of money available for these very worthwhile causes. We hear many complaints at times that not enough money is spent on agricultural research and it appears from these Estimates that the Government is taking a retrograde step. All sorts of problems are plaguing farmers and graziers and an increased amount on research in this regard would be justified.

Is this to be the trend in the future? Can we expect that eventually no amount will be allocated for agricultural development? It appears that will be the situation, particularly when we realise that in almost every other instance, if not every instance, the allocation has been increased.

Quite often we hear country representatives tell us in this Chamber that the people they represent are the salt of the earth and should be looked after, particularly in the field of research, in order that they might continue to produce the wealth of this country. Now, however, we find that the Government, of which they are a party, is to reduce expenditure drastically while in all other departments allowance is made for an increase.

When we take into consideration the problems of inflation, we must realise that in addition to the amount being reduced this year, we will not get as much value for that amount as we would have gained for the same amount last year.

I could not let the item pass without making some comment and I hope that some of those members who look to the agricultural areas for support will question why this amount in the Estimates has been reduced so drastically.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I seek clarification, Mr Chairman. If I speak now will I prevent anyone else speaking on this matter, or are we in Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: We are in Committee so the Treasurer may reply to each point as it is raised.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I invite the attention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the fact that the Department of Agriculture as such in the Loan Estimates is never in its own right a big spender of loan moneys. While it appears that the reduction in these items, percentage-wise is big in comparison with the amounts allocated last year, we must remember that not only must we read these figures in conjunction with the schedule at the back to ascertain the spending allocation and the spread of the spending, but we must also consider them in conjunction with the money allocated to agriculture under the Revenue Estimates.

Under those Estimates an amount of $15.45 million was allocated to agriculture last year, which is roughly $15.5 million, and this year the amount allocated is $18.4 million which is near enough to $18.5 million which makes an increase of approximately $3 million in the amount allocated to the department.

Mr Davies: From what are you quoting?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am quoting the figures in the Revenue Estimates which is where the main debate normally takes place on agriculture as it is in that area that the big sums of money are allocated for such things as staff, research work, extension work, and so on.

Mr Jamieson: But capital works must come under this.

Sir CHARLES COURT: True; but on the other hand I make the point that normally—some years the situation is different—under its own heading agriculture does not have a large amount of money allocated to it for its own actual capital works. In that regard the matter must be kept in its proper perspective. I hope I have explained the position.

I might add that it was not my intention to rush the item through tonight. If members wish to report progress it is quite all right with me. On the other hand, if they wish to proceed further, it is equally all right with me. I again emphasise that this has never been a big vote on its own. The main expenditure for agriculture is in part 5 of the General Estimates for which this year the amount allocated is $18.4 million compared with $15.4 million last year.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr T. D. Evans.

House adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 28th October, 1975

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

BILLS (10): ASSENT

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Inventions Bill.
2. Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill.
3. District Court of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill.
4. Recording of Evidence Bill.
5. Auction Sales Act Amendment Bill.
6. Evidence Act Amendment Bill.
7. Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill.
8. Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill.
9. Juries Act Amendment Bill.
10. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Report: Tabling

THE PRESIDENT: I wish to lay upon the Table of the House the report of the Parliamentary Library for the year ended the 29th July, 1975.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 411).

QUESTION ON NOTICE

WATER SUPPLIES AND SEWERAGE

Relocation: City of Stirling

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

(1) Was the City of Stirling charged an excess of over $70 000 for the re-location of water and sewerage services in Wanneroo Road?

(2) Was this account rendered as long as six months after the works had been completed?

(3) If so, what is the explanation for this delay?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

(1) Yes. The original quote was given in June 1972 and the work was completed, except for some tidying up, in December 1974. The excess cost was due to increased cost of materials and wages as well as variations to the original plans to satisfy the City of Stirling.

(2) Yes.

(3) To ensure the accuracy of the final account.

BILLS (5): THIRD READING

1. Church of England (Diocesan Trustees) Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and transmitted to the Assembly.

2. Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 3).

3. Murdoch University Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills read a third time, on motions by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and transmitted to the Assembly.

4. Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.

5. Motor Vehicle Dealers Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills read a third time, on motions by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Health), and passed.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.45 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

Sections 73B and 79 of the Evidence Act, 1906, as presently in force are both designed to facilitate the proof of the incorporation of companies and the admissibility of copies of documents filed in relation to companies.

Section 73B is applicable to documents which have been in the custody of the Registrar of Companies of this State, and section 79 deals with certifications for incorporation and other documents relating to companies registered outside the State.

In both instances, the sections refer to the officer certifying or having the custody of the documents as a Registrar of Companies, or an Assistant or Deputy Registrar of Companies. The purpose of this Bill is merely to recognise that in this State, as well as in some other States, the title "Registrar of Companies" has been altered to "Commissioner of (or for) Corporate Affairs", and that the titles of the assistants and deputies have been similarly altered. In addition, in New South Wales the Corporate Affairs Commission is a body corporate, and certifications of copies of documents kept by that commission may be given under the seal of the commission, as distinct from under the hand of the commissioner.

Accordingly, the Bill is designed merely to ensure that the purposes of sections 73B and 79 can still be met, notwithstanding the changes in titles which have occurred in this and other States.

In another place the question was raised as to whether clause 4 of the Bill was satisfactory in so far as it had the effect of deleting New Zealand from the category of places to which section 79 applies. It is quite true that section 79, as amended, will no longer have the effect of requiring courts and persons acting judicially to admit and receive as evidence of the incorporation of a company a certificate under the hand of the Registrar or an Assistant or Deputy Registrar of Companies in New Zealand.

In preparing the Bill, the approach was taken that whatever might have been the situation in 1906, there was no longer any reason to place New Zealand in a different category than other of Her Majesty's Dominions, for example, Canada, in this regard. To illustrate the point, it does not seem to be logical that judicial notice should be required to be taken under section 79 of the Evidence Act of a certificate of incorporation or other official record of a New Zealand incorporated company, if no such requirement exists for a Canadian company.

It was also suggested in another place that, in effect, the Bill is relegating New Zealand to the status of a foreign country, but this is not so. For example, in section 58, which facilitates the production in evidence of statutory instruments, the term "Australasian Colony" has been retained, and there is no suggestion that it should be altered to exclude New Zealand.

In the Government's view, the amendments to section 79 of the Act which clause 4 as now drafted would effect, are satisfactory.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South West—Minister for Education) [4.48 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act emanates from a conference of State Premiers with the Prime Minister, held on the 20th June, 1975, when it was agreed that the States would adhere to the principles laid down by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in respect of the implementation of wage indexation.

Some States have already moved in that direction, and Western Australia proposes to conform by amending the Industrial Arbitration Act so as to allow the Western Australian Industrial Commission to refuse to register industrial agreements which do not conform to the general principles of wage indexation. Uncontrolled wage movements in agreements could jeopardise the wage fixation principles.

The Western Australian Industrial Commission, in its decision of the 1st July, 1975, tied its wage indexation in awards to the decisions and principles of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and re-iterated the views "that some form of wage indexation would contribute to a more rational system of wage fixation, to more orderly, more equitable, and less inflationary wage increases, and to better industrial relations, thus aiding economic recovery".

Unions of workers and employers will still have the right to bargin to reach consent agreements, but will have to do so within the guidelines which the arbitral authorities have set down to accompany wage indexation. This action may tend to apply restraints, and stand as a barrier to complete freedom of negotiations between parties, but should encourage each, by its own disciplines, greatly to assist in the salutary steps to be taken to achieve moderation and stability in the pursuit of economic recovery in the community interest.

Lawful action to impose restrictions, and exclude specific matters from collective bargaining or making agreements is not contrary to the principles of international conventions which have been adopted. It has generally been accepted that emergency, as well as temporary measures invoked by the authorities should be admitted which may place restraint on voluntary bargaining without impairing the guarantees of the conventions. The law of the land must be respected and, indeed, this amending law could well be the saviour of the right to bargain, for failure to abide by its principles could lead to a complete breakdown, both industrially and economically, with spiralling inflation.

The Bill will be given effect by clause 4 which adds a new section 71A to the principal Act. This will empower the Western Australian Industrial Commission to refuse to authorise the filing of an industrial agreement by the Industrial Registrar if any provision of it would, if in force, be contrary to and inconsistent with a decision of the commission which is intended for general application, or for the public interest. This will apply to—

> an agreement made between parties under section 37 of the Act to prevent a dispute or resolve an industrial matter; or
>
> an agreement made under section 65 before or after conciliation and where affected parties have been given the opportunity to be heard.

For like reason the commission will also be given the added power to refuse to make an award or order which departs from the principles. But it will not derogate from any other provisions already in the Act where the commission is authorised to refuse to make an order or award.

The new section 71A is wide in its context, as it has been necessary to draft it in this broad manner to capture the principles underlying the main decision of the Western Australian Industrial Commission of the 1st July, 1975, which is tied to the decision of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and any variations which may subsequently follow.

The Western Australian Industrial Commission, in respect of wage fixation principles, and in common with the Commonwealth commission, has indexed wage rates in accordance with the weighted average movements in the consumer price index for the six capital cities. The other principles which support indexation are an annual productivity review where the relationship in the movement in an award which has a well recognised nexus with an award of another industrial authority and the elimination of unfair discrepancies can be considered. Additionally, any wage increase sought will be tested against a change in the nature of the work, skill, or responsibility or the conditions under which the work is performed.

A refusal to authorise registration of an agreement will be a decision of a commissioner against which, in accordance with section 108C, there is a right of appeal to the Commission in Court Session of not less than three commissioners sitting together.

Clause 3, which amends section 38, is consequential because if it is not made there may be grounds to argue that section 38, not being directed at the Industrial Registrar, renders any agreement lodged for filing as being regarded as a filed agreement, notwithstanding the new section 71A empowering the commission to refuse to authorise such filing.

The concerted approach by the States and this Government to alleviate the situation deserves the support of all, including the unions, in its objective. The intention of the legislation is clear. It is a move along a path to overcome problems which pose a real threat to our livelihood, whether we be employers, employees, or otherwise. I would venture to predict, nevertheless, that an improvement in the overall position by, say, the end of next year could well merit a review of the need for the type of legislation contained in this measure.

Some other amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act are contemplated for introduction before this parliamentary session concludes. These may have to be dealt with in separate Bills, as at least two are consequential and dependent upon the presentation and acceptance by Parliament of such measures as an industrial training Bill and an employment agents Bill. There is also a Bill to be presented shortly to cover some machinery and administrative amendments, these matters having already been examined and concurred in by the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and the Western Australian Trades and Labor Council.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the Hospitals Act, 1927-1973, in two areas.

The first amendment is to section 18 (2) and embodies the Government's policy that no Government should hold the power to direct an individual doctor how he may or may not treat his patient. The existence of such a power is completely unacceptable to the medical profession, there being appropriate mechanisms for dealing with ethical problems.

The matter of treating individual patients is one between doctor and patient and no political power should be interposed between them. This principle is not made abundantly clear in the current wording of the Act and therefore an amendment is necessary.

The second amendment deals with the matter of raising fees for doctors' services to patients in Government hospitals. The advent of the Commonwealth-State hospitals agreement precludes the raising of such charges in respect of "hospital" patients and "out-patients" of recognised hospitals as defined by the Commonwealth Health Insurance Act, 1973. The proposed amendment brings the Hospitals Act, 1927-1973 into line with the hospitals agreement and provides that this shall apply so long as a Commonwealth-State hospitals agreement is in force.

I now commend the Bill to the House.

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

MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [4.58 p.m.]: This Bill, if passed, will necessitate some subsequent amendments to the Local Government Act and the Road Traffic Act. Members may wonder why I used the words, "if passed". I did so because during the debate in another place it was pointed out that the opinion of the Local Government Association and the Country Shire Councils' Association had not been obtained. I would like the Minister to indicate, perhaps by way of a nod, whether he would be prepared to delay the debate for a little longer so that the view of those associations could be obtained. I understand they have written to the Minister.

I do not wish to debate the issue at any length at this stage because it would be pointless in view of the fact that the Local Government Association has submitted proposals for amendments. We would have no objection to the legislation as it stands, but in view of the submission received, I would like the Minister to give an indication that the debate will be delayed. We will not oppose the second reading of this or the subsequent Bills on the notice paper provided we can have that assurance from the Minister.

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [5.00 p.m.]: It is not my intention to oppose the second reading of this Bill, but there are one or two matters which I believe need discussion. The Bill refers to the classification of roads in Western Australia. Firstly, it describes a new category of highway which conforms with the legislation which has been introduced in the Federal Parliament. The next classification is main roads, which are substantially what we have always considered them to be,

except that large lengths of main roads have been transferred into the highways category, and this applies particularly in the North Province. The next classification is that of secondary roads and it includes what we used to refer to as both important secondary roads and developmental roads.

The Main Roads Department accepts full financial responsibility for highways and main roads, and some 4 200 kilometres have been added to the existing main roads. This obviously has an effect on the road responsibility of local authorities throughout the State because clearly the 4 200 kilometres of road have been taken from another category and added to the main roads and highways categories, and perhaps this will remove some of the financial burden from some local authorities. Perhaps one result of creating special roads, such as national highways and export roads, will be to enable them to attract some of the special allocations of funds currently available.

The Main Roads Department will make a substantial contribution towards secondary roads but local authorities will have to accept the ultimate responsibility for the continuing maintenance of these roads. In his speech the Minister said funds would be channelled into this category of road but I believe it is essential that there be consultation between the Main Roads Department and the local authorities in connection with the spending of this money, because of the continuing responsibility which, as I mentioned, local authorities will have to carry. I believe it is largely this matter which has been questioned by the Local Government Association, and, like Mr Dellar, I would like the assurance of the Minister that it will be satisfactorily resolved.

The next category is roads other than those classified. The Main Roads Department may spend money on these roads and there is a requirement that consultation take place with the local authority. It is unfortunate that the Bill does not stipulate that there shall be consultation in the case of funds spent by the Main Roads Department on the secondary roads.

In his speech, on page 3579 of *Hansard*, the Minister said—

> Provision is also made in the Bill for the commissioner to construct or assist in the construction of roads other than classified roads, which may be necessary to meet the needs of a particular area.

This obligation to consult is clearly spelt out in the Bill. One interesting provision of which I am very much in favour is that moneys given to local authorities for these roads must be spent within a given time and the work must be carried out to a given standard, otherwise the local authorities will lose the funds. If the local authorities do not meet the standards they will not qualify for the money. This is quite a satisfactory arrangement.

The whole question of sharing responsibility between the different authorities—in this case the Main Roads Department and the shire councils—opens up a wide-ranging discussion. In the Main Roads Act, 1930, it is clearly implied that there will be co-operation between the Main Roads Department and the local authorities, and I am firmly of the opinion that it is only through the development of this co-operation that we will ever achieve a high standard of roads throughout the State of Western Australia. In the amending Bill now before us the implication is quite clear, that the Main Roads Department has a responsibiilty for all roads. I see this being developed with the department, as the central road authority in Western Australia, carrying out its responsibility through its engineers giving guidance to the local authorities, helping them recruit the right type of work force, purchase the right plant, and create an efficient plant maintenance set-up.

It is a pity that we find a tendency among a few of the Main Roads Department field officers to think they do not have a responsibility beyond the main roads. I firmly believe that the expertise of the Main Roads Department, the central road authority, should be applied to every highway and byway throughout Western Australia, and the most effective way in which this can be done is by increasing the capacity of the local authorities to do work efficiently, quickly, and economically.

Some of the outback shire councils have a lamentably poor ability to carry out good road work, but having accepted the responsibility to improve the shires' capabilities, I think it is very important that the Main Roads Department channel funds to enable the plant and the work force to be fully utilised and thus create a uniform high standard of road construction throughout the length and breadth of the State.

The money available to spend on roads comes from many sources, but primarily from the petrol tax which is returned to the local authorities by way of CAR funds. In addition to that, there are specific allocations and other funds which are available. Clearly the best value we will get for the dollar spent is through a concerted effort by all road authorities to improve their ability to use their money efficiently and well.

In making these comments, I am not implying there has been a lack of cooperation in the past. On the contrary, my experience has been that main roads engineers are only too willing to help in every way they can and to advise local authorities how best to put their available funds to use. However, there are some officers who have not yet recognised

the fact that they have a wider responsibility than just working on the main roads.

I go a stage further. I believe in the long term local authorities should be spending most of the road funds which are allocated to roads within the boundaries of their shires. All work other than the construction of main roads and highways should be carried out by the local authorities.

Let us take, for example, the case of the Shire of East Pilbara. From just south of the Tropic of Capricorn to not far from Port Hedland there are about 400 miles of main road, which is a dirt road. In addition, there is what was an important secondary road of about 100 miles from Roy Hill and going towards Wittenoom. In total, there are about 500 miles of road which is being maintained on a regular basis by the Main Roads Department. At the same time, the plant of the local authority is moving up and down the same section of road, usually travelling in a blade-up position to maintain an access road to a mining lease or a pastoral property. Clearly, it would be economical and sensible for the one authority to do all the work, and logically this is the locally based shire council work force. The work force needs to be educated, trained, and encouraged to do this work by the Main Roads Department. In this way, not only could the shire councils do their own work more efficiently and effectively, but all the municipal tasks in the towns of Newman, Nullagine, Marble Bar, Shay Gap, and Goldsworthy could be done as the main plant and work force moved progressively through the shire.

The Bill also deals with road closures, and I will read what the Minister had to say about this, on page 3579 of *Hansard*—

> The Bill also proposes to provide the Commissioner of Main Roads with the specific power of temporary closure of highways and main roads under his control. While local authorities have this authority by virtue of a model by-law under the Local Government Act to enforce temporary closure of roads under their control, there is no such specific power for road closure in the Main Roads Act.

The need to close roads at times when undue damage could be done to them or when it may be dangerous to use them is not disputed. Clearly, there should be authority to close the roads in those circumstances. However, I question whether it is desirable to have this power in the Main Roads Act. I wonder whether the existing state of affairs does not cover the situation better. I refer again to the Minister's speech. On page 3580 of *Hansard* he said—

> The authority proposed to be given to the Commissioner of Main Roads is similar to that contained in the local authority model by-law for closure of roads . . .

The relevant model by-law is No. 15, which deals with the prevention of damage to streets. This model by-law has been adopted by most rural local authorities in Western Australia, although in some cases perhaps with minor modifications. On reading the by-law one finds that a road may be closed to traffic generally or to particular classes of traffic. There are requirements to display notices of closure on a notice board, to broadcast such closures, to erect signs, barriers, lights, reflectors, etc., and to fence off the road. In addition, the manner in which the closure is to be terminated is specifically stated. The same provisions are duplicated in the Bill before us, but the Bill does not provide for the withdrawal of the power of a local authority to close a road. Clearly the local authority, quite apart from the Main Roads Department, must still retain such power to close other roads in the shire and this, in fact, will be done. I believe there could be and perhaps will be conflict in the application of the power of the Main Roads Department to close roads without prior consultation with the local authority.

I could be wrong in this, but I firmly believe there may well be a few occasions when a Main Roads divisional engineer will possibly close a main road without consulting the shire clerk or the shire engineer. It is essential, however, that this consultation should take place.

When considering my own province again I can well imagine that the divisional engineer would not even know that the Elvire River was flooding and he would not know whether or not the main road between Halls Creek and Nicholson Station should be closed. Clearly this action must be taken by the local authority rather than by the divisional engineer who is based 500 miles away in Derby.

I do really believe there is room for misunderstanding in such cases; and I believe it is conceivable the road will be reopened by the shire clerk at the eastern end of Halls Creek-Fitzroy Crossing Road after consultation with the shire president —which he is obliged to do—but the divisional engineer at the same time might close the western end. This, of course, could create problems.

I have great admiration for the engineers of the Main Roads Department—indeed I have many friends among them—but with great respect I believe that the man on the spot is usually the man who is best able to judge the standard and the condition of the road that is being affected; it is he who is best able to determine whether a road closure should be applied.

I do feel the authority we are providing in the Bill before us may tend to have an unsatisfactory result where roads are being

closed without full consultation with the local authority concerned. When the Minister was talking of this and when he was referring to the position as it is at present he said, and I quote from page 3579 of *Hansard*—

> the commissioner ... is obliged to co-opt the services of a local authority in order to close a main road for a temporary period to prevent damage. This is quite an unsatisfactory situation, as I have already indicated.

I do not think it works out that way at all. I believe it is usually the shire clerk and the shire council which co-opts the services of the Main Roads Department. This is usually the case and it may be better to leave it that way.

I would ask the Minister to try to explain to me how he can see no possible conflict between the two sets of laws covering exactly the same thing and applied at exactly the same time. How will this be applied without it occasionally creating a rather chaotic situation?

The third item to which I would like to make brief reference is the fact that the Main Roads Department has the power to borrow money. Quite frankly this took me by surprise, because I was not aware that up to date a semi-autonomous body like the Main Roads Department did not have that power. It is essential that such an authority should have this power and I am glad to see these provisions included in the Bill.

Under the existing financial arrangements in Australia we rarely find any funds that are not proscribed in some manner. We have tied grants for national highways, export roads, urban arterial roads and many other classifications of roads and even in the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act there are specific matching conditions which tend to dictate the manner in which road authorities in Western Australia can spend their money.

It is very easy for me to conceive that the Main Roads Department needs the flexibility which can provide it with certain funds it could spend without having to be tied down by someone sitting in Canberra and telling the department how it can spend its money.

This provision appeals to me immensely, particularly when I note that the type of work that will be done includes the construction of a new divisional office at Port Hedland.

The power is clearly needed and, as the Minister pointed out, the roads funds cannot be applied for such work as the construction of office blocks. But there are other works such as specific bridge work and other things to which the loan funds could be applied.

We need not be concerned about the misuse by the Main Roads Department of this power to borrow funds, because in the past the Treasury Department has kept a very close watch on the dealings of semi-autonomous bodies. Accordingly, I feel there will be no misuse of this borrowing power.

In closing I would like to draw the Minister's attention to the two points I have made; the first of which is that co-operation between the MRD and shire councils should be taken much further; and along with this is the need to channel additional funds to local authorities so that, in fact, they can carry out a far better and bigger task than they have in the past.

This in turn will give them the ability to spend their own money on the normal municipal functions and know they are getting better value for every dollar that is spent in the shire.

In addition, I do think it is important that the House should get some advice from the Minister as to whether there is likely to be conflict on this question of road closures, and if so, how will it be overcome.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [5.22 p.m.]: After reading the Minister's second reading speech I am still not at all sure of the difference between a highway and a main road.

I do think some regard should be had for the fact that so many of our country roads have to carry large quantities of super. So often do we assess a road on the number of cars using it rather than on the weight of goods that is being carried over such a road. There are whole areas of land which cannot be opened up or which could only be opened up only at great expense without the use of special roads.

I say this because I have just been handed a submission to have sealed the remainder of the road from Lake Varley to Lake Armadale. This may sound like a long stretch of road but I assure the House it is sealed for most of the way; there is just a small section between Hyden and Lake Varley that has yet to be done.

It was the intention of the Government two or three years ago to carry out this work. This is evident, because the road has been surveyed, the land has been resumed and there are even piles of blue metal lying around. Unfortunately, however, because of a change of policy the work was never completed.

It is very important to those who live in these areas that this work should be completed. In recent years we have seen this land opened up—and I was up there last week, and I was surprised to find what was the value of the land, and also that a number of companies have shown an interest in moving out there to work at both farming and mining.

I suppose there are very few members in this Chamber who have ever been to Lake Varley, but I can assure them that it has proved to be a successful wheat-growing area, particularly with the farm machinery that is now available.

While these people are able to develop their land they find difficulty in getting the grain to the various CBH receival points. In most cases railways serve the major districts, but there is no service to the areas that were opened up later. I hope the Main Roads Department gives earnest consideration to this submission with a view to alleviating the plight of the people who are developing these remote areas.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [5.25 p.m.]: The amendments contained in this Bill are consequential upon the previous Bill the debate of which has been adjourned a moment ago—the Main Roads Act Amendment Bill. We have no objection to the measure.

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.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [5.28 p.m.]: The Opposition has no objection to this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 28th October, 1975

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

BILLS (10): ASSENT

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Inventions Bill.
2. Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill.
3. District Court of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill.
4. Recording of Evidence Bill.
5. Auction Sales Act Amendment Bill.
6. Evidence Act Amendment Bill.
7. Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill.
8. Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill.
9. Juries Act Amendment Bill.
10. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Report: Tabling

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I table the annual report of the Parliamentary Library of Western Australia for the year ended the 29th July, 1975.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 503).

QUESTIONS (25): ON NOTICE

1\. METROPOLITAN HIGH SCHOOLS

Prevocational Centres

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

(1) Have any of the metropolitan five year high schools not been provided with prevocational centres and, if so, which schools?

(2) Are these high schools to receive priority rating when any future prevocational centres are provided?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) (a) Yes.

(b) John Curtin Senior High School.

City Beach Senior High School.

Tuart Hill Senior High School.

Kewdale Senior High School.

(2) The above schools will receive due consideration in relation to the needs of other schools should additional funds become available for the provision of prevocational centres.