

forwarding of the university's annual report from that of the Auditor-General's report on the university accounts.

With regard to the proposed amendments to the provisions of section 16E of the principal Act, the university authorities requested that provisions similar to section 27 of the Murdoch University Act, 1973, be included following doubts raised as to whether the regulations made by the university senate were regulations for the purposes of the provisions of section 36 of the Interpretation Act relating to disallowance.

The amendment now sought makes it clear that a regulation of the university senate is not, and never has been, such a regulation, and emphasises the time at which it is to take effect.

Section 41 of the principal Act at present provides for the university senate to "within three months from the close of the university year transmit to the Governor a report of the proceedings of the university during the previous year, and such report shall contain a true and detailed account of the income and expenditure of the university during such period, audited at the expense of the university by the Auditor-General . . ." The Act further provides that the report of the Auditor-General on the university accounts shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament at the same time as the university's annual report.

The university has experienced considerable difficulty in recent years in complying with the statutory restriction of three months from the close of the university year in which to submit its report. This has been further aggravated by the need for the report to be submitted together with a copy of the Auditor-General's report on the accounts which, of necessity, is usually not available until later in the following year.

The amendment to section 41 is simple and provides for the senate to forward its report as soon as practicable after the close of the university year, and for the Auditor-General's report to be forwarded as soon as practicable after being received by the university authorities.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 9.51 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 24th April, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

2. **QUESTIONS**

Replies: Cost and Time

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice:

In respect of the answer to question (1) on the 22nd April, 1975, regarding the cost and number of hours spent in answering Parliamentary questions, will the Minister advise—

- (a) the individual departments involved in compiling the information;
- (b) the number of officers in each department required to research the information;
- (c) the total number of hours spent in this research; and
- (d) the total estimated cost of supplying the information?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

(a) to (d) Presumably, the question refers to the cost of preparing the answer to question 1, 22nd April, 1975. If so—

- (i) no estimate has been made;
- (ii) it will be made if the Hon. Member insists that we further aggravate the cost and disruption already experienced by the preparation of answers to the abnormal number of questions covered by question 1, on the 22nd April, 1975.

3.

LUPINS

Research

The Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the problems and difficulties besetting the promising new varieties of lupins, most of

which seem to be prone to diseases and insect attacks, will the Minister advise—

- (a) whether as much progress is being made into the development of resistant varieties and research into lupin diseases as is hoped; and
- (b) whether it is considered that more researchers or better facilities are needed?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (a) Research effort has been principally directed to the production of new lupin varieties suitable for particular areas of the State. A cross-bred resistant to grey leaf spot is, however, likely to be released in 1975-76.
- (b) A decision has already been made to appoint an experienced plant breeder who would specifically work on disease resistance in lupins. Appropriate facilities to support his research programme will be provided.

4.

MINING

Female Employees

The Hon. R. T. Leeson for the Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Does the Mining Act, or the Mines Regulation Act, or any other legislation, prohibit females from working on the surface of a mine or a mining lease as—

- (a) truck drivers;
- (b) light work labourers;
- (c) in the mill;
- (d) storeroom attendants;
- (e) assay room assistants; or
- (f) in any other capacity, excluding office work?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) to (f) The Mining Act, 1904 and the Mines Regulation Act, 1946 do not discriminate against the employment of females in an occupation on the surface of a metalliferous mine. The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1946 prohibits the employment of females in any capacity in or about any coal mine.

5. ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

License Fee to Local Authorities

The Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Where shire councils undertake the licensing of vehicles for the Traffic Authority, will they

receive \$4 for each license, or is it likely that they will be paid only \$2 for renewals of existing licenses?

- (2) (a) Will shires be allowed or required to inspect vehicles for the Traffic Authority; and
- (b) if so, would they receive additional payment for this service?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) They will receive \$4 for each vehicle license issued or renewal.
- (2) (a) Yes, as at present.
- (b) No.

EDUCATION ACT

Disallowance of Regulation: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd April, on the following motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott—

That the amendment to subregulation (2) of regulation 120 of the Education Act Regulations, 1960, published in the *Government Gazette* on the 31st January, 1975, and laid upon the Table of the House on Tuesday, the 18th March, 1975, be and is hereby disallowed.

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [2.39 p.m.]: I must say I was very surprised—perhaps “disappointed” is a better word—at the reaction of the Minister for Education to my motion. He gave no valid reason whatever during his speech to support the amendment to the regulation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: You mean no reason acceptable to you.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Let us look at some of the Minister's statements. He said—

The examination given to this particular problem was very sympathetic.

I would like to know: examination by whom? What sympathetic consideration was given to the problem? What consultation had there been with the union which could have put the case on behalf of the teachers?

I would like to quote from a letter written by the Director-General of Education to the Teachers' Union on the 24th February of this year. In his letter, he states—

These amendments—

Referring to the amendments gazetted on the 21st January—

—had been processed by the Crown Law Department and sent to the Government Printer on 24th of January, 1975. You will appreciate that this action had to be taken to ensure that the new conditions with reference to teacher training now that it is conducted in autonomous institutions were operating legally by the time the academic

year began. I regret that at this time your Executive was in recess and did not have an opportunity to study and comment on the amendments before the legal processes were completed.

What chance was there for the union to discuss them so that sympathetic consideration could be given to its point of view? The colleges had been autonomous for two years as a result of the Teacher Education Act, so why the haste to change the situation in 1975? Why was not more time given?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a contradiction in terms. We did not use haste; we gave them two years.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Government did not give them any notice of the amendment; the colleges did not have two years' notice of that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They have had two years to think about it. They have been given most sympathetic consideration.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Minister also said—

... the teachers' colleges are autonomous and have no responsibility to the Education Department regarding the policing of absences and sick leave entitlements. Certainly they keep records ...

So, the Minister admits the teachers' colleges do keep records. Is he suggesting that the colleges would refuse to co-operate with the department?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would not suggest such a thing, nor did I say it.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Well, it is implied; that is one of the reasons given.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I stated the plain facts.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: A great deal was made of the fact that the colleges are now autonomous and therefore would not be able to provide the records to the department. That is nonsense; they keep records, and surely the department could obtain their co-operation in providing these records.

As I said, the colleges have been autonomous for two years; apparently they have experienced no difficulty in that time in providing information to the department.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It only shows how considerate we are.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Although I dealt with this particular question when I was moving the motion, I should now like to quote from a letter written by the Teachers' Union relating to the keeping of records by the colleges, and whether it

would be possible to pass on such information to the department. This is what the General Secretary of the Teachers' Union has to say about this matter—

I have discussed the matter with the Principal of the Graylands Teachers' College from the point of view that colleges may find difficulty in keeping records of student absences and therefore would be unable to advise the Education Department in order that proper accounting of sick leave credits could be undertaken. I am assured that all colleges do keep complete records of student attendance and that no problems would exist in informing the Education Department should they call for a record of student attendance. Teachers' Colleges are well staffed these days, both administratively and professionally and it would be a red herring if any Member of Parliament thought that there was no co-operation or the task was too difficult for colleges to undertake.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a complete twisting of what I said. Dr Makin has no authority to speak for any of the other members of CAE; nor has he the authority to speak for the Vice Chancellor of the WA University or the Murdoch University.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: But the Minister has already stated that the colleges keep records.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It was the secretary of the union who was making the claim.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Minister has admitted that the colleges keep records. The point I am making is that surely the Education Department could get their co-operation in providing this information for the purpose of assessing sick leave entitlements.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is no legal requirement for them to do so.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The same thing would apply to the universities and the WA Institute of Technology. We all know that, in the past, some students attached to colleges have attended WAIT and the university. They have reported to the college on one day a week. Apparently there was no problem in the past in the way of keeping records of students' attendances when they were attending the university. I do not think the question of autonomy, or the fact that students now attend universities or WAIT are very good reasons for taking away this very important entitlement.

The Minister made much of the fact that of 5 361 students, only 3 531 were pledged to the department, and that some may or may not work for the department.

This is completely irrelevant; we are not concerned about those who will not work for the department.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is marvelous!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a nice thing! I am concerned about all of them. What an admission! The Labor Party is concerned only about some people!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This debate is not about those who will not work for the department, but about those who will.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should be ashamed of yourself to admit that you have no concern for these other people.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is absolute rubbish; the Minister knows as well as I do that the previous regulation which the amendment is seeking to alter is concerned with only those people who went to work for the department. That is what I am talking about, and the Minister knows it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think it is a disgraceful admission.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have just answered what the Minister said. The old regulation had nothing to do with students who went to work with private employers at private schools. We want to retain the old entitlement for those students who, whether bonded or unbonded, go to work for the Education Department. We should not be altering the conditions just because others choose to go into private employment.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Will you clarify one point for me? You referred to "either bonded or unbonded". What if somebody decides after finishing his course that he will go into private employment? Would you give him the entitlement? You would not; that is what you just said.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Obviously Mr Lewis is not aware of the fact that this was the position under the old regulation. The old regulation states that students are eligible for this entitlement; it does not make any distinction between bonded or unbonded students.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: At teachers' colleges?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is right.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Nothing about WAIT or the university?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: But bonded students who attended WAIT and the university—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Cannot be bothered!

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Give her a go!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —were also entitled to this provision.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Not under the old regulation, they were not.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Well, you get up and tell us all about it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He did not get a chance; the Hon. Lyla Elliott leapt to her feet to block off all debate. You adjourned your own question last night.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The debate was adjourned last night in the same way as Ministers adjourn the debate when they want to reply. The Minister also made the rather silly statement that the figure of over \$1 000 constituted a potential debt to the taxpayers of this State. He was referring to the figure I quoted when introducing the motion. But there is nothing new about this; this was the position under the old regulation and has been the position for many years.

Very few students would take advantage of the total entitlement; however, they should be able to retain it in case of prolonged illness or serious injury which could represent a very heavy financial loss by way of income to a young person who is just starting out in his working life. The Minister also stated—

The old regulation referred only to students in teachers' colleges. Many students with departmental scholarships are attending the universities and WAIT this year and are not attached to a teachers' college as has been the case in the past.

My answer to that is, "So what?" Why not amend the old regulation to include these other institutions instead of taking away what the college students already have?

Another factor which should not be overlooked is that the new regulation will have a retrospective effect. As I have just said, unbonded students at teachers' colleges receive this entitlement if they work in the Education Department, the same as bonded students receive it. The effect of the amendment is that not only will it take away the entitlement from all students as from the 1st January, 1975, but it also takes the entitlement away from those unbonded students who were in teachers' colleges prior to the 1st January, 1975.

The amended regulation reads as follows—

Where a teacher was appointed as a monitor or accepted as a student with allowances in a teachers' college prior to the 31st day of December, 1974, he may count his service as a monitor or as a student as service on the permanent staff of a school in determining the sick leave for which he is eligible.

Not only does the amendment take away the entitlement from all students as from the 1st January, 1975, but by including the

words "with allowances" it also takes the entitlement away from those who were in colleges without allowances or who were unbonded, prior to the 31st December, 1974. Does the Minister agree with that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, and I told you about this last night. There is a grandfather clause. Those students who were in prior to the 31st December, 1974, are included.

The Hon. LYLIA ELLIOTT: The Minister does not say that. He does not include students in teachers' colleges, but only students with allowances. He is making a qualification.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You might be right in respect of two students who do not have allowances. I do not imagine there would be any more.

The Hon. LYLIA ELLIOTT: Does the Minister not agree it could have a retrospective effect?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not.

The Hon. LYLIA ELLIOTT: I repeat what I said when I moved the motion. I think it is a very poor effort on the part of the Minister, at a time when conditions for practically every other section of the community are improving, to frame the regulation in such a way that it will take away very important entitlements from teachers—entitlements which they have enjoyed for many years. To make the matter worse, the Minister has given no real justification for his action. I appeal to members to support the motion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—7

Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. Lylia Elliott	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	(Teller)

Noes—17

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. M. McAleer
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. V. J. Ferry
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. W. R. Withers

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

CANNING RIVER RECLAMATION

Assembly's Resolution—Motion to Concur

Debate resumed, from the 23rd April, on the following motion by the Hon. N. E. Baxter—

That the request contained in Message No. 2 from the Legislative Assembly be agreed to.

The Assembly's resolution as contained in message No. 2 was as follows—

That this House do resolve to approve, pursuant to subsection (1) of section twenty-two A of the Swan River Conservation Act, 1958-1966, the reclamation of two areas of the Canning River as follows—

- (a) an area of about 1.7 hectares on the eastern side of the Canning River just south of Canning Bridge; and
- (b) an area of about 4.18 hectares on the eastern side of the Canning River north of Mount Henry,

which areas are shown stippled in the plan deposited in the Main Roads Department and marked MRD Map Drawing No. 7421-89 and as so shown in the copy of that plan laid on the Table of the House.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [2.57 p.m.]: In the speech introducing the motion the Minister informed us that this was one of three related matters, each of which was essential to the other. If this motion is not agreed to, there will be no point in proceeding with the succeeding items which the Government intends to introduce. Conversely, if the motion is agreed to, then we must accept the other items.

I am sure members realise the importance of the debate on the motion. If we agree to the reclamation of the two portions of the Canning River we would agree to the construction of the southern extension of Kwinana Freeway, which is the matter we are now debating.

In a way I feel that the debate in this Chamber is somewhat redundant, because of the extensive coverage and canvassing that took place in the Legislative Assembly in respect of all matters related to this proposal. The result of the voting in that Chamber has indicated that the Government is determined to push this matter through.

I would not delude myself into believing that members on this side of the House have such tremendous powers of persuasion that they can convince the Minister that he should do other than ensure the motion is passed.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Do all members on your side share your view?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I think that attitude would be fairly general. I have no doubt on this occasion we will see the honourable member rising to his feet to give one of his well-known performances, and possibly express a view which is at variance with that of the Government. However, from past experience we know it will be nothing more than a performance,

and the numbers in this Chamber will be so arranged as to achieve the result desired by the Government.

In other words it is my point of view that the Government is determined to get this matter over as quickly as possible and the debate in this Chamber will, I feel, be rather futile. However we have a duty to see that the objections to this matter are properly aired, and we will indeed do our best to achieve this purpose.

It is further my belief that the Government's determination to get this over as quickly as possible is related more to the electoral consequences in relation to the next election than it is to the detrimental consequences that may flow to the public from the construction of this freeway extension; I feel the Government will want this matter settled as soon as possible and as far away as possible from the next election.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Is that why you did not introduce it before the last election when you had an opportunity to do so?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Williams may draw whatever conclusion he may wish about the action taken by the previous Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: But it is not a bad conclusion.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps Mr Williams is privy to the Cabinet papers of the previous Government. I am afraid I am not. The situation is—on reading the debates that took place in another place—the previous Government did not in fact give approval for the freeway extension.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It did not do anything; it allowed the matter to sit.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: There were indeed many matters with which the previous Government did not proceed, and I think I can only give the answer that was given in reply to a similar type of interjection in the Assembly—that the Tonkin Government was extremely active and that the hours which Parliament sat were the longest on record and the legislation which was introduced was also a record. Accordingly that Government cannot be criticised for not having got down to the work it had in hand.

The PRESIDENT: May I indicate to the honourable member that he should not refer to the debate in the Legislative Assembly, because there is a Standing Order that precludes this.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you for reminding me of this, Mr President, and I will endeavour to conform with the Standing Order.

The PRESIDENT: You will conform with the Standing Order.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: As I have said, I will endeavour to do so. Whether or not we refer to the debate in another place the answer I gave would not have been any different.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are getting away from the specific instance; this particular project.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am sure the Minister would be delighted if I did.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I was not referring to anything else.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am sure the Minister would like me to debate all sorts of other matters, and if he wishes to raise other items concerning the actions of the previous Government I would be quite happy to debate them with him but I might add that, as a result, I will take a lot longer than might otherwise be the case.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister and the honourable member will keep to the subject under discussion.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you again, Mr President. We will get back to the specific matter before us which is the resumption of 14.6 acres of the Canning River which, in the words of the Minister, is only a small portion of the river. That, of course, is a very subjective opinion. Anybody who possesses 14.6 acres of urban residential land would think it was far from small; he would indeed think it was worth a tremendous fortune, in fact, depending of course where the land was located.

Just as residential land has a very high value so the public in general places a very high value on the area of water on which Perth is located, and the public considers that 14.6 acres is a very important portion of that area.

In reflecting on what has happened in the past I would point out there are some very good illustrations in a booklet recently distributed to us and which was prepared by Professor Gordon Stephenson. The early pages in that booklet illustrate the original foreshore of Perth; where the Esplanade is now located.

An examination of those diagrams will indicate just how much of the water area below Perth already has been taken over in reclamation. It has indeed been a case of its being taken bit by bit; perhaps not much more than 14.6 acres in one bite, though in total it does constitute a tremendous amount.

There are people who still remember with a great deal of regret the view from Mt. Eliza to the area just below and towards the city which was a very attractive portion of this area; and that is where the interchange is now located.

This is one view that is forever lost to Perth, and as the city grows there will be other areas that will be regarded just as necessary unless members of this Parliament take a very firm stand about the matter. That really is the reason for the intense debate that has taken place on this subject.

Had the Minister looked through the objections tabled in Parliament and which were contained in volumes 1, 2 and 3 of the "Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment, 1974, Submission and Report on Objections" he would have seen that by far the greatest number of those objections were on the grounds of the loss of the river foreshore.

Time and time again that has been the sole objection, and it does indicate the degree to which the people of Perth are concerned about this continual gobbling up, and whittling away of the river.

While there are many citizens who are concerned about the traffic problems and congestions on the metropolitan region streets, there are an equal number who are concerned about preserving as much of the river as they possibly can.

It is predominantly for this reason that there has been a demand for an open, public inquiry on the matter. This will be the continued trend of the debate that will come from the members of the Labor Party in this Chamber; there will be a demand that the Government should check its determination to get these matters through Parliament as quickly as possible, and that it should allow ample time for an open, public inquiry.

The Minister has told us in his speech of the discussions that have taken place; of the people who have been consulted; and of the intensity of the examination that has been made of this project. These things cannot be denied, and it is no good trying to deny them.

The fact is that many inquiries and investigations have been made, but that does not mean—and it is of no use denying the fact—that an open, public inquiry should not be undertaken; because there has not been an open, public inquiry and the extent of the controversy that has followed the presentation of this matter to Parliament should indeed be an indication to the Government that the need for such an inquiry has not been met in the discussions that have so far taken place. The Government is only hiding its head in the sand if it pretends that is so.

I wish to refer to remarks in the Minister's speech, and I could not do better than quote his words to illustrate the point I am making. On pages 22 and 23 of the Minister's speech notes he said—

It has also been said in another place that the extension of the Kwinana Freeway will be ineffectual

in relieving traffic congestion because it will transfer congestion to a bottleneck at the Narrows Bridge and will require duplication of the Narrows Bridge and further reclamation at that location. This claim demonstrates an ignorance of such matters as traffic flows and traffic capacity.

I suggest that statement in itself is sufficient to warrant a further full inquiry which is open to the public.

We were told that the PERTS report in 1970 was the result of an extensive study conducted by a group of consultants, and that therefore we should accept its recommendations, even though many people objected to them very strongly. On page X-9 of that report these words appear—

The other major problem is that of the Narrows Bridge. This crossing point will carry heavy traffic as a result of its dual role as a River crossing for the Regional freeway traffic, and as a feeder to the city centre. The Narrows Bridge will require duplication during the next twenty years in order to provide a capacity balanced with that of its freeway approaches. However, in spite of the duplication the traffic loads projected will cause the Bridge to be fully loaded before 1989.

That is quite contrary to what the Minister said, or perhaps he is saying the people who wrote that report had an ignorance of matters relating to traffic flow and traffic capacity. If so, it is an astounding statement, because the experts who were responsible for the 1970 PERTS study said after an examination of all these matters that the Narrows Bridge would need to be duplicated and that in any case it would be at capacity before 1989; and the Minister tells us today, just a few years later, that is all nonsense.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Where did I say that in the speech?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I will repeat what the Minister said.

The Hon. V. J. Perry: I bet he did not use the word "nonsense".

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No. He used a stronger word than that. He used the word "ignorance". This is what he said on pages 22 and 23 of his speech notes—

It has also been said in another place that the extension of the Kwinana Freeway will be ineffectual in relieving traffic congestion because it will transfer congestion to a bottleneck at the Narrows Bridge and will require duplication of the Narrows Bridge and further reclamation at that location. This claim demonstrates an ignorance of such matters as traffic flows and traffic capacity.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Read what follows.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I could do that, but we were contesting the use of the word "nonsense". I said the Minister regarded that as nonsense.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not use the word "nonsense".

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister did not use the word "nonsense". He used much stronger words: he said it showed ignorance. He is saying—

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: One can be innocently ignorant.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —Dr Nielsen and his associates showed ignorance in making that claim in 1970.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not say that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We spent a lot of money in getting him to say it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not expect the Minister to agree with me—it would destroy his argument to agree with me—but he cannot deny the words—

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The word "ignorance" was used here, yes. I do not deny it. But I did not use the word "nonsense". There is a big difference between ignorance and nonsense.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know how one defines ignorance.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Surely a school teacher can define it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, but the Minister appears to be having trouble with it. In the rest of the remarks on page 23 of his speech notes the Minister goes on to talk about traffic flows and approaches to the bridge. One could justifiably assume—and I think the experts from the Main Roads Department, several of whom are sitting at the back of the Chamber, would agree—that traffic flows on the approaches to the Narrows Bridge were amongst the matters considered by Dr Nielsen and his team of consultants. Or do we say the officers of the Main Roads Department and Dr Nielsen's team were ignorant of these matters and did not take them into consideration?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not say that at all.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister gets himself into a very difficult position.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: No, I do not. Follow through the speech.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I will be interested to see how the Minister slides out of that argument, because the matters have either been considered or they have not. The Minister cannot have it both ways. If those matters have been considered, we must assume that the officers of the Main Roads Department and Dr

Nielsen's team considered the traffic flows and the approaches to the Narrows Bridge and then said the Narrows Bridge will require duplication because by 1989 it will be overloaded.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The people who carried out the inquiry said it will not, if certain things are done. It is as simple as falling off a log.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: What a sad state of affairs!

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is not sad at all. It is factual.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In 1970 the Government was convinced that the Nielsen proposals were up to date as at that moment. Just a few years later, at the beginning of 1975, all those proposals are tossed out and we must start a whole new scheme. The mind boggles at the use of public funds. It has cost millions of dollars to construct the interchange, but now, five years later, we must throw it all out and start again. The ideas of 1970 are no longer applicable.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You might as well say we have changed our minds and will make the crossing at Mt. Henry instead of at Deep Water Point.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is a pity more Western Australians could not be present to hear these proceedings. I frankly suggest they would be shocked at the kind of response coming from the Minister.

The Hon. N. McNeill: It is significant that they are not here.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If this in itself is not sufficient reason for holding an open public inquiry, I do not know what would be.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What would that prove? Nothing.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I should hope it would show up very serious deficiencies.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are just playing politics. It would do nothing of the sort.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am sorry, I cannot always catch the remarks of the Minister.

The Hon. J. Heitman: We have the same trouble with you.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Well, I am sure Mr Heitman is having no trouble at the moment. If the firm proposals made in 1970 are no longer relevant in 1975 we have a very serious situation before us, and there must be very serious deficiencies in the planning approaches of the Main Roads Department. That department would be one of the most heavily funded departments in the State. It has complete control of all the main roads throughout

Western Australia and it is involved in the very genesis of the future of the metropolitan region, because nothing affects the region more than the system of public roads and public transport we adopt. The Main Roads Department is primarily responsible for that. I say nothing could give a more serious indication of the need for an inquiry.

I would think I really should not need to go past that point to provide justification for what we propose. However, there are other matters which I do not propose to develop at length, but merely to mention to the House.

The 1970 PERTS report gave us a plan of travel desire lines. I believe those travel lines have since been updated, although I could not obtain a copy. My impression is that the new plan is not significantly different from that contained in the original PERTS report.

The travel desire lines showed a very strong bias for the north-south access passing through Fremantle. The desire lines were imposed on the route determined by the Main Roads Department to show the primary axis traversing the Narrows Bridge.

In effect the preferred route of the Main Roads Department is forcing an imposed system upon people whereas in fact if we provide an easier flow from the Fremantle area we may find the urgency with regard to the Narrows complex is not so great. Indeed, we may find the route could be moved further to the south and thus avoid the ramifications of the extension of the freeway along the foreshore of the Canning River.

I do not pretend to be an expert in these matters; we must accept the studies of qualified people. However, if we consider that aspect alone it gives us very strong reason to question the relevance of the southern extension proposals; remembering, of course, that it is the very strong public desire to protect our river foreshores. I would again refer the Minister to the objections contained in the tabled papers so that he may see just how frequently the question of foreshore protection arose.

There are various alternatives to the Main Roads Department preferred route. I do not believe the Minister adequately covered the tunnel proposal. I have read through the booklet entitled, "Kwinana Freeway Southern Extension: the Tunnel Alternative to the Main Roads Department Preferred Plan: An assessment of the Playford-Booth concept" by E. N. Maslen. That publication contains sufficient material to throw grave doubt on the basis upon which the tunnel proposal was examined by the Main Roads Department and the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation. Dr Maslen says the studies

were made on a completely wrong basis, and that his concept is a refinement of the Playford-Booth proposals which are very different from a tunnel.

If we look for reasons to support an open, public inquiry, again we find there are more than sufficient; or if members do not like to express the position as strongly as that, we may say that there are strong added reasons to those which have already been given. Dr Maslen agrees that his proposal would cost more than that of the Main Roads Department, but the proposal should not be weighed up only on the basis of a cost-benefit analysis. The Main Roads Department has carried out a cost-benefit analysis on its preferred route, and a summary of that analysis is contained in its report of May, 1974, which deals with the benefits in respect of saving of travel time, and so on. However, the department has not made an examination of the more subjective benefits of an uncluttered and open foreshore which is not cut off by a freeway.

There are no reasonably measurable terms in which such benefits can be gauged, and they are certainly not amenable to a cost-benefit analysis. Nevertheless, we have to weigh these things when comparing the preferred plan with the tunnel proposal.

Ring-road proposals have also been put forward. Here again, I would suggest that an examination of the travel desire lines diagram would reveal enough information to indicate that a road system which is not on the freeway spine plan could indeed satisfy a large measure of the requirement. This is material which could be more fully discussed in an open, public inquiry at which independent experts would be able to give their views.

The Minister also referred in his speech to the environmental examinations which were made. I find it quite incredible that the matter of the environment was referred, for instance, to Rotary clubs and the Chamber of Manufactures.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They would be a big help.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Those groups were asked to give opinions on environmental aspects. I do not know whether it is just an unfortunate association of words in the Minister's speech which gives one that impression; but that is the impression one gains from reading his speech.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Is there anything wrong with referring the matter to other organisations?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Did I say there is anything wrong with it?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You implied there is.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister spoke about public participation and said that environmental considerations had been taken into account and were referred even to Rotary clubs. There is just no connection between the two.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You would not know.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the Minister spoke to the members of one of those organisations—

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Where would you get a better cross section or a more informed group of people than at a Rotary club?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: I can see no connection between Rotary clubs and the reclamation of the Canning River.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr President, that was the point I was making. The sort of results that are emanating from the Environmental Protection Authority can only lead one to the conclusion that it is a very ineffective and hamstrung organisation. Apparently it is being told to mind its own affairs and to do what it is told.

I now wish to make one or two quotations from the remarks made by Dr O'Brien when he participated in a discussion that took place on the "State File" television programme on the southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway. This discussion was held on the 15th April, 1975. Among others, Dr O'Brien made these remarks—

... and now I would contrast for example, the public involvement on the Narrows project, ...

I will return to that statement. I am quoting from page 4 of the notes I have in front of me on which page the following appears—

There was an agreement between the appropriate authorities back in 1969, an agreement in principle, as to the alignment.

These remarks have reference to the route of the southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway—

I come back again to this point of the E.P.A.'s responsibility was to tune up that choice of routes, to ensure, for example, that there were public facilities.

In his speech the Minister said that the Environmental Protection Authority has considered all the alternatives for this extension, including the preferred route. Yet this is what the man in charge of the Environmental Protection Authority has said—

... I come back again to this point of the E.P.A.'s responsibility was to tune up that choice of route, ...

That is, the only concern was to ensure that the preferred route was made as least objectionable to the public as possible.

If we look again at the way this authority operates, it will be found that the people residing on the coast from Cottesloe northwards have been objecting to the West Coast Highway being upgraded to a major regional road. Those people are very much against this proposal. We are talking about public participation and about letting the public know what is going on. I cannot recall any public statement or any statement by the Government that the West Coast Highway is to become a major peripheral highway to serve the northern suburbs, but listen to what Dr O'Brien has to say about that. He said—

... and now I would contrast for example, the public involvement on the Narrows project, with the public involvement in the southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway, with the next one which is the West Coast Highway, Swanbourne, in which the public were invited, interested authorities were invited to even speak to the terms of reference of the consultant study.

In view of the fact that a major portion of this route travels through my province it is indeed a revelation to me that there is any proposal mooted to upgrade the West Coast Highway to a major regional highway.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am glad you put that glass of water down before you involved Mr Cooley in it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I know that the content of what I am saying is probably very embarrassing to the Minister and to his Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The Minister has tried to look after you and you do not like it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: So much for public participation. Dr O'Brien has agreed that when the decision on the construction of the Narrows Bridge was made, public participation in regard to that proposal was almost nil. In this instance I will not deny that a Labor Government was in office at that time. Public participation was still not sufficient enough on the proposal for the southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway, but Dr O'Brien hopes that public participation will be a lot greater when the proposal for upgrading the West Coast Highway is considered. It is indeed an omission that the public has not been invited to participate to an extent that is most desirable, and in fact Dr O'Brien believes that a great deal is capable of being achieved.

In talking of these matters the Minister indicated that groups with vested interests in the construction of roads have a far greater influence than conservation

groups. I refer to the Minister's second reading speech notes where he states that the people involved include the Royal Australian Planning Institute, the Association of Consulting Engineers, the Australian Road Federation and the Chamber of Manufactures.

I would suggest that those last-named groups have indeed a vested interest in the construction of roads rather than the preservation of the environment. They would gain a great deal from the work involved.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are only assuming that. You have no grounds for making that statement. The Chamber of Manufactures does not consist of one person. There are many members of that chamber who are not involved in the construction of roads.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We read the Press article also, you know.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I presume that the Chamber of Manufactures would include people who make road machinery, car parts and other similar goods; therefore it would have a vested interest in seeing that roads are constructed.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: One or two people do not make up the Chamber of Manufactures.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not making a big thing out of it.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: But you are insinuating.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not insinuating; I am stating that those people would have a vested interest in seeing that more roads are built because they sell products that are used on roads.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are insinuating that they will make money out of it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: They will. They would not think much of the Minister's Government—

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is not an answer to your insinuations.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Unless the Minister thinks it is something shameful that they should make a profit out of it—

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are trying to make it look shameful.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister has a twisted mind to draw that conclusion.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I know where the twisted mind is; it is over there and not here.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I say again, as plainly as I can, that these people would have a vested interest in

seeing that the freeway project proceeds because they have something to gain from it. It is a plain statement of fact. I would not expect them to object to it.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: What kind of reasoning is behind that?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: These groups are mentioned in Mr Baxter's speech as supporting the proposal. I am asking: what else could we expect them to do?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I do not see the point. Anyone interested at all has a right to make a submission and they have done so.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What about the people opposed to it; have they no right to be considered?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps we should steer the boat back to the original point I was making which was that there should be an open inquiry in which circumstances we would expect not only those groups—the Association of Consulting Engineers, the Australian Road Federation, and the Chamber of Manufactures—to be able to present their views, but also anyone else who might be interested; and I am sure Mr Withers would agree with that. He would not deny the opportunity to the others to have their say. If it is good enough for one group, it should be good enough for the others.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are you saying people were denied the right to make comments?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: As a rule I try to avoid getting tangled with Mr Withers because it means so much repetition.

I could again refer to the coastal highway when I said that so far as the people out there are aware no Government statement has been made that the coastal road will be a regional highway. They are objecting to its being upgraded, but if they thought it was to be made into a regional highway there would be more fuss made, and the people would be demanding inquiries. They are suffering as a result of a lack of information. It has been said that these schemes have been proposed since 1963.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You have lost me.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That does not take long! Recently I received a letter from the Housing Industry Association.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Someone does write to you then?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He has a lot more friends than you think.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know why, but occasionally people do.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I don't know why, either.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In submitting reasons for the justification of the proposal the Housing Industry Association stated that the plan as adopted in 1963 should proceed.

If I can again refer to my own electorate, I have already mentioned the need for something to be done along the Stephenson Avenue route, but I am apparently not making much progress with the Government about it. It could be said that the people in the northern suburbs have known about the Stephenson Avenue proposals for some time. They know that it is to cross the Wembley Downs Golf Course, through Reabold Park, and that it will affect the picture theatre, and then go along Perry Lakes Drive, etc. Surely members do not believe that if the Main Roads Department were to go out there tomorrow and commence to bulldoze that route there would be no objections. The people involved would certainly not accept any suggestion that because the proposal had been in the plan since 1963 it should be proceeded with.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Have you ever known any major highway to be established in connection with which there were no objections or no rumpus? You always get them.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Would the Minister not agree that merely because there has been a schematic design since 1963 this is no justification for saying that is where the road should go? We know very well that the plan is only schematic and does not deal with the detail concerning the precise boundaries and so on. We know in relation to this plan that the route has been changed. Originally the road was to cross the river at Deep Water Point and it is now to cross at Mt. Henry. As a matter of fact the early advice was that Mt. Henry should not be used, but the position has been changed again.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That shows there has been some good thinking if they can change their minds.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Ideas change; and the alteration from Deep Water Point to Mt. Henry was made because in that stretch of the Canning River a rowing course had been established.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.04 p.m.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Before the afternoon tea suspension I was speaking of the proposal for a coastal highway and the fact that the people who live in the suburbs which will be affected are not aware of any proposal for the upgrading of the road, and they will be most vociferous in their objections.

The outline of the general direction of the freeway system was indicated in the 1963 region scheme but there have been a number of amendments to the general lines of that scheme. It certainly did not specify precisely where the freeway routes would be placed.

The 1963 region scheme was a concept only and this fact, together with the environmental implications, the various alternatives which have been proposed, a very strong public desire to protect our river foreshores, the indications of viable alternatives, and most importantly the very serious divergence between the remarks of the Minister in relation to the Narrows Bridge and the statements contained in the PERTS report of 1970, indicate that there is a need for an open public inquiry into this matter.

It would appear the Government is, indeed, strongly determined that this motion—and the associated Bills which are yet to be introduced—should proceed through Parliament as quickly as possible. I hope the Government is not so bull-headed about this matter that it will not be prepared, at this stage to agree to an inquiry of the nature we have proposed.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.07 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The main provision in this Bill, amending section 98 of the principal Act, is to cause occupiers of shops and warehouses to give notice to the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops where an accident occurs in a shop or warehouse which causes the death of an employee or bodily injury of such a nature that the employee is incapacitated from work for one day or more. This requirement to report such accidents is already applicable in the Act to factories, and its extension to shops and warehouses will enable inspectors better to assess the cause of accidents which should assist in establishing remedial or more effective preventive safety measures. Such notification will, in addition, provide a more comprehensive statistical record for the purpose of accident study.

This extension will be relative also to the discretionary power of the Minister in section 65 to direct an inquiry before a stipendiary magistrate when an accident occurs in a shop or warehouse.

The Bill also contains several minor machinery provisions for tidying up the principal Act.

The principal Act refers to the Secretary for Labour. This title was changed in 1974 when the department was upgraded under an under-secretary as permanent head. There is, accordingly, an amendment to section 5 to regularise the position. The new title of Under-Secretary for Labour and Industry accords with the changed title of the department.

The amendment to section 12 dealing with the appointment of inspectors is inserted to remove conflict which arises between this Act and the Public Service Act in respect of the appointment of inspectors.

Since 1967 the Public Service Act has provided for the Public Service Board—in lieu of the Governor—to appoint officers to the general division of the Public Service. Factories and shops inspectors are appointed to that division. The Factories and Shops Act, on the other hand, presently requires the Governor to appoint inspectors. The amendment is designed to avoid the inconsistency between the two Acts.

Section 45 is to be amended to allow the under-secretary, who is Chairman of the Factory Welfare Board, to appoint a senior officer of the department to act as chairman when he is unable to attend a meeting. The assistant under-secretary alone is permitted to so act. There are occasions, however, when it could be most helpful to have, say, the engineer-chief inspector to chair the meetings in the absence of either the under-secretary or his assistant.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans.

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.11 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments contained in this Bill are of a minor nature and are intended to streamline activities in the office of the Registrar of the Hairdressers Registration Board. They have been drafted with a view to reducing time-consuming methods at present required by the Act, duplication of records, and the saving of unnecessary expenditure to the board. Nothing of importance is lost if the amendments are accepted. Office methods and procedures, and the records maintained will be sufficient and allow the public to be given relevant information upon inquiry.

In respect to clause 2 (a), the qualifications of a hairdresser are recorded on oath on the application form submitted and this is kept on file in the board office. Its transcription to the register is not necessary, and the amendment seeks to avoid this duplication.

Referring to clause 2 (b), the publication of a register of hairdressers each year in the *Government Gazette* is timetaking and costly and it may not serve much useful purpose. It demands the preparation of a list of some 2 000 names, and any person wishing to ascertain if a person is registered and the type of registration held will, by this agreement, be informed upon inquiry of the board.

Amending clause 2 (c) is consequent upon the previous amendment.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans.

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.13 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to amend the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act, 1943-1973.

When section 11 of the principal Act was re-enacted in 1959, paragraph (d) (i) of subsection (1) enabled the trust in its discretion to make certain admissions of negligence on behalf of an insured person and the owner and driver of an uninsured vehicle in cases where the trust had no right of recovery against the person, owner, or driver under the provisions of subsection (3) of section 7, subsection (3) of section 8, or section 15.

The reference to subsection (3) of section 7 is erroneous. It is subsection (5) and not subsection (3) of section 7 which provides a right of recovery.

This brief amending measure proposes to correct this oversight, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. S. J. Dellar.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act, 1971-1972, to enable the alteration of titles of some bodies named in the principal Act, and also

to increase the membership of one such body. The changes are consistent with the Government's expressed policy with regard to conservation and the environment.

The Bill provides for the deletion of the words "environmental protection" and the substitution of the words "conservation and environment" in the long title and in several sections. The Department of Environmental Protection is to be called the department of conservation and environment and the Director of Environmental Protection to be called the director of conservation and environment.

Further, it is proposed that the name "Environmental Protection Council" be changed to the conservation and environment council and the membership of the council is to be increased from 14 to 16.

Members will be aware that in Western Australia the principal environmental executive management responsibility lies with the three-man Environmental Protection Authority. The Minister, when introducing this measure in another place, paid tribute to the work and success of the authority since its inception and made special mention of the competence and diligence of the chairman. It is not proposed that there should be a change in the title of this authority, as it has already established itself within the community through its series of decisions and recommendations which have been accepted by both the previous Government and this Government.

However, the Environmental Protection Council, composed of senior personnel, is regarded by the Minister as being perhaps less well known, and requiring revitalisation. It is suggested that this can be largely achieved by two steps—

- (1) A change of title from Environmental Protection Council to conservation and environment council, and
- (2) An increase in the membership by adding a nominee of the Minister for Agriculture and a nominee of a tertiary institution.

As a consequence, the new council will become very effective in its role of providing advice to the Minister responsible and to the Environmental Protection Authority.

I would like to conclude by adding that in following through the Government's policy there is forthcoming a rationalised arrangement for conservation and environment in Western Australia. The bringing of national parks within the jurisdiction of the Minister is one such example; and the amendments contained in this Bill are another.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. S. J. Dellar.

ANZAC DAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the present wording of the Anzac Day Act to enable the profits from a greyhound meeting held on Anzac Day to be paid to the Anzac Day Trust.

The principal Act provides for all profits made by racing and trotting clubs and 60 per cent of profits made by other sporting organisations from meetings or fixtures held on Anzac Day to be paid to the Anzac Day Trust. Greyhound racing commenced in Western Australia last December, and this amendment of the Act is necessary to ensure that all profits in relation to greyhound racing meetings held on Anzac Day will be paid to the Anzac Day Trust as all profits from horse racing and trotting are so paid.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. S. J. Dellar.

RESERVE (KWINANA FREEWAY) BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [4.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

I have provided for the distribution of 30 copies of the plan to members. The plan depicts the area referred to in this measure which is to be excised from "A"-class reserve No. 21288. This plan was tabled in the Legislative Council as paper No. 136 on the 22nd April, 1975.

This Bill, introduced by the Minister for Transport in another place, and which has the support of the Minister for Lands, deals with the proposal for the excision of a relatively small area from an "A"-class reserve for the specific purpose of extending the Kwinana Freeway. Members would be aware that under section 31 of the Land Act the excision of more than 5 per cent of the area of any "A"-class reserve for a road requires an Act of Parliament. In this instance the excision procedure is being put forward in a separate Bill rather than in the annual Reserves Bill as the action forms an essential part of the Kwinana Freeway extension project.

The Kwinana Freeway extension project involved two other corresponding actions which have taken place in another place; those being the motion for the reclamation of a relatively small area of the Canning River and the tabling of the MRPA recommendation for amending the region scheme along the Mt. Henry alignment.

The three procedures have been placed before Parliament in their proper perspective as part of the overall freeway project.

In speaking on the reclamation motion, the Minister for Transport mentioned that this land excision Bill would be introduced as a complementary measure, and he referred to the wide publicity the project has received, the reports supporting the project, the hearings at which the public had the opportunity to express their objections, and that the approval of relevant authorities such as the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, the Swan River Conservation Board, the Environmental Protection Authority and Council, the Melville City Council, the South Perth City Council, and the Canning Town Council had been obtained.

Members will see from the Bill and the copy of the associated plan which they have before them, that the reserve to which I refer is immediately west of Roe-buck Drive. This reserve is about 2.64 hectares, or 6.53 acres, and the Bill proposes the excision of about 0.51 hectares, or about 1.25 acres, which is a reduction in total area of a little less than 20 per cent. This "A"-class reserve was originally set apart in October, 1934. It then became the responsibility of the South Perth City Council, and the council has approved the Mt. Henry alignment for extending the freeway.

The Main Roads Department engineers, from the outset in their design considerations, have been conscious of the need to fit the freeway into the existing landscape, and while every effort has been made to avoid the need for taking any of the reserve, this has not been feasible.

However, the most interesting part of this reserve, which contains stands of paperbark and wattle trees on the northern and central sections of the reserve, has been avoided. The other parts of the reserve are generally sandy and flat, with some low scrub and a number of introduced weed species. There are no unique flora species within the portion of the reserve which it is proposed to excise, or for that matter, within any part of the reserve.

While this Bill deals only with excision of portion of an "A"-class reserve, and as I have said, the more attractive part of the reserve will remain in its natural state, the basic purpose of the Bill is to permit the extension of the Kwinana Freeway along the best possible alignment, and I ask all members to give their support to the Bill in order to prevent further deterioration in the residential areas of fast-developing southern suburbs which will be serviced by the freeway.

In order that the procedures can be finalised without further delay and to get this important project under way, I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition).

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to make minor amendments to sections 3, 9D, 28, 37AE, 37AF, and 37A of the Education Act, 1974.

In the 1974-75 Budget speech, the Premier announced that the subsidy paid to parents of fourth-year secondary school pupils was to be increased to \$25 from the beginning of the 1975 school year. Consequently, it is necessary to amend section 9D which relates to the subsidisation of the cost of textbooks at efficient schools. The department has been paying the increased rate of subsidy since the beginning of the current school year.

In clause 2 of the Bill, allowance is made for the provisions of clauses 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of the Bill to come into operation on the 1st January, 1975.

The other amendments contained in this Bill are of an administrative nature and relate mainly to the need to widen the current references in the Act to teachers' colleges, so as to include the other tertiary institutions now engaged in teacher education.

With the involvement of the Western Australian Institute of Technology and the two universities in teacher training, the reference to teachers' colleges no longer covers all student teachers adequately. This is particularly important in relation to the department's authority to pay allowances or scholarships to students.

Other references throughout the Act to students attending teachers' colleges are to be amended to include any student pursuing a teacher education course and receiving financial assistance pursuant to section 37A of the Act, as amended.

There is also a clause which adds interpretations to section 3 of the Act for "teacher education course" and "tertiary education institution".

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.27 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In its report, a committee of inquiry set up to investigate registration procedures recommended some amendments to the registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act, to facilitate the registration of births which had not been registered in the normal manner.

Registration of births up to a year after the birth needs no special authorisation, whilst registration between one and seven years after the birth is required to be authorised by the Registrar-General.

Pertinent to the proposals contained in this measure I would point out that at the present time if a person should wish to register his or her birth after a period of seven years from the date of birth, it is required that the necessary evidence be produced before a judge of the Supreme Court.

The purpose of this procedure is to obtain an order directing the Registrar-General to register the said birth.

The amendment to section 24 of the Act, and the repeal and re-enactment of sections 25 and 26 proposed in this Bill, seek to extend the jurisdiction of the Registrar-General by making him, and not the Supreme Court judge, the responsible authority in respect of registration after the seven-year period.

The Bill includes a safeguard, however, in that where the Registrar-General authorises, or refuses to authorise the registration of a birth, any person so aggrieved by such decision may still apply to a judge of the Supreme Court for an order against that decision.

It will be appreciated that appeals against the authorisation of a registration of a birth may come about through persons nominated as parents or relatives wishing to deny such relationship.

Members may be disposed to doubt that hardship occurs under the present procedure, but it is apparent that many people are overawed at the prospect of approaching a judge initially in the matter, and, in some cases, the legal cost of such an approach constitutes a hardship in itself.

In addition to these amendments, opportunity has been taken to propose a number of minor amendments to the principal Act.

I shall outline briefly the need for such legislation.

The object of the amendment to section 18 is to remove the obligation which the

principal Act places on the Registrar-General or a district registrar to permit any person to inspect an entry in a register.

This practice was long since discontinued and today, any person who is entitled to information from a registrar, is supplied with a photocopy of the relevant section, in preference to being allowed to examine the register.

Such examination was required to be done under supervision, as the person concerned may only view the particular information about which he can claim a personal interest.

The proposed amendment merely seeks to legalise established practice which is now the regular procedure. I emphasise that the amendment does not prevent the Registrar-General or district registrar from showing a person the register should he believe this to be desirable.

Under the provisions of section 32 of the principal Act, it is necessary for the death of a person to be reported to a district registrar only.

It is considered desirable now to include assistant district registrars, as district registrars generally are located only in important centres, whereas assistant district registrars sometimes are more readily available in isolated areas.

The amendment is considered to be in the public interest, as it provides a more convenient service.

Section 41 of the Act makes it obligatory for a medical officer to complete a medical certificate forthwith after a death, yet allows him to hold it for up to 10 days before passing it to the person responsible for its registration.

Such person is required to complete registration within 14 days of death, and the purpose of the amendment now sought is to oblige the medical practitioner to give the certificate forthwith to the person required to complete the registration.

Unnecessary delay in the past has frequently caused inconvenience, and is a constant source of concern to funeral directors as a result of which they have made representations in the matter.

It is desired to amend section 45 (1) to include an assistant district registrar as a person who may receive a certificate of disposal of a dead body.

Another amendment revokes subsection 3 in order to re-enact it unaltered in its more logical sequence, as a new section 45B.

A new section 45A is proposed to be inserted to prevent the removal of a dead body from the State before the death is registered, and this is surely a logical safeguard.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

REGISTRATION OF IDENTITY OF PERSONS BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.33 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

A committee of inquiry set up to investigate the situation of people who have no proof of identity has reported that there is a real hardship experienced by people who have no positive proof of identity or registration of birth, and find it absolutely impossible to obtain any recognition of identity whatsoever.

This position is not peculiar to Western Australia; it exists throughout the world. Nevertheless, it is reported that large numbers of people in Western Australia are so inconvenienced.

The purpose of this Bill is to assist persons resident in this State who have no legal means of identification by providing a certificate of registration of identity.

The committee of inquiry was emphatic that such an omission should not be allowed to persist. The legislation now proposed has been the subject of considerable research, and I assure members that ample provision has been made to protect all parties who could be affected. The proposed certificate, as set out in the schedule to the Bill, includes, for instance, the name of the person registered only, and does not mention any other person as a parent or relation.

This was considered to be a most necessary safeguard, as legal complications and distress could occur were such particulars shown.

Another safeguard is the provision that the certificate of the registration of identity is not *prima facie* evidence. A further provision ensures that, in the event of the Registrar General refusing to issue a certificate of registration of identity, the person concerned may appeal to the Minister, who may direct the Registrar General to comply.

I suggest to members that the machinery enabling the provision of a certificate as laid down concisely in the Bill can be more adequately dealt with in Committee, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

House adjourned at 4.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 24th April, 1975.

The **SPEAKER** (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Presentation to Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator: Acknowledgment

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I have to announce that, accompanied by the member for Katanning (Mr Old), the member for Gascoyne (Mr Laurance), and the member for Canning (Mr Bateman), I attended upon His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator and presented the Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, agreed to by this House, and that His Excellency has been pleased to reply in the following terms—

Mr Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly:

I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty The Queen, and for your Address-in-Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened Parliament.

QUESTIONS (38): ON NOTICE

1. WATER SUPPLIES

Warnbro: Knowle Way

Mr **BARNETT**, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Can he advise when water will be available in Knowle Way, Warnbro?

Mr **O'NEIL** replied:

No. If the member has a specific connection in mind, it is suggested that he communicate directly with the Metropolitan Water Board.

2. PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICERS

Employment by Government

Mr **T. J. BURKE**, to the Premier:

In view of the fact that the clarification sought by the Premier in response to question 54 of 16th April, 1975 concerning public relations officers employed by the Government, which sought a reply to question 32 of 26th November, 1974, was given to his secretary in December last year, would he please provide the information required as soon as possible?

Sir **CHARLES COURT** replied:

Yes, although there is a degree of uncertainty in my office about the nature of the information which