

**CHEMISTRY CENTRE (WA) BILL 2006**

*Third Reading*

**HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural - Leader of the House)** [3.08 pm]: I move -

That the bill be now read a third time.

**HON BARRY HOUSE (South West)** [3.08 pm]: The opposition supports the third reading of this bill. However, I want to raise two issues. First, we wholeheartedly support the restructure and refocus of the Chemistry Centre. It is proposed that the Chemistry Centre will move to a new campus at Bentley Technology Park, and be located in a complex with like-minded businesses, research institutes and organisations. There will be a refocusing of the activities of the Chemistry Centre, so that it can continue its core responsibilities to government and the public with regard to security and forensic activities, and also so that it can service needs elsewhere; for example, in the mining and agricultural sectors, the medical sector, and perhaps other sectors. In that capacity it can enter into fee-for-service operations and contracts with private operators. We wish the Chemistry Centre well in its new guise.

The second issue arose during the debate over a disjointed period of a couple of months in this house. Some issues about taxation arose in relation to the bill, culminating in the inclusion of new clause 31, which we discussed the other day. There are a couple of areas of uncertainty about the process. It seems that, at the least, there has been some sloppy drafting in this legislation, which allowed the situation to arise. New clause 31 should have been included in the bill from the start, before its passage through the Legislative Assembly. If that had been the case, there would have been absolutely no argument. I still have not had an answer to the question I posed about whether similar clauses to new clause 31 in the Land Authority Act 1992 and the Forest Products Act 2000 were initially part of the legislation or, as in this case, were inserted as amendments in the Legislative Council. We all know that the Legislative Council cannot initiate money bills. I know there has been an explanation and qualified agreement from the Chair that we were not talking about a tax in this case, but it may still be open to some interpretation. If this clause had been included in the legislation from the beginning, there would have been no issue at all, and the debate on this bill would have concluded months ago. The opposition does not oppose this aspect of the legislation. On that basis, we support the third reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.