

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

C284

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE (Of which some notice has been given)

Thursday, 20 March 2014

Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

With regard to the applications to the WA Stolen Wages Reparation Scheme by two sisters, Phyllis Ningamara and Nancy Dilyai, which were disqualified because the Kimberley Research School and Argyle Station where they were sent by the State Government to do domestic work, when they were taken from their family home on Ivanhoe Station, were not considered 'Institutions and Facilities' within the scope of the scheme, I ask:

1. Will the Minister please provide a definition of 'Government Native Welfare Settlement' as this cannot be found in the Guidelines for the Stolen Wages Scheme?
 - a. If no to 1, why not?

2. Will the Minister please explain how the arrangements at the Kimberley Research School and Argyle Station were different to those at Charles Perkins Hostel in Kununurra, Amy Bethel Hostel in Derby, Moola Bulla Station near Halls Creek and Beagle Bay Mission north of Broome?
 - a. Why were the sisters' applications denied when the applications in relation to these other institutions were accepted?
 - b. In what ways did the Kimberley Research School and Argyle Station differ from these other institutions and facilities

3. Will the Minister apologise to Ms Dilyai and Ms Ningamara for the unfairness inherent in the Stolen Wages Scheme and establish a new scheme that is more even-handed in its treatment of Aboriginal people whose wages were stolen?
 - a. If no to 3 why not?
 - b. If yes to 3 will the Government include Aboriginal people in devising a new scheme?

I thank the Honourable Members for some notice of the question.

(1) (a) The State Government's response was largely based on advice from the Stolen Wages Taskforce, which acknowledged the complexity of the issue due to the lack of surviving records and the passage of time. Government Native Welfare Settlements were broadly defined as places where children and young people were taken into care. The Taskforce recognised that government controls were at their most extensive for those living on Government settlements, including Carrolup and Moore River but acknowledged that they were also in place in other institutions across the state. As a result, each application was assessed by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs on a case by case basis against all criteria rather than solely on the specific locations.

(2) The arrangements for assessing applications were not different.

(a) Neither Ms Phyllis Ningamara nor Ms Nancy Dilyai was aged 14 years or over while resident at Kimberley Research School.

(b) Not applicable.

(3) No.

(a) The eligibility criteria for the Scheme were reasonable and clear and were applied consistently in assessing each application.

(b) Not applicable.



Minister for Aboriginal Affairs

CC

CC