

Mr RUSHTON: According to latest referendums—

Mr Davies: We will not argue that.

Mr RUSHTON: I want to make it clear so that I am not told I am not being factual. It is recorded on the files that on the question of a referendum the LGA does not consider it its business and leaves it to the local authorities individually.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 1.47 a.m. (Wednesday).

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 30th April, 1975

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

QUESTIONS (13): ON NOTICE

1. KIMBERLEY REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR

Applications for Vacancy

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for North-West:

Pursuant to the answer to my question concerning the Kimberley Regional Administrator on the 23rd April, 1975—

- (1) In view of the Premier's statement to the effect that top civil servants in the future would be expected to have passed through these regional posts, can the reluctance of middle level and senior men to apply indicate—
 - (a) an inadequacy in the salary offered;
 - (b) doubts as to the duties, responsibilities and effectiveness of the new structure;
 - (c) reluctance on the part of the more senior officers to leave their comfortable St. George's Terrace offices to face up to "frontier-town" conditions—even though the position offers an outstanding opportunity to prove their administrative and professional capabilities;

(d) an absence of the normally expected services and facilities (particularly educational, medical, etc.) in Kununurra, to which a middle-aged officer would not expose his family?

- (2) If the Kimberley Regional Administrator is appointed from outside the Civil Service, as seems likely, will he—
 - (a) be employed on a contract of service; or
 - (b) be appointed as a permanent officer within the Public Service Act?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) The Minister can find no record of the Premier having expressed the view that "top civil servants in the future would be expected to have passed through these regional posts . . ."

However, an appropriate extract from the Premier's 1974 State General Election Policy document relating to regional centres, is—

"We want these regional representatives to be well-qualified, and to regard their regional service as a positive stepping stone towards advancement in their careers.

It will be our policy to give a significant degree of preference in promotion to men and women who have undertaken regional service.

In this way, the essential central administration in Perth will be increasingly led by people who have the regional concept at heart and believe in the ideal and in the practical application of decentralism."

This is still the policy and the objective of the Government.

Whilst the Government would like to feel that an ever-increasing number of their senior public servants will have had experience in regional offices and similar positions away from the metropolitan area, it would be unrealistic to make this an arbitrary requirement.

The Government does not relate the number of applicants either from within or

without the public service of this State to the points (a)-(d) raised by the hon. member. The calibre of the applicants is more important than the number.

Also, it is expected that when there is greater experience of the organisation and responsibilities proposed in these regional government offices, there will be an increasing interest and desire to participate.

There is a considerable number of very dedicated people within the public service who, we feel, will be attracted to these positions.

- (2) The appointment is as a Permanent Officer within the Public Service Act.

2. RED KANGAROOS

Registered Shooters

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

Are all registered red kangaroo shooters operating on a viable basis?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied: The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife does not have hard data on the financial status of any shooters and no direct complaints of hardship have been received.

The majority of licensed red kangaroo shooters have alternative sources of income—either through shooting goats and donkeys or camels for sale or through other activities. In the year ended the 31st January, 1975 only 21 of the 50 licensed red kangaroo shooters shot their full allocation (or near enough to it). However, most of the others shot at least 75 per cent of their quota. Despite the relatively low numbers of red kangaroos taken, there has been no upsurge of license transfers or cancellations. Rumours have circulated that some experienced shooters are interested in leaving the industry, but one must expect even successful ones to tire of the life in time.

3. TRADE

European Economic Community: Beef and Wine

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Industrial Development:

Has the Australian Government made a trade agreement with the Common Market, and France in

particular, for the European Economic Community to import Australian beef in exchange for Australia importing large amounts of cheap wine from the European Economic Community?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

No. There are no general or specific bilateral trade agreements between Australia and the European Economic Community or between Australia and France.

4. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Charges: Country Towns

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

What is the tariff charged for the sale of electricity to the householder in all country towns served, controlled or assisted, by the State Electricity Commission?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

Domestic Consumer Applicable in	Fixed Charge per Quarter \$	Unit Rate
Interconnected system	1.80	3.4
Derby and Kulin	5.00	3.0
Port Hedland and Karratha	5.00	3.4
Kununurra, Denham, Lake Grace and Marble Bar	5.00	3.5
Jerramungup, Leonora, On- slow and Koebebourne	5.00	4.0
Halls Creek, Cue, Gascoyne Junction, Hyden, Karlgarin, Meekatharra, Newdegate, Nullagine, Nyabing, Pingrup, Ravensthorpe, Salmon Gums, Wiluna, Yalgoo, Kalbarri	5.00	4.5
Esperance	Nil	First 50 per month 3.0 Next 100 per month 5.0 All over 150 per month 4.0

5. PRIMARY PRODUCERS

Government Loans for Machinery and Bores

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Premier:

As the Prime Minister has reportedly agreed to provide low interest loans of \$A3 million to help Peruvians purchase Australian agricultural implements, would he ascertain if the same type of money could be made available to the agricultural industry in Western Australia to—

- (a) purchase agricultural machinery which has escalated in price beyond the financial resources of most farmers; and

- (b) help provide bores and dams for water within the boundaries of the Comprehensive Water Scheme now considered to be too expensive to reticulate with scheme water?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The honourable member can be assured that the Premier and the Government will lose no opportunity to highlight with the Prime Minister and his ministerial colleagues, that the needs of the Australian agricultural industry are just as real and urgent as those of Peruvian farmers.

The significance of the honourable member's question is fully appreciated, especially at a time when many Western Australian farmers are desperately struggling to find money for mere sustenance to enable them at least to remain on their farms in spite of down-turns in beef and some other markets, and steeply escalating costs of fertiliser, machinery and all of the other essentials of farming.

The Prime Minister's acknowledgment of the need for low interest loans to Peruvians to purchase agricultural implements will be a further incentive for us to pursue the prospects of additional money at reasonable interest rates for the Western Australian farming community. It should add greater weight to our representations to get the Commonwealth Government to give dollar for dollar assistance for the additional \$700 000 to the beef industry which the State Government has offered and which—unlike the belated South Australian proposal—the Commonwealth has refused to match.

So far as bores and dams for water are concerned, the Government is currently examining the possibility of an approach to the Commonwealth for financial assistance to improve the provision of secure on-farm water supplies.

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The impact of creating a reservoir on the Fortescue River and its future recreational use is one of the many factors to be assessed during the investigation phases. These aspects are being considered in the current environmental study for the Gregory-Dogger Gorge Dam. In this particular instance, it is necessary to evaluate the use of the reservoir as a part of the overall development of the Millstream area.

At the completion of the current investigation, some years hence, many matters will require policy decisions including the recreational use of the reservoir. It would be premature to decide on this matter at this stage in isolation.

7.

BEEF PRODUCTION

Comparison with Queensland

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Does the Minister agree with the reported statement by Senator Wriedt that Queensland has special needs because of bigger properties and greater specialisation in beef production?
- (2) How do property sizes and specialisation in beef production compare between Queensland and the Kimberley region of Western Australia?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) and (2) A recent paper* by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicated that 36% of producers in Queensland were "specialist" producers; that is, deriving 85% or more of their gross income from the beef enterprise.

The comparable percentage of specialist producers in Western Australia was 16%.

The latest published information from the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicates the following situation—

Number of beef herds 1972-73			
	0-300 head	300-1 000 head	1 000 head and over
Western Australia	9 141	870	198
Queensland	19 385	4 529	1 871

* Source: "The Australian Beef Cattle Industry—An Examination of the Current Situation, Future Prospects and Possible Policy Options".

6.

WATER SUPPLIES

West Pilbara

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Works:

In any storage dam constructed on the Fortescue River for the West Pilbara water supply, will swimming, boating and other aquatic recreational activities be permitted?

8. EDUCATION

Eastern Goldfields Technical School

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that in Boulder recently it was claimed that 1200 students of the Eastern Goldfields Technical School were working in atrocious conditions, and that a new school was urgently needed?
- (2) Is it planned to provide a new school?
- (3) If so—
 - (a) where will it be situated; and
 - (b) at what stage has planning reached?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes, but the word "atrocious" is a gross exaggeration.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) (a) Wilson Street opposite present school.
- (b) It is anticipated that all documentation will be completed by the end of 1975.

9. DENTAL CLINICS

Application of Means Test

The Hon. R. T. LEESON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does a means test apply for persons receiving dental treatment at Government dental clinics in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, what is the means test in—
 - (a) the metropolitan area;
 - (b) country areas; and
 - (c) country areas north of the 26° parallel?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Yes, except in school dental clinics run by Public Health Department.
- (2) (a) See tabled papers—Perth Dental Hospital Assessment Proportion Chart.
- (b) See tabled papers—
 - (i) Perth Dental Hospital Assessment Proportion Chart applies in Bunbury, Boulder, Albany and road dental clinics.
 - (ii) Public Health Department Assessment Proportion Chart (see (c) below) applies in Three Springs, Margaret River, Gnowangerup and Beverley.
- (c) See tabled papers—Public Health Department Assessment Proportion Chart.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 157).

10. ROADS

Rural Areas: Removal of Private Signs

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth for the Hon. C. R. ABBEY, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Main Roads Department, in the south-west and other areas, removing signs on rural properties that relate to the property?
- (2) If so, will the Minister give the reasons and authority for such action?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Signs which relate to the property are permitted on rural properties provided they are not considered to be hazardous to traffic safety or aesthetically objectionable.
- (2) The Commissioner of Main Roads has the authority to exercise such control under section 33b of the Main Roads Act and the Main Roads (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1973 made pursuant to that section.

11. BEEF PRODUCTION

Commonwealth Matching Loan

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the monetary worth of beef exports in the 1973-1974 fiscal year for the States of—
 - (a) Western Australia;
 - (b) Queensland;
 - (c) New South Wales;
 - (d) Victoria;
 - (e) South Australia; and
 - (f) Tasmania?
- (2) In view of the matching Commonwealth loan assistance given to other States for beef aid, what moneys should Western Australia fairly expect to have allocated, if a comparative ratio was calculated against beef production in other States?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) The latest published information from the Australian Bureau of Statistics is for 1972-73.

	\$ million
(a) Western Australia	36.6
(b) Queensland	295.6
(c) New South Wales	109.5
(d) Victoria	170.2
(e) South Australia	19.9
(f) Tasmania	13.7

- (2) Preliminary data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics for beef and veal production during

1973-74 indicate that the percentage production, by State, was—

	per cent
Western Australia	7.2
Queensland	27.1
New South Wales	27.9
Victoria	29.4
South Australia	4.8
Tasmania	3.6

Based on the method of allocation suggested the Commonwealth loan assistance of \$19.6 million would be allocated as follows—

	\$ million
Western Australia	1.41
Queensland	5.31
New South Wales	5.46
Victoria	5.76
South Australia	0.94
Tasmania	0.70

12.

RAILWAYS

Concrete Sleepers

The Hon. R. T. Leeson for the Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

With reference to the proposal to begin next month in Kalgoorlie the manufacture of pre-stressed concrete railway sleepers for the trans-Australian railway line—

- how many sleepers will be required to be manufactured;
- over what period of time will the work take; and
- how many men will be employed daily on the project?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- 300 000.
- Three to four years.
- Approximately twenty.

13. MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Workers' Compensation Coverage

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Justice representing the Treasurer:

Further to part 2 (a) of my question on Tuesday, the 29th April, 1975, concerning compensation for members of Parliament and the reply by the Minister "that members are not employees of the Crown"—

- If the Crown does not employ members of Parliament, who does?
- Does the body that employs members of Parliament employ any person other than members of Parliament?

(3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes" are these additional people covered by workers' compensation?

(4) Does the Workers' Compensation Act specify that this body is excluded from the need to insure some of its salaried employees while it is responsible for others?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

(1) In their capacity as elected representatives of the people, members of Parliament are not employees. To assist members financially to meet their obligations as such elected representatives, Parliament itself has appropriated the Public Account to meet all remuneration payable by virtue of any determination made in accordance with the provisions of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1967-1972.

(2) to (4) Not applicable, in view of the answer to (1).

CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION:

FIRST PART

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.50 p.m.]: I move—

That during the remainder of this first period of the current session so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in any one sitting, and all messages from the Legislative Assembly to be taken into consideration forthwith.

In moving this motion I might add some words of explanation. I think it will be apparent to members of the House and to you, Sir, that we are approaching what we intend shall be the last several days of the first part of the current session of Parliament.

In order that we may be able to proceed without unnecessary delays, in the process of the legislation it is considered the House should provide an opportunity, through the suspension of Standing Orders, to dispense with certain formalities in appropriate situations.

I would like to convey to the House that if members are prepared to support and agree to this motion it is not my intention to unduly hasten legislation, particularly during the general debating stages, to any extent where it limits the opportunities of members to register and record their views and opinions.

I also say that it has been already conveyed, informally, to the members of the House that it is our hope the current part

of this parliamentary session will be concluded at the end of next week, which gives us only a matter of four or five days, as the case may be, during which to complete this portion of our legislative programme.

I am sure members will appreciate there are a number of Bills which it is necessary to pass in order to meet certain statutory requirements where agreements are concerned and which are required to be implemented before the end of the financial year. I will endeavour to give those measures some priority on the notice paper. It may well be—in fact, it is the intention of the Government—that a number of Bills which do not have the same degree of urgency attached to them will remain on the notice paper. Those Bills will be proceeded with in the second part of this session of Parliament—during the spring session.

I hope members will support my motion and I repeat: We will certainly not force measures through this House without opportunity being granted to the Leader of the Opposition, and other speakers, to devote what they regard as an appropriate time to debating them. I commend the motion.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.54 p.m.]: This motion is usual towards the end of a parliamentary session, this being the first part of the current session. We will endeavour to co-operate as far as possible.

I would point out that Bills which are initiated in another place allow us to have some prior notice of their contents, and also allow us to make some preparation with regard to those measures. I am prepared to go on with some of the Bills as they are introduced. Of course, with regard to Bills which we consider should be amended, or which are of a controversial nature, we will naturally ask for a period of adjournment.

Other than that, I think we can co-operate in order to finish this part of the session at the suggested time.

Question put and passed.

NEW BUSINESS: TIME LIMIT

Suspension of Standing Order No. 116

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

That Standing Order No. 116, limit of time for commencing new business, be suspended during the remainder of this first period of the current session.

In moving this motion, inasmuch as it relates to times, perhaps I could indicate that here again this is simply a facility to enable matters to be introduced beyond those times which are presently permitted

under our Standing Orders. The reason for this motion will be obvious to members.

Let me say, once again, it is not my desire to unnecessarily delay the House until what might be called the unnecessary hours of the morning. That is not my intention.

I would also like to convey to members—and again this information has been conveyed informally to members—that there will be some alterations to our sitting times during the remainder of this part of the session in order to give adequate time to the discussion of legislation. The practice has been to give at least a week's notice of our intention to sit on a Thursday night after dinner. I regret I was not able to follow that practice on this occasion.

I would like to think members will co-operate and be prepared to sit after dinner on Thursday of this week; that is, tomorrow night. This procedure will only be necessary if there is legislation before us which, in my judgment, justifies such action.

I also indicate that for next week I have in mind sitting hours which have already been indicated to you, Mr President, and to the Leader of the Opposition. It is my intention that we sit earlier in the afternoon on Wednesday next, commencing at 2.15 p.m. and on Thursday to commence at 11.00 a.m. and continue to sit after dinner on that night.

I hope those sitting hours will enable us to complete our necessary legislative programme. However, in the event that that is not the case I indicate to members it may be necessary for the House to reassemble on the following Friday.

Those comments were a slight departure from the motion before the House and I appreciate your indulgence, Mr President, in allowing me to make that explanation to members. I repeat: The additional sitting times after dinner on Thursdays and on Friday of next week, will be entirely dependent on the position of the legislation in this House.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.59 p.m.]: All I can say is I support the motion.

Question put and passed.

PHOSPHATE CO-OPERATIVE (W.A.) LTD. ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that in 1974 an Act was passed to permit a company known as Phosphate Co-Operative (W.A.) Ltd. to

retain for a limited period application moneys that it had received in response to a prospectus, and so permit the company to make a second attempt to raise sufficient capital to establish a fertiliser works and chemical manufacturing plant within the Shire of Merredin.

The history of the matter had been that the company had failed to attain a minimum subscription to a prospectus issued on the 11th March, 1974, and had approached the Government for assistance in the form of a special Act, to permit the company to retain the moneys initially subscribed for, for a limited period within which the company might register a second prospectus.

The Act which was passed as a result of the company's approach provided that so long as the company, within 14 days of the passage of the Act, remitted all application moneys to the Treasurer and delivered to the registrar the original applications for shares, then the directors would be deemed not to have been in default of section 53 of the Companies (Co-operative) Act, 1943-1959.

The Act then provided that the Treasurer was to invest the moneys so paid to him by the directors, but it further provided that any initial subscriber would be entitled to a refund with interest merely by requesting such a refund in writing to the Treasurer.

Finally, the Act provided that if the company did not lodge with the registrar a second prospectus prior to the 1st July, 1975, or, having so lodged a prospectus, did not obtain a minimum subscription within the ensuing six months, the Treasurer was in any event to repay the moneys originally subscribed.

The directors did, in fact, pay over to the Treasurer the whole of the application moneys subscribed in response to the first prospectus, and they further delivered to the Registrar of Companies all the original forms of applications, but they failed to do so within the limited period of 14 days specified by the Act.

The Government has decided that as the directors have complied substantially with the conditions of the 1974 Act, then the special privileges afforded to the directors by that Act ought still to be granted.

The purpose of the Bill is to repeal and re-enact subsection (1) of section 3 of the Act to provide that the directors have remitted to the Treasurer an amount equal to the total of all moneys received from the initial applicants which the directors are deemed to have been authorised to do, notwithstanding section 52 of the Act. This provision will replace the provision which required compliance within the limited period of 14 days.

Members may note that the Bill does not in any way extend the periods within which the company must lodge the second

prospectus or attain a minimum subscription if such a prospectus is lodged and that the rights of subscribers to the first prospectus as set out in the 1974 Act, have not been altered in any way.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. T. Leeson.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) (5.04 p.m.): I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Stipendiary Magistrates Act at present provides for the appointment of stipendiary magistrates and the assignment of courts to them by the Governor.

The Minister may make temporarily any assignment and in practice assigns magistrates following the appointment and initial assignment by the Governor.

The Stipendiary Magistrates Salaries Agreement provides for various levels of magistrates, including the chief stipendiary magistrate and deputy chief stipendiary magistrate.

The purpose of the Bill is to recognise this fact in respect of the chief stipendiary magistrate by giving authority to the Governor to appoint a chief stipendiary magistrate, and power to the Minister to allocate magistrates to courts. In addition, the Bill provides for the Minister to delegate power to the chief stipendiary magistrate to arrange sittings, reliefs, and to assign duties or any class of duties amongst the stipendiary magistrates.

Implementation of the amendment will result in the chief stipendiary magistrate being responsible to the Minister for the more effective utilisation, management, and servicing of courts throughout the State.

The magistracy at present comprises 29 magistrates. The growth of business handled by the summary courts indicates quite clearly that the present establishment of magistrates will have to be increased from time to time in order to ensure that delays in court listings do not become unreasonable.

Attention to administrative procedures and the optimum use of magistrates' time can be facilitated by granting the chief stipendiary magistrate authority and responsibility to direct and assign magistrates in these matters.

I commend this Bill to the House.

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

AGENT GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.07 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to make permanent statutory provision to enable the Governor to determine, from time to time, the amount of salary and allowances which shall be payable in respect of the office held by the Agent-General.

This will overcome delays occasioned by the existing legislation, which requires proposed alteration to the salary of the Agent-General to be effected by way of amending legislation. This measure will facilitate giving effect to reviews of such salary and allowances which, in this period of inflation, are likely to become necessary more frequently than in the past.

The present salary of £3 500 sterling per annum, which was fixed by amendment to the principal Act in 1969, is now quite inadequate.

Provision is included in the Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates—Division 12—London agency, for the payment of an allowance to the Agent-General for entertainment expenses. The amount of this allowance, which is tax free, has, by past practice, been closely allied to the amount of the salary paid to the Agent-General. This Bill therefore proposes that the amount of this allowance, to be known in the future as a "representation and entertainment allowance" shall also be determined by the Governor.

It is the Government's intention to review the salary and representation allowance payable to the Agent-General more frequently than in the past, taking into account the level of salaries and allowances payable from time to time to the Agents-General of the other States, and to recommend to the Governor-in-Council adjustments to such salary and representation allowance, whenever warranted.

I have mentioned that the rate of salary payable to the Agent-General was last amended in 1969, and it is of interest to note that the rates of the allowances payable to him to meet his housing and entertainment expenses were last adjusted as from the 1st July, 1972.

It is the intention of our Government to recommend to the Governor-in-Council that the rates of salary and allowances be updated, and be payable to the new Agent-General as from the 24th March, 1975, the date of Mr Richards' appointment to that office.

I am now in a position to indicate the proposed salary and allowances. This information was not available whilst the measure was before another place. I will make this information available to the

Leader of the Opposition immediately I have related it to the House. The proposed salary and allowances are as follows—

Salary: £8 000 sterling per annum (approximately \$A14 000 on current rates of exchange).

Representation and Entertainment Allowance: An allowance of 5 000 Pounds sterling per annum (approximately \$A8 800) to help meet extra living costs and other expenses associated with the office of Agent-General.

It also covers expenses incurred on:—

- (a) all entertainment at home;
- (b) all private entertainment;
- (c) out-of-pocket entertainment expenses.

An amount of up to £1 250 sterling (approximately \$A2 200—supported by accounts before recoup—for entertainment of the following description—

- (a) official entertainment at a hotel or restaurant;
- (b) official entertainment at Western Australia House.

Housing: An allowance equal to rent outlaid of up to £50 sterling (approximately \$A88) per week.

To enable the proposed increased rates to be made payable from the date of Mr Richards' appointment, provision is contained in the Bill deeming it to have come into operation as from the 1st March, 1975.

I commend this Bill to members.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.11 p.m.]: I have had an opportunity to look at this measure because it was on the notice paper in another place for some time. At the outset I would like to say that I support the measure. The method of fixing the salary of the Agent-General as provided in the Bill is a vast improvement on the old method adopted under the parent Act, and in particular, it has regard for the current rate of inflation. Many people think that rampant inflation is peculiar to Australia, but we find it throughout the world.

From speaking to not only the last Agent-General, but also to previous Agents General, I know that these people have done a wonderful job, usually at great cost to themselves. I do not intend to mention names, but I know that one Agent-General could not afford to rent a house. He had to live in a hotel because the allowance paid to him was insufficient to rent a home of a reasonable standard.

When Parliament has to fix the salary of an Agent-General, or of anyone else serving overseas in the interests of Western Australia, we are not always conscious of changing money values and the cost incurred by our representatives. I believe we

have been well served by our Agents General. Every person appointed to this position has done his best for Western Australia, irrespective of the colour of the Government which appointed him, or the colour of a Government which came to power after his appointment.

I am very pleased to see that Mr Richards was appointed to this post. I wish him well. When I was speaking to him several weeks ago, I told him I would be in London shortly. He said he would be there three days before me and that in all probability I would be his first caller. I intend to call on Mr Richards, but I will give him time to settle into his new job.

This position is of interest to all of us, and a man of Mr Richards' capacity and proven capabilities in his previous position will benefit Western Australia. He is a trained marketing man, and as well as the entertainment and social side of his duties, he will have a keen eye on marketing possibilities, and any contractual arrangements he can enter into on behalf of our State.

As has been previously stated I think the legislation is good inasmuch as now it will not be necessary to rely on Parliament to set the salaries for people who serve the State. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [5.16 p.m.]: I support the Bill. On several occasions I have been to Western Australia House in London and I have always felt there was plenty of room for improvement—not as far as the Agent-General was concerned, but so far as the set-up in Western Australia House itself was concerned.

For example, one could visit Australia House and obtain a copy of *The West Australian* five days after it had been printed; but to obtain a copy of *The West Australian* in Western Australia House one would have to wait for 10 to 14 days after it had been printed.

It is facilities like these that Western Australians desire when they visit London; the farmers particularly are generally anxious to obtain a copy of *The West Australian* to see what the weather is like back home and how their farms are getting on.

I think these matters could be rectified and the office itself could be made brighter. I am pleased to see that we have departed from the practice of appointing a parliamentarian to the job of Agent-General. It is necessary to have someone to look after the interests of Western Australia; someone to give us the service we have received in the past, and I am glad that the wages to be paid will be commensurate with the work that is done.

I hope that on the next occasion I visit London I will find Western Australia House looking a lot brighter. I also hope that I will be able to pick up a copy of

The West Australian at that house at the earliest possible moment, because I understand it is possible to obtain a copy of this paper within 24 hours—there is no necessity to wait three or four weeks for it.

I have no doubt that our representative appointed to Western Australia House in London will give visiting Western Australians the assistance that has been provided in the past. I am sure that this will be done to the best of the ability of the staff who occupy positions in that house.

I do feel that Western Australia should be advertised a great deal more than has been the case in the past. A great number of tourist attractions could be advertised and the whole purpose of the office in Western Australia House should be to support the industry and the welfare of Western Australia.

I have no doubt the new Agent-General will carry out his duties in the interests of the State and for my part I am glad to see that legislation is being introduced which will provide him with a wage commensurate with the job he is doing which, after all, will be a full-time job.

THE HON V. J. FERRY (South-West) [5.19 p.m.]: It is my pleasure to support this small Bill which proposes to update the remuneration which will be paid to our representative in London, the Agent-General for Western Australia. On considering the remuneration that has been set out and mentioned by the Minister for Justice I feel it is reasonable in this day and age.

I do venture to say, however, that the Agent-General will not be making a profit out of his allowances. As Mr Thompson has said, expenses are escalating rapidly and I am glad the Agent-General will be paid a reasonable allowance to cover the very necessary expenses that are incurred in carrying out what I believe is a very important function for Western Australia.

In speaking of the Agent-General, I am delighted that the Government has seen fit to appoint Mr Jim Richards to this very worthy position. I know Mr Richards has had a very successful commercial career and that he is a man of tremendous capacity. He has been successful not only in the business world but he has also evinced a tremendous interest in the community around him. He has belonged to a number of very worthy organisations, not only in this State but in other States of Australia also. Mr Richards is a man who obviously enjoys meeting people and participating in the activities which will demand his attention. I am sure the choice of Mr Richards as Agent-General for Western Australia is indeed a very worthy one.

May I add that I am also very happy for Mrs Richards whose charm and assistance to Mr Richards will, I am sure, not

go unnoticed. I am convinced that together they will represent Western Australia most ably.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.21 p.m.]: I am very grateful to the Leader of the Opposition, to Mr Heltman, and to Mr Ferry for the remarks they have made. I am particularly grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for his readiness to proceed immediately to discuss the matter before us.

All the members who have spoken have done so in the most generous terms, and not undeservedly, in respect of the appointment of Mr Richards. I thank them for their comments and on behalf of the Government may I say that their comments will be recognised and appreciated by Mr and Mrs Richards personally.

Like previous speakers I, too, associate myself with the good wishes that have been expressed in support of the appointment and the legislation, and I again commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The current Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act Amendment Bill, and the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Bill, make provision for the remuneration of the holder of the proposed new office of parliamentary secretary of the Cabinet.

Section 38 (6) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act provides, as a general rule, that if a member of Parliament accepts any office of profit under the Crown, he forfeits his parliamentary seat.

That section also provides for a number of exceptions from the operation of the general rule, one of the exceptions being that a member of Parliament who is also a Minister of the Crown does not forfeit his parliamentary seat by reason of his also holding that office of Minister of the Crown.

The holder of the office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet will not be a Minister of the Crown, and thus it is necessary to add to the exceptions in section 38 to ensure that the holder of the office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet may receive remuneration in addition to his basic parliamentary salary without forfeiting his parliamentary seat, and the Bill so provides.

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

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES TRIBUNAL BILL (2nd)

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure proposes the establishment of a tribunal with jurisdiction to inquire into and determine the salaries and certain allowances payable to Ministers of the Crown, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, officers and members of Parliament, stipendiary magistrates, special division officers of the Public Service, and certain holders of full-time statutory offices.

The tribunal is also to inquire into and report to Parliament, through the Minister, on the salary and allowances which, in the tribunal's view, ought to be paid to judges of the Supreme and District Courts.

I would emphasise that, excepting judges' salaries about which the tribunal may only recommend, power to determine the other salaries and allowances mentioned will reside in the tribunal.

As a consequential measure, the Bill also provides for the repeal of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1967-1975.

The means by which the salaries and allowances payable to the holders of such offices are presently reviewed and determined are—

Ministers and officers and members of Parliament: Determined by the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal at three-yearly intervals under the provisions of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act.

Magistrates: Determined usually by agreement under the provisions of the Public Service Arbitration Act after negotiations between the Public Service Board and the Civil Service Association. If agreement is not reached the Public Service Arbitrator may hear a claim and issue an award.

Special division officers of the Public Service: Determined by the Public Service Board. Officers have a

right of appeal against the board's determinations under the provisions of the Public Service Appeal Board Act.

Statutory officers and other senior officers in instrumentalities: Determined by the Governor after review by an informal statutory salaries review committee which was set up in 1971.

Judges: Fixed from time to time by Parliament by amendment of the Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act.

The ministerial, parliamentary, judicial and other positions which I have referred to, comprise the most important offices remunerated by the Crown, and in the Government's opinion it is unsatisfactory that there should be such a marked divergence in the methods by which the remuneration for these offices is fixed.

Not only are there major differences in the constitution and jurisdiction of the present salary-fixing authorities, but more importantly, there are substantial differences in the frequency of reviews and the operative dates of salary adjustments.

The establishment of a single tribunal to inquire into and determine, or report upon, appropriate salaries and certain allowances payable to each group, is proposed as the most effective means of achieving the degree of co-ordination desired. In this respect, it is to be noted that the Federal Government has recently established a remuneration tribunal to review the salaries of members of the Federal Parliament, judges, first division officers in the Commonwealth Public Service and statutory office holders.

It is proposed that the tribunal shall make, at the one time, determinations in respect of the holders of these various offices and submit a report in respect of judges, at intervals of not more than one year, so as to avoid the time-lags that have characterised the past.

The last determination of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal was made in 1974 and in order to give effect to the concept of annual determinations, it is proposed that the new tribunal's first determination shall be made as soon as practicable after the first day of July, 1975, but not later than the thirty-first day of August, 1975.

The Bill is arranged in two parts. The first and principal part deals with the establishment and functions of the tribunal, to be known as the salaries and allowances tribunal.

The second part deals with the consequential necessity to repeal existing related legislation—the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1967, as amended, and termination of any determination in force under that Act.

The tribunal is to be constituted by three members appointed by the Governor, one of whom shall also be appointed by the Governor to be the chairman of the tribunal.

The term of office of persons appointed to the tribunal is to be for three years, except that when it is first constituted, one or more of the original members may be given terms of less than three years in order to provide for some continuity. I emphasise that a person who occupies an office within the tribunal's jurisdiction is to be ineligible for appointment to the tribunal. There are obvious reasons for this provision.

The members of the tribunal will themselves be remunerated by fees and allowances fixed by the Governor-in-Executive-Council.

Determinations are to take effect from such date as the tribunal determines and are to have the force of law notwithstanding any other provision in any other law of the State.

By contrast the tribunal's report on the salaries and allowances to be paid to judges of the Supreme and District Courts is to be furnished to the Minister who, in turn, will be required to table that report in both Houses of Parliament within five sitting days, but before the remuneration of judges can be varied a Bill will have to be passed by Parliament to authorise any changes.

This approach preserves the long-standing constitutional convention that the Parliament fixes the salaries of the judiciary but in doing so, the Parliament will, in future, have the benefit of the recommendations of the same tribunal which is to determine the salaries of Ministers of the Crown, officers and members of Parliament and other senior officials.

I might mention that consideration was given to the judges being subject to the same determination, but the judges, themselves, preferred that the final decision should be that of Parliament, even though the tribunal will make the recommendation. Consideration was also given to an alternative method whereby the recommendation of the tribunal should be laid on the Table of the House for a given period, and would not become a determination until that period had expired.

Again, the judges preferred—in fact, they were most insistent—that the final decision should be made by Parliament. This will mean that every time a recommendation comes forward in their case, and in their case alone, Parliament will have to deal with a Bill to give effect to the recommendation. I want members particularly to note the difference.

It is to be noted that, although the tribunal's jurisdiction is divided into two elements—firstly, to make determinations in respect of offices other than judicial offices; and, secondly, to make reports to

Parliament in respect of judicial salaries and allowances, provision is made for the tribunal to perform those two functions at the same time.

The jurisdiction of the tribunal in relation to Ministers of the Crown, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet and officers and members of Parliament, is to embrace all allowances, fees, and other emoluments. This means that the tribunal's jurisdiction is to be as broad as that of the existing Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal.

The Bill also contains the special provisions which are required to preserve the right of members of the Legislative Assembly to be remunerated in the period which commonly occurs every three years between the dissolution or expiration of the Legislative Assembly and the holding of the next general election.

Turning now to the tribunal's jurisdiction in respect of magistrates, special division officers of the Public Service and statutory office holders, it is to be noted that only allowances of an annual nature are to be subject to its determinations.

It is felt that travelling and other occasional allowances are more closely allied to general conditions of service, and that accordingly any such allowances should continue to be fixed and reviewed from time to time as at present.

The statutory offices over which the tribunal is to have jurisdiction are to be specified in regulations made by the Governor-in-Council from time to time.

It is the intention to prescribe all full-time or career statutory offices where the office is sufficiently important to warrant its salary being fixed by the tribunal. Obviously, offices like Commissioner of Railways, Commissioners of the Rural and Industries Bank, Chairman and members of the Public Service Board, Commissioner of Main Roads, Commissioner of Transport, Commissioner of Police, Industrial Commissioners, and many other like offices will be among the statutory offices prescribed as ones over which the tribunal has jurisdiction.

The Bill provides for the appointment of a person nominated by the presiding officers of Parliament to assist the tribunal in determining the remuneration of Ministers, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, and officers and members.

Similarly, a person nominated by the Chairman of the Public Service Board is to be appointed to assist the tribunal in determining the remuneration of magistrates, special division public servants, and the prescribed full-time statutory office holders.

In this respect, it is considered that the tribunal should be assisted by persons familiar with the various offices, particularly as the tribunal is to be constituted of persons who are not themselves holding an office within its jurisdiction.

It seems obvious that it is in everyone's interests to ensure that the tribunal is as well informed as possible.

The establishment of the tribunal will remove the present rights of special division officers to appeal to the Public Service Appeal Board against salary determinations.

However, it must be remembered that the present appeal right is against the fixation of a special division officer's salary by the Public Service Board.

As the remuneration of special division officers is now to be determined by a completely independent tribunal, and not by the Public Service Board, the need for appeal rights is diminished and, in any event, it would be difficult to justify a right of appeal for only one of the groups whose remuneration is to be fixed by the tribunal.

The Government believes that the establishment of a single tribunal with the functions I have outlined, will prove to be of major benefit, and will eliminate dissatisfaction and concern often felt in the past because of the incidence of timing and inconsistency of approach which are inevitable when the remuneration of separate groups of officials is being determined by more than one authority.

When members study this legislation they will appreciate that at present the people who are to be brought under its control have their remunerations and other emoluments of office determined by various statutory and other bodies, a situation conducive to anomalies occurring. For instance, we had the situation last year when the remuneration of magistrates had been fixed independently without any regard for relativity, and they were actually being paid at a higher rate than the District Court judges. Parliament corrected that situation, and that sort of anomaly will not recur.

It is also felt that if there are regular reviews, the steep increases which occur in some of these positions, from time to time, will be avoided. Those steep increases sometimes bring criticism because they are not understood.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to make provision for an additional office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, and to provide for the remuneration of the holder

of such office at the rate payable to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, pending the final determination by the salaries and allowances tribunal, the formation of which is proposed under the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Bill, 1975.

Another current and related Bill, the Constitution Acts Amendment Bill, 1975, is necessary to ensure that payment of any allowances or expenses to the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet would not vacate his seat under the "office of profit" restriction.

An arrangement whereby a Member of Parliament is Secretary of the Cabinet has been in operation in Victoria since 1947. The occupant is remunerated under the Victorian Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, at rates equal to those applicable to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in that State.

The Victorian arrangement works well and is shown to have many advantages.

I might add that the Premier and the Minister for Works have both taken the opportunity of considering that particular office at work in Victoria, where it is well established and developed.

The Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet will not be a member of the Cabinet. He will be required to attend all meetings of the Cabinet for the purpose of carrying out the necessary secretarial duties.

Cabinet has not previously had the services of a secretary or anyone in attendance at its meetings for the purpose of carrying out secretarial duties. The collation of Ministers' submissions, the preparation of agendas, the recording of resolutions and decisions, and the distribution of the papers to the responsible Ministers and sub-committees, has been carried out in the past under the direction of the Under Secretary, Premier's Department, who was not required to attend the Cabinet meetings. These tasks will now be carried out by the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, thereby providing greater security and an improved service anticipated as a result of his attendance at the Cabinet meetings.

Within the Parliament it will be the responsibility of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet to ensure the flow of Bills, and speech and committee notes thereon, for the more efficient operation of the legislative business of Parliament. This will be achieved by his steering the projected legislation through the various stages of Cabinet approval, party approval and placement on the parliamentary notice paper, and acting as a clearing house for second reading speech and committee notes, ensuring they are on hand and distributed at the appropriate time in Parliament. His office will also be the clearing house for answers to parliamentary questions, ensuring timely delivery in the House.

The office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet will serve as a valuable training ground for future membership of Cabinet.

The office will provide a strong link between Cabinet and members of the Parliament. It will also provide greater liaison between Cabinet and the parliamentary wing of the party in Government.

This makes the duties of the Parliamentary Secretary sound rather more simple than they will be, but the only criticism of the position which has come to my notice is that the secretary is not paid very well for what he does.

We regard this office as desirable, regardless of which Government is in power. It will improve the actual machinery of Cabinet and the workings of the Parliament.

This measure would operate until the first determination made by the salaries and allowances tribunal. The Premier was inclined to tie this office permanently to that tribunal, but as the previous Government ran into a slight problem when the salaries fixing tribunal took strong exception to Parliament nominating a salary for one of the lesser officers and the legislation had to be withdrawn and redrafted. However, the matter has been discussed with the tribunal, and the chairman and members are quite happy with this holding measure. It would be unreasonable to reconvene the tribunal to make one determination which Parliament is quite capable of doing.

I commend the Bill to members.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

WESPLY (DARDANUP) AGREEMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [5.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill before the House is to obtain Parliament's authority for the Government and Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd. to enter into the agreement appearing as a schedule to the Bill. By passing the Bill, Parliament would be authorising the Premier to execute the agreement on behalf of the State, and when it

is then executed by Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd. the document would immediately have the force of law.

Members of the Opposition might express surprise that the Government has adopted this procedure. Let me hasten to assure them that there has been no change in the sound policy adopted by the Government that agreements of this nature are executed and brought before Parliament for ratification, rather than following the route whereby authorization of an unexecuted agreement is sought.

In this particular case, however, there is a very good reason why authorization rather than ratification is the appropriate course.

It will be noted that section 2 of the Bill is worded in such a way that not only the Premier is authorized to execute the agreement, but also the company. The reason for this is that it might be argued that certain provisions in the agreement are in conflict with the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act, 1974, being in restraint of trade.

So as to avoid any suggestion of the agreement being held to be invalid on this ground, the parties are taking the precaution of having the agreement authorized by Parliament before executing it. In this way, the agreement is exempt from the Trade Practices Act according to the provisions of that very Act.

The terminology used in clause 2 of the Bill is otherwise identical with that used in previous authorization Bills, in that the right is sought to execute an agreement "in or substantially in accordance with the form set out in the schedule". The use of the word "substantially" is intended to allow sufficient flexibility to enable any last-minute corrections or legal drafting alterations of a minor nature to be carried out without the need to refer the matter again to Parliament. I would not at this stage anticipate that any such changes are necessary, since the agreement has been the subject of the most lengthy and detailed negotiations and of a very careful scrutiny as to its terms.

The particle board industry that will result from the agreement will be the largest of its kind in Australia, and one of the largest industries of its nature in the world. It will be established at a capital cost of \$11.5 million, at a point about midway between Dardanup and Picton Junction, and not far from the existing industrial area at Picton Junction.

The size of the industry will naturally have a significant effect on the economy of the Bunbury region. Additional employment will be generated, and there will be demands for back-up services such as transport, engineering, and so on.

At the commencement of operations, the industry will employ about 100 people within the factory and the forest areas,

and in due course it is planned that the industry will expand to employ some 300 people in factory and forestry operations.

The factory will require considerable inputs of chiplogs and sawmill residues, adhesives, fuel oil, etc., and have a very substantial output of particle board.

It is also anticipated that the company will, in due course, expand its operations into fields which have a natural link with particle board production, such as the manufacture of adhesives.

The achievement of these agreed conditions under which the industry may establish and become a viable operation is an excellent example of Government and private enterprise working in close co-operation to achieve mutual ends.

From the Government's point of view, there is the very real advantage that the project will lead to the significant decentralisation of a metropolitan-based industry, and as I have said provide a considerable economic boost to the Bunbury region.

It will also improve the economics of softwood forestry operations. Furthermore, the company will be utilising chiplogs and sawmill residues which would, for the most part, be otherwise wasted.

On the company's side, in addition to receiving the Government's guarantee of certain borrowings, it has gained the advantages of having assured rights to chiplogs and sawmill residues, and of having certain transport rights not normally available to industry.

The recitals to the agreement summarise the State's and the company's consolidated precepts under which the terms of the agreement have been negotiated.

The company is committing itself to building a factory with a design capacity considerably in excess of the present market for particle board. It naturally could not do so without secure access to softwood resources. The Government recognises the advantages of establishing the industry with capacity to increase throughput and to achieve a level of economy which assures viability.

I turn now to the provisions of the agreement and deal firstly with clause 2. Under this clause the company undertakes to proceed within six months of the date of commencement with the construction of a factory at Dardanup having a capacity to produce not less than 17 cubic metres per hour of particle board, the latter on a basis of 19 millimetre thickness. This plant must be in production within 24 months of the date of commencement which is defined as the date of the agreement.

In fact, some work has already commenced at the plant site and the company anticipates commencing installation of

plant by the 30th September this year, with the plant coming into operation during the third quarter of 1976.

To facilitate this rapid progress in the development of the project, the State has agreed to guarantee the repayment of a series of loans as detailed in clause 3 (1), such guarantees being given under the normal provisions of the Industry (Advances) Act, 1974.

An initial loan for \$1.5 million has already been made available to the company by the Superannuation Board, the normal formalities in respect of securities, etc., required under the Industry (Advances) Act, 1974 having been completed. I should mention here that the agreement has been written with Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd., rather than its parent company, Westralian Plywoods Hearn Industries Limited, primarily because of the security situation in respect of these guarantees.

Although it might be argued that from the outset it would be more desirable for the guarantee for the initial loan to have had the full backing of an authorized and executed agreement, there is no question that the State's security position is satisfactory and, having regard for the commitments already entered into by the company, a delay in making the loan would not have been justified. I recognise, however, that the project cannot succeed without the company having available to it the full rights conferred by the agreement.

Were it not for the Trade Practices Act aspect, we would have executed the agreement long before this date.

So far as the question of raw materials for the industry is concerned, it should be stressed that the capacity of the industry has been based on estimates by the Conservator of Forests as to the availability of these materials during the term of the agreement. This is reflected in clause 4(1).

Subclauses (2), to (4), set out the mechanics by which the conservator and the company will reach agreement as to materials to be supplied to the company in each year of its operations. At the same time under subclause (5) a limit of 330 000 cubic metres in any year is set.

It will be noted that under subclause (3) the conservator, in selling or disposing of chiplogs and sawmill residues to other parties, cannot prejudice the supply of annual quantities to the company as agreed under clause 4. Furthermore, under subclause (5) the State is not permitted to sell to another particle board manufacturer any quantity of chiplogs or sawmill residues which might be in excess of such agreed annual quantity, but less than the maximum quantity to which the company is entitled; namely, 330 000 cubic metres. In other words, the company is

being given sole access to all available raw materials up to that figure, but only in respect of particle board manufacture.

This means that any short-term change in the market demand for particle board does not prejudice the company's reasonable prospects of fully utilising the allocation of raw materials in a subsequent period.

The position regarding the Trade Practices Act to which I have referred relates to this provision.

Whether or not the company has sole right to certain quantities of raw materials, I should point out that in any case the quantities of raw materials available over and above the company's anticipated requirements at any stage of the project, and up to its maximum allocation, are expected to be well below those which would enable a second viable particle board industry to be established in Western Australia. During the first years of the project, it is anticipated that there may be some excess materials available, but in later years during the life of this agreement, the maximum allocation to which the company is entitled will commit fully the presently estimated available resource.

Clause 5 of the agreement simply deals with the specification of chiplogs made available to the company.

Clause 6 highlights an area of significant advantage to the State in entering into this agreement. It is a fact that the Forests Department must thin its pine plantations in order to develop its saw log potential, whether or not the thinnings so produced can be put to good use. Although the company's Kewdale plant has been taking some of these thinnings, there has been considerable volume of wastage. On top of this wastage, there is, of course, the cost of carrying out thinning operations.

Under clauses 6 and 7 of the agreement, however, the company will not only be responsible for the cost of felling, extraction, and cartage of chiplogs to loading points, plus the cost of supervising and overheads associated with this work, but it will also have to pay a stumpage rate or royalty for timber so taken.

The stumpage rates are set out in the schedule to the agreement, under which it will be seen that in the first years of production the company has been given a concessional rate in respect of chiplogs supplied to the Dardanup factory. These rates are subject to escalation in line with inflation, and are subject to review from time to time after a fixed period.

Furthermore, if the anticipated pattern of sales varies from the position where the company sells the bulk of its particle board in the Eastern States to the effect that it will sell more profitably on the local market, then the conservator has the right to review the stumpage rate.

It will also be noted that under clause 2 of the schedule to the agreement the company will have the advantage of lower stumpage rates on chiplogs supplied to its Kewdale plant from southern plantations, prior to commencement of its Dardanup plant.

With your permission, Mr President, I shall table a copy of a plan which is referred to in the definition of pine plantations in clause 1 of the agreement, and which shows the dividing line at State Forest 16 referred to in the paragraph and also in the transport clause.

Returning now to clause 8 of the agreement, this clause provides that the company shall pay stumpage for not less than 90 per cent of the quantity of chiplogs agreed under clause 4 in the event that it takes delivery of less than that quantity.

Clauses 9 and 10 deal with the mechanics of payment of stumpage and the determination of quantities. Under clause 11 the State is protected by *force majeure* type conditions in the event of the destruction or damage of pine plantations, due to fire, disease, or other cause barring the State from supplying the company's requirements.

The next four clauses contain provisions quite comparable to other development agreements of this nature. They set out the terms under which the company will be supplied with its electricity requirements, obtain rights to draw underground water at its own cost or be supplied by the State, obtain supplies of natural gas if available, and conditions for disposal of wastes.

Under clause 17 the State undertakes to buy all of its particle board requirements from the company so long as it is the sole manufacturer in Western Australia, and the quality and price of its product is acceptable.

Clause 18 is one of the most significant in the agreement, in that it provides privileged conditions under which the company may transport raw materials and finished particle board by road, notwithstanding the provisions of the Transport Commission Act, 1966.

Dealing with the subclauses to clause 18 in order, firstly subclause (1) establishes the conditions under which the company may transport its construction materials by road. Although these conditions have been stated in the agreement for clarity the provisions do not differ from the normal conditions under which the Commissioner of Transport issues licenses for road transport.

However, under subclause (2) the commissioner shall grant to the company or its nominee, licenses to operate commercial goods vehicles for the goods and on the routes specified in that subclause.

Cartage of chiplogs and sawmill residues from forest and sawmill to the factories, as limited by the subclause, does not amount to any real concession, since road haulage of sawn logs is normally approved in connection with the day-to-day operations of any sawmill.

The road transport of the Dardanup factory's particle board output and adhesives for the manufacture of the board, has been the result of very careful consideration of the feasibility of alternative forms of transport for this industry by the Government and its advisers.

The location of the factory, the form of packaging of the product, the need for rapid door-to-door service, and the limitations of handling the product during transit, combined with the desirability of an integrated transport operation for adhesives, has led the Government to grant an industry concessions which are not in accord with long-established policy.

The clause grants the company the right to road transport of 70 per cent of the products destined for Perth. However, the qualifications covering the balance of the output make it unlikely that the transport task will be attractive to the WAGR. However, it must also be recognised that the transport task involves a multispecification multidestination product not at all well suited to rail transport, and that without this concession the company would not have entered into its commitment to establish at Dardanup.

There are two observations I would like to make in connection with this position.

One is that I am confident that the boost which will be given to the economy of the Bunbury region by the establishment of this industry, will be reflected in considerable increases in the demand for rail transport in other ways.

The other is that the Government makes it quite clear that the provisions of this agreement do not constitute a change in the Government's transport policy generally.

It will be noted that similar provisions apply in respect of the transport of particle board to the Eastern States, with the exception that the percentage is 50. Transport to the Eastern States is not, of course, subject to licensing under the Transport Commission Act, due to the provisions of section 92 of the Constitution providing for free trade between the States.

I move now to clause 19, which is the usual clause in respect of the company's use of local professional services, labour, contractors, and materials, with the additional provision that the Minister may call upon the company from time to time to provide a report as to its implementation of the provisions of this clause.

Clause 20, covering zoning, nondiscriminatory rates, rating, and provisions regarding resumptions, contains the standard approach to these matters, as does the environmental protection clause, clause 21.

Most of the remaining clauses are standard to this type of development agreement. The exceptions are clause 31 which specifies that the term of the agreement shall be 25 years, clause 32 which provides for the company having the right to seek a further agreement after the expiration of this agreement, and clause 34 providing for the use of the "Made in Western Australia" insignia on all of the company's products.

Let me conclude by saying that the agreement before the House will achieve a number of very desirable objectives sought by the State, and is very real evidence of the Government's desire to foster the decentralisation of industry and provide for employment opportunities and economic growth. The Western Australian company it will assist deserves every encouragement for proceeding with the project.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 158).

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. W. Cooley.

Sitting suspended from 6.02 to 7.30 p.m.

SUPERANNUATION AND FAMILY BENEFITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [7.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks to amend the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act as a means of resolving the problem created by the high contributions which older members of the fund are currently required to meet in order to maintain their full pension entitlement.

Members will appreciate that in a unitary scheme contribution rates are structured to ensure that any unit taken up during an employee's working life will be fully paid by the time retirement occurs. Consequently, the older an employee is when a unit is taken up, the higher is his rate of contribution to the fund.

The problem created by the high cost of units taken up in later years of service invariably has been regarded as a weakness in unit type schemes. Moreover, the problem is seriously aggravated in times of high inflation.

Due to rapid salary increases in recent years, and the resulting high unit entitlement, older members of the fund at all levels of remuneration are faced with unprecedented fortnightly contribution costs

in order to take up the additional units required to preserve their full pension entitlement.

As a consequence, many of these members are not continuing in service on attaining the age of 60 years, simply because their take-home pay after income tax and superannuation deductions would not be very much higher than the after-tax pension they would receive if they retired.

For those who remain in service beyond 60 years and maintain full pension cover, the position worsens as contribution rates rise sharply after that age. Because of this, and the progressive rate structure of the income tax scale, many of these employees face the unpalatable prospect of an ever-reducing take-home pay as their salaries increase. In fact, the stage can be reached where an employee who maintains his contributions to the fund is left with no take-home pay at all.

I am advised that at the present time some senior members of the Government service, who are key people, if they stayed in Government employment would be paying out more than they earn.

Other Government superannuation schemes in Australia have experienced the same problems associated with high contribution costs, and measures have been adopted or are proposed to overcome them.

The Superannuation Board and senior Treasury officers have examined these moves, and agree that similar steps might eventually have to be adopted here. However, a major reconstruction of our scheme would be required, and this would take some considerable time to carry out.

It is therefore proposed as an interim measure—I emphasise that—to allow members of the fund who have attained the age of 60 years, to obtain relief from the high cost of superannuation contributions in the latter years of their service.

This amending Bill proposes to permit members of the fund, if they so wish, to elect to have their pension entitlements determined at age 60, or at such later age up to age 65, thus relieving them of further superannuation contributions. I emphasise that it is at the election of the person concerned. Contributors so electing would then be regarded—but only for the purpose of superannuation—as being retired, except that they would not be paid a pension until actually terminating their service.

As the purpose of the Bill is to relieve older contributors of the burden of the high contribution costs required to maintain full pension entitlement, it is proposed that only those holding their full primary entitlement be permitted to make an election. However, provision has been made for eligible contributors holding less than their primary unit entitlement to

qualify for pension determination if they so desire, by taking up the required additional units.

The Act contains a provision that under normal circumstances of retirement, at least one year's contributions must be paid for all units held before pension can be paid, and accordingly the same requirement is proposed for all units held at the date of determination of a contributor's pension.

A retired member of the fund is barred by the Act from taking up further units except as a result of a retrospective salary increase. It is proposed to apply a similar rule to contributors whose pensions are determined. They are not to be entitled to further units after the date of determination of their pension unless entitlement arises from a salary increase effective from a day prior to that date.

It is usual for retiring members to surrender any units held in excess of their primary unit entitlement and to receive a refund of the contribution paid in respect of those units. Similarly, a refund is to be made of contributions for units in excess of primary entitlement on determination of a contributor's pension.

All pensions paid under the Act are updated in January each year in accordance with the percentage movement in the consumer price index. Contributors electing for determination of their pensions under the provisions of the Bill, will also have their pension entitlements so updated where applicable, over the period that payment of pension is held in abeyance awaiting actual retirement.

As the next updating of pensions will not take place until January, 1976, and because it will relate to the movement in the consumer price index from the 31st December, 1974, it is proposed to allow eligible contributors, if they so wish, to elect for the determination of their pensions on a date not earlier than the 31st December, 1974. Such an election is to be made by the 30th June, 1975.

As the fund share of pension is to be fixed at the date of determination but is not to be paid until the contributor actually retires, it is proposed that the amount involved be accumulated, together with the interest thereon, and in due course converted to pension on actual retirement. This is necessary to ensure an equitable payment from the fund.

The Bill provides for the payment of reversionary benefits to widows and dependants in the event of the death in service of a member who has elected to determine his pension. Provision is also made for the payment of the determined pension in cases of retirement due to ill health.

The proposals I have outlined would not result in increased costs to the State. On the contrary, they would result in savings,

as many older members would remain longer in service and consequently the State's liability for pension payments would be deferred.

This measure is purely a holding one. The authorities and experts involved are making a thorough study of the overall superannuation and family benefits provisions in this State. Also, we have regard for the problems that are being experienced in the Commonwealth and other States, because this situation is not peculiar to Western Australia.

Private enterprise is experiencing similar problems and in some cases to an even more serious degree, because employees are feeling the effects at a lower age in some of the private enterprise superannuation schemes. Therefore, after considering the matter and examining a number of specific cases which have to be seen to be believed, it was considered desirable to bring down a holding measure so that those who desire to do so could elect, at the age of 60, to have their pensions determined at that point of time.

Employees will not draw their money as a pension right while they are still in employment. So, for instance, if they carry on in the employment of the Government until the age of 65, they will not be drawing their pension. All that will happen is that the employee will determine it, and it will increase progressively up to the date of retirement by automatic cost-of-living adjustments which are already in force. However, their position will not worsen from what it is at the present time. For instance, if one senior officer does not retire by the 31st March, he will be \$2 000 per year worse off in his net take-home pay than he will be if he carries on. It is a freak set of circumstances.

When these schemes were drawn up it was in a period of comparative economic stability, and they were not planned on the basis of current inflation or on the basis that wages and salaries would increase at the present rate. Then, because of our existing system, income tax has increased at an even greater rate. So we have a combination of two things, the higher a man's salary becomes, the more tax proportionately is taken out, and at the same time his entitlement under the superannuation scheme increases. He then meets up with another factor—one which members of Parliament are confronted with—and he gets to the point where he runs out of tax deductions in respect of superannuation contributions. From that point onwards he gets no benefit by way of tax relief.

The combination of all these factors has induced the Government to bring down this temporary measure, because the intricacies of the scheme are far too complex for us to bring down a revised scheme this year.

I want also to emphasise that the measure is not brought down to benefit only the people in the higher income range of the Public Service; it applies at all levels. Some anomalous situations can be found through the complete wage scale. In the interests of equality we must do something of a holding nature, bearing in mind that the matter is entirely at the option of the employee of the Government, and not at the option of the Government.

I commend the Bill to members.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [7.41 p.m.]: I support this measure, particularly in view of the fact—which we appreciate—that it is of a holding nature. It is a holding measure because superannuation funds, wherever they may be, at present are running into trouble. As one of my colleagues pointed out to me, the only fault he could see in the measure is that superannuation benefits were designed for people who are retiring, and not continuing work. Of course, that point is well taken, and we appreciate it.

However, the idea behind this Bill is to alleviate some of the problems faced by certain civil servants in the higher income bracket at the moment. I have had sufficient time to study the Minister's speech and to compare it with the Bill. I feel that whoever drafted the Minister's speech did a very good job, because it explains the measure in great detail. I can pick no fault with the Bill because it makes only one amendment to the Act, and that is the addition of proposed new section 60AA. I feel the amendment will be of great benefit to some people for the time being.

As the Minister pointed out, in all probability next year a new superannuation Bill will be presented to us, and that will be the subject of some debate. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [7.43 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. The Minister gave an excellent explanation of it; however, I would like to make one or two comments in respect of the measure. As the Minister pointed out, the current period of rampant inflation through which we are passing has caused colossal escalation of salaries. In stable times when the rate of inflation is relatively low many officers who may have taken up, say, 50 units in superannuation at the age of 40 years still have the same number of units at the age of 60 years; clearly such officers would not be confronted with the difficulties found at the present time. In the normal course of events the situation could only have become irksome to a man who, late in his Civil Service career, gained a considerable promotion. He might have been on a lower level for some years, and suddenly, when over the age of 60, he finds he receives a large increase in salary. This strange anomaly

which penalises the man called on to make additional superannuation payments could thus be a nuisance in more normal times.

However, under these circumstances, promotion brought about the increase in salary, and an officer would be prepared to happily accept this penalty of extra superannuation contributions.

One of the important features of this legislation is that the proposal is optional; no-one is obliged to participate. A man can still elect to retire at 60 years of age if he so wishes; or he can continue to 65, and not continue to contribute to the superannuation fund; or he can continue to 65 years or any year up until 65 years and still take out extra units of superannuation, if he so wishes. In other words, the range of options available to him is complete. I believe this to be a desirable feature of the Bill that has been placed before us.

I might add that the reaction from the senior civil servants to this move has been first class; already, many of the men who contemplated retiring at 60 years of age are revising their plans. They are reviewing their position so we may find that we have the benefit of their experience until they are 65 years of age.

Another point mentioned by both the Minister and the Hon. R. Thompson is that this Bill is not the final answer, but is purely a holding measure. I understand it is anticipated that the new superannuation scheme may be based on "percentage of salary." I am informed that alterations have been made to legislation in other States and, in point of fact, already Tasmania, Queensland and South Australia have adopted a superannuation scheme for their civil servants based on the percentage of salary. It is my understanding that the Commonwealth also is considering similar legislation at this time.

Another interesting and I believe desirable feature of the action now being taken by the Government in introducing this Bill is that there has been close consultation with the Civil Service Association. I understand that the Chairman of the Superannuation Board has met the State Executive of the CSA and has fully explained the implications of the proposal. There has been no expression of opposition from the members.

I believe one of the points which found favour with the CSA was that the Superannuation Board has stated that a civil servant will not be permitted to make a choice without first discussing the implications of what he intends to do with a member of the staff of the Superannuation Board. In other words, the man or woman will not discuss the matter merely with the departmental salary clerk, but will talk the matter over with an officer of the board to ensure that he or she will not be making a decision which could be to his or her disadvantage.

I referred to the fact that similar legislation has been introduced in other States. I thought it rather strange, in a way, when I learned that the New South Wales CSA is rather opposed to the action that is being taken. It is interesting—I am not drawing conclusions from this fact—that the association in New South Wales is what might be described as a more militant organisation than our own CSA and unlike the situation in Western Australia, the New South Wales CSA has a very close association with Trades Hall. Members will be pleased that I learned from a mistake I made a few weeks ago in relation to Mr Collier who came from our own association. The New South Wales association has opposed the introduction of legislation comparable with the Bill we are now considering, because it claims it would tend to encourage people to remain at work until 65 years of age.

I am pleased that this Bill has met with the approval of the House; it will improve the situation and remove some of the anomalies until new comprehensive legislation can be introduced. I am also pleased that a wide selection of options is available to any officer before he is obliged to make his choice. I support the Bill.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [7.50 p.m.]: I am grateful for the support the Bill has received. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the detail in which the second reading speech was prepared. I think it gave a very simplified explanation of the circumstances of the anomalies which were created, to which Mr Tozer referred.

Mr Tozer seemed to place some emphasis—I do not think intentionally or deliberately—on higher-salaried people. I think probably it is more appropriate when considering such legislation—and the anomalies created—in this House to consider particularly the higher income bracket because of the impact of the income tax scale; however, we must also consider its impact through the whole wage range. Because of the progressive rates of the income tax scale, high income earners go into a high tax bracket and their situation becomes further aggravated as a consequence of the situation I have described. I am grateful for the support the Bill has received.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [7.56 p.m.]: The Opposition has pleasure in supporting this measure. We understand the purpose of the amendment is to provide that accidents which occur in shops and warehouses shall be notified in the same manner as they are in respect of factories. It is a little surprising to me and, I suppose, to many other people that such a provision was not included in the Act a long while ago because I suppose shops and warehouses are just as vulnerable to accidents as are factories.

It is presently provided for in the Act that where an accident occurs in a factory and the victim is required to be absent from work for more than one day, the proprietor of the factory is required to report the accident to the appropriate department.

I can recall many years ago when this provision was first mooted by the industrial division of the National Safety Council; it was intended that statistics in respect of these accidents should be taken out. They were working mainly on the principle that prevention is better than cure and I hope that the notification of these accidents is being recorded so that the situation may be studied on a statistical basis and that follow-up action is being taken in areas where such accidents occur. This is a good amendment to the Act and it will no doubt assist in reducing the time lost due to accidents when the cause of accidents can be ascertained.

The Bill also contains other amendments, one of which will take away from the Governor the right to appoint inspectors and will transfer such powers of appointment to the Public Service Board. Another amendment allows for the appointment of a deputy chairman of the Factories Welfare Board when the Under-Secretary for Labour is absent.

Clause 8 is a consequential amendment to clause 4. The Bill tends to improve the Act, and for this reason the Opposition supports the measure.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you, Mr Cooley.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 98 amended—

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When the provision in this clause is put into effect, I would like to know whether the keeping of the statistics will be the same as in the case of an accident which occurs in a factory, and whether the information so supplied will be acted upon quickly to prevent other accidents.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am not altogether certain. I would say that in view of Mr Cooley's vast knowledge of this subject his guess is as good as mine. I guess the statistics are kept by the department and are sent to the Bureau of Census and Statistics, but I am not positive of this.

The honourable member is asking me to provide him with information on the spot. I will obtain a copy of his remarks and forward it to the appropriate Minister who will provide the information to the honourable member by mail.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**Second Reading**

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan) [8.05 p.m.]: In his second reading speech the Minister outlined clearly the intentions of this amendment Bill. We on this side of the House support the Bill in principle and detail.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [8.06 p.m.]: I also support the Bill. However, there is one point I would like to raise, and that is in relation to clause 2 (a) which seeks to amend section 11. The provision reads as follows—

- (a) by adding after the word "made", in line three of subsection (2), the passage "unless the Board maintains some other permanent record, in readily available form, of those qualifications";

I cannot see the need for this provision because there is already a provision which requires that a register be kept. I do not know why the provision in clause 2 (a) has been included.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

RESERVE (KWINANA FREEWAY) BILL**Second Reading**

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [8.08 p.m.]: This is the shortest Bill I have seen in my term in this Parliament. Its purpose is to excise an area of 1.26 acres or 0.51 hectares of a reserve in the vicinity of Mt. Henry for the purpose of the Kwinana Freeway extension. This is one of a group of three measures which are necessary to enable the southern extension of the freeway to be proceeded with.

It has been well demonstrated that debate on this Bill is futile. In fact, this Parliament has been held in contempt by the Minister, because of his refusal to provide answers to the very serious objections that have been raised against the extension of the freeway.

I refer briefly to the items which I have mentioned, and which are contained in the 1970 PERTS report, relating to the duplication of the Narrows Bridge, the building of an additional bridge between the Narrows and Fremantle, the sinking of the central Perth railway line, and the replacement of the suburban rail services with busways.

These were very important recommendations contained in the 1970 PERTS report, but they have been neglected completely except for a small reference to the duplication of the Narrows Bridge. If anything has demonstrated quite clearly the redundancy of this Chamber, the attitude of the Minister on this occasion has so demonstrated adequately. However, the Minister does have a chance to rise from the depth to which his Government has sunk in its treatment of this Parliament. He can do that by saying he will not have the Bill proclaimed until the environmental inquiry has been carried out by the Australian Government, and will urge his Government to participate in that inquiry.

There is little point in members on this side of the House opposing the Bill any further. At this stage we have very little enthusiasm for the proposal. As members on this side have said, it could well be that the extension of Kwinana Freeway is

essential, and that in fact the proposal is the only sound one. At the same time sufficient doubt has been cast on the basis on which the project has been predicated in the PERTS report. That is sufficient to cast doubts on the validity of the recommendations that have been made to the Government.

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [8.13 p.m.]: I have no intention of speaking at length on the Bill. I think the matter was canvassed well and truly last evening. I am extremely pleased that Mr Cloughton agrees the proposed route is the obvious route.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You should listen more carefully.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Honourable member thought the proposed route was a very good one for the freeway to take. Most of the argument from members of the Opposition seems to be based on the hope that they will make some political gain and cause good reports to be printed in the newspapers about them. I have no doubt they would be only too happy if they could achieve that.

It does appear that the main argument centres on the environmental and conservation side, and the issues arising in that regard. I believe that in many cases these issues have been motivated emotionally. It appears that people from all over the State are strongly opposing this Bill and the motion that we dealt with last night. No doubt many of those people have been ill-informed, and they have put forward objections that are not based on balanced opinions.

I share the concern of the people who will be affected by the extension of Kwinana Freeway, and if I were in their place I would be opposing the Bill very strongly also. Whether these people occupy tin sheds or mansions, they are very concerned and they ought to be.

They are also concerned with the dangers of further encroachment of the river. I am prepared to accept that in the very near future we will see the duplication of the Narrows Bridge. I know this has been denied, but if the freeway extension goes through the duplication of the Narrows Bridge will be necessary in order to cope with the traffic.

For that reason I do not think there will be any further great encroachment on the river, but I do expect there will have to be extensions to the Narrows Bridge, or a duplication of that bridge.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You have some doubts.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: No, I have no doubt about that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why did the Minister say the bridge would not be duplicated?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have a democratic right to express my opinion, the same as the Hon. Clive Griffiths.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is what he said last night.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is obvious that the people living in the area will be affected, and there will be an intrusion into their privacy. Also, property values will be lowered. If I lived in the area I would be one of the first to object. We, as members of Parliament, have the unenviable task of having to make a decision based on the facts put forward. That is the reason we are here and that is the reason we should reach a decision. Of course, we employ experts, both environmental and engineering, and they put forward their thoughts, their plans, and their reasons for the construction of this freeway extension. It is up to us to vote on the issue.

The Government has accepted that the proposed route is obviously the only answer to the traffic problems in the area. We heard from the Hon. Clive Griffiths about boats, launches, hydrofoils, etc. I have no doubt we will see more and more of this type of transport in the future, but those suggestions get away from the fact that we do need an extension to the freeway. It has become an absolute necessity and there is no doubt that this measure must go through.

I was surprised to hear the Hon. Ron Thompson suggest that freeways were going out of fashion in certain other countries. I would like him to tell me which countries are affected in this manner because from my own observations, in recent years, it appears that more freeways are necessary and they are having to be built at an increasing rate.

The present extension to the freeway is absolutely imperative. The Narrows Bridge has been constructed for some time and I suggest that those who criticise the Narrows Bridge should have a look at the interchanges and road patterns in other places. They will see that our bridge is attractive and effective.

We have to have roads so let us make the most of the present situation. The proposed development will release part of the reclaimed area so that the public will be able to use it in conjunction with the road usage. If we are to refuse the extension of the freeway, after all the planning which has gone on, we will waste all the money which has been spent on the Narrows interchange.

On a number of occasions last night we heard it said that the freeway will become clogged and crowded. I would like to hear of any city in the world which does not suffer from traffic congestion during peak periods. Even if the freeway were extended to 200 or 300 feet in width, it

would not be able to cope freely with peak-hour traffic. This is a problem which faces us.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is pretty good at 3 o'clock in the morning.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is good, and it also copes with the traffic at most other times of the day.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Have you ever been to West Berlin and observed the traffic there.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: No, I have not been to West Berlin, but I suggest that even the people in that city who drive their cars into the city during peak hours have problems.

We have to make the best possible use of our interchange, and this is possible only if the freeway is extended as is proposed. We cannot stand still. I am not suggesting we should make rash moves, or rash plans, or rash development. However, we still have to accept development because we have to control traffic in the best way possible.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Even if we sacrifice a couple of suburbs.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is not true.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It is.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Hon. Clive Griffiths knows better than that. If he were to go across the Canning Bridge and turn left, and wind his way through the existing area he would find it very difficult to get through because the roads are not built for heavy traffic, and their edges are breaking away. There is no doubt about that at all. The traffic congestion is a threat to the lives of the children in the area, and their parents. The extension of the freeway will take the congestion away from that particular area.

I understand the problem expressed by Mr Clive Griffiths and, obviously, he moved across the floor of the Chamber for a political advantage.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What has what you are saying now to do with my interjection?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: What was the interjection; has the honourable member lost track?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: No, you have.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The heavy traffic goes down North Lake Road at present.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have been there.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It also goes along Stock Road.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I was surprised that the Hon. Grace Vaughan saw fit to criticise, to a certain extent, Dr Brian O'Brien. He is respected in this

State, and in his job he has to make a responsible judgment. No matter what happens with regard to this particular matter, he cannot win!

Dr O'Brien is an expert, and he and other authorities are convinced that this is the best route. For that reason we need to reclaim the parcel of land involved in the Bill and develop it for the freeway extension.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: He stated once that the Deep Water Point route was the best.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He has changed his mind; there were a number of alternative routes.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The most pleasant thing about the speech by the honourable member is that he heard us speaking last night and woke up to the fact that the Bill was before us. He is now making a speech which he should have made to the motion which was before us last night.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is my democratic right.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is not dealing with the subject matter of the Bill.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I believe I am dealing with the subject matter of the Bill. The extension of the freeway is involved in the resumption of the parcel of land covered by this measure, so I think it is relevant. That is my opinion.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: I do not think the honourable member needs any help from Mr Thompson; he is doing very well.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am pleased we gave him an opportunity to speak.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What he is saying is more relevant than were some of the comments from members opposite while speaking to the motion.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: The comments from the other side!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am sure my comments are relevant to the Bill now before us. The members of the Opposition have suggested we should have another inquiry. We already have the results of one inquiry.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Have you read all the submissions?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: No; has the honourable member? We have even had the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr Jones) coming to this State and saying he will restrict funds. If there is a hold up in funds, and there is further congestion at the Narrows interchange, I hope Mr Jones will stand in the middle of the road and explain his position, because I am sure the motorists will be happy to hear what he has to say.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are more stupid than I thought.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Leader of the Opposition has to learn. I make the point that this parcel of land is badly needed. It must be accepted that the free-way extension is essential, and I support the Bill.

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

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [8.24 p.m.]: The Hon. R. F. Cloughton mentioned recently that he had a very small Bill to handle, but I believe this Bill is even smaller. However, it involves an important amendment to the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act. As members are aware, the parent Act deals specifically with people, human suffering, accidents compensation, and other matters associated with motor vehicles.

I agree with what the Minister said during his second reading speech, that the amendment is to change only a small section of the parent Act and to correct a mistake which was made some 16 years ago when section 11 was redrafted.

I would mention that I have no opposition to the amendment contained in the Bill because it will rectify an anomaly. However, I am worried that the parent Act, which deals with the interests of so many people in this State, has been administered for some 16 years with this particular anomaly. I am worried that such an important Act could have been allowed to continue to operate in that way.

I come to the question of how the error was discovered. Obviously, it has existed for a long time. I would also ask the Minister whether the error has caused any hardship or concern for persons involved with the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust. Although it is a small amendment it is possible that the matter which it covers could have been subject to discussion under law. I am not sure which Minister is in charge of the Bill.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am the Minister in charge of the Bill.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I was not sure, and I now realise the Minister was discussing an important matter. My query was whether people had been affected by the anomaly which has now been discovered in the Act, and whether anyone had been deprived of benefits. I would like to know how the error has remained in the Act for a period of 16 years. Was it picked up by a judge when a point was raised in a court, or was it picked up by an officer in the department which has administered the Act?

It seems this rather serious situation has continued for a long time. I support the amendment which will correct an anomaly, and we will not oppose the Bill.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [8.27 p.m.]: I support the Bill. It is apparent that a drafting error occurred some time ago but I would also like to know why it has taken so long to find the error. No doubt, the particular section of the Act has not been used until recently. The only conclusion I can come to is that the matter has not been raised, but perhaps the Minister will enlighten me. As I said, I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams) in the Chair; the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 11 amended—

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I did ask the Minister a couple of questions and perhaps he does not have the answers available tonight. If not, will he supply me with the information at a later stage so that my mind will be set at rest?

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am mindful of the questions raised by the honourable member. I have been through the file containing the information supplied to me by the Minister responsible for the Act but I am unable to locate any reference to any person having been affected, in any way, by the error which has been in the legislation since 1959.

The probable answer to the second query raised by the honourable member and the Hon. George Berry is that it appears to me, from my examination of the file, that it is a matter which has simply come to the notice of the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust.

Probably—and I use that word advisedly—the officer concerned picked up this discrepancy in the course of his examination. Certainly no information is available to me to indicate that anyone has been affected by this provision in any way. Secondly, to the best of my knowledge, it may not have been to the disadvantage of any person that the error was detected. I believe this can be traced back at least to 1973. That is the background to the amendment. However, if it should become apparent to me that there is a specific reason which required a small amendment to be the subject of a Bill, I will certainly ensure that the information is conveyed to Mr Dellar and Mr Berry.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): If I may help the Committee, I believe the explanation may

appear in the Bill itself. Clause 1 (2) carries the side note "Approved for Reprint 3rd May, 1974." It may be that the error was discovered due to the fact that the Act was to be reprinted.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That may be right.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [8.34 p.m.]: Let me preface my remarks to the Bill by saying—and this is not an original statement—that there is an increasing awareness both in the private sector and in Government circles of the important need to legislate and to participate in discussions to preserve our natural facilities for the benefit of future generations that will follow us. That is not an original statement, but most people will be aware of this growing interest.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Very sound statement just the same.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: In the old days, when the country was being settled and development was new, the major requirement was to have a roof over one's head. The settlers sought areas to grow crops, or to establish industries of some kind so that they could survive in an extremely harsh environment—although I do not think they knew that word in those days.

By virtue of the early developments, much of our natural heritage, beauty, and facilities, were either destroyed or changed in such a way that even people of my age could not appreciate some of the features which were in existence before the turn of the century. I believe other members in the Chamber will share that view.

It is not too late, particularly in a young country like Australia—and I believe we are extremely fortunate to live here—to retain our natural beauty and unique features. Of course we appreciate them, and along with others we realise the folly on the part of some of our ancestors who destroyed many of our natural assets.

Evidence of this interest in environmental affairs has been shown by the recent debates in this Chamber and in another place regarding certain conservation and environmental problems associated with a major extension of a particular freeway. Similar debates occurred in the past when

mineral developments were proposed and many of our citizens did not wish to have our national parks, the natural habitat of some of our flora and fauna, destroyed by mining operations. Concern was expressed in regard to the operations in a national park down south. I do not remember its name, but it was somewhere near the Franklin River.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Fitzgerald River reserve.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That is right. Another national park which has caused concern is the one at Kalbarri, and even more recently it has been reported that Aboriginal grounds were interfered with during a mining operation in the north. While that particular matter is covered by separate legislation, it is a point worth considering in this context.

We do not object to the Bill. Following my rather timid approach to it, I must say that I cannot see it will achieve anything at all. This Bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act, and in the second reading speech the Minister told us that it proposes to increase the membership of one body established under the parent Act by adding two members, and it proposes to change the name of the Environmental Protection Council to the conservation and environmental council. This seems to me to be just a few more words added to those we have heard since the 30th March, 1974. Actually, I did find some reference to this matter in the little white book.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What little white book?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: We were told that something like this was going to happen. However, I do not believe that the provisions in the Bill will have any effect whatever in improving the operations of the body, simply by changing its name. As far as I am concerned, this is just a lot of political whitewash. We have been accused of playing politics in regard to a recent Bill, but I am yet to be convinced, having regard for the brief statements contained in the Minister's second reading speech, that this amendment to the Act will achieve one iota of improvement.

It is not intended to alter the name of the Environmental Protection Authority because, according to the Minister, it has performed very well, and it has become known to the public by its work in the conservation of our environment. The Minister said—

It is not proposed that there should be a change in the title of this authority, as it has already established itself within the community through its series of decisions and recommendations which have been accepted by both the previous Government and this Government.

No-one could deny that. The Minister then goes on to say—

However, the Environmental Protection Council—

This is the body which is to have the change of name and two extra members. To continue—

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

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

As a consequence of these two major whitewashing decisions of the Government, the new council will apparently become very effective in carrying out the role which it was set up to do.

I am not a great scholar in regard to environmental protection or conservation requirements, but looking at the measure and reading the Minister's speech, if the protection of the environment is so important, and if it is in line with the Government's stated policy that it is really going to do something about the environment, this legislation does not impress me one scrap. I doubt whether anyone will ever convince me that by altering the composition of the council and by changing its name anything will be achieved.

Let us look at the performance of the council. It met on five occasions in 16 months, for a total of 11 hours and two minutes. That works out roughly to 1½ working days in almost 1½ years. So I do not see that the amendment contained in this Bill will rejuvenate the council and that we will see a corresponding improvement in our environment. The council has been as dead as a dodo. If the provisions of the amendment wake up the council, it will be a very interesting next 18 months. If the legislation is passed, will it affect the workings of the council, and will it change its performance in the future? Perhaps the new members to be elected—a representative of the Department of Agriculture and a representative from a tertiary institution—may be able to kick the other 14 or 15 members along. However, I do not really think the two new members will achieve much.

We do not oppose this Bill, because it is hardly worth talking about. However, it is worth pointing out that the Government is attempting to do something to improve the situation in regard to a subject which is very near and dear to many

people in this State. As I said before, I cannot for the life of me see that this measure will achieve one thing.

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West)
[8.44 p.m.]: I endorse some of the remarks made by the previous speaker. I believe he adequately covered the amendment to change the names of the various authorities and the people concerned, and he also referred to the fact that two more members were to be added to the council. Like him, I fail to see what will be achieved with the mere change of a name, but I believe the addition of two members to the Environmental Protection Council is a different matter. If the council and these other groups are changing their names, I fail to see why the name of the authority is not to be altered. I feel it should be entitled the "authority for the conservation of the environment," or something like that.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It is well known.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I would now like to draw attention to section 12 of the Environmental Protection Act which states in connection with the establishment of the Department of Environmental Protection that it is—

For the purposes of assisting the Authority in the exercise and performance of its powers, functions and duties under this Act, . . .

The whole thing is interrelated and I fail to see why the authority does not change its name in line with the other changes that are being made. If it did so it certainly would not detract from Dr Brian O'Brien who is highly respected and would certainly lose no prestige with a change in name; indeed, if the name were changed I think it would add teeth to the authority and certainly give a semblance of uniformity.

It is certainly optimistic to imagine that the changed name would revitalise the council, but I do believe an additional two members will be an advantage to the council providing of course those duly appointed, are dedicated and qualified to do the job they are entrusted to do by the public. If this is the case it will certainly revitalise the council, and this is what we are looking for.

The public is becoming more and more aware of the problems and the dangers to the environment and related conservation issues that arise every day. This problem is evident even in Western Australia with an area of one million square miles and a little more than one million people. We find that in the city we are choking ourselves to death, apart from which we are poisoning our water and our food supplies by the use of innumerable pesticides and insecticides. The dangers inherent in these pesticides and insecticides are not altogether appreciated.

Recently I read an article which stated that in America there was a big lake which had a very low contamination from DDT, but the vegetation was slightly more affected, and the fish in that lake had a high count of DDT in their bodies. The article added that the birds that had eaten the fish from the lake had died. It would seem that there is a moral in this story.

While talking about the environment and of conservation issues I would like to bring forward something which concerns me greatly. I refer to what has happened at Whitford Beach which is part of the Wanneroo Shire. I bring this forward because if the authority is to be revitalised this is one of the areas at which it could have a look.

I have here a document presented by the combined coastal community associations which contains a submission opposing coastal nodes development at Whitford.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What was that; how do you spell it?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I was referring to coastal nodes at Whitford. I was expecting the Hon. Grace Vaughan to pull me up on this and, as a result, I looked up the Oxford Dictionary to ascertain the meaning of "nodes" and I find it describes a node as a hard tumour; a knotty swelling on a joint affected by gout or rheumatism; any knot, bump, or knotty formation. Perhaps I should explain that these nodes are situated between the sea-shore and the West Coast Highway. The area in question is about 70 acres or 28 hectares. It is a considerable area which it is proposed will be developed for residential purposes. I think this is wrong, and the people of Whitfords think it is wrong.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: But the MRPA thinks it is right.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have had an inquiry into the Corridor Plan and this development was approved.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am strongly opposed to the development in this area, and it was certainly not approved by the Wanneroo Shire Council or the people in the area. The potential use of the beach is very important at this point of time. The northern development is proceeding very quickly; much more quickly than the local authorities, the Government, or the developers ever thought possible.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You must have two MRPA's.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I would like to quote from this document which is a submission opposing coastal nodes at Whitfords. I quote—

The population in the coastal districts of Mullaloo, Whitford, Marmion and Duncraig, is about 15 000 persons.

I might interpolate that this was written in about 1973.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You had better go as fast as you can before you are pulled up and brought back to the Bill.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The quote continues—

The population of the adjoining districts of Warwick and Greenwood is about 7 000 persons. Further east in Girrawheen, Koondoola and the Wanneroo Townsite there are another 11 000 persons.

At that time the population was 33 000 people, but today—only a short time later—it is 42 000 people. Accordingly the importance of this area from the point of view of recreation is increasing all the time.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I wish you had been at Cockburn Sound.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I make these points, because I believe the council when revitalised will again be able to have a look at the matter. Not only must we consider the development that is taking place at Whitfords, but we must also consider the development in the City of Stirling itself, where the beaches are constantly overcrowded in the summer months.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do not let the MRPA in there.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Unfortunately south of Perth we have seen development restricting the public use of beaches around Kwinana, etc.; these beaches have all been spoilt or they have been restricted to public use in some way or other. So people will be looking north rather than south for their recreation. We are not talking of only 40 000 or 50 000 people; the vast majority of the people in the metropolitan area will be going north.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This was done B.G.—when people worked for a living.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What is B.G.?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Before Gough!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I would like to point out that the anticipated population of the Wanneroo Shire in the next 10 years could be 150 000 people. It certainly looks as though it will reach that figure. The issue I have raised is critical for the residents of that area. Whitfords Beach is unique inasmuch as it is protected from the rips and the ocean swells and, accordingly, it is a safe swimming area. If we go further north from Mullaloo to Burns Beach we find a rugged, rocky coastline which contains only a few limited areas of sandy beach.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is about time you brought in that question of the council looking at it again.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The public use of this public open space will be further restricted by the need to protect the fragile frontal dunes. The fine white sand of the dunes makes the Whitford-Mullaloo area particularly vulnerable to destruction by wind erosion and any development there will be likely to cause a disturbance and make the situation much worse. The public will have to be restricted to certain areas to protect these other areas from cars and from too much public usage on the unstable sand dunes. If this were not done it could upset the balance of the environment.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You want concrete freeways.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am talking about a different situation. I am merely emphasising the fact that heavy public usage could destroy the sand dunes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought you said the public would be covered by the sand dunes!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The important thing is that the West Coast Highway has followed the coast, but in this particular instance it is moving away from the coast. The submission opposing coastal nodes at Whitford further points out that—

The concept of this extension departed from that given to this highway further south, as regard was given to the topography of the area the need to safeguard the stability of the dunes . . .

This clearly indicates that the intention was to protect the sand dunes and leave them untouched. Since then the developers have moved in, and the Wanneroo Shire Council has indicated that it is strongly opposed to what is happening and indeed it purchased about 14 blocks from developers at a cost of some \$114 000 to make sure that the area is protected. But the council cannot possibly afford to purchase these larger areas of some 70 acres.

I believe the need to control the beach area is very great indeed, and I would like to quote from an article in *The West Australian* of the 10th February 1962, by Professor Gordon Stephenson which reads—

The first is that the highway should follow the beach front all the way from Fremantle to Sorrento. Provision would have to be made for its extension northwards later and the professor has suggested that all the beachfront land to Yanchep be reserved. The second principle is that all houses and building—except public amenities and provision for parking—should be on the landward side of the road.

This is the very point I have been trying to make. It is imperative this policy be continued. If a precedent is set there could be further development north or south with the same result.

As I have said the Wanneroo Shire Council has not the financial ability to purchase the land to which I have referred and I believe there are two possibilities open to the Government—one of which is the purchase of the land, which would be expensive—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Heltman would be the most tolerant Deputy President I have seen.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I believe the revitalising of this council is very important and I feel it is important that this matter should be brought to its attention as soon as it gets off the ground. As I have said there are two alternatives; one is for the State Government to purchase the land, which would be expensive; and the other alternative is to carry out a land swap.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Honourable member should get back to the Bill.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In the revitalising of this council pressure should be placed on the State Government to take the steps I have mentioned. There should be a land swap or the land in question should be purchased. The land swap would be the more practical and within the reach of the State Government. I hope the authorities concerned will use their powers to carry this forward.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What would you swap?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I believe some other developmental land is being negotiated. It is considered to be a priority by the State Government and I should think that 12 months would be sufficient time to make a decision.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Perhaps you could swap Mr Griffiths!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The other point that is of concern to me and to the Shires of Mundaring, Kalamunda, and Armadale—and perhaps Mr Pratt will back me up on this matter—relates to an environmental issue and the needless destruction of trees in the hills areas as a result of the activities of developers. More damage has been done in these areas in six months than would be done on the whole of the freeway extension. We talk about installing freeways and things like that, but people just do not realise how much damage is being done in the hills areas. There are fairly large blocks in this area ranging from a half-acre, or 2 hectares to 20 acres or 8 hectares that have been completely denuded of trees by developers who have put through bulldozers and knocked everything down.

The Environmental Protection Council has been consulted about this problem and I have letters which indicate that the council is fully in support of what I will suggest; that is, an amendment should be made to the Local Government Act to grant powers to local authorities, if they so wish, and if the community so wishes, to enact a by-law which will enable local authorities to adopt a tree preservation by-law. I am not suggesting that this be brought about in many other areas, but I believe, in the hills area, where there is danger of tree destruction being carried out, that local authorities should be granted powers to enact a tree preservation order such as I have suggested. I know that some of the local authorities in the hills area have also approached the Minister on this point.

I understand that quite often the owners of land who have been adversely affected are struck with horror when the developers, builders, or contractors move in and completely clear the surface of trees. I cannot continue to make this plea, because I believe I may be ruled out of order, but I believe this is an important aspect and I hope the Minister will give due consideration to it. I support the Bill.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [9.02 p.m.]: When speaking earlier, Mr Dellar said he could not be convinced there was some value in the Bill, but later I was pleased to hear him say that he expressed a desire for someone to show him that there was some value in it. I hope, in some small way, to do this. I wish to refer specifically—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We will listen very intently to ascertain whether you can.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: If both Mr Dellar and Mr Claughton listen I may provide some information that will convince them.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I always listen.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I know that. I was not referring to the honourable member specifically when making that remark. I now wish to refer to that part of the Bill that seeks to increase the membership of the council from 14 to 16 by the inclusion of a nominee of the Minister for Agriculture and a nominee of a tertiary institution. In his second reading speech, in referring to these changes, the Minister said—

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

I consider that these two additional members will achieve this objective.

I refer firstly to the second appointment; that is, to the nominee of a tertiary institution, because in our tertiary institutions we do have a field of pure research as opposed to the field of specific research in which are engaged officers of various departments. I feel sure that an interest is being taken in the environment and in conservation matters in our tertiary institutions and not only will we gain, but also the Minister and the authority will gain from the advice coming from a nominee of a tertiary institution where pure research in these fields is being conducted.

In referring to the nominee of the Minister for Agriculture, it is becoming increasingly evident in the world today that the actual carrying out of agricultural pursuits is having a marked effect on the environment. Mr Masters referred to the effect of DDT on the environment. DDT received such widespread publicity that I am sure almost everyone who is able to read is aware of the problem created by it.

I would now like to refer to some of the effects that are being felt as a result of agricultural pursuits. Here I would mention the use of other insecticides, hormones that are used for the killing of weeds, and also, fertilisers which probably are having the greatest effect of all on the environment. Within my electorate is situated the Peel Inlet area which at present is being adversely affected by the growth of algae. To a large extent that growth of algae can be traced directly to the use of fertilisers on agricultural properties in the vicinity, because these fertilisers are finding their way into the watercourses, enriching the soil with nutrients and so is causing an increase in the growth of algae which, in many ways, is despoiling the waterways in the Peel Inlet, together with some of the estuaries in the Mandurah area. At one time these spots were very pleasant in the height of summer, but they have now reached the stage where it is almost impossible for anyone to live in the vicinity because of the algae growth.

I am sure that the additional advice on agricultural affairs that will come from the two members who will be appointed to the council will prove to be of value. At the very worst any expert advice in fields such as this can be of no harm.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you know that the algae started in the Serpentine River? It started after the Serpentine Dam was built and it has been evident from that time onwards.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition, being quite expert in this field and conversant with the cause of the algae growth in the Peel Inlet may be able to give us some advice in regard to finding a solution to the problem.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I have been visiting a property situated in the Peel Inlet area all my life, and in my opinion the construction of the Serpentine Dam has caused the great amount of algae.

The Hon G. C. MacKinnon: It is interesting to learn that the use of fertilisers is causing the algae growth, but it is probably an interaction; both honourable members are probably right.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I thank both the Minister and the Leader of the Opposition for their advice, but what I am looking for and what the Government and the authority is looking for are solutions to these problems. It has been established in the minds of experts—I know we are in the habit of questioning experts from time to time in this House—that to a large extent the build-up of the algae is caused by the extra nutrients in the water which are coming from fertilisers, and probably this has been aggravated by the construction of the Serpentine Dam.

However I wish to return to the point that I am sure these two additional appointments to the council will strengthen that body and will result in better advice being presented to both the Minister and the authority. I support the Bill and I hope Mr Dellar will perhaps think about some of the statements I have made and may consider that I have persuaded him to think a little more kindly of the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [9.07 p.m.]: I very much appreciate the pleasure the Minister showed when I rose to my feet. I know he always enjoys a speech from me.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I love to see democracy at work.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The most appropriate word I can think of to describe the Minister's speech when introducing this Bill, is "diffident". Obviously, judging from the brevity and the terms of the speech it was very diffident in respect of a matter that one would expect the Government to view as being of major importance.

However whilst we might describe the Minister's speech as being diffident, I am afraid the proposal in the Bill can only be described as pathetic. I am afraid the Minister's remarks were unable to persuade me that there is any great importance in the Bill. The Environmental Protection Council already has a membership of 14 which one would have thought would be adequate to cover most aspects of the environment, and any aspects that were not covered with the expertise available within the council could be covered by advice that could be obtained quite readily by the authority.

In fact, the Bill, in dealing with the council, quite readily will promote the sort of remarks Mr Masters made, because among the powers the council has is to examine town planning matters. I must confess that since the Government has taken office, the impression I have gained of the council is that its powers have been restricted in all directions, and more particularly in the field of town planning.

I have in mind a specific instance; namely, the investigation that was made into a matter that I mentioned previously in this Chamber and which took place in Subiaco. That was the report the authority made on a lot in Onslow Road that came out against the decision of the council and instead of its taking any notice of the recommendation from the Environmental Protection Authority the Subiaco council completely ignored the report and the matter was allowed to proceed. As I said previously, that was a case I know of in which the authority had taken up a town planning matter. The report was referred to the Environmental Protection Council and it was obvious from what subsequently took place that it got a rap on the knuckles and was told, "Just keep out of this; it is none of your business."

The same is likely to occur if the EPC intends to intrude in what is taking place in respect of the coastal nodes in the Wanneroo Shire. Mr Masters has not been a member of Parliament for very long; he has been a member only since the last election and so he would not know the background of that affair. However, Mr Griffiths who was a member of the Select Committee which inquired into the corridor plan for Perth would know that that plan had been approved by a Cabinet sub-committee and this bypassed the plan put forward by the Town Planning Department. Therefore the Government of that time must bear the responsibility for the approvals as did the Brand Government, and the present Government must also accept responsibility.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: The previous Labor Government did not change it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: When there is a written agreement it is not so simple to change it, and in reply to the honourable member who has just interjected I would point out that the present Government which has been in office for 12 months has allowed the matter to remain as it is. The Shire of Wanneroo, since it became aware of this approval, has been attempting to get the decision reversed, and I hope it will eventually succeed. The shire has been working for an exchange of land in order to achieve this objective.

I had not intended to speak at length on the Bill, but I was inspired to do so by the remarks made by Mr Masters. I think the Bill is small cheese. Its advent in

the Chamber was made with as little fuss as possible and I was quite prepared to let it pass with as little noise as possible. I think it is of no great moment. I regret that I have reached the conclusion that it does not matter how good our legislation is in respect of environmental protection; it is how good the Government's intentions are in respect of these matters.

If we have a Government which intends to take notice of the people and honour its pledges to them about these matters, effective legislation will be permitted to work for the benefit of the people; but if we do not have a Government with that intention, it does not matter how good the legislation might be.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [9.16 p.m.]: I will be polite and thank all members for their keen interest in this measure! I do not know there is much else I can say because all points have been answered by other members. I suppose because of our late sitting last night members cannot be blamed for taking advantage of the situation; but, for the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone should object to a Bill which appoints someone from the Department of Agriculture and from tertiary institutions to the council. It seems such an eminently sensible approach.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: No-one objects.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I wonder how it was ever missed in the first place. I have always been amazed at the tremendous amount of fuss people who get tied up with conservation societies and the like make about mining activity. We have only to fly across this country at any height and look down to see that the environment has been changed to an almost miniscule extent by mining, but to a tremendously large extent by agriculture. Both pursuits are necessary. We must eat and we need the benefit of mining activities as well.

All the queries on the legislation were answered by one or other of the speakers, Mr Pratt doing most of the answering, for which I thank him. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

ANZAC DAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [9.20 p.m.]: After having very carefully studied the Bill, I find I can support it!

The Hon. N. McNeill: That was a fine speech!

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [9.21 p.m.]: I promise to be brief in my support of the Bill which is designed to bring greyhound racing into line with horse racing. Greyhound racing is a new sport which commenced in 1974, and the Cannington stadium was built at a cost of \$2 million to accommodate the sport, and money is still being spent on the stadium.

The purpose of the Bill is to ensure that the money and proceeds from the racing go to the trust which, as we all know, does a great job.

It is interesting to note how much the Anzac Day trust does obtain in income over the years. In 1973 the total income was \$53 987.94. The gate takings on a good day or night at greyhound racing are approximately \$7 500 which obviously means very little profit would be gained because high costs are involved in maintaining this sport. However, no doubt in the future it will make a considerable amount of money.

The proceeds from horse racing on a good day would be \$73 000. This I believe would give the trust an additional \$7 000 or \$8 000 a year and does not take into account the off-course betting proceeds.

The money is given by way of a Government grant and is equivalent to the amount of betting tax derived from trotting and racing meetings on Anzac Day in that year.

I believe this is a worth-while Bill and I fully support it. The trust does a great deal to relieve the burden of the families of those people who fought to preserve our freedoms. The trust goes some way towards helping them and repaying our debt.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [9.25 p.m.]: In the ordinary course of events one would be inclined to say that this is a small machinery Bill with two main provisions, the first being to increase the allowance payable in respect of fourth and fifth-year high school students and the second to take account of the change in respect of teachers' colleges since they have become autonomous institutions and are no longer under the direct control of the State Education Department.

However, as a consequence of these amendments and the Government's attitude particularly in relation to the status of the teachers' colleges, new regulations were framed to cover bonding of teacher education trainees and the allowances payable to them. Recently in this Chamber a motion was dealt with designed to disallow the regulations.

I do not propose to canvass the subject at great length as it has been dealt with in another place, but as the Minister for Education is in this Chamber, I must raise the matter to give him an opportunity to state his views.

The students have made submissions to the Government for an increase to bring their allowance to \$40 a week which amount they regard as the minimum on which a student can be expected to maintain himself at a satisfactory level. The present allowance is a little over \$21 a week.

We have heard a great deal in this Chamber about the effect of inflation and this week a decision has been made to increase the minimum wage payable to about \$82 a week. Consequently we can realise that the amount paid to a student holding a State Government scholarship to these institutions is considerably lower than the minimum wage. It is \$31 compared with the minimum wage of \$82. The \$40 requested by the students is still a great deal short of the minimum wage. The students have further suggested increased scales in respect of living-away-from-home allowances, married students' allowances, etc.

During the earlier debate the Minister excused the Government's action on this matter by indicating that the amounts compared favourably with the tertiary education allowances. That may well be so, but at the same time the Government is always stating its concern to preserve the State's rights. This is a matter in which the State does in fact have responsibility and in which it is able to take its own independent actions for the benefit of the people.

I bring to the Minister's attention the matter of allowances and the matter of the bond itself. There has been a general

move for some time now to have the bond abolished altogether for reasons I do not propose to canvass at this stage because the Minister is aware of them and they are contained in submissions to him.

A further proposal which I believe has a great deal of merit is that the allowances—or scholarships, which amount to the same thing—be adjudicated upon by the Teachers' Tribunal as an independent body which has the expertise to take into account all the relevant matters on which to fix a reasonable rate to be paid to the students.

With those remarks I support the Bill. The increased allowances in the fourth and fifth years will be greatly appreciated by the parents of students. The other machinery amendments in respect of the change in status of teachers' training institutions are necessary.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Education) [9.32 p.m.]: I thank Mr Cloughton for his support of the Bill. He has asked me to speak about the allowance situation and the possibility of eliminating bonds, which is obliquely touched upon in the legislation, and I will briefly do so.

I agree with Mr Cloughton, and have so stated, that the system of bonding trainee teachers has, in the main, outlived its usefulness so far as the department is concerned. This method was used to attract and hold teachers within the departmental service at a time of great shortages which we can all recall and which has apparently passed. I say apparently because, despite all the very deep and careful studies made of population trends, the age-old habit of procreating tends to bedevil us from time to time, and of course the situation becomes further confused by immigration programmes which are sometimes necessary on humanitarian or economic grounds. So we always have to keep a weather eye on that situation. However, the position with regard to the supply of teachers, looking at it objectively and cold-bloodedly, is now infinitely better than it has been in the past.

Very harsh and arbitrary action has been taken by Mr Cameron in cancelling the visas of teachers who were contracted to come to Australia from the United States of America. It has not affected Western Australia but has caused some perturbation in New South Wales, and the Premier (Mr Lewis) and the Minister for Education (Mr Willis) in that State are angry about this action, I believe with justification. When a State enters into a contract, it is up to that State to honour the contract. Mr Cameron's action cannot be doing much good for Australia's image in America.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You do not mind teachers in Australia being unemployed?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course I mind. I go so far as to say I mind teachers being unemployed in the United States of America. However, a contract was entered into and I believe the New South Wales Government had an obligation to provide employment for those teachers. We in Western Australia placed an extra 1 000 teachers in primary schools in one year.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you agree it is not unusual for Governments to cancel visas for individuals? There is no agreement with the United States Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: When the Government or a State authority has entered into a contractual arrangement with people, with the approval of the Federal authorities, it is unusual to have it cut off out of the blue, not because of subversion, illness, or anything like that which is perfectly normal and can happen from time to time, but for an ideological reason.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What ideology is involved in cancelling visas?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Getting 800 or 200 votes; that is what it was about.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is not ideological.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I know that, and I do not want to enter into the ramifications of it; but that is what it was about.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: They could carry a stigma because of having lost their visas.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is right. It must leave a bad taste in the mouth of the Americans. They have to explain—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You might speak about the cancellation of visas by previous Governments.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: —to their friends that the Australian Government has cancelled their visas. When they are asked, "Why has the Australian Government done that?" they will reply, "I do not know." I think Mr Wordsworth is quite right.

I was illustrating the fact that the supply situation in relation to teachers has changed, thus decreasing the necessity for the bonding system. I was endeavouring to answer Mr Cloughton. I have said on a number of occasions that I think we should do something about the bonding system, and indeed we are now doing something about it.

Tied up with this is the fact that the Federal Government now makes tertiary education allowances, and South Australia has already legislated to cease paying student allowances or scholarships to teachers, trainee teachers, and students of any kind from State funds. The students

now make application to the Commonwealth authorities for the student allowances. I think this is a very suitable solution to the problem.

It would of course be harsh and unconscionable for us to stop the allowances now because a number of students have geared their activities to the receipt of the Education Department's allowance or scholarship. A number of students welcome the bonding system. I have had from students a number of letters and communications in different forms thanking me for saying we would not stop the bonding system out of hand. They see advantages in a guarantee of three years' employment. Occasionally a student wants to escape his or her obligation under the bonding system and leave the State for one reason or another without paying it back, but they are few and far between.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think Rolf Harris is still paying his back at 10c a week.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We are kindhearted and considerate. I would have to check his file. I doubt that is so from what I see of that gentleman on television; I am sure he would do better than that.

I agree with Mr Cloughton that we should be moving—and indeed we are moving—towards a change in this system. As I said the other night in another debate, the change is being brought about almost automatically by the students themselves in that the bulk of them are receiving student allowances from the Commonwealth Government, which is the major tax agent. Indeed, the major role of the Commonwealth Government in Australia is that of a tax-collecting agency, and it seems to do the job rather efficiently. It is reasonable that the Commonwealth Government should pay these allowances. This is a field we should vacate, which would then leave certain moneys at our disposal which could be used to attract teachers to remote areas. One advantage of the bonding system was that it enabled us to direct a teacher to a particular town.

I believe this problem can be solved. As members know, I recently spent some time in New Zealand on a holiday, and I took the opportunity to spend a few days with the education authorities there. New Zealand has a system of attracting students to remote towns on a promotional basis. We hope to obtain money to do this, and it is the sort of thinking which is going on now, with the idea of accomplishing the aims about which Mr Cloughton spoke.

Mr Cloughton's other aim to get a much higher allowance for student teachers would automatically become a matter for the Commonwealth Government. At the present time the State allowances are higher than those of the Commonwealth. We are more generous than the Commonwealth in that regard.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: \$119 more generous.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That particular aspect would then become the responsibility of the Federal authorities, and as both the tertiary and the CAE colleges are now funded by the Commonwealth Government, it seems to me that is a proper objective. I believe we will accomplish what seems to be the desire of most people; that is, the elimination of the bonding system and a uniform approach to allowances.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 28 amended—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I feel obliged to rise to comment on some of the remarks made by the Minister. On the information I have, the annual allowance payable by the State is \$1119 for a first-year student and the allowance under the Commonwealth scheme is \$1000 a year, so there is a difference of \$119.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I said we were more generous.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Marginally more generous. The living-away-from-home allowance paid by the State is \$1504, while the Commonwealth's allowance is \$1600; so here the Commonwealth is more generous. The differences are not significant.

The G. C. MacKinnon: All theirs are subject to a means test; ours are not.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am pleased about the line the Minister is taking in respect of country appointments. I have made suggestions along that line on a previous occasion. Incentives should be provided to encourage teachers to take these appointments. This idea is not new. In the past teachers have gone to one-teacher schools in country areas in order to obtain promotion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We used it this year to solve the problem on the trans.-line.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, the idea is not new. I think monetary incentives could also be used to get experienced teachers to go to country schools.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We were successful in that respect this year. We acquired experienced teachers for about three schools.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes. So often country schools are staffed by teachers fresh out of college who stay there for a year or two only to be replaced

by other teachers fresh out of college. I would prefer to see a fair distribution of our teaching resources.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Certainly it is not a fair distribution of experience.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Country people have had to suffer the consequence of this for many years. I certainly would encourage the Minister to adopt that line.

Unfortunately the Minister has not made a firm commitment regarding the abolition of the bond. He has indicated that the State would prefer to move out of the area of allowances and scholarships and to leave that matter to the Australian Government. I believe it is hardly satisfactory to suggest that payment to students should not be one of the matters determined by the Teachers' Tribunal.

My final point is in respect of the Minister's reference to the action of the Federal Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr Cameron) in cancelling the visas of teachers who were encouraged to enter the New South Wales teaching service. I should have thought the Minister for Education would agree that Mr Cameron was accepting his responsibility by taking that action when there are possibly 1000 teachers out of work in New South Wales—a very serious unemployment situation in that profession. That situation can only be exacerbated by the entry of a large number of teachers from overseas. It is possible those very teachers may have found themselves out of employment within a short period.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thank Mr Cloughton for underlining my remarks. I was in fact indicating my line of thought, and members will be aware that any changes made will be subject to the decision of Cabinet, and may even require amendments to the Act. I merely wished to indicate the lines along which we are thinking. I did not mention the Teachers' Tribunal acting as a salary-fixing agency, because I do not think that is proper. I believe all students should be dealt with at the one level, and that the tribunal should not deal with one set of students in isolation. I believe teacher training equips people to fit into other employment much easier than training for some other professions can do.

With regard to Mr Cameron's action, it is possible, particularly in the teaching profession, to have an oversupply of labour at the same time as a serious shortage of labour. For instance, we can have an oversupply of primary school teachers and an undersupply of high school teachers at the same time. It must be remembered that the American teachers were not encouraged to come to Australia; they were contracted to do so. I have met the lady who interviewed these

teachers for Western Australia, and they were chosen for their skills, personality, and academic qualifications.

I am sure Mr Claughton, after a moment's thought, would realise it is quite possible to have general or physical education teachers looking for employment while at the same time we are desperately short of science teachers. Indeed, in Western Australia at the moment we have in the vicinity of 20 secondary school teachers who are not in employment. Some of these are unemployed because they do not wish to move to another location as they are married, and the area in which they live has no employment available for their speciality.

I trust I have answered the queries raised.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 9 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [9.57 p.m.]: The Bill before us is a result of investigations made by a committee set up by the Tonkin Government in 1973. The committee, which presented its report on the 12th July, 1973, was composed of the Deputy Director of the Department for Community Welfare, a legal officer from the Crown Law Department (Mr Smith), and the Registrar-General (Mr Ockerby).

The Opposition can see nothing in the Bill to which it could object, and therefore we intend to support it.

I certainly agree with the proposed amendment to section 25 of the Act, which will remove the necessity for a person to appear before a judge of the Supreme Court if that person has not had his birth registered within seven years of his date of birth, and he wishes to have it registered. At present the Act provides that such a person must appear before a judge of the Supreme Court to obtain proper birth registration. The amendment proposes to alter that so that the Registrar-General will have the authority to register the birth

of such persons. I think that is sensible and desirable. This is the case in England and New Zealand, where the respective Registrars-General have a similar authority.

I am always in favour of the administration of law being simplified as much as possible in the interests of the average person in the community.

The other amendments in the Bill also seem reasonable, and I do not intend to waste the time of the House by going into them in detail.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [9.59 p.m.]: May I thank Miss Lyla Elliott for her support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

House adjourned at 10.03 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 30th April, 1975

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

MINING BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Mensaros (Minister for Mines), and read a first time.

As to Second Reading Stage

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Mines) [4.35 p.m.]: Before I move that the Bill be now read a second time, I ask your guidance, Mr Speaker. I understand that today, being private members' day, I may not be able to move the second reading. I was wondering whether I could move to have the second reading stage of the Bill taken at a later stage of the sitting.

The **SPEAKER**: I suggest to the Minister that he moves the second reading of the Bill on another day.