

A great deal of concern is being expressed by people who are becoming more and more hedged in and who are finding it increasingly difficult to enjoy their particular recreations. However, I believe it is reasonable to support the Bill as it is. I agree that the way in which the Bill is administered will depend very much on the attitude of those responsible for its administration. It is quite possible that a form of dictatorship could be created.

The manner in which the regulations are administered depends very much on the tone of the administration by the Government. Whether it be the present parties or the Labor Party in government I believe in our society that is not the attitude of Governments, even though for party-political propaganda reasons one side or the other is accused of these things.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would like to make one more comment. Mr Wordsworth brought up this matter, and in the notes Mr Brian O'Brien has supplied to me he says—

The importance of the Bill to the southwest of the State has also been stressed. There is no question that the region is of very great importance to the tourist industry, and national parks should be provided and managed for that industry, for local residents and for conservation.

Several speakers have mentioned the importance of access to coastal areas and with this I completely agree. I am advised that recent meetings of officers of the Department of Conservation and Environment with local authorities, including the Esperance Shire Council have paid particular attention to this matter and I am confident that it can be resolved satisfactorily.

I wanted that incorporated in *Hansard* to ensure Mr Wordsworth knew the matter was under consideration.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am glad the Minister raised this issue because the shire is very concerned about it and its recommendations were that national parks should not reach the waterfront but that access should remain along the beach so that it may continue to be used as it has been used for generations. I hope the national parks authority will take that into account.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr O'Brien agrees.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 6.03 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 20th May, 1976

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

TOTALISATOR AGENCY AT LEONORA

Closure: Petition

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [2.17 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed to you, Mr Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly. It is signed by people at Leonora, and it calls upon the Government to restore betting facilities at Leonora following the closure of the TAB agency there recently, either by the reopening of that agency or the registration of an off-course bookmaker. The petition is signed by 126 persons and I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the House.

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

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 241).

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): For the information of the House, and in accordance with past custom, I propose to adjourn questions on notice until after the afternoon tea suspension.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR RIDGE (Kimberley—Minister for Lands) [2.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill proposes amendments to the Mental Health Act, 1962-1973, to provide for approval of premises which are conducted as private psychiatric hostels for the accommodation and care of persons who are socially dependent by reason of a mental disorder. These premises cater for the needs of people who have received treatment in an approved psychiatric hospital and have been either discharged or placed on after-care. Under existing arrangements hostel proprietors are paid by the State a subsidy of \$1 per day for each approved resident accommodated.

Provision has been made for the production of audited financial records and balance sheets of private psychiatric hostels. These are to be supplied only if required, and it is envisaged they would be needed only in support of a claim for increased subsidy or where considered necessary in the determination of a complaint relating to a financial matter. It is not intended nor required, that financial returns be submitted on a regular basis.

Provision has been made for the application and issue of a declaration of approval for premises which are conducted as private psychiatric hostels. The persons conducting such premises will also be required to be licensed.

If the Director of Mental Health Services subsequently advises the Minister that the premises are no longer suited to be an approved hostel, or that the licence holder is no longer a fit and proper person to conduct an approved psychiatric hostel, the Minister may revoke the approval and the licence. The licence holder will be given a copy of the director's report together with one month's notice of the intention to consider revocation.

It is considered that existing arrangements under which subsidies are paid to the proprietors of private psychiatric hostels require further clarification and therefore the principal Act is appropriately amended.

In 1974 the community psychiatric division of Mental Health Services was established under a psychiatrist superintendent. The aims of the division include the selection of hostels to provide ongoing rehabilitation for selected patients, and in 1975 additional staff were appointed to assist in the improvement of patient activation and to improve the selection of patients for discharge to these hostels. Although it has been the practice to ensure that adequate medical care is available to residents in private psychiatric hostels the legislation will regularise the situation.

Provision is made for the establishment of boards of visitors to visit and inspect private psychiatric hostels and to be available to interview residents and to receive complaints or recommendations affecting the welfare of residents.

Members of boards will receive fees which are currently \$40 per meeting for the chairman, and \$30 per meeting for members, and are recouped the cost of travel and incidentals. These procedures are consistent with those appertaining to boards of visitors appointed for approved hospitals.

The board will have a direct responsibility to the Minister and is required to undertake visits to, and inspections of, private psychiatric hostels, and to concern itself with general patient welfare matters. Each hostel must be visited once in each two months and inspections carried out every four months or as often as the Minister requests.

The attention of members is drawn to the provisions of the Mental Health Act, 1962-1973, relating to the appointment and responsibilities of boards of visitors and to the specific sections dealing with approved private hospitals. It will be noted that much of the existing legislation has been adapted to suit the proposals with regard to private psychiatric hostels.

Provision is also made for the annual approval of premises which are conducted as private hostels, day activity centres, and sheltered workshops for the intellectually handicapped, and with similar provision in respect of standards of care and facilities relating to private psychiatric hostels.

Similarly provision is made for the issue of licences annually to fit and proper persons applying to conduct approved premises as a private hostel, day activity centre, or sheltered workshop for the intellectually handicapped. The provisions which apply to private psychiatric hostels in relation to the issue and revocation of declarations of approval and licences will apply to private hostels, day activity centres, and sheltered workshops.

Provision is also made for the payment of grants and subsidies towards the cost of maintenance of private hostels, day activity centres, or sheltered workshops for the intellectually handicapped.

The provisions for the establishment of boards of visitors have not been extended to cover facilities for the intellectually handicapped as it is not considered that such provisions are necessary under the existing system of co-operation which has been established between the department and the two voluntary organisations concerned.

Regulations will be necessary for the carrying out of and giving effect to the legislation.

It is proposed that a fee of \$10 per declaration of approval and a fee of \$5 per licence per annum will be prescribed by regulation. However, hostels, day activity centres, and sheltered workshops not conducted for profit shall be exempt from payment of the prescribed fees.

Under the regulations it is proposed that the Director, Mental Health Services will prepare a brochure outlining the standard of buildings, equipment and furniture, and the provision of services required. Copies of the brochure will be made available to interested persons.

Provision will also be made for the safety, health and welfare of residents in, and attenders at, premises approved under the legislation.

By mutual arrangement some staff of the Slow Learning Children's Group are already undergoing training with the mental deficiency division of Mental Health Services and it is proposed to extend this scheme.

Regulations will also provide minimum nutritional food standards for residents in hostels.

It is considered that residents in private hostels should be guaranteed a minimum proportion of any age or invalid pension received on their behalf to be applied for their own personal use to enable them to purchase items of clothing, toilet requisites and other desirable items. Pensioners accommodated in departmental hospitals and

hostels currently retain part of their pension for their own personal requirements. It is considered that part of the basic pension should also be provided to residents in private psychiatric hostels and private hostels for the intellectually handicapped for their own personal use.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Davies.

FINANCIAL AGREEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [2.27 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to approve the execution of an agreement dated the 5th February, 1976, entered into by the Commonwealth of Australia and the six States to amend the financial agreement. The amending agreement is included in a schedule to the Bill.

Section 105A of the Australian Constitution provides that the Commonwealth may make agreements with the States with respect to the public debt of the States, and further provides that any such agreement may be varied by the initiating parties.

The financial agreement was entered into under section 105A by the seven Governments in December, 1927. It provided for the assumption by the Commonwealth of State debts on terms set out in the agreement and established the Australian Loan Council to co-ordinate and regulate future sinking fund provisions on State debts.

The provisions of the agreement have been amended several times by subsequent agreements.

The present amendments are principally concerned with the assumption of liability by the Commonwealth Government for \$1 000 million of State debt in accordance with the undertaking given in 1970 by the then Prime Minister when a new financial assistance grant formula for the five-year period 1970-71 to 1974-75 was determined.

The amendments also seek to update and streamline the operation of other provisions of the agreement, encompass new and simplified sinking fund provisions on State debt, provide greater flexibility in Loan Council procedures and remove certain obsolete provisions from the financial agreement.

In the five-year period between 1970-71 and 1974-75 the Commonwealth provided financial assistance to the States to progressively meet interest and sinking fund contributions on \$1 000 million of State debts. The first payments in 1970-71 were in respect of interest and sinking

fund payments on \$200 million and a further \$200 million of debt was "taken over" each year in this way until, in 1974-75, the Commonwealth was meeting the debt charges on a total of \$1 000 million.

In Western Australia's case, we received a grant of \$5.5 million in 1974-75 which represented the debt charges on a total of \$96.1 million.

The final step in this process was to be the formal transfer of the debt to the Commonwealth following which the States would be relieved of the debt charges and the need for offsetting grants would cease.

It was agreed by the Australian Loan Council at its meeting in June, 1974, that assumption by the Commonwealth Government of liability for the \$1 000 million of State debts should be effected by amendment to the financial agreement. The amending agreement, which it is now proposed to ratify, gives effect to that decision.

The actual securities to be taken over by the Commonwealth Government and the amounts involved are set out in a schedule attached to the amending agreement.

Sinking fund provisions: The opportunity has been taken to adopt a greatly simplified approach to the determination of sinking fund contributions by the States.

The sinking fund provisions of the 1927 financial agreement provided for Commonwealth and State contributions to be made in relation to State debt outstanding at the 30th June, 1927, as set out in the agreement. Contributions on new debt incurred since that date have been calculated on each loan issued on behalf of the States since 1927, involving voluminous and complex calculations on behalf of each State each year.

The proposed new procedure provides for sinking fund contributions each year to be calculated as a simple percentage of the net debt of each State outstanding at the 30th June of the preceding year.

The new rates of contribution have been calculated to provide sinking fund receipts comparable to the projected amounts payable under the previous arrangements and no State will incur any extra costs compared with those arising under the previous arrangements.

The contributions on debt outstanding at the 30th June, 1927, were due to cease at the 30th June, 1985, and the new provisions take into account the reduction in contributions which would have been consequent to this.

More specifically the new sinking fund arrangements on State debt provide for specified contributions by the Commonwealth and State Governments for 1975-76 adjusted in each subsequent year until 1984-85 by a percentage of the difference in net State debt outstanding at the 30th

June of the year preceding the contribution and net debt outstanding at the 30th June, 1975.

As from and including 1985-86, annual contributions payable by each State will equal 0.85 per cent and by the Commonwealth 0.28 per cent of net debt of each State outstanding at the preceding 30th June. This avoids the complexities inherent in linking sinking fund payments to the securities issued in each loan on behalf of the States.

Accounting procedures for expenditure under the new sinking fund arrangements have been greatly simplified with all costs associated with the repurchase or redemption of State debt being a charge on the sinking fund.

The National Debt Commission will continue to control the State sinking funds but can arrange with a State to act as its agent in making payments to bondholders.

The new arrangements will provide for effective and simply calculated payments for the retirement of State debt.

Loan Council procedures: The opportunity has also been taken to effect other small changes to the agreement to expedite proceedings of the Australian Loan Council. These provide that the nomination by a member of the Loan Council of a substitute Minister as his representative will now include any person acting in that capacity for the time being, and that decisions by the Loan Council on the amount and allocation of Government loan programmes can now be made by correspondence without the necessity to hold a formal meeting to endorse the decision.

The amending agreement provides for the omission of several clauses in the financial agreement which no longer have force.

Also included is a provision for retrospective effect of the agreement from the 30th June, 1975. The agreement cannot be operative until legislation to approve its execution is enacted by all Parliaments.

Members will have access through the normal channels at Parliament House to a 1973 reprint of the financial agreement made between the Commonwealth and the State should they wish to refer any aspects of the Bill and the schedules to that particular document.

Also it will be known to members that we have suspended Standing Orders in respect of this Bill, but my understanding is that the Leader of the Opposition will adjourn the debate until next Tuesday which will allow plenty of time for it to go through this Chamber and through another place before this part of the session terminates.

The SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the Premier to table that paper?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, Mr Speaker, because it is a document which is already readily available to members. I checked with the Treasury and I have

been assured that copies are available to members through the normal channels. If anybody is in difficulty in acquiring a copy I shall obtain one for him. I commend the Bill.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Second Reading

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Local Government) [2.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend the provisions of the Local Government Act in respect of two matters. Firstly, it proposes that specific power be written into the Local Government Act to permit councils to place obstructions in streets to prohibit the flow of vehicular traffic.

It is often desirable in the interests of traffic safety or traffic regulation, for a council to close off a street at its intersection with another by means of raised paving or some other form of barricade. The effect, of course, is to convert the particular street into a cul-de-sac. The street is not in any way closed to pedestrian traffic but only to vehicular traffic.

In introducing this amendment, I think I should inform members that many councils have in fact installed such obstructions in the past in the belief that the Local Government Act did confer the necessary authority. Recently, however, the Crown Law Department gave its opinion that the provisions of the Local Government Act which were thought to give this authority, did not in fact do so.

There are provisions in the Local Government Act which can be used to authorise the temporary closure of streets by forming them into culs-de-sac for experimental purposes but there is nothing to authorise closures of this nature on a more permanent basis. In other words, if an experimental closure were successful, there is presently no power for it to be continued on a permanent basis.

This Bill therefore seeks to fill this gap in the Local Government Act and also to authorise those closures which have been purported to have been made under legislative provisions which have now been found to be deficient.

The second matter covered by this Bill concerns the composition of the Building Advisory Committee which is constituted under the Local Government Act.

The Building Advisory Committee is established to advise the Minister with respect to any matter touching on the provisions of the Act covering building standards. In particular, the Building Advisory Committee exercises a detailed

surveillance over the uniform building by-laws and recommends any amendment to these by-laws which it considers necessary.

Building Advisory Committee members are appointed by the Minister but, as the Act stands at present, its complement is restricted to seven members.

It has always been considered necessary to keep the membership of this committee to the maximum of seven to ensure a reasonable representation of the various areas of expertise and interest in building matters.

From time to time, representations have been made by other organisations having a particular interest in building matters, to be represented on the committee.

The WA Fire Brigades Board is one such body which has repeatedly advocated that it could make a worth-while contribution by taking part in the committee's work.

However, it would be inappropriate to dispense with any of the existing members in order to make room for a representative of the Fire Brigades Board or any other organisation.

I believe the problem would best be resolved by removing the upper limit of the membership of the Building Advisory Committee. This would provide a degree of flexibility and allow the membership to be increased or decreased as is appropriate from time to time.

This Bill therefore seeks to remove the present limit.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Taylor.

BULK HANDLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.41 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As members are aware, section 31 (1) of the Bulk Handling Act, 1967-1974, provides for the payment of a foundation toll of \$1.84 per tonne or such lesser toll as the Governor may from time to time fix by Order-in-Council.

Payments received from this toll may be applied by Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited for additional capital expenditure, for the repayment of moneys borrowed for that purpose, and for replacing losses incurred by the company in the conduct of its business. The maximum permissible charge has not been reviewed since the Act was updated in 1967.

Indications are that grain production will continue to expand in Western Australia and there will be a need for additional capital funds if the company is

to continue to maintain its construction programme at the same rate as in past years.

Because of the continued escalation in costs and the expansion in crop production the company has requested that the foundation toll be increased from \$1.84 to \$2.94. The Bill before the House is intended to give effect to this request.

The present position is that a foundation toll of \$1.10 per tonne is being charged and this may be increased to a maximum of \$1.84 per tonne by Order-in-Council. Co-operative Bulk Handling has requested that such an Order-in-Council be made.

In order that an additional security be available to lenders in the event of a year of poor crop yields the company has requested that the maximum permissible foundation toll be now increased from \$1.84 per tonne to \$2.94 per tonne.

I commend the Bill to members.

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

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 13th May.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [2.44 p.m.]: In the light of the fact that the purpose of the Bill is to establish a more effective and meaningful structure to achieve better co-ordination and future development of post-secondary education in Western Australia, the Opposition supports the Bill in general terms. However, the Opposition desires to sound serious warnings about several clauses in the Bill. Having considered the Bill in some detail, the Opposition has some reservations about those clauses, to which I will draw attention later.

So while we give general support to the need to establish what has been commonly called WAPSEC—that is, Western Australian post-secondary education commission—it is important that at the outset we sound a warning about the fact that no-one in the Chamber or in the education enterprise generally can reliably predict exactly where developments will head once the body has been established.

We are, in fact, revamping and reactivating the Tertiary Education Commission established in 1970. This is being done because that commission has not fulfilled its tasks as completely as we might have expected it would and, more importantly, because developments have outstripped the capacity of the TEC to cope with issues which have arisen.

Our concern is that because so many clauses are expressed in vague terms it is possible for different interpretations to be

placed on them. I propose to refer to some of them in more detail a little later. By the very nature of the legislation it almost follows that no-one can predict exactly what form of co-ordination or control will eventuate under the Bill because it is almost impossible to legislate for co-operation, co-ordination and rationalisation.

The purpose of the Bill is to establish a commission which will overview in an umbrella fashion every post-secondary education institution in the State. It has become patently clear, by 1976, that the eight tertiary institutions in our State require some form of overriding supervision. I do not want to use the term "supervision", but in fact that is ultimately what the commission will accept as one of its responsibilities. This form of co-ordination from above is what is seen to be necessary and many arguments can be given to illustrate the need for it.

However, the problem we face with this type of legislation is that it is difficult to legislate for sensible co-ordination and co-operation between the universities, WAIT, and the colleges of advanced education. The kind of co-operation we expect is something which really grows only out of sensible relationships between the administrative bodies of all those institutions—the decision-making bodies. This is why I say it is very difficult for us to know exactly what sort of development and what forms of co-ordination will occur. Of course the people in most of the institutions are fearful of what will occur because it is almost impossible to predict what forms of control will be exercised over their traditional areas of autonomy.

The irony we face at the present time involves the substantial difference between the national and State control. The difference between the financial and statutory responsibilities is causing complications and there is a question mark above the future of the commission.

We have the situation where the Federal Government is financially responsible for funding all tertiary institutions whereas in fact those tertiary institutions are established by virtue of Acts of this Parliament. So the statutory authority for tertiary education resides with the State Parliaments, but as a result of decisions by the Whitlam Labor Government funding of all tertiary education institutions now rests with the Commonwealth.

So when we begin to examine how co-ordination and co-operation between all of these institutions and the State Government will be achieved, and relate that to the national funding commissions which supply the funds for these institutions, we see there are many grey areas and a whole host of difficulties for the future.

The Bill arises directly out of the Partridge committee report. Members of this Chamber are well aware that during

the 1960s rapid growth took place in enrolments in tertiary institutions in Western Australia, and during the life of the Brand Government the Jackson committee reported with the recommendation that the first Tertiary Education Commission be established. The brief given to that commission was to act as an over-viewing, co-ordinating body for tertiary education institutions in this State. That particular commission was established in 1970.

Since 1970 a number of very important developments has created pressure for further changes. There has been the separation of the teachers' colleges from the Education Department. There was the establishment in 1972 of a Teacher Education Authority to overview all of the teachers' colleges. There has been a rapid expansion at WAIT, and we have seen the establishment of the State's second university—the Murdoch University. Most importantly, since 1970 we have seen the financial responsibility for tertiary education institutions assumed by the Commonwealth Government.

With these developments, by the end of 1974 the Tertiary Education Commission recommended to the Government that another survey be undertaken, and it was the Government's decision to appoint the Partridge committee. The report of that committee made 20 recommendations, and the most fundamental, wide-sweeping, and important of those changes in terms of structures was the recommendation which is the basis of this piece of legislation. The Partridge committee reported to the Government that a post-secondary education commission should be established in Western Australia, and made suggestions as to the powers and functions of such a commission and how it should be composed.

All of us in this Chamber have received varying amounts of literature from the different institutions which have a vested interest in the Partridge report and, subsequent to the report, this particular Bill. Letters which have come to me expressed views as to whether or not the Western Australian post-secondary education commission ought to be established and whether or not certain functions should be extended to the new commission. Most importantly, we have received quite a lot of information from the different institutions within the tertiary sector on their views as to how this new body should be composed. I might add there is certainly no unanimity within any of the political parties or the educational institutions as to how the body would best be composed. I do not think it is possible to satisfy everybody in regard to the composition of a commission. So many different value judgments are involved that we could have a whole range of arguments about it.

My contact with all the institutions, both by letter and in person, has led me

to the conclusion that there is undoubtedly a wide consensus of opinion supporting the establishment of a Western Australian post-secondary education commission. The composition of it is a subject for debate. There seem to be two differing schools of thought.

The present Tertiary Education Commission comprises representatives of specific institutions in the tertiary sector. More specifically and importantly, the executive heads of the universities and WAIT are included on that body. There has been a lot of criticism of that structure, and the Partridge report was certainly critical of this type of representation on the ground that if a commission of this kind is composed of the executive heads of all the institutions concerned, at meetings of the commission there will be a group of people with a narrow barrow to push, a very narrow interpretation, and a vested interest to reflect. In my own personal opinion, such a group would not provide the best overview of where the education enterprise ought to be heading, and this is also the opinion of the Partridge committee.

The Partridge committee recommended in its report that the executive heads named in the Bill should not be the representatives of those institutions on the new body. It is suggested instead that there should be selected from society a whole range of people experienced in university research work, advanced education, teacher education, and community groups. I support that concept.

I have only one reservation to make about the structure of the new commission. I think there is a great deal to be said for the view advanced by the Teachers' Union that so far as the two representatives of the university world are concerned at least one of them, if not both of them, could be elected by all the people inside those institutions. As far as the teachers' colleges are concerned, since there will be on the commission a person who is regarded as an expert in teacher education or who has wide experience in that field, my view is that there is merit in allowing all the staff involved in those institutions to elect a representative. Of course, the same could be said of the other categories to be represented on the commission.

I would draw a conclusion on the structure of the commission by indicating that in my view and in the view of my committee members it makes for a superior structure to have people broadly representing the community and having a wide range of experience, rather than to select administrative heads as representatives to play the principal roles on the commission.

The only certainty which will flow from this legislation—and I think it is a rather crucial point—is that there will in the future be more control over the

activities and pursuits of tertiary education institutions than there has ever been in the past. I am certain of that.

Just what form those controls will take and what the extent of the controls will be cannot really be predicted at this stage. However, I sound a warning about it because there is a very sound argument relating to the preservation of intellectual and academic freedom in all these institutions that I propose to put to members shortly.

As far as the universities are concerned, a great deal of argument has been put forward by the representatives of the colleges of advanced education about the alleged intention of the Partridge committee to give the universities a privileged position. In my opinion, this measure does not give the universities the same privileged position suggested by the Partridge committee. I would be happy to point out these particular sections of the Partridge report to any member who feels this is not so.

The point I make here is that if a Government at any time in the future decided it wanted to crack down on the universities in this State it could use this piece of legislation to do so if it felt the desired form and level of co-ordination and co-operation was not forthcoming.

With respect to subsection (1) of proposed new section 12, which leads into the provisions for the functions of the commission stating that due regard must be had for the traditional autonomy of the universities, we could have a wide-ranging debate, lasting for many hours, before we arrived at any agreement as to what that means. I am sure, as far as the future is concerned, the power rests with a State Government to insist upon co-operation and co-ordination from the universities as well as the other branches of tertiary education.

My real concern about the Bill is based on one particular provision on page 9 because of a matter of principle. I do not propose to discuss paragraph (e) in detail, but subparagraph (iii) was the subject of a question asked by me yesterday. I am very disturbed, and I believe everyone who has an interest in tertiary education agrees with me, that the Government has not spelt out clearly its alleged policy in relation to the reintroduction of fees at tertiary education level.

If the Liberal Party in Western Australia and at national level were genuine and sincere that these fees would not be reintroduced at some time in the near future—and members are aware of the many changes of mind we have experienced under the Fraser Administration—that particular provision would not be necessary.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr Blaikie interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I beg your pardon?

Mr Blaikie: You heard me the first time.

Mr BRYCE: Nobody hears the member for Vasse very clearly, and even when we do hear him, he is usually mumbling such irrelevant interjections that it is almost beyond comprehension to relate them to the subject before the Chair.

Mr Blaikie: There are none so blind as those who will not see.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRYCE: Presumably the member for Vasse was in the Chamber yesterday when I asked a question of the Minister representing the Minister for Education about the intention of the Government to introduce fees for classes or courses, examinations, or academic awards conferred at either of the universities, WAIT, or any of the colleges of advanced education.

Mr Blaikie: You have already predecided the answer.

Mr BRYCE: If the honourable member's party was in the position to be straightforward and honest with the public, there would be no need for that provision in the Bill. If the member for Vasse is prepared to listen to the answer provided in this Chamber by his own Minister, he will begin to appreciate the point I am making.

Mr Blaikie: Which I heard yesterday.

Mr BRYCE: The Minister replied that there were no plans to reintroduce fees for tertiary education, but he was replying for the State Government. Of course the State Government does not intend to reintroduce fees, but the State Government is just as much at the mercy of the Fraser Government on the question of the reintroduction of tertiary fees as it was over the question of union ballots. The State Government could be left standing high and dry and very embarrassed. I believe this matter needs to be spelt out because I then asked the Minister whether, if it was not the intention of the Government to reintroduce fees, he would indicate the purpose of this particular provision.

The functions of the commission are spelt out in this proposed new section, and it is suggested that one of the functions of the commission will be to advise the governing authorities of all these tertiary institutions in respect of fees to be charged by and paid to those institutions for classes and courses, examinations, and academic awards. It is a fact of life that fees for classes and courses at post-secondary level of education have been abolished because of the decision of the Whitlam Government. Traditionally, the Liberals in the national Parliament opposed the request from unions connected with education and from many other different groups within society to abolish fees at tertiary level. This same cause was put forward to the Menzies, the Holt, and the Gorton Governments. It was suggested that as primary

and secondary education is free, the third level of education should also be available to people without payment of fees. Of course Malcolm Fraser, as the then Minister for Education, steadfastly opposed the abolition of tertiary fees. He said that this could not be done; that the national Government could not afford it. Of course, this was one of the first actions taken by the Whitlam Government.

Mr Mensaros: What about the \$5 000 million deficit?

Mr BRYCE: If the Minister would speak up, I could hear him.

Mr Mensaros: What about the \$5 000 million deficit? That does not matter from your point of view.

Mr BRYCE: If the Minister would open his eyes a little, he would see the size of the deficit in other western countries.

Sir Charles Court: *Per capita?*

Mr BRYCE: The Premier does not seriously suggest that the deficit was something—

Mr Clarko: It is a national disgrace—unique to Australia.

Mr BRYCE: This illustrates the very narrow thinking and the traditional thought processes of conservatives opposite.

Mr Clarko: It was the highest on record.

Mr BRYCE: Obviously the honourable member does not understand the needs of a country such as ours—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ascot.

Mr BRYCE: —at this particular time in the century. If members opposite could just catch up about a quarter of a century in their thinking, they might get somewhere! They are so old-fashioned and outmoded that it is embarrassing to listen to them.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ascot.

Mr BRYCE: Perhaps the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Development will be game enough now to say that they disagreed with the action taken by the Whitlam Government to spend the estimated \$100 million to abolish tertiary education fees so that this education is available to everyone, and that they believe the fees should be reintroduced. If that is the position they take, I challenge them to be big enough and game enough to say so now.

Sir Charles Court: You and your challenges! You are like a little boy.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier heard the quote I made. We hear this type of comment day after day from the Premier, but let him be game enough to spell out what he really means.

Sir Charles Court: Just keep quiet for a minute and let us ask you this simple question: Do you condone the deficit of \$5 000 million?

Mr BRYCE: I do condone a very large deficit if it is a necessary thing.

Sir Charles Court: What a statement! That will make good reading material at the next election.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier is so old-fashioned and so much a part of nineteenth century economics that he cannot refrain from relating the economics of this nation to the economics of a business.

Several members interjected.

Mr Jamieson: I cannot hear anything!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the debate be conducted in a better vein. There are too many interjections from all sources.

Sir Charles Court: That is nice material for the next election!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Ascot to confine further elaboration on this clause to the Committee stage.

Mr BRYCE: Mr Speaker, I had no intention of discussing the wording of the clause, but it raises a matter which must be spelt out, because it relates to political responsibility. We have heard the Premier decry the large deficit, part of which was due to the national Government's decision to abolish fees at tertiary institutions. I repeat the challenge: If the Premier is game enough, let him say now that he disapproves of the decision, and that these fees should be reintroduced.

Sir Charles Court: We will deal with individual items at the right time. However, we are glad to have it on the record that you condone a deficit of \$5 000 million, which is sending this country bankrupt.

Mr Jamieson: No it is not; that is how much you know about finance.

Sir Charles Court: I am pleased to have it on the record.

Mr Jamieson: Australia is nowhere near bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the continuation of the debate along its present course would have only a tenuous relationship to the contents of the Bill. While it may have some relevance, I do not believe it has sufficient for me to allow the debate to continue in this vein. The member for Ascot.

Mr BRYCE: I was rudely interrupted before I had the opportunity to conclude by quoting the answer to the question asked yesterday which sought to establish whether it was the intention of the State Government to impose tertiary fees; and if it was not the intention of the Government, what was the reason for

including such a subparagraph in the Bill. The answer, in part, was as follows—

Advice to governing authorities of tertiary education institutions concerning fee matters is a retention of an existing function of the Tertiary Education Commission.

For members who are not familiar with the legislation, the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission Act contains a provision allowing the commission to advise universities, WAIT and other institutions as to what fees they should impose for classes and courses.

Since 1973, fees have been abolished at this level of education and, presumably, that clause becomes old hat and is no longer relevant. But when we asked the reason for incorporating the clause in the new Bill, the Liberal Party revealed itself to be completely wonky on this question. The Minister's answer continued—

The Government was advised to retain this function for the new Commission so that in the unlikely event of changes in national policies on fees, then further amendments to the Act to restore the function would be unnecessary.

In that answer, the State Government has spelt out to this Parliament that it is not at all confident that the Fraser Government does not intend to reintroduce fees. The Government is so concerned that may happen that it is insisting this principle is contained in the Bill now before the House.

That is the issue I suggest should be drawn to the attention of every student, parent and institution involved in tertiary education. I serve notice to the Minister that although I have no amendments on the notice paper relating to this Bill, it is my intention to move during the Committee stage for the deletion of that subparagraph.

The most important central theme of concern arising from the Government's decision to introduce this Bill relates to the question of autonomy, and intellectual academic freedom. I am sure all members have received submissions from the teachers' colleges and universities relating to the question of institutional autonomy, intellectual and academic freedom and professional maturity. All these questions are very important, and near and dear to the hearts of the people responsible for keeping our tertiary educational institutions functioning.

The principle of autonomy, or the freedom for people to develop and pursue knowledge at this level of education is terribly important. Only as long as Australia remains free from the clutches of ideological dictatorship, either from the extreme right or the extreme left, will we see the freedom of institutions of learning to

pursue the development and spread of knowledge, despite the reaction of officialdom; this remains a vital cornerstone of our society.

I put it to members that it is basically wrong for any Act of Parliament to permit a legislative basis for interference in, for example, the research programmes conducted by universities. Universities have a particular brief in life. Their basic responsibility is to operate at the forefront of knowledge; to develop and spread knowledge. Their research programmes are a vitally important part of their function, and it would be wrong of any Government or society to turn the research facilities and efforts of universities into the tool of a defence department of a particular Government, or a tool of commerce and business.

It is terribly important that they retain their autonomy to pursue those areas of knowledge, and the development of new ideas, concepts and elements in the way their professional integrity leads them.

It is also very wrong for any Bill to be introduced into this Parliament which could stifle the professionalism of educators in the colleges of advanced education. I think it is a great pity that, in the discussions which followed the release of the Partridge report and the Government's decision to establish this commission, the opinion of colleges of advanced education was not given greater weight and so much attention was given to the universities.

So much in the Bill is vague, and possibly must be vague because it is impossible to be explicit about legislating for co-operation and co-ordination. What in fact should happen is that WAIT, the colleges of advanced education and the universities should work together to ensure that no matter which political party is in power, a sensible amount of co-ordination and co-operation and rationalisation of resources is achieved with a minimum of dislocation to the essential professional autonomy of these bodies in the pursuit of new ideas and the administration of the institutions.

Universities have argued that they should have a privileged position, based on a different function. However, no matter what arguments universities or other tertiary educational bodies advance, all such institutions must accept they have a basic responsibility to the community.

It is the community which funds these institutions, and without the contributions from the taxpayers the institutions would not exist; therefore they do have a fundamental responsibility to heed, to some extent, the desires and wishes of the community.

The question of technical education is also very important to this Bill. Members who have not had the opportunity to study

the intricacies of the Bill in great detail may not be aware of the reason for the change of name from Tertiary Education Commission to post-secondary education commission. The reason is that it is considered desirable to take technical education away from the control of the Education Department, establish a technical and further education authority alongside the other tertiary institutions under the umbrella of this commission, and thus introduce a nontertiary element. Hence the redefining of the term "post-secondary education commission" rather than "Tertiary Education Commission".

The position with regard to technical education itself concerns me greatly, and I know it also concerns a great number of others who are interested in education. The report of the Partridge committee has suggested the establishment of this new authority. I have a worry that this new TAFE authority, alongside the universities, WAIT, and colleges of advanced education, could well become the poor relations of this sector of education. It concerns me greatly, because I believe there is not one other sector of education which requires such a vast and immediate injection of funds as does the technical division.

It does worry me that to some extent the new authority could become the poor relation of this division, as the technical division has been for some years the poor relation of the Education Department. Of course, technical education in that role suffered as a result.

This constitutes the case for replacing the Tertiary Education Commission with the new body referred to as the Western Australian post-secondary education commission. There have been a number of developments in recent years, which have meant that we have to change the structures at this level of education to achieve an intelligent and essential form of co-ordination and rationalisation.

The fantastic growth in tertiary education which occurred in the 1950s and the 1960s has just about come to an end. We are now embarking on a plateau period, and it is anticipated that for the rest of this century there will be nothing like the growth in demand for tertiary education as there was in the last decade or so.

At present 15 110 students attend WAIT and other colleges of advanced education, and 9 387 students attend the two universities. There are eight of these institutions handling tertiary education. If we accept the fact that there are eight different institutions handling this section of education, and that the period of rapid growth in demand has tailed off, then at this stage of our development it becomes essential that extravagant and wasteful duplication does not occur in the courses pursued in these different institutions. We as members of Parliament certainly

have a responsibility to the community to ensure that this form of duplication does not occur.

All the institutions in the 1970s are feeling the effects of the demands for more open forms of education. The demand for different types of education in these institutions means that it is essential for us to have a responsible body to ensure that the inevitable wastage resulting from the lack of co-operation and co-ordination does not occur.

These different tertiary institutions are competing with one another for their share of the resources; they are also competing against other sections of education—primary, secondary, and pre-school—for the available resources. Furthermore, the whole education enterprise is competing against other forms of welfare expenditure for resources. So, once again I stress the need for some form of sensible overview as to the plans for the future, for new institutions, for new horizons, etc.

It is possible that waste and extravagant duplication will creep in. However, it is important for me to qualify my concern about duplication, because duplication in itself is not *prima facie* a bad thing. It may be very desirable in sheer geographical terms, from the point of view of the needs of different parts of the city, to establish schools and courses in different institutions; but unnecessary duplication which results from empire building inside institutions must be prevented. We have come across unnecessary duplication in Government departments, businesses, and the community in almost every form.

Regrettably the education enterprise is not free from this. I believe it is one of our responsibilities in this Parliament to ensure that wasteful extravagance associated with this is eliminated and does not occur.

As far as the Bill is concerned I have referred to the significance of the change in name and the changes in the composition of the commission. It is not a very large Bill. The most important clauses of it deal with the composition of the new commission. The actual functions and duties of the new commission are remarkably similar to those of the old commission; and no doubt this is the principal reason behind the Government's decision to introduce a Bill which seeks to amend the existing Act, rather than to introduce a new Act altogether as was suggested in the Partridge committee report.

If the Government is prepared to follow the recommendations of the Partridge committee, the new Western Australian post-secondary education commission will have some very important tasks ahead of it. This is one of the reasons that I can understand the Minister for Education is keen to see the commission established, as I am sure everybody else is keen to see it established.

The Partridge committee has recommended that it is essential there be a form of inquiry into the training of pre-school teachers in this State forthwith, particularly in respect of the number of different institutions which ought to be handling the training of these teachers.

One of these important recommendations relates to the establishment of comprehensive community colleges in country districts. This is a very interesting new concept. There are in this State towns like Bunbury, Karratha, Port Hedland, and those on the goldfields which are specifically concerned with the terms of the recommendations in the Partridge committee.

It is suggested that community colleges should be established at Bunbury and on the goldfields, and that technical schools should be established at Karratha and Port Hedland with a view to developing these into community colleges in the future.

The new commission will have a very important role to play in terms of the assessment of priorities. Kalgoorlie has a very important interest in the establishment of the commission because one of the first decisions of the commission will be related to the future of the School of Mines in Kalgoorlie. The future of that institution is causing a great deal of anxiety in Kalgoorlie and hopefully the whole question will be thoroughly investigated and a decision made as soon as possible.

The Partridge report also suggested that the new commission should consider the future development of the Western Australian Institute of Technology. WAIT has been criticised with regard to the extent to which it has diversified its activities over the last decade. It has grown enormously. I am not quite sure whether it is bigger than the campus of the University of Western Australia, but certainly it has grown very rapidly. In order that the critics can be answered thoroughly and adequately WAIT should have an opportunity to explain the rationale behind the development which has occurred, and I believe that is something the commission should pursue fairly quickly.

Members in this Chamber also have received some correspondence from those with a close interest in the future of the Graylands Teacher's College, with regard to whether or not it should be phased out. That is an important question, and concerns my colleague the member for Cockburn because it has been suggested the college should be phased out and re-established as a college of advanced education in the Coogee or Fremantle area. Obviously, a decision will not be made until the commission is established. So the suggestion of the Partridge committee that the new commission should hold an inquiry as quickly as possible to determine the future siting, timing and character of future institutions, at the top of the tertiary level, is

very important. The recommendation of the committee that the Technical and Further Education Authority should co-ordinate technical education in this State, in years to come, is something the new commission will have to consider.

A singularly important area on which the commission will have to focus its attention is that of teacher education in Western Australia. Teacher education courses and classes are available at all of the eight tertiary institutions in our State. There is no doubt that some of the competition which has developed between the different institutions, if allowed to continue completely unchecked, will lead to wasteful duplication. It is in this area of education that some form of rationalisation is necessary fairly quickly. That, of course, will surely be one of the areas of immediate concern to the commission.

There is a whole range of reasons to support the establishment of the proposed commission. To reiterate: what we are doing, in fact, in this legislation, is reactivating or reforming the Tertiary Education Commission and establishing a full-time chairman. The composition of the new commission is more likely to be successful and will more readily be able to grapple with the challenges which are involved in trying to achieve co-ordination and rationalisation at the tertiary level of education. It is very important that wasteful duplication and extravagance at the tertiary level of education should be minimal because that is the most expensive level of education which has to be funded. Each unit of duplication becomes very costly as far as society is concerned.

I believe there is a very sound case to be made for the challenge to Governments, of both sides, during the last quarter of this century to re-examine priorities in terms of the resources which are devoted to tertiary education as opposed to primary education.

A tragedy of our present system is that the largest classes exist at the primary level of education where the youngsters have their appetite for learning and their thirst for knowledge whetted for the first time. When the students reach the stage where they can concentrate of their own accord and do not require as much supervision as they required previously, we quite often find the smallest classes. I refer, of course, to the senior secondary and tertiary levels. There are larger lecture groups, of course.

The amount of money spent per head of population at the tertiary level compared with the amount of money spent per head at the primary level leaves a great deal to be desired if we are to achieve a superior form of education during the last quarter of the century. It will not be easy and it will involve an enormous amount of funding. Vested interests will spring to the defence of those areas of education

which it is suggested should take a back seat during the last part of this century. There is no doubt that enormous sums of money will be pumped into tertiary education which should be going into primary education if we are to solve some of the problems which we all recognise exist.

In conclusion, I would say nobody can question where we stand with regard to this legislation. The members of the Parliamentary Labor Party, with the members of the institutions involved, have considered the proposals to establish a Western Australian post-secondary education commission. We support the move by the Government to establish the commission but we do express our concern—our very serious concern—about the decision of the Government to include the provision in clause 13 which will give the commission the right to advise institutions in respect of fees which are to be charged at the institutions.

I reiterate that if there is no intention on the part of the State Liberal Government and the Federal Liberal Government to introduce fees then the clause could be removed from the Bill. The clause has been transferred from the old Act which, in my view, is no longer relative and, certainly, not necessary.

Mr Skidmore: It was not made valid by the Minister in his second reading speech, either.

Mr BRYCE: The other warning I must reiterate to all members concerned is that we have to be absolutely certain what forms of control will be necessary in the hands of the Government or the commission to achieve the co-ordination which is desired.

There is a widely-held consensus of opinion that the commission should be established. It is vitally important for the quality of education in this State that all educational institutions at tertiary level should work together to ensure that the most sensible and responsible forms of rationalisation are co-ordinated, and can be brought about without the sacrifice of academic freedom and institutional autonomy.

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [3.40 p.m.]: I agree with the analysis that has been made by the member for Ascot of the major provisions of the Bill before the Chamber. I also agree with the basic conclusions he has drawn from the salient features of the Partridge committee report in which, of course, this legislation had its genesis.

However, it is with some mixed feelings that I indicate my support for the measure; and I hasten to qualify the support I will give the Bill by saying that in no way is this to be taken as an endorsement of the Partridge committee report because,

in my view, that report is very much like the curate's egg—there are some parts of it which are good and there are some parts of it which are definitely bad.

I believe that the Partridge committee was commissioned by this Government in 1975 and the cardinal error in the commissioning of this committee, and in charging it with certain responsibilities, was that a Government of the same political ilk commissioned the Jackson committee report prior to 1967.

When one considers the personnel of the Jackson committee one finds there was an absence of what one might call elitism. It is true it had the necessary expertise, because on it was the then Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia and the then Director of Education, but there was also community representation and Treasury Department representation. It was the Jackson committee which recommended first of all the establishment of the WA Tertiary Education Commission which, of course, gives its title to the Bill before us.

It is my view that the personnel sitting on the Partridge committee were too much and in too many ways oriented towards university life. This fact becomes patent when one reads not only the recommendations but also the back-up evidence given by the Partridge committee to justify the recommendations it made.

For that reason I believe one must look very closely at the recommendations made by the Partridge committee.

There is another comment I wish to make about that committee, and I am sure, Sir, you will give me the opportunity to do this, because it is so necessary to understand Partridge in order to make the legislation before this Chamber meaningful.

Since the report came to hand in January of this year—and whilst one might say there has been the opportunity in terms of time that has elapsed since that date—in fact there has been very little initiative demonstrated by the Government to involve the public—the community—in dialogue and in the consideration of the report and its recommendations.

It is true a seminar was held in Bunbury a month or so ago, but the persons who gathered at Bunbury to support the Partridge committee report had vested interests in the recommendations of that committee.

There has been great feeling and concern in Kalgoorlie about the Partridge committee inasmuch as its report touched on the role of the School of Mines. But here again it is true that the people who are concerned with that part of the Partridge committee report have a vested interest, too.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.02 p.m.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I pose two questions. The first is: Since the report was made available to the Government in January—I interpolate that this is one of the few reports made available to the Government which has been made available to the public with some expedition, for which I compliment the Government—what opportunity has there been for examination by the community of the global provisions of the report? Secondly, what initiatives have been taken by the Government to provide that opportunity? The answer to both questions appears to be "Nil". I think this is regrettable.

It could have been said that the Government was giving ample time to the community to enable a close study, understanding, and appreciation of the provisions of the Partridge report, but in fact the Government has not done this at all by the presence of the legislation before us; because it has determined that it will implement one part of the Partridge report without having regard to Partridge being examined globally by the community. I do not criticise the Government for this, because in terms of one of the recommendations of Partridge, that on the future role of the School of Mines in Western Australia, I indicate that the Government should have set up an *ad hoc* committee for the purpose of arriving at a quick determination on the matter. I expect and hope that the determination of such an *ad hoc* committee would be to reject that part of the report. So it would be inconsistent for me to criticise the Government for preferring to implement one part of the Partridge report without having regard to the remainder.

I mentioned there are some parts of Partridge with which I violently disagree. I have spoken in this Chamber previously on that part of the report touching on the School of Mines, and it would be repetition on my part to dwell on that recommendation at great length on this occasion. However, I believe the very essence of this legislation—the creation of a commission for the purpose of co-ordinating the various limbs and institutions involved in post-secondary education—refers to one of the major recommendations of Partridge: that such a body first of all should be created, but that such a body should not have jurisdiction over universities.

That is another reason that Partridge is suspect. This is what Partridge had to say to justify the need for a commission to co-ordinate the various interests and activities of institutions providing post-secondary education—

On the other hand, the universities should not be considered as being detached from the State's system of post-secondary education. They compete for funds with other parts of the system, and share many areas of teaching with other post-secondary institutions—for example, educating for the professions of teaching and

engineering. Thus, many of their activities and plans for development necessarily raise issues of co-ordination and the rational use of resources. For these reasons, we agree that a State commission should concern itself with the activities and plans of the universities . . .

That is to be found in paragraph 8.22, page 155 of the report. Having said that, what did Partridge finally recommend? I quote from paragraph 8.21 of the same part of the report, and note the contradiction here—

... we think that the universities, because of their particular characteristics and the richness of the international system from which they draw their strength, should stand in a special relation to the State's system of post-secondary education.

So Partridge finally recommended that a commission designed to co-ordinate all limbs of post-secondary education should not have jurisdiction with regard to universities. That is another reason I believe Partridge is suspect, and hence my qualifying remark that my support for the legislation should not be taken as an endorsement of Partridge as a whole.

However, I am pleased to see that the Government, in the matter of determining whether or not universities should be brought under the umbrella of the proposed Western Australian post-secondary education commission, has agreed that Partridge should not be followed in so far as universities should not be included. I commend the Government for that, but at the same time I think the approach made by the Government is a little wishy-washy, because this is what proposed new section 12(1) says—

(1) The Commission shall have the functions set out in subsection (2) of this section and shall perform those functions subject to the Minister and with due regard to the traditional autonomy of universities and to the major role of universities in areas outside the scope of post-secondary education.

I believe that whilst on the surface it appears the Government, in drawing up this legislation, has not followed Partridge, at the same time I believe it has adopted a formula which in the future may well provide some form of disagreement between the hierarchy of the universities and those who determine policies at the commission level. I say that because it might well be said by the universities, "You have not had due regard to our unique position and the quality of our autonomy."

So I think the Government should look at this clause to ensure without any doubt at all that the commission should have authority to co-ordinate the interests and activities of all limbs of post-secondary education.

Another reason I take umbrage with the Partridge report is its failure to recognise, first of all, the need to continue the tradition of Graylands Teachers College; and, furthermore, to recognise that there is no question that if Graylands is to continue it is most desirable for it to be relocated. The relocation of that college in the Cockburn area would be an added educational asset to the southern part of the metropolitan area. However, Partridge recommended that the plans which were drawn up and submitted by the Teacher Education Authority to the Commission on Advanced Education should be scrapped.

I have read Partridge carefully, and I am convinced that certain persons on the committee were so dominant that even though they might have been a minority the others were prepared to follow them; and I believe the university hold is so evident that one should look very closely and study very objectively the Partridge report. At the same time, there are some parts of the report which I would endorse.

I believe the recommendation touching upon the future of technical and further education in Western Australia, and the launching of a body in that respect as an autonomous authority beyond the jurisdiction of the Education Department, but within the umbrella of the proposed commission, is most desirable and timely. As a matter of fact, I recall that the printed manifesto of the policy speech delivered by the former Leader of the Opposition at the 1974 election contained a promise to do just that.

So it was not novel to Partridge but I believe it was desirable for him to recommend this course of action, and I endorse it. As a matter of fact, it is because of reference to and an appreciation of the importance, and perhaps the neglect, of the technical and further education that we see the need to change the name of this Act because technical and further education must be brought into proper perspective according to the definition of tertiary education recommended by the Jackson report and the proposed change of the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission Act would be inconsistent with its recognition as a full partner in the post-secondary educational spheres of technical education. I am afraid that technical and further education at one end of the scale and primary education at the other end have been the neglected cousins of education for a long time, politics and the Governments of the day aside.

I hope that the legislation is passed and, in accordance with the undertaking given to me by the Minister in this Chamber representing the Minister for Education, that early opportunity will be given by the Government for the proposed commission to make a quick determination of two questions. One is the future role of the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie and the second is

the future role of Graylands Teachers College or the question of the name "Graylands" being associated with a new college of advanced education to be located elsewhere.

I hope that the members of the proposed commission will read *Hansard* to find out the views of the members who deliberated on this legislation. If they do so I hope they take note of the wishes I have expressed which are that the proposed commission will give early and favourable consideration to rejecting those parts of the Partridge report which refer to the School of Mines and the strangling and interring of the name "Graylands" by its not being associated with another education institution at the post-secondary education level in Western Australia.

Before I conclude I should like to touch upon two provisions of the Bill. I know these matters could be dealt with at the Committee stage but I believe two principles are involved and I feel opportunity should be taken to explain them in some detail so that analysis at the Committee stage can be more meaningful.

The Bill provides for the appointment of a chairman of the proposed commission and sets out the various provisions which relate to his situation. One is that a determination must be made as to the conditions of his service, the salary he shall earn, and whether he shall be part time or full time. We find that the conditions of his service are expressed in the Bill to be "such as the Governor determines". I know that formula has been used on many occasions and I am not criticising it. I am contrasting it with the clause of the Bill which provides for the conditions of service of the other members of the proposed commission. The Bill provides that—

Members other than the Chairman shall be paid such remuneration and allowances as the Minister, on the recommendation of the Public Service Board, from time to time determines.

The terms of service and conditions of the chairman are to be determined by the Governor.

We know the Governor acts only on the recommendation of his Minister and so it becomes incumbent upon the Minister, without any charter by way of legislation, to make all necessary inquiries to arrive at conditions which will be equitable and attractive to the proposed chairman. Naturally he will seek the best advice but he will not necessarily be bound to follow that advice. After deliberation the Minister will propose conditions of service and will recommend to His Excellency the Governor that they be endorsed. In due course the Governor, acting on the advice of his Minister, will no doubt endorse those terms of service. But in the case of the other members of the proposed commission this course of action is not contemplated. We are told

that there will be no reference to the Governor and that the Minister will do certain things, acting on the recommendation of the Public Service Board.

I interpret that to mean that the Minister will be bound to follow the recommendations of the Public Service Board. I do not believe the Minister should be bound to follow those recommendations; naturally he would have regard for them, but he should not be bound by them. Perhaps the wording is a little loose in clause 11 of the Bill which states—

Members other than the Chairman shall be paid such remuneration—

Not "may be" but "shall be"; it is mandatory—

—and allowances as the Minister, on the recommendation of the Public Service Board, from time to time determines.

The Minister might like to look at that clause and seek advice as to whether the interpretation I put upon it is the correct one. I think the matter should be expressed in terms which include such words as "the Minister having had regard to advice from the Public Service Board on whatever conditions are determined from time to time", but it should not be expressed in such a way that suggests the Minister is bound to adopt any recommendation that the Public Service Board puts forward.

I hope this legislation is passed for the reasons I have outlined. I hope sincerely that the minimum amount of time is exhausted after the passage of the legislation before the members of the proposed commission are appointed and in fact the proposed commission begins to operate, because there are two burning questions which should be resolved as soon as possible in the interests of the State. I refer particularly to the situation of the Kalgoorlie School of Mines.

There was some talk around the Chamber—I did not hear it confirmed—that the Minister for Education had mentioned in another place that even if the legislation were passed during this part of this session, it might well be some time around Christmas before the commission is functioning. I hope that this inordinate delay does not take place. I should like to express to the Minister for Education, through the Minister for Labour and Industry, the fond hope that if for any reason the view I have heard expressed is correct, that there is some impediment to an early functioning of the proposed commission, some note may be taken of my earlier plea that an *ad hoc* committee be established particularly to study the two questions I have mentioned, with great emphasis on the future role of the School of Mines.

For those reasons, whilst I am not greatly enamoured of all its provisions, I support the legislation before the Chamber.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier).

(Continued on page 1198.)

QUESTIONS (27): ON NOTICE

1. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Paper Bark Tree: Yunderup

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is he aware that claims have been made that a "paper bark" tree at Yunderup may be the largest tree of this species extant?
- (2) If so, what steps are being taken to protect the tree and any others nearby, and what is the status of the land upon which the tree stands?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

2. FLORA AND FAUNA

Wongan-Ballidu District

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Has he received a copy of the report made by the W.A. Naturalists Club on the flora and fauna in the Wongan-Ballidu district?
- (2) Are there species of flora and fauna in this area which are not contained in reserves?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Not yet.
- (2) (a) The report of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee to the Environmental Protection Authority states that several species of flora are restricted to the Wongan Hills area. I understand that at least one has not yet been recorded on a reserve.
- (b) As far as my department is aware, there are no species of vertebrate fauna restricted to the Wongan Hills area.
- (c) The recommendations of the Committee in respect of this area were endorsed by Cabinet and have been communicated to the respective departments for follow up action.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wesply Factory: Effluent

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Has the Environmental Protection Authority been informed regarding the volume of water to be used

by the Dardanup Wesply factory, the disposal method of running off water and the results of soil profile tests?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

No.

4.

FAUNA

Wardens

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Is he concerned at the possible extinction of the Australian bustard?
- (2) Is he satisfied that honorary fauna wardens have sufficient power?
- (3) How many honorary fauna wardens are there in—
 - (a) the metropolitan area;
 - (b) country areas?
- (4) Is it the Government's intention to appoint more?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes, but while the Western Australian Wildlife Authority has expressed concern for the future of the Australian bustard it has not to date recommended that the species be declared rare or endangered.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Precise records are not available because persons appointed as honorary wardens have moved about and out of the State without notifying the department. A circular letter and a renomination pro-forma are currently being sent to all appointees following last year's amendments to the legislation.
- (4) Yes, provided I am satisfied that they will make a real contribution to conservation.
I wish to table the circular and the notice involved in the question.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 242).

5. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Concorde Aircraft: Impact Statement

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Has an environmental impact statement in relation to the introduction of the Concorde airliner into Australian air space been made available for public scrutiny and comment?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

Yes.

6. PINJARRA ROAD

Roadworks

Mr SHALDERS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Main Roads Department currently engaged on the provision of new roadwork along Pinjarra Road between Mandurah and Pinjarra?
- (2) If so, what is the extent of the work being undertaken?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Sand fill is to be placed on the approaches to a new bridge over the Serpentine River. The bridge will be constructed in the 1977-78 financial year, by which time stability of the embankments will have been achieved.

7. LAND AGENTS

Unlicensed Operators

Mr SHALDERS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Is it a contravention of the Land Agents Act for any person other than a licensed land agent or his employee to—

- (a) act as an intermediary between a willing lessor and a potential lessee;
- (b) collect rent or lease payments made by a lessee, on behalf of the lessor;
- (c) conduct a rental services business?

Point of Order

Mr BARNETT: On a point of order, I believe question 7 requests a legal opinion of the Minister and should, therefore, be ruled out of order.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: I am somewhat inclined to the belief that the member for Rockingham is correct. As I have said on past occasions, although not in completely the same fashion, I trust the Minister may see fit to reply in a mode which would presume that the question were asked correctly.

Mr O'NEIL: I think the answer as prepared by the Minister for Justice meets with your requirements, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Under those circumstances I shall permit it, but I want members to have regard to the point of order raised.

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The situation referred to in the question may involve a contravention of the Land Agents Act,

but whether or not a particular business concerned with agency transaction relating to leases does breach the Act must depend on the precise circumstances of the case.

I do not think that answer gives a legal opinion.

8. PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES

Government Funds

Mr SHALDERS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What funds were made available to the Pre-School Board for the provision of pre-school centres in 1975-76 from—
 - (a) State Government sources;
 - (b) Commonwealth Government sources?
- (2) What priority is currently given by the Pre-School Board to the provision of a permanent pre-school centre at Dwellingup?
- (3) In the event that no Commonwealth funds are received for the purpose of providing pre-school centres in this State during 1976-77, is it anticipated if State funding continues at the 1975-76 level and the Dwellingup centre retains its current priority, that a permanent pre-school centre will be provided at Dwellingup during 1976-77?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Grants approved for the provision of pre-school centres in 1975-76:
 - (a) State kindergarten building grant—total \$80 000. This grant is allocated each year at the rate of \$4 000 per centre and \$6 000 per centre above the 26th parallel. It is administered by the Education Department.
 - (b) (i) Funds provided through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs for centres which cater predominantly for Aboriginal children totalled \$270 000.
 - (ii) Funds provided through the Children's Commission under the childhood services capital programme totalled \$41 055.
- (2) The estimate of requirements for 1976-77 under the childhood services programme recently submitted by the board to the Children's Commission included a provision for one capital project

only—that being the provision of a permanent pre-school centre at Dwellingup.

(3) No.

9. HIGH WYCOMBE SCHOOL

Library and Storage Area

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the lack of library facilities and storage area at the High Wycombe Primary School?
- (2) If "Yes" why has no action been taken?
- (3) (a) Will the Minister receive a deputation from the High Wycombe Primary School parents and citizens' association during the week commencing 30th May; and
(b) if so, would he indicate the time and date?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Insufficient funds are available to provide library facilities in several schools whose circumstances are similar to High Wycombe's.
- (3) No purpose could be served by receiving such a deputation. The desire for library facilities is known—the availability of money for library purposes is not.

10. SCHOOLS

Kalamunda Electorate: Expenditure and Enrolments

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) For the financial years 1974-75 and 1975-76 would the Minister advise—
 - (a) the total expenditure for maintenance, improvements and new works; and
 - (b) the enrolments for the following primary schools—
 - (i) Gooseberry Hill;
 - (ii) Lesmurdie;
 - (iii) Kalamunda;
 - (iv) Walliston, and
 - (v) High Wycombe?
- (2) Would the Minister list the anticipated expenditure at the same schools for the financial year 1976-77?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) (a) Exclusive of maintenance, details of which are not available, the works undertaken at the schools nominated are as follows:—

Gooseberry Hill: 6 classrooms and covered assembly, 1974-75, nil, 1975-76, \$235 461;

Lesmurdie: 6 classrooms, resource centre and covered assembly, 1974-75, nil, 1975-76, \$202 639;

Kalamunda: Library-resource centre, staff toilets, 1974-75, \$16 980, 1975-76, nil;

Walliston: 6 classrooms and covered assembly, 1974-75, nil, 1975-76, \$245 337.

High Wycombe: Nil.
- (2) Proposed expenditure for 1976-77—

Gooseberry Hill, \$28 000 (oval); Lesmurdie, nil;

Kalamunda, nil;

Walliston, nil;

High Wycombe, nil.

11. CO-OPERATIVE COMPANIES

Operation as Building Societies

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Attorney-General:

Further to his recent answers to questions relating to the Companies (Co-operative) Act Amendment Bill:

- (1) How many of the 77 co-operative companies were incorporated before section 5A of the Building Societies Act, 1920-1970 became law on 16th November, 1961?
- (2) (a) Are the two co-operative companies incorporated on 27th June, 1972 duly incorporated;
- (b) if so, are the objects of these two companies valid insofar as they purport to allow those companies to operate as building societies?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) 64.
 - (2) (a) The Registrar of Companies certified under his hand and seal that each company was duly incorporated as a limited company under the provisions of the Companies (Co-operative) Act, 1943-1959, on 27th June, 1972.
- Section 26(1)(b) of the Act reads as follows:

A certificate of incorporation given by the Registrar, or a copy thereof certified as correct under the hand and seal of the Registrar or the *Gazette* containing the notice mentioned in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall be conclusive evidence that all the requirements of this Act, in respect of registration and of the matters precedent and incidental thereto, have been complied with, and that the association is a company authorised to be registered and duly registered under this Act.

- (b) The question is an improper one in that it seeks an expression of opinion on a matter of law.

12.

FINES*Defaulters: Arrest*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) (a) Is it now common practice to arrest without notice people who have shown over a significant period satisfactory performance in paying of fines in compliance with a magistrate's order but who by inadvertence suddenly default in making a payment;
- (b) If "Yes" since when has this policy been invoked, and why?
- (2) (a) Would the Minister consider forthwith a policy of giving seven days' written notice in the event of defaults of this kind before allowing arrests to be made;
- (b) if not, why?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No. The majority of magistrates do not make specific orders for payment of fines by instalments. However, if such an order is made, a warrant is issued only after consideration of the particular circumstances of the case, the amount involved and the number of instalments in arrear. As a general rule persons allowed to pay by instalments are clearly advised verbally of the procedures.
- (2) Reminders are generally sent when time to pay arrangements break down after a significant period of compliance. This is within the administrative discretion of the officer of the court

where the order was made, who has the knowledge of the circumstances of the various actions.

13. **INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT***Manufacturing Enterprises: Attraction*

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it a fact that well over 60% of private enterprise manufacturing concerns in Australia are situated in and about Melbourne and Sydney?
- (2) Is he aware that even now there is a continuing rush or trend towards increasing the amount of centralism of private enterprise activities in Melbourne and Sydney?
- (3) What has he done to attract more private enterprise manufacturing concerns to this State from Melbourne and Sydney and thereby reduce the gross and objectionable centralism referred to above?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) At 30th June, 1973, 59.3% of employment in Australia's manufacturing establishments was located in Melbourne and Sydney.
- (2) The trend is for manufacturing industry to move away from Melbourne and Sydney. At 30th June, 1969, 60.4% of employment in Australia's manufacturing section was located in these two centres.
- (3) Positive steps were taken last year to promote industrial investment in Western Australia by Eastern States industries. The appointment of a Government trade representative based in Sydney and an advertising campaign in New South Wales and Victoria have increased recognition of Western Australia as a desirable manufacturing location.

During the term of this Government a number of Eastern States industries have established in this State, or are currently negotiating to do so. These include abrasives, rail equipment, rubber belting, stationery and wool processing.

The Government has also been successful in persuading one substantial employer to cancel plans to close down its local manufacturing operation to concentrate production in the Eastern States.

14. **GREYHOUND RACING***Introduction of Bookmakers*

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

Further to the advice given me in his letter of 2nd April last concerning bookmakers at greyhound racing events, is he now able to announce any decision?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The position is still the same as advised in my letter of 2nd April.

15. **COAL-OIL-WATER EMULSION***Investigation into Use*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) (a) Has the State Energy Commission investigated the potential of the coal-oil-water emulsion being promoted by an American ultrasonics expert, Mr Eric Cottell;
- (b) if so, what progress has been achieved?
- (2) Because of its average 20 per cent water content would Collie coal be suitable in the initial testing programme?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) The State Energy Commission is awaiting receipt of an emulsion sample from the company concerned for testing on a pilot scale. The Commission has also suggested several checks that the company should do itself.
- (2) The emulsion sample would use Collie coal and its suitability would thus be checked.

16. **PLANT NURSERIES***Registration*

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it proposed that legislation for the registration of plant nurseries will be introduced by the Government?
- (2) If so, when?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) The answer given in this House on the 10th September, 1975, is applicable:

No. The matter of registration of plant nurseries on the basis of Australia-wide uniformity is currently receiving consideration by the Standing Committee on Agriculture. Until the Committee's report is received it would be inappropriate to consider the introduction of legislation.

17.

POLICE*Complaints Against Officers:
Avenues*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Police: What avenues—formal and informal—are available to a person who might need to make a complaint against a member of the Police Force?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Informal complaints may be made by personal approach or by telephone to any member of the force.

Formal complaints should be made in writing to the Commissioner of Police.

18. **ALCOHOL AND DRUG
AUTHORITY***Report*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

When is it anticipated the first report of the Alcohol and Drug Authority will be tabled?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The report will be tabled on Tuesday, 25th May, 1976.

19 and 20. *These questions were postponed.*

21.

FERTILISERS*Phosphate Ingredients:
Investigation*

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In view of the possibility that types of phosphate materials not currently used but which could be important in agricultural practice in the future, could he advise if the department has programmed experiments to test these materials this year?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) what materials are to be tested;
 - (b) what will be the nature of the investigation;
 - (c) where will the trials be conducted?
- (3) If "No"—could he alert the Department of Agriculture of primary producers' interest in the evaluation, especially of "C" and "D" grade rock phosphate, either as raw, ground or calcined material?
- (4) In view of the importance of cheaper forms of phosphate materials to primary producers, could he recommend to his Federal counterpart the necessity of having the phosphate bounty extended to cover not only superphosphate

and ammonium phosphate, but also calcined "C" and "D" grade C.I. phosphate?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Citraphos 500.
Citraphos 900.
C grade rock phosphate.
A grade rock phosphate.
Queensland rock phosphate.
- (b) Glasshouse, laboratory and field trials to compare the various sources with plain superphosphate in terms of current and long term response of both crops and pastures.
- (c) Mogumber, Wongan Hills, West Toodyay, Newdegate, Mt. Barker and Busselton.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) It is not possible to make an economic appraisal of these alternative sources until the results of the above investigations are known.

22. MENTAL HEALTH

Kareeba Hostel: Funds for Acquisition

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) In financing its purchase of Kareeba hospital, did the State Government receive any monetary assistance by way of grant, subsidy or otherwise from the Australian Government?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) what amount was received;
 - (b) what is the position now that Kareeba is on the market for sale?
- (3) Can the Minister guarantee that all fittings, fixtures, equipment, etc., that formed part of the original purchase of the hospital remain intact?
- (4) If not, what is the position?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) \$217 500.
(b) Kareeba is not on the market for sale. It is on offer only to the Belmont Shire Council.
- (3) and (4) Every reasonable precaution has been taken to ensure the security of the building and equipment. A caretaker-cleaner was appointed immediately the premises became the responsibility of the Mental Health Services and the building is kept locked. There are also regular

inspections by Mental Deficiency Division staff. Some equipment has been temporarily re-located elsewhere within the Mental Health Services.

23. FOCAL UNIVERSAL ACTIVITIES

Press Report

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Further to my question 17 of 19th May, 1976 regarding the activities of the firm Focal Universal, can he advise whether a press report that he "and members of the State Government were fully aware of Focal's activities" is correct as far as he is concerned?
- (2) If so, can he advise the nature of Focal's activities and whether there is any concern regarding same?
- (3) If the report is not accurate, can he advise what he knows, if anything, of Focal's activities?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The report is not correct so far as I am concerned.
- (3) To the best of my recollection, my knowledge is limited to the Press report, which I have now seen and the member's questions. The Premier's Department is examining its records to see if there has been any correspondence, or other representations to me or the department from this organisation.

24. HOSPITALS

Resident Medical Officers, and Supervision

Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) (a) Which hospitals in the metropolitan area have resident medical officers;
- (b) how many are employed at each hospital; and
- (c) in each hospital how many resident medical officers are undergoing training, requiring supervision?
- (2) Where supervision is required, what is the nature of the supervision?
- (3) With regard to the statutory requirement for doctors to spend their first year after graduation in an approved hospital, what are the criteria for an approved hospital?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) (a), (b) and (c)—
Royal Perth Hospital, 77.
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, 51.

Fremantle Hospital, 41.
 Princess Margaret Hospital,
 18.
 King Edward Memorial Hos-
 pital, 7.

- (2) There is an agreed protocol in the care and management of patients and this is outlined in, for example, the Royal Perth Hospital Handbook for Medical Officers which is tabled herewith.
- (3) Section 2(1)(b)(vi) of the Medical Act requires that a person must have spent a period of or periods aggregating 12 months in the position of resident medical officer in one or more institutions or hospitals approved by the Medical Board in order to be entitled to be registered as a medical practitioner.

The book was tabled (see paper No. 243).

25. IRON ORE

Northern Mining Company Developments

Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Could he indicate if there have been any recent happenings which would signify the Northern Mining Company's intention to proceed with their iron ore developments at Weld Range and elsewhere?
- (2) As this is a matter of continuing interest to local authorities, business people in Murchison communities, particularly Mt. Magnet where the closure of Hill 50 has left some uncertainty, in these circumstances has he any knowledge of joint venture plans which could give encouragement to local people?
- (3) Are there any special difficulties being encountered by Northern Mining Company which is impeding their progress?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Northern Mining is continuing with its marketing and funding negotiations which have to be successful before the project could get off the ground.
- (2) It is encouraging that the Company is continuing its endeavours to mount the project, but there is no tangible result reported to the Government so far.
- (3) Northern Mining faces the same difficulties as all iron ore companies at present; in particular, a tight market situation coupled with an inflated cost structure within Australia. This raises the minimum quantity which would

make a mine feasible and the world demand cannot accommodate all potential iron ore ventures in Western Australia at the same time.

26. *This question was postponed.*

27. PRICES JUSTIFICATION TRIBUNAL

Submission to Commonwealth Government

Mr HARMAN, to the Premier:

Has he made a written submission to the Australian Government on the future role of the Prices Justification Tribunal?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

No, assuming the member means the Commonwealth Government —although the matter has been the subject of discussion with the Prime Minister.

QUESTIONS (7): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. OIL EXPLORATION PERMITS

Abrolhos Islands

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

I preface my question by advising the House that this morning I phoned a question to the Minister's office seeking elaboration and clarification of a number of points in the announcement about oil permits at the Abrolhos Islands and that the Minister has advised me that the information will not be available until Tuesday. I ask him: How is it that the Minister is able to give the Press a substantial statement concerning the permits and indicate that strict conditions will prevail to protect the environment and the crayfishing industry, but is unable to provide answers to questions arising therefrom, or to provide details of the environmental conditions concerned, for the benefit of members of this Parliament?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The question was phoned to my office at noon and I expect that it will be on notice next week. The information was not made available to the Press by me, but by the Minister for Mines whose department is responsible for issuing the permits. The shortage of time available between noon and the sitting of the House today prevented my obtaining from the Minister for Mines the information requested in the nine-part question. I can answer portion of the question, but as I feel sure the

honourable member would like the full details requested in the question, I suggest that it be placed on the notice paper so that all the relevant information can be made available on Tuesday.

2. UNEMPLOYMENT

Statements by Member for Maylands

Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has he seen the statements made by the member for Maylands in which the Government is criticised for failing to meet its promises of solving unemployment?
- (2) Does he agree with the statements?
- (3) If not, why not?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I thank the member for Karrinyup for some notice of the question.

Mr Jamieson: Who gave the notice—you or the member for Karrinyup?

Mr GRAYDEN: The answer is as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No, I reject them completely.
- (3) With the exception of South Australia, Western Australia has a lower percentage of unemployed as compared with the work force than any other State. The position as at April, 1976, was—

	Per Cent
Western Australia	3.86
New South Wales	4.80
Victoria	3.95
Queensland	5.11
South Australia	3.56
Tasmania	4.88
Australia	4.41

In each of the six months ended January, 1976, Western Australia had the lowest percentage of any State. This State is the best administered State in the Commonwealth. It has a Government which is acutely conscious of the need to stimulate industrial development. In the present climate of industrial unrest and excessive wage demands this Government cannot work miracles, and no other Government could.

Mr Bertram: How many had to leave the State?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I just want to inform Ministers that question time is not a time when one

makes major political points. I did note that the information contained in one of the answers was given by the Minister in his address in the House yesterday. I understand that certain questions can be asked and answered in a certain form; but there are limits which Ministers and members should watch closely.

3. UNEMPLOYMENT

Relief Measures

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

In view of the fact that since the Court Government has been in office unemployment in this State has more than trebled, and because the Premier staked his reputation on a promise to solve the unemployment problem within six months, will he outline to the House what he proposes to do to restore the Premier's tattered reputation?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I regard the question as ridiculous, particularly in view of the Government's record. As I mentioned earlier, in each of the six months to January, 1976, the State had the lowest unemployment figures in Australia and at present it has the second lowest in the Commonwealth.

This Government is bending over backwards to put into the pipeline undertakings which will overcome the problem, and I think in the circumstances, after three years of the disastrous policies of the Whitlam Government, we are at last able to see daylight.

4. UNEMPLOYMENT

Basis of Statistics

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Can the Minister advise me whether or not the percentage figures he quoted to the House today in his answers to questions are seasonally adjusted figures or prime figures?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The figures to the end of April, 1976, which have been supplied refer to the proportion of the work force unemployed and unfilled vacancies, seasonal data.

5. UNEMPLOYMENT

Basis of Statistics

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Is he aware that statistics and analyses which are provided for the guidance not only of members of Parliament but also of other people in industry are given in two forms; that is, seasonally adjusted figures and prime figures?

Sir Charles Court: We are in the same position on both, if you take the trouble to look at them.

6. LEAGUE FOOTBALL MATCH

Sunday Permit

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

(1) Is it a fact that the Western Australian National Football League has raised a query with him as a consequence of a statement he is alleged to have made to the effect that the football match on Sunday, the 9th May, served no useful purpose?

(2) Does he intend to answer this query?

(3) If "Yes", how and when?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) to (3) I have no knowledge of any query raised with me by the President of the Western Australian National Football League arising out of my statement.

Mr Bertram: Not the president; the league.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Or the league.

7. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Manufacturing Enterprises: Attraction

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

Further to his answer to question 13 on today's notice paper could he tell the House whether the Government trade representative referred to is the same person as he who was euphoniously named "the expediter"?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Yes, except that this person was appointed soon after the Government took office, mainly for the purpose of expediting, as it were, delivery of the shortages of supply in orders by Western Australian industry placed in the Eastern States. When the industrial situation regarding shortages eased, it was found he was very useful not only for that purpose but also for

generally promoting Western Australian industries, and he was retained for that overwhelming purpose.

LAND TAX ASSESSMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [4.49 p.m.]: I rise to speak on the proposed legislation to amend the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission Act because of my involvement with the Mt. Lawley College of Advanced Education as a board member and because I had the privilege of representing that board at the seminar which was organised by the education people in Bunbury.

I find it passing strange that in the second reading speech of the Minister he suggests the opinion presented to him arising from that seminar was that the major problem concerned the composition of the commission. Had the Minister remained at the seminar he might have been better informed as to the areas of disputation which existed among the hundreds of delegates who attended, because over the two days the seminar dealt with many facets and problems associated with acceptance by all the tertiary institutions of the setting up of a commission to control their destiny. Everyone at that seminar went in to bat for himself. Delegates put forward their points of view which indicated a great degree of concern for all people and all types of post-secondary education institutions.

I therefore take umbrage at the fact that the Minister thinks—and this seems to be the only part of value in his second reading speech—the question raised at the seminar on the discussion of the Partridge report was merely the composition of the commission. I am aware of many of the problems which were discussed at the seminar, and one which received a great deal of consideration was the position of the university as it affected other colleges of advanced education. Deep concern was expressed by many people representing colleges of advanced education about the intrusion upon their autonomy which had been so valiantly fought for over many years and which would appear to be in jeopardy if the commission is not controlled in a manner to enable it to undertake its functions for the betterment of education, generally.

It was a deep disappointment on receiving the Bill to observe in clause 13 the following words, which have already

been referred to by the member for Kalgoorlie—

... subject to the Minister and with due regard to the traditional autonomy of universities and to the major role of universities in areas outside the scope of post-secondary education.

I might not be alarmed at those words if I could be persuaded by my efforts in the education field, not from the point of view of teaching, instruction, or ability to look at the question of technical or secondary education as a teacher but from the point of view of a parent and a member of a college board. I express deep concern that the universities may escape their responsibility of taking their place in a proper manner in the field of post-secondary education.

I would like to refer to the Partridge report, some sections of which have already been quoted by the member for Kalgoorlie. Paragraph 8.21 on page 183 says—

We reject the proposition that all post-secondary institutions have equal claims so far as institutional autonomy is concerned;

When I look at that I ask myself: does it really mean what it says? Does it in effect say that the Partridge report believes the autonomy so hard won by the colleges of advanced education will be whittled away? This is one of the basic problems which were voiced at the seminar with vigour and enthusiasm by tutors and principals of colleges of advanced education; and it was quite right and natural that they should advance such points of view. However, the Partridge report contains a series of contradictions, because on one hand it makes a recommendation and in the next paragraph it makes an immediate contradiction of the philosophy previously expressed.

Paragraph 8.21 of the report continues—

... we think that universities, because of their particular characteristics and the richness of the international system from which they draw their strength, should stand in a special relation to the State's system of post-secondary education.

Mr Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not quarrel with that, but paragraph 8.22 of the report says—

On the other hand, the universities should not be considered as being detached from the State's system of post-secondary education.

The Bill says that due regard will be paid to the traditional autonomy of universities. One can flip a double-headed penny in some two-up schools but in the school to which I belong one is likely to be lynched for doing so. The Minister for Education is trying to flip a double-headed penny.

Paragraph 8.22 of the report goes on to say—

They compete for funds with other parts of the system, and share many areas of teaching with other post-secondary institutions—for example, educating for the professions of teaching and engineering.

When we take into consideration the fact that they do compete with the colleges of advanced education, and particularly the Mt. Lawley College of Advanced Education, in teaching and educating teachers who will take their places in the education system, as a member of the board of that college I feel we should look very closely at the functions of the commission to see whether or not my fears are grounded, and whether or not the colleges of advanced education which have been in touch with me are needlessly concerned that their autonomy will be whittled away by the implementation of this Bill.

On page 184 of the Partridge report, in the same paragraph, 8.22, these words appear—

The universities, however, should continue to deal directly with the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and the proposed Universities Council; and no doubt, these bodies will make their own decision with regard to the advice offered them by the State body.

My understanding of the desire of the Minister for Education was that the purpose of the commission would be to co-ordinate and control the post-secondary education system, and I believe that is a very worth-while objective which has been lacking in this State for a long time. All levels of post-secondary education and other forms of education should be controlled so that the best use can be made of the resources which are available to the Government.

I find it almost impossible to envisage that where we have funding from the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission direct to the universities it will not have its action upset by a proposal that the universities may educate people to become teachers in competition with colleges of advanced education which are undertaking the same courses. I wonder who will get the best piece of cake. Will it be the universities, or will it be the State instrumentalities and State colleges of advanced education?

There is so much doubt about the matter that I became deeply concerned. I will come back to the functions of the proposed commission in a moment because I want to develop a continuing theme of concern that I have about this measure. At this stage I can tell the House I accept that the principle involved in the setting up of the commission has been a step in the right direction but I am concerned about the untidy way in which the Government went

about its job. The Partridge report recommended the setting up of a separate and complete commission. The Government saw fit to use the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission Act as the vehicle for putting into effect the recommendations of the Partridge committee. In my candid opinion, the Government also adopted a very weak attitude to what the recommendations of the Partridge report sought to achieve. The Government virtually took without question most of the functions of the old Tertiary Education Commission to use as the functions of the new commission, and strangely enough, if we look at the old functions, the new functions, and the recommendations of the Partridge report we find many contradictions.

The member for Ascot mentioned that when we look at the basic fundamentals of the functions of the old commission under the parent Act, we find that many of them differ from the recommendations of the Partridge report. Also, it appears to me that one of these functions is redundant. This matter was mentioned by the member for Ascot who reminded us that the payment of fees for tertiary education disappeared from our education system by the very good and worthy action taken by the Whitlam Government. That Government decided that students in universities, colleges of advanced education, colleges of technical education, and all other fields of tertiary training, would be able to attend those institutions without the payment of fees.

I do not want to elaborate on the arguments advanced by the member for Ascot because he covered this aspect adequately. However, later on I would like to refer to technical education in this context.

Mr Clarko: You would know that long before the Whitlam Government came to power, education at the University of Western Australia was free. We had had this for over a generation.

Mr SKIDMORE: As the member for Karrinyup said, I am aware of that fact. However, I am not trying to score political points off other people with most of my statements in this House.

Mr Coyne: You must be joking!

Several members interjected.

Mr Clarko: Western Australia led the world in that regard, due to the endowment of a capitalist.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not attempting to achieve the objectivity of the Minister for Labour and Industry who is always able to enthrone a great deal of merriment in this House. I accept the statement made by the member for Karrinyup.

I will now proceed to deal with the Partridge report. When we consider the functions recommended by the Partridge report for the Tertiary Education Commission,

we see that they are not the same as the functions set out in the Bill. Most of the functions are similar, but there are some remarkable differences. I will refer to the most pertinent of these, as it seems to me that the measure will bestow upon the commission a function and power which will whittle away the autonomy of the colleges of advanced education. The main function of the commission is to advise, and I have reservations about that term when I try to imagine what the commission will do when it determines to advise a college of advanced education on certain issues. I wonder whether a college board could advance a contra opinion with any faint hope of winning the battle.

Some few weeks ago, during the Address-in-Reply debate, I referred to the fact that the Council of the WA Teacher Authority Council had overriden the board of the Mt. Lawley College of Advanced Education on the question of the payment of a certain wage to some of its academic staff. At that time the council vetoed the college board and the instructors at the college were robbed of some \$10 000 in salary. In fact, they have been downgraded and they are now unable to compete for promotion in the open market. This downgrading occurred not because of any disability, but merely at the whim of the council.

The Partridge report did not recommend that the commission should have control over the salaries and wages paid to the staff of colleges of advanced education. The Minister handling this legislation may correct me if I am wrong—and I hope he will do so during the Committee stage because I intend to pursue this question—but there was no recommendation in the Partridge report to the effect that the new commission should control the salaries and wages of the staff at colleges of advanced education, including tutorial staff, maintenance staff, and any other staff. However, what we do find in the Bill is this provision in paragraph (e) of proposed new section 12(1)—

(e) to advise the governing authorities of the respective post-secondary education institutions on—

(i) the terms and conditions of appointment and employment, including salary payable, of the staff, whether academic or otherwise of those institutions;

If the proposed commission carries out this function, it is heading for a great deal of trouble. The conditions of maintenance staff, gardeners, and academic staff are governed by awards of the Industrial Commission. For the life of me I cannot see why the commission would want to interfere in that sphere, and so I will pursue this matter in depth at a later stage.

I accept your forebearance, Mr Speaker, in allowing me to refer to the clauses of the Bill, because without doing so it would

be very difficult to show in a valid way my opposition to the provisions which give such wide-sweeping powers to the commission—powers which the Partridge report never sought. I will deal with other portions of the Bill during the Committee debate but I wish to illustrate my objection to that particular provision.

I would like to take up the cudgels on behalf of the colleges of advanced education which have expressed deep concern about the setting up of the commission. Both the Mt. Lawley college and the Churchlands college have written to me setting out their objections to the proposed commission. They do not suggest that the commission is not a good proposal, but they are concerned that their autonomy will be whittled away, and they pointed out the contradictions between the recommendations of the Partridge report and this measure.

I would like to refer in passing to an objection which was put forward by the Mt. Lawley college to the Minister. I would like to record the comments of the college accurately otherwise it could be said that I was putting forward my own point of view and not that of the college board. With your forbearance, Sir, I propose to paraphrase the recommendations of the board, where possible, but it may be necessary to read certain recommendations because of difficulties in interpretation. In brief, the college board felt the Partridge report definition of post-secondary education in Western Australia included all tertiary institutions; that is, the universities, the Western Australian Institute of Technology, the teachers colleges, technical, and further education institutions. The member for Ascot, of course, referred to the TAFE.

Broadly speaking, the board defines post-secondary education as consisting of all things in education which cannot be done in any other way. The member for Ascot has indicated that his point of view is that there is an intermingling of thought, action, and effort of all parts of education and that this must be looked at. Therefore, one would feel that some overriding control should be exercised by the commission and this is the point of control by co-ordination as distinct from the previous control—which I would refer to as being co-ordination by control.

The college goes on to say that the Partridge report argues very strongly for co-ordination and rationalisation of post-secondary education in this State. It makes mention of the fact that Perth is a medium-sized city with two universities, WAIT and five smaller colleges. These institutions overlap on very many points. For instance, we have the Churchlands College of Advanced Education undertaking the training of teachers to take their part in the education system, and likewise other colleges such as the Claremont Teachers College. The board makes note of the fact

that the Partridge report is concerned that co-ordination between these colleges of advanced education—using the easy term of reference—should be controlled in some way so that there will be no needless waste of finance. I believe implicitly that is a good thing, but I would also like to say that it seems to me the new commission will just simply bypass what has been very effective control of the colleges of advanced education by the Teacher Education Authority under which they operate.

The setting up of that authority has co-ordinated the activities of the colleges of advanced education in a very meaningful way. The college boards are concerned that such co-ordination will be denied to them under the functions of the proposed commission. Again, of course, it is pure supposition, but this is the problem the boards are facing in trying to understand what the Bill is all about. It is such a nebulous measure, prepared in haste, and it proposes to set up a commission to do what? Rather than give the Partridge report the consideration it deserves, the Government has come up with this hotchpotch Bill. It reflects discredit upon the Government.

The Premier often expounds on his Government's proposals to develop the education system of Western Australia, but the Government did not even have the initiative to accept the recommendations of the Partridge report by introducing a new Bill. Instead it chose to amend the parent Act.

The case of the Mt. Lawley Teachers College Board against the post-secondary education commission proposed in the Partridge committee report continues—

The Partridge committee acknowledges that the need for co-ordination extends to the universities.

... the universities should not be considered as being detached from the system of the State's post-secondary education. They compete for funds with other parts of the system and share many areas of teaching with other post-secondary institutions ...

The board disagreed with the proposal to set up a system which specifically excluded universities. This exclusion is clearly illustrated in the following quote from the Partridge report—

... we think the universities, because of their particular characteristics and the richness of the international system from which they draw their strength, should stand in a special relation to the State's system of post-secondary education.

The universities, however, should continue to deal directly with the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and the proposed Universities Council ...

The board acknowledges that the universities are in a peculiar position, but unless the tertiary teaching institutions co-ordinate their operations, the functions of any commission will be made very difficult. The board's case continues—

The board sees that the report is inconsistent in terms of its own philosophy. The report argues for co-ordination but then sets up a commission which could not achieve that objective.

The colleges are concerned that any new authority will interfere with their autonomy. The parent Act has been in force for some four years and during that time nothing has been done by the committee of control to co-ordinate the educational facilities offered at colleges and universities. This leads me to question whether we need to establish a commission with such wide powers and functions. The board continues—

The Partridge Report sees the universities being coordinated into State post-secondary education at the Federal level. The Board feels that this is again inconsistent with the Committee's own philosophy which stresses the need for State coordination, and that this may be politically undesirable.

It is quite possible that it will be politically undesirable. The board continues—

The Board feels that the proposed limited Post-Secondary Education Commission leaves out one sector which, because of duplication and competition for funds and students, should be included. The Board sees the universities, WAIT and the teachers colleges as similar tertiary institutions in respect of entrance qualifications, of the kind of courses they provide and of the kind of market in which their graduates find employment.

I repeat that co-ordination in these institutions is required, but that the colleges are entitled to a degree of autonomy. To continue—

The Board feels further that the proposed limited Post-Secondary Education Commission mixes up sectors which are very dissimilar and should not be grouped together. The Board sees that the Technical and further education sector, although it has some small part in common, has substantially more elements that are at variance with the tertiary institutions. In 1964, before the formation of WAIT,

"The Martin Committee on Tertiary Education (1964) attempted to define 'tertiary' as students enrolled in Universities, Teachers Colleges and 40 per cent of all enrolments in technical and other non-university institutions" (cited in The First Report of the National Population Enquiry, W. D.

Borrie Chairman, page 380); so that today the percentage of tertiary students in the technical and further education sector (TAFE) considered in the Partridge Committee Report would be very much less.

The Board feels that a suitable organization already exists for the stated purposes of coordination of the recognized tertiary institutions, i.e. the W.A. Tertiary Education Commission.

As the member for Ascot said, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet." The Government has shown a lamentable lack of understanding of the needs of education in Western Australia. After two years and three months of office, the Court Government has been unable to come to grips with the education system in the manner it foreshadowed it would if elected to office. I hope that the citizens of Western Australia will demonstrate their displeasure at the inactivity of the Government in the field of education.

Mr Young: This Government has done a better job in regard to education than any previous Government in Western Australia.

Mr Clarko: Have a look at the comparable increases in expenditure on education; it is much more than your Government provided.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: The Whitlam Government did that.

Mr Clarko: Look at the percentage increases.

Mr Bryce: Where did you get the money from?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SKIDMORE: The board's case continues—

The Board is of the opinion that statements that universities are of a different kind from other tertiary institutions, are elitist in the extreme and contrary to the trends of the last two decades. The Partridge Committee recommendations would permit the uncoordinated expansion of the universities to the prejudice of the other tertiary institutions.

In that paragraph is contained the deep fear of quotas being applied to education; the board is afraid we will return to the old days of inactivity, when they were controlled by an education system which said, "You will get \$X" when in fact they needed \$XY.

They used to put forward substantial cases for the development of different courses, but were denigrated to the extent that our education system suffered greatly. We have overcome that situation; in three short years we have seen these institutions fulfilling the role which should have been theirs many years previously.

Nobody can ever accuse the Mt. Lawley College of Advanced Education or the Churchlands College of Advanced Education of being anything but first-class teaching institutions, which turn out professional teachers. I understand that the Minister for Industrial Development is a member of the board at Churchlands; no doubt he would agree the college is entitled to autonomy.

The Academic Staff Association of the Churchlands College of Advanced Education also expressed concern in the following terms—

This association feels that this glaring inconsistency can only be rectified by a broadening of the functions and powers of the proposed commission to include the universities.

I believe the opinion of the colleges should be given due regard by this Government; after all, the interests of the universities were taken into consideration.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has seven minutes remaining.

Mr SKIDMORE: The Academic Staff Association continued—

This association is concerned with the fact that of the numbers to make up the proposed Post Secondary Education Commission, two persons from the university sector, which is not under the control of the commission, would be included. The association feels that an unusual and unacceptable situation would arise if all members of the co-ordinating committee were not subject to the same co-ordinating procedures.

The association is concerned that the proposed membership of the Western Australian Post Secondary Education Commission will do little to achieve the aims as outlined in the report in that the imbalance and inadequacy of representation work contrary to such aims. It is felt essential by this association that there should be a continuation of representation of the institutions by the executive officers of those institutions, and that representation from each of the main staff bodies be included, balanced by a large well informed community membership.

It felt the commission should be widened, and I note that the Minister has accepted that view to the extent that the number on the commission has been increased to 15.

The association continued—

A further provision of the report recommends the establishment of a Western Australian College of Advanced Education, with each of the present colleges becoming only a campus of that college.

This really concerns the many implications of the Partridge report. The association went on to discuss the inability of the proposed legislation to give assurances to people engaged in the field of education. They are concerned with their security, and with the actions the commission may take in the future. Quite frankly, I do not know how the Government proposes to establish a commission when it does not know what the commission will do.

I should like to read to the House some of the recommendations put forward by the WA Teacher Education Authority at a meeting on Wednesday, the 25th February, 1976. In dealing with the Partridge report, it was resolved to request the chief executive officer to reply to the Acting Minister for Education enclosing points set out in discussion at the council meeting. That discussion paper set out some 13 points of objection to the establishment of such a commission. My remark is pertinent, because it is the opinion of the body concerned with co-ordinating the colleges of advanced education.

It is a pity that time does not permit me to quote all the points that are set out in this document. However, some of the points are as follows—

(iii) that the Universities and WAIT should be asked to withdraw from teacher training areas covered by the colleges and that they should be encouraged to concentrate on research in education;

(iv) that there does not appear to be any proof that a large multi-purpose institution will produce better teachers than a small teachers college;

I am not convinced that shires, like the City of Stirling, constitute better shires than small ones like the Shire of Bassen-dean. To continue with the points—

(v) that institutions of technology should not be allowed to move into the field of teacher education—they should be encouraged to remain technological institutions;

(vi) that it should be made clear that the development proposed at Cockburn was never seen as a creation of a new institution—it was to be a replacement for Graylands;

I would have liked much more time to develop my comments on the Partridge committee report. Whilst we on this side of the Chamber accept the Bill in its present form, we are deeply concerned that the proposed commission should act with due regard for the autonomy not only of the universities, but also of all other institutions of tertiary education.

From that point of view I believe I have stated adequately that this concern is held by many people. For the reasons I have

given I trust that after the proposed commission has been established it will pay due regard to the recommendations of the Partridge report, and will not take away from the colleges of advanced education their autonomy. I trust the commission will control by co-ordination, and not control without co-ordination.

I leave any further remarks I wish to make to the Committee stage. I conclude by saying that I hope other members of this Chamber will look at the Partridge committee report, and subsequently make a contribution to the debate, because in that report lies the future of our children and of this State. It will be the means of enabling the children to receive the education they deserve. I regret that I cannot put forward all I have been requested by people to do in respect of technical education, because time does not permit me. I hope that later on I will have the opportunity to develop the question of technical education further. To those people I tender my regrets at not being able to develop that theme further at this stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Section 12 repealed and re-enacted—

Mr BRYCE: I wish to relate my remarks to proposed section 12 (e) (iii) at page 9 of the Bill. Is it your intention, Mr Deputy Chairman, to treat the clause as a whole?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): For the moment I shall treat the clause as a whole, unless we get into difficulties.

Mr BRYCE: I want to make quite sure that everyone understands the position of members on this side of the Chamber. We want no misunderstanding that we are completely and without qualification opposed to proposed paragraph (e) (iii).

In the second reading debate I indicated that I believed it was important that we should spell out precisely the reason. Proposed section 12 contains a list of the functions of the commission. It is proposed that the power should be vested in the commission to advise the governing authorities of post-secondary education institutions on the fees to be charged and paid to those institutions for classes, courses, examinations, and academic awards.

The provision in clause 13 has been transplanted in toto from the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission Act. This provision appeared in that Act in 1970 when fees were being charged at the tertiary institutions in this State. However, now the fees for attendance at

these institutions have been abolished; therefore there is no necessity for the provision to remain.

I regret the Premier has left the Chamber, because he dodged my two invitations in the second reading debate to indicate precisely where his Government stood on the question of fees being charged at the tertiary education level.

Mr Grayden: We have already answered a question on that.

Mr BRYCE: I accept the point the Minister makes in respect of the State Government. It is quite clear the State Government has no intention of reintroducing fees to be charged for attendance at WAIT, but there is no guarantee in terms of attitude that we can confidently expect an undertaking that this will not happen through the Government at Canberra.

Point of Order

Mr HARTREY: On a point of order, does the speech of the honourable member relate to the Committee stage or to the second reading stage of the Bill?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): I believe that so far it relates to the clause under discussion. I have allowed the honourable member a certain amount of licence.

Committee Resumed

Mr BRYCE: I am happy to show the member for Boulder-Dundas the page of the Bill we are considering. If he opens up his copy at that page and listens to the debate he will appreciate that proposed section 12 (e) (iii) at page 9 relates specifically to the question that was asked in this Chamber yesterday about the Government's attitude on this matter.

With this provision in mind I asked the Minister a question yesterday whether it was the intention of the Government to reintroduce fees in the tertiary institutions, and, if so, what was the purpose of the provision. The Minister indicated the purpose in his answer to the question as follows—

Advice to governing authorities of tertiary education institutions concerning fee matters is a retention of an existing function of the Tertiary Education Commission. The Government was advised to retain this function for the new Commission so that in the unlikely event of changes in national policies on fees, then further amendments to the Act to restore the function would be unnecessary.

All members on this side of the Chamber are happy to spell out the fact that we are clearly opposed to any provision in the Bill to enable the Government at either the national or State level to take action to introduce fees to be charged at tertiary institutions. If there were Labor

Governments in office in Western Australia and at the national level there would be no doubt about this whatsoever; no fees would be charged.

Mr O'Neil: Could you not visualise the Australian Labor Party changing its policy on this matter at some point in the future?

Mr BRYCE: No, but if we took that interpretation into account on every Bill that we consider, we would have a list of clauses as long as one's arm with qualifications for every possible change of policy in the future. I do not think that is a practical consideration.

If there were Labor Governments at both the State and national level there would be no need for this clause in the Bill. It is for the reason that there is a Liberal Government in office in Canberra that confusion and anxiety are created in the minds of the people as to the reintroduction of fees at the tertiary level.

Mr Blaikie: The only anxiety that is created has been created by the member for Ascot.

Mr BRYCE: The Government could dispel the fear and the anxiety in the minds of the people by the removal of this clause. That would be one step.

Mr O'Neil: What would be the position if the occasion arose 30 or 40 years' hence to charge fees? The Government has already expressed its present view in answer to a question you put to the Minister.

Mr Jamieson: This Government has gone back on many of the views it has put forward.

Mr BRYCE: It is precisely the fact that this Government has gone back on so many of its promises that many people are concerned. It is obvious that members of the Government in this Chamber cannot give us an assurance that from the point of view of their own political party the Fraser Government will not reintroduce these fees.

I move an amendment—

Page 9—Delete subparagraph (iii).

Mr GRAYDEN: I think the member for Ascot is tilting at windmills on this particular issue.

Mr Davies: We remember what happened with regard to the amendment to the State Housing Act.

Mr GRAYDEN: The fears of the member for Ascot are quite unfounded. In reply to the question he asked we obtained an answer from the Minister for Education which was absolutely specific. The Minister said there were no plans to introduce fees for tertiary education institutions. The Government was advised to retain the provision so that in the unlikely event of changes—which I emphasise—in national policies, then further amendments to the Act to restore the function of the education council to advise on the

charging of fees would be unnecessary. That answer is absolutely specific and sets out the attitude of the State Government.

The Government cannot go beyond that and commit future national Governments of whatever political complexity they may be. I would remind the member for Ascot that a most important aspect of this measure is that we are dealing with the actual post-secondary education commission, the composition of which he has spoken about quite favourably. The functions of the commission will be to advise the governing authorities of the respective post-secondary institutions on various matters, one of which is that to which he has referred: the fees to be charged by and paid to those institutions. If at some time in the future there is some change in national policy—whether by a Liberal Government or a Labor Government—the provision to charge fees will be in the Act.

In view of the unequivocal assurance of the State Government, and in view of the impossibility to commit any Government of the future, I regret I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr JAMIESON: I support my colleague in his move to delete subparagraph (iii). Similar information to that supplied by the Minister could probably have been supplied to us when we had before us last year an amendment to the State Housing Act. We do not intend to be caught again and have the Government claim that we did not oppose the measure. On the occasion last year we were told that the legislation proposed a nominal fee, but it turned out that the fee was more than nominal.

If some future Government desires to charge a fee for tertiary education it will be up to that Government to come to Parliament and ask for the provision to be included in the Act. At present, and as far as can be seen in the future, fees will not be charged. Governments come and go, but the Minister cannot assure us what future Governments will require of the authority. We should make sure we give a direction at this juncture.

The Government and the tertiary educational institutions should not have the opportunity to make a decision overnight, and start to charge a fee. I suggest the Committee would be wise to vote for the deletion of the subparagraph.

Mr SKIDMORE: I support the amendment. It should be a function of Governments at least to try not to clutter Bills with unnecessary clauses. People become confused with the verbiage of some Acts and certainly some of that verbiage has been challenged in this place.

The Minister, in replying to the amendment, indicated a complete lack of sincerity. He said that in 1970, when the Act came into force, the provision for fees was included and the present measure is simply

a retention of the existing functions of the Tertiary Education Commission. He said the provision has not been implemented during a period of six years. Although the provision has been redundant for six years it is to be included in the present measure in case at some future time there is the unlikely need to impose a fee. It is quite ridiculous to retain the provision and it makes a farce of the Bill. I support the amendment.

Mr BRYCE: The explanation provided by the Minister was not satisfactory at all. The provision became redundant in the old Act when fees for tertiary education were abolished. If we were to take into consideration all the forward steps taken during the last 50 years, but retained in our legislation all the redundant provisions because they might be required in the future, our legislative programmes would become hopelessly bogged down.

The truth of the matter is that the Liberal Party, as a party, is not committed to retaining free tertiary education. There has been a lot of shilly-shallying at the national level. It is important to remember that on two specific occasions the Premier refused to answer very simple questions when asked whether he approved the decision to abolish fees for tertiary education, or whether he supported a move to reinstate them. He completely rejected the opportunity to answer those questions, as he has done in the past with regard to other questions. If the Government were opposed to the reintroduction of fees at the tertiary level of education it would have no hesitation whatsoever in agreeing to the deletion of the provision.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: When I attended the university it was free, and no fees were payable. With the advent of the Liberal Government in Canberra in the 1950s, we went backwards because fees were introduced for the first time ever.

Mr O'Neill: What Government was in power in Canberra while you received your free university training? You said that with the advent of the Liberal Government, fees were introduced.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I attended university during the first two or three years of the Menzies Government, but it took a while to get moving and then fees were introduced for the first time. With the introduction of fees, when the standard of living was much lower than it is today, a large number of people were prevented from attending university. When I was a teacher I taught many people who did not go on to university for that very reason.

Mr Clarko: That is not true.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I do not appreciate being called a liar by the member for Karrinyup.

Mr Clarko: I did not say that; I said the reason was not true.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: It is true, because many people could not get a Commonwealth scholarship.

Mr Clarko: Not in your day.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: They were not able to go on to a university education. I knew a certain person who was the son of a doctor, and he was generally regarded as being a "log". In those days he was able to attend university for four years until he passed the first year. Dad was able to pay for him to go back time and time again, until eventually he got his degree and he was let loose on the public. That kind of opportunity was denied to people living in poorer circumstances.

Mr Clarko: The opportunity was not denied to them because of fees.

Mr Blaikie: Was that the exception or the rule? Be fair.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We believe there are people within our community whose ability we need. It will be remembered that the conservatives, 60 or 70 years ago, raised the same argument against secondary education for the children of working class people as was raised 100 years ago when there was opposition to education for children of primary school age. Those propositions were resisted, except for the children of the rich, and in the same way it seems the Government is ready to make tertiary education available only to the privileged.

Mr Clarko: Are you quoting Karl Marx or Groucho Marx?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We reject this for two reasons. Firstly, on the simple principle of equity because no child chooses his parents, and therefore he should not be punished for his parents' inability to pay. Secondly, we reject it on rational ground that this country needs the abilities of every one of its citizens, no matter from what economic class he has come.

Mr Clarko: Economic class—that's a nice expression!

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Concern has been expressed from the other side about a \$5 000 million deficit, but this deficit did not stop Malcolm Fraser putting his hand into a public fund to reintroduce the superphosphate bounty. Malcolm Fraser, a wealthy man, also said that the pensioners could not have an increase.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): Could you please come back to the Bill we are discussing. We are not discussing superphosphate or any such thing.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We are discussing tertiary education fees.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, let us discuss them.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We are discussing where this money comes from. If you are to allow people on the other side of the Chamber—

Mr Mensaros: Do not argue with the Chair!

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will the member please resume his seat? I have ruled already that we will return to the clause in question and discuss that. I do not expect you will enter into a debate on a ruling from this Chair. The member for Morley.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The question of the \$5 000 million deficit was raised by the other side of the Chamber.

Mr Clarko: Not on this clause.

Mr Bryce: Yes, on this clause.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Is your ruling, Sir, that I am not allowed to reply to that comment?

Mr O'Neil: We are talking about an amendment moved by one of your members.

Mr Bertram: It does not matter who introduced it—it is in.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The point is that the money will have to come from the public purse, and it has been stated that there is a \$5 000 million deficit.

Mr Clarko: That has nothing to do with this clause.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: If there is concern about that deficit, why is it that the Prime Minister of this country put his hand into the public purse to reintroduce the super-phosphate bounty? We believe there is a shortage of money, but our priorities are different from those of the Government. Our priorities were different decades ago.

Mr Bertram: And still are.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We are very proud that they are different. I will repeat this again, for the benefit of the slower learning pupils opposite. I remind this Chamber that aeons ago I attended a free university. A Liberal Government introduced fees. It is possible that again a Liberal Government will introduce fees, because it does not believe in free education for everyone.

Mr Grayden: That is absolute nonsense!

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr Clarko.

FREMANTLE PORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 18th May.

MR McIVER (Avon) [6.04 p.m.]: I wish to indicate that the Opposition agrees fully with the provisions contained in the legislation. We commend the Fremantle Port Authority for the action it proposes to

take in relation to ships entering Fremantle Harbour. The other clauses in the Bill appertain also to the authority, and we support them.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 6.09 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 25th May, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE

HEALTH

1.

Mt. Magnet: Nursing Post

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the present staffing situation at the Mt. Magnet Nursing Post?
- (2) Does the Minister consider this adequate to meet the needs of the district?
- (3) What arrangements are there for the public to receive emergency after-hours treatment?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Mt. Magnet Nursing Post is staffed by a full time Sister-in-Charge.
- (2) The normal staffing arrangement for Nursing Posts is one full time Sister with provision for a local registered nurse to be available on call when the Sister-in-Charge is away on her days off duty. To date it has not been possible to make a call arrangement at Mt. Magnet but efforts are continuing.
- (3) Sister is available after normal hours of emergency treatment. On Sister's days off when she may be away from the town, a notice indicates that those requiring attention should contact Meekatharra Hospital and that ambulance transport may be arranged through the local Police.

2.

WATER SUPPLIES

Darkan

The Hon. T. O. FERRY, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) When is it anticipated that the upgrading of the Darkan water supply will be completed?