Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 5 May 1981

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

THE LATE MR E. T. EVANS

Condolence: Motion

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [4.33 p.m.]: I desire to move, without notice, a motion of condolence in the following terms—

> That this House places on record its deep regret at the death of Mr Edward Thomas Evans, a member of this House, and tenders to his relatives its sincerest sympathy in the loss they have sustained, and desires the terms of this resolution to be communicated to his relatives by Mr Speaker.

The very sad and sudden passing of this member reminds us all how unpredictable life is. Here was a young man who had come only recently to this House; a friendly person who had made a great contribution in his community in a number of ways, and who was all of a sudden taken from us. There would not be a member of this Parliament—of the Legislative Assembly or of the Legislative Council—who is not saddened by the suddenness and the circumstances of this man's death. The fact that there was such a large and representative funeral to pay respect to our former member speaks for itself.

Mr Evans made a contribution outside his professional activities. He was known as a fine sportsman, and in the best traditions of football, not only was he a great and a highly respected player himself, but also, he gave of his talents as a coach—the hallmark of a true sportsman is one who is prepared to continue, after his playing days are done, to further the interest of that sport and those involved in it.

Many young people in the goldfields area came under the influence of Mr Evans, and they are the better for his commitment to sport.

In the short time he was a member of this House he made a contribution as a member of the Public Accounts Committee. No doubt his own colleagues nominated him for that position because of his professional background as an accountant which gave him the qualification to contribute to the work of that committee.

It is, of course, all the more sad that he was in this Parliament for such a short time. It takes quite a while for a person to become part of the institution of Parliament and to become acquainted with its practices so that he can make a contribution. Nevertheless, at a very early stage in his parliamentary life, Mr Evans became a part of the important Public Accounts Committee. As I said, his nomination to this committee signifies the regard his colleagues had for him.

From this side of the House we would like to express our appreciation of the friendliness we received from Mr Evans. He had a natural friendliness. In my limited contact with him, it appeared that his main interests in this Parliament involved ordinary people. I suppose in many ways that statement typifies the life and work of our former colleague.

And so, Sir, it is with sadness that I have moved this motion, and, following discussions I have had with the Leader of the Opposition, with respect, I suggest that on the passing of this motion of condolence—which we would like you to convey to his relatives—you leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells at 7.30 p.m. No doubt my suggestion will have the support of the Leader of the Opposition and of the Parliament, and I make it believing that it is fitting, on passing the resolution, to make this gesture to our former colleague.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [4.36 p.m.]: I second the motion, but as members would realise, I get no pleasure out of seconding it. I want to thank the Premier for his kind remarks, and say that the sentiments he has expressed were endorsed to me left, right, and centre, on Friday last when we learnt with shock, and certainly surprise, of the untimely passing of Ted Evans, or as he was better known, Shack Evans. I do not use that nickname with any disrespect, because it was the name used, as you well know, Sir, in the church services yesterday, and it is the name used by everyone who knew him.

As the Premier said, Shack Evans was very young to die. He was aged 41 years, and he leaves a wife, Sally, and two young sons, Greg and Darryll. His family is most grateful indeed for the many expressions of sympathy which have been passed to them from all members of both Houses of this Parliament. He was in the hospital for minor surgery only, and my understanding is that as yet the cause of death is unknown. The initial autopsy did not show any immediate cause of death, and it is all very puzzling, confusing, and distressing, I am sure, to his wife and family.

He was, as the Premier said, well known in sporting and business circles and in the eastern goldfields. He had participated in many facets of community life, and I do not think I need repeat the Premier's comments which were so well and eloquently phrased in regard to that part of his life.

Shack Evans was a universally likeable fellow; a chap who was always good company. He had a ready wit, and was able to keep us amused with a pertinent remark. At the same time, he had a serious side, and I believe it was apparent from his speeches in this House that he had a very sensitive regard for people, and that all his efforts were directed towards the betterment of their lot.

I know he will be missed on the goldfields. The enormous crowd which attended the church service and funeral yesterday was evidence of the esteem in which he was held on the eastern goldfields. I am quite certain he will be a hard man to replace because of his links.

Shack Evans was an accountant, and I am sure members of the Opposition elected him as their representative on the Public Accounts Committee for that reason. Indeed, we used his expert knowledge in that field on a number of occasions in relation to matters which had come before the House.

We will miss his company. We expected he would be here for a long time—far longer, possibly, than most of us—but this was not to be and we will never know the reason.

I express my thanks to the Deputy Premier for the ready arrangements he made in regard to getting people to Kalgoorlie and back for the church service and funeral. Given the size and seniority of the contingent which wished to travel to Kalgoorlie, it would have been impossible had the Deputy Premier, on behalf of his Government, not been so ready to make suitable arrangements.

After the funeral yesterday, Shack's widow asked me to convey her family's sincere thanks to the many people who had contacted her with expressions of sympathy and condolence, and with offers of support; no doubt she will do so personally, in due course. The Opposition certainly will be keeping in contact with her and making certain that everything which needs to be done is done to assist her.

We are sorry to lose our colleague in this way. It would be a fine gesture Mr Speaker, if, as the Premier has suggested, you adjourn the House until the ringing of the bells.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [4.42 p.m.]: I wish to express condolences on behalf of my colleagues in the National Country Party. Ted, or Shack Evans, as he was affectionately known was, as the Leader of the Opposition said, a man with a very keen sense of humour and one whom most members came to respect and like very much in the short period he was here. Although he was here only a short time, he certainly made his presence felt. I believe that in this particular institution, the great majority of members—despite their political affiliations—learn to respect and in most cases to like each other. This is part of the success of the parliamentary system.

Ted Evans was a very friendly man. He was obviously a good member because he never missed an opportunity to promote Kalgoorlie in particular or the goldfields in general. I guess that is what politics is all about. Apart from that, he showed his willingness to co-operate in fields further apart from his own electorate inasmuch as he was a valuable member of the Public Accounts Committee.

It gives me no pleasure to take part in the debate on this motion. With great respect, to use the vernacular, Shack Evans was a good bloke.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [4.44 p.m.]: I and my colleagues in the National Party support this motion. Unlike many members in this Chamber, I did have the privilege of knowing Shack Evans long before he entered this House. Over a period of something like 15 years, we were adversaries on various sporting fields, particularly the football oval and the international rules basketball court. Although we saw each other only fleetingly and always as adversaries, it became quite apparent to anybody that Shack Evans treated everything he did very enthusiastically and wholeheartedly.

Although we did not know Shack Evans for very long in this place, it became evident he was a most enthusiastic member and gave everything he had to politics, just as he did to sport.

We are very sad about the occasion which has brought on this motion. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to convey the feelings of the National Party to Shack Evans' widow and children.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [4.45 p.m.]: It is with a great deal of sadness I rise to support this motion. Shack Evans was a close friend of mine. Like the member for Merredin, I was involved in football for a great number of years. It was about 25 years ago that I first met Shack as an opponent on football ovals in the goldfields. Since that time, and because of our association with the Australian Labor Party, I came to know him a lot better and to respect him.

Shack Evans was a person who was always doing something, whether for himself, his family, or the community. He went to school in Boulder,

and started work in the mines as a sampler. He then became a truckie and then a machine miner. Subsequently, he decided to study accountancy. I understand from close friends of his that it was a struggle for him to undertake this sort of work; however, he applied himself, and was successful. Really, he was a self-made man who was able to impart a great deal of confidence to all those associated with him.

As one person said to me yesterday morning in Kalgoorlie, Shack Evans was a man who was always looking after people. If anyone had a problem and approached him, or if he became aware that someone had a problem, he would do as much as he could to help him. That, really, is why he became known and respected in Kalgoorlie not only since he became a member of Parliament, which was only recently, but also in the years before that, when he was always trying to help some person in difficulty.

On this sad occasion, we need to remember his wife and two sons. We hope they will come through this very trying period. At least they will know their husband and father was a man who was well liked and respected, and who served the community of the goldfields with distinction.

The SPEAKER: I invite members to rise in their places for a brief period of silence in support of this motion.

Question passed, members standing.

Sitting suspended from 4.49 to 7.30 p.m.

TRAFFIC

Reduction of Road Carnage: Petition

MR HERZFELD (Mundaring) [7.30 p.m.]: I desire to present a petition which is couched in terms similar to others I have presented dealing with a request that the Government continue to support effective measures against the road carnage, the reduction of the legal blood alcohol limit, and compulsory alcohol tests. The petition has 94 signatures, 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. 36.)

TRAFFIC

Reduction of Road Carnage: Petition

MR CARR (Geraldton) [7.31 p.m.]: I have a petition couched in similar terms to that just presented by the member for Mundaring. It has 84 signatures. 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. 37.)

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Presentation to Governor: Acknowledgment

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I have to announce that, accompanied by the member for Clontarf, the member for Darling Range and the member for Fremantle, I attended upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech in opening Parliament. His Excellency has been pleased to reply in the following terms—

> Mr Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty The Queen and for your Address-in-Reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

CLEAN AIR AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

MR YOUNG (Scarborough—Minister for Health) [7.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR HODGE (Melville) [7.51 p.m.]: I wish to take this opportunity to comment on one aspect of the Bill. I raised a query during the second reading stage in the hope that the Minister would reply at some time during the Committee stage. He did reply to many of the points I raised, but there was one particular technical point to which he did not reply. I was not able to refer to this point during the Committee stage because it was not actually contained in the Bill. However, I believe it is a matter which will be affected by the Bill so I think it is important that it should be referred to again at this stage.

During the second reading debate I referred to a change to the Act by clause 12 of the Bill. Clause 12 of the Bill amends section 24 of the principal Act in that it adds a new paragraph 4(b). This gives the council the power to place

conditions on the issuing of a licence, the suspension of a licence, or the revoking of a licence, etc.

I believe that a further change should have been made to accommodate this under section 27 of the Act. Subsection (1) of section 27 of the Act states—

> A licence shall, subject to this Act, remain in force for a period of one year from the date of its issue and may from time to time be renewed for a further period of one year upon application made within the prescribed time.

The important word there is a licence "shall" remain in force for a period of one year. I believe the wording should have been a licence "may" remain in force for a period of one year. Bearing in mind the alteration made by the new paragraph in section 24, that new paragraph empowers the council to revoke a licence at any time, yet section 27 states that a licence "shall" remain in force for 12 months. It seems to be that with one section of that Act a licence can be revoked at any time yet, with the other section, which has not been altered, it states that a licence shall remain in force for a period of one year. That seems to be in direct conflict and the Government should arrange for a very small amendment to be made to section 27 to substitute for the word "shall" the word "may". In my opinion, that would overcome the problem.

MR YOUNG (Scarborough—Minister for Health) [7.55 p.m.]: In reply to the member for Melville: The answer is to be found in section 27 of the Act which he quoted wherein it uses the words "a licence shall" and subsequently the words "... subject to this Act remain in force for a period of 12 months". That particular wording ensures that this amendment, having been passed at a later stage than the provisions written into the Act has precedence over the conditions of that licence. Under normal circumstances the licence would remain in force for 12 months; however, section 27 of the Act will be subject to this Act. This amendment therefore qualifies that particular section. I think that answers the query of the member for Melville. I thank members for their general support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Labour and Industry), and transmitted to the Council.

SEEDS BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [7.57 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This legislation proposes the repeal and re-enactment of the Seeds Act, to permit the introduction of new concepts in seed marketing.

The Act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

The Bill was prepared after extensive consultation with representatives of the seed industry.

Development of this legislation has been a very extensive process which commenced some years ago. It has been fostered by the Australian Seeds Committee in order to ensure that, as far as possible, the various States' legislation is compatible, to permit free trade of seed with a minimum of authoritarian intrusion. The Australian Seeds Committee has representation from all States of Australia.

Very early in the discussions it became obvious that the present legislation was not in line with the needs of the industry in the late 1970s and beyond, and with current overseas seed marketing practices.

The present Act contains a number of provisions which are impracticable and need revision. Amongst these is a total prohibition on the sale of seed having physical qualities of germination and pure seed content below prescribed standards.

It became apparent that there was a real desire in the industry to permit the sale of previously legally substandard, but nevertheless valuable seed provided the seller made the buyer totally and truthfully aware of the actual quality of the seed in question, and in any case there was a need for this information to be available to buyers.

The sale of seed mixtures is also effectively prohibited in the present Act by the prescription of a maximum level of crop seed other than the predominant one, which can be included in seed offered for sale.

These are the major thrusts of the new legislation. The Bill provides for the sale of all

seed, regardless of its germination and pure seed content, provided that the actual details of these characteristics are stated on a label fixed to or accompanying the seed.

In 1978 a document outlining the conceptual changes which had been recommended by the Australian Seeds Committee was prepared by departmental officers. The content of this document was circulated and discussed with representatives of the farming community and particularly with those involved in the seed industry.

A number of submissions and suggestions were subsequently received, and were given careful consideration and further discussed at the 1979, 1980, and 1981 meetings of the Australian Seeds Committee.

This process of consultation with the local farming community and seed industry and with other States has enabled the Government to bring forward legislation which is very much in line with the views of all those involved.

Of utmost importance in this legislation is the introduction of labelling requirements for all seed offered for sale for sowing. These requirements are detailed in part II of the Bill.

The labelling requirements will not apply to a prescribed person or a class of person who sells or treats seed which is not intended for use within Australia. Examples of this are a firm exporting seed for other than planting purposes, a seed cleaning works, or a firm involved in the production of stock feed which results in the devitalising of the seed.

It would not and never has been practicable to extend the Act to cover these types of operations. The present Act has never been enforced on export sales of seed, even though it provided for an offence for the sale of technically substandard seed, based on the prescribed standards.

Clause 5 of part II provides that the Bill shall apply to seed sold in lots of a significant quantity, which would exclude all small household packs of seed, such as vegetables.

Provision is made also for the exclusion of the seed which is sold to persons who do not intend to use the seed for sowing. Such a situation would occur where seed is sold for stock feed or for drought relief from a seed export firm. The Bill provides a safeguard for the seller under such circumstances, as he will be required to obtain a declaration to this effect from the buyer who must accept responsibility for the quality of the seed.

The labelling requirements are specific and are detailed in clause 7 of the Bill. There is no intention that every sack of an apparently homogeneous seed lot must be labelled. The legal requirements would be met by a single label accompanying an assemblage of sacks, all bearing the same designation.

In particular, the legislation will require a statement naming any prescribed chemical additives, such as fungicides and insecticides, and the name of major crop seed components together with their respective proportions and the minimum proportion of each which is germinable. Fungicides and insecticides are hazardous materials and buyers should be advised if these materials are present in a seed lot.

The label also must bear a statement giving the name and the maximum proportion of prescribed weed seeds contained in the seed. Although it would be advantageous if the weed seed list was uniform throughout Australia this situation is not attainable due to the differing climatic and cropping regimes of each State. Lists will, however, be as uniform as possible.

Prescribed prohibited weed seeds, which would include all those detailed under the Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act, will not be permitted in any seed sold, as will declared pests or diseases.

The Bill contains a unique provision, introduced at the request of the industry, in which the words "select quality" may be included on the label provided the quality of the seed to which the label refers is equal to or greater than prescribed quality levels, which would be set to define normal good quality seed.

This provision enables a seller of good quality seed to make a general claim about his seed, giving the opportunity for purchasers to be reassured without a close scrutiny of the actual details which would still be marked on the label. Such a situation would apply normally to sales of cereal crop seed, to merchants marketing full processed—graded—seed and to seed meeting the requirements of the seed certification schemes, which are described in the Bill.

The Bill maintains most of the powers of inspectors and seed analysts contained in the present Act. However, the power to seize seed suspected of being in contravention of the Act has been clarified. An inspector will be able to order the holding of such seed only until the statutory time limit for bringing a prosecution forward has expired or until the determination of an order or a prosecution, whichever occurs first.

Part V of the Bill provides for an agent and a principal seller to be equally responsible, unless the principal can substantiate that his agent acted

outside his authority. An agent can bring forward his principal in his defence and if the court accepts the situation it can acquit the agent and convict the principal.

Where a person is convicted of an offence against the Act the seed lot involved shall, at the discretion of the court, be forfeited to the Crown and dealt with by the Minister. Alternatively, the court may order a seed lot to be treated or, except for seed containing prohibited seeds, returned to the property on which it was grown. In this manner more discretion has been given to the court than is available in the present Act. The court will in future have such power only upon conviction.

The necessity for the Department of Agriculture to provide a seed analysis service has been maintained, to assist seed sellers with labelling of their seed.

In all determinations of the accuracy of label statements the Bill provides for prescribed tolerances between the statements and relevant analysis results.

The power to make regulations has been widened to provide for the labelling concept and to link the seed certification schemes with minimum quality standards equivalent to those to be prescribed for select quality seed.

The express power to charge a fee for seed certification services also has been included in the scope of the regulations, rather than by ministerial approval as has been the practice.

Provision for the registration of seed treatment works processing certified seed, has been included. With a trend towards specialisation in seed processing, this power is seen as a necessary adjunct to the seed certification schemes.

The opportunity has been taken in preparing this Bill to revise the penalties in line with current monetary values and with the severity of the offence.

I believe this Bill represents a consensus as expressed by representatives of the farming community and of the Government. It offers important and significant improvements to the system of seed marketing in Western Australia, and introduces a new concept in which the purchaser of seed will be given vital information on which he can value his purchase and base his seeding operation.

It avoids the legal wastage of seed of a quality below arbitrarily set standards, while maintaining those standards through the select quality label. This is considered to be particularly helpful for buyers who are not used to making such detailed decisions, preferring to accept that select quality seed is of good quality.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

WHEAT BAGS REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [8.08 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill provides for the repeal of the Wheat Bags Act 1928. It was my intention to incorporate this Bill with the Seeds Bill. However, because of the different responsibilities of each piece of legislation it is more appropriate to introduce it as separate legislation.

The Act requires that, for purposes other than seed or feed, every grower of wheat sold in bags shall stamp the bags with his name and address or with his registered brand under the Brands Act 1904. This requirement is now, and has been for many years, obsolete.

The original Bill was introduced in 1928 to provide purchasers of wheat with documentary evidence of the person from whom they purchased the seed. At the time there was apparently a considerable shortage of labour at rail sidings and poor quality material was often purchased without sampling, with no evidence from whom it was obtained and thus no opportunity for purchasers to reject such grower's seeds in the future.

Hansard of 9 October of that year indicates that earth, machinery parts and other foreign matter had been found in bags of wheat.

Today there is no need for an Act requiring that all bags of commercial wheat shall be branded with the name and address or stock brand of the grower.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [8.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill proposes two amendments to the Local Government Act, the first being provision for inclusion in the Uniform Building By-laws of

building standards for buildings constructed within prescribed earthquake-prone zones, and the other to permit councils to meet the reasonable expenses incurred where a councillor's partner accompanies that councillor whilst attending a municipal conference or carrying out a specific municipal duty.

The amendment in relation to special building requirements for earthquake zones is the result of detailed consideration by the building advisory committee of minimum standards for building construction in earthquake-prone areas.

The standards that will be incorporated in the Uniform Building By-laws will include more stringent structural requirements for buildings constructed within defined parts of the State which are known to be earthquake-prone areas. A graduated scale of additional structural requirements is proposed, with the most stringent requirements applying to the highest risk areas and less stringent requirements applying to areas on the periphery.

The second amendment, which relates to the payment of expenses for the partner of a councillor travelling on municipal business, is an issue that has been of some interest to local government recently.

As members may be aware, councils in this State participate in various municipal conferences, including the biennial Local Government Week activities. The format of several of these conferences and, in particular, Local Government Week, is designed to encourage participation on the part of the partners of local government delegates.

These conferences often serve as a very valuable forum at which councillors from all over the State can get together to participate in a diverse range of activities.

The Local Government Act specifically authorises a council to meet the expense incurred by its delegates in attending municipal conferences and the like, but does not authorise expenditure incurred in relation to a person accompanying that delegate.

I believe that permitting councils to meet these expenses, which would on most occasions be only a fairly modest amount, will not impose any great burden on ratepayers. In fact, the relatively small additional expense involved would, no doubt, be far outweighed by the advantages of increased participation by councillors in these activities.

The amendments proposed in the Bill will permit councils to meet the reasonable expenses necessarily incurred by a councillor when he is accompanied by not more than one other person while attending a municipal conference, carrying out a duty, or performing an act under expressed authority of the council and only where the council, having regard to the nature of the conference, duty, or act, considers such expenditure appropriate in the circumstances.

It is further provided in the amendment that the payment of such expenses for travelling outside the State requires authorisation by the council as well as approval of the Minister.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Carr.

TRANSPORT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [8.12 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In speaking to amendments to this Act in October of last year, I alerted the House to the fact that the progressive implementation of the Government's land freight transport policy would necessitate further amendments to the Act from time to time.

Members would be aware that the basic principles of the present Transport Act have changed little since it was enacted in 1933. At that time it was known as the State Transport Co-ordination Act. It is not surprising then that with the passage of time the Act needs to be amended in such a manner as to accurately reflect the changing goals of the Government's overall transport policy.

Despite the forward planning associated with the new transport policy, it is possible only in the light of experience to determine what legislative refinements are needed to ensure the orderly progress from a system of regulated road transport to a system whereby the users determine their choice of the transport mode.

The new freedoms will, of course, be subject to any safeguards it might be necessary to introduce to protect community interests.

Whilst our transport policy objectives have been clearly stated before, it would be of value, I think, to re-state them here. They are designed to lead to user choice of the transport mode and are—

1. to establish in Western Australia a transport system wherein each mode of transport performs that portion of the transport task for which it is best suited—where both State and private resources allocated to transport are used to maximum efficiency with a minimum of waste;
2. where all Western Australians benefit from a co-ordinated secure transport system; and
3. where by and large the interplay between the suppliers and users of transport will determine the allocation of traffic between and within modes.

However, whilst there is a general appreciation of those objectives, what is not fully understood is the methodology being employed to meet them. This methodology requires a considerable amount of field work together with basic research work in order to test the validity of the implementation plan. This is being undertaken by officers of the Transport Commission in a systematic manner.

Members are aware that the new policy is being implemented in a stage-by-stage development in order to ensure that the changes introduced can be measured by the Transport Commission in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. This detailed work is to ensure that during the transitional stage there will be as little disruption as possible to the basic transport services people have been accustomed to receive over many years.

As a result of the experience being gained, it is becoming readily apparent that there are some omissions and certain weaknesses in some of the provisions of the present Act which are working against the implementation procedures. This leads to the amendments currently before the House.

The first of these relates to defects in the existing Act whereby in respect of the issue of a licence for the transport of goods on a semi-trailer, it is the load bearing portion only of the combination—that is to say, the semi-trailer itself—which is deemed to be operating and licensed under the Act. The forward section of the trailer—that is, the prime mover—does not require licensing. Because of this omission it is possible for a group of farmers to buy a semi-trailer and use the farmers' exemption provisions of the Act to hire a haulage contractor's prime mover to haul the trailer.

The whole purpose of the licensing system is to ensure that a measure of control over the movement of vehicles exists; and if the practice I have just referred to is allowed to continue and escalate it could seriously jeopardise the new policy which seeks to encourage the transport of bulk traffics by Westrail.

The amendment will define the prime mover as part of the operating vehicle, and it will have the effect of requiring the prime mover to be licensed in the same manner as the trailer. However, a farmer will still qualify for the farmers' exemption for his own prime mover; but he will not be able to contract with a professional carrier for the haulage of his own trailer.

In addition to the foregoing, difficulties are being experienced with those sections of the Act which lay down the criteria which the Commissioner of Transport is obliged to consider before granting or refusing a licence in respect of the operation of a commercial goods vehicle, an omnibus, and an aircraft.

Last year the long title of the Act was amended to include the passage—

> for the progressive removal of measures which hinder the efficient and safe transport of goods.

This objective, of course, is incompatible with licensing criteria which direct the Commissioner of Transport to undertake certain procedures when considering applications for licences. It is considered essential that the commissioner be given some flexibility of action in order that he may implement stated Government policy objectives in this area. The proposed amendment will give the Commissioner of Transport discretionary powers as to which of the criteria specified in the Act he should take into account when considering an application for a licence.

One further proposed amendment, which is outside the scope of the land freight transport policy, relates to the distribution of surplus funds from the Transport Commission fund. At present the Act provides for a rather complicated method of distribution to statutory authorities. It is now proposed that the commissioner, after meeting the cost of various transport subsidies currently met from Treasury funds, may distribute any surplus moneys held to the credit of the Transport Commission Fund at the end of the financial year to the Main Roads Trust Account under the Main Roads Act.

In the light of the current responsibilities of the Main Roads Department to distribute to local authorities funds for the provision and maintenance of roads, it is considered more appropriate that surplus moneys available from the Transport Commission Fund be allocated for use by that department.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr McIver.

PUBLIC MONEYS INVESTMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [8.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to give effect to the conclusions arising from a major Treasury review of the adequacy of the Public Moneys Investment Act to deal with changes in the short-term investment market. The review also pointed to the need for support to be given to the development of an active secondary market in State semi-Government securities.

Recent litigation in New South Wales contesting ownership of securities lodged with local authorities as security for an advance to a merchant bank has pointed also to the desirability of introducing new procedures for establishing a register of dealers and ensuring that a similar circumstance could not arise here.

In summary, the Bill provides for—

(a) advances to be made to registered dealers against prescribed securities;
(b) the establishment of a register of approved dealers;
(c) the introduction of an offer to deal and acceptance agreement;
(d) provision for trading in Commonwealth or State guaranteed securities;
(e) the inclusion of the Rural and Industries Bank in the definition of banks with which funds may be deposited; and
(f) provision for certain other securities issued by Commonwealth Government authorities and bank accepted bills of exchange to be accepted as security for advances on the approval of the Governor.

The changes proposed represent a substantial reconstruction of the machinery provisions of the Act, but there will be no major change in the nature of Treasury investments which will continue to conform to well established market practices and to place emphasis on the complete security of any investment.

We are seeking more to streamline procedures, remove some obvious anomalies such as the exclusion of the Rural and Industries Bank from the list of authorised banks, and to provide a more flexible framework for the future.

The stated purpose of the Public Moneys Investment Act, when introduced in 1961, was to empower the Treasurer to invest temporary balances of funds in the Public Account with banks or the then newly developed short-term money market. It needs to be appreciated that funds available to be invested are for the most part short term in nature. In the course of the year, the pattern of receipts as against expenditure can result in cash balances in the Government account which will be required at a later date to meet committed expenditure but are temporarily available to earn additional revenue instead of lying idle.

As the size of our Budget grows, these balances can reach substantial figures. As an example, this State's share of personal income tax is paid to us in monthly instalments of $61 million on the 15th of each month. Even assuming that all of this sum is expended within the following month, there will be an average balance of $30 million available for investment for short periods during that time. This is no different from an individual's personal bank account, which can have a fluctuating positive balance at all times, even though debits to the account throughout the year equal the amounts credited.

In addition to balances arising from transactions on the Consolidated Revenue Fund, Loan Fund, and other general accounts, the Treasury acts as banker for and administers the accounts of a number of statutory authorities, and is responsible also for a range of trust accounts. Cash balances arising from all of these sources constitute a pool of funds which are invested as a pool, rather than as a series of separate transactions. The operation is a complex one, requiring the Treasury to forecast the cash requirements of all funds well ahead, and to place funds out at a range of maturities to ensure that the correct amount of cash is always available as required. The art is, of course, to minimise the uninvested funds standing in the Government account while ensuring that cash is always available to meet our day-to-day commitments.

The success of our investment operations is attested by the total of $161.1 million earned on the investment of cash balances from the enactment of the legislation until April last. During that time no losses have been incurred, which reflects the care taken by the Treasury to ensure the security of investments.

Though not immediately relevant to the Bill, I would like to take a few moments to explain how the earnings are brought to account as there has been some confusion in Parliament on this point. The amount likely to be earned in any year will depend on two unpredictable variables, the average level of cash balances and short-term

interest rates available. The latter element has been particularly volatile in recent years. In addition, part only of the amount earned from the pool is available to the Government because earnings on trust and some other accounts must be credited to those accounts. To preserve the economies arising from the investment of a pool of funds as distinct from keeping all balances in separate compartments, earnings are allocated on the basis of the average rate of interest earned on the pool.

The difficulties involved in forecasting the earnings likely to be available during the year in respect of each source of funds, and budgeting in any meaningful way for expenditure of the earnings during the year, will be readily apparent. Consequently the procedure that has been followed for many years is to pay earnings accrued during the year into Treasury receipts in suspense, and, at the end of the year, to allocate to trust and other contributing accounts their share of the earnings in proportion to the amounts contributed to the investable pool from each source. The balance of the earnings is then available for appropriation to the services of the following year as a known amount.

This procedure, which I believe members will agree is an eminently sensible one has, however, the consequence that a substantial balance is shown in receipts in suspense at 30 June each year until allocated in conformity with the following year's Budget provisions. It is this balance which presumably has led to claims that funds are being hidden away and that the Government is concealing a surplus on the year's transactions. However, it must be appreciated that the amount available to the Government is not known until the close of business at the end of the year when the distribution is effected. The balance shown in the account at 30 June each year immediately becomes part of the revenue available to the Government in the following year and is treated accordingly. No advantage would be gained by drawing on the earnings in the year they are generated. Indeed, the only result would be greater uncertainty in budgeting and a more complex administrative task in investing the pool and allocating earnings.

I trust that explanation will clarify for members a basically simple and effective accounting procedure around which a great deal of confusion has arisen.

To return to the purpose of the Bill, the present Act envisaged two main ways in which cash balances could be invested—

(a) by depositing funds with banks or providing advances to money market dealers which have "lender of last resort" rights with the Reserve Bank; or

(b) by investing in securities of or guaranteed by the Commonwealth or the State.

The Act therefore placed emphasis on the security or safety of the avenue of investment; this principle has been central to Treasury investment procedures over the 20 years of the Act's operation. As I remarked earlier, no losses have been incurred.

Apart from the banks which actively seek short-term funds and quote competitive rates, the money market is made up of two groups of dealers: official dealers which have recourse to the Reserve Bank as "lender of last resort", and so-called unofficial dealers which do not have Reserve Bank backing in this way. The unoffical dealers are no less strong or well managed than the official dealers, and mostly comprise the money market arm of merchant banks and other financial institutions.

As the Act stands now, Treasury could invest with official dealers by providing direct unsecured advances. Investment with unofficial dealers has to be through the medium of acquiring securities of the types stipulated in the Act. In practice, we do not rely on the security of official dealers' Reserve Bank backing, but provide funds to both categories, requiring adequate security to be lodged with Treasury.

To meet the requirements of the Act relating to investment in prescribed securities, we have followed the practice of requiring paper provided as security to be transferred to our name other than where possession of the paper actually confers ownership as in the case of negotiable certificates of deposit. When the advance is repaid, the securities are transferred back to the original owner.

As presently framed, the Act appears to be directed more towards trading in securities—that is, buying and selling—and less towards advancing funds against security taken, which is the soundest and most orthodox way of investing cash balances in calculated amounts and periods to ensure that cash is always available when required to meet a variable cash flow pattern.

The Bill therefore proposes that investments may be made in the following ways—

(a) by buying and selling securities of or guaranteed by the Commonwealth Government or the State Government;

(b) by placing funds on deposit with trading banks, including the Rural and Industries Bank; or
(c) by advancing funds on deposit with registered dealers against approved securities lodged with the Treasury.

I will deal shortly with the question of to whom funds may be advanced against security, but first I wish to deal with the more important issue of the nature of the securities which are to be taken.

The most essential element of any investment policy is to ensure the safety of funds advanced. To whom those funds may be advanced is, in comparison, a secondary consideration.

The value of a security is determined either by its face value if it is held to maturity, or its market value if it is longer term paper which may have to be sold on the secondary market to obtain the cash equivalent. This in turn requires us to be concerned with the soundness of the issuer or the effective guarantor of the paper.

For this reason the Bill provides that the security which may be taken for advances to registered dealers shall be limited in the first instance to securities of or guaranteed by the Commonwealth or the State Government and negotiable certificates of deposit issued by a bank.

That represents little change from the present situation and there is a need for the Act to provide for the possibility of other securities being added to the list.

From time to time, representations have been made to the Government for us to accept as security for advances, negotiable paper issued by Commonwealth statutory bodies such as the Australian Wheat Board or the Australian Industries Development Corporation which are not supported by a specific guarantee from the Commonwealth.

In addition there have been a number of requests for us to give support to the commercial bill market by agreeing to take as security, bank accepted or bank endorsed bills of exchange.

The Government's view is that our first responsibility is to give preference to securities issued by State semi-Government authorities such as the State Energy Commission, the Metropolitan Water Board and Westrail.

An increasing proportion of the State's borrowing allocation determined by the Australian Loan Council is in the form of semi-Governmental borrowing authority. The borrowing programme for infrastructure requirements has also added greatly to the borrowing programme of State authorities.

At the same time the market has tightened and it is an increasingly difficult task to find lenders to fill the approved borrowing programmes. There is no doubt that the problem of achieving adequate primary sales of State securities is made much more difficult by the lack of any substantial or organised secondary market in those securities.

It must therefore be a key part of our investment policy to give strong support to the development of a secondary market in our own securities by giving preference to State authority paper as security for advances. This we propose to do as I shall explain shortly.

However, as that market develops there could well be scope for us to accept a wider range of securities and the Bill provides for this to be done to a limited degree. Subject to the approval of the Governor, the list of acceptable securities could be extended to include securities issued by statutory authorities of the Commonwealth or the State which do not carry a specific Government guarantee and to bank accepted bills of exchange.

In the case of the first category, the Treasury would, of course, be most circumspect about the securities proposed to be admitted and each type of security would be submitted to the Governor for approval.

The decision to provide for admission of bank accepted bills of exchange as against bank endorsed bills relates more to the relative ease of recourse to the guarantor bank rather than to any substantial difference in the degree of final security involved.

I would stress that it is the Government's clearly stated intention to give preference to our own semi-Government securities until we have achieved our aim of developing a sound secondary market in that paper. For this reason I do not expect that the Government will seek to make use of this provision for some time.

There is also a need for a more flexible but controlled approach to determining the institutions with which the Treasury may deal if we are to move with the times and cope with the changing structure of the market.

In relation to the market today, the Act is deficient in that there is no provision for institutions to be able to apply to deal with the Government nor any approval or registration process. It does not, for example, allow us to invest with the Rural and Industries Bank in the same manner as with the trading banks because, as a State bank, the R & I is not covered by section 5 of the Commonwealth Banking Act. I have already dealt with the simple step proposed to correct that anomaly.

It is proposed to amend the Act to provide for persons or companies to be able to apply to the Treasurer for approval to be registered as a dealer for the purposes of the Act. If the Treasurer approves the application after such investigations of the applicant's affairs as thought fit have been made by the Treasury, an offer to deal will be made to the applicant in the form of an approved offer and acceptance agreement.

The purpose of the agreement is to put beyond doubt the Government's right to obtain legal title to securities lodged with the Treasury in the event of default by the borrower or in the event of a petition being lodged for the winding up of the borrower. This was the issue in the New South Wales equity court litigation to which I referred earlier.

On formal acceptance of the offer and the conditions therein, the dealer's name will be added to the register as an approved dealer.

Provision also is made in the Bill for a dealer to be removed from the register on the direction of the Treasurer and for the person or body to be notified accordingly.

The names of dealers registered with the Treasury would be available to the public at all times but the amount and nature of transactions with individual banks and dealers should remain confidential to the Treasury for commercial reasons which I am sure will be readily accepted.

The Bill provides for funds to be advanced to registered dealers against lodgment with the Treasury of the limited range of securities prescribed in the Bill.

As I mentioned earlier, the Bill makes specific provision for the purchase by the Treasury of securities of or guaranteed by the Commonwealth or the State as does the present Act. Such a provision is necessary as circumstances could arise where that would be the preferred method of securing an advance.

However, it is proposed that the main use of this facility in future will be to enable the Treasury to buy and sell State semi-Government securities to support the development of a secondary market in those securities.

Only limited amounts of semi-Government paper have been purchased as a direct investment in the past, because the term of the paper available, at four years or longer, is too long as a medium of investment of short-term cash balances.

To participate in the development of a secondary market in State semi-Government securities, the Treasury will need to buy, and if necessary, sell before maturity. Trading in securities as distinct from buying paper at issue and holding to maturity requires the investor to have regard to both buying and selling price as well as the interest rate payable in assessing likely net earnings.

My reason for emphasising this obvious point is to ensure that members appreciate the different nature of investment techniques involved in these circumstances and that it is the net result of the transaction that matters not whether paper is sold for more or less than it was purchased.

It is not proposed that trading in State securities will constitute a major part of our investments in future. The Treasury will invest in this way only as worth-while opportunities arise and to the extent necessary to assist in the growth of a secondary market in those securities.

The existence of an active secondary market in State semi-Government securities would enable purchasers of our paper to realise on their investment for cash at any time. The negotiability of securities is an important consideration in determining their attractiveness to investors and in promoting a strong primary market and that of course is our ultimate objective.

An increasing proportion of the State's capital works programme is being financed by semi-Government borrowing. A short time ago, the State Energy Commission was the only State authority to raise public loans. Today it has been joined by the Metropolitan Water Board and Westrail and the volume of public loans being offered each year has increased dramatically.

There is a limit to the ability of the market to absorb Government and semi-Government paper. With all States seeking to raise much larger amounts in the market, it is essential that we do everything possible to enhance the attractiveness of Western Australian semi-Government securities to the investor and to build a strong local market.

Because the day-to-day investment of our cash balances is a highly technical operation requiring continuous contact with the market and on-the-spot decisions, it must be carried out by experienced officers with full authority to make those decisions. The operation is therefore conducted almost entirely by the Treasury with policy supervision by the Treasurer.

Although effective delegation can be given to Treasury officers for this purpose without specific reference in the Act, the proposed broadening of our investment activities could require somewhat cumbersome documentation in the absence of a clear and specific delegation provision.

Consequently we decided that, on balance, it is desirable to provide in the Act for delegation of all day-to-day market operations to the Under-Treasurer or other designated Treasury officers and the Bill provides accordingly.

Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt), the present Act has served us well for 20 years but continued changes in the market and the need to provide for the future, warranted a complete overhaul of the present provisions. The Bill reflects the comprehensiveness of that review and draws heavily on the knowledge and experience of the Treasury and on discussions with experienced operators in the market. I commend it to members.

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

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [8.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill now before the House has two main objectives, these being—

the conversion of the present annual licensing system to a two-monthly licence; and

the inclusion in the law of grouping provisions.

In addition, it is proposed to rectify one minor anomaly which has come to light since the legislation was amended last year to remove the fees payable by tobacco retailers.

I shall now explain and comment upon each of the proposed changes: The first objective is to convert the present annual licensing system to a two-monthly arrangement.

Under the present legislation, a wholesaler is required, by February each year, to pay an annual licence fee of $100, together with an additional fee of 10 per cent of the value of the tobacco products sold in the State during the preceding 12 month-period ending on 30 November.

Provision exists in the legislation for that additional fee of 10 per cent to be paid in six two-monthly instalments, the first of which is to be paid, together with the $100 licence fee, by February each year.

Recently there has been a number of cases where a wholesaler has lost a customer to another wholesaler. This loss of trade creates a problem for the particular wholesaler and if the loss is significant, the problem is so much greater. In such cases, the cause for concern is the payment of the 10 per cent additional fee which has already been determined for the current licensing year.

The resultant loss of income sustained by the wholesaler places him in a difficult or perhaps impossible position to meet his liability for payment of the remaining instalments. The number of instalments involved will depend upon when the loss of business occurs.

On the other hand, the wholesaler who has benefited from the additional trade has a consequential increase in income, but is not, under the present law, required to pay any additional fee on those increased sales until the expiration of his current annual licence.

For obvious reasons, both of these situations are inequitable as on one hand, a wholesaler is required to pay a fee that is higher than his current sales indicate and on the other hand another wholesaler is paying a fee that is less than 10 per cent of his current sales.

In addition, should a wholesaler be unable to meet his licence fee commitments, for one reason or another, several months' revenue could be at risk. A similar situation can arise also when, for one reason or another, a wholesaler ceases business.

It is proposed by the Bill now before members to overcome this inequitable situation by the introduction of a two-monthly licensing period.

The new licensing system is to commence from 1 March 1982, immediately following the expiration of the current wholesale licensing period.

The adoption of a two-monthly licensing period will mean that the loss of a customer will be almost immediately reflected in the sales of tobacco products with a corresponding reduction in the 10 per cent fee payable by that wholesaler.

Similarly, the result of the increased sales will be more promptly reflected in the sales of the wholesaler who gains from the new business, with a compensating increase in the fees payable by him.

As it is proposed to convert annual licences to a two-monthly licence, the basic annual fee of $100 payable by wholesalers will, of necessity, also have to be paid every second month.

A direct conversion of the present fee would result in the amount of $16.66 being payable every second month. However, as the fee has remained unchanged during the past five years, it

is proposed that there will be a small increase to the more convenient amount of $20.

Earlier in this speech, I referred to the additional fee payable by wholesalers, of 10 per cent of the value of tobacco products sold.

As the proposed change to a two-monthly licensing system will require the additional fee to be levied on more recent sales, there may be—subject of course, to fluctuations in the value of future sales—a marginal increase in the revenue collections.

Schedule 1 of the Bill lists the various licence periods and the relevant sales periods, upon which the fee is to be assessed.

The second main objective is the proposal to protect the revenue because of arrangements made by groups of companies or businesses to minimise the payment of their licence fees.

This is to be achieved by including in the law, provisions which will enable commonly-controlled businesses of one type or another to be grouped for the purpose of assessing and collecting licence fees.

It is proposed that the grouping provisions will operate from 1 July 1981.

The proposed grouping provisions are similar to those that were included in the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Act a few years ago.

The Bill sets out the various tests that are to be applied before businesses will be grouped and as is also the case with the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Act, the commissioner will be able, where the circumstances so justify, to exclude certain businesses from those grouping provisions.

All members of the group will be jointly and severally liable for the payment of the licence fee.

As the legislation now stands, it is possible for a wholesaler to fragment his operations and by the manipulation of sales as between the various outlets adversely affect the amount of the additional annual fee based on 10 per cent of the value of products sold.

Mr Davies: I thought you blocked that one last year.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I think this has a slight variation which I can explain to the Leader of the Opposition. The introduction of a two-monthly licence fee referred to earlier in this speech will counteract this particular problem to a large extent.

However, the introduction of grouping provisions, similar to those contained in the pay-roll tax legislation, will ensure that no matter what restructuring or rearrangement of business activities are made, each member of the group will be jointly and severally liable for payment of the fee and, therefore, the revenue will, at all times be safeguarded.

If I remember rightly in reference to the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition, we foreshadowed that this amendment might be necessary. We were hoping it would not be.

The final point is a minor matter concerning a retailer of tobacco products.

Last year the legislation was amended to relieve the normal retailer from the necessity of having to be licensed and to pay a fee when he purchased all of his tobacco products from a licensed wholesaler.

Subsequent to amending the law, it has come to the attention of the Commissioner of State Taxation that some small retailers are actually buying from other retailers such as chain stores, in lieu of purchasing from licensed wholesalers.

It was never intended that this type of situation would necessitate a retailer to be licensed and, therefore, it is proposed to amend the law to overcome the anomaly that has arisen.

Although I have referred to licensed wholesalers only, there are also a small number of licensed retailers.

At present, wholesalers are licensed until 27 February 1982 and retailers who purchase products from unlicensed wholesalers, until 30 June 1981.

It is, therefore, proposed in future to have all licences operate from the one point in time and for the sake of uniformity, to bring all licences into line as from 1 March 1982, immediately following the expiration of the current wholesalers' licences.

Therefore, certain provisions of the Bill will operate from different dates and for varying periods of time until 19 March 1982 when all licensing periods will be standardised on a two-monthly basis.

The proposed schedule to the Act lists the licence period and the corresponding sales period upon which the fee is based.

The initial licensing period of March and April 1982 will require the payment in February 1982, of a similar fee to that payable at that time under the present annual licensing system.

Therefore, the transition from the annual licensing system to a two-monthly licensing system will cause no change to a wholesaler's existing financial arrangements.

I commend the Bill to members of the House.

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

VALUATION OF LAND AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [8.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill now before the House proposes to amend the Valuation of Land Act which came into effect from 1 July 1979 and was enacted for the purpose of standardising and co-ordinating procedures that were to be used for all rating and taxing valuations.

When drafting the legislation, it was necessary to incorporate in the one Act portions of several existing Acts and to amend certain definitions because of the standardisation of valuations.

At the time, it appeared that the modified definitions would be acceptable and would apply in all circumstances.

However, it has been found that some definitions are possibly capable of more than one interpretation and other items need to be clarified.

In addition, certain situations that were not in existence at the time are not covered by the current legislation.

In particular, it is now necessary to amend the Act in respect of the definitions of the terms "gross rental value" and "unimproved value", and to be more specific regarding the inclusion or otherwise of improvements in the determination of gross rental value where structural work is in progress.

At present, the phrase "gross annual rental" as used in the definition of "gross rental value" may be interpreted in a number of ways: For example, 52 times a weekly payment or the amount of a single annual payment paid in advance.

It is, therefore, proposed to amend the definition of the term "gross rental value" to attain uniformity of interpretation.

There is a further need also to amend the definition of the term "gross rental value".

Under the legislation superseded by the Valuation of Land Act, the "annual value" of land on which improvements were being erected was determined as if it was vacant land until such time as the improvements were completed or were capable of being occupied.

This is a well-recognised valuation procedure supported by established legal precedents. However, there is now some doubt regarding the application of these precedents as "annual value" in the previous legislation has been replaced by "gross rental value".

Therefore, it is proposed to make statutory provision in the law to enable the continuation of this long-established valuation procedure.

The proposed amendment will apply also to existing improvements that are rendered incapable of occupation as a result of alterations or extensions being in progress.

Difficulties have arisen also in the determination of the term "unimproved value" as presently defined.

An amendment is necessary in the first place to provide for the valuation of certain leases of Crown land which were not in existence when the legislation was drafted and are, therefore, not covered by the present definition.

In the second place, it is equally necessary to amend the existing definition in order to ensure that townsite lands are always valued on the basis of their site value, as was intended originally.

As the definition now stands drafted, the proviso enables certain leases to be valued on other than a site value basis.

Additionally, difficulties have arisen regarding the present definition of the word "improvements".

The definition includes as "improvements" fixtures to the land but excludes machinery.

The particular problem relates to certain fixtures which have themselves a mechanical content and it is proposed to clarify the situation and put the matter beyond doubt by specifying those items of fixtures which are to be included in valuations.

At the same time, it is proposed to remedy a minor deficiency in respect of section 5 of the Act by amending subsection (2) so that the transitionary provisions of the section will relate both to the financial years and the rating years.

Finally, there are a number of references to areas of "4 000 square metres" and the opportunity is to be taken to convert these measurements to "a hectare" which is the usual unit of area applicable to larger land holdings.

I commend the Bill to members of the House.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Postponement

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [8.54 p.m.]: I move—

That Orders of the Day Nos. 11 to 13 be postponed.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [8.55 p.m.]: I must register some disquiet that the Government intends to postpone the Acts Amendment (Electoral Provinces and Districts) Bill. This is probably the most important piece of legislation likely to come before this Parliament between now and the finish of the autumn session which will probably be the end of next week if the Government decides to keep to its pre-announced plan.

It is of little consequence to the Opposition whether we finish next week, the week after, or the week after that. We will be here as long as there is legislation to debate. By the same token, the Government having announced its intention to introduce this most important piece of legislation, which will affect every member of the House, we are rather disturbed that the Government will not inform us of the contents of the Bill as soon as possible. Members of the Government are privy to the contents of the Bill as it will have been discussed in the Government parties' room.

From inquiries I have made I understand that the Bill is in the House tonight. Just before Mr Speaker took the Chair after the tea suspension, some conversation took place across the House between the Premier and me. I understood him to say then that the Government was not proceeding with this Bill and several others, but I could not quite make out whether he meant Order of the Day No. 11. Several times I asked him whether he was seeking to postpone the electoral legislation, and I received a sort of puzzled look and a shrug of the shoulders from the Premier. The Premier looked at the Minister, and the Minister looked back at the Premier. I do not think either of them got much enjoyment from what they saw!

That was the only reaction I received to my question. This is a serious state of affairs. This matter would have been considered in the Government parties' room over a week ago. Indeed, exactly a week ago the Premier was good enough to give us all a copy of his news release. The Bill was introduced last Thursday which means that four whole days, and part of today were available to do the necessary work. We would have expected that the contents of the Bill would be made known tonight.

We always require, and I must say it is generally given, a week's adjournment of a Bill of this nature so that we can investigate its provisions properly. If the Minister moves the second reading of the Bill tomorrow, and if we are afforded the customary week's adjournment—and I do not want anything less than that, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt)—then according to the present programme, we will have one day only to put the Bill through this House and through another place. That is totally unacceptable.

Even if we sat for another week, the period of debate would be very limited. The Premier prides himself that he has always given us ample time to debate legislation. Some of my colleagues, and especially some of those who have been in the House for a short time only, would not agree with him. Generally I have found that the Premier and the Leader of the House (the Deputy Premier) have been very co-operative in regard to adjournments, but it is no good asking the Opposition to agree to the adjournment of something of which we have no knowledge.

This Bill I am discussing affects every member of Parliament vitally, and I would like to know where we are going. If my memory serves me correctly, before the commencement of the session I was advised by letter from the Premier when the session would commence and the date by which he aimed to finish. I have never been advised of any other proposed plan.

I was told about a fortnight ago that I would shortly be given a list of the legislation the Government wanted to put through the Parliament this session. I have been very patient and co-operative with the Government, but no list has been forthcoming. When are we to be told as a simple matter of courtesy just what the Government wants to do in the remaining days if the session is to finish as proposed? We have agreed to sit after tea on Thursday nights to help speed the passage of legislation, but that will make very little difference. I have even indicated that if the Government wanted to finish next week, the Opposition would be prepared to sit on Friday. I do not like these hurried, end-of-session sittings; I would much rather come back the following week. I asked the Deputy Premier by telephone today when I could expect the list of legislation the Government wanted through this session, and once more, to give him credit, he said he would let me have it tonight. A fortnight after that list was first promised it is not yet in our possession. How can the Government expect continued co-operation from the Opposition?

I am not really concerned about that matter, but about the fact that one of the most vital

pieces of legislation, affecting every member of this House, of which official notice was given last Thursday and of which media notices were given a week ago tonight is to be postponed until goodness knows when. The Bill has been printed, but the Government, without any explanation, seeks to postpone its second reading. A shrug of the shoulders and a blank look was all I could get when I tried to question the Premier across the House. I agree it was not the best of circumstances in which to question the Premier, but obviously, the Government did not want to give us an explanation.

It is true that the way in which the Parliament is conducted is always in the hands of the Government; we acknowledge that. However, when a Bill of this nature, which is so vital to each and every one of us is proposed, it should be made available not only to the Parliament but also publicly at the first available opportunity.

If the second reading of the Bill is moved tomorrow, with the normal sitting days we will have Thursday of this week, and Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week to discuss it, as well as discussing other legislation—including, no doubt, the Workers' Compensation Bill—the Government wants to have passed in this part of the session. The Government has had three years to deal with the Workers' Compensation Act and it is not a matter to be dealt with lightly, capriciously, or quickly in this House. Even if we were to agree with everything in the Bill—and I assure members we do not—we would need considerable debating time.

What kind of game is the Government playing? What is its excuse for not wishing to proceed tonight with the Acts Amendment (Electoral Provinces and Districts) Bill? Why do we simply get a shrug of the shoulders? Why have we not yet been told which Bills the Government wants through this session? I understood that Order of the Day No. 8 was to be postponed and probably abandoned for this session and I further understood that orders of the day Nos. 12 and 13 were likely to meet the same fate.

Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt), you might think it is strange that I should be asking for this Bill to be introduced when last Thursday I opposed the introduction of the Bill. That would be a very good point, except that if the Government is hell-bent on changing the electoral boundaries, we want to know about it as quickly as possible. The legislation is important enough to have had office staff working on it ever since the Government first announced it, to ensure it was before the House at the first available opportunity.

If as I am told the Bill is in the House and ready for presentation, the only reason I can imagine the second reading is not being moved tonight is that the Minister's second reading speech is not ready, or the maps are not ready; or perhaps the Government has not yet decided on where the metropolitan area is going to be—that will be an interesting clause in the Bill.

This session, for the most part, has gone very well because there has been good co-operation between the Deputy Premier, myself, and the Opposition Whip—and, indeed, with individual members who have sought to be accommodated. However, we need to know, if the session is to finish by the end of next week, just what legislation the Government wants passed because, as I remind members, it must pass not only this House but also another place.

Mr Bryce: There would be some doubt about that.

Mr DAVIES: Above all, I would like a reason that Order of the Day No. 11 is not to be proceeded with. The Opposition is opposed to the motion to postpone order No. 11.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [9.06 p.m.]: I too wish to protest about this situation. As the member who will be charged with the responsibility of leading the debate on this Bill on behalf of the Opposition, I will not have sufficient time to research the legislation. It is all very well for the Government, which has had all its research done and determinations made to race the Bill through Parliament in one week, as appears to be its intention; however, it does not give the Opposition an opportunity to examine the Bill in detail and establish our attitude to the legislation.

Members of the Press also are entitled to have access to this legislation so that they can make their own determinations as to whether what the Government is putting forward is a just case. The Press has been very interested in the matter of electoral redistribution. A number of editorials and articles on the matter have appeared not only in the Western Australian Press but also in the national newspapers; there is a genuine concern and interest in the subject.

The Opposition and the public are entitled to an explanation as to why the Government wishes to postpone moving the second reading of the Bill. Perhaps we could understand the situation if the Premier had informed the Leader of the Opposition some problem existed with the legislation. Indeed, there might be some problems

we do not know of; that could have been explained to the Leader of the Opposition. However, the Premier saw fit to inform the Leader of the Opposition only about the postponement of the other items on the notice paper. This makes the Opposition very suspicious. What is the purpose of this latest ploy on the part of the Government? Has it made a mess-up of the Bill, or has it discovered it can make even more sure it will be returned to Government after the next election?

Last week, the Premier made it clear the motion for the second reading of the Bill would be moved this week. Now, we are not to see the Bill until at least tomorrow and perhaps even later. We are certainly entitled to protest about that. It is not a fair and proper move on the part of the Government, and the Opposition is justified in taking this unprecedented action. Does the Government seek to postpone this legislation so that it can get up to some more shifty business to make sure it stays in office for ever and a day, or is there some genuine reason for its postponement?

Until we receive answers to our questions, the Opposition is entitled to object strenuously to the Premier's action tonight. I oppose the motion.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [9.11 p.m.]: I join with my leader in expressing my dissatisfaction and disgust at the tactic adopted by the Government to delay the introduction of a piece of legislation everybody regards as important, the details of which have been known to Government party members for some time. This manoeuvre has come at a time when everybody was anticipating the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

This is government by rumour and innuendo. I am advised by one of my own colleagues that he stumbled across a group of Government members in a corridor this evening sweating over the map. It would appear the map already exists. We understand the Bill is in the building. Can members imagine a more serious slight on the Legislative Assembly than for this situation to occur, where information of this nature is freely available to members opposite but not available to the institution as a whole, and to members of the Press Gallery and anybody interested in the parliamentary politics of Western Australia? All visitors to the gallery tonight would learn would be the latest rumour from Government back-benchers. This State is being governed by rumour and innuendo and I join with my leader in expressing my distaste for the tactic, and the way it has been employed.

I ask the Chief Secretary, who is responsible for this legislation, whether he can indicate by interjection why the second reading of the Bill is not to be moved this evening?

Mr Hassell: Unlike the Opposition, we have a spokesman on behalf of the Government, who will answer you in due course.

Mr BRYCE: The position is that the Chief Secretary, who is responsible for this piece of legislation is unable to explain to the House, even though we have given him the opportunity, the reason for this little bit of dirty work at the crossroads. All of a sudden the Government has decided a neat manoeuvre is necessary in an attempt to hoodwink somebody.

Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt), I draw your attention to the hour of the evening: It is merely 9.15 p.m. The time involved in reading a second reading speech to this House would be negligible. In fact, the time involved in moving the second readings of Orders of the Day Nos. 11, 12, and 13 would be negligible.

So, if we simply disregard the question of courtesy, we are left in our minds only with the assumption there is a need somewhere or other for a devious little turn.

I come to the last aspect of my concern, and it was a concern expressed also by the Leader of the Opposition: I am concerned that major pieces of legislation such as the Acts Amendment (Electoral Provinces and Districts) Bill and the Workers' Compensation Bill—two issues which could be expected to generate dozens of hours of debate in this Chamber and in another place before Parliament rises—have been brought to the House in the closing stages of this part of the session.

Perhaps I ought to indicate to the Deputy Premier that so far as we are concerned we have no intention of accommodating anyone's desire to enjoy the second week of the school holidays or not to have to come back after the school holidays if this is the way the Government proposes to deal with the timetable of legislation.

It is not good enough to say tactically "Let us pass the time of day with non-legislative debate—the relatively innocuous debate involved with the Address-in-Reply week in and week out—and then at the end of the session try to steamroll through the Parliament major pieces of legislation." We find that appalling. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that all this leaves us, if there is to be the customary week of adjournment after tomorrow, just one or two days at best to debate the detail of this measure before the anticipated time for the rising of this Assembly.

As far as we are concerned, we intend to treat this subject with the seriousness it deserves. I conclude by saying I share the disgust of the Leader of the Opposition with this manoeuvre. No explanation has been given, which is only a matter of courtesy. We treat the matter seriously and we disapprove of the situation which this produces in this House of government by rumour and innuendo.

MR TONKIN (Morley) [9.17 p.m.]: It all depends how seriously we take this place. The fact of the matter is that the Government has had a long time to consider these matters. Even if the Bill were read or explained by the Minister tonight, it would still not be long enough for us to consider it. We have had given to us a Workers' Compensation Bill which is incredibly complex and the Government has said that a week is long enough for us to consider it. I believe three weeks would not be long enough. We believe it is time the Government realised that if it needs years to consider a measure, we certainly need more than a week to do so.

I protest that even if the Bill had been explained by the Minister tonight, to want to get it through by the end of next week is intolerable unless members opposite regard the Parliament as merely a rubber stamp for the Executive. If that is all it is, we should admit that and stop pretending to be legislators. We should stop calling ourselves members of Parliament and we should realise that this is nothing more than a farcical House, merely doing whatever the Premier of the day says should be done. If, however, we believe that the Parliament is a legislative body, then certainly for major legislation such as the Workers' Compensation Bill and the electoral districts legislation, we should have at least four weeks to discuss it.

It seems as though we are not even to be given a week and this is why we are protesting. I emphasise again that if the Bill had been explained to the House tonight, we would still not have long enough to consider it. We have to get away from the idea that we can consider complex legislation in a week if the Government, with all its attendant army of experts, takes months to draw up the legislation—indeed years to do so. That being the case, this Parliament should be given the courtesy of considering the matter in depth, which means that with a major piece of legislation a week or two weeks is simply not enough.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [9.19 p.m.]: When the Premier moved that these three items should be postponed, he gave no explanation. After the Leader of the Opposition had spoken and the Premier had risen to his feet, I anticipated that he was proposing to explain the reasons the Bill to which reference has been made had been postponed. But you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt), did not give the Premier the call because it was indicated that that would close the debate, and so you gave the call to the member for Welshpool.

It would be beneficial to the House if an explanation were given. We would then know what we were debating in more detail. It would be advantageous if that could be done because this Bill affects all of us and it has created a tremendous amount of interest amongst members of Parliament. An explanation should be given to the House so that we can understand more clearly why the matter has been deferred.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Deputy Premier) [9.20 p.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that he had spoken to me regarding the number of Bills it was anticipated would be before the House this session. One of the reasons for the delay in giving the information to him was the fact that we are trying to delete a number of these measures and take as many of them as possible through to the August part of the session. I refer to Orders of the Day Nos. 11 and 12, which are a couple of the Bills concerned.

During the day I had drawn up a list of the Bills we anticipate will go through this session. However, the Premier has been in Canberra at the Premiers' Conference and I have had little opportunity to discuss the list with him. I have the list prepared, but I would like to discuss it with the Premier before I give it to the Leader of the Opposition. I expect to be able to do that tomorrow morning at the latest.

Mr Davies: I think you will acknowledge that a fortnight ago the Premier said to me he would let me have a list almost immediately.

Mr O'CONNOR: That may be the case; I am not sure. I may not have been here at the time. However, a list has been drawn up and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to peruse it tonight I will be happy to let him do so, although there may be a couple of alterations after I have discussed it with the Premier, because we are wanting to keep it down to as few Bills as possible going through in this part of the session.

With the Acts Amendment (Electoral Provinces and Districts) Bill, it would be improper to introduce it to Parliament or for it to be implemented before we were totally satisfied. We are trying to get this attended to as quickly as possible.

The member for Ascot has mentioned that if necessary the Opposition would be prepared to sit after next week. I make it clear that so are we. If legislation needs to go through and it is necessary for us to put in the time, we are willing to participate in the debate. However, we are not trying to defer or delay these Bills; we are trying to delete those we can from the list which I will give to the Leader of the Opposition tomorrow morning. As soon as the electoral legislation is available, we will have it introduced into the House. I hope that will be tomorrow, but I cannot give an undertaking to that effect.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balcatta) [9.21 p.m.]: If one listened closely to the words of the Deputy Premier one could not help but be dissatisfied with the explanation he gave for the delay in the introduction of the electoral Bill. He started off by explaining how he would have talks with the Leader of the Opposition about the need to introduce certain Bills and to delay others. He then went on to say that the delay was due to the need to delete certain Bills from the list of those that would be brought before Parliament in this part of the session. He then told us that a list had been drawn up and, after stating that, he pointed out that the Premier had been in Canberra, and because he wanted to show the list to the Premier we could not see it yet.

Mr O'Connor: I did not say that. I said the Leader of the Opposition could see the list if he wished.

Mr B. T. BURKE: My understanding of the Deputy Premier's words was that the Premier was to check the list and that the Deputy Premier would not like to show the list to the Leader of the Opposition until the Premier had seen it.

Mr O'Connor: You are again quite incorrect—totally incorrect.

Mr B. T. BURKE: We then had about 30 seconds on why we have had the introduction of this Bill—No. 11 on the notice paper—delayed. The Deputy Premier said it would be improper for the Government to introduce the Bill if it were not totally satisfied with it. But the Deputy Premier did not do us the courtesy of explaining where the problem had arisen. He did not deny that the Bill has been printed and is in the House. He did not deny the charge by the member for Ascot that certain Government members have been seen and have been heard discussing the proposed boundaries of the metropolitan area. The Deputy Premier simply threw to this House the morsel of the Government's dissatisfaction and of the impropriety involved in introducing something with which the Government was not totally satisifed.

How many of us here can remember Bills that this Government has introduced previously and then has gone to great lengths subsequently to amend? Talk about not being satisfied! Talk about real reason for suspicion as to the Government's true motives!

The Opposition has every right to be concerned about and suspicious of the Government's action in this matter. The Opposition has every right to be concerned about and suspicious of the rumours circulating everywhere tonight on every side about the member for Subiaco having been bought off for his vote with the promise that the seat of Subiaco would not disappear.

Mr Young: What a load of rubbish!

Mr H. D. Evans: Are you going to give him Floreat Park instead?

Mr Bertram: What about the member for Mt. Marshall? What are you to do with him?

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Opposition has every right to be concerned about and suspicious of the rumours that have been passed around about this legislation, which has the potential to bury the Labor Party Opposition for the rest of the time we will experience in this House, because that is the sort of thing being bandied about. Members of the Opposition object to the shoddy treatment the House has been subjected to tonight. Who can forget that the intention of this legislation was given in a Press release, put out after a Cabinet meeting in the evening, that was couched in terms that indicated this was a major and urgent piece of legislation that could and should not be delayed. Yet we see the Government is causing its own delay. There has not been one single logical reason apart from the lame, limp wrist excuse of the Deputy Premier when he said it would be improper to introduce a Bill with which the Government was not totally satisfied. Let the Deputy Premier, the Chief Secretary, or the Premier—who has seen fit now to take a pair and leave the Chamber—

Mr O'Connor: He was committed to a show and you probably well know it.

Mr Sibson: Hang your head in shame.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier has knowingly taken a pair, with the result that he will avoid the debate, because he has a commitment to a television interview.

Mr O'Connor: You did know.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Of course I know. Not only knowing that, if the Premier takes a television interview as being a pre-eminent reason for

leaving a debate in this House, I believe he is not fit to be Premier.

Mr O'Connor: It is to give the public of this State information in connection with the Premier's Conference, information which they are entitled to have.

Mr Sodeman: And which your own leader would do.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The fact remains that the Government has not advanced one solid or other reason for delaying this legislation, yet the Premier, in the face of what was obviously a developing debate, was prepared to leave the Chamber and place a television interview before his courtesy to this place.

Mr O'Connor: To the public of this State.

Mr B. T. BURKE: He was prepared to leave in his place a Deputy Premier who could advance only this reason—that it would be improper to introduce legislation with which the Government was not totally satisfied. Why is the Government not satisfied? Is it true that the Bill is printed? Is it true that members of the back bench of the Liberal Party are privy to information about the proposed boundaries of the metropolitan area? Is it true that the member for Subiaco has reached certain arrangements with the Government about the continuation of his seat?

Mr O'Connor: None at all.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Is it true that the Government members have said the Bill will see the Labor Party buried?

Mr Young: It is not true.

Mr B. T. BURKE: If it is not true, then the Government should start giving us the truth and give us some reasons for the delay.

Mr O'Connor: You don't know much about the truth.

Mr Young: The member waits for people to walk in. As soon as he knows he has a gallery he goes on. No-one takes him seriously.

Mr B. T. BURKE: We all know the Minister for Health has been through a particularly trying period.

Mr Young: Which particular period was that? Was it the last seven minutes? It has been seven minutes exactly.

Mr B. T. BURKE: It can be seen by his demeanour that he is not these days comfortable—having rapidly lost the image of the Andrew Peacock of the West. He is a rather dishevelled and frantic Minister, from time to time on the point of collapse, but I am prepared to take him seriously.

Mr Young: No-one takes you seriously.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let me pause to accommodate the Minister for Health and give the Deputy Premier an opportunity to tell us why the Government is not totally satisfied with this legislation.

Mr O'Connor: You will find out when the Bill comes up.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Come on! The Minister for Health wants to moan and criticise and his Deputy Premier is not prepared to enlarge in any meaningful way on why the Government is dissatisfied with the legislation. Is it that the second reading speech has not been prepared? Is it that some adjustments are being made to the previously drawn up metropolitan area boundaries?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Is it a boundary to be arbitrarily drawn between the Kimberley and the Pilbara—to be changed at the last moment? What is the reason for the delay in the introduction of a piece of legislation which previously was so urgent?

No-one has any doubt whatsoever that the Government has the numbers in this place, but it would be a poor old Opposition which did not rise to its feet to try to extract from the Government—even burdened as this one is with excessive numbers—some logical and rational reason for its failure to provide the people with any sort of courtesy and its failure to explain its actions in this matter; and for the failure of the Premier to answer questions raised in a debate resulting from a motion which he brought forward.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [9.33 p.m.]: Obviously something very phoney is going on in respect of the electoral Bill.

Mr Bryce: In the State of Western Australia.

Mr Young: You are in good form.

Mr Bridge: He is spot on.

Mr Shalders: The message you are about to hear is a recording.

Mr BERTRAM: When we have one—

Mr O'Connor: One-vote-one-value.

Mr BERTRAM: That will not be in the Deputy Premier's day. When we have a political party, or a coalition of political parties, which has permanent power, then this legislation is the sort of nonsense we are likely to cop. In respect of matters relating to electoral laws, what sort of an Opposition would we be if we were not extraordinarily suspicious of this Government?

I ask the House to consider its track record and I ask those listening to this debate what they think about this Government in respect of the electoral laws it has put forward.

I refer to the first step. The Court Government was elected to this place in 1974. It did not ask for a mandate from the people on that occasion—of course, it did not receive one—to tamper with the electoral laws. It did so completely unnecessarily, and that was despicable. It increased the number of members of this Parliament from 81 to 87.

Mr Young: What about the member for Balcatta's seat and the member for Moore's seat?

Mr BERTRAM: There was no necessity for an increase. The taxpayers are paying for it. We had to expand this building to accommodate them. The taxpayers of Western Australia always have paid many millions of dollars in excess of what they should have paid for this Parliament.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): I suggest the member confines his remarks to the motion.

Mr BERTRAM: I will explain to the members of this House—they should not need an explanation, but these remarks are for the benefit of those without a very good memory—the reason for the increase in the number of members of this Parliament in 1974. It was twofold. Firstly, it was to ensure the Premier, Sir Charles Court, never would be defeated in an election in this State. The second purpose of the manoeuvre was to enable—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. The motion before the Chair is that certain Orders of the Day be postponed. I am having great difficulty in determining the relevance of the remarks of the member. I ask him to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr BERTRAM: I will confine my remarks to the motion. I assure you, Sir, about that. I am sure that people—I am sure you, Mr Acting Speaker, do this—judge others on their performance. I am duty bound to remind this Chamber of the performance of this Government. I said something phoney is going on in regard to this legislation. The second reason the Premier fiddled with the electoral laws in 1974 was he hoped and went one step in achieving it, that he would be the first Premier of this State to be a Premier without a coalition Government. Members of the Cabinet and others who know the Premier accept that as the truth.

The next time the Government fiddled with the electoral laws of this State was to deny the black people in the north a vote. In 1979 a Bill to change the electoral laws was defeated—it was just more mischief. It was to protect the seat of Kimberley and deny the vote to black people in the north.

Then we come to 1981, almost right up to the moment.

Mr B. T. Burke: Delay, delay, delay!

Mr BERTRAM: The Governor delivered a Speech prepared for him by the Government, a Speech which made no mention at all of changes to the electoral laws. Such legislation would be the most major in all the years I have been in this House, and that is 15 years. The fact that the Governor made no mention of such legislation in his Speech shows that the matter was concealed from him.

Then we have the next unusual situation; a Bill was brought in. It is proposed to increase the number of members of this Parliament, but no mandate was sought from the people at the last election to increase that number. It is proposed to increase the number while the Commonwealth Government is using the razor to cut back the number of jobs in Australia. In this State the Government is trying to create jobs and give security to people sitting on the other side of this House. As a consequence of this action, for the first time in my memory, there appeared an editorial in *The West Australian* condemning the Bill even before we saw it, and well the newspaper did so. Because of that condemnation we have this delay while the Bill is undergoing repair.

The Deputy Premier told us the Government must be satisfied completely with the legislation. Is there anything new about that? Should not the Government have been satisfied completely by the time the Bill got through Cabinet and the Government had made the announcement? The Government should have been completely satisfied, but because of the editorial and the rumblings within the community the Government backed off. The people are sick of this racket of creating jobs for the boys—creating another six seats so that the members opposite who are the favourites of the Government can be assured of their positions. The member for Mt. Marshall will not get it easy, and the member for Subiaco is not rejoicing. This legislation is designed for the favoured ones. After a redistribution not one of the favoured ones will lose his seat.

Members have said a redistribution affects us, but I say it affects every man, woman and child in this State. Electoral laws in this State are worse than they are in Queensland. I had a person from New Zealand here today and had to explain to him the situation with the upper House. Since 1890, 40 elections for that House have been held

and have been won by one side and, of course, all lost by the other.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! The member will resume his seat. I have asked the member to confine his remarks to the motion. He is talking about the contents of proposed legislation. Again I ask him to confine his remarks to the motion or a particular part of it.

Point of Order

Mr BRYCE: I am fully aware of the Standing Order which requires members to make their remarks relevant to the motion before the Chair. I ask you, Sir, to rule that the member for Mt. Hawthorn is justified in his concern for the significance of this Bill, a concern which explains the significance of why the Bill should not be postponed. To me that would seem, given the debate which already has gone before us this evening, to be a fairly broad canvass on which the member for Mt. Hawthorn could paint his explanation and concern.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I see no point of order and no reason for me to give such a ruling. Every other member who has contributed to this debate thus far has discussed in broad terms and posed questions to the Government on the reasons the Bill is being postponed. Basically it is a debate on information made available previously through Press releases and the like.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn has ranged far and wide. I agree it is a subject near and dear to his heart, and I know he will use every opportunity to espouse his cause, but I feel this is not one of them. He should confine his remarks strictly to the motion.

Debate Resumed

Mr BERTRAM: At the time you asked me to return to the subject matter, I remind you I was touching on a point which most speakers appear to have touched upon; namely, the point that this Bill affects all of us here. I say it does more than that. I am not concerned two hoots about what happens to the members here—they do rather well. I reiterate that it affects every man, woman and child in this State.

Mr B. T. Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr BERTRAM: The people of this State have been humiliated. As difficult as it may be to believe, the electoral laws of this State are worse than those in Queensland where a man has become Premier with about 33 per cent of the total vote.

Mr Bryce: That is another good reason the Bill should not be postponed a minute longer.

Mr BERTRAM: What about the humiliation of the people of this State? I was obliged today to tell a person from New Zealand interested in political matters and involved in them that 40 elections have been held for the upper House since 1890, and all of them have been won by one political side and, of course, all of them lost by the other. He said "The game must be pretty crook."

Mr B. T. Burke: Why can't we be told the reason for the delay?

Mr BERTRAM: Why should we have elections for the upper House when anybody of any intelligence knows the result before the official announcement is made? What sort of racket is that? We accuse Russia and Singapore of such things.

Mr Grewar: You can win the seats if you want to.

Mr BERTRAM: Members of the other side are so sure of winning that they would saddle the people with another six seats. How many more millions of dollars per annum will that cost the people of this State? It is disgraceful, and I suggest members on the Government side who have a conscience—there may be only a few—should feel disgraced. However, we have seen very little evidence of their humiliation in regard to electoral laws. The Government has acted in an extraordinarily dirty way.

How well we remember the Premier apparently proudly endeavouring to imitate R. G. Menzies by unveiling a map of electoral boundaries. What did it reveal? It revealed a crooked line. It had an electoral line down the main street of Armadale in order to save a Minister's seat. That meant that on one side of the road, some people in Armadale had a vote worth approximately 1 000 per cent more than the people on the other side. At the same time, my vote as an elector of the North Metropolitan Province is worth 1/17th of the vote other people in Western Australia have. Some people have 1 700 per cent more voting value than the people in my electorate. How about that! There is no evidence that this electoral Bill will be any real improvement.

Mr B. T. Burke: There is no evidence of the Bill.

Mr BERTRAM: On behalf of the people of Western Australia the Opposition wishes to make known its concern that there is a move afoot. The editorial of *The West Australian* has already made it clear that there is a move afoot but it did not use the same language. However, the message

was there for all the world to see. The Opposition quite rightly wishes to know what is happening. It certainly wishes to know the reason for this delay in an attempt to ensure that the decent and fair thing is done.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [9.46 p.m.]: After listening to the debate I have seen no conclusive reason that a debate on the electoral Bill should be postponed. It is quite obvious that in the past some discussion has taken place between the Premier, or in his absence the Leader of the House, and the Leader of the Opposition in relation to matters such as this.

Judging from the reaction of the Leader of the Opposition there has been no discussion about a postponement of the Orders of the Day, particularly Order of the Day No. 11. Therefore, I would venture to suggest to people on this side of the House that the real reason for the postponement is that once again the Government made a decision, in Cabinet, and has either forgotten or has decided that the back-bench members of this House supporting the Government were not even worth consulting on the issue. I am quite sure in my mind, as I am sure are members of the Opposition, that the Bill has been printed and that the maps have been produced and that they have been available for back-bench members to scrutinise.

I am quite certain that some of the back-benchers, whom the Government took for granted, decided that perhaps there should be some review of the Bill in its present form. I imagine that the focal point of the review would have been two issues: the metropolitan boundary and the boundary that is drawn by this Parliament of those section seats. I would have been much happier if the Government or the Deputy Premier had been prepared to stand up and say that a miscalculation was made. There are some members on this side of the House who have a conscience and who have some reservation about the Bill in its present form. However, instead of that we have a situation where this House is again being dictated to by the Government—by the Cabinet, one and the same thing.

I know that in the past the member for Fremantle has said that this subject is a hobby-horse of mine. When the Constitution of this State was established there was only one body created outside the Crown that would have some control over the Government and that was the Parliament. It makes me sad to see that the Parliament has abrogated its responsibility and that the Cabinet can go to the Press with a statement that it will amend the Electoral Districts Act to correct the imbalances that have occurred over the years and then to discover that none of the back-bench members have seen or approved the Bill. It annoys me that the Government is not prepared to say that some of the members supporting the Government have reservations about the Bill, therefore it will have to be postponed for one or two days. I am sure that is what should have been said.

MR HODGE (Melville) [9.50 p.m.]: There is no doubt about it; the electoral Bill is here in Parliament House: I saw it myself in the office of the Clerk of Papers when I went there on another matter. Therefore, there can be no excuse that the Bill is not ready or that it is not printed. The Government cannot deny that the Bill is here in Parliament House.

The rumour in the House is that the Bill has been outlined at the Government parties' meeting. I should like to offer the Deputy Premier an opportunity to refute my statement.

Mr Hassell: What was outlined at your party meeting?

Mr HODGE: Certainly not the Bill.

Mr Hassell: Do not be silly.

Several members interjected.

Mr HODGE: The Deputy Premier has chosen not to take up the opportunity to deny that this matter has been outlined to Government members.

Mr Hassell: Do you believe in the party system, or don't you?

Mr HODGE: If the Bill is here in Parliament then the only conclusion one can draw is that it ran into trouble in the party room. It is obvious the matter has been discussed in the party room but the Government is not prepared to deny the obvious; the Bill ran into trouble in the party room.

We all know that the member for North Province in the other House was proposing to stand for Kimberley and that he is not very happy with the new proposal that Labor pockets from the Pilbara be hived off into the Kimberley area. He went to the Press and expressed his outrage. We also know that the member for Subiaco will be redistributed out of existence as will the member for Moore, probably.

Mr O'Connor: You know more than we do.

Mr HODGE: It is not difficult to know more than the Deputy Premier.

Mr O'Connor: What you are saying is not fact.

Mr HODGE: The Bill is sitting in a room a few yards from the Chamber; we all know it is there

and we all know that Government members know what is in the Bill and that they have perused the map. However, for some party political purpose the Government will hold back the Bill to cut down on public debate and parliamentary debate and will use its numbers to ram the Bill through the House.

It is obvious that the Government has run into opposition in the party room and the Deputy Premier is not prepared to stand here and tell the truth about the situation.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 26

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Mr Clarko	Mr Old
Mr Coyne	Mr Rushton
Mrs Craig	Mr Sibson
Dr Dadour	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr Hassell	Mr Trethowan
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Tubby
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Watt
Mr Laurance	Mr Williams
Mr McPharlin	Mr Young
Mr Nanovich	Mr Shalders *(Teller)*

Noes 19

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bertram	Mr Hodge
Mr Bridge	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Parker
Mr Carr	Mr Taylor
Mr Cowan	Mr Tonkin
Mr Davies	Mr Wilson
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Bateman
Mr Grill	*(Teller)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr MacKinnon	Mr T. J. Burke
Mr Mensaros	Mr Pearce
Mr Crane	Mr Skidmore
Sir Charles Court	Mr McIver

Question thus passed.

JURIES AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Deputy Premier) [9.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill deals principally with the proposed operation of a jury pool system in Perth for Supreme and District Court criminal trials.

At the same time, the opportunity has been taken to put forward amendments to allow the service of summonses by post and for the selection of jury panels as well as the preparation of summonses by computer. The Bill also includes provision to dispense with the draft jury roll as presently in use.

As mentioned, the principal purpose of this Bill is to provide for the operation of a jury pool system for Supreme and District Court criminal trials in Perth. It allows also for the extension of such a system to other courts or localities as may appear necessary from time to time.

Under the present provisions of the Juries Act, it is necessary to summon up to 120 jurors a week during normal criminal sittings of the Supreme and District Courts in Perth. The number of jurors summoned depends on the number of courts in session and the number of trials in such courts.

To select three jury panels when three separate courts are sitting, it is necessary to move jurors from court to court until the selection has been completed, as the draw for jurors must be from the whole panel. The result is that trials in the last court in line can be considerably delayed until this procedure has been finalised.

In planning the new District Court building in Perth, provision has been made for a jury assembly area. It is proposed that when the new court building is in operation, sufficient numbers of jurors can be allocated to each court from the jury assembly area so that the selection process can take place simultaneously in all courts. The new selection process will be made possible by the introduction of a new type of jury precept.

Jury requirements are embodied in precepts, which are directions issued by the Chief Justice or other judge to the summoning officer who, in Perth sittings of the courts, is the Sheriff.

To distinguish between the current system, which will still continue in circuit courts, and the new pool system, precepts issued in accordance with the current system will be known as general jury precepts, and those issued in accordance with the new system will be known as pool precepts.

Provision has been made in the proposed new section 32A so that general jury precepts can still be issued in Perth according to particular requirements.

Jurors summoned under the new system will assemble in the jury assembly room and the jury

pool supervisor will then allocate jurors by ballot to the various courts in accordance with the pool precepts he has received.

The number of jurors who will, under the pool system, proceed to the various courts, will be specified in the individual pool precepts. The number should be sufficient to provide for the jury, after allowing for challenges. The Bill does not alter the existing system of challenges in any way.

Also included in the Bill are provisions to eliminate the present cumbersome procedure for the compilation of draft jury rolls for each jury district throughout the State and to eliminate the requirement for despatch of notices to every person included in such rolls.

Under the present procedures an examination has to be made of all claims for exemption received following the despatch of the notices. Thereafter, the draft jury roll has to be revised and becomes the jury book for the year. It will be appreciated that this practice places a very heavy work load on the Sheriff and his officers in processing the claims, and involves a considerable cost in relation to printing and in the postage of notices and other correspondence.

The Bill eliminates the "draft jury roll" concept. Under the existing system all those persons whose names appear on the draft jury roll receive notices to that effect, even though they may never be summoned to attend as jurors.

Under the proposed new system an explanatory notice will be despatched only to those persons who are actually summoned as jurors. The selection of persons to be summoned will be made at random by computer or manually by ballot.

The notice to be despatched to those persons who receive summonses will advise that they may, if entitled, claim exemption or, for sufficient reasons, be excused from service. Under the present system all of those persons who are on the draft jury roll, when notified of that fact have to consider whether to claim an exemption, while under the proposals embodied in this Bill only those persons actually summoned as jurors will now be affected.

It should be noted that the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia recently released its report on exemption from jury service and this report is at present being considered by the Government.

The Bill now before the House does not contain any reference to that subject which is being dealt with as a separate issue; in other words, the Bill does not vary the existing arrangements for exemption from jury service.

The principal reason for proceeding with the legislation relating to the jury pool system at this stage is so that the legislation can be brought into operation after 1 July and before 1 November this year.

The date 1 November would be the critical day for the old draft jury roll procedures to commence for the ensuing year and it is therefore desirable that the legislation be in force to ensure that the new procedures can operate in 1982-83.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bertram.

LAW REPORTING BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Deputy Premier) [10.06 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

From time to time questions have been raised about who controls the rights to publish judicial decisions of courts in Western Australia. The Western Australian Government has always asserted that the copyright in written judgments belongs to the Crown in right of the State.

Copyright is also a Commonwealth matter under the Constitution and there is, of course, a Commonwealth Copyright Act. That Act does not take away the right of the State to control the reproduction of written judgments by State judges.

The right to permit more than one reproduction of written judgments rests, therefore, with the State and the purpose of this Bill is to give statutory backing over the control of the State's copyright.

New South Wales and Victoria have adopted differing approaches to this problem, but the underlying theme of both is to ensure that the right to grant reprinting rights of judgments remains with the State.

This Bill gives statutory backing to this assertion by regulating the reporting of judicial decisions of courts as part of a series of law reports.

Courts are defined in the Bill to include the Workers' Compensation Board and the Supplementary Workers' Compensation Board

constituted under the Workers' Compensation Act 1912. It is particularly opportune and necessary that this Bill should now be brought before the State Parliament. The Premier's policy speech for the last State general election referred to the Government's intention to legislate. This intention derived from what then appeared to be a rather haphazard proliferation of law reporting proposals, some of which had some degree of official support and some of which did not.

Since that time the computer has loomed as an important factor which cannot be overlooked in the law reporting field. Representations are being made to Governments in Australia that various kinds of exclusive or non-exclusive rights should be given to computer-linked agencies. Important considerations attend decisions in such matters—considerations affecting costs to the profession and the public and also the right of access to public reports.

The Standing Committee of Attorneys General presently is concerned with some of these matters and it is believed opportune for us to have this legislation so that they can be considered and advice obtained from appropriate sources.

It is proposed that a law reporting advisory board will be set up consisting of six members. The chairman will be a Supreme Court judge nominated by the Chief Justice.

The Chief Justice will be required also to nominate a member who shall be one of the following: a judge from either the District Court of Western Australia or the Family Court of Western Australia; or the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board or the supplementary board.

Three members will be legal practitioners nominated by the council of the Law Society and the remaining member will be a legal practitioner nominated by the Attorney General. Members of the board will be eligible for appointment for a term of up to three years.

The board will be in a position to give the Attorney General advice on any aspect of law reporting, and the exercise of his powers and duties in that respect.

The Bill makes provision for the Attorney General to authorise the preparation, publication, and sale of reports or summaries of reports of judicial decisions of any court in this State. Also it authorises the Attorney General to negotiate with various publishers and enter into contracts with a person, firm, or corporation in the exercise of his powers under the Bill.

The Bill provides that powers to be conferred on the Attorney General will be able to be delegated to the board or some other designated person or body. The power to enter into contracts will remain with the Attorney General, but all other powers may be delegated with the exception of the power of delegation itself.

It is not the intention of this legislation to interfere with the present arrangements with regard to the Western Australian reports, except to the extent of requiring the formal approval of the statutory board.

It is, of course, hoped that those persons who have given their services to the editing of the reports would continue in that role and that the board would give them every encouragement to continue. It is envisaged that the board would, of course, satisfy itself as to the qualifications of editors and ensure that the standards of reporting are maintained at the present level.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

RESERVES BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mrs Craig (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [10.12 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The proposals contained in this Bill relate to eight separate variations to Class "A" reserves which require the approval of Parliament to become effective.

In addition to making a brief explanation on each of these proposals I wish to inform members that the customary notes on the clauses of the Bill and plans of the areas involved will be tabled at the conclusion of my remarks.

Members will observe that a new format has been adopted by Parliamentary Counsel in the drafting of the Bill. The Bill no longer contrives to direct in its various clauses the purpose to which the subject land will be put unless such land is to be of Class "A".

It follows that once Parliament has consented that certain lands will be no longer of Class "A", deletion of a specific direction in the Act will allow great flexibility for the future administration of those lands under the Land Act.

Class "A" unvested "protection of flora" Reserve No. 12098 comprises nearly 36 hectares and is situated about 42 kilometres east of Pingelly. Investigations into the future of this reserve have led the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife to seek a change in the purpose of the reserve to "conservation of flora and fauna" and that it be vested in the WA Wildlife Authority. Both the Pingelly Shire Council and the Lands and Surveys Department endorse the proposal.

Class "A" unvested "protection of flora" Reserve No. 16714 comprises nearly 28 hectares and is situated about 19 kilometres south-east of Corrigin townsite. Following investigations into the future of this reserve, the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife has sought a change in the purpose of the reserve to "conservation of flora and fauna" and that it be vested in the WA Wildlife Authority. The Corrigin Shire Council and the Lands and Surveys Department endorse the proposal.

Following consideration of nine alternative sites, the Department of Administrative Services applied on behalf of the Geraldton Rifle Club to establish a 12-target rifle range in the district of Walkaway. Land affected by the proposal comprises freehold and portion of Class "A" park Reserve No. 8613, which is under the control and management of the Greenough Shire Council.

With the shire indicating its agreement to relinquish the area required, reference was made to a number of Government authorities, some of which opposed the idea. After lengthy discussions and negotiations, the proposal has reached a stage whereby all concerned have now consented to allow development of the range to proceed. Excision of portion of Class "A" Reserve No. 8613 is necessary with the intention "that the area be reserved for a 'rifle range' ".

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife has submitted that the purpose of Class "A" unvested Reserve No. 27310—"preservation of indigenous timber"—be changed to "conservation of flora and fauna" and that it be vested in the WA Wildlife Authority. The department supported its request with comprehensive descriptions of the types of vegetation and fauna found on the reserve; and it was reported that some observations evidenced the existence of quokkas. Both the Forests Department and the Manjimup Shire Council agree to the action proposed; and an inspection by a Lands and Surveys Department representative confirmed the value of the reserve for conservation.

The National Parks Authority and Mindarie Property Company Pty. Ltd. have negotiated a land exchange involving portion of Class "A" Neerabup National Park Reserve No. 27575 for two portions of adjacent freehold land at Quinns Rocks. The areas concerned have been isolated as a result of the proposed Mitchell Freeway alignment; and the exchange will be of benefit to both parties. The Wanneroo Shire Council and the Department of Conservation and Environment support the idea; and the land purchase board has recommended that the exchange proceed on an equal basis.

The Shire of Mandurah has been endeavouring to establish a bowling club in the South Mandurah area and, following thorough investigation, selected a site within Class "A" Reserve No. 2851, which has been set aside for the purpose of "recreation and camping" and vested in the shire. Survey of the site has been effected and approval is sought to excise an area of three hectares for its subsequent reservation and vesting in the Shire of Mandurah for the purpose of "recreation and club premises".

Due to recent expansion of Walpole townsite, the Public Works Department has found it necessary to develop a new water supply source. The land required for this essential development comprises portion of Class "A" Walpole National Park Reserve No. 31362; and the National Parks Authority has agreed to excision of the area required. Survey of the site has been completed; and it is proposed that the area be reserved for water supply purposes.

Kalgoorlie Lot No. 510 was set aside as reserve 3362 for "Hospital (St. Johns)" in June 1896, and in July 1898 a Crown grant in trust was issued. The Sisters of Saint John desire to sell the hospital, which has been erected on portion of the lot; and survey has been effected to define the land containing the buildings. Parliamentary approval is sought to remove the trust over portion of Kalgoorlie Lot No. 510 so that the sale of the hospital may proceed for its intended use as a private nursing home.

I seek leave of the House to table the notes and plans to which I referred previously.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 185).

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

BULK HANDLING AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 16 April.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.18 p.m.]: The Bill before

the House seeks to do two things. However, there are a number of aspects in connection with the wheat industry that have not been considered, and yet they should be examined. Some problems need to be resolved, and some questions need to be asked.

However, the purposes of the Bill are twofold; and it is as well to record them, and to make some comments on some of the conditions contained in the amendments.

The first intention contained in the amendments is to extend the period in which Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has the sole right to handle wheat and barley in Western Australia to 31 December 2000. The reason for this has been given in the Minister's notes. This makes CBH the sole grain-handling agent. Of course, it has pressures on it to maintain insect control standards; and also it has a responsibility to raise loans so it can extend facilities, not only in the ports, but also in the wheat-belt areas.

The second measure in the Bill is to ensure that it is clear that when CBH is acting as the authorised agent or licensed receiver, the appropriate standards are those specified by the relevant marketing authorities. The only two relevant marketing authorities that become involved are the Australian Wheat Board and the Grain Pool.

The procedure has been changed; and that is of some interest. CBH, when it is acting on behalf of the authorities, will be notified by the relevant marketing authority of the appropriate grades and dockages involved because of any quality deficiency in the grain it receives. At the same time, as warehousing has become a distinct possibility for some grains, grades and dockages will be set by CBH after proper consultation with the relevant marketing authority which, in Western Australia, would be the Grain Pool.

The method of implementation, to indicate the change in the standards for qualities, is that the Director of Agriculture is to be notified, and the information is to be published in *The West Australian*.

I would like to make two comments in connection with the first aspect, which is the extension of CBH's jurisdiction and mandate to the year 2000. There is in this a compromise in that there is a form of sunset legislation which does terminate the Act at that time. It has been extended from 1985, but in this case it gives CBH the opportunity to find sufficient time to raise the loans to meet its expansion programmes. This brings me to the second point, which is the need for an indication of CBH's building programmes. It is obvious there is a need, as far as policy allows, for some indication of this, particularly with respect to the future of the outports.

There have been indications and suggestions that CBH has proposed to maximise the use of Kwinana, and therefore the future of Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany and Esperance needs to be qualified as far as possible. There is the move towards larger shipping, and to a degree this will centre itself on Kwinana.

The announcement recently, after some years of consternation in the south-west and great southern, that Bunbury is to continue as a CBH shipping centre has brought about a certain amount of relief, but I do think in the case of the other ports that there has to be some fairly sound indication of what the future holds.

The advent of super tankers will undoubtedly be applied to various grain shippings and to some extent these will be determined by the draught in the home ports or the ports to where the grain is to be delivered. Nonetheless, in the future interests, and particularly where the Government becomes involved with planning infrastructure of various kinds—whether it is shipping facilities or railways and any aspect of the infrastructure connected with CBH—and in the interests of decentralisation in the outports for wheatbelt towns, some indication of what the future holds should be given.

There has been some criticism of CBH in regard to its rather closed dealings. Obviously in many instances this is necessary because of commercial activity, but at the same time there are other areas in which a little more frankness could have been possible in the interests of the industry, especially with country towns. I might add, as we are on the aspect of the provision of facilities by CBH, that some criticism has been brought to my attention in that CBH may be verging to some extent on the extravagant. This is reflected in its charges—and that is to be understood—and in handling charge costs, in that increases must come back and be an imposition on the industry and on the farmers within the industry.

Passing on to the standards and dockages, under the Wheat Marketing Act the Australian Wheat Board sets the discounts and the premiums for the quality and variety of wheat grain. There is a removal of inconsistency through this amendment of the Western Australian Wheat Marketing Act, an inconsistency which is hampering the effective implementation of the varietal control scheme for wheat, as the

appropriate standards will no longer be those specified in the Bulk Handling Act regulations.

The Wheat Marketing Act specifies that the Australian Wheat Board sets the discount and the premiums for the quality and variety. However, at the present time CBH must abide by the regulations in determining quality standards and dockages. The Bill ensures that the appropriate quality standards, dockages, and varietal discounts for wheat applied to CBH are those notified to CBH by the Australian Wheat Board. A consequence of the removal of grades and tonnages from the regulations is—as the Minister pointed out—an anomaly which the Department of Agriculture has experienced in serving as arbitrator in disputes between CBH and growers where dockages and quality are involved; that is, the grades and tonnages need to be altered at least annually, but I understand that the regulations have not been altered since 1975. The upshot of this is that the Bill will allow the department to arbitrate on the basis of the most recently set standards by the Australian Wheat Board.

It is essential that the varietal control standards for 1982 be set in 1981. There is a provision for sampling, and the Bill will enable CBH to take a sample of wheat at a siding and forward it to the Australian Wheat Board for determination, but at the same time it has a provision that the grower must be notified. Once the Australian Wheat Board has determined the type of grain, both CBH and the grower are notified. Dockages by CBH are based on the determination of the Australian Wheat Board through this provision. The disputes on the Australian Wheat Board varietal determinations are resolved by the Research Unit of the CSIRO in Sydney if this becomes necessary. I have no doubt this will be necessary in the fullness of time.

But there are some points at issue. It is a matter of conjecture whether in actuality, as the Bill is applied in the day-to-day operation of the industry, this measure will improve the position of the grower and of the industry.

I believe the mechanism which will be used now is that the Australian Wheat Board will notify CBH of standards of quality and, in the event of dispute, the Department of Agriculture will arbitrate on the matter.

Mr Old: Any dispute over variety will be arbitrated by CSIRO.

Mr H. D. EVANS: A dispute on varietal determination will be arbitrated by the research unit of CSIRO.

I should like to make a further point in that regard. I am a little perplexed as to how this will assist the industry in a practical way, bearing in mind that some farmers are growing insignia and delivering it without declaring it. Obviously it will become an administrative issue.

I should like to elaborate on that to some extent. I do not know whether members are aware of specific instances, but it would appear that, particularly in the eastern wheat belt where insignia is a variety subject to varietal dockages, it is possible for such wheat to be delivered without declaring it. If that occurs, it tends to lower the Australian standard white to such an extent that it could endanger the overseas market if the practice were to become widespread.

I point out that under varietal control, dockages in 1980-81 amounted to 44 280 tonnes of wheat subject to varietal discount. This amounted to a total of $91 655, the dockage level being at $3 a tonne. It is probably apposite to ask whether benefits occurred as a result of these dockages and who received the benefits. It is possible it is advantageous to millers if they obtain wheat on which the farmer has received a discount, if they find it is of a sufficient quality to be millable and used in the normal industry production.

As I pointed out, insignia has been subject to dockage in the eastern wheat belt, but when it is grown inland in areas with which the members for Merredin and Mt. Marshall would be familiar, the quality is improved to the extent that it can be regarded as more comparable with Gamenya which complies reasonably favourably with the standards of ASW at the present time. The future of Western Australian wheat is a little doubtful and there is need for concern at the State level.

The role of the State Wheat Advisory Committee should be clarified and it may be necessary for its structure to be changed. We do not know how it will proceed in the future and what its role will be under the new legislation. Presumably the committee will be restricted to the enforcement of varietal controls and it will make recommendations as to the varieties which should be grown in various areas so that the standards set by the Australian Wheat Board will be met.

That is my understanding of the situation; but I wonder whether there is room for initiative on the part of the advisory committee so that it may be involved in actual determinations of quality and may have a more active part to play in the role of the Australian Wheat Board.

It is also probably apposite to ask whether the State Wheat Advisory Committee should be

answerable to Parliament under the existing legislation, and that is within the province of the Minister. The committee has an important part to play in a multi-million dollar industry and it should be borne in mind that other authorities, such as the APV and SEC, are accountable to Parliament. Therefore, I wonder whether the State Wheat Advisory Committee should be in the same position. It may be necessary for the composition, function, role and responsibilities of the committee to be adjusted to meet changes which occur within the industry.

It is important that we look at these issues whilst we are dealing with the legislation. We do not intend to oppose provisions of this kind, because they are of benefit to the industry; but some of these matters should be examined in the interests of the total operation.

Recently a seminar was conducted at Merredin at which derogatory comments were made in regard to Western Australian wheat. According to the reports I received these comments came mainly from grower sources, but they should not be disregarded. The two main considerations in regard to bread flour are protein content and stretchability. The latter is measured on an extensograph.

This brings me back to the question of whether CSIRO should be the sole body responsible for arbitrating on decisions taken in conjunction with the standards set by the bread industry. The Bread Research Institute is an authoritative body and has an excellent background. Its ability is of world class and, for that reason, I wonder whether it is in the best interests of the growers of Western Australia to have the sole determining body in regard to wheat production based in Sydney.

In the past farmers have been involved in disputes and I am sure this will occur in the future. Western Australia is isolated from the rest of the country and I have some reservations as to whether it is a good idea for the arbitrator to be situated 3 000 miles away. The question springs to mind as to whether the set-up is in fact in the best interests of Western Australian growers. It is possible Western Australia could be disadvantaged if the influence of the State in the operation of the industry is reduced. I am always a little reluctant to see such a situation arise, and this could well be the case.

I appreciate the Australian Wheat Board has a responsibility to deal with overseas customers and the wheat and flour trade has always had exacting standards. In some countries the tolerance level for insects is nil and other countries adopt a discounting practice. It is clear we should never be complacent or tempted to lower standards and facilities in an industry of this kind.

I appreciate the point that the Australian Wheat Board must involve itself in this matter; of course, CBH is fully cognizant of that. However, I would like to see some greater safeguarding—which does not seem to exist at present—of Western Australian growers and the Western Australian grain industry.

The Primary Industry Association raised an interesting peripheral issue, and one that needs to be clarified. It concerns the handing-over to CBH of the responsibility for recording the production of wheat so that possible future quotas may be set. That is something which I fervently hope does not arise again; however, the recording is necessary, and I believe CBH has shown some reluctance to accept that role. Growers accept that the records must be maintained, but I do not know whether the growers at present have confidence in CBH to do that.

I refer to the dockages and the end use of the wheat subject to those dockages for a variety of control reasons. I wonder whether the $91 000 for discounted wheat found its way to the millers. That needs to be clarified, and I am sure the Minister will be only too happy to do just that.

The matters I have raised essentially are part and parcel of the industry even though they are not referred to in the legislation. The two provisions in the Bill are not opposed, but at the same time the broader issues must be answered. We look to the Minister for some specific clarification of the points raised.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [10.43 p.m.]: The Bill before us relates to an amendment to the Bulk Handling Act. I think it is well just to make reference to the company known as Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, which is financed, owned, and administered by producers. Tolls are taken out of the grain returns and administered by producers elected democratically from various wheat zones throughout the State. We have one of the best grain handling systems in Australia; in fact, it has been said we have the best. The complex we have at Kwinana is regarded as one of the best, if not the best, in the world. It is at least equal to the best in the world.

Mr H. D. Evans: How do the handling charges compare with those in other States?

Mr McPHARLIN: They are equal to some, although the charges vary. They are not all on the same level. I will come to that in a moment. The member for Warren mentioned the administration of CBH. It is carried out by democratically-

elected producers, and I believe they have demonstrated that producers can and do operate a very efficient organisation. The Bill proposes to extend the right solely to CBH to receive and handle barley and wheat until 31 December 2000. This move is desirable so that CBH has an extended right. It is necessary because of the commitments of CBH and is acceptable because CBH has a very high standard of grain hygiene which is absolutely essential in regard to the taking of our grain by overseas buyers who are very strict indeed when it comes to insect infestation of grain. Strict hygiene standards must be maintained, but, of course, that incurs extra costs.

Mr B. T. Burke: What sort of insects, mainly?

Mr McPHARLIN: They are mainly weevils.

Mr B. T. Burke: I thought boll weevils were in cotton.

Mr McPHARLIN: There are a number of insects other than weevils. What was the honourable member's last comment?

Mr B. T. Burke: I thought boll weevils were in cotton.

Mr McPHARLIN: We are not talking about cotton.

Mr B. T. Burke: I didn't think you had cottoned on.

Mr McPHARLIN: The planning of the company relating to the extension of receival points for handling and the cost of that programme always has been under discussion by shareholders of the company and its board of directors. They gave serious consideration during the 1969 drought to going ahead with the plant-building programme. They made a decision then to go ahead, and it has proved to be a very wise decision because of the required upgrading of receival facilities in many country areas.

The member for Warren mentioned that perhaps the board has been a little extravagant in its provisions, but the programme has proved not to be extravagant and to be a very wise programme in which to participate. Last year it was decided that State accounting would be brought into operation, which means that each State is responsible for the provision of its finance and the operation of its building programmes. Before that came into being, costs were spread amongst all wheat growers in Australia. It was thought preferable that each State fund its own programmes. As far as Western Australia was concerned, it may cost a little more in the next year or two, but other States have found it necessary to go into an extensive building programme with ever-increasing costs. This State will be far better off than it was before. That will prove to be the case in light of the tremendous problems other States, and particularly New South Wales, have encountered, with infestation of grain by insects, and problems with grain held in silos. The planning will prove beneficial to the Western Australian growers. Even though past actions may appear to have been extravagant, certainly they will not be proved to be extravagant as time goes on.

The member for Warren referred to other matters relating to this Bill, but I do not intend to comment on them except to refer to dockages.

He referred to the wheat variety insignia being grown in the eastern wheat belt. This wheat has proved to be a very high yielding wheat but as soft wheat it does not have good milling qualities. In the eastern wheat belt area where there are dry conditions, the protein content of the grain is quite high but because of its milling qualities it does not measure up.

There have been restrictions on the growing of wheat and dockages have been applied; even so, farmers still grow insignia because of its yielding qualities. However, there is an acceptance of this fact by growers and some are attempting to produce a better quality grain in order to meet the customer requirements in various parts of the world.

In the past it has been necessary to alter the grain dockages annually. However, this Bill will change that and it will be far easier to administer. We have no opposition to the provisions which have been made in this Bill because it is a step in the right direction. Of course, there will always be some arguments put forward by producers against dockages but if reasons are given for these dockages then most producers will accept them. The amendments made in the Bill are quite acceptable.

MR TUBBY (Greenough) [10.52 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words about the Bill. CBH is a company with which I have had close associations for many years. I can remember very distinctly when the company was formed in the mid-1930s and what a boon it was to the farming industry in those days because the methods of handling wheat then were quite different. The wheat was handled in sewn bags and it was all manually handled and individually stacked at various sidings and each siding had a number of stacks which represented various companies which handled the grain. Such companies were Wesfarmers, Dalgetys, Burridge, and Warren and Bunge. However, when Co-operative Bulk

Handling Ltd. was formed all of those handling agents disappeared and CBH was the sole handler of wheat in Western Australia.

The company has come a long way in its development of equipment in that period. The company started off with a very small operation in those days with quite primitive methods of testing the grain. It certainly did not have the modern procedures we have today.

The quality control by CBH and its responsibility to the Australian Wheat Board in the quality testing of the grain and inspection for weevils and other vermin is strictly controlled. It always amazes me when I note the number of skilled staff the company is able to muster for the very busy wheat handling period. I think they do a tremendous job and fulfil a great responsibility in ensuring that the quality is correct and that there is no contamination from noxious weeds or vermin in the grain. Also, the temperature of the grain is tremendously important because we all know that if moist grain is stored it is most susceptible to weevil strike.

With the strict requirements for grain export, it is absolutely essential that everything be in 100 per cent condition at the receiving end.

Over a number of years, CBH has run competitions for farm hygiene in an attempt to improve the standards of farmers handling grain. These competitions have been very popular and some valuable prizes have been offered. I believe the company is doing a tremendous amount of good with these competitions in an effort to upgrade the standard of farm hygiene.

This Bill is essential and it is pleasing to note that CBH will be given the sole responsibility to handle grain until the year 2000 in this State. This legislation is essential because from time to time the company has to raise considerable sums of money to keep up the demand for upgrading facilities. This occurs because of the increase in wheat-producing areas and increased yields.

We have very modern facilities for the handling of wheat right throughout the State and it is important that systems continue to be upgraded. It certainly makes handling of wheat much easier as far as the farmers are concerned and therefore it is a credit to that company.

We in the regional centres—and I refer mainly to Geraldton—are concerned about the emphasis which is being placed upon Kwinana as the main outlet for grain in this State. We look upon Geraldton as having an advantage over other ports in the State because it is so much closer to the north and ships have to pass that port on their way to Kwinana, Bunbury, and Albany. The people in the Geraldton area are very anxious about the long-term planning for the development of the port and the development of the Co-operative Bulk Handling facilities.

A top-level meeting is to be held in Geraldton this week to discuss the long-term planning for the development of the bulk handling facilities in that port. Those participating in the meeting will be CBH, Westrail representatives, the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, the Primary Industry Association and the Geraldton Port Authority. The outcome of the meeting will be very keenly awaited by farmers in that area because the long-term planning for the area is tremendously important to them. I take pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [10.59 p.m.]: I thank members who have contributed to the debate. I think it has been fairly well agreed that there is general acceptance of this very reasonable and simple but necessary amendment to the Bulk Handling Act.

There is not much in the Bill which is complicated but a few remarks should be made in response to some queries that have been brought forward. One query was about the CBH building programme. I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is well aware that CBH building programmes are referred to the Minister for approval and are naturally referred by the Minister to the members of the staff of the Department of Agriculture.

This time-honoured practice still continues, in the main to ensure that the guidelines laid down by the producers and CBH are adhered to; in other words, the guidelines regarding distances between installations and the type of installations to be provided.

An interesting observation was made about centralisation at Kwinana. I guess the capacity at Kwinana would have been adequate to handle the whole of the Western Australian wheat crop in each of the last few years. However, I hope in the not-too-distant future that capacity will be taxed to the limit and that the outports will also be straining at the seams.

I would like to point out that to a very large extent the Albany installation has been upgraded by the provision of new galleries in concert with some deep dredging. Albany is able now to handle ships of a considerable size. So that is a definite alternative to Kwinana.

As was pointed out during the debate, the decision has been made to retain Bunbury as a bulk-handling port. However, I do not anticipate that it will be a bulk-handling port of the size of

Geraldton, Albany, or Esperance. Certainly it will be an important handling facility, especially in the coarse grain section of the industry.

It has been pointed out also that the setting of standards and dockages has been taken out of the hands of the department and CBH. CBH will be the authorised handling agents, and it will accept grain on the standards set down by the person marketing the grain. In the case of wheat, the standards will be laid down by the Australian Wheat Board, and the Grain Pool of WA will lay down the standards for coarse grain.

Varietal control testing was the subject of some discussion. I do not have a great deal of information to hand on that, except that I am aware that the identification of cultivars cannot be undertaken here. Where there is any suspicion of an incorrect definition of wheat cultivars, CBH now is empowered to take a sample of the grain—if necessary without reference to the grower—and send the sample to the department. In turn the department forwards the sample to the CSIRO wheat-testing unit where a diagnosis will be made. Having done that, it will be incumbent upon CBH to advise the owner. We assume that the owner then awaits the outcome.

If the standards that the industry hopes to achieve are to be achieved and maintained it is important that the owners are truthful in the definition of wheat.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to testing for the extensibility of dough. The extensibility and baking tests are carried on for about eight months of the year, and when varieties are grown out of the recommended areas it is obvious in the results. The testing is virtually a continuous process. While the introduction of varietal control was cause for a fair bit of heartburning, I think the industry has accepted it very well. We can now expect to have the right varieties grown in the right areas. Obviously there will always be people who want to grow varieties outside the prescribed areas, and these growers will be able to deliver their crops to certain bins, as long as they accept a dockage which will be determined by the Australian Wheat Board.

Mr H. D. Evans: Does any of the discounted wheat find its way into the milling industry?

Mr OLD: Not to my knowledge, because most of the baking wheats come from centres which would not attract docked wheat. There are only certain areas in the district where docked wheat can be delivered.

I believe it would be quite a rare thing for docked wheat to go into ASW or hard-wheat areas.

The recording of wheat quota information was referred to. I would like to point out that some time ago the Government decided there would be no further wheat quota recording by the Government. However, it was agreed that the opportunity would be given to producer organisations if they so desired. CBH decided to undertake production recording, but I point out that it is production recording as distinct from wheat quota recording.

CBH is interested in recording receivals to various areas so it has a pattern on which to work, and some assistance in its forecasting. The Primary Industry Association asked CBH to allow the PIA to continue the wheat quota committee to consult with CBH. However, no accord was reached on that matter because CBH considers that the information it requires can be obtained with the minimum of staff by the use of a computer. It saw no necessity for an advisory committee

As no further steps have been taken, I would volunteer the opinion that many growers are very relieved that there is a continuation of quota recording, and I refer to those people in drought-affected areas, and particularly those who have suffered drought conditions for several years. Although the Government gave an undertaking that they would not be affected adversely in the unlikely event of the reintroduction of quotas, the banks have a definite tendency to use wheat quotas as a basis for determining loans. Wheat quotas should not be used in this way, because in the unlikely event that they are reintroduced—and it must be nine years or more since we have had them—there is no guarantee that the same formula will be used. So it may well be that the time and effort put into recording wheat quotas would be wasted.

We were the last State to discontinue wheat quota recording, and if it were reintroduced, it is quite likely that the Agricultural Council will devise another method to determine State quotas.

I thank members for their support of the Bill, and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Clarko) in the Chair; Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 6A inserted—

Mr H. D. EVANS: It may be a relatively small point, but an unusual one, that proposed new subsection (2)(a) specifies *The West Australian* as the sole vehicle for notification.

I am a little puzzled about that because, for example, the chairman's newsletter would be read by many farmers. Probably fewer farmers would miss an item in the chairman's newsletter than would miss publicity about it in *The West Australian.* After the introduction of quotas, despite the nine months or 12 months of publicity given to the matter, when deliveries first commenced several wheat growers arrived at sidings and when asked for their certificates wanted to know "What certificate; and what is this quota business all about?" Sometimes it is difficult to get detailed information through to everyone within an industry.

Therefore I question the use of *The West Australian* solely in this respect. It seems to me the newsletter provided by the Chairman of the AWB would be equally effective, and probably would cover some of the areas of deficiency.

Mr OLD: I take the point of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I suggest *The West Australian* has been specified because it has the broadest circulation. I have no doubt such an important matter as the standards of the grades of wheat to be received and the dockages to be applied, etc., would be the subject of comment in the chairman's newsletter. It is a requirement of the interaction between the States that the matter receive wide publicity, and I guess each State would consider the best media to use. I would be most surprised if the chairman's newsletter were not used to get the message through.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 12 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 Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

CITY OF PERTH ENDOWMENT LANDS AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mrs Craig (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [11.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

It will be recalled that the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act was amended in 1980 to resolve rating difficulties confronting the City of Perth as a result of the determination of an appeal by the Land Valuation Tribunal. That amendment was an interim measure and applied only for the two financial years 1979-80 and 1980-81.

A comprehensive review of the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act, including the rating procedures, has since been carried out by a committee of inquiry appointed by the Government. Consideration is now being given to the recommendations of that committee but it will be a little while yet before firm decisions can be made on all the issues involved.

In the meantime, it is necessary that the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act be further amended to permit the City of Perth to continue to rate the endowment lands area in the same manner as applied for 1979-80 and 1980-81.

Under the procedure the proportion of the total rates that the endowment lands must bear is equal to the proportion that the total gross rental values in the endowment lands area bears to the total gross rental values for the whole of the district of the City of Perth.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Carr.

COMPANIES (ACQUISITION OF SHARES) (APPLICATION OF LAWS) BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

As to Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed to the second reading at a later stage of the sitting.

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Bill.

2. Companies and Securities (Interpretation and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Application of Laws) Bill.

Bills received from the Council; and, on motions by Mr O'Connor (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

House adjourned at 11.21 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HOUSING

Purchase: Interest Rates

858. Mr BRYCE, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

What are the conditions under which interest rate increase deferments will be granted in respect of State Housing Commission purchase contracts providing for escalating interest rates?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

Clause 68 of the Housing Act 1980, provides for the extension of time in cases of hardship, upon such terms and conditions as the commission, with the approval of the Minister, may determine.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Public Servants: Early Retirement

931. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

(1) In each of the past five years, what percentage of retiring public servants have retired at full retiring age?

(2) Of those who retired early, what were the main reasons, in percentages, for such retirements?

(3) Of those retiring on the grounds of ill-health, what were the main reasons, in percentage terms?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1)

	per cent
1976/77	82
1977/78	84
1978/79	83
1979/80	85
1980/81 (to date)	84.

(2) Ill health was the only reason for early retirement, percentages being—

	per cent
1976/77	18
1977/78	16
1978/79	17
1979/80	15
1980/81 (to date)	16.

(3)

	Heart Related Diseases	Asthma Bronchitis	Stress Depression Hypertension	Arthritis or Muscular Causes	Cancer	Spinal Back Injuries	Parkinson's Disease
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1976/77	25	5	30	5	10	10	Nil
1977/78	30	Nil	35	5	5	15	5
1978/79	17	4	25	8	8	8	4
1979/80	21	Nil	26	Nil	16	21	Nil
1980/81 (to date)	15	10	15	Nil	15	20	5

CITIZENS

Information: SEC

941. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) Does the State Energy Commission supply other public authorities with information about private citizens?

(2) If so—

(a) what information is provided;

(b) which public authorities receive information about private citizens from the State Energy Commission;

(c) what guidelines exist to control the use and disposal of this information?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) and (2) The State Energy Commission takes the view that information arising from supply agreements with individual customers is confidential between the two parties.

As such, the commission does not normally make this information available to any third party, including a public authority, unless the customer's specific agreement is obtained beforehand.

TOURISM

Cheynes Beach Whaling Station

992. Mr DAVIES, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Tourism:

(1) Further to question 456 of 1981 relevant to improvements of the Cheyne Beach whaling station, can he indicate the nature of the formal approach to the Federal Government requesting funds to upgrade the Cheynes Beach whaling station?

(2) Will he advise the results of his representations when they are received?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

(1) A formal submission was made to the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce (Sir Phillip Lynch).

This submission was later discussed personally with the Minister who was unable to accede to this request.
However, an indication was given that a further submission to the Minister for Home Affairs (Mr Wilson) would be given consideration.
The matter is now under consideration by that Minister.

(2) Yes.

HEALTH

Cosmetics

1002. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) What is the Government's attitude towards the suggestion that there should be a requirement for manufacturers to list the ingredients of cosmetics?

(2) Is he aware of the disquiet in the medical profession because people using cosmetics have allergies to their contents and because such allergies are difficult to treat due to the lack of knowledge as to the components of the cosmetics?

(3) If so, what action is intended to deal with this matter?

(4) If the answer to (2) is in the negative, will he act to acquaint himself with the publicly-stated disquiet?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) The Government has agreed with the recommendations of the national therapeutic goods committee that member companies of the Cosmetic and Toiletry Manufacturers Association of Australia maintain a register of all ingredients in cosmetics and related products so that individual queries concerning possible allergy can be readily answered.

(2) No, there has been no general expression of disquiet, but there are requests from time to time for information regarding the identity of ingredients in certain cosmetics.

(3) Discussions are continuing between the national therapeutic goods committee and the Cosmetic and Toiletry Manufacturers Association of Australia as indicated in the answer to (1).

(4) Not applicable.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Music: Scholarship

1003. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it a fact that Eileen Joyce has donated $40 000 to set up a Western Australian scholarship for young piano students?

(2) If so, which Western Australian music body or other organisation has been the recipient of this amount?

(3) Who is administering this award, and under what terms and conditions is the money being applied?

(4) What qualifications are required of applicants for the scholarship/award?

(5) Who have been the recipients of the scholarship/award?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) Yes, but the sum is $37 600.

(2) The University of WA is the recipient.

(3) The Vice Chancellor of the University of WA, on the recommendation of the full-time staff of the Department of Music. The university calendar states the terms and conditions as follows—

(i) The income from the fund after capitalisation in accordance with current Senate policy shall be used to provide:

(a) awards for students who have completed the requirements for the degree of Mus.B., or B.Mus.Ed., (pass or honours), or B.A. with a major in Music (pass or honours), of the University of W.A., to assist them to obtain advanced keyboard experience outside W.A., such students to be known as Eileen Joyce Music Scholars.

(b) financial assistance towards the cost of bringing to the University distinguished keyboard teachers and performers from outside W.A. for short terms to perform and teach, such visitors to be known as Eileen Joyce Visiting Musicians.

(c) grants for the purchase of keyboard music and related books for the University's Wigmore Music Library, such acquisitions to be collectively known as the Eileen Joyce Music Collection.

(4) See answer to (3)

(5) No awards have yet been made.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Rates: Metropolitan

1004. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Local Government:

(1) What was the rate in the dollar struck by each of the Perth metropolitan local authorities for the current financial year?

(2) (a) Have there been any applications from any of these councils to amend their rate during the current year:

(b) if so, which?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

(1) The following rates were levied for 1980-81 by each of the twenty-six metropolitan municipalities—

	CENTS	
CITIES		
Belmont	1.439	on unimproved values.
Canning	1.1777	on unimproved values.
Cockburn	1.16	on unimproved values
Fremantle	9.9	on gross rental values.
Gosnells	1.809	on unimproved values—1.086 for urban farmland.
Melville	.8819	on unimproved values
Nedlands	6.03	on gross rental values.
Perth	9.597	on gross rental values.
	.991	on unimproved values.
South Perth	7.0	on gross rental values.
Stirling	1.4682	on unimproved values—.7341 for urban farmland.
Subiaco	7.8	on gross rental values.
TOWNS		
Armadale	2.041	on unimproved values—1.224 for urban farmland.
Bassendean	11.1	on gross rental values.
Claremont	7.3	on gross rental values.
Cottesloe	7.9	on gross rental values.
East Fremantle	9.0	on gross rental values.
Kwinana	3.0	On unimproved values 2.1 for urban farmland.
Mosman Park	6.5	on gross rental values.
SHIRES		
Bayswater	3.01	on unimproved values 5.51 for special rating area.
Kalamunda	1.66	on unimproved values 1.25 for urban farmland.
Peppermint Grove	4.3	on gross rental values.
Swan	6.54	on gross rental values.
	.656	on unimproved values .492 for urban farmland.
Mundaring	.9838	on unimproved values .4919 for urban farmland.
Rockingham	1.837	on unimproved values .92 for urban farmland.
Serpentine-Jarrahdale	.77	on unimproved values .52 for urban farmland.
	25.0	on gross rental values.
Wanneroo	1.4	on unimproved values .7 for urban farmland.

(2) (a) and (b) There has been no such application and, as the Local Government Act does not make provision for a council to amend its rates, I am at a loss to understand what the member has in mind in asking this question.

ELECTORAL

State Enrolments

1005. Mr BRYCE, to the Chief Secretary:

What was the total State enrolment as at 31 March for each of the last six years?

Mr HASSELL replied:

31 March 1975	624 458
31 March 1976	651 235
31 March 1977	683 774
31 March 1978	692 757
31 March 1979	697 062
31 March 1980	729 408
31 March 1981	712 171

WATER RESOURCES

Balingup

1006. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Water Resources:

In the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 15 April during the Address-in-Reply debate, he stated that he would "follow up" the problems of the quality of water at Balingup. In view of his assurance, will he state what action will be taken to alleviate the problem?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Investigations into the quality of Balingup's water supply have been undertaken and I will write to the member for Collie setting out full details of the problem and what action has been initiated to overcome it.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS

Enrolments

1007. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Adverting to his answer to my question 924 of 1981 regarding projected high school enrolments, in what specific way

will the relocation of students from Bentley and Tuart Hill Senior High Schools indirectly increase the enrolments at Kewdale, John Forrest, Balga, and Cyril Jackson?

(2) What special classes have been established at John Curtin and Swanbourne Senior High Schools to increase the utilisation of these schools and how many students are attending these special classes at each school?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) The schools mentioned in my response to question 924 may benefit indirectly from the relocation of students as a result of changes to admission policies in other schools more directly involved.

(2) John Curtin Senior High School, Theatre Arts and Dance, 127 students. Swanbourne Senior High School, ethnic language group, 34 students, and partial hearing group, 20 students.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Tuart Hill: Closure

1008. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) In view of the apparent continuing anxiety on the part of students at the Tuart Hill Senior High School because of uncertainty about the effect on their future schooling of new school boundaries resulting from the decision to convert the school to a senior college, can he give an approximate date by which the new school boundaries will be finalised?

(2) How does he explain the apparent discrepancy between his earlier statements that every concession would be made to compensate for the fact that students were being forced to change schools, and more recent statements indicating that students would be forced to comply with new school boundaries?

(3) Will the school band still be available for year 10 and year 12 music students continuing at the school in 1982?

(4) Where will the remedial class at the school be relocated in 1982?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) and (2) School boundaries are normally not finalised until late in the year. In the case of Tuart Hill consideration will be given to meeting parental preferences. Approximately 70 parents have already accepted the invitation to discuss this question with senior staff of the regional office.

(3) No.

(4) Not yet determined.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY AND GAS

Charges: Rebates

1009. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) Is his department presently considering the report of a joint working party of his department and the State Energy Commission on a proposal for a rebate on energy billls for low income earners referred by the Minister for Fuel and Energy?

(2) If "Yes", when was this joint working party report referred to his department by the Minister for Fuel and Energy?

(3) When will the department be in a position to convey its response to the joint working party report to that Minister?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The final report was referred to my Department on 24 March 1981.

(3) When consideration of all implications has been completed. Refer also to the answer to question 220—1 April 1981.

HEALTH

Speech Therapy

1010. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

(1) In view of his answer to my question 158 of 1981 in which he referred to scope for a limited expansion of speech therapy

services in the near future and the situation at the Koondoola School health services clinic where the waiting time for speech therapy assessment is five months and for treatment 18 months, is it proposed to augment existing speech therapy services at this clinic in the near future?

(2) If "Yes", what form will this augmentation take?

(3) If "No", what other measures, if any, will be taken to cater for the growing need for speech therapy services in northern suburbs between Nollamara and Yanchep?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) No.

(2) See (1) above.

(3) Speech therapy services in northern suburbs will be considered in the context of the 1981-82 Budget, together with other areas of need.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS

Bentley and Tuart Hill: Closure

1011. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Has he given consideration to the request contained in question without notice 174 of 1981, to make available the report prepared under the supervision of superintendent James proposing alternatives to the closure of high schools?

(2) If "Yes", is he now prepared to table the report, and if not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) and (2) The document referred to was an attempt to identify metropolitan high schools whose enrolments were dropping significantly and to suggest ways of tackling the matter. Many schools were considered and a variety of proposals, including large scale bussing of pupils were discussed. As very few of the schools mentioned in the paper are ever likely to experience a change of role, public release of the document would achieve nothing more than create unnecessary anxiety and unreal controversy.

STOCK

Food

1012. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is there presently a complete prohibition in this State of the addition to livestock food of—

(a) dianisyl hexene;
(b) stilboestral;
(c) hexoestrol;
(d) dienestrol; and
(e) other hormones?

(2) What is the present position with respect to the bile addition of thyroid stimulants?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) (a) to (e) Yes.

(2) There are no thyroid stimulants registered for addition to livestock food.

PESTICIDES

Advisory Committee

1013. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

Who are the members of the pesticides advisory committee, and which bodies or interests do they purport to represent?

Mr YOUNG replied:

Dr R. S. Lugg, a medical officer of the Public Health Department nominated for appointment by the commissioner.
Mr R. C. Gorman, the Director of the Government Chemical Laboratories.
Mr B. J. Gabbedy, Assistant Director of Agriculture, nominated by the Director of Agriculture—awaiting gazettal.
Mr W. M. Griffiths, Principal Pharmacist, Public Health Department, appointed by the Minister to be secretary of the committee.

HEALTH

Food: Wrappings and Containers

1014. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Has the national health and medical research council set limits of vinyl chloride monomer to be permitted in containers and food wrappings different from the interim standards established some years ago?

(2) Have standards been established with respect to the levels of such monomer in food?
(3) If so, what are they?
(4) What checks are made of food to ensure that these standards are met?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) Yes.
(2) Yes.
(3) (i) In rigid polyvinyl chloride containers and utensils intended for contact with food or which may normally come into contact with food—five mg/kg;
(ii) in flexible polyvinyl chloride films intended for use in contact with food or which may normally come into contact with food—one mg/kg;
(iii) in foods and beverages—0.05 mg/kg.
(4) Testing of food by the Australian Government Analytical Laboratories, Plastics Institute of Australia and Western Australian Health Department—Government Chemical Laboratories—was commenced in 1976. The tests were discontinued in 1978 because the strict control over the material used in PVC containers and films by industry resulted in overall satisfactory results from samples analysed.

HEALTH

Cheese

1015. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

What additives are permitted in cheese?

Mr YOUNG replied:

Cheese as defined by regulation may contain harmless ripening agents, seasonings, calcium chloride, acid calcium phosphates, flavourings, permitted colouring and risin.
The range of processed cheeses, cheese spreads, cream cheese spreads, cream cheese, club cheeses, potted cheeses, luncheon cheeses, cheese pastes and cheese mixtures may contain the following additives—emulsifying agents, sodium phosphates, sodium citrate, sorbic acid, sodium alginate, sulphur dioxide, condiments, and antioxidants as prescribed by regulation.

HEALTH

Food and Drinks: Additives

1016. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

Is he aware that some research indicates that certain substances added to food and soft drink products may distort a child's development?

Mr YOUNG replied:

Yes.

HEALTH

Food: Pesticide Residues

1017. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Does The National Health and Medical Research Council conduct tests of a market basket of food to discover the incidence of pesticide residues?
(2) If so, will he table the 1979 and 1980 results?
(3) In comparison with earlier years, are the latest results considered to be better, worse, or much the same?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) Yes.
(2) Yes for 1979; the 1980 results have not yet been released by the council.
(3) Better. There has been a continuing decline in the level of pesticide residues due to public health action and associated improved agricultural practice.

The 1979 results were tabled (see paper No. 183).

EXPLOSIVES

Warnbro Area

1018. Mr BARNETT, to the Deputy Premier:

(1) In view of the fact that the map supplied by him in answer to question 756 of 1981 showed high explosive finds to the north, east, south and west of the Warnbro housing estate, what action has been taken to date to ensure the housing estate is made clear of high explosives?
(2) How many houses are involved in the area?
(3) How many empty blocks are involved in the area?

(4) What future action is proposed to ensure the safety of the families in the housed and subdivided area of Warnbro?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) The joint Commonwealth-State committee set up to direct clearance operations at Warnbro has recommended that clearance of housing areas be given further consideration at a later stage of the project. Its recommendations in this regard have not as yet been received.

(2) and (3) No records have been compiled, as project staff are fully occupied on tasks related to other areas.

(4) It is anticipated that the committee will take safety factors into account when submitting its recommendations.

LESCHENAULT INLET

Boats

1019. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) In answer to question 826 of 1981 he said the Harbour and Light Department was unaware of any requests for speed restrictions within Leschenault Inlet. Has he or the Harbour and Light Department read section 6.3.1 of the Leschenault Inlet management programme which, in part, states management actions recommended are—

(a) restrict access by power boats in sensitive areas;

(b) use speed limits to enhance safety while minimising bank erosion?

(2) In view of the above will he cause investigations to be done into implementing the recommendations?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) and (2) The draft 1979 Leschenault Inlet management programme was amended and has yet to be finalised. Any recommendations on recreational use referred by the Leschenault Inlet Management Authority will receive consideration by the Harbour and Light Department.

FISHERIES

Abalone: Zones

1020. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) In respect of abalone areas 2 and 3, has there been an overlap of these two areas?

(2) When did it occur?

(3) What are the details of old and new boundaries?

(4) Why was it necessary?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) 21 July 1972.

(3) Prior to 21 July 1972, area 2 extended from Augusta to Fanny Cove and area 3 was defined as being the west coast.
Subsequent to 21 July 1972, area 2 extended from Fanny Cove to Busselton and area 3 from Leeuwin to Wyndham.

(4) Area 2 divers were restricted to taking only green-lipped and black-lipped abalone and area 3 divers were restricted to taking only Roe's abalone. Green-lipped abalone were found to occur on the west coast north of cape Leeuwin—where they had not previously been known to occur—and with the agreement of divers area 2 was extended to Busselton so that area 2 divers could take green-lipped abalone occuring on the west coast.

RAILWAY

Point Peron-Rockingham

1021. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to his answers to question 796 of 1981 relevant to Rockingham-Point Peron railway, will he provide me with a map showing details of the clearly defined route for the railway line through Rockingham to Point Peron?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The details required by the member are shown on the Shire of Kwinana town planning scheme plans nos. 2 and 6 which may be sighted at the Shire of Rockingham or alternatively at the Town Planning Development.

BOATS

Rockingham: Marina

1022. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

(1) Has any approach been made to the Government by "The Cruising Yacht Club of WA" currently based in Rockingham or its representatives in respect of a site for a marina?

(2) What sites have been—

(a) requested by the club;

(b) investigated by the Government?

(3) What results are there to the investigations?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) The club sought consent from Rockingham Shire Council to redevelop the existing site in Val Street;

(b) (i) the old turtle factory site, Point Peron.

(ii) Mangles Bay—

(1) near the public launching ramp, Palm Beach; and

(2) between Wanliss Street, Governor Road, and Rockingham Road.

(3) I understand site (a) was not acceptable to the council and sites (b) (i) and (b) (ii) (1) were not acceptable because of the reservation in the metropolitan region scheme for the proposed outer harbour and lack of sufficient space. However, a site in the vicinity of Governor Road appears suitable from the planning viewpoint. The club has recently made a request to council for a site and details will be forwarded shortly for consideration by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Water Discharges

1023. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) When is it expected that the technical review committee formed to investigate Government and private enterprise options for in-plant treatment of water discharges will bring down a report on its findings?

(2) Will the report be made public?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) For the member's enlightenment, the technical liaison committee was set up to provide environmental advice to such bodies as the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board throughout the consideration of options for handling effluents. In this role the group does not prepare a report, but aims to ensure that environmental aspects are fully considered before a firm recommendation is made to Government.

(2) Not applicable.

JERVOISE BAY

Marine Industries

1024. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) Is it a fact that the Environmental Protection Authority report on the Jervoise Bay proposal recommended further studies to assess the potential problem of sand blasting and spray painting from industries based on Jervoise Bay?

(2) Is the Environmental Protection Authority aware that as indicated in answers to question 829 of 1981 the Minister for Health considers these studies to be now unnecessary?

(3) Is the Environmental Protection Authority satisfied that the changes made indicate no need for the originally recommended studies?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) The EPA relies upon the expert knowledge of the department of health and medical services in such matters.

The Department of Conservation and Environment has been advised of the stringent guidelines for applications for consent to undertake sandblasting and believes that the EPA's concerns are adequately satisfied. The guidelines have been specifically developed to ensure that the potential problems identified by the EPA will not arise.

FISHERIES

Owen Anchorage

1025. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Further to his answers to question 802 of 1981 relating to shellfish, is it considered unnecessary to test shellfish from Owen Anchorage for bacteriological content just because they are not processed for sale?
(2) What are the criteria for not testing?
(3) Is he able to indicate whether shellfish from this area are taken for consumption by amateurs?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) No.
(2) Having determined on previous occasions that pollution was present, the public were advised through the media and by public notice.
Should ocean monitoring indicate an alteration in the situation further action would be warranted.
(3) No.

FISHERIES

Cockburn Sound

1026. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

Further to his answers to my question 801 of 1981 in respect of the contamination by heavy metals of fish and shellfish in Cockburn Sound, would he please produce the charts and test results which substantiate his claim that a reduction has occurred?

Mr YOUNG replied:

The information available to the department is contained in the list tabled herewith.

The information was tabled (see paper No. 184).

LESCHENAULT INLET

Foreshore Reserves

1027. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Further to his answers to questions 645 and 790 of 1981 relating to reserves, would the Minister please supply a detailed list of the areas with physical or biological characteristics necessitating larger reserves in the area controlled by the Leschenault Inlet Management Authority?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No such list has been made. Proposals for reservation are assessed individually as they arise.

ALUMINA REFINERIES

Alcoa of Australia Ltd.: Caustic Mud Lakes

1028. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Further to the Minister's answers to my question 794 of 1981 relating to the Alcoa mud lakes, wherein he claimed plans available on the Alcoa mud lakes seepage problems were "complex and require technical explanation and as such are not suitable for general use", will the Minister—

(a) provide me with the details;
(b) arrange for his department to brief me on the leaks and the possibilities of recovery?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(a) The Minister provided details in answer to specific questions in question 794 of 1981. If the member were to ask further specific questions the details would be provided.
(b) No.

HEALTH

Chromium

1029. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

Would he please provide me with details of the effect of chromium on the human body?

Mr YOUNG replied:

No, it is not my business to educate the member in any respect whatever. Details of the effect of chromium on the human body are readily available in any textbook on toxicology.

COCKBURN SOUND

Chittleborough Report: Soluble Fluorides

1030. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) Is it a fact that the Chittleborough report on Cockburn Sound calls for further studies into the problems caused by the input of soluble fluorides into the sound?

(2) Why have these studies not been done, even though they were recommended over 18 months ago?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) No. The member is referred to the final report of the Cockburn Sound environmental study which made no such specific recommendation. Page 57 of that report foresees that land disposal of waste gypsum caused this input of fluoride to the sound.

(2) Not applicable.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Warnbro Sound

1031. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

In respect of his answers to my question 805 of 1981 relating to effluent disposal, what precisely is being done in the studies on the proposed Point Peron effluent disposal, and in what precise areas has it been done?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Studies being carried out include the following—

(a) Survey of the structure and stability of the seabed along the route of the proposed pipeline;

(b) measurement of waves, storm surges and near bottom water velocities in the area;

(c) a study of water circulation in the area through all seasons;

(d) prediction of effluent dispersion including direction of travel and downstream dilution;

(e) description of marine life within the potential area of effect, and commercial and recreational importance;

(f) assessment of potential impact on marine life and upon other users of the area.

Observations are being taken up to 20 km offshore and 25 km along the coast from the vicinity of Warnbro Sound to north of Garden Island.

COCKBURN SOUND

Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Ltd.

1032. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) Is the Minister aware that since the blast furnace at AIS closed down for relining there have been many reports that water clarity in Cockburn Sound adjacent to the plant has improved from approximately 18 inches visibility to 20 to 30 feet?

(2) Will he have his officers examine the claims with a view to logging the difference when the plant reopens?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) No.

(2) Water clarity is being measured.

COCKBURN SOUND

CSBP and Farmers Ltd.

1033. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) What action has been taken by the Minister to back up the assertion by his department on page 24 of the

Environmental Protection Authority and Conservation and Environmental Council reports 1979-80 in respect of the CSBP proposals to landfill with gypsum—
The initial site chosen by the company and the preparation proposed has led the EPA to express concern since it is a wetland with high water table and uncertain load-bearing characteristics. The Authority's concern relates to the problem of preventing contaminants in the gypsum stockpile being leached into the groundwater which ultimately finds its way into Cockburn Sound?

(2) Why is the Minister allowing this dumping to happen?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) As a result of the Department of Conservation and Environment's involvement in discussions with the company and the various Government authorities involved, conditions have been applied to the licence to dispose of the gypsum waste granted to the company by the Metropolitan Water Board under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act.

COCKBURN SOUND

Effluent: Treatment

1034. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) Further to the Minister's answers to my question 810 of 1981 relating to effluent treatment, where is the effluent from—

(a) Eagle Wools;
(b) Anchorage Butchers;
(c) McGilvrays Tannery;
(d) Eagle West;

now discharged, and with what precautions for the environment?

(2) What are the minor process improvements which affect the effluent of—

(a) WA Meat Exports;
(b) Robb Jetty;
(c) Watsons Foods;
(d) Shilkins Tannery;
(e) Crayboats Co-operative;
(f) Coogee Fellmongers?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) As this will take some time to collate the information will be forwarded directly to the member.

LAND ACT

Amendment

1035. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands and Forests:

(1) Is it proposed to amend the Land Act to enable the Nornalup Inlet to be made a national park?

(2) If "Yes", when is it expected that amending legislation for this purpose will be introduced?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

(1) and (2) In answer to question 403 asked by the member on 8 April 1981, it was stated that the Government is currently examining the ramifications of permitting submerged lands to be declared conservation reserves and determining how this proposal could best be achieved. It was also stated that no final decisions had been taken and this is still the situation.

AQUATIC RESERVE

Nornalup-Walpole Inlet

1036. Mr H. D. Evans, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) Is it intended to introduce legislation to create an aquatic reserve or national park of the Nornalup-Walpole national park?

(2) If "Yes"—

(a) when is it expected that such legislation for this purpose will be introduced;

(b) what in principle will be the purpose of such legislation?

(3) If "No" to (1), what is the intention of the Government in the longer term for the administration and management of this inlet?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) The matter of future management of the Nornalup-Walpole Inlets is currently under consideration by the National Parks Authority, the general fisheries advisory committee, and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife.

(2) and (3) Upon receipt of recommendations from these bodies the Minister will make an appropriate recommendation to Cabinet, noting that the recommendation of the Environmental Protection Authority, which has been endorsed by Cabinet, reads—

> until legislation is enacted to allow conservation reserves to include submarine lands, the Fisheries Act be employed to protect the Broke and Walpole-Nornalup Inlets and the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife be made responsible for their protection.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Developers: Contribution to State

210. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

(1) My question concerns the exploits of the Fraser "razor gang" and the attitude and role of the Prime Minister in terms of the financial treatment he has meted out to the States in recent days. With that as a backdrop, did the Premier see the article in tonight's edition of the *Daily News* suggesting that developers may feel the crunch in Western Australia?

(2) Is the Premier aware of the deal done by the Premier of Queensland whereby developers in that State are now contributing $112 million per year profit to the Queensland railway system, which goes into Consolidated Revenue?

(3) Does the Premier and Treasurer of Western Australia intend to review the position of resource developers in Western Australia with a view to having them meet a greater part of the increasing financial burden placed on the State?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) to (3) I suggest that if the member wants a considered answer to such a question he should place it on the notice paper. However, I will make passing reference to the last part of his question. We were the pacesetters in Australia in getting developers to make a contribution to the development of our State. Literally hundreds of millions of dollars are already invested in permanent assets in our State by developers in the way of towns, railways, ports, water supplies, and in all forms of schools and hospitals. I am amazed the member raised a question in the context he did. People throughout the world were staggered that we were able to get companies to do so much and at the same time pay a royalty. However, in Queensland the Government has an entirely different system. It has elected to run its railways for most of the projects as part of the revenue-producing side of things. I invite the member to consider the Queensland railways overall and suggest he compares that with how we are performing in this State. It would not do him any harm to look at what Western Australia has done and is doing, because he should be proud of the fact that we have taken the initiative in many of these things. We broke new ground during the development of iron ore, nickel, and alumina. Beyond saying I have not seen the article he mentioned, I suggest that he, firstly, gets behind his own State and, secondly, places his question on the notice paper if he wants a considered answer.

WATER RESOURCES

Greenbushes

211. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Works:

I preface my question by indicating that having regard to the fact that the catchment area of the Greenbushes water supply includes the townsite area together with the fowlyards and horse stables, and the prevalence of water birds on existing stored water, could he advise—

(1) whether there have been any complaints this year regarding the quality of the Greenbushes town water supply, and from what sources have these been received?

(2) What solution to the Greenbushes town water supply problem is proposed in—

(a) the immediate future, and

(b) the long term?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) I know the honourable member does normally give notice of such questions but I have not received any information on this occasion. I will endeavour to give him an answer tomorrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Rates: Alternative Systems

212. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Local Government:

(1) Has the Government yet received a report from the committee which was inquiring into alternative rating systems?

(2) Does the Government intend to make that report public, and if so, when can we expect the report to be made public?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

(1) and (2) In fact, there are three studies relating to rating systems: One by the Department of Local Government, one by the Local Government Association, and one by a committee commonly referred to as the McCusker committee.

Mr Carr: That is the one.

Mrs CRAIG: The McCusker committee of inquiry into rates and taxes does not have a responsibility to report to me. I believe its responsibility to report is directed to the Premier, so I think the member would be best advised to direct his question to the Premier.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Rates: McCusker Committee

213. Mr CARR, to the Premier:

(1) Has the McCusker committee yet reported to the Government?

(2) If so, does the Government intend to make the report public?

(3) If it is to be made public, when is it likely to be made public?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) to (3) Up to the time of my departure to the Premiers' Conference I had not received a copy of the report. Certainly I will follow it up for the member. My understanding is that after the Government has had a chance to study the report it will become a public document. I will know more about that when I have had a chance to see it. The last information I had was that if it is not finished it is so close to being finished it does not matter, and that I will receive the report in its final form fairly soon.

LAND

Ord River District

214. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

Some notice of this question was given by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is as follows—

(1) Have any Ord River farmers been informed that they will forfeit their blocks if they do not comply with the letter of their conditional purchase agreements, and plant specified crops this season?

(2) If "Yes" to (1)—

(a) How many farmers have been so informed;

(b) what is the choice of crops they are required to grow;

(c) what area of crop are these farmers required to grow?

(3) (a) In what years did each of the farmers upon whom notice to grow a crop to comply with CP conditions each obtain their blocks;

(b) have all other Ord River farmers complied with their CP conditions; and

(c) did the blocks from the Hooker sale division released last year contain CP conditions which require the growing of a crop and, if so, what is the reason for the double standard of conditions to Ord River farmers?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

I thank the member for having given notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) Two are currently under notice of forfeiture;

(b) the lease agreement does not specify the crop to be grown; and

(c) 80 hectares.

(3) (a) Lease commenced on one of the locations on 1 April 1964, and the other on 1 April 1965;

(b) the most recent inspection, August 1980, revealed that the majority had complied, whilst others were carrying out development work in order to comply, and further follow-up inspections to observe progress with development are to be undertaken; and

(c) King locations 566, 567, 568, 571, 572, and 574 were released under special settlement conditions as particularised in the *Government Gazette* of 3 October 1980. The reference to double standards is not understood.

STATE FINANCE

State Income Tax

215. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

(1) Was the subject of State income tax discussed at the recent Premier's Conference?

(2) Has he changed his position with regard to the implementation of State income tax in Western Australia?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) The question of State income tax might have been mentioned in passing by the Prime Minister or one of his Ministers, but I could not be categoric about that. It was not discussed in an official manner by either the Federal Government or the State Governments, although it may have been in the course of the Prime Minister's comments in attempting to convince us we had other sources of revenue, that he referred to it in passing only. It was not part of a serious debate.

As far as I am concerned and all the other Premiers are concerned our postion is unchanged; we have made it clear to the Commonwealth on previous occasions and made it equally clear on this occasion there was no change of view of any of the Premiers.

STATE FINANCE

Commonwealth Funds: State Options

216. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Premier:

What options in the face of the Prime Minister's repeated refusal to accommodate the requests of our Premier and the Premiers of all other States does the Government now face in the pursuit of the reversal of or change in the policies being implemented by the Fraser Government?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The options that confront this Government as confront all other State Governments are: Firstly, that we consider the outcome of the pronouncements made yesterday by the Commonwealth Government, and then await the further outcome of the subsequent meeting to be held in June, because the Commonwealth was not prepared yesterday to make any pronouncement about the amount of General Loan Funds or semi-Government borrowings that were to be approved. These are crucial because in the past few years there has been a tendency to cut them down in real terms and, sometimes, in dollar terms. Therefore, we are all concerned as to what will be the decisions. The indicators are that the Commonwealth believes it must still further cut back

Commonwealth funds available to the State Governments as part of its overall financial policy. I hope it will not as a result of yesterday, and will have received the message from the State Governments about their financial needs. Secondly, we must consider after the Ministers for Health meet on Friday what the end result will be so far as the States are concerned in respect of health funding. The Commonwealth is insistent that it will not impose any financial burdens on us, but we will believe that after the Ministers for Health have come to grips with the problem.

Thirdly, we must determine when we meet again on 19 June whether the Commonwealth will impose any further unilateral decisions in regard to cutting back specific purpose grants. Again it was not prepared to give an undertaking yesterday on that matter. One can but await the final outcome.

Another option available to the State Governments is to make some representations to the Prime Minister in the hope when he sees the result of yesterday's decisions in stark reality that he will be prepared to reconsider the Commonwealth's decisions. I would not be too sanguine about that because the Prime Minister and his colleagues were quite adamant yesterday that that was as far as they would go.

I can assure the member that some forcible arguments were put forward as to why the decisions were an abrogation of the arrangement in respect of tax sharing, and, certainly, the amount of money proposed in the new arrangements is inadequate for our needs.

We therefore come to the further option that we must examine how much we can curtail our services and thereby save money. By what means we do that is yet to be decided.

In regard to the additional sources of revenue available I would not make any conjecture about that at this stage, because far too much must be found out about the final amount we are to receive from Canberra.

LAND

Ord River

217. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

This question arises from the reply given by the Minister representing the Minister for Lands to the question just asked by the member for Kimberley. I preface my question by stating the fact that two farmers in the Ord River area are under notice of forfeiture if they do not comply with the CP conditions and grow specified crops to meet those conditions. It is as follows—

(1) Will he explain what crops can be grown commercially and would be viable in the Ord River area on a small scale sufficient to meet the conditions?

(2) What crops are these that can be grown commercially and viably?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) I suggest the member place his question on the notice paper because I could not quite follow the import of it. I listened to the answer given by the Minister representing the Minister for Lands, but I would need to consider both questions and the answer in detail before I could reply.

Some crops are showing great promise in that area. The member would know there are probably more acres under cultivation there today than in the boom days of cotton growing.