

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 15th August, 1978

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

SHOPPING

Geraldton Auction Mart: Petition

MR CARR (Geraldton) [4.35 p.m.]: I present the following petition from 572 residents of Western Australia, most of whom reside in Geraldton—

To:

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

We, the undersigned request the Government to allow Geraldton Auction Mart to resume the Saturday afternoon auctions which it has conducted for the last 15 years.

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 conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly, and I have certified accordingly.

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

(See petition No. 15).

HOUSING

Leeming: Petition

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch) [4.36 p.m.]: I present the following petition from 607 residents of Western Australia as follows—

We,

Strongly protest against the development of the State Housing Commission in the South Western Corner of South Street and Benningfield Road, Leeming.

The petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly, and I have certified accordingly.

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

(See petition No. 16).

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

BILLS (3): RETURNED

1. Land Drainage Act Amendment Bill.
2. Architects Act Amendment Bill.
3. Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

INDUSTRIAL LANDS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.13 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill before the House has important implications in connection with the Government's programme to encourage the development of industry.

Members will be aware that the Government adopted as part of its policy platform, the promise of improved incentives for industry, including—and I quote—the acquisition or lease of land or buildings for industry at reasonable cost.

Members will be aware also that industrial land is already available for sale or lease on attractive conditions in a number of metropolitan and country locations through the Industrial Lands Development Authority.

The authority was set up initially to promote the development of industry by ensuring a good supply of well designed and serviced industrial land is available on the market at all times and at reasonable prices. The record shows that the operations of the authority have been a great success, firstly in accelerating the rate of growth of industry and, secondly, in being able to maintain its operations on a relatively commercial basis, substantially funding its own way through the use of private borrowings and its domestic funds.

The Government wishes to see this commercial approach continue and does not see the authority as the vehicle through which any more generous incentives might be offered to attract industry, such as help with land purchases or with the construction of factories.

This is more correctly the role of the Department of Industrial Development, which already administers a range of incentives available to country-based industry which is

expected to be expanded in the future, subject to finance becoming available.

Any assistance with land purchase or leasing involving ILDA land would therefore be on the basis of the department funding the authority to the extent of that assistance.

Although such arrangements regarding land do not have a direct bearing on the Bill before the House, the funding basis applies in respect of assistance with factory accommodation, and I now turn to that subject.

I should firstly make it clear that the Government is satisfied that its entry into the field of promoting industry through assistance with factory accommodation will benefit the economy in the same way as the provision of industrial land has done and on this basis it is justified.

The Government has examined ways in which factory construction could best be handled and has concluded that, subject to adequate controls being available to ensure the protection of the private sector, the Industrial Lands Development Authority is the best vehicle through which factory construction should be implemented.

The authority is already well experienced in all aspects of land acquisition, development and sale, leasing, management and so on, and it is well versed in the needs of industry in respect of factory accommodation. Factory construction is an activity which is a natural extension of its present responsibilities.

The Industrial Lands Development Authority is a body corporate handling its own administration and affairs under the terms of its Act. Because of its area of interest however, and in order to avoid costly duplication of services, etc., its staff are attached administratively to the Department of Industrial Development. They handle for the department those industrial land matters which fall outside the terms of the Industrial Lands Development Authority Act, such as Kwinana land.

The Act does not at present enable the authority to enter the field of factory construction, or to act as an agent in this field, hence the terms of the Bill before the House.

Factory construction can be broken into two areas of interest. The first is the situation where there is a need identified for general factory accommodation and the need is not being serviced by the private sector, a situation more common to country centres. The need is usually for rental space in small factory units.

On the same principle as it ensures that an

adequate supply of industrial land is on the market, the Industrial Lands Development Authority will be enabled by this amendment to its Act to construct such factories. However, before doing so the authority will have to ensure, to the Minister's satisfaction, that the private sector has been given the opportunity to service the need, but that it has not done so or it will do so only on terms that are not suitable.

The preferred way to test the private sector's willingness to meet the demand is to call tenders for development of specific lots on appropriate conditions.

The second area of interest in factory construction is where the Government sees it desirable to attract a specific industry to establish—perhaps a pioneer industry in the metropolitan area or in a regional centre—or to encourage an existing industry to expand.

The industry in this case would require accommodation specifically designed for its needs and construction might be taken on either by the Industrial Lands Development Authority alone, or on a basis of funding by the Department of Industrial Development or any one of a variety of arrangements which could be negotiated with the industry.

It would again be desirable for the private sector to be given the first opportunity to meet the accommodation needs of the industry and the provision to which I referred earlier will also apply to this area of interest.

Having dealt with the concepts behind the proposed amendments, I turn to the Bill itself and will deal with its provisions generally.

The whole of the amendments apply to section 8 of the reprinted Act as amended. Clause 2(a) of the Bill deals firstly with the amendment of subsection 8(1) of the Act by inserting the words "or develop" so that the authority may, in its formal role as an agent, carry on the activity of factory development on land which it might not own and therefore which it could not sell or lease. In other words, the present limitations of the subsection will be expanded to meet the variety of circumstances which might apply in offering industry an incentive to develop or expand.

Clause 2(b) of the Bill goes on to deal with the more substantive amendments to the Act. It repeals the original subsection (2)—which provided only for the subdivision and servicing of land—and substitutes a new subsection (2) which in addition to providing for the subdivision and servicing of land, gives power to grant easements and other interests in or rights over land owned by the authority and also, under 2(b), enables the

authority to provide, construct, adapt, alter and maintain buildings or structures and works ancillary thereto in or on the authority's land.

New subsection (2aa) enables the authority to exercise its powers under subsection (2), firstly as an agent and secondly, in respect of any land whether acquired by the authority or not. The wording of the agency provision is such that the authority can act, for instance, on behalf of a body corporate in circumstances such as the joint funding of a construction project by a private company and the authority or a private company and the Department of Industrial Development.

Going back now to the proposed new subsection (2a), this is designed to ensure that the private sector has the first chance to perform in the provision of factory accommodation under the conditions I have previously discussed. Although this provision is something of a constraint on the Government in quickly providing assistance with factory accommodation, especially in respect of offering the assistance to attract specific industries to establish or expand, the Government believes it proper to offer private enterprise the first opportunity. I understand that other States are operating in this field without such a constraint.

To summarise, I believe the amendments proposed under the Bill will lead to the sensible implementation of a significant part of the Government's industrial development incentives programme, and I commend the Bill to the House.

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

BILLS (3): MESSAGES

Appropriations

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

1. Industrial Lands Development Authority Act Amendment Bill.
2. State Energy Commission Act Amendment Bill.
3. State Energy Commission (Validation) Bill.

ACTS AMENDMENT (CONSTITUTION) BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Clarko) in the Chair; Sir Charles Court (Premier) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Section 73 amended—

Mr DAVIES: I might just recap what has happened so far with this Bill. I said during the second reading debate that I was not too concerned with the Bill because when the people felt a change was necessary, no matter what that change was, it would take place. I am quite certain that will be the case whether or not this Bill is carried.

However, there can be forces which try to stop the will of the people being put into effect. Members opposite have indicated clearly what the position would be because of the interpretation they have placed on the policy of the Australian Labor Party—a policy, I remind members once again, which is printed, and which has been discussed in public with members of the Press present. We have nothing to hide, but our policy can be interpreted any way members opposite think appropriate to the occasion.

The member for Cottesloe went back several years and said that, because certain things had been said some years ago, this was going to happen tomorrow and therefore it was incumbent upon a Government, having made this matter such a huge election issue—at any rate, in the eyes of the member for Cottesloe and the Premier, although it was hardly mentioned during the last election—

Mr Hassell: It occupied a page and a half of policy.

Mr DAVIES: It does not matter whether it occupied a page and a half of policy or a page and a half of the newspaper; it does not matter whether it was written on a writing pad; no great public debate on the issue took place. I do not believe it was an issue at all. I believe the Premier tried to create one and tried to indicate his was the only party which had any respect for the Crown or any mortgage on paying homage to the Crown or the Crown's representative. We said that was all nonsense, but it suited the Premier's ends to stir up a bit of feeling and he was successful in that endeavour.

However, the fact remains the Government is being patently dishonest with what it is doing. Despite its dishonesty, I still do not think this is a matter about which we should get terribly upset, because the Government can put into effect all the rules, regulations and laws that it likes; it can alter Statutes; it can do what it likes; but when the people want a change, that change will come about. It does not matter what we write into legislation; there will be a surge of feeling from the grass roots—from the electors

themselves—and, no matter which Government happens to be in office at the time, if those electors want a change, that change will be brought about.

It will be brought about reluctantly; members can be sure that as many obstacles as possible will be put in the way of those changes, and it is in relation to that point that the Opposition has expressed concern during this debate.

To meet your wishes, Mr Chairman, I move an amendment—

Page 7, after line 17—Insert a proviso as follows:—

Provided that if a Bill is passed by the Legislative Assembly in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (f) of this subsection, but is then rejected or not passed by an absolute majority of the Legislative Council pursuant to those provisions, or is passed with any amendment to which the Legislative Assembly will not agree, and if after an interval of three months from the date of such occurrence the Legislative Assembly in the same or next session again passes the Bill by an absolute majority in accordance with those provisions, with or without any amendment which has been made or agreed to by the Legislative Council, and the Legislative Council again rejects or fails to pass the Bill in accordance with those provisions or passes it with any amendment to which the Legislative Assembly will not agree, then the provisions of paragraph (f) of this subsection shall be deemed to have been complied with in full and the question for the approval or otherwise of the Bill shall be submitted to the electors in accordance with the provisions of subsection (3) of this section.

I was at the point where I was concerned that, as an Australian Labor Party at some future time five, 10, 15, or 20 years hence, we may make this matter an election policy, or the feelings of the public, whether or not we like it, may make it an election policy. Having been returned to office with this as a specific plank, we would have to honour our election promise, but would be prevented from doing so by the very undemocratic nature of the Legislative Council.

We do not feel we shall have control of the Legislative Council at the next election or for many elections to come. We will not obtain that control until substantial changes are made in the

formation of the Council and that will, of course, require further legislation.

Nevertheless, we believe we would be seriously handicapped when trying to put into effect the wishes of the people. Tonight I am trying to overcome the handicap imposed by the Legislative Council. Of course, it could work in the reverse if such a Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council and it would be up to the Legislative Assembly to amend it in that way if it so desired; but I am trying to put into this legislation some principles of democracy.

Last Thursday evening I said I did not like the Premier fiddling with the Constitution for his own ends. I said I wanted to see greater public debate. I said that was the only reason I had taken it upon myself to oppose the legislation. I did not like one man fiddling with something which belongs to the population and something which has a great effect on our lives in so many different ways. The Premier is doing this for his own ends. I believe he is doing it undemocratically; he is doing it immorally, because I do not believe the issue of concern is present in the community, as postulated by the Premier.

Having said we are worried about what can happen to the democratic procedures in the Chamber, we have moved this amendment so that if such a Bill is carried in the future and it goes to the Legislative Council and is rejected, without amendments or with amendments to which this House cannot agree, if the matter is then lost for the time being, and a Bill is introduced within three months, or at the next session of Parliament, and that Bill again is submitted to the Legislative Council and again rejected by it, the Governor can proceed with a referendum as if such a move had been agreed to by the Legislative Council.

I am sure that is a very fair amendment with which the Committee can readily agree. I say it is a fair amendment, because it is in line with the principles set down in the Australian Constitution. Members will see in section 128, dealing with Chapter VIII—Alteration of the Constitution, certain procedures have to be followed. That section reads in part as follows—

But if either House passes any such proposed law by an absolute majority, and the other House rejects or fails to pass it or passes it with any amendment to which the first-mentioned House will not agree, and if after an interval of three months the first-mentioned House in the same or the next session again passes the proposed law by an absolute majority with or without any amendment which has been made or agreed

to by the other House, and such other House rejects or fails to pass it or passes it with any amendment to which the first-mentioned House will not agree, . . .

Therefore, it can be seen that we are endeavouring to write into the Constitution of Western Australia a provision which exists in the Constitution of the whole of Australia. I believe that is an eminently fair situation and one to which the Government could easily agree.

To give some power to my argument—dealing with another clause—the Bill before us now provides for an amendment to which the Premier would not agree during the last session of Parliament, but which he says he agrees to now, because that same provision is written into the Australian Constitution. The Premier said that was the only difference between the 1977 Bill and the 1978 Bill and that he had agreed to it because it was written into the Australian Constitution. He said he thought it was fair enough, although he still did not have very great feelings about it. He thought it was fair, if it was written into the Australian Constitution, that it should be written into our Constitution also. That is all I am proposing to do. I am proposing to take from section 128 of the Australian Constitution, procedures which will be followed if the other House does not agree to legislation which has twice been agreed to by this House. Under those circumstances I say the provisions in regard to the holding of a referendum of the public shall apply. I think that is only fair.

If the Government of the day, whether or not it has made the matter an issue, decides that because of the representations which have been made, and the grass roots feeling of the community which has come through, wants to make an alteration which requires it to go to referendum, and the Government twice attempts to put the matter through both Houses of this Parliament and it is not agreed to by the Council, having done this within a period of three months or at the session of Parliament after which it was originally rejected, then those required procedures shall be carried out as if the other place had agreed to it. I do not think that is unfair. It is a perfectly legitimate request. It is one that comfortably fits into the Australian Constitution. As far as I know no-one has challenged it or sought to have it deleted from the Australian Constitution and, as we are amending our Constitution at this time, I believe we should include a similar provision in the Western Australian Constitution.

Mr PEARCE: I should like to support the amendment moved by my leader. The principle

enshrined in it is a sound one and the soundness of it is recognised by the fact that it is taken from the Australian Constitution. The principle is this: If the Government and the people, as separate entities, agree that the Constitution ought to be changed, then it ought to be able to be changed. We all appreciate that the Government resides in the Legislative Assembly and it is the Legislative Assembly which decides the processes of government. If the Assembly agrees the Constitution ought to be changed in some way and if a referendum is put to the people and the majority of the people agree to the change, then it should not be possible for the Legislative Council to frustrate the change, in exactly the same way as it should not be possible for the Senate in the Australian system to frustrate changes passed by the House of Representatives, changes to which the people agree.

I feel the integrity of members on the Government benches will be questioned by the vote on this amendment. Last week we heard a great deal about the need for democracy and the fact that the people should decide. The amendment we are discussing presently is in line with that and it would mean a very small part of the political process, the Legislative Council, would not make the ultimate decision.

An analogy can be drawn between the position of the Senate in the Australian system and the position of the Legislative Council in the Western Australian system in so far as constitutional changes are concerned. I suggest one reason the Senate cannot frustrate constitutional changes is that there is recognition of the fact that the Senate is an undemocratic institution because of the nature by which it is elected. There are probably good reasons that the representation in the Senate is biased in the way that it is. But surely a recognition of that bias can be seen in the way in which the Australian Constitution prevents that institution, by itself, frustrating constitutional change. The reasons for the bias in the Legislative Council are much more difficult to sustain and much less easy to understand. As I demonstrated to the Chamber last week, there is an inherent bias of at least 10 per cent in the way in which the boundaries of the Legislative Council are drawn and a differential of up to 19 times between the largest and smallest Legislative Council provinces, which means that an entrenched minority could hold the Legislative Council year after year and election after election, almost despite the will of the people, unless a very substantial majority of the people decree that it should be otherwise.

Because the Legislative Council is

undemocratic in that way, it should not be allowed also to frustrate the constitutional changes which are agreed to both by the Government and by the people.

My leader's amendment is quite conservative. It does not say that the Legislative Council should be completely cut out of the procedures to change the Constitution. The amendment says that, having once knocked back a proposed change of the Constitution, the Assembly should be given the opportunity to consider the proposed change again in the light of the Council's declared attitude; that is, when the Bill comes back to the Assembly for the second time, the Assembly would vote on it in a different way, or bear in mind considerations which were not taken into account on the first occasion. That difference would be the declared attitude of the Legislative Council. But if, as set out in my leader's amendment, the Assembly then were to agree with it, despite the declared attitude of the Legislative Council, it is still right for the matter to go to the people, and it ought to be able to do just that.

I will be interested to hear some of the democrats on the Government benches point out what is in fact wrong or undemocratic about the procedures here proposed. While they are pointing that out, if indeed they intend to vote against the amendment, perhaps they could expand their remarks to point out the wrongness and the lack of democracy in the self-same matters in the Australian Constitution.

Sir CHARLES COURT: One could give the Leader of the Opposition 10 out of 10 for trying and perhaps for ingenuity, but when it comes down to the absolute, actual substance of his argument he would not score very much at all. The cold hard facts are that the proposal by the Leader of the Opposition exposes more clearly than ever the difference in approach between the two sides of the Chamber on this constitutional question.

The Leader of the Opposition was taking refuge in section 128 of the Australian Constitution as being the panacea to all his problems and the reason that his amendment should be supported. But I remind the honourable member that in this particular section that is proposed to be amended by the Government's Bill, we are referring to specific matters that have been enunciated for a particular reason. They are not all embracing. The reasons have been stated without qualification and without evasion. I take strong exception to the Leader of the Opposition saying again in this place that he objects to one man fiddling with the Constitution undemocratically.

Mr Davies: Hear hear!

Sir CHARLES COURT: How can one man fiddle with the Constitution when we have to get an absolute majority on the second reading and when we have to obtain an absolute majority on the third reading? We have to get it to another place and go through the same process. Is that being undemocratic? I do not know how one man can be accused of being undemocratic or of "fiddling" when he has to get absolute majorities during the second and third readings of a Bill of this kind.

The argument put forward by the Leader of the Opposition does him no credit when he talks about somebody fiddling with the Constitution undemocratically. I remind him this was in fact featured during the 1977 election, and for good reason. It is not a matter which has been sneaked up on the people. It is something which was very clearly stated, and stated for good reason.

Members opposite have smarted very quickly under the suggestion that they might want to alter the Constitution when they get the opportunity so as to do away with the office of Governor, and do certain other things that would destroy the Constitution as we know it and destroy the monarchical system as we know it, and which we on this side quite unashamedly espouse. It would appear that members from the other side have all of a sudden fallen in love with the monarchical system.

Mr Davies: That is completely unfair. The Premier thinks he is the only one with a mortgage on this "holier than thou" attitude. He cannot prove that, and he would not take the matter to a Select Committee. He did not have the stomach to take the matter to a referendum.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition is meant to destroy the purpose of the Bill. The specific reason for the Bill which has been brought down has been spelt out in the particular clause which the honourable member seeks to amend. There is no doubt about what the honourable member states: If the Legislative Assembly of the day passes a Bill for a referendum which it seeks to introduce, and the Legislative Council rejects that Bill on the first occasion, and rejects it again for a second time, then the referendum can proceed without let or hindrance.

Mr Bryce: Why not? What is unreasonable about that?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The whole purpose of the Bill is to make sure that the provisions we are seeking to enshrine in the Constitution are, in fact, enshrined in the custody of the whole

Parliament; the whole Parliament being the Legislative Council, the Legislative Assembly, and the Queen—or the King—as the case may be.

Mr Pearce: We dealt the people in.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We are trusting the final decision to the custody of the people, not to the Government, of any colour.

Mr Pearce: So does the proposed amendment.

Sir CHARLES COURT: So, we do reject the amendment. The honourable member made his position clear; he wants to be able to bypass the Legislative Council, and I say quite categorically that so far as the Government is concerned we do not intend to make that possible. The honourable member refers to a situation where there is a ground swell of opinion in favour of what the Opposition wants to do; that the Government of the day had received a "message from the people".

Mr Davies: The Premier does not listen, as usual. We did not say there is one; we said, "when" there is one. It will come, whether the Premier wants it or not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am about to deal with that.

Mr Davies: You are being quite categorical; you always are.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is the "grass roots message".

Mr Davies: When, say "when".

Sir CHARLES COURT: Always, "when" or "if". Do not fiddle with words.

Mr Davies: You are the champion when it comes to using words, or when it comes to fiddling with words.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If there were such a "grass roots message", members opposite would control both Houses at that time.

Mr Bryce: Under your gerrymander?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Members opposite could then go forward and get a referendum approved by Parliament and passed by the community. It is as plain as a pikestaff that the ALP does not want to enshrine this provision into the Constitution. The ALP wants to be able to bypass the Legislative Council, and as far as this Government is concerned we do not intend to permit that.

Mr Davies: You are not game, when you have to put your courage on the line.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is not a question of doing this or that; it is a question of cold hard constitutional reality. Members opposite use a lot of stupid phrases when talking about matters as

important as this. The Leader of the Opposition should choose his words more responsibly.

Mr Davies: You are not game to take it to a Select Committee.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I take offence at the reference by the Leader of the Opposition to being undemocratic, because there is nothing more democratic than bringing the matter here and getting it passed constitutionally. We reject the amendment.

Mr BRYCE: The reality of this Bill is that the Premier wants to entrust the Constitution to the Liberal Party; to the back-room boys in Colin Street. They are the people he wants to give the sole right to determine when and if the Constitution of Western Australia ought to be changed. Unfortunately, the Premier was not big enough to say precisely what his Government intended.

Sir Charles Court: I thought I said it fairly definitely.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier ducked and dived. He knows that in the other place there is a permanent 146-year majority as a result of a series of dishonest pieces of legislation. The most recent piece of dishonest legislation that was put through this Parliament to preserve that dishonest long-term majority was introduced in 1975. It was introduced into this Parliament by the present Government. That is the crux of this measure.

A few days ago we saw members in this Chamber from the Government benches almost shedding crocodile tears with regard to their commitment to the will of the people. The member for Cottesloe and the member for Murdoch were in the front ranks. We saw them bewailing, and putting a case to this Chamber imploring us to support the belief that the people should have an opportunity to decide. They were not sincere or dinkum in their propositions to this Chamber. They know full well that they are opposed in principle to allowing the people to decide the proposition which has been put to this Committee by the Leader of the Opposition as a meaningful and sensible amendment.

The amendment is suitable to the 1980s, and it displays a sense of fair play. We are suggesting simply that a Government of the day—be that Government Liberal, Labor, or National Country Party—ought to have an opportunity if it commands a majority in this House of the Parliament to put to the other House a proposition for a change to the Constitution. Presumably, that proposition may well have been endorsed by the people on the hustings. If the second House of Parliament rejects the

proposition, the proposition can then come back to the Legislative Assembly.

We are simply saying—as it is provided for in the Constitution of the national Parliament—that the proposition should then go to the people in the form of a referendum. The members of the Liberal-National Country Party who are prepared to support this Bill tonight are supporting the rigged and crooked structure of this Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member to be careful in his choice of words. He is reaching the stage where I believe he appears to be using unparliamentary expressions. I would urge him to use his considerable vocabulary in order to avoid that transgression.

Mr BRYCE: I believe the Premier failed dismally in his responsibility during this Committee debate to explain to us how or why it was undemocratic or unfair, so far as the people of Western Australia are concerned, to give them the right to express their opinions on a proposed change to the Constitution after the Government of the day has put it to the people, has secured a majority in the Legislative Assembly, and has then been prepared to put it to the people directly after it had been frustrated by the Legislative Council.

The Premier said he resented the suggestion that one man was fiddling with the Constitution. He said it was beyond his imagination that one man could do so. Could I remind the Premier that the way the Government of this State is constructed at present, it is run by a one-man band. One man controls the Cabinet; one man controls the Government parties; one man controls the Legislative Assembly; and because of his omnipotent power over the Liberal Party, he controls the Legislative Council. As a result, in this instance we see one man fiddling with the Constitution. There are very few members opposite who have the gumption or the fortitude to buck that one man.

So, we see it is possible in a so-called "democracy" for one man to fiddle with the Constitution. The Premier, during his remarks, outlined his sense of paranoia.

We have been perfectly frank and open during the second reading debate, and we have indicated to the Chamber that it is not only the people of the Australian Labor Party who consider that the Constitution needs to be modernised and changed in various ways. We are proud of our attitude, and we are quite happy to put this proposition to the people at any time.

The Premier expresses—in his twilight days—a sense of concern that when he is gone things might happen which he might regret. During his

last days in the Parliament he is attempting to impose a far-reaching control over the destiny of Western Australians yet unborn. That is precisely how one man fiddles with the Constitution.

I suggest to members opposite that none of them dare to use the term "democracy" in a serious and sincere way. Most members opposite recognise that this Parliament is the most undemocratic Parliament in the world bar none, in terms of overall structure. Yet, we hear the Premier say that changes to the Constitution should be dependent upon the overall Parliament, not just dependent on the will of the Legislative Assembly.

It is a retrograde step to insist that the proposition put to this Committee by the Leader of the Opposition does not have a great deal of common sense and merit. It has been endorsed by the conventions that were behind its drafting, and it has been accepted by the national Constitution. I have not heard members opposite suggest for a minute that there is anything Machiavellian or devious or dangerous about this particular provision in the national Constitution. I submit it is fair and reasonable that if this proposition is in the national Constitution it should be written into our State Constitution, rather than the proposition contained in the Bill.

Mr DAVIES: To say the least I am aghast that the Premier has not agreed to my amendment—particularly after hearing him speak so many times about how wise and how far-seeing were the drafters of the Australian Constitution. The Premier said he was amazed at the great wisdom—I think those were the words he used. He has implied that we have had no need to change the Constitution—or have had need to change it only in a minor way on so few occasions—over a long period of time.

Actually, the people who drafted the Constitution were only members of Parliament. There were one or two clever people amongst them, but I do not look upon those members of Parliament as gods or demagogues, and it was possible for them to make mistakes the same as it is possible for politicians to make mistakes in this day and age. The Premier seems to regard the people who drafted the Constitution as though they were from some special class. He has often said that the words they wrote down should not be put aside lightly at any time.

Having expressed himself in that manner on many occasions, I thought the Premier would at least have acknowledged that the drafters of the Constitution had some sense or foresight in including in the Constitution a section of this nature. I refer to section 128 which deals with the

rejection of a Bill, either way, by either House of the Commonwealth Parliament. On this occasion we are dealing with the matter only from the point of view of a Bill being rejected by the Legislative Council; after having passed successfully through this Chamber with a constitutional majority—at no time do we suggest there should be less than a constitutional majority—then the House of the people can force the matter to a referendum. If the Premier so desires, let him amend the Constitution so that the same provisions will apply from the other end. He can do that at any time by making a further amendment to my amendment.

We do not think it is necessary of course. It is quite apparent that the people want to do something about the situation, so the obvious way to do this is to take the matter to the people. We do not have to wait for the members of a Chamber that is outdated and a bit out of touch with the people to make up their minds. We do not want to see legislation passed today become entrenched so firmly that it would be impossible ever to take the question to the people.

I am surprised at the mock concern expressed by the Premier and by some members of the Government about taking this matter to the people. When I suggested last year that a maximum period in regard to a referendum ought to be written into the legislation, the Premier said, "Nonsense." He did not want a maximum time laid down. He said that Parliament, having considered the matter and having decided to put it to a referendum, might then feel it had dropped a clanger and decide that it did not want to proceed with it. I could hardly believe that the Premier could adopt such a stance. He is suggesting that we should waste the time of both Chambers passing such legislation, but then, if the Government felt that it may have dropped a clanger, he wants to be able to opt out of a referendum.

The Premier now says, "We must take the matter to the people. They are the ones who have to decide." I cannot agree more with that statement. If this amendment is accepted, the matter having twice been rejected in another place, the people would then have an opportunity to decide whether or not they want certain steps to be taken. We realise, of course, that this is only in relation to the office of Governor and the office of Parliament.

The Premier seems to take some sneering pride in suggesting that we have no consideration or respect for the monarchy. We gave the Premier the opportunity to appoint a Select Committee to investigate this matter and he rejected it.

The Premier was not game to appoint a Select Committee because its finding would have been that this alleged stand taken by the Australian Labor Party did not exist at all. He was not game to investigate our policy. I pointed out to the Premier that he could call forward any witnesses he liked to ask how our policy was founded, what it meant, and how we interpret it. He would have found that his reasons for bringing forward this legislation would disappear because there is no foundation at all for his remarks.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition just said, the Premier is trying to ensure that long after he is gone procedures will be enshrined in this Parliament to make it well nigh impossible to alter our Constitution, alter our parliamentary set-up, or change the manner in which the representative of the monarch operates.

It is really of no concern to me whether or not we include this principle in the Statute because I believe when the time is right nothing in the legislation will stop the people from having it changed. However, I am concerned that the Premier believes he is the only one with any respect for the monarchy, the only one who is prepared to bend the knee and to accept the privileges handed out. For some reason or other he believes he has a special duty to protect the monarchy. The monarchy is not under attack, and it is not necessary for him to lay down his cloak in a grand fashion to protect it.

There is no substance in the argument put forward by the Premier for rejecting this very sensible amendment. I want to remind the Premier that when this measure passes to another place, it may be that it will not receive the required constitutional majority—exactly what happened on the previous occasion.

Our amendment proposes that when such a measure has been rejected twice the Governor could automatically set up a referendum. There is protection for the Premier's party, for his own conservative ways, in what we are proposing. This is not a one-direction protection; it is a protection that travels both ways. It is for the good of the community and for the people of Western Australia.

At a time when our Constitution is under attack, it is only right and just that we should write into our Constitution a prescription which will allow us to ensure that the people of the community are allowed to express themselves, despite the conservative feelings in another place.

Mr BRYCE: I am surprised to say the least that the member for Cottesloe and the member for Murdoch have not made a contribution to the

deliberations of the Committee on this question. Last Thursday, during the second reading debate, I suggested rather facetiously to this Chamber that the member for Cottesloe and the member for Murdoch had learnt the trappings or the rhetoric or the Premier's utterances on this question, and that they trotted out these views to put themselves forward in the Cabinet stakes for the next vacancy.

Mr Davies: It has been filled.

Mr BRYCE: The next vacancy.

Mr Carr: There is the possibility of two there.

Mr BRYCE: I may have been quite unfair, and even fairly inaccurate. There is a chance that the member for Cottesloe and the member for Murdoch were sincere in their pleadings to this Chamber on behalf of the people in respect of their desire to see the matter referred readily to the people. Perhaps they were sincere in their utterances about their commitments to democracy, and so I would like to put a question across the Chamber to these members. I ask them: Why have they remained silent during the Committee debate on this measure when they were given the opportunity to explain to us the reason that this particular amendment is not the epitome of democracy and fair play for the people?

Mr Pearce: Where is the answer to that question?

Mr BRYCE: Naturally we are deafened by the silence. It appears that the Premier, the one man who has the power and the authority to fiddle with the Constitution, has used that power and authority to silence his back-benchers once again. We can assume only that their utterances last Thursday were insincere in the extreme and hypocritical.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 20

Mr Barnett	Mr Hodge
Mr Bertram	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr McIver
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Pearce
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Dr Troy
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr Wilson
Mr Grill	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

Noes 28

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Sir Charles Court	Mr O'Connor
Mr Coyne	Mr Old
Mrs Craig	Mr O'Neil
Dr Dadour	Mr Ridge
Mr Grayden	Mr Rushton
Mr Grewar	Mr Sibson
Mr Hassell	Mr Spriggs
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Tubby
Mr Laurance	Mr Watt
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams
Mr McPharlin	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders

Pairs

(Teller)

Ayes	Noes
Mr Jamieson	Mr Sodeman
Mr Harman	Mr Crane

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 put and passed.

Preamble—

Mr DAVIES: I am seeking information. I have been in Parliament since 1961 but I cannot recall a Bill with such a long preamble as this one has. I wonder whether it fits into the Act, because the Act as it stands has only a relatively short preamble of about 1½ pages, whereas the preamble in the Bill now before us runs into nearly three pages. I am wondering what it is all about. I do not like passing legislation when I do not know what it is all about, and I am sure the Premier will be able to tell me.

Sir CHARLES COURT: While the preamble is not part of the basic legislation as such, it has become an established custom and is regarded as desirable, especially in legislation of this kind, to spell out certain basic information and principles. The Leader of the Opposition will find that is exactly what has been done here, and it is not an unusual form of preamble for legislation of this kind. On the contrary, it is quite the normal thing.

The Leader of the Opposition will remember the type of preamble to some of the letters patent, to documents relating to the appointment of a Governor, and the like. The preamble has a meaning and purpose in this legislation, although it is not part of the clauses of the Bill.

Mr DAVIES: That was very nice but it told me nothing I could not learn from reading the Bill.

Sir Charles Court: That is the point.

Mr DAVIES: The point is it tells us nothing; so we are passing legislation which tells us nothing, and obviously the Premier does not know what it is all about.

Sir Charles Court: It is not part of the legislation. It is the preamble.

Mr DAVIES: The Premier has just said it is part of the legislation.

Sir Charles Court: It is not part of the legislation as such, where there are specific clauses.

Mr DAVIES: That is an amazing thing to say. I have been here only 17 years but I could have appreciated that. Will this preamble be incorporated in the Act? I have had a look at some of the earlier amendments to the Constitution Act.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr DAVIES: We have been discussing the preamble. The Premier said this was not part of the legislation, but just of the Bill. I am quite certain that the shock of the Federal Budget has divorced his mind of all matters that we have been talking about; and it looks as if some of my colleagues have left the country after hearing such a cruel Budget!

Mr Blaikie: When you refer to it as such a cruel Budget, I am surprised you talked with a smile on your face.

Mr DAVIES: I think that the cruel Budget might have been the cause of it, but I doubt whether they can afford the \$10 to leave the country! However, I am sure they will return before very long. We are not discussing the Federal Budget announced tonight, but I am sure we will discuss it before the session is over.

I am surprised to see such a lengthy preamble to the Bill. I have seen some of the other Bills to amend the Constitution, and generally they had some kind of preamble, but I cannot sort out whether those preambles were incorporated into the legislation.

In this case, the existing Act contains a preamble of 1½ pages, none of which makes any sense to me. The Bill contains almost three pages of preamble. It does not say whether it replaces the existing preamble, or whether it is an addition to the existing preamble.

It is not unreasonable that members should be made aware of what the preamble does. Although the preamble, as such, might be complete verbal garbage, I suppose that in the legal sense it has some meaning. However, nobody has explained what it means, why it is in the Bill, and what eventually will happen to it. The Premier has merely said it is not part of the legislation, but that does not answer the query.

The fact that it is in the Bill and the fact that we have a right to discuss the matter entitle me to ask the Government to explain what it means, why it is in the Bill and what will happen to it

eventually. It refers to some people in history about whom I have forgotten; that is, if I knew about them in the first place!

The preamble seems to be such an appendage that it does not excite me very much. It is one of the matters we might refer to the Law Reform Commission to determine whether we need to go on which this kind of double-talk which looks very well, but does not read very well and does not mean very much.

I am repeating this to enable the Deputy Premier to look into the matter and to see if he has an answer. If the Government does not have an answer, we can only suppose that the Parliamentary Draftsman has considered the preamble to be necessary, and therefore included it in the Bill. But it does not get away from the fact that we should not pass the Bill, without knowing the reason for the inclusion of the preamble and what it means.

Although the Premier gave me to understand it has little importance, that merely belittles the query I have raised. As the Minister handling the Bill he should be able to give us a reason for its inclusion in the Bill, and tell us why it is necessary, whether it is to be part of the legislation, or whether it is merely padding.

Preamble put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

LAND VALUERS LICENSING BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd August.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balcatta) [7.37 p.m.]: This Bill is a simple measure designed to provide for statutory control of land valuers, because at present they are not subject to any specific statutory control.

The Opposition has no great objection to the Bill, but thinks that the two reasons given for its introduction should be supplemented by the other bases on which the Government is seeking to act in this matter. The two reasons that the

Government, through the Chief Secretary, advances are that, firstly, there are no standards or guidance on standards required to be applied to applicants seeking to become sworn valuers. Apart from this, there are no prerequisites, qualifications, or experience, set down or required of these applicants.

On the Opposition benches we would like to know, firstly, the origin of the legislation; whether it was suggested by the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia; if it was suggested by that body, the reasons it was suggested; and the reasons that the proposals have been accepted by the Government. We want to know the problems confronting valuers at present, and whether any specific problems with respect to their performances have given rise to the legislation we are now considering. We would like to know the nature of any inquiries that will be held by the Land Valuers Licensing Board, and the nature of the inquiries which the board will hold once it is constituted.

It is also of interest to the Opposition to see how the Government intends to co-ordinate this new initiative with the Government's already announced stringent policy on additions to the Public Service. What will this new measure mean in terms of additions to the Public Service, and how will these additions reconcile themselves with the Premier's very tough policy, as announced, to control the expansion of the Public Service?

One of the matters the Opposition wishes to draw to the attention of the House is the result of this Government's failure to act with respect to the Land Commission, as suggested by the previous Federal Government—a commission which, when established in other States, resulted in much more desirable land prices in those States. The South Australian example, for instance, has resulted in more land being made available, and the land which has been made available is made available at lower or more attractive prices than is the case in Western Australia. We can see a case for that sort of commission.

Regarding the Government's proposal in the Bill, while the Opposition takes no strong exception to its implementation, there are areas in which the Opposition would like more information from the Minister.

MR O'NEIL (East Melbourne—Chief Secretary) [7.42 p.m.]: I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill. Firstly, let me take his last point. It is not envisaged that this measure will entail any charge on the Crown whatsoever; and I

gather there has been no Governor's Message associated with its introduction.

The Bill will, in fact, establish what is essentially a self-supporting and self-regulating body to administer the proposals in the Bill in respect of the registration and the qualification of land valuers. It is not unusual for Parliament to agree to a Statute to establish such a body. One can think of the Australian Medical Association, the Builders Registration Board, and a few others, where the body is self-supporting and self-financing, and is established to create standards of qualifications to become registered—in the case before us to become registered as valuers under the principal Act.

As far as I am concerned, the Bill had its genesis in the discussion held with me by the President of the State body of the Australian Institute of Valuers. There is a body known as the Australian institute, and I can understand that in all of the other States there is a similar organisation looking after the State interests.

The person who happened to be president at the time when the discussions were held was Mr Beeson, who is now the Regional Administrator at Bunbury. At the time he was in charge of the land and valuation office in the Public Works Department. He raised the matter with me, and indicated that the Western Australian organisation had been working for some time on proposals in respect of this Bill; and his suggestions were examined. Certain suggestions were made by me, including the one that the Bill should come into operation on a date to be proclaimed in order that various regulations etc., might be made under the Statute.

As I understand the situation, currently valuers are officially recognised through an Executive Council minute of appointment, and most, but not all, applicants are vetted by the Building Societies Advisory Committee, the registrar of which is Mr Bruce Brotherson.

I can recall that, as Minister for Housing, frequently the Building Societies Advisory Committee would recommend to me that a certain person, who had obtained the appropriate qualification or had been accepted as a member of a national body, should be registered as a valuer in this State. To the best of my knowledge that is still the position obtaining. It probably will obtain for some time until this new body has been established, has created the standards, and has organised proper schools and the like. Then it will become the recommending and registering authority.

I do not know that any major difficulty in

respect of valuations has been experienced. I suppose that is a pious suggestion because I do not think the value made by a valuer on behalf of a vendor has always been accepted by a purchaser, so there is always conflict in valuations.

However, I am assured they all use the same principle for establishing valuations and where there is any dispute between a value offered by a resuming authority, namely the Public Works Department, and the person whose land is to be resumed, provision is made for the matter to be arbitrated upon by an independent arbitrator accepted by both parties. As to personal differences of opinion, I do not know of any major problem.

The body concerned in this State has seen a need to follow the branches in other States and that is why this measure is before the House. As the honourable member said, I do not think that on either side of the House there can be any objection to the principle, but there may be matters which the Opposition may like to raise, relating to regulations, which are to be ultimately tabled before the Bill becomes fully operative.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr O'Neil (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Composition of Board—

Mr DAVIES: This legislation is similar to legislation we have dealt with on many occasions. The composition of the board is similar to that of many boards we have discussed on other occasions. We try to get a balance with ministerial appointments to positions of chairman and deputy chairman. This is another one of those measures that provides for control of an industry; measures the present Government has brought in and this one greatly increases its record and surpasses by far the Labor Party's record of bringing in controlling legislation of this type. I would have thought the Government would be most reluctant to introduce further community controls and that it would never let the light of day shine on a board of this nature.

Appeal provisions are to be found in clause 16 of this Bill and they seem to be quite satisfactory. It seems the board will be required to table in Parliament a report of its workings. Provided we have a right to look at the work that has been done during the year I do not suppose there is any

real objection. However, the Government needs to be castigated as does the Minister for not giving more detail in the introductory speech.

In the Minister's reply he gave no demonstration of there having been a swell of opinion from any section of the community to set up a board of this nature. The mere fact there is such a board in other States is no real justification for acting accordingly in this State. If there had been complaints about the way valuers were working, the situation might be different, but as there have been no complaints of any substance I am surprised the Government has decided it wants to set up another statutory authority. But the Government is once again following this course of action and the Labor Party can see no real need for it.

Mr O'NEIL: This is not a matter of the Government establishing another form of control. Perhaps it is self-control, as this board will be self-supporting and self-administering, as are other boards which control or administer their own members—the Barristers' Board is one example. The board is to be established to provide a better standard within the profession. The valuers requested this measure. There is no control by the Government; the valuers have surveillance over the administration.

Mr Davies: At whose request?

Mr O'NEIL: It was a request from the Western Australian Branch of the Australian Institute of Valuers. Some of its more active members have for some time been considering ways and means of improving the standards within the profession by having a system of registration and in time establishing courses in local institutions which would enable the standard of the profession to be improved.

There will be no control by the Government, although it is fair enough that this sort of authority should at least provide Parliament with the opportunity to have some surveillance over its activities. Hence the need for the tabling of various reports. As I see it, there is no financial burden upon the community.

Mr DAVIES: I thank the Minister for his explanation and point out I was outside during his earlier explanation. However, we would be kidding ourselves if we said the Government would have no control over the board, because under this legislation the Minister has the right to make certain appointments. The Minister can appoint people who can put some effective control over the board by the very nature of their association with the Minister and the Government. We have all heard of political

appointments and no-one should kid himself by saying Governments do not try to put their own supporters on boards. Even when Governments change, those supporters often remain on the board and are capable of providing a contact with the political party which initially appointed them.

There is nothing wrong with the industry controlling itself. However, I maintain that although the Government might not be spending any money on maintenance of the board, the community will be spending money because, obviously, land valuers are going to be licensed and those licence fees will be recouped from the community. I imagine those fees will be high enough to ensure the board is kept afloat. There are sure to be sitting fees and I believe they are provided for in a later clause. The Minister is shaking his head and I am pleased about that.

Obviously, the people on the board are not going to give their time for nothing. The fee will probably run to \$20 for a half-day. I do not know the going rate, but it is probably double that amount the way prices are rising. This means it will be a fairly expensive board to keep going and perhaps the only way to reduce costs would be to get someone who is already a registrar, secretary, or manager of an existing board who might be willing to take on this one as well. It would be ridiculous to suppose anyone could be provided with full-time work in keeping this board going.

There is money involved which will once again be borne by the community, whether consciously or unconsciously. The Premier himself has on many occasions said that these charges, small as they are, are all reflected back on what the community has to pay, and we would find no argument with that.

Here we have the situation where a profession will be given legal status. Its members will be able to control the profession and have some power over registration. There are grandfather clauses to allow present valuers to continue, but in due course they will be absorbed and the board will set its own standards.

I have concern that some boards are able to make regulations. Although we have a minor rules and regulations review committee, I am not filled with great joy as I have seen no evidence of its work up to now. I have seen no reports, although there may have been some I missed. Again, I say that although there may be no cost to the Government, it is still a form of control we are giving to a statutory authority, and the Government still maintains some control by the appointments it makes.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 36 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.

ACTS AMENDMENT (LAND VALUERS) BILL

Second Reading

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from the 3rd August.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.

SUITORS' FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd August.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [8.03p.m.]: For many years the only avenue of appeal from the decision of the Local Court was by way of direct appeal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court. A couple of years ago the law was changed so that appeals now initially go to the District Court.

At that time of course an amendment should have been made to the Suitors' Fund Act to meet the changed situation, but such an amendment was not forthcoming. However, the amendment before us now is designed to meet that changed position and it is in fact about two years late. Nonetheless it is most essential and restores the Suitors' Fund Act to the position it was in prior to the amendment to the appeal procedure to which I have referred.

In those circumstances the Opposition supports the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), and transmitted to the Council.

PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd August.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [8.07p.m.]: Once again the subject of fruit-fly control is before the House and it would be appropriate to refer to a somewhat similar fruit-fly prevention Bill which was introduced during the Tonkin Government's regime and perhaps we could make some sort of comparison and examine the attitudes of the two Governments and ascertain where the deficiencies exist in the present system.

The measure before us proposes to amend the Act in two ways. Firstly it will enable the Minister to name a committee and to include as secretary an officer nominated by the municipality concerned. In other words this is a departure from the present method of appointment of a committee. The Minister will have more latitude and will be able to involve a local authority by appointing as secretary a member of its administration.

This would appear to have several advantages—not great ones, but nevertheless advantages which could be of assistance to the committee in the saving of funds. Also there could be a greater continuity with the implied support of the local authority. This would be the greatest benefit. For these reasons the measure can be seen to be of advantage.

Incidentally the fruit-fly baiting schemes were established as a community service in an effort to assist individual householders and orchardists in the control of fruit fly. However the whole situation has altered since the legislation was first introduced in 1947, and a number of reasons exist for this.

The position which pertained in 1947 was vastly different in the sense that the quality and effect of herbicides and other sprays were

nowhere near as effective as they are today. This fact has resulted in the commercial orchardist being able to look after his own affairs and keep his own house in order. As a consequence the major problem with fruit fly has occurred in the urban and metropolitan areas and in the towns.

As I said, the commercial orchardist has no real worry because he is able to look after his own affairs fairly well. However he still faces a certain amount of frustration. I know of one orchardist in Bridgetown who found live fruit-fly larvae in apples last season. This was rather unusual and indicates the severity of the situation in the last two seasons. One of the reasons is the climate. The seasons have favoured the reproduction of the fruit fly very much indeed because the winters have not been harsh and the fruit fly which survived from the previous spring were far more numerous than was the case in previous years.

In addition the control measures have been ineffective, and that is the subject we are discussing tonight. We are trying to ascertain what ought to be done to improve the fruit-fly control.

The commercial orchardist, although he is subject to frustration and vexation because of the spread of fruit fly by the less vigilant householders in the town, has not been affected to any great extent as yet. However, with the increase of hobby farms the incidence of fruit fly could be greatly increased and could cause economic loss to the commercial orchardists and therefore to the State. Consequently the commercial orchardists will be affected by every householder who has fruit trees, particularly those living in the mid and more northerly areas if effective control measures are not adopted. That is the first aspect.

The second important aspect concerns the trend in housing development areas and in most towns, of the householders to establish gardens and extend them. The recent tendency is to plant exotic shrubs and in this way a far greater range of host trees for fruit fly are being provided. Therefore, although householders may not have fruit trees on their premises they could well have shrubs which are serving as hosts to the fruit fly, thus resulting in the spread of the pest. In some instances the householders are unaware of the fact.

The question arises as to who is responsible for fruit-fly control in the State. I suppose it could be argued readily, logically, and reasonably that if a person plants a fruit tree, he is responsible for the control of any resultant pests which could spread

to his neighbours in surrounding districts. The individual must accept responsibility in this way.

Because of the change of situation and the overall planting of gardens, the community has a greater involvement. Previously the poll regarding the establishment of fruit-fly baiting schemes involved only registered orchardists, including backyard orchardists. Now of course, with the establishment of more gardens, there should be a greater involvement in and responsibility for the control of fruit fly.

How can we enlist community assistance? The fruit-fly baiting schemes were originated for the purpose of avoiding costly duplication and ensuring large areas of baiting could be done. It could be argued that in view of the considerable spread of infestation the responsibility comes back squarely on the Government. The precise mechanics of the operation will be a matter of conjecture and discussion before a final solution is hammered out.

I suppose the basic question is: Does the community want fruit-fly control? If it does, there must be some avenue through which it can be provided. If the community does not want it, so be it; but we still have the unfairness of the slothful and careless householder who does not accept his own responsibilities.

The lack of success of the fruit-fly baiting schemes at the present time is revealed in many ways, the most salutary of which is the extent to which fruit-fly infestations have moved throughout the State in the last couple of seasons. I have spoken to the President of the Fruit Growers' Association and the presidents of the fruit-fly baiting schemes in my area, and they are concerned, with some cause, particularly in Bridgetown and Donnybrook where the infestations are very heavy. The inquiries I have made about the metropolitan area have met with a similar reaction—that the schemes are not working or providing the level of control which many people desire.

The second measure contained in the Bill is not a positive one as the first measure is. It is rather negative because it makes provision for the Minister to direct that a scheme which is currently in abeyance or in long-term recess and not likely to function be wound up. Previously the winding up of a scheme required an approach by 10 per cent of the members of a scheme during the June-July period—and then only—for a referendum to be conducted. That was a complex and rather lugubrious method of winding up a scheme, and I suspect a number of schemes

continued for some years because of the difficulty of winding them up.

The figures we have been given by the Minister are of interest and perhaps can be considered in their proper context. While the first provision in the Bill will assist existing schemes in the sense that it invokes assistance from local government authorities, the second provision simply assists the complete phasing out of the schemes which are on the way to becoming defunct. That may be a rather defeatist attitude and not a very constructive approach.

The present lack of success in control can be attributed to a number of factors. Not only in the metropolitan area but also in country towns we have the situation where only part of a district is covered. Fruit fly do not readily recognise boundaries, and if a scheme finishes on one side of a road the fruit fly will travel from the area which is subject to fruit-fly control, pass through the infected area, and return to the controlled area. This is the kind of problem to which the schemes give rise. I suppose at the time the pyramids were built many people neglected their duties and responsibilities and such is the case with fruit-fly control measures. Many people will not pick up fruit which has fallen on the ground or carry out precautionary work, and their neighbours suffer the vexation and frustration that fruit-fly infestation brings with it.

Another factor is inspection, and here it could be pointed out that the measures which must be taken to convict a person who is not fulfilling his responsibilities tend to be rather cumbersome. Fruit-fly inspectors have a problem in effecting the conviction of someone who is not measuring up to his control responsibilities, there is no doubt about that; but how many convictions have taken place in, say, the last two years? I am sure when he replies to the debate the Minister will be happy to advise the number of convictions in the last two years, to give an indication of the diligence and the number of inspectors on the job. I will look forward to that information with some interest.

The years 1977 and 1978 were seasonally conducive to fruit-fly infestation, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Crane), although in the area you represent fruit fly probably would not have been of such great significance as grain weevil. Normally the Donnybrook and Bridgetown areas are reasonably free of fruit-fly infestation, but in the last couple of years there has been a spread of the "little beastie", and the orchardists and residents are concerned about it.

The figures the Minister provided are rather interesting. By 1966, 50 fruit-fly baiting schemes

were in operation, a number of them in commercial fruit-growing areas. Since 1960 the emphasis has moved from commercial areas to country towns, and 24 of the 25 schemes currently operating have no relationship to commercial fruit growers. So 25 fruit-fly baiting schemes exist in the State at the present time, and on the figures provided by the Minister 26 schemes are at this moment in long-term abeyance and held in recess but not finally wound up. Therefore, of the 51 schemes something over half of them are not operative. That is the level to which the fruit-fly baiting schemes in Western Australia have fallen.

If we have a relatively small number of schemes, we have correspondingly very little control of the pest. I am aware that total control of fruit fly in Western Australia is not possible because many native plants, shrubs, and trees are host to the fruit fly. In addition, a large number of suckers and seedling fruit trees are growing on the roadside and on abandoned farms or farms which have been amalgamated, where a house may have been pulled down but a fig tree remains and is a potential source of the spread of fruit pests. Even if the fruit trees which are no longer associated with residences were not a problem, a vast number of native shrubs and trees will have fruit fly.

An inspector stopped in the course of a long trip to put a can of petrol in the tank of his motorcar. Petrol is a lure to fruit fly, and when he poured in the petrol he found four or five fruit fly buzzing around in the 10 minutes he stopped. That is an indication of the difficulty, and I venture to suggest that with the present technology and methods it militates against the complete eradication of fruit fly.

That is the statistical revelation we have before us in terms of past and present schemes, and it can be interpreted only as an ineffective attempt to control fruit fly. I cast the minds of members of this House back to 1972, when a good Government of that day introduced a Bill in an endeavour to improve the Plant Diseases Act. To that end it suggested some fairly sweeping changes to the Act.

Mr Jamieson: When was that?

Mr H. D. EVANS: April, 1972. It was a very good Bill.

Mr Jamieson: That ran into petrol trouble, too!

Mr H. D. EVANS: It was magnificently presented to the House, if I may make so bold as to say so. The attitude and sheer gall of members opposite astounds me. We suggested at that time that local authorities could play an increasing role in the control of fruit fly, and we sat here on

several nights debating the Bill for many hours. Members opposite indulged in a great deal of stonewalling and vituperation, but through an unforeseen circumstance the Bill was not actually passed.

Mr B. T. Burke: The upper House?

Mr H. D. EVANS: No. Where is the Minister for Local Government? I refreshed my memory in regard to some speeches made on the other occasion, and I notice he was prominent in those debates. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at present because I would have liked to refer him to some of his previous comments.

Mr Laurance: Tell us about that unforeseen circumstance.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The then Opposition, the present Government, demonstrated its attitude towards fruit-fly control on that occasion in 1972. That Bill was a sincere and genuine effort to bring about some meaningful reform but we were unable to do so. Even if the unforeseen circumstance had not occurred, had the then Opposition so desired, it would still have been possible to have the measure passed; but no, it was not prepared to do that. Now we see the Government tip-toeing back with a paltry little ineffectual measure, and the amazing thing is that it still involves local government. Once again I can only repeat that nothing this Government does in the future will surprise me.

There are a number of unanswered questions about this legislation. If the Government were genuine in its effort to do something about fruit-fly baiting schemes it would certainly not be satisfied with the two piffling little amendments before us this evening. The Government is saying, "We will allow a committee to be nominated by the local authorities", but this will not involve many committees because only 25 schemes are left in the whole of Western Australia. The other amendment provides an opportunity to wind up schemes more easily and to allow control to slip away more readily from those who require it.

It has reached the stage that the Government must look at the existing fruit-fly control situation and decide whether or not it will do anything meaningful and purposeful. It cannot justify fiddling around on the fringes of the problem with a measure such as this.

I would like some further clarification from the Minister for Agriculture in regard to a question I asked on the 9th August. The question was as follows—

- (1) How many fruit fly baiting schemes have been operating in each of the past five years?

- (2) How much money has been paid to fruit fly baiting committees in each of the past five years, and which committees received assistance and to what extent?
- (3) What was the cost, actual or estimated, to the Agriculture Department for fruit fly control in each of the past three years?

In his reply the Minister said that the information was detailed and that he would make it available to me as soon as it is compiled. However, that will be after this debate, and that is not altogether satisfactory.

I then turned to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of June, 1978, but I was unable to obtain a very clear picture of the situation from the division relating to the Department of Agriculture. So I was not able to determine the expenditure in recent years in regard to fruit-fly control and the number of inspectors engaged in this work. One thing is certain: the effectiveness of control is declining, just as the number of schemes is declining. I would like to indicate now that at an appropriate stage in the debate I will move for some further investigation into this matter. What can we do with a measure such as this? We cannot really support it because of the ineffectual effort it represents. I can only shake my head about legislation such as this.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [8.35 p.m.]: For obvious reasons I do not often become involved in debates on agricultural matters. However, during my period here I have rarely let a debate on fruit-fly control go by without having something to say, and I intend to say something on this occasion. The proposition before us is an endeavour to arouse further interest on the part of local authorities in the control of fruit fly, and I am afraid it is doomed to failure. When schemes such as fruit-fly baiting schemes get off the ground, local authorities seem to come in for all the odium associated with them.

I well remember when the Belmont Shire Council initiated a scheme of its own. This scheme was closed down rather ingloriously by the council's own action because it ran into all sorts of problems. In some circumstances the committee took action against residents in State Housing Commission multiple dwellings simply because a particular tree was growing close to such a dwelling, and it was not part of a registered orchard. This particular scheme did nothing but disturb the ratepayers. Certainly it did not improve the fruit-fly situation.

As far as I could see, it had the opposite effect; fruit fly was found in trees which had never been

infested before. It seemed that the bait actually attracted the fruit fly. I found this happened in my own garden and the fruit fly has remained ever since. Of course, one would not expect an authority would do anything to induce fruit fly into an area, but one of the problems with voluntary schemes—and these schemes were offshoots of voluntary schemes—arises when a neighbouring local authority refuses to take part in it. If one's next-door neighbour is not doing anything about his responsibility, the fruit fly will breed in his garden and travel to yours. That is what happened from authority to authority.

I have often said in this House that we will not control fruit fly in our State until a Government of the day takes the matter in hand properly and introduces a scheme such as that used to control Argentine ants. When the Argentine ant became a menace in our community, the Government took drastic measures and now, although there are a few minor outbreaks, in the main the infestations are under control. With modern technology and the chemicals that are available, surely we could initiate a similar attack on the fruit fly. Certainly it will be a harder problem than that presented by the Argentine ant because of the wide area the fruit fly can cover, but nevertheless the problem is there to be solved and it will not be solved through local authorities.

I would like to draw the attention of members to the situation that developed in the Belmont Shire. As I said, a committee was set up by the shire council, but after it had been operating for a short time, the councillors started to receive many complaints about the efforts of the fruit-fly baiters. The council decided that the scheme should cease, but as it was the wrong time of the year, it was impossible to call for a referendum in the period available. The council then took other action to rid itself of this committee.

As the Belmont Shire Council no longer used the old Belmont Shire hall for administrative purposes, the committee had been using that hall. The council then told the committee that it wanted the hall for something else, and the hall was turned over to some youth organisation. The committee then occupied a garage at the back of someone's house, and the council, still wishing to be rid of this scourge, took action against the committee on the grounds that it was conducting a commercial venture from residential premises.

Eventually my colleague, the member for Warren, who was then the Minister realised that the situation had gone far enough and he agreed to the winding up of that scheme and to the disbursement of its funds. If that is an example of how local government is likely to regard such

schemes, I do not consider shires will be anxious to make available clerical assistance for the running of baiting schemes, as is proposed in this amendment. I imagine local authorities would be anxious to keep right away from such schemes. Indeed, although I notice this proposal was supported by the Country Shire Councils' Association, no mention is made of the organisation representing metropolitan authorities, and that is important if a real attack is to be made on fruit fly.

Therefore, I feel this move is doomed to failure as other moves have been. I do not really know how the problem should be attacked, although I know it must be attacked eventually on a compulsory and overall basis. It seems the only way this is able to be done effectively is by the Department of Agriculture. If a disease breaks out amongst pigs the department does not rely on individual people or local authorities; it takes the necessary action to protect the public against the spread of the disease. The same applies in respect of many other diseases inherent in agricultural pursuits.

Therefore it is rather strange that when it comes to fruit-fly control we attack the problem in a piecemeal fashion and we expect voluntary organisations to be set up and to be very enthusiastic even when they can see their neighbours in the next zone are doing absolutely nothing to help with the control of the menace.

My colleague has indicated that the Bill represents a little improvement, but I cannot even see that. However, I suppose one must agree with it because some change might be better than no change. The Bill does not seem to me to attack the position in a satisfactory manner, and I would hope that before many years some Government will be brave enough to bring forward a positive line of action so that we can overcome fruit fly in Western Australia.

Other States impose severe restrictions under their Departments of Agriculture, and I have seen what they do. If an outbreak occurs in South Australia departmental inspectors and officers are sent out to rip up tomato plants to take all the fruit off the trees and to clip the pods off rose bushes. They go to no end of trouble to ensure the infestation does not spread and that is the only way to do it.

I have suggested before that a complete stripping of all known hosts over a period of two years probably would do more to eliminate fruit fly in metropolitan Perth than any other method, including spraying. No doubt this would be a massive task, but it would not be impossible. It

could be tackled on a grid formation, and the host plants could be attacked in one or two seasons. Certainly we would reduce infestations, and we would not have all these large areas and trees, for which nobody seems to be responsible, contributing to the problem.

Flowering peaches seem to attract a great many fruit flies. They seem to be a good host for the parasite, and nearly every house in the West Perth area seems to have one or two flowering peaches in its garden. I have instanced before that flowering peaches in the precincts of Parliament House have dropped fruit onto the pavement, and one had only to squash the fruit to see what was in it. This has not occurred in recent years because the gardeners are aware of the situation and have ensured that the fruit is removed. However, many gardeners do not appreciate that they are hosting fruit fly because they have a flowering shrub which manages to produce a few fruit amongst leafy coverage, and those fruit are attractive to fruit fly.

I suggest the problem requires to be given more attention rather than being tackled merely on a piecemeal basis of changing a few rules to enable a few things to occur on a voluntary basis. We will not get very far until we have some form of compulsion or a universal attack on the fruit-fly menace. Therefore I have great reservations about supporting any move that is not prepared to go further than this Bill.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [8.46 p.m.]: I thank the members for Warren and Welshpool for their qualified support of the Bill. It is well known to them that fruit-fly baiting schemes are voluntary and, as such, are implemented only when requested by registered orchardists; and then only if 60 per cent of the registered orchardists vote in favour of a scheme. The Government has no intention to make schemes compulsory—certainly not at this stage.

Criticism has been levelled at the fact that fewer baiting schemes are in operation now than at the peak. To some degree—certainly I would not say it is the sole reason—this has been brought about by the cessation of some baiting schemes in commercial fruit-growing areas. This was acknowledged by the member for Warren, who pointed out that with the advent of newer chemicals better control is able to be maintained in commercial orchards.

The Bill embodies three simple amendments, and I am surprised it has attracted so much debate. It merely gives the Minister of the day power to order a poll for cessation of a scheme where it is obvious that the scheme is in decline

and no request has been made by the registered fruit growers. This can be done if the scheme is obviously in a state of decline which would render it incapable of control, and it can be done instead of having to obtain a petition of 10 per cent of the registered orchardists within the zone concerned.

The Bill also gives the Minister power, without reference to the registered growers, to wind up a scheme in the event that it has been redundant for some time. This provision is included in the measure so that equipment which may be lying idle and has some value may be stored or its value realised and the scheme squared up.

I thought the matter of local government involvement would draw a few comments. However, it is not the complete involvement of a local authority in the running of a scheme; the amendment simply requires a local authority to provide a secretary. This has become necessary because in some cases it is increasingly difficult to obtain efficient secretarial expertise, particularly in country towns. I do not say in all cases because I know there are schemes where other local government officers are acting as secretary, and are doing so very efficiently.

However, in order to ensure adequate secretarial facilities are available, local government has agreed to become involved so that there is continuity of secretarial services and some local government involvement which gives the scheme a little more credibility in regard to the collection of fees. I do not think anybody would quarrel with that basis.

I apologise to the member for Warren for not answering his question. I must admit it slipped my memory and I am surprised I do not have the information. It certainly was not done with any malice aforethought because the debate was due to come on tonight. I am sorry I cannot furnish the honourable member with the figures off the top of my head; I could probably take a guess, but the member for Warren doubtless would prove me wrong tomorrow. I do not carry that sort of information around in my head.

I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

As to Reference to Select Committee

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [8.53 p.m.]: I move—

That a Select Committee be set up to

examine the provisions contained in the Plant Diseases Act, the operation and administration of fruit fly baiting schemes currently operating in this State, to determine the reasons for the failure of schemes which have ceased to operate and to make recommendations to improve fruit fly control methods in W.A.

The Opposition is not at all happy with the lack of effort on the part of the Government with regard to fruit-fly control and to this end, we have made several suggestions. The member for Welshpool made a comparison with Argentine ants; I do not know whether a similar control measure in the case of fruit fly would be the solution. I do not know whether a greater degree of local government authority involvement is the answer.

However, there have been no suggestions or guidance from the Government or indeed, very much enthusiasm regarding this important problem. The position has deteriorated. Whilst we may be able to blame two dry winters to some extent in some areas, in other areas we cannot use this as an excuse for Government inactivity. I would like to know the extent of the departmental activity in the field of inspections and matters of that kind, because I believe it must be considerably lacking.

The situation at the moment not only is unsatisfactory but also is deteriorating to the extent where there could well be some problems facing commercial growers in the not-too-distant future. Perhaps the present voluntary scheme could be extended through shire councils. No longer is the backyard orchardist alone the culprit. The ordinary gardener has a responsibility of which, in many cases, he probably would not be aware. However, the cold hard fact remains that if we are to tackle the fruit-fly problem with a degree of sincerity, what has been proposed tonight must be brought about.

The starting point for such proposals is a Select Committee that can have a look at the problem, amass the relevant data and obtain an indication of all the facts we do not have before us this evening. It can trace the history of the various control measures and can make projections to the future.

Acting Speaker's Ruling

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order! The motion moved does not seek to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. To be in order, it would be necessary for the member for Warren to move a substantive motion to that effect. Therefore, I rule the motion to be out of order.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I should like to query one

point, Mr Acting Speaker. While the provisions contained in the Bill seek to amend the parent Act, they are so limited in their application that it would be meaningless to try to frame a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee around those provisions. The Bill contains two provisions, one of which is acceptable, with some limitations, and the other of which is a purely machinery measure relating to administration. The substance of my motion refers to the parent Act; in effect, it is the operation of the Act which is in question. The effect of this Bill on the operations of the parent Act will be negligible and, indeed, trivial.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I must stand by my ruling that the motion is out of order. The member for Warren may move to disagree with my ruling if he cares to, but that is my ruling.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [9.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [9.01 p.m.]: I intended to refrain from taking part in this debate as it was my intention to speak to the motion that was to be moved by the member for Warren. As that motion has been ruled out of order I shall take this opportunity to speak.

Firstly, I would like to support the member for Warren and the member for Welshpool in their endeavours to have something done about fruit-fly controls in Western Australia. I think the Minister would be well aware of the problems, because I presented a deputation to him on the 23rd February this year on behalf of the Collie fruit-fly baiting committee. The committee was experiencing difficulties in the operation of the scheme.

If we examine what has taken place we find that since the scheme was first introduced fruit-fly control in Western Australia has deteriorated. We can go to most areas where fruit is grown and see a great deal of fruit lying on the ground.

When the scheme was originally introduced there were sufficient inspectors available to police backyard orchards. They were even able to conduct their own fruit-fly baiting operations and they went so far as to clean up fruit lying on the ground. That is not the present situation. This is one of the many problems we are faced with and it shows how the scheme has broken down. In addition, a number of voluntary schemes are finding it very difficult to function as they lack

sufficient finance to put adequate baiters into the different areas.

One of our concerns with the present Act is that in certain towns we find that only part of them are covered. For instance, only half of Collie is covered by the present scheme. In response to my letter of the 1st May, 1978, the Minister replied on the 23rd May in the following terms—

The continuing problem of fruit fly infestation is a matter of concern. However, as we stated at the deputation, adequate control measures are available if growers or schemes will use them.

Mr Old: They have the opportunity.

Mr T. H. JONES: Unfortunately, the situation is that the scheme is not being used. With situations such as that existing in Collie we find the whole scheme is breaking down. The scheme would be effective if everyone paid a keen interest in the operation of it, but the Minister would know that does not happen.

As the member for Warren indicated, there are 25 schemes actively operating in Western Australia and another 26 existing in name only. Surely this indicates that the schemes are not working. When I presented the deputation to the Minister I supported the member for Warren's remarks that it was time we had an overhaul of the existing legislation, but the request fell on deaf ears.

There are problems even in the Minister's own electorate. He should know that the people he represents are complaining about the spread of fruit fly in their area. It was reported in the *Collie Mail* of the 16th March, 1978, that a meeting of the West Arthur Shire was held in Darkan the previous week. The report said, "Grave concern was expressed by many residents of the Darkan townsite, at the epidemic proportions of fruit fly within Darkan and surrounding farms." I repeat that this is the Minister's own electorate. The report went on as follows—

The council was told that the fruit-fly infestation was beyond the control of the average householder.

Ratepayers were advised that the council could not form a committee, as this had to be done by the ratepayers themselves. The council had discussed the problem at their last meeting, and as a result, have asked for a report from the Agricultural Department.

Councillors suggested that a committee be formed, so as a compulsory fruit-fly baiting scheme, under the supervision of the

Department of Agriculture, can be started as soon as possible.

So it can be seen that the Minister has merely to go to his own electorate to realise there are problems. Unfortunately, as I have said already, nothing has happened since my deputation to the Minister and that is why the member for Warren, the member for Welshpool, and myself are concerned.

The Donnybrook fruit growers are concerned. The Donnybrook area is the largest fruit-growing district in Western Australia. On the 14th March this year the Donnybrook District Association wrote to me in the following terms—

I have been directed by my Association to write to you and ask that you do all in your power to clean up Fruit Fly in the Collie district, and we fully support the efforts being made by your Local Committee.

They were expressing concern, because the Preston Valley is situated near the Collie Shire. The Donnybrook orchardists are concerned that the fruit fly might spread from Collie into their area. It is time the Minister took positive action.

Earlier this year at a meeting of Collie townspeople further concern was expressed and reported in the *South Western Times* dated the 30th March, 1978. It reads as follows—

COLLIE fruit fly baiting committee cannot afford to keep up weekly spraying of trees on the charges set by the government, electors were told at their annual meeting.

The electors called on the shire council to act quickly to improve the situation after some had called for the abolition of the scheme.

Cr Mayne Coverley said that although the scheme was set up after a referendum by the council, the committee which ran it then had full autonomy.

The council could have a member on it, but it did not, and unfortunately the committee did not come under the control of the council, he added.

In reply to questions, Cr John Mumme, chairing the electors' meeting, said councillors and the local fruit fly committee had recently met the Minister for Agriculture.

Unfortunately, nothing has come of that meeting apart from a very minor amendment which we are debating tonight.

I point out that the Hon. A. A. Lewis is concerned about this problem in the Bridgetown district. In a speech in another place on the 21st

March this year he said it was time the Government came to grips with the problem and he mentioned the question of penalties. So we have people in the Darkan area complaining, and this area is in the Minister's electorate. Further, we have complaints from Collie and Donnybrook and the Hon. A. A. Lewis has mentioned problems in the Bridgetown area.

Does this not spell out clearly that it is time something was done to improve the standard? If the voluntary scheme is not working satisfactorily, and if fruit fly is spreading, something should be done. I do not think the Minister will deny that fruit fly is spreading. Anyone who cares to go down to the fruit-growing areas, talks to the fruitgrowers, and makes an inspection of the orchards, will see that fruit fly is spreading throughout Western Australia. This problem is very worrying. It does not worry the people who are not involved in the industry and who do not rely on it for their livelihood. However, it is certainly worrying the fruit growers in the Donnybrook and Bridgetown areas. These people rely on fruit growing for their income.

The member for Warren demonstrated clearly the situation. All I want to do is express my concern. Not only am I concerned, but also members of the Collie Shire and the fruit-fly baiting committee are concerned. Insufficient inspectors are available. The committees do not have adequate finance and little interest has been shown in the fruit-fly baiting scheme. I am not condemning the voluntary members of the committee at Collie. However, as the Minister knows, little interest is being taken in it.

I have demonstrated clearly that concern is being shown in the four areas I have mentioned. I appeal to the Minister to have another look at the proposition and to re-examine the Act, because it is evident to me, and evident to the people in the four areas I have mentioned, that the existing provisions are not meeting the situation. If that is the case, we have a responsibility to the people whom we represent and we should do something about the matter. We should make changes which will reduce the fruit-fly problem in Western Australia. I hope the Minister will reconsider the matter in the light of what has been said and that the present legislation will be overhauled.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [9.12 p.m.]: I was wondering, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Crane), whether you would be prepared to allow me to put forward a second amendment requesting the setting up of a Select Committee. I should like to move an amendment that a Select Committee be set up to examine whether the involvement of local bodies proposed in this Bill is sufficient to

achieve the desired control of fruit fly, and the alternative courses of action which are available to curtail fruit-fly infestation.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): If you wish to move that the Bill be considered by a Select Committee you must do just that. I believe there may be an opportunity for you to do that; but I am sure you have had every opportunity so far. Therefore, I believe we should proceed with this Bill.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Mr Acting Speaker, with deepest respect—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Would you like to move me out of order and disagree with my ruling? I will accept such a motion.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Before doing so, Mr Acting Speaker, I point out that the substance of the motion relates to one of the provisions in the Bill; that is, the existing involvement of local authorities and any alternatives that are available. It applies to one of the provisions in the Bill and, on those grounds, it is referring, in effect, half the Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr P. V. Jones: I think that tie of yours has fruit fly.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I shall put the question.

Point of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: On a point of order, I was wondering whether you, Sir, are going to reply to my proposition.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have replied by proceeding with the Bill. Order!

Mr H. D. EVANS: I have received more courteous replies on occasions, Sir.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I believe I gave you a fair opportunity to move a substantive motion and you did not do so. I would like to proceed with the Bill.

Debate Resumed

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT AND CONTINUANCE BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd August.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [9.16 p.m.]: This Bill is one of little import. It affects a measure which has not been proclaimed since 1947. It is not envisaged that it would be required, but in the event of this occurring, we should deal with it at

the present time. The very laudable legislation was introduced by a Labor Government. Of course, the only substantial rural legislation introduced, either in the Federal Parliament or the State Parliament, has been by Labor Governments. I thought I should make that observation.

Mr Old: Surprise, surprise!

Mr H. D. EVANS: However, the usage of this Bill is not required until the Federal arrangements break down. This does not seem to be likely. The Act will be in operation until the 31st October, 1978, hence the appearance of this legislation before the House, to ensure the continuance of the provisions for a further five years. It is possible changes will occur in the wheat industry. The IOC report has been brought down, but the recommendations which will be accepted from that report are not known at this time. If the recommendations are accepted substantially, sweeping changes could occur in the wheat industry. However, at the present time this is a precautionary Bill and one to which the Opposition has no objection.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [9.18 p.m.]: I thank the member for Warren for his support of the Bill. As he said, it seeks an extension of time and a continuation of the Wheat Marketing Act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HEALTH

Foods and Fish: Tests for Heavy Metal Content

1088. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What tests for heavy metal content in foods and fish have been conducted in and near the Perth metropolitan area within the last 12 months?
- (2) With specific reference to—
- market gardens;
 - privately grown vegetables in the Rockingham area; and
 - fish molluscs and crustaceans from the vicinity of the gypsum deposit in Cockburn Sound,

will he please provide me with details of sampling results over the last 12 months?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Laboratory examination of samples of fish, oysters, mussels and foods in general routinely, as a result of complaints and on behalf of the NHMRC (Market Basket) Sydney.
- (2) (a) and (b) nil;
- (c) the sampling results are shown in the attached tables which were provided to the Commissioner of Public Health by the Department of Conservation and Environment.

Values for Cadmium in $\mu\text{g/g}$ from *Mytilus* collected 16th November, 1977 in Cockburn Sound

Date 16th November, 1977	Mean $\mu\text{g/g}$	Range $\mu\text{g/g}$
30 station sample (includes CBH, CSBP and AIS)	0.4	0.1-6.9
CBH	2.0	1.5-2.4
CSBP	5.5	4.1-6.9
AIS	2.1	1.7-2.3
Buchanan Bay Garden Island (control)	0.1	0.1-0.3

Mean values for Cadmium ($\mu\text{g/g}$) from monthly collections of *Mytilus* from sites showing increased levels

Date	CBH	CSBP	AIS	Buchanan Bay (control)
15th December 1977—				
Mean	2.0	5.6	1.9	0.2
Range	1.7-2.1	4.6-6.9	1.6-2.3	0.1-0.3
9th January 1978—				
Mean	1.9	5.0	1.9	0.4
Range	1.8-2.0	4.4-6.1	1.7-2.1	0.2-0.6
13th February 1978—				
Mean	1.9	4.9	1.7	0.3
Range	1.4-2.4	4.0-5.8	1.4-2.2	0.2-0.4
22nd March 1978—				
Mean	1.6	5.6	2.0	0.2
Range	1.3-1.9	4.9-6.3	1.8-2.1	0.1-0.3
19th April 1978—				
Mean	2.0	5.9	2.0	0.2
Range	1.9-2.2	5.4-6.3	1.8-2.2	0.1-0.3
23rd May 1978—				
Mean	2.2	6.1	2.1	—
Range	1.9-2.3	5.6-6.3	1.9-2.2	—

Mean values of Cadmium ($\mu\text{g/g}$) in transplanted *Mytilus* over an 18 week period 15th December 1977—19th April 1978

Date	CBH	CSBP	AIS	Buchanan Bay (control)
15th December 1977— (transplant date)				
Mean	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Range	0.1-0.3	0.1-0.3	0.1-0.3	0.1-0.3
9th January 1978—				
Mean	2.0	2.3	N.S.	0.2
Range	1.7-2.3	2.0-2.5	—	0.1-0.3
13th February 1978—				
Mean	2.1	2.2	N.S.	0.2
Range	1.6-2.8	1.9-2.6	—	0.1-0.4
23rd March 1978—				
Mean	2.0	2.5	N.S.	0.2
Range	1.9-2.3	2.0-2.9	—	0.1-0.3
19th April 1978—				
Mean	2.1	2.8	N.S.	0.2
Range	1.8-2.4	2.4-3.2	—	0.1-0.3

SOLAR ENERGY

Research

1141. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- Would he give details of the ten projects that are mentioned in his answer to question 830 of 1978 dealing with solar energy?
- Would he table the "Directory of Solar Research Projects" as mentioned in his answer to question 830 of 1978?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- The 10 projects are—
 - The Australian Minerals Industry Research Association for the installation of monitoring equipment in two houses air-conditioned by solar means.
 - The Shire of Carnarvon for the installation of monitoring equipment for solar radiation and meteorological variables.
 - The University of Western Australia for development of a low cost indirect solar water heater.
 - Quark Pty. Ltd for experiments in the static design of a solar house and ongoing monitoring.
 - S. W. Hart & Co. Pty Ltd., for the installation of a prototype black chrome treatment bath which is to be available to the institute.
 - The University of Western Australia for the evaluation of radiative cooling techniques.
 - The Western Australian Institute of Technology for Fundamental investigation into the performance of materials for solar applications.

- (viii) S. W. Hart & Co. Pty. Ltd. for the development of prototype industrial solar collectors and their performance testing.
- (ix) The Western Australian Institute of Technology for the development of a low cost trickle plate collector.
- (x) The University of Western Australia for the development of low cost concentrating solar collectors for industrial and mineral process heating.

The board of directors has now approved additional projects as follows—

- (xi) The Western Australian Institute of Technology for the investigation and development relating to lithium bromide absorption air conditioning units fed from solar collectors.
- (xii) Murdoch University for the installation of specialised solar radiation measuring equipment.

The 12 projects named above will substantially commit the \$250 000 made available to the institute last year and some have ongoing commitments which are subject to confirmation after the first year of progress.

The total value of the projects involved, including contributions from the recipients, exceeds \$2 million.

(2) Yes.

The document was tabled (see paper No. 306).

SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS

Grants for Functions and Sports

1147. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Would the Minister advise all the associations that have requested assistance to put on functions or to conduct sporting activities during the 150th year celebrations, the amounts they requested and the names of the associations that have received favourable consideration together with the amount they are to receive?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

Yes, if the associations ask for the advice.

EDUCATION

Schools: Staff Lists

1166. Dr TROY, to the Minister for Education:

(1) How does he intend to have administration functioning so effectively

that staff lists will be ready in advance of the normal school starting time?

- (2) In light of the fact that most staff return voluntarily to their school of appointment prior to the commencement of the school year, what advantage does he see in making this state of affairs compulsory?
- (3) Does the teachers' charter include the desirability of each teacher having 10 periods per week where there is no contact with children?
- (4) Is this the current practice?
- (5) If "No" does he intend to implement it?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) The following measures have been introduced to ensure that staff lists are ready—

- (i) The schedule for all of promotional positions in the department has been brought forward.
- (ii) The closing dates for applications for transfer have been brought forward.
- (iii) A computer programme to assist with part of the promotional staffing has been completed.
- (iv) New application forms which allow transfer and promotion information to be processed more easily have been developed.
- (v) Tertiary institutions have been asked to supply information on graduates at an earlier date.
- (vi) The complex specialist teacher staffing of primary schools which in 1977 was done late in the year is already well in hand.

(2) It is not true that most staff return voluntarily before the commencement of the school year; however, where this has happened it has been apparent that the school can make a better start to the school year, and this has led to the pattern which will operate in all schools in 1979.

(3) Yes.

(4) No.

(5) Non-contact time for teachers is currently provided in primary schools by the specialist teacher programme. This programme will be expanded in 1979.

COCKBURN SOUND**BP Refinery: Oil Spillage**

1167. Dr TROY, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it a fact that BP refinery has stopped its practice of having a stand-by crew for the purpose of oil spillage disposal?
- (2) In the light of pollution already being a problem in Cockburn Sound what is the attitude of the Government towards the seeming reduction in surveillance stand-by by the BP refinery?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No. There have been changes in procedures to deal with oil spills but there has certainly been no decrease in the company's preparations for dealing with any spills.
- (2) As there is no reduction in surveillance this question does not arise.

EDUCATION**North-east Metropolitan Region:****Special and Remedial**

1168. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he list the type and location of facilities available for special education in the north-east metropolitan region?

- (2) Will he list also the type and location of specific remedial programmes being operated in the same region?

- (3) How many teachers are employed within the region with specific appointments in—

- (a) special education; and
- (b) remedial education?

- (4) Can he say at which schools the teachers are employed and for how many days per week?

- (5) What attempts, if any, have been made to survey the numbers of children requiring special and remedial education in the region?

- (6) If such surveys have been conducted, what indication have they given regarding the number of children in the region requiring special education at—
 - (a) primary school level;
 - (b) high school level?

- (7) How many children are currently in special education programmes at each school in the region?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2)

Teachers:**Special Education Facilities—Metropolitan North-east Region**

Regional Superintendent—Mr. G. Watt

Secondary Superintendent—Mr. F. Gatti

Primary Superintendent—Mr. F. O'Sullivan

Teacher Special Duties (Spec. Ed.)—Mrs. D. Prakhoff

Remedial Clinic Teacher—Mrs. L. Leonard (Morley Primary School)

Classes**Schools****Intellectually Handicapped**

Secondary Primary

Gov. Stirling
S.H.

Bayswater

Hampton
S.H.

Eden Hill

Highgate (2)

Hillcrest

Maylands

Midvale (2)

Mirrabooka

Morley

Nollamara

Nollamara J.P.

North Perth

Nollamara (2)
Junior

Nth Inglewood
(Middle and
upper primary)

Warriapendi
(Middle and
upper primary)

Vision
Impaired

Nollamara (2)

Morley S.H.

Hearing
Impaired

Balga (Intellectually Handi-
capped)

Bayswater (Intellectually
Handicapped)

Sir James Mitchell (Spastic)

Sutherland Blind Centre

Teachers specially appointed

2

13

4

3

53

Plus—1 Remedial Clinic Teacher

1 Teacher Special Duties (Spec. Ed.)

Total

75

Teachers: Special Education Facilities—Metropolitan North-east Region
 Regional Superintendent—Mr. G. Watt
 Secondary Superintendent—Mr. F. Gatti
 Primary Superintendent—Mr. F. O'Sullivan
 Teacher Special Duties (Spec. Ed.)—Mrs. D. Prakhoff
 Remedial Clinic Teacher—Mrs. L. Leonard (Morley Primary School)

Intellectually Handicapped		Classes			Schools	
		Remedial	Vision Impaired	Hearing Impaired		
Secondary	Primary					
Gov. Stirling S.H.	Bayswater	Nollamara (2)	Nollamara (2)		Balga	20
Hampton S.H.	Eden Hill	Nth Inglewood	Morley S.H.		Bayswater	11
	Highgate (2)	Warriapendi			Sir James Mitchell	17½
	Hillcrest				Sutherland Blind Centre	4
	Maylands					
	Midvale (2)					
	Mirrabooka					
	Morley					
	Nollamara					
	Nollamara J.P.					
	North Perth					
Teachers specially appointed (Full Time equivalents)						
2	13	4	3			52½
					Total	74½

Plus—1 Remedial Clinic

1 Special Duties (Spec. Ed.)

i.e. All specially appointed teachers are full time except for one who works three days per week.

Children: Special Education Facilities—Metropolitan North-east Region
 Regional Superintendent—Mr. G. Watt
 Secondary Superintendent—Mr. F. Gatti
 Primary Superintendent—Mr. F. O'Sullivan
 Teacher Special Duties (Spec. Ed.)—Mrs. D. Prakhoff
 Remedial Clinic Teacher—Mrs. L. Leonard (Morley Primary School)

Intellectually Handicapped		Classes			Schools	
		Remedial	Vision Impaired	Hearing Impaired		
Secondary	Primary					
Gov. Stirling S.H. 52	Bayswater	9 Nollamara (2)	Nollamara (2)		Balga	213
Hampton S.H. 24	Eden Hill	10 Nth Inglewood	Morley S.H. 7		Bayswater	119
	Highgate (2)	19 Warriapendi			Sir James Mitchell	123
	Hillcrest	40			Sutherland Blind Centre	23
	Maylands	5				
	Midvale (2)	20				
	Mirrabooka	24				
	Morley	33				
	Nollamara	13				
	Nollamara J.P.	12				
	North Perth	16				
76	201	73	23			478
					Grand Total	851

Note: (1) Figures are February figures.

(2) These enrolment figures include children from other regions besides the north-east.

- (3) A total of 77 teachers have specific appointments in remedial and special education. Also, most primary schools in the region have support teachers engaged for part of their time in internally organised remedial programmes.
- (4) See attached sheet B.
- (5) No survey has been made on a regional basis.
- (6) Not applicable.
- (7) 851. Details are provided on sheet C.

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD AND EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

New Premises

1169. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What proposals are there in hand to provide new headquarters of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board and the Education Department?
- (2) Is it contemplated that any other Government departments will be moving into new or alternate premises in the near future?
- (3) Has any inducement been offered to private developers or to assist Government departments or instrumentalities to decentralise their activities from the Perth Central Business District or near thereto?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board's development plan 1978-83 has set out the board's programme. In brief, the Metropolitan Water Board head office sections are currently distributed over five buildings in West Perth. To assist closer co-ordination the board is moving to develop a city board site to enable all central administration to be housed together. Planning of the building is in progress to allow on-site work to commence early in 1979.

A concept design of new headquarters for the Education Department, to be erected on the old Hale School site, has been approved in principle. The question of how the project is to be financed is under consideration.

- (2) No.

- (3) No inducement has been offered to private developers. However, for many years it has been the practice to study the possibility of locating departments outside the central business area and much has been achieved. For example, Westrail, the State Housing Commission and the Agriculture, Police and Main Roads Departments are all housed in substantial buildings away from the city. This policy will continue.

POLICE

Small Boat Launching Ramps

1170. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) On Monday, 6th August, were police officers deployed to prevent boat owners launching boats into the ocean from public boat ramps?
- (2) If "Yes" why was this done?
- (3) Was the Fremantle Port Authority contacted with respect to any such action?
- (4) Were local authorities who own and/or control such boat ramps advised and was permission necessary and was such permission obtained?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) To ensure security and public safety. See also answer to question 1127 of the 10th August, 1978.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No. Permission is not necessary from local authorities. Fremantle Port Authority is the responsible body with respect to the launching of boats from the ramps in question.

POLICE

Hiroshima Day March

1171. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

With respect to the Hiroshima day march through Perth on Saturday morning, the 5th August, last:

- (1) What is the estimated number of people who marched?

- (2) How many police were specifically deployed in any capacity because of the march?
- (3) Of the number in (2) above:
 - (a) how many officers were motorcycle police;
 - (b) how many officers were horse mounted; and
 - (c) how many officers in all categories accompanied the marchers for any part of the procession?
- (4) What is the estimated additional cost of deploying additional staff?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Approximately 450.
- (2) 92. This figure includes 25 officers who were available on standby basis, but were not actually used.
- (3) (a) 7;
(b) 12;
(c) 39.
- (4) \$48.00 approximately

LAND

Development by Local Authorities

1172. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What shires are involved in developing—
 - (a) industrial;
 - (b) commercial; and
 - (c) residential,
 Crown lands?

- (2) In relation to (1) above, would she advise those shires and the areas and cost of land involved, where Crown land has been or is in the process of being acquired by the local authority in each year since 1970?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) The Local Government Act does not empower local authorities to acquire lands for the purpose of subdivision and sale. No shire councils are developing Crown lands for the purposes mentioned.

- (2) Since 1970 local authorities in the State have acquired hundreds of parcels of land from the Crown for various purposes; for example, depots, employee housing, aged persons homes. The information requested cannot be provided as it is customary for files to be destroyed about two years after the grant of land in freehold when it passes from the control of the Lands Department.

WATER SUPPLIES: RATES

Rebate: Recovery

1173. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

When pensioners entitled to a 25% rebate for water rates, having paid such rates in advance subsequently sell their property, what action, if any, is taken to recover from the new owner the 25% discount allowed, assuming of course such new owner does not qualify for a rebate?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Section 5(1)(b) of the Acts Amendment (Pensioners' Rates Rebates and Deferrals) Act, 1977, states—

- (1) Where an entitled pensioner pays the rebated amount of rates or charges within the period for which they were levied—
- (b) the Administrative Authority shall, subject to section 10 of this Act, have no further claim in respect of those rates and charges.

ENERGY

Electricity and Gas: Deposits by Business Houses

1174. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Since when has the State Energy Commission required business houses to lodge deposits against accounts when seeking—
 - (a) electricity; and
 - (b) gas connections?

- (2) How many connections, and in what way, has the system been reviewed?
- (3) What is the current requirement?
- (4) Under what regulation is the deposit required?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Deposits have been collected from customers for many years and certainly this was the practice prior to the formation of the State Electricity Commission in 1946.
- (2) The number of connections involved, to industrial and commercial customers, is approximately 35 000.
The amount of the deposit required has been reviewed on numerous occasions over the years to ensure that the Commission has reasonable security against nonpayment of accounts.
- (3) The current requirement is that the level of deposit required is such as to ensure that the commission has reasonable security against nonpayment of that account. This principle has not changed over the years.
- (4) Part VIII, section 239 of the Electricity Act regulations has been used over the years, however, legislation now introduced provides this power under the State Energy Commission Act.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Prices: Comparison with other States

1175. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that a recent survey of price levels on a basket of 53 shopping items, by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in all capital cities, showed that Perth was the most expensive city in Australia in which to purchase shopping goods?
- (2) Can he explain why this is so?
- (3) What does he intend to do about it?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) and (3) The Leader of the Opposition is presumably referring to the Bureau of Statistics publication, "Average Retail Prices of Selected Items, Six State Capital Cities and Canberra", for the June quarter, 1978. This publication contains information on the prices of a restricted range of items selected mainly from the food group of the Consumer Price Index. No information is given on average retail prices of a wide variety of other goods which are also purchased by the general public.

The Australian Statistician, when referring to the scope of the particular publication, states that the items covered do not comprise all of the items and varieties incorporated in the food group of the Consumer Price Index. In addition, unlike the Consumer Price Index, the "basket" of goods covered is not supposed to represent goods and services which account for a high proportion of expenditures by metropolitan wage and salary earners, nor are the items weighted to take into account household spending patterns. Thus the series "Average Retail Prices of Selected Items" does not purport to measure relative shopping costs.

As stated above, a simple summation of the prices of a limited number of items cannot be taken as a measure of relative shopping costs. The statistics do show that the average retail price of 15 of the 53 items is higher in Perth than in the other capitals. The particular items involved include some processed goods imported into Western Australia the prices for which would reflect transportation costs from interstate. In addition, the prices for some other commodities such as certain cuts of lamb and potatoes have been influenced by adverse seasonal conditions in Western Australia.

IMMIGRATION

Vietnamese Refugees: Number

1176. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Acting Minister for Immigration:

How many Vietnamese refugees have settled in Western Australia in the past 18 months?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

From the 1st February, 1977, to the 11th August, 1978, 1 098 Vietnamese refugees arrived in Western Australia. Due to voluntary interstate movements it is not possible to give definite settlement figures, but it is estimated that approximately 1 000 are living in Western Australia.

Source: Commonwealth Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.

Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital to Sir Charles Gairdner, Fremantle, and Rockingham Hospitals are not calculated on the basis of three course meals, but are calculated on the basis of weight of food produced. This averages \$2.23 per kilogram of food produced.

PETROL

New Variety

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Contributory Extension Scheme: Increased Charges

1177. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Adverting to the answer to my question without notice on Tuesday, 1st August concerning the 100% increase in charges for connecting rural properties to the State Energy Commission supplies and his answer that an announcement has been made about the final scheme, will he advise:

- (a) when the announcement was made; and
- (b) to whom it was made?

- (2) If the announcement was in written form, will he table it?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) To the public, by way of a news release by the Premier dated the 14th July, 1978.
- (2) Yes.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 307).

1179. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

In view of the relatively short period of time before the expected domestic crude oil shortage in Australia (by the middle 1980s) does the Western Australian Government propose to immediately investigate the possibilities associated with the new catalytic technique developed by Mobil to convert natural gas into high grade gasoline which could be sold in Australia as a valuable supplement to the nation's dwindling supplies of petroleum?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The Mobil process is only at the bench scale pilot plant stage and it is not expected that it will be fully developed to a commercial scale before the mid-1980's at the earliest. The Government is actively monitoring Mobil's development work.

HOSPITALS

Meals: Production Costs

1178. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

What is the present total production cost per meal (three course) by the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital for the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, the Fremantle Hospital and Rockingham Hospital?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Production costs for meals supplied by

FUEL: LIQUID

Collie Coal: Conversion

1180. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has the State Government investigated any of the different techniques available for converting coal into liquid fuel in respect of Collie coal reserves?
- (2) If so, will he provide details

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) The State Energy Commission has kept fully abreast with developments within Australia and overseas relating to the production of liquid fuel from coal. The main thrust of these activities in the Australian context takes place in the Eastern States where abundant reserves of both black and brown coal are available. At the present time the reserves of coal available within the State of Western Australia are not such as to justify serious consideration of their use for the production of liquid fuel.

ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Overseas Market

1181. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What progress has been made in securing an overseas market for North-West Shelf gas—
 - (a) in the United States of America;
 - (b) in Japan; and
 - (c) elsewhere in the world?
- (2) With which countries/consumers are negotiations for the sale of North-West Shelf gas currently proceeding?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Market discussions were initiated last year and have been followed up by the parties involved in the North-West Shelf gas project.

Members of Government have also talked to Government and potential consumers in Japan, the United States of America, and South Korea.

It is too early to talk about securing the markets for the gas.

However, my own inquiries give me confidence that the markets can be secured in time.

- (2) The principal consumer interest is in Japan and the United States of America and negotiations are proceeding.

ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Export and New Petrol Variety

1182. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

In respect of the North-West Shelf gas project:

- (1) Is it a fact that development plans envisage the export of 6.5 million tonnes/year of liquefied natural gas?
- (2) Is it a fact that 6.5 million tonnes per year of liquefied natural gas would generate 11.4 million kilolitres of methanol?
- (3) Is it a fact that the new Mobil catalytic process could convert 11.4 million kilolitres of methanol to 4.7 million kilolitres of high-grade gasoline?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This quantity of methanol was proposed by a speaker at the Alcohol Fuels Conference in Sydney held last week, and is of the right order of magnitude. Actual yield depends on conversion efficiency.
- (3) No. The Mobil process has only reached the pilot stage of development and is not available commercially. Mobil is proceeding slowly in development of the process in view of the rapidly developing technology in this area of research, and commercial results are not expected before about 10 years.

INFLATION

Effect of States' Advice

1183. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

Does the State Government endorse the Prime Minister's view that inflation would now be raging instead of coming down if the Commonwealth had accepted the advice of the States over the past two years?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied

No.

STATE FINANCE

Recession and Economic Recovery

1184. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) In view of his reported comments that loan fund cutbacks at the last Premier's conference were a "prescription for recession", can he give any indication when Western Australia will reach the bottom of its recession and when it may expect to undergo economic recovery?
- (2) Can the Premier advise which industries within this State will be most affected by the recession which he has predicted?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) As the Member for Ascot well knows, my comments were directed at the Commonwealth Government's policy of holding down all public sector expenditure, including capital works programmes, in the drive to bring inflation under control and to reduce the Federal deficit.

Whilst supporting the Prime Minister's objective to get inflation down, I have argued with him, and publicly, the case for an increase in public sector investment on utility services such as power, transport facilities and water supplies as a means of generating demand for the output of the private sector, as well as ensuring that these basic working assets are adequate and efficient.

I would have thought members of the Opposition would support my efforts in this regard rather than indulge in "nit picking" questions which I assume they assess may have some political point scoring potential.

Of one thing we can be sure. When the economic upturn does get under way in Western Australia and Australia as a whole, it will not be because of any efforts, ideas or confidence engendered by members opposite.

1185. *This question was postponed.*

HOUSING

Funding: Federal and State

1186. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it correct that Western Australia will have to find approximately \$12.2 million extra to qualify for its full entitlement of Commonwealth funds for welfare housing?

- (2) If so, is it the State's intention to make up this shortfall?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) No extra funds for eligible qualifying expenditure will be required in order to take up Western Australia's matching entitlement under the 1978 Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

HOSPITALS

Bed Charges

1187. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is his Government prepared to increase hospital bed charges by 50 percent?
- (2) If "No" by how much does his Government intend to allow an increase in hospital bed charges?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) If a decision is made on hospital bed charges an announcement will be made.

HOSPITALS

Bed Charges

1188. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he in a position to announce when hospital bed charges will rise?
- (2) Is it correct that specific purpose grants covering such State agencies as public hospitals, having been reduced, have forced pressure for higher hospital charges?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

TRAFFIC

Motor Vehicles: Licence Fee Increase

1189. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

In view of the cutbacks in Federal funds

for roads in Western Australia, can he advise the House whether there will be an increase in car registration fees within the next six months?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I do not anticipate such an increase, but the member would understand that, at this critical stage of finalising the 1978-79 Budget, it is not practicable, nor desirable, to express a final view.

COCKBURN SOUND

BP Refinery: Work Boat

1190. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Has BP (Kwinana) Refinery recently taken out of service a work boat used in association with loading and discharging activities?

(2) If "Yes" was the boat—

(a) used for anti-pollution duties which included the task of detecting and clearing oil spillage;

(b) used for safety measures both to assist in case of fire and to remove seamen from vessels which for any reason are under stress?

(3) (a) Will the anti-pollution activities of the company be in any way impaired;

(b) will the safety facilities of the company be in any way diminished?

(4) (a) Are any men to be dismissed, and if so, how many;

(b) are any men so dismissed to be given alternative employment;

(c) if not, why not?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) During loading and unloading at the refinery, tugs and work boats owned by Kwinana Towage Service are contracted out to BP for various purposes. The number varies depending on refinery needs.

(2) (a) Following a review of oil spill dispersion procedures it was decided by BP to discontinue the use of dispersants in shallow waters. A shallow draught work boat equipped to operate in these areas is therefore no longer contracted for this purpose.

(b) The work boat in question had no role in these areas.

(3) (a) and (b) No.

(4) (a) No;

(b) and (c) not applicable.

HOUSING

Kwinana

1191. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Housing:

How many units of accommodation in the Kwinana area are presently unoccupied?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

154 units, as follows—

	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom	Total
Dwellings—				
Under offer.....	2	11	—	13
Under maintenance.....	3	7	1	11
Sub total.....	5	18	1	24
Apartments.....	65	65	—	130
Total.....	70	83	1	154

Currently, pensioner couples are being approached with a view to tenancing 2-bedroom apartment accommodation.

The incidence of vacant apartment accommodation is due to declines arising from the degree of selectivity of the applicants.

SECURITY INDUSTRY

Private Companies: Number and Police Investigations

1192. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

(1) How many private security companies are there operating in Western Australia?

(2) How many security agents are employed by these companies?

(3) Have the police ever investigated the service provided by any of these companies to their clients?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) 17.

(2) 17.

(3) Yes, on one occasion prior to the licensing of the company.

ENERGY

Electricity Supplies: State Housing Commission Multiple Units

1193. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can he say whether an investigation has been made into problems affecting sub-metering of electricity supplies in State Housing Commission duplex and other multiple units?
- (2) Has a decision yet been reached on the matter?
- (3) If "No" to (2), when can a decision be expected?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes, in regard to avoiding the necessity for billing by State Housing Commission, rather than the State Energy Commission.
- (2) and (3) Yes. The changeover would be financially impractical.

HEALTH

Drugs: Education Programmes

1194. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

What action has been taken in response to recommendation 1 of the report of the education sub-committee of the Alcohol and Drug Authority of December 1976?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Schools are in possession of the report and attention has been drawn to the need to avoid a "crisis-oriented" approach to drug education.
- (2) Health education programmes at the secondary level include topics on drug education and the endeavour is to treat these as a part of a total health programme rather than to study the topics in isolation.
- (3) Teachers are made aware, through support curriculum materials and in-service programmes, of the contribution made by other agencies, for example, Public Health Department and Health Education Council.

HEALTH

Drugs: Education Programmes

1195. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

With respect to recommendation 2 of the report of the education sub-committee of the Alcohol and Drug Authority of December 1976:

- (1) What action has been taken to mount a strong health education programme at the early primary level?
- (2) What progress has been made in establishing the administrative structure to back such a programme?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The early primary "Growth and Development" course which has been introduced to schools is proving to be a most appropriate course for primary students. The department has two full-time officers engaged in advisory and inservice programmes.
- (2) A review of the 1974 primary health syllabus is currently being undertaken.

HEALTH

Drugs: Education Programmes

1196. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

With respect to recommendation 4 of the report of the education sub-committee of the Alcohol and Drug Authority of December 1976, what specific further opportunities have been made available for the continuing education of teachers of health education in both Government and non-Government schools?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) An Associate Diploma in Health Education has been established at Claremont Teachers' College. This course is available to all teachers at Government and non-Government schools.

- (2) All inservice courses conducted by the department in health and physical education hold places for teachers from both Government and non-Government schools. There have been three such courses conducted this year.
- (3) All pre-service courses at tertiary institutions provide courses in health education.

HEALTH

Drugs: Education Programmes

1197. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

With respect to recommendation 6 of the report of the education sub-committee of the Alcohol and Drug Authority of December 1976, what action has been taken towards—

- (a) establishing an Education Department committee on health education; and
- (b) appointing a senior Education Department official responsible for issuing instructions to schools?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (a) A departmental working party is currently completing a report on health education programmes in both primary and secondary schools.

The recommendations of this report will give direction for future developments;

- (b) the Superintendent of Health and Physical Education has the responsibility for the subject area. He has advisory and curriculum officer support for this task.

HEALTH

Drugs: Education Programmes

1198. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

With respect to recommendations 5 and 6 of the report of the education sub-committee of the Alcohol and Drug Authority of December 1976:

- (a) what action has been taken to devise means for encouraging a positive health message in the mass media;
- (b) what progress has been made towards setting up a Government-community council to advise on drug education policy and a Government, inter-departmental committee?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (a) In accordance with recommendation 5 of the education sub-committee report, the matter of devising means for encouraging a positive health message in the mass media has been referred to and discussed at length with the private sector sub-committee of the Alcohol and Drug Authority;
- (b) the Alcohol and Drug Authority has considered the merits of recommendation 6 and is in the process of broadening the scope of other sub-committees to endeavour to fulfil the intention of this recommendation. Informal inter-departmental meetings are held regularly between related departments and the Health Education Council with a view to co-ordinating a unified drug education policy.

IMMIGRATION

Skilled Workers

1199. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) Is the Government attempting to have migrate to Western Australia tradesmen in all or any of the following categories:
 - (a) pipe-fitters;
 - (b) electricians;
 - (c) motor mechanics;
 - (d) factory workers;
 - (e) domestic servants;
 - (f) clerks;
 - (g) carpenters;
 - (h) sawmillers;
 - (i) heavy vehicle drivers;
 - (j) tailors;
 - (k) plumbers;
 - (l) machinists;
 - (m) refrigeration and insulation mechanics;
 - (n) general workers;

- (o) glass fitters;
- (p) lift mechanics;
- (q) masons;
- (r) bricklayers;
- (s) bakers;
- (t) cooks;
- (u) printers;
- (v) crane operators;
- (w) riggers;
- (x) moulders; or
- (y) sheet metal workers?

- (2) If so, which categories?
- (3) Which of the above categories are acceptable by the Commonwealth Government as a basis for immigration to Australia?
- (4) Is he aware that the Western Australian Government's Singapore office is informing agents in Singapore, including the Purple Star Shipping Enterprises, of the names of Western Australian firms with a view to finding employment for people in the above categories who are at present not residents of Australia?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Recruitment of migrant workers is conducted in accordance with the guidelines and list of approved occupations for migrants which are issued by the Commonwealth Government. These are reviewed frequently by State and Commonwealth authorities. In addition, the review committee is able to look at any special requests from employers for categories of workers who cannot be recruited in Western Australia and Australia.
- (3) The following categories listed by the member are acceptable by the Commonwealth Government—
 - Motor mechanics;
 - Refrigeration mechanics;
 - Machinists—first class;
 - Sheet metal workers;
 - Moulders.
- (4) No. Such advice has not been given by official representatives of the WA Government Trade Office in Singapore, nor to the best of my knowledge by any businessmen using the facilities of that office.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

Funds and Equipment

- 1. Mr O'NEIL (Deputy Premier): I desire to correct the answer I gave to part (1) of question 1015 asked by the member for Dianella on the 8th August, 1978.

Part (1) of that question relates to the funding of the State Emergency Service in each of the last six financial years, and the figures shown under the heading "Commonwealth" for the years 1976-77 and 1977-78 should read \$209 279 and \$220 489 respectively.

MINING

Royalties

- 2. Mr BRYCE, to the Treasurer:

I refer to question 1131 of Thursday last, which was a fairly short question in two parts and in which I asked the Premier which mining companies pay royalties to the Western Australian Government and how much each company has paid in royalties to the State Government during each of the last five financial years. The Treasurer's reply was, "This is information of a confidential nature and therefore is not available."

I can appreciate some degree of sensitivity in respect of the second part of the question but I ask the Treasurer: Will he indicate to the Parliament on which convention he bases his belief that information as to which mining companies pay royalties to the Western Australian Government is too confidential to be made available to the Parliament?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The information given to me and since confirmed, as a result of an interjection or an utterance the honourable member made after I gave the answer, is that it has been customary to treat this matter as confidential for a number of reasons. One reason is that if we disclose the amount of royalties paid by each company, in view of the fact that the rates of royalties are well established and well known the operating levels of

those particular companies could be revealed.

I understand also that the physical factor involved in making available this information to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would be Herculean; it would be impossible. He would not expect it anyhow, once he knew the magnitude of it. But that is, of course, quite different from the answer given in respect of confidentiality.

The question of how royalties are checked is easily answered. First of all, the royalties are well established either in agreements which have been ratified by this Parliament where they are spelt out specifically, or by being declared rates. The rates of royalties are publicly known and are checked not only departmentally but also by the Auditor General and others. Therefore, the honourable member may be assured that very close surveillance occurs of the amount of royalties due to ensure that people do in fact pay their proper commitment.

SHIPPING

P & O Shipping Co.,

3. Dr TROY, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

In view of the Government's publicly stated desire to have as much as possible of the North-West Shelf gas project work done locally, will he prevail upon the P & O Shipping Co. to have its tender boat, the *Lady Anne* docked at Fremantle, and to have all maintenance work done here as there is a high level of unemployment amongst this segment of industry?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

First of all I cannot see much of a connection between the North-West Shelf project, on which construction will start probably in early 1980 or late 1979, and the tender boat mentioned by the member for Fremantle. However, I am quite happy to make inquiries in connection with the *Lady Anne*, and I will let him know the result.

MINING

Royalties

4. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

My question is supplementary to the one I asked a few moments ago. I indicated that I could understand some degree of sensitivity with regard to the second part of the question. However, I would like the Premier to review his answer to the first part of the question, since it is very hard to imagine the convention which requires that the names of the companies which pay royalties to the Western Australian Government should remain confidential on the one hand or be too difficult to calculate on the other hand.

The SPEAKER: That question is precisely the one you asked previously.

Mr BRYCE: No it is not, Sir. The Premier misunderstood the question, and that is why I am asking it.

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I will gladly endeavour to accommodate the honourable member. The significance of the difference between the two questions is clearly understood. On the one hand he wants a list of names, and on the other hand he wants amounts. I will have a look at what he asks for; but without knowing the details—bearing in mind that the matter is not under my direct control—I would hazard a guess that the names are so many in number that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would not expect us to compile a list.

However, if he has any special concern about any particular company, I am sure the Minister for Mines without any hesitation would be only too pleased to acquaint him with the facts privately.

SHOPPING

Geraldton Supermarkets and Auction Mart

5. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

With reference to the Minister's reported comments that four Geraldton supermarkets will be allowed to trade outside normal shopping hours, pending a review of the position—

- (1) Is this review also considering the Saturday afternoon auctions held by Geraldton Auction Mart?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), is Geraldton Auction Mart allowed to hold Saturday afternoon auctions pending the results of the review?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The deputation that I met a day or two ago was in connection with supermarkets in the Geraldton area, and I said I would review the position and, in the meantime, allow the status quo to remain. In the meantime, if the member for Geraldton supports extended trading hours and makes a request in connection with the Geraldton Auction Mart, I will be quite prepared to review that matter as well.

HEALTH

Mussels

6. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a firm named B. & J. Seafoods operating in Rockingham and selling mussels collected daily in Cockburn Sound?
- (2) As a result of publicity given to the mussels near the gypsum deposit, sales have dropped and staff have been temporarily laid off. The firm has forwarded mussels to the Public Health Department for testing, but has been told results may take a week or more. Can the Minister have these tests expedited and subject to their being satisfactory, will he make a public statement to that effect in order to allow the firm to continue in business?

Mr RIDGE replied:

I thank the member for Rockingham for adequate notice of the question. The answer is as follows—

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Samples of mussels forwarded to the Public Health Department are being tested both bacteriologically and for cadmium content. Preliminary results indicate that cadmium content is within permissible levels. Due to laboratory techniques involved, bacteriological examinations cannot be expedited and results cannot be expected prior to Monday the 14th August.

In view of previous bad publicity, I will be delighted to make a Press statement if the results are satisfactory.

HEALTH

Herbicides 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T: Use by Local Authorities

7. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Health:

In view of the answer given by the Minister for Local Government that he could not advise what local authorities are using 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T herbicide—reference question 1036 on the notice paper dated the 9th August, 1978—will he advise—

- (1) Can his department provide this information?
- (2) If "Yes", what local authorities in Western Australia are using this toxic herbicide and for what reasons?
- (3) If the answer is "No", will he advise why his department has no statistics regarding the use of such a dangerous herbicide?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The member should be aware that these chemicals have been widely used safely for over 25 years, and there is no evidence whatever to indicate that this use is dangerous.

EDUCATION

Warriapendi School

8. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Can he say whether the teacher in charge of the remedial class at Warriapendi Primary School in Balga is to be removed to another school?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), will another teacher be appointed in her place?
- (3) If the teacher is not to be replaced, what alternative arrangements will be made for the remedial class, and what effect will this have on the children concerned?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

I thank the member for Dianella for adequate notice of the question. The answer is as follows—

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

HEALTH

Mussels

9. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

The Minister's answer to my question without notice of a few moments ago was that cadmium levels in the mussels tested were below permissible levels. Can he indicate whether the permissible level to which he referred was 5.5 or two parts per million?

Mr RIDGE replied:

No.

WATER SUPPLIES

Reports

10. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

On Thursday, the 3rd August, I asked the Minister if he would table the reports of the past 12 months of the Water Purity Committee and the Water Resources Council when the House next assembled. He said he would give consideration to the matter. Unfortunately, I did not ask a follow-up question to remind him of the matter. I am sure he has an answer he would like to give to the House, and I give him this opportunity to do so.

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I kept the answer here all last week and took it out of my folder today. I will hand it to the Leader of the Opposition tomorrow.

IMMIGRATION

Skilled Workers: Recruiting

11. Dr TROY, to the Premier:

Why did the Singapore office of this Government provide to the Purple Star Shipping enterprise a list of local companies which allegedly need labour when there is already a pool of increasing unemployed people living here?

Mr O'Connor: I have already answered that.

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I must admit I am not aware of the matter to which the member refers, and I thought he had already received an answer from my colleague to a similar if not exactly the same question.

IMMIGRATION

Vietnamese Refugees: Number

12. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) Will the Minister confirm the information given in a written answer to question 885 of 1978 that there are now over 1 000 Vietnamese refugees in Western Australia?
- (2) Will he also confirm that the State Government has received correspondence expressing concern over the continuing arrival of Vietnamese but has not seen fit to make approaches to the Federal Government on the matter?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I do not think the member would expect me to know whether that correspondence has gone forward. I will give him a considered reply if he places the question on the notice paper.

IMMIGRATION

Skilled Workers: Recruiting

13. Sir CHARLES COURT (Premier):

When I answered the last question of the member for Fremantle I was under the impression that the Minister for Labour and Industry had already provided him with an answer on that matter. I now find that he gave the answer to the member for Morley.

WATER SUPPLIES: RATES

Rebate: Recovery

14. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Referring to question 1173 on today's notice paper in respect of pensioners

who have been allowed a 25 per cent rebate on their water rates subsequently selling their properties and being asked to pay back the rebate or a proportion of it, as I have correspondence on my table indicating this has happened to a pensioner, will the Minister ensure that the department is not asking agents for the rebate or a proportion of it? Will he also ensure as far as possible that this matter is given publicity so that unscrupulous agents do not ask for a rebate in such circumstances?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The answer to both questions is "Yes". I suggest if the Leader of the Opposition has a particular case in mind he should let me know the details and I will follow it up for him.

