will do.

Mr Court: Pathetic!

Mr TAYLOR: The member can call it whatever he likes.

The SPEAKER: Order! One minute.

Mr TAYLOR: Let it hit home on the member for Nedlands. These matters are also relevant. If members opposite want to talk about some of the issues before this House, these matters are bigger and more important to the State of Western Australia than some of the issues the Opposition has dealt with.

That is my view of the situation. I have not discussed this with my colleagues; it is just a view I have come to. I have heard some of the things members opposite are saying about past members of this Government and the activities of this Government. We will go back and investigate the past. We will start as far back as may be necessary.

It was interesting to hear the Leader of the National Party say that there may well be matters which it would be almost impossible for a Royal Commission to investigate without having an adverse effect on those who have been charged or on those who may be charged. It is not a matter which can be easily ignored or put to one side. If members opposite want to look at Royal Commissions in the past, they can do it with some of the Royal Commissions this Liberal Opposition dealt with when in Government. They never ever saw the light of day.

Mr Cowan: It would be the commissioner's responsibility to determine whether he held particular evidence in camera.

Mr TAYLOR: The Opposition has already made the position clear, when it said, "We will not accept a Clayton's Royal Commission," that it will not accept any Royal Commission. The only thing the Opposition will accept is the opportunity to sit on this side of the House.

Mr MacKinnon: We will have that opportunity.

Mr TAYLOR: The Opposition will settle for nothing less than sitting on the Treasury benches.

Mr MacKinnon: That will do us.

Mr TAYLOR: That is the only objective the Leader of the Opposition has in relation to this issue.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is precisely why I asked for five minutes without interjection; because I thought that during that five minutes members might reflect on the level of interjection and the sense of the interjection; whether it would contribute to the debate or whether it was merely designed to stop the person on his feet from being heard. That is the sort of interjection - constant repetition - which I cannot tolerate. It is not fair to any member of this House. I will not tolerate it from the Government and I will not tolerate it from the Opposition. Members' interjections should contribute to the debate. If members think their interjections will not contribute to the debate they should not use them.

Mr TAYLOR: This Opposition's demand for a Royal Commission is nothing but a charade. The Opposition has never been able to accept that it has lost in three elections. It has ended up on the other side of the House and members opposite cannot bear the thought of sitting there for two or three years.

Mr MacKinnon: You are quite right!

Mr Pearce: At least you are honest.

Mr TAYLOR: I can understand that. I sat there for only 20 months but that was enough for me. I can understand the Opposition getting sick of it, but it is not a good enough reason, because members opposite are sick of it -

Mr Court: We are sick of corruption.

Mr TAYLOR: Many business people in this State are saying that they have had enough of this Opposition.

Opposition members: They have had enough of you.

Mr TAYLOR: They are very happy with our attitude towards them. I meet a whole range of business people these days and they are very happy. They are concerned about the damage the Opposition does to the standing of this State; the damage that this Opposition does to the Superannuation Board and the State Government Insurance Office. The Opposition has no concern for priorities; it has only one concern and that is nothing but a political concern - members opposite cannot bear the thought of a couple more years in Opposition. They think that it will not be only a couple more years; it could well be another four years after that, and perhaps another four years after that. Members opposite could have a long history in Opposition.

Mr Kierath: We are calling for a Royal Commission.

Mr TAYLOR: That is the point I am making. As far as members opposite are concerned, a Royal Commission can be nothing but a charade. If people making inquiries in this State were to say that a Royal Commission is the alternative facing the Government, we are prepared to face up to that, but we will not be forced into the situation laid down by the National Party and the Liberal Party because members opposite are prepared to be involved in the dastardly attitude of the upper House where members will block legislation. The Government will not be blackmailed. This is a properly elected Government and members opposite will not get their own way on this issue, unless people outside this House put to the Government that that is the way this issue should be tackled. If people outside the House put it in that way, we will not shy away from the issue, but we are not going to be blackmailed by an incompetent and offensive Opposition such as this.

MR LEWIS (Applecross) [8.08 pm]: Mr Speaker -

A Government member: The spokesman for this group.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Applecross has not even started and already we have had an interjection.

Mr Kierath: Typical!

The SPEAKER: Quite so, I am afraid.

Mr LEWIS: Let me put very firmly on the record the fact that the Opposition parties are not putting on a charade about this at all; they are absolutely firm in their intention to force this Government to appoint a Royal Commission on the terms and conditions laid down by this Parliament. There is no retreating from that understanding which has been on the agenda now for six months. If the Premier or the Deputy Premier think that we are feigning or trying to con the Government, we are not. We are firmly resolved that this Government will have a Royal Commission on the terms of this Parliament or it will be forced to an election. That is unequivocal and the Government should get the message that we have a resolve and we will pursue that role to the end of the day.

The members of this Government unceremoniously dumped the former Premier and Deputy Premier of this State - something absolutely unheard of in the history of politics in this State and probably in Australia. The extremes of sacking a Premier, a Deputy Premier, and one of the senior members of the Cabinet are unheard of. And we have a new light - we have the Premier of the day, all fuzzy and good feeling, a new broom. "We will have open and accountable Government; we will be honest; we will do everything by the book." That was a perception presented once again by the Government to the people of Western Australia, and all we have had since we have been pursuing this non-negotiable position of having a Royal Commission is this Government repeatedly defending the past scandals that have rocked this State and this Government since 1983 - scandal after scandal and cover-up after cover-up. The people of this State at last have seen through the glib and sharp words and the television charisma of the likes of Dowding and Burke and they are now demanding a Royal Commission, as *The West Australian* newspaper so aptly reported last weekend. The public of Western Australia have come to the conclusion that enough is enough - enough rot and deception, enough corruption and dishonesty have gone on in the last seven years in this State with the Labor Government, and the public want a full and comprehensive Royal Commission to get to the bottom of it. They are the facts, and if this Government thinks that this Liberal Opposition and our colleagues in the National Party will retreat from what we desire and what we believe the public of this State desire, it has another think coming.

The Deputy Premier made the point that Labor had won the last election. That is fine, it did; but it was an election won on deceit, deception, and an idea of a better future for Western Australia - the perception of "A future you can believe in."

Mr MacKinnon: Where is the man who said that?

Mr LEWIS: He has gone - he has been discredited, as have the member for Eyre and the past member for Fremantle. They have been discredited and they have since gone. The most incredible thing is that no explanations were given. They were just dismissed by this Labor Party, but on the orders of the Prime Minister of Australia, who happened to be in Western Australia and spent a lot of money ringing the Ambassador to Ireland and - in collusion with the candidate, the pretender to the seat of Fremantle - put in place a takeover and the sacking of the two principal members of the Government of this State.

Mr Cunningham: You would make a great fiction writer.

Mr LEWIS: They are the facts, and the member knows that. If this Government thinks the public of this State do not want a Royal Commission, it is so far out of touch that it should call a general election and see what the public think.

Mr Kierath: It would not have the courage.

Mr LEWIS: It does not have the guts, nor the courage. I will relate one very small cover-up that unfortunately I happened to be involved with very directly - I wrote a minority report. The cover-up was that of the inquiry into the Midland abattoir.

Mr Pearce: We are coming to that.

Mr LEWIS: We had heard the Leader of the House promise emphatically in this House on two or three occasions that that matter would be debated but it was never debated because orders were passed down by the then Premier that it should not be debated. In the dying hours of this Parliament, at 3.30 one Saturday morning, the report was tabled and accepted by the Parliament. There was not even a motion that it be printed. There was no motion at all, it was just presented and laid on the Table and it was never debated because it was a massive cover-up.

Mrs Buchanan: Boring!

Mr LEWIS: It is not boring; these are the facts. Let me remind the Parliament of some of the things that went on in that Select Committee. Witnesses to a Select Committee of this House of Parliament were intimidated, and statutory declarations were presented to the effect that they were intimidated by people associated with Ministers of the Crown for them not to give evidence. That is just one thing. It is absolutely scandalous. The whole business transaction of the sale of the Midland abattoir was absolutely scandalous. The abattoir was sold for many times less than it was valued at. It was established at the hearings that the principal people negotiating the sale - the vendor on behalf of the Government and the purchaser in his own right - were longstanding acquaintances and that, indeed, they had colluded. Would you believe, Mr Speaker, that the person who was working for Western Australian Development Corporation at the time - that discredited body - who was the sole negotiator on behalf of the Government and who was taking orders from a senior member of the Government, happened to be having his luxury motor launch refurbished in the purchaser's boat yard? The purchaser of the abattoir land leased a boat yard and happened to be refurbishing in that boat yard the pleasure craft of the person who negotiated the sale to that purchaser. He was refurbishing that boat at his own cost at the very time that he was negotiating that crooked, corrupt, dirty deal that was done on the Midland abattoir sale.

Mr Kierath: Is that what you call graft?

Mr LEWIS: I suggest it is corruption and graft in the extreme. Another very sad thing is that this Government, without any thought or consideration, sold the principal saleyard for the livestock industry of Western Australia. In 1986 it was making a profit of over \$200 000 a year, and this Government negotiated a sale for the whole of that property, 78 acres in the heart of Midland, for \$450 000.

Mr Trenorden: You must feel sorry for Mr Ellert! He is going to sell it now.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, he did very badly.

Mr Trenorden: He is going to sell it now.

Mr LEWIS: What a terrible thing. That was deception in the extreme. I remind the House that Premier Lawrence, the Minister for South-West, and the Minister for Education - three senior members of the Government - were members of that Select Committee and were the authors of the majority report that covered up and whitewashed that dastardly and dishonest affair. A minority report, by myself and the late Cambell Nalder, a former member for Narrogin, did not see the light of day. It was published but never debated and nothing ever happened.

Mr Pearce: It was tabled in Parliament.

Mr LEWIS: There were very strong grounds for a comprehensive judicial inquiry into that whole dirty transaction. I repeat that the people who covered up the matter in the Select Committee were members of this Parliament and one of the principal persons involved was Premier Lawrence. Her hands are not clean.

The transcript of in camera evidence taken during that inquiry was shredded without a motion from this Parliament. That evidence was privileged and it was the property of this place. I emphasise that that evidence was shredded without referral to Parliament. The whole scenario of the Midland abattoir matter reeks of dishonesty and corruption. If ever a matter should be inquired into by a Royal Commission it is that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The matter of in camera evidence has already been addressed in this Parliament and the member, I think, is fully aware of the fact that is was.

Mr LEWIS: I am not aware of it.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps the member and I should discuss in camera evidence afterwards, and why it is not available to the general public. I will speak to the member behind the Chair.

Mr Pearce: The member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr LEWIS: I know that.

I will now respond to some matters touched on by members of the Government during debate. The Leader of the House stated that it was hearsay evidence that ex-Premier Burke influenced the R & I Bank to advance \$18 million against the bank's desires; it was hearsay evidence that a cheque for \$5 000 was made available by the managers of Teachers Credit Society to a senior Government employee as a corrupt payback. That was a dirty deal. That in itself was tantamount to corruption, and that in itself should be investigated because with every deal the Government does it expects a kickback to boost party funds. That is corruption. It should be investigated, and the people of Western Australia know that it should be investigated.

The Leader of the House says that the Opposition is not dinkum in its desire for a Royal Commission.

Mr Pearce: It isn't!

Mr LEWIS: We are absolutely dinkum and we will see the Government to the polls if it does not think that we are dinkum.

Mr Pearce: That is the point I was making.

Mr LEWIS: That is how dinkum we are.

The Premier was talking nonsense when she tried to give the perception to the public of Western Australia that a Royal Commission could not be established because it would be a contempt of court or would prejudice the court cases that are listed or maybe in process currently. That argument was very easily debunked by an opinion put forward by an eminent Queen's Counsel. The Government has insulted the author of that opinion, Terry O'Connor, QC. In this cowards' castle the Government has implied that his opinion is biased. What a terrible, disgusting implication to make.

Mr Pearce: Who paid for the opinion?

Mr LEWIS: The Liberal Party paid for the opinion.

Mr Pearce: It got the opinion it wanted. Surprise, surprise!

Mr LEWIS: One of the principal law firms in this town, Mallesons Stephen Jaques, asked for Terry O'Connor to report. If the Government thinks that Mr O'Connor is so bad or biased why was he hired to prosecute in the Supreme Court the dealings associated with Teachers Credit Society and the disastrous loss of over \$129 million. Why did the Government commission O'Connor if it thinks he is corrupt and his opinion is biased? The Government has no answer.

Mr Pearce: I have observed that you got the opinion you paid for - surprise, surprise!

Mr LEWIS: The Government usually gets an opinion for nothing, does it?

Mr Pearce: We usually get yours for nothing, and that is value for money - just.

Mr LEWIS: Enough of the jokes emanating from the Government bench.

An important point should be made very clear. In O'Connor, QC's opinion he states that a Royal Commission may be established in three ways. The learned opinion states that there will be a contempt of court, that legal proceedings will be prejudiced if a Royal Commission is established either by royal prerogative or by the exercise of the powers of the Executive or otherwise using existing legislation. The only way that O'Connor, QC suggests that there will not be a contempt is if a specific and comprehensive Act comes from this House of Parliament establishing that Royal Commission. That opinion absolutely debunks the insufficient advice that the Premier has selectively partitioned to suit her desire to give a perception to the community that we cannot have a Royal Commission because it will prejudice cases at law.

MR PEARCE (Armadale - Leader of the House) [8.29 pm]: If I can continue with the fairytales this evening, I will tell the Opposition about the little boy who cried wolf. One of

the problems the Opposition has in trying to sustain credibility with the call for a Royal Commission is that it has done so so frequently in the last few years that it has devalued the currency.

I have a list of 33 separate calls for a Royal Commission made by the Opposition in the last year or two. The Leader of the Opposition has on seven different occasions called for a Royal Commission into WA Inc; three into Rothwells; six into the Bull-Peters affair; six into violence; one into the Perth City Council; and now he has put forward a Bill to cover some of these matters.

The member for Cottesloe wanted a Royal Commission into the Peter Tan case, the Bull-Peters affair, the Corporate Affairs Department, and WA Inc. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition wanted two separate Royal Commissions into the Corporate Affairs Department. The Leader of the National Party wanted a Royal Commission into prostitution, and now he has called for two inquiries into WA Inc. That is a total of 33 calls for a Royal Commission from members of the Opposition alone in the last 18 months. That totals 30 calls too many from a group of people which seeks to establish credibility in this area. It is worse than that.

Mr Cowan: How many have I called for?

Mr PEARCE: The member called for a Royal Commission into prostitution on 1 February; he called for a Royal Commission into WA Inc on 15 February and he called for a further inquiry on 28 March this year.

Mr Cowan: Two things!

Mr PEARCE: Yes, but three calls.

Mr Cowan: I cannot help it if you won't heed the call.

Mr PEARCE: Throughout that period, the Opposition has had the forum of this Parliament to establish any corruption on any of these matters. We have spent many hours and days and weeks in this place arguing about all these issues. Now it has put together, in a kind of a portmanteau, an amendment to the Address-in-Reply including everything it can think of that has occurred since 1983, including the Argyle diamond scandal and the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd scandal, which, in its opinion, establish the necessity for a Royal Commission.

In all of the debates that we have had in this House on all these issues, the Opposition has never once been able to prove, even with the advantage of parliamentary privilege, any significant wrongdoing or any corruption by members of this Government. I go further and say that the net result of all the inquiries and of all the court cases is a single conviction of a former officer of the Government and that, so significant was his conviction, the court ruled that he be fined \$5 000. That is not the sort of thing which makes for Royal Commissions or which brings down Governments. If there were any corruption in these matters, surely even this incompetent Opposition would be able to demonstrate it.

Out of all these things there has been some demonstration of corruption. However, that is the one thing that is excluded from the Royal Commission Bill put forward by the Opposition. The clear evidence of corruption in this place stems from the instance mentioned by the member for Applecross relating to the Midland abattoir so-called scandal. One thing that was clear in that was that the Opposition sought to use the forum of the Parliament to prevent a brickworks from being established in Midland because it would compete with Midland Brick. It is a matter of public record - although the amounts have never been made public - that, subsequent to the efforts of the Opposition on that occasion, the owners of Midland Brick made substantial contributions totalling millions of dollars to the Liberal Party campaign.

Mr Lewis: Where is your evidence?

Mr PEARCE: I ask any member of the Opposition who claims to speak with any authority on this matter to deny that substantial contributions were made to both individual electorate campaigns and to the general State campaign by Midland Brick for the 1989 elections.

Mr Court: Tell us about your Bond money.

Mr PEARCE: Who is going to deny that claim?

Mr Nicholls: I will.

Mr PEARCE: I am asking for someone from a position of authority to deny that Midland Brick made substantial contributions to the Liberal Party or to individual campaigns.

Mr Wiese: That is not the real point of this debate.

Mr PEARCE: There is no authoritative denial of that and, as a matter of public record, no denial of the Opposition's strenuous attempts to prevent the emergence of competition for Midland Brick.

Opposition members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have clear evidence that there are two sets of rules in this place or, at least, people consider there are two sets of rules. I hesitate to say this because I know that I should not take sides in this debate but there is clear evidence that people on my right are prepared to listen to people on my left speaking while people on my left are not prepared to listen to people on my right. I want the same sorts of rules to apply to everybody in this place.

Mr PEARCE: The Government's position is that no-one has been able to establish any clear evidence or even prima facie evidence of corruption in any of the matters listed in the amendment. Until such time as that is established, there is no case for a Royal Commission. Quite properly, the Premier has not ruled out the possibility of a Royal Commission some time down the track when all the court cases and inquiries into these matters are finalised. The Premier will make a decision when those inquiries, including the McCusker inquiry, are finalised. It will depend on whether there is some evidence of a wrongdoing being committed that will lead to a Royal Commission.

In relation to the \$5 000 cheque of the Teachers Credit Society, people have referred to newspaper reports of a case which is currently going on and to a person giving evidence of circumstances about which, on his own admission, he has no direct knowledge. He was reporting conversations with other people. He said about the cheque that, as a result of what he alleged were efforts to prevent Teachers Credit Society going into liquidation at that time, out of gratitude for the efforts made by people he believed were connected with the Government, the then director of the Teachers Credit Society decided to make a donation to the ALP.

Mr Lewis: What do you think we are - fools?

Mr PEARCE: Members of the Opposition referred to the case. I am referring to what the report said. There is no suggestion that that money was given to the ALP even by the person concerned.

Mr Court: Do you think it is proper that a senior civil servant should be a bagman for your party?

Mr PEARCE: We probably should not even be discussing a matter that currently is before the courts. There is nothing in the reports made so far to suggest that anybody improperly or corruptly sought any kind of donation. That is the problem of credibility that the Opposition has in these matters. It tries to make a little thing into a mountain. It leaps from conclusion to conclusion and, at the end, it comes to the grand conclusion that a Royal Commission is required. However, there are people in this State - many on this side of the House, many in the Press Gallery and in the community generally - who see the leaps of faith that are involved in each of the steps away from the small kernel of potential truth that the Opposition seeks to build on to the fallacy of the grand edifice that the Opposition hopes to end up with. That is why people are not able to accept anything that is not proved in these matters.

I am not surprised by the poll in *The West Australian*.

Mr Trenorden: Neither are we.

Mr PEARCE: The member ought to be if he agrees with his colleagues. The people have said that they do not want an election because they do not support the blocking of Supply. Forty per cent of people have said they do, which means that 60 per cent do not. They do not support an election and they do not support the blocking of Supply. However, they want inquiries held into what has occurred so the truth can come out and we say that inquiries are under way.

Mr Trenorden: Which inquiries?

Mr PEARCE: The McCusker inquiry for one and a whole range of actions are before the courts.

Opposition members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps I will say something different. I am very pleased with the way interjections have been going on over the last half an hour, but they are beginning to deteriorate.

Mr PEARCE: The National Companies and Securities Commission is conducting inquiries. There are seven or eight separate inquiries or court actions which cover almost all the current issues before the public. Those inquiries ought to get to the truth and, if they do not, if they are unable to point to elements of corruption - which nobody has yet been able to do clearly - the Government may be able to accept this proposal. Both the Premier and the Deputy Premier have said that at that point a Royal Commission will be the way to deal with this matter. Substantial legal issues are involved in having a Royal Commission now. As the Premier indicated, and as I said by way of interjection, we do not believe that the Opposition is serious in its call for a Royal Commission. The National Party may be serious in its call, but the Liberal Party wants to be on the Government benches and that is all there is to it no matter what we agree to in terms of a Royal Commission -

Mr Nicholls: I am prepared to sit here for two or three years if you have a Royal Commission. I am prepared to wait for the next election.

Mr PEARCE: I have made a number of predictions in this place which have been moderately accurate and my prediction in relation to the member who has just interjected is that he will be here for another two and a half years and not past that time no matter what. It is not likely that there will be a Royal Commission. It is my belief that the various inquiries and court cases which are proceeding will, to a large extent, validate the propriety of the actions of various Government people and the things they did in what they saw to be in the best interests of the State.

It is easy for people to have 20-20 hindsight in many of these matters, but the Government had to make difficult decisions regarding the collapse of financial institutions in light of financial deregulation and some of the pressures brought to bear on financial markets and the financial area generally following the 1987 worldwide collapse of the share market; it had to take action in what it saw as the best interests of the State.

Mr Court: Everyone in town knew that TCS was going under for two years before it did and you people did nothing; you did not even know who was the Minister responsible for it.

Mr PEARCE: The Registrar of Building Societies did not know it and he prepared reports. We did not appoint the Registrar of Building Societies; he was inherited from the previous Government. When there was cause for inquiry into some of the actions taken prior to 1983, the standard, solid stone wall was presented to us. That included parliamentary inquiries. We now have the strange case of a Legislative Council committee into these matters which has been meeting for close to six months. We reached an agreement with the Opposition prior to Parliament's rising at the end of last year that it would not be prorogued until a few days prior to this sitting so that that committee could beaver away and find out something. What has it found out? Nothing! It was not able in six months to make any kind of recommendation or any finding on anything.

Mr Lewis: Have you read that report?

Mr PEARCE: Not only have I read that report, but also a good part of the transcript of evidence given.

Mr Lewis: But you have not read the Auditor General's report?

Mr PEARCE: Yes, I have.

Mr Court: You have not read it.

Mr Lewis: You are telling pork pies again.

Mr PEARCE: Members opposite will hear what I have read in a moment when I tell them what people said to that committee, which was unable, under any circumstances, to make any

finding or recommendation to the House. In order to make some kind of case it had to do the most blatantly dishonest, unjust and immoral thing that one could imagine; it produced allegations without making any effort to hear rebuttal evidence or responses to allegations made. Even worse was that in order to cover itself it sought advice from Mr McCusker, QC, and the Crown Solicitor as to whether it should produce that report and what impact it would have on prosecution inquiries or court cases already under way. They advised the committee that the report should not be produced because it would prejudice inquiries and be unjust or unfair to individuals.

Most of the published criticisms or allegations in the report emanated from Mr Ken Judge. The circumstances in which Mr Judge appeared before the committee are easy to describe. He is a senior executive with Bond Corporation. Shortly after the former Premier explained in the House the pressure brought to bear by Bond Corporation on the Government to enter into a range of financial settlements to get Bond Corporation out of its difficulties - and there was great embarrassment to Bond Corporation because of those matters being revealed in the Parliament - Mr Judge went to the committee volunteering to give evidence.

Mr Omodei: Are you saying he told lies?

Mr PEARCE: What he said to the committee can hardly be a matter of surprise; they were things which helped Bond Corporation in its legal action against the State of Western Australia. In his letter to the upper House committee the Crown Solicitor pointed out that the bulk of Mr Judge's allegations were expansions of matters raised in the statement of claim lodged before the court by Bond Corporation which had been denied by the State of Western Australia in its filed defence.

Mr Omodei: What has happened to your standards?

Mr PEARCE: Does the member for Warren say that that is true or not; that the Crown Solicitor wrote in those terms to the upper House committee? I have the letter in front of me and am happy to table it if members opposite wish to see the terms in which he wrote. Mr Judge went before the committee making great play on the fact that pressure had been brought to bear on him not to appear before the committee. The clear implication in his remarks was that somebody in Government or associated with it had brought pressure to bear on him not to appear before that upper House committee.

Mr MacKinnon: Who was it?

Mr PEARCE: I will tell the Leader of the Opposition in just a moment. Members will recall that Mr Judge made play of that matter in some of the local Press. When he appeared before the committee he was questioned about who brought pressure to bear on him and he had to seek an adjournment so that he could refresh his memory. When he was to return before the reconstituted committee he decided that pressure of business made it difficult for him to appear. All of this appears in the unreleased portion of the transcript. I would have thought that any member of the upper House committee - even if he wanted to produce a report based on the evidence of five people to which there had been no rebuttal evidence - would have had the decency to produce a report that was at least balanced regarding the credibility of the people who appeared before it.

Mr Court: So you are now knocking that committee, are you?

Mr PEARCE: There was an ambassador for Great Britain who caused great problems for himself with his monarch when he described ambassadors as people sent abroad to lie for their country. Mr Judge is the corporate version of that ambassador, so far as the upper House committee was concerned. Mr Judge was sent by Bond Corporation to make allegations before that committee in support of the Bond claim before the courts of Western Australia.

Mr Court: That is a disgusting and absolutely despicable thing to say. The Leader of the House should read the code of conduct for members of Parliament.

Mr PEARCE: These matters are clearly revealed in the Crown Solicitor's letter to the committee in which he drew attention to passages in the draft report forwarded to him. I will not read all he said but he says in part that the allegations appeared in the statement of claim in *Bond v SGIC* and had been denied in the defence filed. Mr Judge went on to do a job for Bond Corporation and the committee picked that up and ran with it. That transcript contains

clear evidence of a lack of credibility on the part of Mr Judge. It is up to the Opposition to put up or shut up regarding these claims. If it wants a Royal Commission it should produce evidence of corruption because until it can do that its claim is a hollow sham.

MR TRENORDEN (Avon) [8.50 pm]: It is very interesting to hear the Premier saying one day we must give members of the public the opportunity to defend themselves, and then hear from the Leader of the House the bucketing which he has just given to a member of the community.

Mr Pearce: If you move a motion to call Mr Judge before the Bar of the House, we will support you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRENORDEN: In the future we will have plenty of opportunity to test the evidence of Mr Judge, and other people, in the courts of this land and, hopefully, before a Royal Commission. A number of other things were said by the Leader of the House which are very interesting. I find it absolutely amazing that the Leader of the House can point out to the Liberal Party that it got the opinion it paid for. I suggest to the Leader of the House that the State Government Insurance Commission and the Government Employees Superannuation Board have done exactly the same thing. They got the opinions they paid for too, yet a week ago the Leader of the House said that was not right. He cannot have it both ways.

Mr Pearce: Do you support the proposition that the Liberal Party got the opinion it paid for?

Mr TRENORDEN: No.

Mr Pearce: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr TRENORDEN: I agree, and I do not want it both ways, but the Leader of the House has just taken it both ways. Why cannot the SGIC ask for a valuation of a property, pay for it, and get the opinion that it seeks? That is perfectly okay on the Leader of the House's argument. I am not saying that at all.

Mr Pearce: So are you saying that the SGIC's opinion was a fair and reasonable one?

Mr TRENORDEN: No, I am not.

Mr Pearce: You seem to be unclear about what your opinion is.

Mr TRENORDEN: I am saying the Leader of the House is skating on very thin ice when he talks about getting the opinions which one pays for.

Mr Pearce: What is your opinion?

Mr TRENORDEN: I will have a fair bit to say about the SGIC.

Mr Pearce: What is your opinion about those matters?

Mr TRENORDEN: Which ones?

Mr Pearce: Either of the matters; either on their opinion or on the SGIC's opinion.

Mr TRENORDEN: I will make no comment about the legal opinion because I have no knowledge in that area but I will have plenty to say about the SGIC because I have plenty of knowledge about that.

A question which has been put to me constantly as I have gone around my electorate is what return we will get for the money which has been lost. We have read in the weekend newspapers that Ralph Sarich said if he had had the opportunity of investment his company would have been manufacturing motors in Western Australia rather than in Michigan USA. It is not only the losses incurred by the SGIC, the Government Employees Superannuation Board, and on the old Swan Brewery building down on the river that people are asking questions about; they also want to know about the lost opportunities.

At the moment many of our wool producers are feeling a great deal of pain because a 25 per cent levy is to be placed on wool. A Western Australian has produced technology which will dramatically improve the value of wool. It looks as though that technology will now go to France. If the member for Eyre was here I am sure he would support my point of view because I have heard him talk many times about the opportunities of value adding to our mining and agriculture. This State has lost money which could have been used to provide opportunities to Western Australians. The Federal Government and the Federal

Opposition are making a lot of noise about what will happen to improve our economy. Members on both sides of the political equation agree that we must get involved in value adding to our mining and agricultural activities. The amount of money we are talking about here would have been more than enough to crank up many industries in this State, which are just waiting to be started up.

The question to be asked in a Royal Commission is not only what has happened to the money that has been lost but also why certain individuals have received money. It is interesting that Mr Holmes a Court was paid \$800 million in a seven month period for fortuitous assets, which are now worth about \$500 million. What a great investment that was! People in the community are talking about the lost opportunities, and the one who is making the most noise is Mr Sarich. He has a very good argument. Many of us have listened to the debate which has been raging on ABC radio over the past few days about those lost opportunities. We cannot deny that Western Australian technology is now being made available to the United States of America. The intellectual properties of that technology will be the next thing to go. The money which has been lost could have retained those benefits for Western Australia.

The same argument applies to our skin industry and the grain industry, and to our getting involved in noodle and pasta manufacturing in this State. We have a situation where \$6 billion worth of produce is brought into this State from the Eastern States alone. If we could invest that money in this State we could turn around the economy of this State and would be able to offer opportunities to our youth and to Western Australians in general. That opportunity has now been lost. The Government has told us that it wants to provide a better future for Western Australians. However, it has stolen the future of Western Australians for a considerable number of years ahead. Many of the value adding industries which are keen to start up in Western Australia will not be able to do so. We have just heard about one industry which will go to Queensland. I believe another two are on thin ice at the moment because we are so busy extracting costs out of our own businesses that those people who wish to start find it not viable to do so.

We must get to the bottom of this question. It is not a matter of the Opposition's saying it wants a Royal Commission. I even had the president of one of the branches of the Labor Party in my electorate approach me and ask me to keep on working hard to make sure this Parliament has a Royal Commission.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (22)

Mr Ainsworth	Mr Hassell	Mr Mensaros	Mr Trenorden
Mr Bradshaw	Mr House	Mr Minson	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Court	Mr Kierath	Mr Nicholls	Mr Wiese
Mr Cowan	Mr Lewis	Mr Omodei	Mr Blaikie (<i>Teller</i>)
Mrs Edwardes	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Strickland	
Mr Grayden	Mr McNee	Mr Thompson	

Noes (24)

Dr Alexander	Mr Cunningham	Mr Leahy	Mr P.J. Smith
Mrs Beggs	Mr Donovan	Mr Marlborough	Mr Taylor
Mr Bridge	Mr Grill	Mr Pearce	Mr Thomas
Mrs Buchanan	Mrs Henderson	Mr Read	Dr Watson
Mr Carr	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Ripper	Mr Wilson
Mr Catania	Dr Lawrence	Mr D.L. Smith	Mrs Watkins (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Mr Clarko	Mr Kobelke
Dr Turnbull	Mr Graham
Mr Shave	Dr Gallop
Mr Watt	Mr Troy

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR RIPPER (Belmont) [9.02 pm]: In March this year this country had a current account deficit of \$1.8 billion. We are heading towards an annual current account deficit for the year of \$20 billion. This \$20 billion deficit must be financed by foreign investment, by sales of Australian assets to foreigners, or by foreign debt.

The **ACTING SPEAKER** (Mr Donovan): Order! The level of background conversation is too high; I cannot hear the member for Belmont.

Mr RIPPER: This is a situation which cannot continue indefinitely. We cannot continue to exist in this country on the savings of foreigners, so there is a continuing need for income restraint and for economic restructuring. There is an urgent need for microeconomic reform. This is a need which the labour movement has accepted.

It is interesting to look at the figures for wage restraint and wage growth over the past five or six years. The average weekly award rates for Western Australian wage and salary earners in 1984-85 increased by 5.6 per cent. The following year they increased by 4.5 per cent; the year after by 4.7 per cent; the following year by 3.8 per cent; and in the last financial year by 5.2 per cent.

That is a very good record of income restraint, given the rate of price increases revealed by the CPI. It is not quite reflected in the figures for average weekly earnings, because they include people who are not on awards, people in higher status occupations. Some of these earnings are reflected in the figures for average weekly earnings, which are a little higher. The increases were 6.8 per cent in the last financial year and six per cent for the preceding financial year.

It would be nice to say that all sectors of the community have accepted the need for income restraint and for microeconomic reform, as have the trade unions and the labour movement. Unfortunately one cannot say that all sections of the community have accepted the need for income restraint. It is very difficult to find the figures for the remuneration of executives and managers - they are not disaggregated from other earnings figures - but I have been able to find something called the National Remuneration Survey which is compiled by the National Remuneration Centre, a consortium of accounting firms. This organisation conducts an annual survey, and the latest results I can find were published in *Australian Business* of 7 December 1988. Those figures reveal that for the year to 30 September 1988 the total remuneration of managers and executives increased by 9.3 per cent. If members compare that with award wage growth in Western Australia in the previous financial year, or in the financial year immediately preceding that - 1987-88 - they will see that award wages increased by 3.8 per cent while managers' salaries increased by 9.3 per cent.

Mr Trenorden: Are ministerial advisers on that list?

Mr RIPPER: They would be on awards.

Mr Trenorden: Not on contracts?

Mr RIPPER: They would be on awards.

Average weekly earnings for the same period increased by six per cent. So whatever figures one takes, workers who received their wages through industrial awards have done substantially worse than those who received wages through the wage and salary market for executives. If members look at the preceding year, they will see the same sorts of results. Executive salaries increased by nine per cent; award wages in Western Australia increased by 4.7 per cent; and average weekly earnings increased by six per cent. These figures imperil prospects for continuing wage restraint and microeconomic reform in this country. One cannot expect unionists and award wage workers to continue to exercise wage restraint if they are not seeing other sectors of the community also exercising restraint. If workers see managers taking increases 50 per cent greater than they are taking, or three times greater, as some of these figures indicate, the prospects of maintaining wage restraint, which everyone in this country agrees is essential to our economic future, are diminished. It is in the interests of the managers, the chief executive officers and the corporations to set the right example. The whole thing will come tumbling down if they do not. There is only so much that we can ask of workers and of union leaders. Union leaders have to be elected, and it is difficult for them to continue to be elected if they ask their members to undertake greater sacrifices than other members of the community are seen to be accepting.

The professions also must accept income restraint and the appropriateness of undertaking the changes required of working people. My colleague, the member for Pilbara, dealt with the legal profession at the beginning of this debate. I would like to make some comments on the need for income restraint and the preparedness to accept change in the medical profession. I start with the annual report of the Commonwealth Department of Community Services and Health. That report reveals that the health care access program run by the Commonwealth Government cost \$7.8 billion in the last financial year.

That is a considerable amount of public money. According to the report the program operates under pressure for a number of reasons such as the ageing of the population; the technological advances in new drugs, treatments and diagnostic procedures which increase costs; consumer expectation; and interestingly because of the supply of service providers. That is an interesting comment on the state of the market in the health industry - increase the number of service providers and one increases the number of services. The cost of each service remains the same and the total bill to the community increases. The report also noted that the program operates in an environment where there is no contractual arrangements with the Commonwealth covering either quality of services or the fees doctors may charge. That is a particular difficulty for the health care access program operated by the Commonwealth Government.

I mentioned the need for an acceptance of income restraint in the medical profession. If one looks at the way in which the Medicare benefits schedule has been increased, one sees that the figures are not too bad compared to the award wage and average weekly earning figures I have mentioned. On 1 August 1988 general practitioners received an increase of 5.4 per cent in the medical benefits scheduled fees and for other services the increase was four per cent. Last year all services were increased by five per cent with the exception of pathology, because the pathology table had a particular problem and needed to be restructured. On the face of it those figures do not look too bad, but they ignore the no extra claims commitment which trade unionists are required to make in order to receive their increases through the arbitration system. When unionists receive their increases they must make commitments not only to accept restructuring and micro economic reform but also to make no additional claims beyond the increases awarded to them by the commission. It is in the area of extra claims where we see the medical profession excelling itself. The medical profession does not make claims on a collective basis but by the expedient of individual practitioners charging above the scheduled fee determined by negotiation.

Dr Turnbull: You don't have to go to someone who charges more.

Mr RIPPER: There is that feature -

Dr Turnbull: You can go to someone who bulk bills.

Mr RIPPER: If the member for Collie follows my argument, she will see that I will deal with the operation of the free market in medicine and I will point out some ways in which there is market failure in the health industry.

Dr Turnbull: That is interference by Government.

Mr RIPPER: The alternative to interference by Government is to throw all Australians onto their individual resources and to have them bear the burden of sudden catastrophic illnesses entirely from their own resources. In my view that is an unconscionable alternative which no-one on this side of the House would consider supporting.

There are extra claims in the health industry which are reflected when one looks at the consumer price index for personal and health care. If one does so, one will see that in the last financial year the CPI in this State increased by 8.9 per cent in the health and personal care area compared to a general increase in the CPI for Perth of 7.4 per cent. That reflects some of these extra claims which might be made by medical practitioners.

Dr Turnbull: That includes chiropractors and people like that.

Mr RIPPER: Yes, it is a global figure. However, it is interesting that it is in excess of the CPI generally. The cost of health provision in this country is extraordinary. I mentioned the \$7.8 billion spent by the Commonwealth Government; interestingly that is not the majority of expenditure according to an estimate by the Victorian Health Issues Centre. Its estimate is that expenditure in this country from public and private sources, Federal and State, is

\$20 billion. That is a very large figure; coincidentally, that seems to equate to our likely current account deficit for this year.

Mr Bradshaw: Do you want to hear what Mr Hodge said in 1982? He said that the Commonwealth would compensate us for any increased activity in Government hospitals and that compensation would involve the appointment of additional staff.

Mr RIPPER: That is perhaps relevant to an earlier debate; it is not particularly relevant to this debate.

A contributor to this very large expenditure on health in this country is the way in which doctors' incomes are determined. We have already had some comments about the alleged operations of a free market in medicine. Those comments are regularly reinforced by the Australian Medical Association. In last Sunday's *Sunday Times* the Vice President of the Australian Medical Association, Dr Warwick Ruse, said -

It is a free market and if the Government wants everyone to be absolutely predictable, they should put everyone on the payroll . . .

I wish to make some comments in respect of this alleged free market because we need to ask: Why does not competitive pressure protect consumers from excessive medical charges? Why does not competitive pressure limit excessive medical charges? Why cannot the operations of the market restrain medical charges? I draw the attention of the House, and in particular the attention of the member for Collie, to some features of the medical market which limit the ability of competitive pressure to restrain medical charges. In the first place there is a monopoly of medical services. That is established for very good social reasons, but nevertheless doctors enjoy a monopoly legislated by this State Parliament. Regularly we have calls from the AMA for that monopoly to be tightened. Indeed, on 1 May, on the day this session of Parliament opened, an article in *The West Australian* reported that the AMA said that a glut of doctors was worrying the medical profession. The AMA called for restrictions on the numbers of medical students and restrictions on the immigration of overseas doctors. On the one hand when it comes to prices the AMA calls for a free market and on the other hand -

Dr Turnbull: When demographic and geographic factors are involved, there should perhaps be a limit on it. If you quoted that article properly, you would not give the wrong impression.

Mr RIPPER: It may be that the member for Collie should have an argument with the journalist who wrote the article. The article read as follows -

The immigration of medical graduates with overseas qualifications should be restricted to those with skills not existing here.

In other words, the only people the AMA wants to come in are doctors who have skills which are not possessed at all by members of the medical profession here. In short we have the situation where on the fee side the AMA calls for a free market while on the supply side it calls for regulation and protection. That monopoly by the medical profession is one feature of the market which makes it difficult for charges to be restrained. A second feature of the market is information. Patients lack information about charging rates and policies. Basically, one finds out when one gets the bill how much the doctor charges, what his charging policy is, what the scheduled fee is and how much above it the charge is. There is a lack of information about charging policies and I accept that one can make the point validly that consumers could also have a role here. They should be more assertive and should shop around for medical services in the same way they shop around for plumbing services and all sorts of other things.

The lack of information about doctors also extends to the merits of specialists. After all, which patients choose their specialist as well as their general practitioner? Most specialists are chosen by referring practitioners who do not know the charging policies of the specialist. Usually they have a longstanding arrangement with a specialist to whom they refer their patients. The patients do not have the information to exercise a normal choice in a market situation. This lack of information is compounded by the advertising ban. Therefore, we cannot even provide patients with information which purchasers of other goods and services have as a matter of routine. Doctors are penalised if they are involved in advertising, and if they participate in activities which are more public relations than advertising they can be

penalised for that also. That lack of information for patients could be partly redressed by the patients, but this is a feature of the medical market.

Dr Turnbull: It is the same when people purchase credit.

Mr RIPPER: The health industry is not the only one which has this market failure.

The third feature which makes the operation of a medical market difficult is that the demand for medical services is, in economists' terms, "price inelastic"; in layman's terms that means that if one has a broken leg the price of the service will not alter the fact that the service will be purchased - the leg will be fixed whether the cost is \$1 000 or \$500. If a patient needs a coronary bypass, he will not haggle with the specialist about the rate that he or she charges for the operation.

Dr Turnbull interjected.

Mr RIPPER: The member is confirming my argument. Market failure exists in many areas in the economy. The electricity industry is a little different. Some services in medicine are essential and do not involve choice. With electricity the consumer can switch off the light or ration his consumption, but he cannot do that if he is seriously ill.

The fourth point I raise involves public and private health insurance. Just in case we have a long debate about Medicare and private insurance, the operation of both Medicare and private health insurance is essentially to reduce the effective price of the service at the time of the decision made by the consumer. Whether we are talking about Medicare or the Hospital Benefit Fund - which are absolutely essential - we do not want to have a situation in which we do not have either public or private insurance. Nevertheless, this reduces the ability of the market to restrain price increases. Although the insurance reduces the effect of the price to the consumer, the results of the purchase of medical services can be expensive for the unsuspecting consumer.

I will mention a couple of examples that were brought to my electorate office. In one case a mother had an operation at a local hospital late last year. The charge for that operation was \$878; the scheduled fee was \$507.50. She was overcharged above the scheduled fee by \$370, 73 per cent more than the scheduled fee. Another example brought to my attention involved a pregnant woman who had her confinement in the south east metropolitan area. The scheduled fee for the service was \$305, and the patient was overcharged by \$595, almost three times the scheduled fee. That is something I find outrageous as it is affecting many working families. In many of these cases the patient has to go back to work earlier than was medically recommended to pay the difference between the charge and the scheduled fee. This should be considered when we discuss family living standards. Of course, the pattern of charging is not uniform across the medical profession. The Medicare figures in Western Australia show a pattern of charging that varies from section to section within the medical profession. For example, last year 3.9 million GP attendances cost Medicare \$104 million. Of those, 61.8 per cent were bulk billed; in other words they were in effect charged for less than the scheduled fee. Of the 202 000 specialists services, costing \$35 million, only 22.8 per cent were directly billed. In view of the time I will not refer to all the figures. There were 10 000 anaesthetist services, which cost \$7 million. Of these only 5.2 per cent - that is one in 20 - were bulk billed.

For all these reasons I assert that the market cannot be effective in restraining medical charges, protecting the consumer or controlling the national health expenditure. If the market has failed, other measures must be found through the process of negotiation on the micro-economic reform agenda. I am not suggesting any sort of confrontation with the medical profession. One of the differences between the Labor micro-economic reforms and the conservative micro-economic reforms is that Labor wishes to achieve its goals in the country's interests through a process of consensus. In some ways that is rather slower than confrontation, but the results are more lasting. I would like to see this approach applied to the medical profession. We need a process akin to award restructuring. When Medicare benefits and scheduled fees are next established, the medical profession and the Federal Government should negotiate increases in scheduled fees by negotiating on the same basis as other sections of the work force. Any increases in remuneration should be in return for restructuring to deal with the problems of that industry. This process has already occurred to some extent. The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners has reached an

agreement with the Federal Government to establish a vocational register. That register gives doctors access to higher item fees for their services, and in return the doctors have to undertake to involve themselves in quality assurance programs - education programs in particular. The doctors must accept an independent utilisation review of the patterns of their service. That is an example of an award restructuring that has occurred and could occur in other areas of the medical profession. Regrettably, the Australian Medical Association has strenuously opposed that restructuring. The association has argued with the college about that settlement.

I suggest that a number of issues ought to be taken up in this de facto award restructuring process. The need for a maximum fee limit to be set to protect the consumer and to contain national expenditure on health is the number one issue. My federal parliamentary colleague, Mr George Gear, has established that, across the country, \$485 million is spent in payment of medical practice charges over the scheduled fee. In Western Australia the figure is almost \$40 million. It is an important issue that needs to be dealt with the next time consideration is given to increasing the scheduled fees.

The provision of medical services to country areas should be considered. An obvious way in which incentive could be given to medical practitioners to serve in the country is to increase the scheduled fee payable to practitioners located in country areas. The Government does not have an open-ended purse, but it is one way in which the medical profession might deal with the increased remuneration question in its negotiations with the Federal Government. In other words, within the same global allocation agreement to higher scheduled fees for different areas with a consequent smaller increase to the scheduled fees in the metropolitan area may be reached. Another alternative would be for the medical profession to accept the obligation which has long been accepted by the teaching profession; that is, to make country service a condition of employment. I am a practical man and I do not expect that proposition to be favourably received by the medical profession. It is certainly resisted by many teachers, but if a person wants a career in the State education system in Western Australia he must give a commitment to serve anywhere in the State. That is the way in which education services are provided to country areas. The same rigorous rule is not applied to the provision of health services to country areas.

The issue of the direction of Western Australia's medical services should be given consideration. The Better Health Commission, in its publication *Looking Forward to Better Health* states that Australia is spending its health budget almost exclusively on treatment of illnesses. It also states that the neglected areas in the field of health are the promotion of health and the actual prevention of disease. It is an urgent issue which the medical profession should discuss in its negotiations with the Commonwealth Government. Time does not permit me to deal with the variety of mechanisms suggested by the Better Health Commission to achieve that aim. However, the suggested mechanisms include a voluntary capitation scheme to encourage doctors to provide preventive health counselling, the encouragement of health maintenance organisations and an increase in the number of community health centres employing salaried doctors.

Dr Turnbull: And costs run away.

Mr RIPPER: I am suggesting that if these initiatives are undertaken within an award restructuring negotiating process the costs can be contained because they will be offset.

The considerations applied to the rest of the work force in negotiating their remuneration should be applied to the medical profession.

MR BRADSHAW (Wellington) (9.33 pm): It was interesting listening to the member for Belmont. The most sensible thing which has been said recently in the field of health was said by the Minister for Health when he indicated that we should have a national summit on health. It was a sensible comment, although it was three years late.

Mr Omodei: It was more than three years late.

Mr BRADSHAW: Yes. I should go back to when Medicare was originally introduced. However, I concur that a crisis summit should be held to overcome the crisis we have in Australia in the area of health.

The member for Belmont was not here in 1983 when complementary legislation to the Federal legislation was put in place by the then Minister for Health, Barry Hodge, who

indicated there was no waiting list at public hospitals in Western Australia for people seeking surgery. I can quote from his speech if the member would like me to. Within a year of that statement there were waiting lists and the member for Belmont is trying to tell the House that the waiting lists have resulted because of new technology and an ageing population. Those things did not occur overnight. It is a prime example of the fact that Medicare has failed and it will continue to fail in its existing form.

Mr Ripper: Your party was asked to come up with an alternative to Medicare, but it could not tell us how much it would cost or whether it would be \$2.6 billion extra. Your national health spokesman indicated in his comments to the Press that the Liberal and National Parties had a poor record in the health policy area.

Mr BRADSHAW: He was talking about the Labor Party's policy.

Mr Ripper: He was talking about the policy of the Fraser Government's.

Mr BRADSHAW: I can assure the member that in 1983 Western Australia had the best health service in the world and it was destroyed by Medicare.

Mr Ripper: What is your alternative.

Mr BRADSHAW: I will admit it will not be easy to correct and we need experts to provide a balance between the private and public hospitals.

Mr Ripper: Two Western Australian Liberals who have been health spokespersons have been sacked before they could produce a health policy.

Mr BRADSHAW: That is not correct. One of those people had his portfolio changed. It is a little different from being sacked.

Mr Ainsworth: It is like your Premier - she has changed her portfolios.

Mr BRADSHAW: That is right.

In his speech the Governor said -

The Premier has made it clear that her first priority is to make sure trust, openness and confidence in government are maintained.

I find that an outrageous statement when there is no trust and no openness in Government and the confidence of the people in the Government of Western Australia has been shot to pieces. It will be a disaster if that is maintained. The Premier said that we should have a future to believe in. It is time we had a good investigation into the past activities of this Government to ascertain what went wrong and who did what. It is not good enough to lose \$1 000 million of taxpayers' money or for the State Government Insurance Commission and the State Superannuation Board to initiate huge developments which will cost the people of Western Australia millions of dollars.

The proposed renewable energy advisory council is an excellent idea, although a few years ago this Government disbanded a similar body. We should certainly be putting more effort into renewable energy sources to do away with coal-fired power stations. It is a fact of life that we have to look at these things. It will be a major thing to overcome the hurdle that exists and it will be many years down the track before we can harness wind power. Some of us may be dead and gone before an alternative is reached.

The Governor also said in his speech that -

Nevertheless, the Government will continue in its commitment to reducing the burden of Government on the community and is firm in its resolve to reduce expenditure, taxation collection and debt as a share of the economy over the current term of office.

As a result of the massive losses which have occurred over the last few years it is hard to believe that taxation will be reduced without a reduction in services. It is all very well for the Government to say it will reduce spending within Government departments, but we need essential services and we have a situation where the Capital Works Program has been curtailed and, as a result, schools are suffering. One of the petitions presented to the House today outlined the problems occurring at one of the schools in the northern suburbs. We would probably find that 90 per cent of the schools are in dire straits and need upgrading.

I take heart in the Governor's announcement that a new pearling Act will be introduced into

the Parliament in the forthcoming session to significantly improve the Government's ability to properly manage the pearling industry which, according to preliminary statistics, generated more than \$80 million in export income during 1989. Recently I was approached by one of my constituents whose son, a pearl diver, unfortunately died last year as a result of a work-related accident. A report was presented through the acting Chief Inspector, Construction and Safety Branch, Frank Keough, and Inspector V. Browne to John Randall, Acting Director of Advisory and Information Services on the subject of fatal injury to Richard Samuel Gough. Some of the conclusions in the report were very interesting.

There is no certification required, therefore no formal training, for pearl divers. Pearl companies employ their divers on a face value basis. There are at least 3 main diving certificates available to divers wishing to acquire qualifications.

The report names those certificates. It continues -

There is no recognised qualification nor requirement for commercial pearl diving, particularly in drift diving.

Pre-employment under the Pearling Act requires divers to pass a medical examination prior to commencement of diving and then every twelve months before they continue diving. There is no requirement that the Medical Practitioner conducting this examination has any experience in hyperbaric (underwater) medicine. Should one doctor refuse to pass a diver as fit for diving there is no system established to check if the diver goes to yet another doctor, provides misleading information, and subsequently gets passed as medically fit. This situation is exacerbated in so far as very few doctors have been trained and are experienced in hyperbaric (underwater) medicine.

The report recommends that it is time standards were put in place to protect divers, and other recommendations are made on mechanisms that should be put in place to make the industry safer.

Richard Gough was not the only diver to die at that time; to my knowledge at least three people died during that period while diving for pearls. This person was only 24 years old and I understand he was very fit. The situation arose because no specific guidelines were laid down on who could dive, and the only requirement was a medical examination. Bearing in mind that people are able to manipulate doctors to get the necessary approval, such a requirement is not sufficient. I hope the legislation to be put in place will contain some of the recommendations made by this inquiry and that the industry will become much safer for the workers. This industry should be fostered. As indicated in the Governor's Speech, it generated more than \$80 million in export income during 1989, and Australia needs that income. The industry creates jobs and is also good for the tourist industry. Therefore, it is very important for strict legislation to be put in place to ensure the safety of those divers.

Mr P.J. Smith: Are you aware that when the underwater diving task force made its recommendations, the pearling industry wrote strong letters of condemnation of the report?

Mr BRADSHAW: I am not surprised, because if the industry thought it would cost money, its members would shy away from it. The causes of the deaths of those three divers should be looked at on a rational basis and cost should not be a consideration when improving safety in the industry.

I refer now to the multifunctional polis which received publicity in the latest Federal election campaign. It is sad that the debate developed tones of racialism and did not provide a rational explanation of the proposal. Perhaps a multifunctional polis will be a great thing for Australia, wherever it is sited, but it is time people knew what is involved. Very little detail has been provided on what it will consist of or how it will be achieved in Australia. Some questions need to be answered before the development of a multifunctional polis takes place. I would like to know why the Japanese intend to build a multifunctional polis in Australia rather than in Japan. I wonder whether its construction in Australia means that the technological developments in Japan have led to undesirable environmental problems which the Japanese wish to pass on to Australia. I am not suggesting that is the case, but it is important to investigate it before agreeing to such a development in Australia. I have not been favourably impressed by Japanese corporatism in that most houses in Japan are owned by corporate bodies and very few people own their own home. It is part of the Australian

dream to own one's home and, if the Japanese style corporatism were introduced into Australia, such corporate ownership could take over. It is important that rational debate take place and more information be provided so that people know what a multifunctional polis is all about. We should let the people of Australia make a decision on this issue. A statement was made on this subject by the former Premier who gave the impression that it would be built in the Spearwood area. He did not make it clear that other States in Australia were also vying for this development. It is important that we know what is entailed.

I am also concerned about the auditors and directors of companies in this State. In the last few years many companies have gone to the wall, following auditors' reports indicating that the companies were trading satisfactorily and were profitable. In many cases following a favourable report companies have been reported as running at massive losses. I find it strange that companies could change overnight from a profitable position to a deficit position. It is time that a more active role was played by the people who audit the auditors, such as the National Companies and Securities Commission and the Corporate Affairs Department. I am staggered by some of the reports issued by auditors, and I wonder how accurate they are. Auditors are appointed to protect shareholders and to ensure that accurate figures are available to lenders and others. However, as auditors are appointed by the directors of companies, one wonders whether it is a question of the person who pays the piper calling the tune. Perhaps auditors are presenting the type of report the directors want rather than a report which accurately represents the financial position of the company. An article on this subject which appeared in *The Bulletin* of 3 April 1990 states -

The community - particularly investors and lenders - expects auditors to do more than provide reasonable assurance of the "truth and fairness" of accounts. They want them to act as insurers and guarantors of corporate solvency. But to act as private detectives, undercover fraud squad members, corporate policemen and moral majority representatives is a tall order for people whose fees come from corporate clients and not from the purses of aggrieved creditors or the National Companies and Securities Commission.

The problem is that the directors are paying auditors, rather than the NCSC, lenders or the shareholders of those companies. Somehow or other we must reach a situation where auditors are appointed by some independent group so that the auditors are perhaps more honest in their appraisal of those companies.

Over the last year or two we have seen instances of directors ripping off their shareholders. A prime example is Christopher Skase of Qintex, where he had a management company which ripped off \$43 million, I think. In Western Australia Dallhold Investments, Bond's private company, took a \$30 million commission for moving \$1.2 billion from Bell Resources into Bond Corporation. The fact that Bond was managing director of both companies and also took a \$30 million commission for his private company is quite immoral and quite wrong, and it is time something was done about those sorts of commissions. Another instance concerned Gofair Investments, which had an account in the petrochemical company for \$58 million. A newspaper article in the *Sunday Times* of 13 November 1988 read in part -

Hong Kong business circles had been surprised when GoFair Investment popped up described as having "extensive experience in the construction of petrochemical plants".

The South China Morning Post said on August 14 that the experience must have been acquired fairly quickly because GoFair had been set up only 18 months earlier and had practically no paid-up capital.

What they are saying is that that company was a sham and a farce and it was really out to rip off the shareholders who would have put money into that petrochemical plant. Again, I am quite astounded that when the Government became involved in the petrochemical plant it did not follow that through and find out exactly why Gofair had an account for \$58 million. All the Government said was that it would not pay it, and I feel the Corporate Affairs Department or the Government should have found out who those people were who were possibly trying to rip off the future shareholders of the petrochemical plant.

With regard to the south west, a grave situation has developed over the last year or two and I

will quote a few of the local south west newspaper headlines that have appeared over the last few weeks to explain what I am talking about. From the *South Western Times* of Tuesday, 10 April, "S-W boom fades staff retrenched"; from the *Bunbury Mail* of 31 March, "Hospital crisis feared as cost cutting bites"; from the *South Western Times* of Tuesday, 27 March, "Bunbury 2000 dead - Mayor"; from the *South Western Times* of Tuesday, 5 April, "St John faces fiscal problems"; from the *South Western Times* of Tuesday, 20 February, "Strike threat over office conditions"; and from the *South Western Times* of Thursday, 29 March, "Hospital surgeon resigns in protest".

It is quite a sad state of affairs when those sorts of headlines appear week after week. The south west is a prosperous area and I am worried that those headlines, exacerbated by the current financial crisis in the State Government, will make the situation worse. What will happen is that the cutbacks in capital works will occur in the south west as in the rest of Western Australia, and Government programs such as reticulated sewerage installation and the upgrading of schools will not proceed. Those schools have been visited by the current Premier and I will not go over them again because we have said it before and the Ministry of Education certainly knows what those problems are and what needs to be done.

Mr D.L. Smith: Those things do need doing.

Mr BRADSHAW: Yes. The Minister for South-West is the former member for some parts of my electorate and he certainly knows that. Unfortunately those things will not happen because of the cutbacks in the Capital Works Program due to the state of the finances of this Government. When cutbacks occur in capital works programs they have a multiplier effect - or at least, if money is spent it has a multiplier effect; if it is not spent there is no such effect.

The recent tannery dispute at Boyanup has also shown that the Government has failed the south west in the promise it made in 1987 when the debacle over the silicon smelter sited at Picton occurred. At that stage, because of the outcry made by the people of Eaton, the Government of the time said it would identify future industrial land so the problem would not recur. Nothing was done and the next thing that cropped up was the idea of putting a tannery at Boyanup, which the people in that area said quite forcefully on many occasions they did not want. Unfortunately that has created dissension and some ill will amongst people in the Capel shire. Certainly that has been exacerbated by the Minister for South-West, who last week tried to have some influence on the shire council elections by releasing a letter into the Capel area.

Mr Blaikie: The Minister did what?

Mr BRADSHAW: That is right - the Minister released a letter into the Capel townsite trying to influence those Capel shire elections. That is an absolute disgrace.

Mr D.L. Smith: You had better explain what you are talking about.

Mr BRADSHAW: Is the Minister saying he did not put forward some information with regard to the shire council last week in Capel?

Mr D.L. Smith: Not at all.

Mr BRADSHAW: Unfortunately I do not have it with me but I have certainly heard via a phone call that he did.

Mr D.L. Smith: There is absolutely no truth in that, I assure you personally.

Mr BRADSHAW: So the Minister did not put out a letter with regard to the Capel Shire Council?

Mr D.L. Smith: I had absolutely no involvement in any shire election anywhere.

Mr BRADSHAW: I am not saying the Minister necessarily got behind any particular candidate, but that he made a statement with regard to the Capel Shire Council last week in Capel.

Mr D.L. Smith: No.

Mr BRADSHAW: Well, if that is the truth I apologise because my information was that the Minister had done that. I certainly will chase up the people who have spoken to me about it because they have rung up about it - about not only the Minister but also the people tied up with the tannery. That is their position. The people proposing the tannery can certainly go

ahead and make statements, but it is wrong for the Minister to do so. I apologise if he did not, and I will follow it up.

Mr D.L. Smith: I certainly wrote to the people who wrote to me individually about the tannery. I have written back to them, but there has been no letter in the Capel townsite. There have been five letters in response to letters from people who have written to me asking me to do certain things.

Mr BRADSHAW: I will find out about that. Another thing that worries me about the Minister for South-West is that he is accusing the administration of the Bunbury Regional Hospital of maladministration, when that hospital has been working at capacity.

Mr D.L. Smith: You do not understand the argument. It is not the hospital that has been guilty of maladministration, but because the theatre listings and patient admissions are in the hands of private practitioners -

Mr BRADSHAW: I do not have much time left, but the Minister fails to take into account that the support for Medicare - which he supported back in 1983 -

Mr D.L. Smith: And I still support it.

Mr BRADSHAW: The Minister is misguided in that. Thousands of people have dropped out of private health insurance, which puts more pressure on the public health system. The Minister has failed to provide extra funds to compensate for the rise in nurses' wages, career restructuring and reduced working hours, which lead to a requirement to employ more nurses. That in turn increases the population in the south west.

Mr D.L. Smith: Does the member agree with the restructuring of the nursing profession?

Mr BRADSHAW: I agree that nurses need more money; they are underpaid. I must admit I have a vested interest, having a wife who is a nurse.

Mr D.L. Smith: So the member does agree with the restructuring and that the increased wages are required?

Mr BRADSHAW: Yes. But the Government made no provision for extra funding. The former Minister for Health, Barry Hodge, stated -

The Commonwealth will compensate us for any increased activity in Government hospitals, and this compensation will involve the appointment of additional staff.

That statement was made in 1983 when the Medicare complementary legislation was introduced in this place.

A couple of weeks ago, the Minister for South-West angered the agricultural people in the south west - not to mention the rest of the State - when he said that we should do away with the veto on mining companies entering farming properties. That is a hypocritical point of view because the Minister should recognise that the last election he lost the support of any farming properties in his electorate, and now he seems to have had an about-face.

Mr D.L. Smith: Firstly, he did not say that the veto would be automatically withdrawn; he said it should be debated.

Mr BRADSHAW: If the Minister says that, obviously he supports that move. It is hypocritical of the Government.

Mr D.L. Smith: The member should understand that it would be in the interests of the farming community generally for that to occur. At the moment only one per cent of farmers in this State would be affected.

Mr BRADSHAW: I cannot listen to the Minister any more; my time is running out. I do not agree with what the Minister says.

Amendment to Motion

Mr BRADSHAW: I move -

That the following words be added to the motion -

But regret to advise Your Excellency that the Minister for South-West has lost the confidence of the people of the South West and Agricultural Regions because of his failure to retain the Bunbury Regional Hospital at a full

working capacity and public statements relating to agriculture that have caused widespread concern, confusion and conflict with the Government's intentions and its policies.

DR TURNBULL (Collie) [10.03 pm]: I second the amendment.

Mr Pearce: This amendment makes a farce of the process of seeking to amend the Address-in-Reply. That process ought to be confined to serious and significant issues. Talk about debasing the currency! This is a sham and a distortion of the parliamentary process.

Dr TURNBULL: That is perhaps the reason we are all a little interested in why the Minister for South-West has bought into the argument surrounding the Bunbury Regional Hospital as heavily as he has.

Mr D.L. Smith: The member represents the mining community. I am interested in why she is concerned.

Dr TURNBULL: Probably because the Minister for South-West is responsible for a number of matters, mainly to encourage industrial development and the further development in the south west. But the South West Development Authority's and the regional Minister's roles include a social role, and that obviously includes the hospital system.

Last week the Minister emphasised that he thought the reason the Opposition wished to debate the problems in the health area - particularly in regional hospitals - was to bring on debate about the losses incurred by WA Inc. That point was well made, but the main reason for debate on the health area is that the people of the south west are suffering from lack of services. Specifically, the people of Bunbury are suffering due to lack of services at the Bunbury Regional Hospital. Our constituents in the south west have urged us to censure the Minister for South-West for that reason.

I draw attention also to the overall destruction of the regional hospital system and the health care system. Those systems have been built up over many years and although the Bunbury Regional Hospital was by no means perfect and is far too small for the service and role envisaged for it, it was still performing a function.

The Government should take three lines of action. The Minister for Health and the Minister for South-West both emphasised the first line of action last week. We should be playing the Medicare game. We want to receive more funds from the Federal Government for the hospital system in Western Australia. Our hospitals should not be penalised. We know the extra costs are basically related to wage increases for nurses. As everyone else in the community was receiving wage increases, nurses had every justification for receiving an increase. But that should have been taken into account when the Medicare allocation was made. If the Federal Government wants to promise a universal coverage whereby anybody can receive services in any hospital run by the State at any time of the day or night or on any day of the week, the Government will have to face up to the fact that this costs money.

Secondly, we need rational decisions which are not based on accountants' decisions. The Minister for South-West has become defensive about something he cannot defend; that is, the reduction of services at the Bunbury Regional Hospital caused by cutting the lists for surgery. That action is counterproductive and I will explain why: If only one operating theatre is open, the staff available can staff only one theatre. When that staff works five days of the week and on the weekend, something will go wrong.

Last weekend a serious case of degradation of the services of the Bunbury Regional Hospital occurred. A debacle occurred in which four cases of emergency, two appendectomies, and two bowel obstructions, had to be sent to Perth. Basically those four operations in the hands of good surgeons, with good support theatre staff, do not represent serious operations. They could easily have been managed in the Bunbury Regional Hospital if it were not for the lack of technical assistance and administrative factors and other things which went wrong in organising the operations.

Another emergency occurred in Bunbury last week. A local surgeon had to perform an emergency which took six hours to organise and to perform. We all know that patients are much better able to recover if an operation is carried out quickly. The longer a patient has to wait, the more difficult it is, not only for the poor patient who is suffering from the illness, but for the people who have to do the operation.

The Minister for South-West has lost the confidence of the people because he has indicated that it is the fault of the doctors that the system is not working. He said that in March at the time of the last Federal election. Because of those allegations and other suggestions that the doctors were overusing the system, a very experienced surgeon in the south west resigned his services. People who commented on the resignation ignored the fact that the surgeon had offered to operate in an emergency at the regional hospital at any time and at no cost to the health system or the hospital if so requested. That indicates why the doctors at the regional hospital do not want to aggravate the situation. The intransigence of the administrative cuts to the operating services forced him to resign and when the people found out he had resigned they lost confidence in the system.

The Minister for South-West has lost the confidence of the people also because he suggested that actions which have been taken by the Government were the only actions available to it. It is quite obvious that other decisions about cost cutting should have been made or that the Minister for South-West should have advanced the case of the hospital in Cabinet so that the cuts were not applied to that hospital. How can a hospital which is supposed to be servicing Bunbury and the south west continue to do that when it is unable to perform more than six operations a day in one operating theatre and when those operations are exclusively emergency operations so that virtually no booked admissions are being done?

The people of the south west have also lost confidence in the Minister for South-West because of his recommendation that resident medical staff be introduced to the Bunbury Regional Hospital. Does the Minister for Health agree with that recommendation by the Minister for South-West? The Minister for Health knows that one way to increase costs in a hospital is to put in resident medical staff.

Mr D.L. Smith: Have you discussed the matter with Mr Lishman and Dr Mason?

Dr TURNBULL: I am coming to that discussion. The Minister for South-West has not discussed the proposal with Mr Lishman.

Mr D.L. Smith: Have you asked Dr Lishman whether I have discussed the matter with him?

Dr TURNBULL: Yes, I have and when I asked him he said he had not. The Minister may have discussed it with him in the last two or three days.

Mr D.L. Smith: It was a month ago for two hours on a Sunday.

Dr TURNBULL: I want to get straight that there is a difference between resident medical staff to cover the whole hospital and replacing the doctors and surgeons, which was originally suggested. The Bunbury Regional Hospital has already tried using resident medical staff. The orthopaedic surgeons and general surgeons are in favour of having a limited number. They want a limited number because they know what costs are involved in a 24-hour-a-day, seven-days-a-week cover of medical staff. The suggestion by the surgeons for assistance is to have one appointed orthopaedic registrar and one general registrar. An article in the *South Western Times* on 19 April stated that Dr Lishman -

... welcomed South West Minister David Smith's proposal for resident doctors, Dr Lishman warned it would be an expensive remedy and could create new problems.

Mr Smith told the *Times* last week local doctors had generally been opposed to residents. However, Dr Lishman revealed the doctors had conducted their own trials in the past.

They have tried them twice before and said they were in favour of such a proposal. In addition, it will allow for junior and trainee hospital staff to be taken on. However, to have resident medical staff replace the current surgeons in Bunbury and therefore try to overcome the problem of the resignation of Dr Lishman and other doctors' very limited operating situation will not be a solution to the problem in Bunbury.

The Minister said last week in this place -

I have outlined the kind of cooperation we are seeking from the medical profession. If they had said to us, "We can do better in terms of allocation of theatre time to make sure we get 100 per cent of the allocation instead of only 65 per cent", then we could do something about it.

The Minister may not know that the doctors at Bunbury offered to look at the scheduling of operating staff and to make sure that emergencies and booked admissions could be fitted in.

However, that has not come about either. Unfortunately, the situation in the south west and in Bunbury is that, unless the Minister for Health quickly calls a meeting at which all people involved are present, nothing will ever be done. The Minister for Health has to call it because he is responsible for the budget of the hospital. I believe also that the Minister for South-West should work in Cabinet to have budget cuts applied to areas which are not vital and which are counterproductive. The decision last week to shut operating theatres did nothing but disadvantage the disadvantaged and deferred the problem until after 1 July. The problem will not go away for people who need hip replacements, who suffer from intractable pain, and who require operations. I think the Minister should press the case in Cabinet that regional hospitals should not have to bear the cuts in costs which destroy their services; the cuts should be applied elsewhere. The decisions for making these cuts should not be left to accountants. Cost cutting should be done on a rational basis after reasonable debate with all people involved in the problem. It will have to be something that the community accepts, and it does not accept the closure of major theatres. The community does not accept that emergencies in Bunbury have to be sent to Perth. On that basis I second the motion.

MR OMODEI (Warren) [10.21]: I support the amendment to the motion and commend the member for Collie for pointing out some of the machinations of the situation at Bunbury Regional Hospital. We are talking of a situation where health facilities have been set back in the region for which the Minister for South-West is responsible. In a speech the other night the Minister agreed with some of the comments made by people on this side of the House, saying he was concerned about the health situation in the south west and believed it was of paramount importance. He went on to say that the Minister for Health had made a significant speech about that matter. Of course, the Minister for Health received some Press publicity when he stated that it was necessary to have a national debate on the health system. The same Minister in bringing the matter to the House, stated the Opposition for not doing so earlier. Obviously the Minister agrees that there has been a deterioration of health facilities in Western Australia, particularly in the south west, which has been occurring for a long time.

The Minister for South-West is responsible for a hospital which has deteriorated to a serious extent. When challenged the Minister agreed that there had been serious cutbacks in the health area about which he had known since January this year. During that time the Minister said that the hospital had to live with the budget cutbacks. I am concerned that the Minister's criticism of the medical system and the doctors in Bunbury has cast a cloud over the Bunbury Regional Hospital. We have been told the hospital will have to live with these health cutbacks. With his Cabinet position the Minister should have more influence in relation to this matter. Losses at Bunbury Regional Hospital are serious; I think the Minister mentioned an amount of \$1.85 million with \$400 000 still to be covered. This matter obviously requires greater attention.

I turn now to the matter of farmers' rights to veto land access by mining companies. Members of this House know full well that there are already safeguards and conditions regulating mining and exploration under the Mining Act. I am concerned that Ministers make statements that are convenient at the time they are made. The comments made about the Minister for South-West in the *Farmers Weekly* appeared under the headline "Smith accused of 'naive' approach to land access." This quote did not come from the Liberal Party, or members on this side of the House, but from a farmers' organisation. The editorial was scathing of the Minister, so I will leave out the parts that would embarrass him. The paper states -

It is not true that the Minister for the South West, Mr David Smith, at a very early age was robbed of his favourite Teddy Bear by a baby who grew up to be a farmer at Bunbury.

Nor would it be entirely accurate to report that the same Minister, as an acne-ridden, sporty youth was sold shares in Sydney Harbour Bridge by a conman who retired to the land for taxation purposes.

Mr Lewis: Does it mention a purchase of lotto tickets?

Mr OMODEI: No. The editorial continues and mentions the "Easter Bunny", the "Tooth Fairy" and "Uncle Tom Cobby" saying that the Minister thinks that they are alive and well in some remote corner of his electorate. The editorial continues -

No, no, Mr Smith does not hate farmers, he's not a fool, he is just very gullible indeed.

True, Mr Smith may have fallen for the old trap of telling a specific audience what they wanted to hear, without considering the wider ramifications of his ill-chosen words.

In essence, Minister Smith suggested the mining industry, because it is a major contributor to the local economy, should enjoy an open slather, a licence to mine where and when it wants and bugger everyone else.

Does the Minister also condone mining in public parks, national parks, sporting arenas and even home backyards?

The Minister for South-West has been the subject of scathing criticism in relation to farmers' rights to veto mining on their properties, an area held dear by farmers. I know that the Minister's electorate does not cover much of the farming area close to Bunbury. I wonder what many of the dairy farmers who have lived on the land for many generations would say if they knew he advocated open slather for mining and exploration on their properties. This concerns me.

Another matter of concern raised earlier by the Minister for the Environment related to the Kamikaze attack. I was trying to highlight the fact in my Press release that a number of Ministers for South-West have made conflicting statements. All members would be aware that the member for Armadale has raised the question of pulp mills. In the *The West Australian* of 11 April the headline appeared, "Pearce supports pulp mill for SW". The article mentioned a plan by the Forests and Forest Industry Product Council for a Kraft chlorine bleach pulp mill to be built in the south west, so we had the Minister for the Environment proposing a Kraft chlorine mill. I will relate this to what was said by the Minister for South-West.

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Marlborough): The member should address his remarks to the amendments relating to the south west.

MR OMODEI: I am concerned that a past Minister for South-West is agreeing with a statement made by the Minister for the Environment and that not a word has been heard from the Minister for South-West when this pulp mill could be in his back yard. There could be sulphur dioxide emissions from such a mill which would cause damage to agriculture areas in the south west.

Mr McNee: You could have acid rain.

Mr OMODEI: Yes, and my spud crops would not look too good. I turn now to the lack of interest by the Minister for South-West in protecting ground water in the south west. We know there are proposed mining projects for Beenup and Jangardup. I have not seen a statement from the Minister for South-West that he is concerned about that ground water. This is a matter for serious concern, so I would like the Minister when he responds to address these issues and also to take them before Cabinet to protect people living in the south west.

MR D.L. SMITH (Mitchell - Minister for South-West) [10.29 pm]: The motion before the House is a rather hypocritical one coming from people opposite, as was much of the debate about what they perceive to be the cutbacks in services at Bunbury Regional Hospital.

However, if they had their way and blocked Supply all hospital services in the State would come to a halt, as would education and the provision of other services. The Opposition is willing, for its own shallow, political purposes, to bring every hospital and Government service in this State to crisis point. It then wants to criticise people for the problems in one particular hospital. In my desire to avoid repetition I will not repeat many of my comments on the issue because they appear in *Hansard* of 3 May 1990, and I suggest that anyone who is interested should read that speech. It said in essence that the Bunbury Regional Hospital's budget this year was increased by 16.8 per cent, and that the hospital has overrun that budget by a further 18-odd per cent. So the actual amount which has been spent this year will be 35 per cent more than was allocated in last year's Budget. It has not been a matter of the Government's saying it will not provide for any of that cost overrun. We have provided \$1.3 million of the \$1.7 million, and it is the \$400 000 which is outstanding in relation to the overrun which has led to the cut back in services.

I became aware of the problem in January this year. I met with the administration of the hospital, and as a result of that meeting I requested a meeting with the Minister for Health and with his executive staff from the Health Department. My plea to them was that they not introduce the sorts of cut backs which were being envisaged and that they go down to Bunbury and talk to members of the private medical profession about the way in which savings could be made without the sorts of draconian cuts which were then being envisaged. The response of the medical profession to the Commissioner for Health and the manager of country operations in the Health Department when they went to Bunbury was that it was a problem for the Health Department and not one about which they, as private medical practitioners, should be advising the Government about how to save money.

On that basis, the Health Department devised its own scheme for making the savings. By that time it was 18 March and they had to save \$400 000 between the middle of March and the end of June. Members opposite well know that the cuts in services which have been imposed are in place only until 30 June, and the additional funding will be provided in the new budget year. In effect, what members opposite are pleading for is that any instrumentality of Government, whether it be a hospital, school or penal institution, should be allowed to overrun its budget to the extent of 18 per cent and then go to the Government and say, "We have overspent our budget: give us some more money." If that were the case with all Government agencies and there was an overrun in budget of 18 per cent, we would be looking in this State at an additional expenditure in the order of \$900 million.

In situations like this proper accountability and administration requires that the agency which has overspent its budget be brought to account and be involved in sharing the burden of solving the problems caused by that sort of cost overrun. It is not enough simply to say there is an inexhaustible supply of taxpayers' money and we can keep writing out cheques, regardless of whether we are conforming to accountability. It was not a matter of the Minister for Health's or my saying we would impose an accounting solution. We wanted to impose a solution which was worked out in conjunction with the local medical profession and the local hospital administration, but that simply was not possible because the doctors refused to get involved in those kinds of negotiations.

No-one believes that health services should be cut in the way that the services at the Bunbury Regional Hospital have been cut, but in the end result in terms of proper accountability and the proper administration of the State there really was no alternative but to impose the sort of temporary pain that is now being felt in Bunbury. In terms of whether representations have been made to the Minister for Health and to Cabinet about the problems at Bunbury Regional Hospital, I re-emphasise that my conscience is clear and I have made those representations. I met with Dr Lishman after he had announced his resignation. I had lengthy discussions with Dr Rod Mason, who is the representative of most members of the Bunbury medical profession. I have also had private conversations with other doctors and specialists in Bunbury about their views.

Mr Lewis: Are they happy about it?

Mr D.L. SMITH: They are not happy; the public is not happy; I am not happy.

Mr Lewis: What are you doing about it?

Mr D.L. SMITH: In the end result one has to be practical in terms of what the solutions are, and one cannot allow education or other services to be cut so that one can push more money into a health system which has overspent its budget. I indicated the other day that what is really required in relation to health services generally is the sort of debate that is being conducted in the United Kingdom, New South Wales, and elsewhere. Dr Lishman is the specialist surgeon who has resigned, and it is interesting to hear what he had to say about the issue. He said during a radio interview in Bunbury -

Well, as I said, it's not just a state problem, it's a national problem. I would hope that the problems will be looked at with more, sort of, sensitivity. After all, it's really the politicians that have got to decide what to do, and the public, of course, have got to decide how much money they want to spend on health care.

He acknowledges two things: First, it is a national problem and it is not peculiar to Bunbury. It is certainly known in New South Wales under the Greiner Government, and in Britain under the Thatcher Government. It is a problem which requires a solution from the political

process, after a considered debate, where we can get down to the real issue of the sort of health service we believe the community can afford, rather than the simple approach of members opposite that if there is a problem, just blame the Government and just tell the Government to write out another cheque. That is the only contribution which most members opposite are willing to make to solve the problem. There has not been one constructive comment from any member opposite about how we might plan the future of the Bunbury Regional Hospital.

There has been no acknowledgment from the member for Collie that we have rebuilt the Collie Hospital. There has been no acknowledgment that we have rebuilt the Margaret River Hospital; that we have built a new hospital in Mandurah; that we are in the process of planning the rebuilding of the Warren District Hospital; that we have provided a modified hospital at Augusta; that there is a new South Bunbury community health services establishment; that there is a new building at Bunbury for the Silver Chain nursing service; that we have established for the first time psychiatric services in the south west; that we have established for the first time a mammography service in the south west; and that we have regionalised the administration of the Health Department by establishing a south west regional administration, with a staff of seven. There is no acknowledgment of any of those achievements but simply a banal sort of comment that there has been a cut in services at Bunbury Regional Hospital; therefore, we are failing the process. There is no acknowledgment that the complete report on the redevelopment of the Bunbury Regional Hospital has been done, with the estimated cost for that redevelopment being in the order of \$31 million.

There has been no acknowledgment by members opposite of the many problems involved in the health services in the south west which have arisen from the years of neglect by members opposite when they were in Government. The exception is the member for Vasse who was only too ready to acknowledge the problem in relation to the Margaret River Hospital. The member for Wellington fails to acknowledge that last year we increased the number of nurses at the hospital, not just in response to career restructuring but also in relation to the issues raised by the Royal Nurses Federation in relation to the needs of the hospital. Funds were made available for those increased staff levels. All those things are matters which, in terms of considering the issue of whether the Government or the Minister for South-West has failed in any respect in relation to the health services, members opposite should raise in a serious way in order to provide solutions to a difficult issue.

The member for Collie went part of the way by adopting the solution preferred by some of the medical specialists in Bunbury who would like to see medical registrars established. This would mean they would not need to be on call for aftercare of their patients in hospital and they would have a better quality of family and personal life. This might encourage other specialists to go into the south west.

That is the sort of debate we should have. We should debate the issue of registrars and the redevelopment of the hospital; whether it should continue to be funded at a regional hospital or outer metropolitan regional hospital standard. We should be debating whether we should provide teaching opportunities for medical practitioners in order to encourage them to go into other areas of country practice. These are the sorts of issues which the Opposition should be raising for debate.

Another issue on which members opposite seek to censure the Minister for South-West deals with the mining veto presently available to private landowners, not just farmers, in relation to the application for mining tenements. Members opposite tend to take the rather naive approach of the farmer organisations and the *Farmers Weekly* which has been supported by some of the conservation organisations. The *Farmers Weekly* and some farming organisations have tried to portray me as being a newcomer to the area. My wife comes from farming stock, my sister is still married to a dairy farmer, two of my wife's uncles are dairy farmers, and I have a multitude of other relatives on various sides involved in the farming industry. For 20 years as a legal practitioner in Bunbury I represented many farmers in opposing mining applications on their lands. As local member for the Shires of Capel and Dardanup for six years I took a great interest in the issue. During that time I always argued for the veto to remain. However, when one becomes Minister and takes on an overall responsibility for farmers, as well as for the south west community, one must look at the problem from a different perspective. What is of concern to farmers really is not the

question of access to their land but their very viability. It is their economic future which is of concern to farmers; their ability to continue farming. That is dependent upon and interrelated with the health of the national economy and of the southwest economy.

I was speaking to a councillor involved in a rural election last week - not in Capel I hasten to say - and he told me that when he was doorknocking his farming constituency in relation to a mining project proposed in the area, nearly all the farmers in that ward supported mining. They did so because it provided their families with a second source of income. They will learn, in the same way as Capel farmers have learnt, that mining is a very valuable second income which makes many farmers viable and enables them to go on farming and earning a reasonable standard of living.

What we now know is that mining is critically important to the national economy. Commodity prices are critically important. The volumes and prices of our exports are critical to the health of the national economy, and if we allow shackles to be put on certain sectors of the export effort which prevent them from achieving their maximum potential, the rest of the community which imposes those shackles must accept the burden which that implies. If we have a deficit in our balance of payments, that puts pressure on the Australian dollar. We have to maintain an artificially high level of interest rates to protect the value of the dollar and the national economy. The net borrowers in the community have to bear the major burden of the high interest rates, and the farming community in particular bears part of that burden. The only farmers who would be affected by any lifting of the right of farmers to veto in relation to mining would be those who may have minerals on their properties. If a farmer has no minerals on his property, no-one will be interested in mining his land. Ninety-nine per cent of the farmers in Western Australia have no minerals on their land, and they have nothing to fear from the removal of any ban.

In any event, farmers at the present moment do not have a right of veto in relation to their land. They have a right of veto in relation to the first 100 feet or 33 metres depth of their land. Any mining company can peg the land and have a mining claim granted, subject only to the exclusion of the first 100 feet. The farmer does not have a right of veto in the way it is popularly promoted. That often causes real problems to farmers who, for reasons of reputation or financial stability, may not be willing to deal with one miner, but they may be willing to deal with another. The first miner who comes along is in a very strong bargaining position which prevents that farmer from dealing with any other miner subsequently.

Under the current arrangements the farmer is not entitled to any compensation for loss of use of the land. If the Government resumes land for road purposes, that landowner gets 10 per cent more than the value of the land. Under the current compensation arrangements, farmers get no premium at all where mining takes place. It is simply a matter of the farmer trying to use his veto power to bargain.

The farming community generally fails to acknowledge that in relation to most of the properties we are talking about, it is the Crown, which is the community, which owns the minerals in the land. The title provides that the minerals in the land belong to the Crown, and therefore to the community. Members opposite are saying that the community which owns those minerals should be deprived of any economic opportunity that those minerals should provide because of the wish to protect one per cent of farmers from the risk of their properties being affected.

Another thing members opposite fail to recognise is that if we are to protect national parks, or require the approval of both Houses of Parliament before miners can mine in national parks, if we are to keep miners out of environmentally sensitive areas, we must start to make available those areas which are not environmentally sensitive but involve the community deciding the competing uses which might be available for that land. We should remember that it would not be for the miner to decide but for the Warden's Court. The legislation would provide for him to be the umpire, and the ultimate decision would be made by the Minister. The only issue which has been raised is that these matters should be discussed and debated before we come to any conclusion. I recommend we oppose and dismiss the amendment.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [10.49 pm]: Over the past 15 years I have heard the Minister for South-West speak at a series of forums. We heard him tonight defending his indefensible stance at a conference in Bunbury two weeks ago.

Mr D.L. Smith: It was not my conference but a conference of community groups from around the south west.

Mr BLAICKIE: In the *Farmers Weekly* recently an editorial dealing with the Minister's naivety - as revealed in the statement he made in relation to removing the mining veto from farmers - concluded as follows -

It is to be hoped that the Premier, Dr Lawrence, gives him a sharp slap in the ear to bring him back to reality.

I have heard this Minister speak at a series of forums over the past 15 years. Tonight he has given a tale of where he sees the industry going. Three weeks ago he gave a different story in a different forum of how he supports the mining industry. I also happened to be at a meeting at the Boyanup Hall 15 years ago when the Minister for South-West, who was then a lawyer, had an entirely different point of view, which was that Governments had no right to interfere with farmers and it was only good lawyers like him who protected them and looked after their interests. He was conjuring up business. At a subsequent meeting when he was a member of Parliament he indicated to another meeting, again in the Boyanup Hall, that if a Government with which he was associated dared interfere with the right of farmers to veto mining, he would cross the floor and vote against it. Here is the Minister now revealed as a man of straw, who delivers speeches depending on the forum. He panders to his audience. This Minister has been caught out telling pork pies time and time again. The people of Boyanup know this as do the people of Elgin. The Minister has lost the confidence of the people of the south west. They thought he was there to give them some protection. However this Minister has taken their protection completely away from them; he has sold them out. The Minister has made a series of stances and at each forum he has indicated a different stance. Those stances are well and truly known to the people of the south west. They certainly have not forgotten them. The Minister has needlessly opened up a can of worms; he has caused a feast.

The Minister said that he went to that mining seminar as the Minister for South-West and that he did make the statement about removing the veto, but when he made that statement - when he was invited as the Minister for South-West to do so - he was talking as David Smith, private citizen, not as a Minister of the Crown. He was expressing a personal view which differed from his ministerial point of view.

Mr D.L. Smith: I said I was talking as the Minister for South-West, not as the Minister for Mines with no capital responsibility for the issue.

Mr BLAICKIE: That is certainly very true. As a Minister of the Labor Government, the Minister for South-West has a collective responsibility for whatever he says and he has now been caught out. Notwithstanding the comments made by the Minister for South-West, the Minister for Agriculture has not made any comment either in defence or rejection of what the Minister for South-West said. That has been noted in the south west. The Premier has made no comment in either defence or rejection of the Minister for South-West's comments. On that basis the people in the south west are under the impression that what the Minister for South-West has said has Government support.

Another instance where the Minister has lost the confidence of the people of the south west is in relation to proposed mining at Scott River. The Minister is prone to shooting from the lip when making his statements and then reading next day what he has said, hoping to God that he was on target. However so often this Minister has been very much off target. In early December the Minister attended a meeting at Scott River of people concerned about mineral sands mining in that region. In his address to those people the Minister said, "As far as I am concerned as Minister I give my qualified support to sand mining in the region", at which there was a great howl from the people. They were quite concerned at what he had said. The Minister then went on to say, "You can have mining but you must trust the Government - trust me - to look after you." Without exception everyone was horrified at what the Minister said. The Minister has also been on the record as supporting the transport of mineral sands from that region by road; he has said that time and time again. On page 179 of the Australian Labor Party (WA Branch) State Platform 1989 under the heading "Mineral Sands Mining at Scott River" it is stated -

Labor will ensure total restoration of mined land, full protection of ground water and

wetland areas including re-forestation with species native to the area. Rail will be the preferred method of transport to port.

This Minister has run around giving his preferred options without regard for his party's own written policies. One of the champions of the rail cause has been the Leader of the House and I commend him for that. People know what the ALP policy is; they read the policy statements and they are quite upset about it.

Mr D.L. Smith: Do you support the rail option?

Mr BLAIKIE: I support it totally. The people of the south west have lost confidence in this Minister.

Another matter I wish to speak briefly about is the Bunbury Regional Hospital. The people of the south west are concerned that in their regional hospital 20 beds have been closed down, a minor theatre has been closed, and so on; we have gone over ad nauseam the statements made by Dr Manea in respect of his concern and why Drs Lishman, Olsthoorn and Thompson have resigned. There is great concern throughout the south west. This again runs counter to the Government's stated policy on health, which reads that Labor will -

Ensure that the sick or disabled have access to affordable, appropriate and effective services as far as possible within their local community, with particular attention to groups with special health needs.

That is what the policy says, but in reality hospital beds have been closed down. If the Minister wants to refute the comments made about him tonight by members on this side of the House, I challenge him to have an open debate in the south west media. I would be prepared to take him on in Busselton and no doubt the member for Collie would be prepared to take him on in her electorate; likewise the member for Warren in Manjimup and the member for Wellington in the Harvey area. Let the people decide whether they have confidence in the Minister.

I support the amendment moved by the member for Wellington and I believe that the people of the south west have lost confidence in their Minister for South-West. He has not done his job. He has failed on a series of occasions and I believe the amendment warrants the support of this House. I also believe it warrants debate in the wider arena of the south west so the Minister can be tested and advised of what the people think. His actions to date show that he has completely ignored the people in the street and what is happening in his own responsibility as Minister for South-West.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (22)

Mr Ainsworth	Mr House	Mr Minson	Mr Fred Tubby
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Kierath	Mr Nicholls	Dr Turnbull
Mr Court	Mr Lewis	Mr Omodei	Mr Wiese
Mr Cowan	Mr MacKinnon	Mr Strickland	Mr Blaikie (Teller)
Mrs Edwardes	Mr McNee	Mr Thompson	
Mr Grayden	Mr Mensaros	Mr Trenorden	

Noes (24)

Dr Alexander	Mr Cunningham	Dr Lawrence	Mr D.L. Smith
Mrs Beggs	Mr Donovan	Mr Leahy	Mr P.J. Smith
Mr Bridge	Dr Gallop	Mr Marlborough	Mr Taylor
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Grill	Mr Pearce	Mr Thomas
Mr Carr	Mrs Henderson	Mr Read	Dr Watson
Mr Catania	Mr Gordon Hill	Mr Ripper	Mrs Watkins (Teller)

Pairs

Mr Clarko	Mr Kobelke
Mr Hassell	Mr Graham
Mr Shave	Mr Troy
Mr Watt	Mr Wilson

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Thomas.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE - SPECIAL

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, 9 May at 10.00 am.

House adjourned at 11.04 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PRISONS - CASUARINA

Construction Cost Estimate

36. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister representing the Minister for Corrective Services:

- (1) What was the original cost estimate at the time of commencement of work of the Casuarina Prison?
- (2) How much has been currently expended on the prison to date?
- (3) What is the current final estimate for the completion of the prison work?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) The original budget was \$52.175 million for a 372 bed prison, as approved in 1986, covering escalation until an anticipated completion date of December 1989.
- (2) \$49.074 million.
- (3) A revised estimated project cost of \$73 million was announced in November 1988 after the Government had made decisions to expand the capacity and upgrade security. In November 1989 the estimated project cost had increased to \$78.5 million, which is the approved budget for 1989-90. Since that time the project has been subject to substantial additional claims, many of which are being disputed. Negotiations are continuing.

CORPORATIONS - FAILURES

Breaches of Law

141. Mr GRAYDEN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Government satisfied that everything possible is being done to identify breaches of the law that may have occurred relative to the spate of corporate failures that have taken place since the share market collapse of October 1987?
- (2) Is it the Government's intention to vigorously prosecute all such breaches?
- (3) If so, will the Government expedite, where possible, such prosecutions?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1) Yes. Within the context of the unprecedented number of matters emerging from the October 1987 market crash, the need to give priority to urgent major investigations and the effects on the Corporate Affairs Department of the Commonwealth's attempts to assume responsibility for companies and securities regulation, everything reasonably possible is being done.
- (2) All offences justifying prosecution will be vigorously pursued.
- (3) It is not practicable to give a commitment either generally or in respect of specific matters that prosecutions will proceed other than in the ordinary course.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL - MEMBERS

167. Mr COURT to the Premier:

Who are the Government members of the Government's Environmental and Economic Development Council?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

Mr Barry Carbon:	Chairman, Environmental Protection Authority
Dr Syd Shea:	Executive Director, Department of Conservation and Land Management
Mr Bruce Sutherland:	Coordinator General, Ministry of Economic Development

Mr John Morhall:

Coordinator-Chief Executive,
Department of Resources Development

WATERFRONT - REFORMS
Government Action

177. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What action is being taken by the Government in relation to reforms on the waterfront?
- (2) Is the Government working in liaison with the Federal Government on this matter?
- (3) If yes, how is this cooperation achieved?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) A working party comprising relevant waterfront representatives has been established to facilitate an appropriate State perspective on waterfront reforms and to ensure that current reform initiatives act to the benefit of all Western Australian ports and their users. Appropriate consultative mechanisms have also been established to ensure regular dialogue between the relevant parties involved in the reform process. At the Fremantle Port Authority, enterprise level reform is being pursued.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Cooperation is being achieved at a number of levels including the Waterfront Industry Reform Authority.

"AUSTRALIA II" - WESTERN AUSTRALIA
Permanent Display Representations

190. Mr HOUSE to the Minister representing the Minister for The Arts:

- (1) Has representation been made to the Commonwealth Government to have *Australia II* on permanent display in Western Australia?
- (2) If yes, have these representations been successful?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Minister for The Arts is still awaiting a response from the Federal Government.

VIOLENCE - NATIONAL COMMITTEE
"Violence: Directions for Australia" Report

208. Mr HASSELL to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Has the Minister read the final report of the national committee on violence entitled "Violence: Directions for Australia"?
- (2) What is the Minister's response to the report?
- (3) Who is considering the report at the moment?
- (4) What sort of timetable is being considered for the implementation of the recommendations of the report?
- (5) Who will be responsible for the implementation of the recommendations?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- (1)-(5) The recommendations of the national committee relate to a wide range of portfolio areas. A number of Ministers will be asked to examine the report and its recommendations, and a whole-of-Government response will be prepared in the near future.

SWIMMING POOLS - FENCING REQUIREMENT

214. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has the Government decided to require isolation fencing around private swimming pools?
- (2) If not, has it decided not to require it?
- (3) Is there a working party on swimming pool safety?
- (4) If so, what is its membership?
- (5) What is its progress?
- (6) Who has or will it consult?
- (7) When will it report?
- (8) What issues is it examining?
- (9) Has it examined pool nets and their relative cost and safety?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The effectiveness of isolation fencing is under review.
- (3)-(9) No working party currently exists to examine matters related to swimming pool safety.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES HOUSING AUTHORITY - HOUSING *Tambellup, Cranbrook, Mt Barker, Albany, Denmark*

225. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Housing:

For each of the towns of Tambellup, Cranbrook, Mt Barker, Albany Shire and Denmark will the Minister provide the following information with regard to the Government Employees Housing Authority -

- (a) the number of GEHA houses build in the 1987-88 financial year;
- (b) the number of GEHA houses built in the 1988-89 financial year;
- (c) the number of GEHA houses planned to be built this financial year;
- (d) the number of GEHA houses planned to be built next financial year?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (a)-(c) GEHA completed one house in Mt Barker in 1987-88 and one house in Denmark in 1989-90. No additional housing was provided in Tambellup, Cranbrook or the Albany Shire.
- (d) For 1990-91 GEHA has received requests from departments for two houses in Mt Barker and one from Mt Many Peaks. Provision is subject to priorities established by departments and available funding in the 1990-91 Budget.

ROADS - MUIR HIGHWAY, MT BARKER-MANJIMUP *Traffic Count - Maintenance Work*

226. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When was the last traffic count conducted on the Muir Highway from Mt Barker to Manjimup?
- (2) What was the result of that count?
- (3) How much money was spent on maintenance work on the Muir Highway during the financial years -
 - (a) 1986-87;
 - (b) 1987-88;
 - (c) 1988-89?

- (4) How much money has been allocated for maintenance work on the Muir Highway for the 1989-90 financial year?
- (5) How much money was spent in construction work on the Muir Highway during the financial years -
 - (a) 1986-87;
 - (b) 1987-88;
 - (c) 1988-89?
- (6) How much money has been allocated for construction work on the Muir Highway for the 1989-90 financial year?
- (7) What major works are planned for the Muir Highway in the financial years -
 - (a) 1989-90;
 - (b) 1990-91;
 - (c) 1991-92?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) A permanent count station has been in place 17 km west of Mt Barker for several years.
- (2) The annual average daily traffic in 1988-89 was 345.
- (3)
 - (a) \$112 885
 - (b) \$161 644
 - (c) \$203 336
- (4) \$253 133
- (5)
 - (a) \$ 13 500
 - (b) \$114 354
 - (c) Nil
- (6) \$400 482
- (7)
 - (a) The major projects for 1989-90 are -

Drainage improvements	\$50 000 (work completed)
Widen and concrete overlay bridge - Kent River	\$70 482 (work completed)
Replace bridge with culvert	\$43 000 (work completed)
Widen and concrete overlay bridge - Hay River	\$30 000 (work completed)
Recondition shoulders, drainage and verges and reinstate edges between Namaberup Gully and Emu Road	\$205 000
 - (b)-(c) The Main Road Department's approved annual budget and program of works is not announced until the start of each financial year. The details of any major works planned on the road during 1990-91 and 1991-92 are therefore not available at this stage.

ROADS - HIGHWAY No 1, DENMARK-WALPOLE
Traffic Count - Maintenance Work

227. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When was the last traffic count conducted on highway No 1 between Denmark and Walpole?

- (2) What was the result of that count?
- (3) How much money was spent on maintenance work on highway No 1 between Denmark and Walpole during the financial years -
 - (a) 1986-87;
 - (b) 1987-88;
 - (c) 1988-89?
- (4) How much money has been allocated for maintenance work on highway No 1 between Denmark and Walpole for the 1989-90 financial year?
- (5) How much money was spent on construction work on highway No 1 between Denmark and Walpole during the financial years -
 - (a) 1986-87;
 - (b) 1987-88;
 - (c) 1988-89?
- (6) How much money has been allocated for construction work on highway No 1 between Denmark and Walpole for the 1989-90 financial year?
- (7) What major works are planned for highway No 1 between Denmark and Walpole in the financial years -
 - (a) 1989-90;
 - (b) 1991-91;
 - (c) 1991-92?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) 1987.
- (2) 476 annual average daily traffic.
- (3)
 - (a) \$103 238
 - (b) \$185 245
 - (c) \$185 885
- (4) \$287 327.
- (5)
 - (a) Nil
 - (b) \$61 775
 - (c) Nil
- (6) \$120 000
- (7)
 - (a) The major works for 1989-90 are -

Recondition shoulders and drainage	\$120 000
Correct surface and repair pavement	\$200 000
 - (b)-(c) The Main Roads Department's approved annual budget and program of works is not announced until the start of each new financial year. The details of any major works planned on the road during 1990-91 and 1991-92 are therefore not available at this stage.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES HOUSING AUTHORITY - POLICE HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr Barker

228. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Housing:

Is the Minister aware of a shortage of Government Employees Housing Authority housing in Mt Barker for police officers?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

The Government Employees Housing Authority is aware that the Police Department has included a requirement in its 1990-91 accommodation requirements. Provision will be subject to funding in the 1990-91 Budget.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT - DADOUR AMENDMENTS
Boundary Changes - Public Referendum Assurance

232. Mr MENSAROS to the Minister for Local Government:

Can the Minister give an absolute assurance that the Government will not attempt to repeal those parts of the Local Government Act which by now are known as the Dadour amendments and provide for a public referendum to be held before boundary changes or amalgamation of municipalities is implemented?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

These matters are discussed in a paper titled "Chapter 2 'Constitution of Local Government'" which I recently released and which is available for public comment. The member is referred to this paper for information on proposed recommendations dealing with these issues. Final decisions on these recommendations will not be made until the consultation period has concluded.

BUILDING - PATIO AND HOME IMPROVEMENT INDUSTRY
Non-registered Builders - Maximum Contract Price Change

240. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Does the Minister intend responding to my letter of 15 February 1990 regarding my proposal to raise the maximum contract price for nonregistered builders in the patio and home improvement industry above the \$6 000 ceiling set in 1975?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that this inappropriate ceiling price is causing severe hardship in the patio and home improvement industry?
- (3) If a response to my letter is to be forthcoming, when can I reasonably expect this to occur?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) I have responded to the member's letter. The delay was caused by the need to refer this matter to the Builders Registration Board for comment.
- (2) The board has recommended that the present limit be retained on the ground that consumers are best protected by building work above this limit only being undertaken by a registered builder. However, in view of the length of time since this limit has been increased I have asked the board to look at this matter again.
- (3) Not applicable.

SCHOOLS - ARMADALE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
Upgrading

241. Mr TUBBY to the Minister for Education:

- (1) During the Minister's inspection of the Armadale Senior High School on Friday, 20 April did the Minister take careful note of the following -
 - (a) the inadequate and outmoded administration area and staff room;
 - (b) the badly deteriorated state of all buildings due to the lack of adequate maintenance;
 - (c) the cracking and bowing of the large brick retaining walls;
 - (d) the proliferation of structural cracks in the brick buildings;
 - (e) the badly deteriorated asbestos cladding of all roof areas;

- (f) the inadequate and badly deteriorated manual arts rooms;
 - (g) the outmoded and inadequate science laboratories;
 - (h) the cracked and disintegrating areas of many verandah ceilings;
 - (i) the cracked and dangerous basketball courts which, for safety reasons, students have been banned from using;
 - (j) the poor library facilities;
 - (k) the two small gymnasiums which have limited usage due to their size and poor acoustics;
 - (l) the complete lack of any facilities for the conduct of theatre arts lessons and performances?
- (2) Since the Minister's inspection has a strategy for addressing these problems been instituted?
- (3) If yes to (2), could the Minister indicate -
- (a) when the upgrading of facilities at the Armadale Senior High School will commence;
 - (b) the priority order for the upgrade;
 - (c) the time frame for conducting the upgrade?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. Possible strategies are still being considered by ministry officers.
- (3) Not applicable.

BRYCE, HON M.J. - FORMER DEPUTY PREMIER
Government Employment

242. Mr COURT to the Premier:

- (1) What Government positions does the former Deputy Premier Hon M.J. Bryce currently hold?
- (2) What are the terms of his remuneration for these positions?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

I refer to answer to question 996 in the Legislative Council dated 19 December 1989.

RAILWAYS - ELECTRIFIED SERVICE
Claremont Area

247. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In the construction of the electric railway system past the Claremont shopping centre, what arrangements have been made in connection with the siting of the rail line?
- (2) Is the rail line to be shifted, or the station arrangements changed?
- (3) What is the progress of the proposals to sell land from the rail reserve at Claremont?
- (4) Has agreement been reached with the Town of Claremont?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) Westrail will electrify the railway in its existing location at Claremont.
- (2) No decision has been made on whether the rail line at Claremont will be shifted or arrangements changed.
- (3) No decision has been made on whether the rail reserve land at Claremont will be sold.

- (4) Consultation with the Town of Claremont on these matters is continuing.

RAILWAYS - ELECTRIFIED SERVICE

Commencement Date

248. Mr HASSELL to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) On what date was the operation of the electric rail service due to have commenced?
- (2) If there have been delays, what has been the cause of the delays?
- (3) Have there been cost overruns?
- (4) If so, to what extent?
- (5) What was the originally scheduled/announced date on which the electric rail service between Perth and Fremantle was to operate?
- (6) What is the scheduled date upon which it will now commence operations?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) The 1988 master plan scheduled commencement of the rail service for the end of 1989.
- (2) As Parliament was advised in October 1989, decisions were made and publicised in 1988 to improve the design of the railcars, which caused some delays to their delivery.
- (3) No.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) As the member was advised in answer to question 1907, electric railcar services were scheduled for introduction commencing February 1991 on the Fremantle line.
- (6) Operations are now scheduled for April 1991.

"EVENING STAR" - COST

250. Mr COURT to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What has been the total cost of purchasing and maintaining the *Evening Star* vessel?
- (2) What is the current estimated value of the *Evening Star*?
- (3) When will the *Evening Star* be sold?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) Purchase price of *Evening Star II* was \$350 000. Maintenance costs for the vessel were -

1987-88	\$110 000
1988-89	\$241 000
1989-90	<u>\$241 000</u>
Total	<u>\$592 000</u>

- (2) It is not possible to estimate the current value of the *Evening Star II*. Price will be identified by the tendering process. Estimated value of individual items of equipment on board is \$250 000.
- (3) A sale may be achieved within three months. The current schedule includes -
 advertising for open tender Australia-wide by the State Tender Board by 30 May;
 out to tender for two weeks;
 assessment of tenders by State Tender Board complete by 20 July.

NORTH WEST SHELF GAS PROJECT - PIPELINE, SOUTH WEST
Fire Protection System Products

253. Mr COURT to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What are the main products used in the fire protection system for the North West Shelf pipeline to the south west?
- (2) What security is kept on these products?
- (3) Have any accidental dumpings occurred?
- (4) If yes to (3), have formal inquiries taken place into these accidents?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) Halon, as a fire extinguisher.
- (2) The halon is locked in a cubicle, with restricted access.
- (3) Yes.
 - (i) Compressor station 7 in 1984.
 - (ii) Compressor station 9 in April 1987.
 - (iii) Compressor station 3 in July 1987.
 - (iv) Compressor station 3 in November 1987.
 - (v) Mainline valve 92 and Geraldton gate station in December 1989.
- (4) Yes.

AIRPORTS - BROOME AIRPORT
Development Proposals

254. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

What are the latest proposals for the development of a new airport at Broome?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

I am not aware of any proposals to develop a new airport at Broome, other than a joint venture development involving Ansett Transport Industries and Australian City Properties, which, according to recent Press releases, has been suspended.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS - DEPARTMENT HEADS
Salary Increase Scheme - Staff and Spending Cuts

256. Mr COURT to the Minister for Public Sector Management:

- (1) Did the Government introduce a scheme last year whereby Government department heads would win salary increases if they cut staff and spending?
- (2) If yes, what department heads received salary increases by meeting these new guidelines?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

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

AIRPORTS - KARRATHA AIRPORT
Upgrading Assistance

259. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

What assistance is the State Government providing for the upgrading of the Karratha Airport?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

The State Government is not providing financial assistance for the upgrading of Karratha Airport.

TOURISM - QUALIFIED TOUR GUIDES

Adequate Numbers

263. Mr COURT to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is there an adequate number of qualified tour guides for the Western Australian tourist industry?
- (2) If no, what steps are being taken to encourage people to enter this occupation?
- (3) What languages are most in demand by visitors requiring interpreters?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) I am advised that there is an adequate number of English speaking tour guides; however, there is a possible shortage of guides who can speak a second language, particularly for emerging markets such as Korea.
- (2) The Western Australian Tourism Commission is meeting with relevant sections of the industry to assess the situation.
- (3) Japanese and Chinese.

POWER STATIONS - KWINANA POWER STATION

Fuel Use

266. Mr COURT to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What fuel has the Kwinana power station been using over the past 12 months?

Mr CARR replied:

Kwinana power station has used a mixture of gas, coal and oil over the last 12 months. Twelve-monthly figures for Kwinana power station fuel use May 1989 - April 1990 -

Gas	29 525.7	terajoules
Coal	290 659.0	tonnes
Oil	7 768.6	tonnes

AIRLINES - DEREGULATION

Government Committee

268. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does the Government have a committee in place examining the deregulation of the airline industry both in relation to freight and passengers?
- (2) If yes, who are the members of that committee?
- (3) What is the current state of their activities?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

(1)-(3)

The impact of the new policy on Western Australia will be monitored by the Department of Transport.

HOMESWEST - RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

Construction

271. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

What is the total of residential tenancies Homeswest has on its inventory as at 30 April 1990?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

33 244.

MCKENZIE, MR W.A. - STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

Remuneration

272. Mr LEWIS to the Minister representing the Minister for Planning:

What was the total amount of moneys for salary leave entitlements and other gratuities paid to Mr W.A. (Bill) McKenzie on his resignation as Chairman of the then State Planning Commission?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

Consistent with policies adopted by previous Governments, I do not propose to disclose the personal financial details of individuals who were formerly employed in the public sector.

HOUSING - HOMESWEST
Rental Accommodation - Construction

273. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many units of Homeswest rental accommodation have been built to completion from commencement at 1 July 1989 to 30 April 1990?
- (2) What is the total amount of moneys expended constructing the units of housing as in (1) above?
- (3) How many units of housing has Homeswest constructed or does Homeswest expect to commence to construct in its own right from 1 July 1989 to 30 June 1990?
- (4) How many units of Homeswest housing as referred to in (3) above are expected to be completed to occupancy by 30 June 1990?
- (5) What is the total amount of funds expected to be expended by Homeswest on units of housing as referred in (4) above?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Homeswest Rental
Commenced/completed 1 July 1989 to 30 April 1990

Construction	143
Spot Purchase	<u>312</u>
Total	<u>455</u>
- (2) Homeswest Rental
Commenced/completed 1 July 1989 to 30 April 1990

Construction	7 833 527
Spot Purchase	<u>22 152 027</u>
Total	<u>29 985 554</u>
- (3) Total unit commencements by Homeswest 1 July 1989 to 30 June 1990 - "in their own right" -

Construction (Rental)	1 628
Construction (Purchase)	102
Spot Purchase	<u>411</u>
Total	<u>2 141</u>
- (4) Total unit commencement and completion by Homeswest 1 July 1989 to 30 June 1990 - "in their own right" -

Construction (Rental)	527
Construction (Purchase)	18
Spot Purchase	<u>411</u>
Total	<u>956</u>
- (5) Total unit commencement and completion by Homeswest 1 July 1989 to 30 June 1990 - "in their own right" -

Construction (Rental)	27 057 410
Construction (Purchase)	1 433 709
Spot Purchase	<u>29 116 322</u>
Total	<u>57 607 441</u>

HOMESWEST - HOME PURCHASE APPLICATIONS
Home Purchase Applications

274. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many applications for home purchase were pending approval on Homeswest waiting list as at 30 April 1990?
- (2) What was the expected wait turn time in the metropolitan area as at 30 April 1990?
- (3) What was the arrived turn date of applications for Homeswest home purchase loans as at 30 April 1990?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) 11 905, of which 6 673 are also listed for rental accommodation.
- (2)-(3)

The current month of allocation for loan assistance is August 1986. This is the only advice given to clients on expected waiting times.

HOUSING - KEYSTART HOME LOANS SCHEME
Recommendation

275. Mr LEWIS to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to recommence the Keystart loans scheme in the 1990-91 financial year?
- (2) If yes, what is the expected date of the recommencement and what amount of funds are planned to be released in that phase?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Planning has yet to be completed for 1990-91. The Government commitment is to \$750 million over its four year term.

**TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS - SOUTH STREET-BENNINGFIELD ROAD
INTERSECTION**
Pedestrian Overpass-Underpass Plans

276. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many traffic accidents were recorded in the vicinity of the South Street/Benningfield Road intersection in the past two years?
- (2) Does the Government have any plans to provide a pedestrian overpass or underpass in this locality?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) 1988 - 14 accidents
1989 - 16 accidents
1990 - Nil accidents to 31 January.
- (2) No.
- (3) Pedestrian movements at this intersection are catered for by the existing traffic signals, which were modified in November 1989 to include pedestrian push buttons and Walk/Don't Walk displays.

ROADS - FREEWAY, CANNING BRIDGE-SOUTH STREET
Lighting Installation

277. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When will the unlit sections of the freeway between Canning Bridge and South Street be provided with appropriate lighting?
- (2) Why has this lighting not been installed to date?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

(1)-(2)

Priority for lighting is given to all interchanges on freeways and locations involving weaving, merging and diverging movements of traffic. The unlit sections of freeway between Canning Bridge and South Street are considered to have a low priority for lighting and there are no current plans to complete the lighting of this section.

SCHOOLS - JANDAKOT PRIMARY SCHOOL

Enrolments - Classrooms

278. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the current enrolment at the Jandakot Primary School?
- (2) How many permanent classrooms are located on site at the Jandakot Primary School?
- (3) How many temporary classrooms are located on site at the Jandakot Primary School?
- (4) How many additional temporary classrooms were required on site at the Jandakot Primary School at the beginning of the 1990 academic year?
- (5) When will the school be relocated?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) As at 16 February 1990 there were 49 preprimary children and 183 students in years 1 to 7 at the school.
- (2) Two.
- (3) Seven temporary classrooms and a transportable preprimary centre.
- (4) One.
- (5) While the replacement school has been listed on the proposed 1990-91 school building program, it is not possible to indicate when the actual work will commence until the details of the State Budget have been finalised later this year.

SCHOOLS - HIGHGATE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Land Sale

282. Mr MacKINNON to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to sell off any of the land upon which the Highgate Primary School is currently located?
- (2) If so, when is it anticipated that sale will proceed?
- (3) Why is the sale proceeding?

Dr GALLOP replied:

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

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN - PREMIER DOWDING

Security System Expenditure

285. Mr MacKINNON to the Premier:

- (1) Referring to question 450 of 1989 addressed to the Premier's predecessor concerning the cost of installing a security system at the former Premier's residence, has the Government received any recoup for this expenditure?
- (2) If not, is it expected that the Government will?
- (3) If not, will the Premier detail the complete cost of the installation of this security system?

- (4) Has any cost been recouped from the former Minister for Economic Development and Trade, Hon Julian Grill, MLA, for similar costs?
- (5) If not, why not?
- (6) If no expenditure is to be recouped, what total outlays were expended by the taxpayers for this purpose?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) Not as yet.
- (2) This has yet to be determined.
- (3) The total cost of security improvements made necessary because of the Premier's position and paid for by the Government was \$4 906.
- (4) Not as yet.
- (5) See answer to (2).
- (6) \$2 000.

STATE FINANCE - BUDGET

Management Services - Consultancy Fee Payments

287. Mr MacKINNON to the Treasurer:

As the Budget papers under the item headed Management Services, Item 13 - Division 13 show that payments of consultancy fees made in 1988-89 were \$21 787, whereas the amount budgeted for 1989-90 is \$272 000, could the Treasurer advise in each case -

- (a) to whom the consultancy fees were paid;
- (b) for what services those consultancy fees were paid;
- (c) for the year 1989-90, the amount of consultancy fees paid to date and to whom?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) (a) Dr J. McKee.
- (b) Advice to the Treasurer on a number of issues.
- (c) \$252 970 has been paid for salaries, office and travel expenses associated with Dr McKee to 30 April.

NORTH WEST SHELF GAS PROJECT - PIPELINE

Capacity Increase

292. Mr COURT to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) When will the Government complete its \$150 million project to increase the capacity of the North West Shelf gas pipeline by 20 per cent?
- (2) What will be the maximum capacity of this line after the upgrade is completed?
- (3) Are further upgrades possible to increase the capacity further?
- (4) If yes, what is the maximum capacity which can be achieved without constructing a new line?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) December 1991.
- (2) 445 TJ/day.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) About 550 TJ/day within current economic parameters.

MINERAL SANDS MINING - REGIONAL STRATEGY

294. Mr COURT to the Minister representing the Minister for Resources:

- (1) Has the Government completed its regional strategy for mineral sands mining?
- (2) If yes, when will this study be made public?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Copies will be available for public distribution this week.

STATE ENERGY COMMISSION - CUSTOMER SECURITY DEPOSITS *Upgrade Proposals*

300. Mr COURT to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is the Government continuing with its proposals to upgrade the security deposits of the existing customers of the State Energy Commission of Western Australia?
- (2) If yes, how many customers have been asked to increase their deposits?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) SECWA is presently reviewing the securities held for commercial customers. The current review is directed at those customers who have a poor payment history. Customers with a good payment history will not be affected, provided they maintain their good payment record.
- (2) 25.

SHIPPING - COLUMBUS LINE *Container Shipping Service Discontinuance*

301. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that an important container shipping service between Geraldton and Fremantle connecting with Singapore, Hong Kong, Osaka, Kobe, Moji, Nagoya and Yokohama - that is, the Columbus Line - is about to be discontinued?
- (2) If so, what does the Minister propose to do about this?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I am advised that the service commenced about 18 months ago on a trial basis, but it has failed to live up to expectations. The withdrawal of this service is a commercial decision by a private shipping company and does not warrant a response from Government. There were arrangements in place, prior to the commencement of this service, to cater for the requirements of shippers wishing to trade between Western Australia and South East Asia, the Far East and Japan. These arrangements are still in place and are available to shippers.

ROADS - MAINTENANCE *Expenditure*

304. Mr COURT to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How much did the Government spend on maintaining its road systems in the financial years -
 - (a) 1987-88;
 - (b) 1988-89?
- (2) What is the anticipated expenditure for 1989-90?
- (3) Does the Main Roads Department have an accounting system which takes into account the optimum maintenance level required for our road system?

- (4) If yes, have projections been prepared for the maintenance of our road system for the next five years?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) (a) 1987-88 - \$66 million.
(b) 1988-89 - \$76.4 million.

Both amounts include contributions to local governments.

- (2) 1989-90 - \$86 million. Includes contributions to local governments.

(3)-(4)

The Main Roads Department currently maintains details of a forward strategy in respect of maintenance of highways and main roads. The department reviews this strategy on an ongoing basis. Information is collected through its regions and assessed on a Statewide basis. The department also has a comprehensive road management information system which supports this assessment. These procedures are being further enhanced through the development of a pavement management system, which will facilitate determination of the strategy to maintain the road network to an acceptable standard and at least cost.

RHONE POULENC - RARE EARTH PLANT, PINJARRA
Alternative Site - Gallium Plant

306. Mr COURT to the Minister representing the Minister for Resources:

- (1) What steps have been taken to encourage Rhone Poulenc to establish its rare earths plant at an alternative site to Pinjarra?
(2) Has the Government tried to encourage Rhone Poulenc to keep its gallium plant open?

Mr TAYLOR replied:

- (1) The Rhone Poulenc project has been deferred, so the question of site alternatives is not an issue.
(2) The suspension of the gallium production is a result of a decline in the world gallium market, which is beyond the control of the company and the Government.

TOURISM - PILOTS' DISPUTE
Estimated Cost

310. Mr COURT to the Minister for Tourism:

What has been the estimated cost to the tourist industry of the recent pilots' dispute?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

It is estimated that the pilots' dispute has cost the Western Australian tourism industry \$86 100 000, made up of \$19 250 000 intrastate and \$66 850 000 interstate.

SWAN BREWERY SITE - RECONSTRUCTION
Delay Costs

311. Mr COURT to the Treasurer:

What are the construction delays at the old Swan Brewery costing the taxpayers of Western Australia on a monthly basis?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

At the present time the holding costs for the old brewery project are running at the rate of \$46 000 per month.

THOMSONS LAKE - LANDCORP LAND

Contract of Sale

315. Mr KIERATH to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Does a contract of sale exist over LandCorp's 178 hectares of land-holdings in the Thomsons Lake development which will be exercised when the Minister for Planning approves the urban rezoning?
- (2) Will the Government then receive \$51 million in exercising this contract with some unknown private developer?
- (3) Was the LandCorp land originally acquired for the purpose as outlined in the publication "Planning for the Future Perth Metropolitan Region" November 1987, at page 8 -

... there will also be a need to contemplate further selective acquisition of land in the rural wedges to conserve environmentally important areas, add to the metropolitan open space system, and assist in the management of available water resources?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

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

EDUCATION MINISTRY - EDUCATION ALLOWANCE

Parents' Cheques

316. Mr AINSWORTH to the Minister for Education:

Concerning the education allowance -

- (a) on what basis did the ministry decide to which parent to send the cheque;
- (b) were steps taken to ensure that cheques went only to custodial parents;
- (c) how many cheques were made out and sent to non-custodial parents;
- (d) where a cheque was sent to a non-custodial parent, did the ministry seek to recover the money and was a second cheque issued to the custodial parent;
- (e) have all eligible parents now received the allowance?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (a) Schools advised the ministry of the name of the parent(s)/guardian(s).
- (b) Refer to answer (a).
- (c) Based on the records provided, it is known that a small but indeterminate percentage were sent.
- (d) Yes, where advised by the schools.
- (e) Most, but not all.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - OFFENCES

322. Mr COWAN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) For each of the last five years, how many persons were -
 - (a) convicted;
 - (b) charged
 with offences related to domestic violence, including incest?
- (2) Is the Minister able to advise of the estimated proportion of offences related to domestic violence, including incest, that are not reported?
- (3) Does the latest research in Western Australia indicate whether the incidence of domestic violence, including incest, is falling or increasing?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

(1)-(3)

This question cannot be answered as there is no recognised category of offences described as "domestic violence".

WATER RESOURCES - GROUNDWEATER

Gelorup Quality Tests

336. Mr BRADSHAW to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Have any ground water tests been carried out at Gelorup with regard to water quality?
- (2) If yes, were these tests giving satisfactory results?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes, the Environmental Protection Authority is aware of tests having been carried out by SCM Chemicals Ltd as part of its proposal to use the Gelorup quarry for waste disposal.
- (2) The proposal was withdrawn. The test results were not formally submitted to the authority.

THOMSONS LAKE - COCKBURN INDUSTRIAL STRIP

Pollution Reduction Assurance

339. Mr KIERATH to the Minister for the Environment:

What assured reduction of industrial pollution from the Cockburn industrial strip has been secured by the Government in order to fulfil conditions set down by the Environmental Protection Authority - EPA Bulletin No 429 page 2 recommendation 4 - to permit the safe discharge of nutrients and urban contaminations from the proposed Thompsons Lake development into Cockburn Sound?

Mr PEARCE replied:

There is no current legal or policy basis under which such a recommendation could be implemented. The principle involved is currently under consideration, but the Government has significant reservations about developing a trade in pollution rights, as this would have the effect of making a capital asset of current production of pollution.

TRANSPORT - MANDURAH

Inadequate Public Transport

341. Mr NICHOLLS to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the gross overcrowding being experienced by Mandurah commuters on peak hour services from Mandurah in the mornings and returning in the afternoons?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that there is no public transport which leaves Perth after 6.00 pm and therefore workers living in Mandurah and travelling to the metropolitan area must use private vehicles?
- (3) How many Transperth buses travel between Rockingham and the inner metropolitan area -
 - (a) Monday to Friday;
 - (b) weekends and public holidays?
- (4) Does the Minister intend to accept alterations to bus routes 117 and 115, which would see further time being added to the trip between the Kwinana terminal and Mandurah?
- (5) Will the Minister take action to purchase the land for a rail reserve between Rockingham and Mandurah within the next calendar year?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) I am aware that some trips are heavily loaded at the times when school children are travelling, and that Transperth is conducting a survey of the existing passengers and of Mandurah residents to provide the best solution to this problem. Once the current survey has been completed, and as resources become available, additional trips on the service will be introduced.
- (2) I am aware that no public transport operates to Mandurah from Perth after 6.00 pm. Mandurah is like a number of other suburbs where the demand for service after 6.00 pm is extremely low, and the cost of operating additional trips cannot be justified.
- (3) The number of trips between Rockingham and Perth is about to increase as part of an interim review by Transperth commencing on 14 May 1996.

EXISTING

	To Perth	To Fremantle	From Perth	From Fremantle
(a) Monday to Friday	22	38	18	43
(b) Saturday	5	22	5	21
(c) Sunday and public holidays	Nil	8	Nil	8

AS FROM 14 MAY 1990

	To Perth	To Fremantle	From Perth	From Fremantle
(a) Monday to Friday	25	42	20	46
(b) Saturday	5	22	5	21
(c) Sunday and public holidays	Nil	8	Nil	8

A full review of Rockingham and Kwinana services is to be introduced in August/September.

- (4) Transperth is currently surveying Mandurah residents with a view to upgrading their service. Part of this survey is to ascertain if the 115 and 117 routes should be changed to travel via Rockingham bus station, which would increase the journey time by approximately 15 minutes. If the results of the survey show that the majority of people surveyed wish to travel via Rockingham, I would have no objection to this change.
- (5) The South West Corridor Transport Study Steering Committee has recommended the reservation of land for railway use between Rockingham and Mandurah. A railway enabling Bill is being drafted.

PUBLIC COMPANIES - FAILURES

Audit Reports - Validity Inquiry

346. Mr BRADSHAW to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

Is any investigation taking place into the validity of audit reports such as for Rothwells or any other failed public company in the last few years?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

Yes.

COMMISSION OF THE PEACE - COMMISSIONERS FOR DECLARATIONS

Appointments

349. Mr GRAYDEN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) How many persons have been appointed to the Commission of the Peace in each of the last five years?

- (2) How many persons have been appointed as commissioners for declarations in each of the last five years?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-----|
| (1) | 1985 | 114 |
| | 1986 | 115 |
| | 1987 | 70 |
| | 1988 | 156 |
| | 1989 | 74 |
| | 1.1.90 - 4.5.90 | 19 |
- (2) Information on appointments for the period 1.1.85 - 30.4.88 is not available.
- | | | |
|--|-------------------|----|
| | 1.5.88 - 31.12.88 | 34 |
| | 1989 | 51 |
| | 1.1.90 - 30.4.90 | 32 |

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES HOUSING AUTHORITY - HOUSES

Ownership - Valuation

352. Mr AINSWORTH to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Outside the metropolitan area, how many houses does the Government Employees Housing Authority -
- own;
 - lease?
- (2) What is the current value of the houses outside the metropolitan area owned by GEHA?
- (3) Is this valuation the true market valuation, or is it based on construction cost?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) (a) 4 087.
(b) 123.
- (2) Total cost: \$167 181 650.10
Book value: \$152 706 374.10
- (3) The valuation is based on construction or acquisition cost.

HOMESWEST - CHAIN LETTER

Mandurah Resident

353. Mr NICHOLLS to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Minister been made aware of a request for further information regarding an incident where a Mandurah resident received a chain letter through the mail from Homeswest?
- (2) If yes to (1), has the culprit been identified and what action has been taken to prevent this happening again?
- (3) If no to (1), what action will the Minister take to investigate this matter?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

- (1) I understand that the previous Minister was made aware of an incident involving a chain letter.
- (2)-(3) No. I am advised that there have been no further incidents and that all the necessary precautionary steps have been taken.

COMPANY DIRECTORS - BREACHES OF LAW

Western Australian Acts

355. Mr GRAYDEN to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

What Western Australian Acts contain provisions relating to breaches of law by directors of companies?

Mr D.L. SMITH replied:

The following Western Australian Acts provide specifically for breaches of the duties and responsibilities of company directors -

Companies (Western Australia) Code
Companies (Co-operative) Act 1943
Companies Act 1961
Criminal Code
Occupational Health, Safety & Welfare Act 1984

Many other Western Australian Acts contain provisions which are applicable to breaches of law by, among others, company directors, but are not restricted to acts or omissions by company directors specifically.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS - COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

358. Mr COURT to the Premier:

What is the current status of the Government's proposals to establish its own communications network between Government departments?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

Through the Department of Computing and Information Technology, coordination of all public sector communications activity, ranging across voice and data networks to video conferencing and radio network facilities, has continued. For the time being, the Government has deferred going to tender for the supply of a common Statewide public sector network.

PULP MILL - SOUTH WEST *Government Policy Change*

360. Mr COURT to the Premier:

Have the Minister for the Environment and the Executive Director of the Department of Conservation and Land Management, Dr Shea, been informed of the change in Government policy to not proceed with the establishment of a pulp mill in the south west?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

I refer to answer to question 70 in the Legislative Assembly dated 2 May 1990.

URANIUM MINING - RUDALL RIVER *CRA Exploration*

362. Mr COURT to the Minister for Mines:

Will the Government allow CRA Exploration to proceed with uranium mining at Rudall River if Federal Government permission is granted to export the product?

Mr CARR replied:

The Premier has announced that there will be no uranium mined in this State during the term of the present Government.

PUBLIC SERVANTS - LEVEL 1 to LEVEL 7 PROMOTION

363. Mr COURT to the Minister for Public Sector Management:

- (1) Was it correctly reported in the *Sunday Times* of 15 April 1990 that a public servant had been promoted from a level 1 directly to a level 7?
- (2) If yes, who was that person?
- (3) What was the reason for this rapid promotion?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) I am advised the report was incorrect.
- (2)-(3) Not applicable.

PARMELIA PROJECT - SWAN RIVER SITE

367. Mr COURT to the Minister representing the Minister for Planning:

- (1) What Government approvals have been given for the development of the Parmelia project on the Swan River sited near the No 4 causeway car park?
- (2) When is the project to be commenced?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

- (1) I am advised that the Minister responsible for waterways has approved the project, subject to conditions, but that the applicants have requested a reconsideration.
- (2) Not known at this stage.

SERVICE STATIONS - ROSTER SYSTEM CHANGES

369. Mr COURT to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

At what stage are the Minister's discussions with the service station industry on changes to the roster system?

Mrs HENDERSON replied:

I am having ongoing discussions with the Motor Trade Association in regard to the roster system and it would be premature to make any statement in this regard at this time.

BY-ELECTIONS - POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

Public Funding

373. Mr COURT to the Premier :

Will the Premier give an assurance that the Premier will not use publicly funded political advertisements in the lead up to the forthcoming by-elections?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

Yes.

TREE FUND LIMITED - GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Tree Plantings

374. Mr COURT to the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) What assistance is the Government providing the Tree Fund Limited?
- (2) How many trees is it anticipated will be planted by this fund?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The Government is providing information on the technical and financial aspects of growing trees in the south west of Western Australia.
- (2) The number of trees that will be planted depends on the amount of funds raised by Tree Fund.

WEST AUSTRALIANS FOR RACIAL EQUALITY - GOVERNMENT FUNDING

377. Mr COURT to the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs:

- (1) Does the State Government fund an organisation, West Australians for Racial Equality?
- (2) If yes, what funds has this organisation received from the State Government?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (1) Yes, the State Government has made a grant available to this organisation.
- (2) A grant of \$25 000 was made to West Australians for Racial Equality.

ENERGY - UNDERGROUND POWER LINES
Perth Suburbs Proposal

378. Mr COURT to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Will the Government support the Liberal Party's proposals to implement a plan to underground power lines in Perth's established suburbs over the next decade?

Mr CARR replied:

No, unless the costs are met by those who gain the direct benefits. The costs associated with the undergrounding of existing high and low voltage overhead lines are excessive and funds are not available for such works. Such a project would have a severe impact upon SECWA's charges. The Government encourages the servicing of all new subdivisions with underground services rather than face excessive costs later.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS - MEMBER FOR PEEL
Candidates' Support Letter

379. Mr KIERATH to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the member for Peel has sent letters to ratepayers in the town of Kwinana urging them to support two candidates in the local government elections on 5 May 1990?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the letter was sent on the member's parliamentary letterhead?
- (3) Is the Minister aware of any rules or regulations that do not permit the use of electorate office facilities, such as stationery, franking machines, and stamps, for purposes other than parliamentary office business?
- (4) Does the Minister consider the support of candidates in local government elections, using parliamentary office facilities, to be a misuse of electoral allowance?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

- (1) The Leader of the Opposition drew attention to the matter in a question without notice addressed to the Premier on Thursday, 3 May 1990.
- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3)-(4)

I trust the member has a copy of the "Electorate Office Handbook" and the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal's determinations which detail the rules governing the use of parliamentary electorate offices and associated facilities, including postage.

EDUCATION MINISTRY - AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT
Property Registers - Inadequate Maintenance

380. Mrs EDWARDES to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Referring to question 198 of 1990, would the Minister advise the reason why -
 - (a) property registers have not been adequately maintained;
 - (b) an annual physical inventory had not been carried out as required under the Treasurer's Instructions?
- (2) What work is in progress to implement appropriate controls?
- (3) What is intended by the phrase "substantially addressed" when referring to the Attorney General's concerns?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) Due to the complex nature of the organisation and the major restructuring which has been occurring over the past two years it has not been possible for

the ministry to maintain fully, and undertake, an annual physical inventory of property registration.

- (2) Arrangements are in hand for a physical inventory to be undertaken of the ministry's central office property.
- (3) Subsequent to the physical inventory, appropriate computerised records will be developed and maintained to provide the mechanism for effective control and movement of property.

ROADS - GREAT NORTHERN HIGHWAY
Motor Vehicle Counts - Gingin Turn-off - New Norcia

381. Mr McNEE to the Minister for Transport:

Referring to question 58 of 1990, would the Minister provide the required information for a representative location on the Great Northern Highway between the Gingin turn-off north of Bindoon and New Norcia for which the Main Roads Department has data available?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

Average based on continuous data collection over the last 12 months, four kilometres north of the Dewars Pool-Bindoon Road -

Cars	379
Utilities and light trucks	214
Heavy trucks	124
Semi-trailers	99
Road trains	8

MINING - PRIVATE LAND-HOLDER'S VETO
Government Policy

383. Mr COWAN to the Minister for Mines:

What is the Government's policy in relation to the land-holder's veto on mining operations?

Mr CARR replied:

Provided that the interests and livelihood of private landowners are adequately protected, the Government believes that the mining industry should have access to private land for the purpose of mining operations. To this end discussions have been taking place between the farming and mining industries to establish whether the problems associated with such access could be resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned without the need for legislative change. The Government is hopeful that success will be achieved in this regard and does not propose to move for any legislative changes unless and until all avenues for a satisfactory resolution to the matter by discussion have been exhausted.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS - ABORIGINAL WELFARE
Duplication Reduction

384. Mr COWAN to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

Further to question 154 of 1990, how long will it be before there is a reduction in duplication and other waste of public moneys among the various agencies providing Aboriginal welfare?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

The Government recognises that there is a perception within some sections of the community that there is waste and duplication in service delivery to Aboriginal people.

The Government does not agree with the proposition that there is substantial waste and duplication in service delivery. Of the 11 recommendations made by the Select Committee, only one - recommendation 3 - made specific reference to duplication in funding and operation of Aboriginal programs, and

which it further said could be remedied by an enhanced coordinating function of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority.

A restructuring of the authority is under way and when completed in the near future will have an enhanced policy development, planning and coordination function.

Other sections of the report drew particular attention to the need for improved coordination of health and housing services, and it is recognised that there is a need for better coordination of Commonwealth and State programs.

The Health Department of Western Australia has established an Aboriginal health policy unit which is reviewing the provision and level of health services for Aborigines in conjunction with Aboriginal Medical Services and associated Commonwealth and State agencies, with the objective of ensuring coordinated and cost effective services. The review will be completed by December 1990. The need for ongoing coordination of health services will be met by the establishment of the Tripartite Forum for Intersectoral Cooperation, which will have its inaugural meeting in July 1990 and is to be chaired by the Commissioner for Aboriginal Planning.

The State advisory committee on Aboriginal housing was established in 1988 in accordance with the Commonwealth-State housing agreement for the purpose of coordinating housing programs. The AAPA is continuing to monitor the operation of this committee.

MINING - PRIVATE LAND-HOLDER'S VETO *Removal Recommendation*

385. Mr COWAN to the Minister for the Environment:

Does the Minister support the removal of the private land-holder's veto on mining activity, as recommended by his colleague, the Minister for South-West?

Mr PEARCE replied:

Provided that the interests and livelihood of private landowners are adequately protected, the Government believes that the mining industry should have access to private land for the purpose of mining operations. To this end discussions have been taking place between the farming and mining industries to establish whether the problems associated with such access could be resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned without the need for legislative change. The Government is hopeful that success will be achieved in this regard and does not propose to move for any legislative changes unless and until all avenues for a satisfactory resolution to the matter by discussion have been exhausted.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN - TRAVEL *Essential - Non-essential Penalties*

387. Mr COWAN to the Premier:

Further to question 49 of 1990 -

- (a) has the Premier indicated to Ministers and chief executive officers what disciplinary action will be taken if they embark on or approve travel that is not essential;
- (b) if yes, what is it;
- (c) what constitutes essential travel?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

- (a) I have sufficient confidence in Ministers and chief executive officers not to have specified penalties for non-compliance with the provisions of my circular on cost saving measures. The requirement that travel be limited to essential purposes will be monitored.

- (b) Not applicable.
- (c) Essential travel is that which, in the judgment of the Minister or chief executive officer, as appropriate, demands the attendance of Ministers and/or officers because it is important to the State's interests.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY - CLERK AND DEPUTY CLERK
Cars Decision

393. Mr TRENORDEN to the Speaker:

- (1) Further to question 106 of 1990, given the provisions of the Parliamentary Employees Award how does the Speaker justify making the decision to provide cars to the Clerk and Deputy Clerk of the Legislative Assembly as part of their conditions of employment when he is not their employer?
- (2) Was the matter referred to the Governor-in-Executive Council?
- (3) If no to (2), why not?
- (4) If yes to (2), when?

The SPEAKER replied:

- (1) At the time the decision was made and the positions of Clerk and Deputy Clerk of the Assembly were advertised, the Parliamentary Employees Award was not in force. While the appointments to these positions in the past have been made by the Governor-in-Executive Council, conditions of employment have been determined by the Speaker.
- (2) No.
- (3) See (1) above.
- (4) Not applicable.

SCHOOLS - GUIDANCE OFFICER, KATANNING
Psychologists Registration Board Qualifications

395. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the current guidance officer in Katanning meet the psychology qualifications set by the Board of Psychologists in Western Australia?
- (2) Is the person appointed registered with the Board of Psychologists?
- (3) Has the person appointed completed teacher training?

Dr GALLOP replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The person appointed is fully registered with the Psychologists Registration Board of Western Australia.
- (3) The person appointed has not completed teacher training.

EDUCATION - CENTRAL OFFICE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Role and Resources

396. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Education:

Can the Minister define what the role and resources of the central office consultative committee will be?

Dr GALLOP replied:

The role of the central office consultative committee is to resolve or attempt to resolve grievances to a point where they can be handed back to the district or school to implement. The central office consultative committee will consist of one ministry industrial relations representative, one other appropriate ministry nominee, as well as a union industrial representative and a nominee of the president of the union. The committee will be supported by part time personnel.

TRANSPORT - EXEMPTIONS
Transport Co-ordination Act 1966, Section 19(2)

398. Mr NICHOLLS to the Minister for Transport:

Who has been granted exemptions, which apply currently, under section 19(2) of the Transport Co-ordination Act 1966?

Mrs BEGGS replied:

The list of exemptions under section 19(2) of the Transport Co-ordination Act 1966 is lengthy and contained in the Transport (Exemptions) Order 1985 (as amended), copies of which can be obtained from the State Printing Division.

EDUCATION MINISTRY - STATE SCHOOL TEACHERS UNION
School Resources Negotiation

402. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Why will the resourcing of schools in the future be subject to negotiated agreements with the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia?
- (2) How will this mechanism ensure that agriculture and other export-orientated skills and attitudes are not subject to union ideology?
- (3) Will the Minister ensure that the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations will be in agreement with all future arrangements between the ministry and the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia so that community participation becomes a reality?
- (4) Will the Minister undertake that the teachers receive a second tier wage increase subject only to full acceptance of school based decision making groups within the parameters acceptable to the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations?
- (5) What will be the legitimate role of a school council in monitoring a school's performance?
- (6) What will be the changes in the work done between 1982 and 1990, and changes in the structural efficiencies being offered for negotiation with the State School Teachers Union up to 1993?
- (7) What will be the cost of this change?
- (8) What are the areas that the ministry intends to negotiate with the union over which the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission would have no jurisdiction?

Dr GALLOP replied:

(1)-(2)

The Ministry of Education and the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia have agreed on a process of devolution, whereby authority will be delegated to schools at the same time as school staff are given a means of accounting for that authority. The implementation of this process - particularly in terms of professional development and appropriate retraining - is the specific area which will now be effected within negotiated parameters and dependent on negotiated resource agreements. This will simply ensure that industrial parameters are protected and that the necessary resources for implementation are provided. There is no provision for union control or veto of school curricula.

- (3) The Ministry of Education will continue to consult with the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations on the wide range of educational issues which have formed its agenda over the years. However, no guarantee of agreement on all of these issues can be given.
- (4) No. The parameters pertaining to school based decision making groups are the result of a working party comprising representatives of the primary and secondary school principals' associations, the State School Teachers Union of

Western Australia, the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations, the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union, and the Civil Service Association, together with officers of the Ministry of Education. The parameters were not formulated in relation to the present memorandum of agreement.

- (5) Within the context of the school development plan, school decision making groups - which some schools may choose to call councils - will report to parents and local community representatives on schools' educational objectives, priorities and performance.
- (6) These changes are described in detail in the memorandum of agreement between the Ministry of Education and the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia, which has been submitted to the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission.
- (7) The salaries package, which is still subject to ratification by the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission, will have a full year impact of approximately \$41 million. Future costs will be subject to further negotiation.
- (8) Without limiting the subjects for negotiation, areas that it is proposed the ministry negotiate with the union, over which the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission has no jurisdiction, would include student instructional time and the school year.

SCHOOLS - CLASS 1 DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOLS
Library-Resource Centres

403. Mr McNEE to the Minister for Education:

Referring to question 56 of 1990, will the Minister advise how many class 1 district high schools do not have a purpose-built library/resource centre?

Dr GALLOP replied:

One.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BURKE, MR BRIAN - TELEVISION STATIONS
Litigation - Government Finance

26. Mr LEWIS to the Premier:

I refer the Premier to today's issue of *The West Australian*, and the reference to an out of court settlement by two of Perth's commercial television stations in relation to litigation brought by former Premier Brian Burke against those stations and ask -

Have Western Australian Government funds at any time been used to finance former Premier Burke's litigation against those television stations in the case specifically referred to, or any other litigation for damages?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

I have seen the report referred to. I am not aware that Government funds have been used and I do not expect that they would have been.

Mr Lewis: Will you inquire into the matter?

Dr LAWRENCE: I shall be happy to do so, and it is obviously the sort of question that should have been placed on notice if the member wanted an answer with which he would be satisfied.

LEGISLATION - NATIONAL PARTY STRIKE
Liberal Party Members - Selective Legislation "Work to Rule" Policy

27. Mr DONOVAN to the Premier:

Further to my question last week on the National Party's proposed "strike" in the upper House, what is the Premier's response to this week's earlier

announcement that Liberal members in the upper House have agreed to a "work to rule" policy on selective legislation?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

I noted with interest last week that the National Party members in the upper House had indicated their intention to adjourn debate on all Bills. It very quickly became evident that their colleagues in crime, members of the Liberal Party, had indicated they were not prepared to adjourn debate but rather they would selectively block legislation. That clearly resulted in a falling out between the two parties again and the weekend was spent -

Mr Court: - reading the front pages of *The West Australian*.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: The two parties spent the weekend trying to reconcile the split that had occurred so soon in their ranks after their happy marriage in earlier weeks. They have fallen out again and they cannot agree about whether they are on strike or are working to rule. It seems at this stage that they want to agree to disagree. In either case, I would have thought the essential services legislation the Opposition has proposed many times in this House to apply to other workers who go on strike in areas I regard as essential to this State, might equally apply to this Parliament.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr LAWRENCE: I want to take a moment seriously to consider what is proposed in the upper House.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! After calling for order, and I waited deliberately on this occasion to ensure that I could be under no misapprehension that all members heard me call for order, two members of the Opposition chose to continue with their interjections. I suppose most members realise that I am a very gentle person who does not get angry quickly, and I will not do so on this occasion. This should be the last time I ask for cooperation. If members are intent on delivering their interjections I suggest that before doing so they address themselves to the Standing Orders because, without question, if I ask for order again and they ignore me, I will have recourse to those Standing Orders.

Dr LAWRENCE: The question of the behaviour of members of the upper House in adjourning or selectively refusing to debate certain legislation is a serious matter. Members opposite are intent on looking at opinion polls and front page stories in *The West Australian* but they may have had time to read a serious political commentary, the editorial of that newspaper on Saturday, which clearly indicated that in the view of that newspaper, and in my view also, the Opposition has gone too far. There is nothing new in that; the Opposition has been threatening this Government for a long time over a range of matters. The nature of the threat changes from time to time but the position of members opposite is that they clearly believe it is appropriate for members in the upper House to delay serious legislation; and, in the case of the National Party, to not consider it at all. So members opposite would prevent seniors from receiving a rebate on water charges; they would prevent the passage of the freedom of information legislation; and they would prevent the appointment of a Director of Public Prosecutions.

Mr Court: You have lost hundreds of millions of dollars, and all we want is a Royal Commission.

Dr LAWRENCE: Members opposite want to prevent this State from operating. What members opposite are suggesting is totally irresponsible. What members in the upper House are suggesting amounts to nothing short of

blackmail, and what members opposite continue to suggest is a perversion of the parliamentary system.

Government members: Hear, hear!

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS - VOTING IRREGULARITIES

Inquiry

28. Mr WIESE to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) In view of the revelations and allegations of voting irregularities in the recent local government election can the Minister assure the House that a complete investigation of the allegations will be undertaken?
- (2) Will that investigation be undertaken by the Department of Local Government?
- (3) If the investigation reveals that substantial irregularities have occurred will the Minister take steps to ensure that the recent election result is annulled and a new election is called?

Mr GORDON HILL replied:

(1)-(3)

I am not aware of any allegations being made in relation to the local council which the member represents, or the area covered by his electorate.

Mr Wiese: I am talking about the election as a whole.

Mr GORDON HILL: Certainly where allegations have been made, those matters will be investigated thoroughly.

Mr MacKinnon: By whom?

Mr GORDON HILL: It is appropriate that the allegation be investigated by the returning officer at first instance, if the allegation is made to the returning officer. If the allegation is made to the Court of Disputed Returns, it will be investigated by that body. If the allegation is made to the Department of Local Government, it will be investigated by that department. If the matter is being investigated by the police, as is the case with the Perth City Council, then I have made it clear that the electoral rolls will be opened to assist the police to undertake their investigations thoroughly.

There will be a thorough investigation of all the allegations made, if there is in fact evidence to substantiate those allegations. One cannot institute investigations on matters without there being evidence. If the member has any specific issues he would like to raise or have investigated further, I will be happy to discuss those with him.

Mr Wiese interjected.

Mr GORDON HILL: It depends on the circumstances and, if there is a matter before the Court of Disputed Returns, on whether the Court of Disputed Returns deems it appropriate.

PULP MILL - WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Establishment Plans

29. Mr RIPPER to the Minister for the Environment:

Is the Government considering any proposal for a paper pulp mill for Western Australia?

Mr PEARCE replied:

There is no active proposal for a pulp mill currently before the Government of Western Australia, but during the last few weeks the Government has taken the opportunity of laying down the ground rules for any pulp mill in Western Australia. They are, first, that no pulp mill will be established in Western Australia -

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us have some manners in this place. If members will not abide by the Standing Orders they should at least use the manners that they grew up with, I hope.

Mr PEARCE: - until such time as sufficient plantation forest has been established to provide the base stock for that mill. We will not have an increased draw from the native forest in order to establish a pulp mill. If at the time those plantations are in place there is a proposal for a pulp mill, it could perhaps go ahead but only on the basis that the world's strictest environmental guidelines can be established, using as a minimum the guidelines previously established by the Commonwealth Government for chlorine bleach mills of this kind. We have also made it clear that we are interested in alternative technologies which are being developed, which may produce cleaner processes.

That position is held by all Government Ministers, including the Premier and me; and despite claims by the Opposition that there are differences between members of the Government, I can say clearly that is the Government's position. It is not clear, however, that the Opposition has a coherent policy. I say that because the *Countryman* of last Thursday, 3 May, says that -

The Opposition spokesman for Agriculture and the South-West, Mr Paul Omodei, has launched a scathing attack on three Government Ministers.

He picked me first.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: In fact, attached to that article is a very nice cartoon of me in a fighter plane, shooting the member down. The editors of the *Countryman* certainly knew what would happen to Mr Omodei when he stuck his head up!

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not proper to mention a member's name.

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, I am sorry to have to emphasise names but a bit further down in the article Mr Omodei is described as referring to the Minister for South-West as Mr Barry Smith. I know that the member is relatively new to the Parliament but I thought by now he would have worked out who are the Ministers.

The Opposition spokesman for agriculture and the south west called upon me to resign for my "kamikaze" approach in supporting a chlorine bleach pulp mill in WA's south west; that is, if one supports a chlorine bleach pulp mill in the south west, one should resign. The member should have addressed his remarks to Greenough MLA, Kevin Minson, who is quoted in *The Geraldton Guardian* of 27 April, as saying -

... he also questioned the morality of the Government in its stance on importation of bleached paper.

"The Government is being completely hypocritical in allowing woodchips to be exported and used in chlorine bleach mills overseas and then reimporting the bleached paper to print its propaganda on, leaving the pollution in someone else's backyard," he said.

"It would be better and more responsible to use those woodchips in a local mill using the latest technology where we could strictly control effluent levels, rather than allow those chips to go to old, poorly controlled mills overseas."

Mr Minson said that dioxin levels were low in modern mills and could be very strictly controlled in Western Australia.

Mr Minson: I did not say you had to use the Kraft chlorine process.

Mr PEARCE: What other process produces dioxins? That is talking exactly about that process.

Several members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: It is no good trying to weasel out of that. The member for Greenough sits two seats away from the shadow Minister for Agriculture and South-West, yet he cannot get the same story. It is a bit unfortunate -

Mr MacKinnon: Mr Speaker, it is time that the Minister wound up his answer, in line with your earlier direction.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point is well taken in respect of my earlier request, rather than direction. I am absolutely certain the Minister was on his last sentence.

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, you are absolutely correct. I was just pointing out that the unity of approach on this issue on the Government's side might well be emulated by the Opposition.

ROTHWELLS LTD - CONNELL, MR LAURIE

Personal Assets Commitment - Deputy Premier Parker's Statement

30. Mr HASSELL to the Premier:

- (1) Does the Premier recall the statement made by the then Minister, David Parker, in this House on 27 October 1987 in relation to Rothwells that "the Premier made it absolutely clear to Mr Connell on a number of occasions that he wanted Mr Connell to place every one of his assets on the line . . . every one of his assets had to be more at risk than other people's assets . . . Mr Connell readily agreed to that"?
- (2) Further, that Mr Parker reported that, "Mr Connell was prepared to put everything on the line"?
- (3) Is the Premier aware of any action whatsoever by Government to enforce or ensure that these undertakings were fulfilled?
- (4) Is the Premier aware that the State has lost many millions of dollars from its rescue of Rothwells?
- (5) Would the Premier agree that it would be fit and appropriate for Mr Connell to fulfil the promises said to have been made to the Government so as to minimise the losses to the taxpayers of the State?
- (6) Will the Premier institute inquiries and seek advice on this matter and report to the House in the near future?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(6)

The first part of the question makes some of the rest of it rather difficult to answer, because the member asks if I recall a statement by Mr Parker on that day and the answer is that I do not. I know the general tenor of the matter because the member has described it and because it has been described by others in this House. I do not believe that speculation on my part about whether Mr Connell has kept to the letter of an undertaking that he gave to a former Minister will be particular helpful. What is important is that the whole collapse of Rothwells is correctly investigated. I believe that is what is happening at the moment. The liquidators are very carefully looking at those matters and Mr McCusker has specifically as one of his terms of reference an investigation into Rothwells. If there is some matter that may be the subject of a reasonable question from the member about a specific promise that Mr Connell was known to have made and it was known to have been breached, I would be more than happy to answer that question. The critical thing about this issue is not whether a particular individual - a former Minister, a businessman in this town - may or may not have proved to be correct in hindsight. That will not contribute to this debate at all and the member knows that. What we need to know in this House is precisely that: What led to the collapse of Rothwells; which businesses and institutions benefited from that; which businesses and institutions should be asked to repay certain funds; and which businesses, institutions or individuals - I

exclude no-one - should be investigated in a way that has been suggested in this House by members opposite many times.

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES - LOCKRIDGE FRINGE DWELLERS

Government Assistance

31. Mr DONOVAN to the Minister assisting the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

This question relates to several of my constituents. Can the Minister please advise what steps are being taken to improve the living conditions of the Lockridge-Eden Hill campsite currently occupied by several members of the Aboriginal community known as the fringe dwellers of the Swan Valley?

Mrs BUCHANAN replied:

I thank the member for Morley for this question and I am very pleased to be able to advise that following the member's representations the Government has acted immediately to address both the short term and long term needs of the Lockridge fringe dwellers. After some consultation with the community, measures are now in progress to alleviate the squalid conditions and to better equip the people for the coming winter months. In the longer term the Government is committed to provide Lockridge residents with secure land tenure and more appropriate housing than the temporary shelters they currently occupy.

PULP MILL - WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Kelty, Mr Bill - Government Reconsideration

32. Mr MENSAROS to the Premier:

This question relates to a subject which was dealt with by the Minister for the Environment a few moments ago.

- (1) Is the Government aware that the Secretary of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, Mr Bill Kelty, on the Walsh program on Channel 9 on Sunday, 29 April, instanced a paper pulp mill as one of the desirable extensions of Australian manufacturing industry?
- (2) In view of this, will the Government reconsider its position, stated a couple of minutes ago by the Minister for the Environment, towards establishing such an industry in the near future and not only in the next century as the Premier told the Press Club in her address recently?

Dr LAWRENCE replied:

(1)-(2)

I would have thought that the position of the Government was made eminently clear by the Minister for the Environment just a moment ago. I did not happen to see Mr Kelty on that matter. The Government has always indicated that value adding products here is desirable and is promoted by the Government. The position we have taken in relation to a pulp mill is really a position in relation to the use of our hardwood native forests. I understand there is in fact a proposition before various business interests at the moment to use straw to produce certain types of cardboard through a pulping process. That is something we welcome, and the Minister responsible for Economic Development and Trade did that this morning, but it is important that we recognise the very serious challenge against our native forests. Members opposite also know that we have indicated we are phasing out woodchipping of many of those forests in favour of plantations which are a far preferable way of providing the necessary stock.

WATER RESOURCES - PIPELINE

Kimberley-Perth - Infrastructure Development Corporation Study

33. Mr LEAHY to the Minister for Water Resources:

Would the Minister advise when the Infrastructure Development Corporation will complete its study into the development of a water pipeline from the Kimberley to Perth?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

Mr Speaker -

The SPEAKER: Order! I heard the song relating to this earlier today and members will be very interested in it.

Mr BRIDGE: I thought you were rather impressed with that verse, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Absolutely.

Mr BRIDGE: It made good sense, and I will just repeat it: "Now come on Australia, join with the Speaker and me. Let us build this pipeline for all the world to see." The Speaker thought that was very good.

Mr Court: It is about time you built it - you have been talking about it for about five years.

Mr BRIDGE: I have had to put up with a lot of urging from Opposition members and the public generally in getting this pipeline built, but one of the things we had to do, in response to the member for Northern Rivers' question, was to have a further study carried out in respect of this proposal. I am happy to be able to report to the Parliament tonight that I have received today the document that is the study into the Kimberley pipeline proposal. I would like to present it to Cabinet next week for Cabinet's noting and then, during next week, I hope to present it to the Parliament, or make a copy available, so that members of the House will be able to look at it.

Mr Blaikie: Could you also tell us what you are going to do about country drainage at the same time?

Mr BRIDGE: Yes, the water from the Kimberley will flush out all of the member's sewerage problems.

Mr Shave: Could you give us a costing on the proposal?

Mr BRIDGE: Yes, that is interesting. I did not want to summarise the study in any detail because I thought I would do that when presenting it to Parliament next week; but a major reduction in cost has been identified in this study as opposed to what was the going figure some two years ago. That will be of particular interest to the public, and the report does conclude, as we would expect, that the project is technically capable of being constructed. It really now leaves the Western Australian community in a position where that document ought to be the basis of sensible debate in looking at the long term options available for the provision of water supply in this State.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE - NEW SITTING HOURS

34. Mrs WATKINS to the Leader of the House:

When does the Government propose to commence the new sitting hours for Parliament?

Mr PEARCE replied:

A number of members have asked that question. Following discussions between the three parties last week, I gave notice of a motion today which would have the effect of moving to new sitting hours as follows: Starting at 2.00 pm on Tuesdays and sitting through to 11.00 pm with a dinner break from 6.00 to 7.30 pm; commencing on Wednesdays at 10.00 am and sitting through until 6.00 pm with a one hour lunch break from 1.00 to 2.00 pm; and on Thursdays starting at 10.00 am and sitting through until 4.30 pm with a one hour lunch break from 1.00 to 2.00 pm.

Although I gave notice of the Sessional Order which would have the effect of putting that into effect today, which will be open for discussion tomorrow, members will be aware that I have been adjourning the House on a special adjournment each day previously under the terms of the old sitting hours. Following that agreement between the parties, it is my proposal on behalf of the Government to start the new sitting hours as from this week; so the special

adjournment for tomorrow will have the effect of the Parliament's sitting at 10.00 am tomorrow, there will be no sitting tomorrow evening, and the new hours will follow thereafter.

SHEEP - SAUDI ARABIA
Live Sheep Trade Problems

35. Mr HOUSE to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) With regard to the current problems with live sheep exports being turned away from Saudi Arabia, what steps is the Minister taking to ensure that the Western Australian live sheep export industry is responding adequately to the current problems?
- (2) Has the Minister approached his Federal counterpart, Mr Kerin, to discuss the problem? If so, what decisions were made regarding the future of the live sheep export trade from Western Australia?

Mr BRIDGE replied:

(1)-(2)

The deputy leader of the National Party would know as well as anybody that this has been a particularly difficult issue to resolve, and it has not been for want of great endeavour on the part of the Western Australian Government and the industry in Western Australia, or indeed the whole of Australia. We have a continuation of difficulties, and appropriate resolutions are not in place.

I have written again to the Federal Minister suggesting to him that, in my view, the most realistic and practical way in which a solution can be arrived at is for the Federal Minister to go overseas and deal with the issue. The Federal Minister has rejected that proposition. I do not know what else I can offer as a suggestion to deal with the problem. Members of the industry have stated constantly that it is a delicate and sensitive issue and that we should not be making aggressive overtures about a resolution.

Mr House: If that is the case, what efforts have been made to find other markets for the live sheep trade?

Mr BRIDGE: The member has heard me say from time to time that, through the three dimensional evaluation concept in agricultural matters, I have offered the industry people entree to me to talk about the options. I have given the opportunity to the industry of Western Australia to suggest how we might be able to examine some other options or avenues to solve the problem. I repeat that I am very keen to see that happen. Making that offer to the industry and writing to the Federal Minister is what I have done to date. I feel that is all that one can do at this stage.
