Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 15 October 1981

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 10.45 a.m., and read prayers.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

Television Camera: Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I wish to announce that I have given approval for filming of the parliamentary proceedings in this Chamber this morning, commencing at 11.00 a.m., for a period of approximately 20 minutes.

The filming will be carried out by Shepherd Baker Studios Pty. Ltd., of Como, on behalf of the Department of Industrial Development and Commerce.

The purpose of this exercise is to produce an audiovisual programme for distribution overseas and interstate, in an endeavour to encourage interest and investment in the State of Western Australia.

Mr Bryce: You want us to look like a stable Parliament, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: We are a stable Parliament.

HOUSING: INTEREST RATES

Increases: Petition

MR TONKIN (Morley) [10.48 a.m.]: I have an excellent petition with 57 signatures and I am sure that there will be other similar petitions to come. It reads—

> To the Honourable Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, we the undersigned residents in the State of Western Australia do hereby pray that Her Majesty's Government will—
>
> re-examine its attitude to the plight of homebuyers who are being forced to sell their homes or to deprive their families of necessities in order to keep their homes;
>
> show its concern for the importance of family life by developing policies that will lessen the assault upon the family home;
>
> introduce the family allowance conversion scheme so as to reduce the principal owed by many families thereby reducing their monthly payments.
>
> Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable house will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 103.)

CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION

Standing Orders Suspension

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [10.49 a.m.]: I move—

> That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be introduced without notice, to be passed through all their remaining stages on the same day, and Messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day they are received.

As some members know, this is a customary motion which is moved at this time of the year. I have discussed it with the Leader of the Opposition and explained to him that it was felt necessary to suspend Standing Orders in this particular case because there are times when we want to follow the processes of seeking leave, introducing a Bill, and proceeding to the second reading stage so that the Bill is at least launched. Likewise, when we have a situation where a Bill has been through the second reading and Committee stages we want to pass it here so it can be introduced in another place.

However, I made it clear to the Leader of the Opposition that it has been the custom in preceding years that the machinery is to be used only through consultation between the Opposition and the Government. It is not intended that it be a *carte blanche* suspension so that we proceed with Bills without any consultation. The main point is to have the machinery available so we can move if we need to between now and the end of the session.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.50 a.m.]: I wish to indicate that we support this traditional motion moved by the Premier.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS: PRECEDENCE

All Sitting Days

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [10.51 a.m.]: I move—

That on and after Wednesday, 21 October 1981—

(a) Standing Order 226 (Grievances) be suspended, and

(b) Government business shall take precedence of all Motions and Orders of the Day on Wednesdays as on all other days.

This is also a customary motion, and although it is probably moved a little later than usual, I did not want to move it immediately after the Royal Show recess. I have discussed this motion also with the Leader of the Opposition and advised that together we would work out times, preferably block times, for the consideration of private members' business which is presently on the notice paper. I cannot give any undertaking that new business of this nature will be dealt with, but so far as the business that is on the notice paper is concerned, it is our desire to arrange for reasonable time to deal with it.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.52 a.m.]: I wish to indicate that the motion will be supported.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Pay-roll Tax Assessment Amendment Bill.
2. Stamp Amendment Bill.
3. Business Franchise (Tobacco) Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bills introduced, on motions by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer) and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION (GENERAL LOAN FUND) BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [10.55 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of this Bill is to appropriate sums from the General Loan Fund items of capital expenditure the details of which are provided in the General Loan Fund Estimates of Expenditure.

Moneys paid into the General Loan Fund consist of new government borrowings approved by the Australian Loan Council, general purpose capital grants from the Commonwealth, repayments to the fund of various advances made in previous years and when available, interest earnings from the short term investment of Public Moneys held in the Treasury.

Information presented in the General Loan Fund Estimates of Expenditure outlines the Government's overall works program and takes into account projects financed from all sources including the General Loan Fund. The sources of other funds include semi-governmental borrowings, certain Commonwealth specific purpose grants, the domestic funds of Government Instrumentalities, Loan Council's infrastructure borrowings program and contributions from industry and property developers. These other funds provide the major portion of funds available for capital works and are identified under each expenditure item of the Estimates in arriving at the proposed General Loan Fund allocations.

Some additional funds of a capital nature received by the State are paid directly to authorities such as the Main Roads Department and tertiary education institutions. Although not included in the Estimates these funds do form part of the total capital works undertaken by the Government for the year.

Loan Council Program

The States were once again confronted with a disappointing decision by the Commonwealth Government at the June 1981 Australian Loan Council meeting, when allocations to the States for their General Works Program were held at the same levels as for 1980-81. This decision was made despite strong representations from the States to have their allocations increased.

The amount approved for distribution between the States totals $1 307.2 million, the same monetary allocation as last year. This approval makes no allowance for cost escalation which is currently running at a rate of approximately 12% per annum on building and construction projects and makes no provision for growth.

Members will recall that in 1980 it was only after lengthy negotiations and bargaining that a 5% increase was conceded for that year and this small increase followed a 13.2% reduction in the allocation from the previous financial year.

Western Australia's share of the 1981-82 approved program is $120.9 million of which two-thirds ($80.6 million) is borrowings and one-third ($40.3 million) is provided as a capital grant to the State.

Effectively this means that Western Australia's allocation has been reduced by approximately $14.5 million in real terms.

This process of reduction has been continuing for the past five years and our allocation has deteriorated to such an extent that the approved level of funds is now only slightly more than half of the 1975-76 allocation in real terms.

The Commonwealth has maintained its "no growth" philosophy to borrowing approvals under the semi-governmental basic program for larger authorities. This year Loan Council announced an allocation to the States of $1 225 million which is the same amount as for 1979-80 and 1980-81.

Western Australia's share of this borrowing program for larger authorities therefore remains at $75 million. From this sum, an amount of $5.7 million has been allocated to larger Local Government Authorities leaving $69.3 million available for the larger State semi-governmental authorities.

In addition to the basic borrowing program Western Australia received an additional approval of $26.6 million as a continuation of the special temporary addition to our borrowing program for further work on the upgrading of the Kwinana to Koolyanobbing railway.

At the June 1978 meeting, Loan Council adopted new guidelines for its consideration of special additions to larger authorities borrowing programs for financing infrastructure. In effect this program established a new tier of borrowing which is made available for projects that meet with Loan Council's guidelines and approval.

Borrowings under the infrastructure program in 1980-81 amounted to $34.9 million.

Requested borrowing approval for the infrastructure program in 1981-82 was $188.8 million. The amount approved by the Commonwealth is $121.2 million, a reduction of $67.6 million.

This reduction in the allocation affecting works for which we are committed, has necessitated a re-organisation of the program and a greater recourse to trade credit facilities which do not form part of the Loan Council allocation.

Total borrowings by Western Australian semi-government authorities under the "larger" authorities and infrastructure programs is therefore expected to amount to $222.8 million and details of the distribution of this sum are set out in a Schedule to the Estimates.

Loan Council places no restrictions on the overall level of borrowings by "smaller" authorities, those whose individual new borrowings do not exceed $1.2 million in a year. Smaller semi-government authorities under this heading are expected to raise a total of $17.8 million in 1981-82, details of which are set out in a Schedule to the Estimates.

On previous occasions I have explained to Parliament the Government's policy of utilising earnings on the investment of cash balances held in the Treasury. In the first instance they are applied to meet recurrent expenditure requirements and to avoid a deficit on recurrent transactions. Then, as far as possible, they are to be applied to fund capital works. This year we have been able to provide $2.8 million from this source to augment funds otherwise available to the General Loan Fund.

A substantial increase in loan repayments of $9.0 million is expected in 1981-82 and is mainly due to the inclusion of proceeds from the sale of Greenplace Hostel. Whilst these funds have been paid into Loan Repayments and as such form part of the overall balance of the General Loan Fund for 1981-82, the Government has undertaken to ensure that an amount equal to the surplus from the sale will be made available to provide for the Mental Health Swanbourne Hospital replacement program.

The proposed expenditure from the General Loan Fund in 1981-82 is $151.5 million, an increase of only $8.2 million on that expended last year.

With the funds available from the various sources described, a total works program of $672.1 million is proposed to be undertaken this year, financed as follows:—

	$m
Government borrowing approval	80.6
Commonwealth General Purpose Capital Grant	40.3
Short Term Investment Earnings	2.8
Receipts from Loan Repayments	23.2
Balance in the General Loan Fund as at 30 June 1981	4.5
Borrowings by State Authorities—	
Larger Authorities Basic Program	69.3
Larger Authorities Special Addition	26.6
Larger Authorities Infrastructure	121.2
Smaller Authorities	17.8
Commonwealth Special Purpose Payments	58.2
Internal funds of Government Authorities	101.4
Other funds	126.2

Despite the difficulties created by the reduced real levels of funds from many of the sources mentioned, the Government has formulated a balanced program of expenditure for 1981-82.

Emphasis has been placed on the development of energy, hospitals, housing and health facilities. The program continues to reflect the Government's determination to provide stimulus for employment and for the optimum utilisation of State assets.

Mr Speaker, I would now like to refer to some of the details of the Capital Works Program. Specific details of works to be undertaken are set out in the Estimates and therefore it is unnecessary for me to comment on all items. I intend therefore to confine my remarks to some of the more major aspects of the program. Members will have the opportunity, if they wish, to obtain further details from appropriate Ministers during the debate on the Estimates.

State Energy Commission

Major capital expenditure is proposed for the State Energy Commission in 1981-82. This expenditure will enable the Commission to continue its program of infrastructure development and, at the same time, provide the facilities required to satisfy normal growth in domestic and commercial demand for electricity and gas.

Total expenditure on capital works has been estimated at $276.6 million which is $122.0 million, or 79% higher than in 1980-81. The total comprises $200.9 million for special projects, and $75.7 million for normal works.

The Energy Commission's capital works program will be funded from internal funds and short term deferred financing arrangements, from subscribed loans authorized under the basic semi-governmental Loan Program, and from infrastructure borrowings. The Commission expects to arrange buyer credits totalling $81 million to finance the purchase of specific items of equipment during the year.

Planned expenditure on normal works during 1981-82 is considerably lower than in the previous financial year. This reflects, in part, the completion of major projects during 1981-82.

Work on Muja Power Station Stage "C" and associated transmission lines to supply the Perth metropolitan area is expected to be completed during 1981-82 at a total cost of $185.6 million. Expenditure this year on the project is estimated at $15.9 million.

Completion of Muja Stage "C" will enable the Energy Commission to supply future growth in electricity demand using the most efficient generating plant available in the interconnected system and will reduce dependence on expensive fuel oil.

Expansion and upgrading of the Energy Commission's transmission and distribution system will be necessary to meet forecast growth in domestic and commercial demand for electricity in the metropolitan area and in the country. Expenditure of $39.6 million is planned for 1981-82 and includes $4.8 million for commencement of construction of a transmission line into the Eastern Goldfields.

The Commission will continue work on four special projects during 1981-82. These projects are:—

- — Dampier to Perth Natural Gas Pipeline.
- — Conversion of Units 1 and 2 at Kwinana Power Station from oil to dual oil/coal firing.
- — Muja Power Station Stage "D".
- — Pilbara Integrated Power System.

Substantial purchases of pipe and other equipment for the Dampier to Perth Natural Gas Pipeline will be made during 1981-82. Expenditure of $118.2 million during the year has been planned. The largest single component of the total is $73.3 million for pipe, the purchase of which will be funded through buyer credit arrangements.

Conversion of Units 1 and 2 at Kwinana Power Station, from oil firing to dual oil/coal firing, and their subsequent operation on coal is expected to save the Commission $12.0 million a year. Work on the conversion commmenced in 1980-81 and contracts for civil works, pipework and coal bunkers have been let. Expenditure of $21.5 million is planned for 1981-82. One unit is expected to be returned to service in August 1982 and the other in May of the following year.

Stage "D" of the Muja Power Station project will add 400 megawatts of generating capacity and the transmission lines to link it into the interconnected grid system.

Expenditure of $48.7 million on foundations, buildings, boiler plant, and transmission work, is planned for this project during 1981-82. It is scheduled for completion in 1986 and the total cost is expected to be in excess of $280.0 million.

Work will continue on the integration of the separate power supply systems in the Pilbara. Operating efficiencies achieved through integration of the separate system will contribute to lower rates of increase in energy costs in the region. An amount of $12.5 million has been allocated for this program which includes

approximately $3.0 million for a new transmission line from Cape Lambert to Karratha.

The State Energy Commission's capital works program for 1981-82 is part of a total strategy to meet future domestic, commercial and industrial energy demands in Western Australia. The policy is designed to meet the growing needs of mining and industrial development, to reduce dependence on oil fuels, and to achieve the rational development of the State's energy resources.

It is anticipated that over $1 000 million will be spent on special projects alone during the next five years. This planned level of capital works activity by the Energy Commission will create a wide range of opportunities for business, and employment, in Western Australia.

Hospital and Health Services

Capital expenditure of $44.1 million on hospitals is proposed in this financial year.

The program will ensure that work will continue on major projects under construction and a start can be made on several other priority works.

Amounts totalling $16.7 million will be needed to enable the completion and commissioning of the Podium and Ward Block at the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre and the South Terrace Block at Fremantle Hospital. The total cost of the two projects is estimated at $86.8 million and $57.5 million respectively.

The program also allows a number of projects associated with the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre site to be finalised, including upgrading site services to achieve economies in energy consumption.

The construction of the Patients' Services Block at Princess Margaret Hospital will be continued and an amount of $8.0 million has been allocated in the Estimates for that building.

The Government has given high priority to the Pilbara region's Nickol Bay Hospital in Karratha and funds have been allocated to ensure its completion in time to service the increased population associated with the North West Off-Shore Gas Project.

Work will be completed during the year on improvements to the Albany Regional Hospital, Broome Hospital and the North Midlands Hospital at Three Springs.

Despite the heavy commitments to works in progress, funds have been provided for a number of new projects to be commenced.

An amount of $300 000 is to be provided to enable Royal Perth Hospital to engage a consultant to assit in re-assessing plans for the North Block with the aim of reducing the cost of the project before a commitment is made to proceed with further expenditure.

Other major projects included in the hospital Capital Works Program are—$250 000 for Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital redevelopment Stage 2 and $230 000 for improvements at the Derby Hospital.

To meet the anticipated demand for permanent care facilities as a result of the increasing number of aged persons in the community, an amount of $500 000 has been provided.

These facilities will be attached to suburban hospitals to obtain maximum utilization of existing services and to achieve economies in operation.

Development of the School Dental Program will be continued with an allocation of $150 000 for four new mobile dental clinics. This program of preventative care has now proceeded to the stage where virtually all primary school children in the State are able to receive dental attention.

New health clinics and staff accommodation are to be established at remote locations, at a cost of $200 000. Although it has not yet been finally decided where these will be built this year, Billilluna, Kalumburu, Lake Gregory and Noonkanbah are sites under consideration. These areas have relatively small populations, mainly aboriginal, and are presently serviced under difficult circumstances.

Expenditure of $900 000 is proposed this year under the Mental Health works program as part of a program to provide new facilities to replace the Swanbourne Hospital. Although the detailed design of the total plan has not been finalised, at this stage it is estimated that the total program will cost in the vicinity of $16.0 million.

The acquisition of the Edward Millen Home in East Victoria Park from the Commonwealth Government will enable Child Psychiatry facilities to be established south of the river in the future.

Corrections

The Government will continue the staged implementation of a program to upgrade or replace prison facilities throughout the State.

The allocation of $6.0 million in 1981-82 for the Department of Corrections is indicative of the Government's firm intention to improve the prison system.

Major work will be undertaken this financial year on the prisons at Canning Vale, Bunbury, Wyndham and Boulder.

Site services are to be provided for a new regional prison at Roebourne. At the same time, work will proceed on the design of the Prison and it is expected that construction will commence by the end of this financial year.

Electrical services will be upgraded at a number of institutions and the main water supply line to the Albany Prison is to be replaced.

The medium security prison at Canning Vale, which will accommodate 248 inmates, is expected to be completed prior to December 1981. The plans for the maximum security complex at Canning Vale which will include medical and psychiatric facilities, are being reviewed to ensure that they meet the future needs of the State as efficiently as possible. It is envisaged that this unit will be commenced next financial year.

Water Supplies, Sewerage and Drainage

The proposed Capital Works program of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board is estimated at $70.0 million in 1981-82, an increase of 20.7% on the $58.0 million spent last year.

The Board's program will be financed by allocations of $20.5 million from the General Loan Fund, $24.5 million from the larger authorities borrowing program, $13.9 million from internal funds, and the balance from developers' contributions.

Expenditure totalling $20.5 million is proposed in 1981-82 for water supply projects in the metropolitan region. In real terms this is a reduction on the amount spent in 1980-81 and reflects the reduced demand for water brought about in part by drought conditions in the latter part of the 1970s, and restrictions which sharpened the public's awareness of the need to conserve water.

To meet future demand, the Board is continuing the development of underground water sources and in 1981-82 has a program of $1.8 million of which $574 000 is allocated to the further development of the acquifer monitoring network.

An amount of $638 000 will be spent on completion of Stage I of the Mirrabooka Underground Scheme and the continuation of Stage II which ultimately will increase production from 71 000 to 96 000 cubic metres per day.

A sum of $2.1 million has been provided to continue construction by contract of the 3.7 km tunnel outlet to increase delivery from the Wungong Dam.

The program of roofing Service Reservoirs is to be continued and $728 000 is to be spent on completion of the Melville Reservoir roof, $262 000 for roofing Greenmount Reservoir, and $104 000 for commencement of roofing the Mt. Eliza Reservoir which will cost $1.6 million to complete.

Almost $11.2 million is required for distribution and reticulation mains to cope with urban growth and for minor extensions or improvements to existing services.

Expenditure on sewerage works is estimated to be $39.4 million, an increase of almost 50% on the expenditure in 1980-81. The major proportion of this expenditure will be committed to works currently in progress.

An amount of $15.8 million has been provided for extensions and redevelopment of existing Wastewater Treatment Plants, with $2.7 million allocated to the redevelopment of the Subiaco Treatment Plant.

The continuation of the second stage of extending Beenyup Treatment Plant will cost $4.3 million in 1981-82, and $5.6 million has been allocated for the commencement of stage one of the extension to Woodman Point Treatment Plant.

An allocation of $11.7 million has been made for Main Sewers and Major Pumping Stations which includes $3.5 million for the Bibra Lake Main Sewer, and the associated Munster Pumping Station, which will be completed in 1982-83.

Associated with the Bibra Lake main sewer is the construction of a pumping station and rising main at Westfield which will allow further development in the South East Corridor.

Major projects at Midland, Thornlie, Booragoon, and Balcatta will also be undertaken during the year.

Expenditure on the Cape Peron Outlet study is estimated at $1.4 million.

Expenditure of $17.4 million on water supplies for country areas and towns is programmed for 1981-82.

An amount of $2.5 million has been provided to enable a continuation of the upgrading of the West Pilbara Water Supply to meet the increased industrial and domestic demands in the Dampier, Karratha, Wickham and Cape Lambert areas. Woodside Offshore Petroleum Pty. Ltd. and the Commonwealth Government are contributing funds for this project.

It is anticipated that funds totalling $1.5 million will be made available by mining companies with activities located in the Eastern Goldfields for upgrading several of the pumping

stations on the Goldfields and Agricultural Areas Water Supply main conduit. These improvements will supply additional water required by the companies. State funds will be provided to complete the remote control system for the main conduit pumping stations of this scheme.

At Geraldton, $1.5 million will be spent on upgrading the water supply. This will provide for improvements to the Allanooka headworks and supply main, and for improvements to the distribution system. The improvements include the construction of an elevated service tank and pumping station at Tarcoola.

Expenditure of $1.4 million has been allocated to enable continuation of the De Grey River Scheme which provides a new source of water for the expanding Port Hedland area. The Mt. Newman Mining Company is contributing half of the estimated cost of the scheme with the Commonwealth Government and the State funding the balance.

Extensions of the Mandurah Regional Water Supply to the rapidly expanding Miami/Falcon area south of Mandurah, is estimated at $1.5 million, and $1.6 million is to be spent on meeting the water requirements of the Worsley Alumina project.

Expenditure of $600 000 has been provided for enlargement of headworks in the Eaton/Australind water supply, and $604 000 for completion of a new supply for Walpole.

It is proposed to continue the program of tank roofing and installation of additional chlorinators in country water supplies to improve water quality and reduce the risk of infection from amoebic meningitis.

Funds have also been provided for major improvements to a number of town water supplies including Broome, Binningup, Cue, Mt. Magnet, Pemberton, Hyden, Onslow and Ravensthorpe.

Expenditure of $9.8 million is programmed for sewerage works in country towns, including works financed from Local Authority borrowings of $3.2 million.

At Karratha an amount of $1.2 million is being provided for the extension of the reticulation and construction of additional treatment works to cater for the increased population.

Works estimated to cost $458 000 will be undertaken at Kununurra to provide sewerage reticulation in existing and newly developed areas, whilst at Broome $540 000 will be spent in the construction of reticulation and treatment works for a new subdivision.

An amount of $668 000 has been provided to enable the continuation of sewer reticulation in Esperance, and $536 000 has been provided for similar works in Albany.

At Busselton the provision of $450 000 will enable construction of treatment works and reticulation to continue, and an amount of $280 000 will enable further reticulation extension to be undertaken at Bunbury. Similar works to the value of $357 000 will be carried out at Collie.

New schemes will be commenced at Dunsborough and Yunderup. Funds have also been provided for major improvements and extension of sewerage schemes at Mandurah, Derby, Narrogin, Brunswick, Harvey and Australind.

The allocation this year for irrigation and drainage works is $2.0 million.

An amount of $500 000 has been provided to continue construction of a piped system to replace the old open channel system in the central Harvey area.

At Camballin, improvements to the irrigation scheme to match the Australian Land and Cattle Company's expansion program will cost $228 000.

Commonwealth funds of $100 000 have been provided towards a total of $570 000 which will be spent on improvements and additions to works on the Ord Irrigation Project.

Transport

The works proposed by Westrail for 1981-82 are estimated to cost $65.7 million of which $23.3 million is to be financed under leasing arrangements. Continued investment of this magnitude is needed to enable Westrail to compete with other transport modes under the new Land Freight Transport Policy.

The main thrust of this years program is the continued upgrading of the permanent way.

Work on upgrading the standard gauge line between Kwinana-Koolyanobbing will be concentrated in the Forrestfield-Avon and Merredin-Koolyanobbing sections. Finance for the rehabilitation portion of the project is being provided by a special temporary addition to the Loan Council's borrowing program. Approval has been received for borrowings of $26.6 million for this work in 1981-82.

Upgrading of the Kwinana-Mundijong line will be completed this year. This line provides the vital link for haulage of bauxite, alumina, coal and other products to the Kwinana industrial area.

The Midland Workshops upgrading program will continue. The cost of this program is $1.7 million in 1981-82.

Fifteen narrow gauge grain wagons—to replace out-dated open wagons—are scheduled for construction and should be available for the 1981-82 grain harvest.

Improvement of facilities for urban public transport will be continued this year.

Work will commence on a new rail car depot at Claisebrook at an estimated cost of $1.2 million with expenditure of $450 000 this year.

The 1981-82 proposed expenditure program for the Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust is $3.9 million, excluding lease financing, an increase of $1.1 million on the previous year.

An amount of $2.5 million is proposed for improvements to the Trust's fare collection system to provide greater efficiency, $490 000 is allocated for the construction of a bus transfer station at Warwick, and $450 000 for work on various depots.

Forty new buses will be acquired at an estimated cost of $4.2 million under lease financing arrangements.

In the current budget year Stateships has taken delivery of two multi-flex vessels M.V. "Koolinda" and M.V. "Pilbara". These two sister vessels to M.V. "Kimberley" are replacing the now outmoded older ships M.V. "Nyanda" and M.V. "Boogalla" in maintaining the fortnightly service from Fremantle to North West ports and Darwin.

A sum of $1.2 million was required for modifying the vessels to meet Australian crewing requirements. In addition $354 000 was spent on facilities for the bulk cartage of cement from Fremantle to Darwin.

The facilities of the two ships in the North West service have permitted Stateships to now secure cargoes previously beyond the capabilities of the older ships, namely, bulk cement to Darwin, bulk fuel to Yampi Sound and containerised meat from Kimberley ports for transhipment to overseas vessels at Fremantle.

In conjunction with the acquisition of new ships, the Stateship terminal at North Quay Fremantle has been substantially upgraded at a cost of $280 000. New equipment such as containers and forklifts has also been supplied.

The commissioning of M.V. "Koolinda" and M.V. "Pilbara", and the disposal of M.V. "Nyanda" and M.V. "Boogalla" mark the completion of the fleet replacement program approved by the Government, which commenced with the acquisition of the first multi-flex vessel M.V. "Kimberley" in 1979.

Port and Marine Works

The program of improvements and extensions on Harbours and Rivers work throughout the State is estimated at $6.5 million this financial year.

The first stage of bulk loading facilities at Broome to enable the export of bulk grain products will be completed with a further outlay of $1.2 million this year. In addition, $142 000 has been allocated for modifications to the outer berth fender system, which will lessen the risk of damage to the jetty and vessels.

At the Port of Wyndham, $420 000 has been provided to complete containerisation improvements, to purchase cargo handling equipment and to commence construction of a workshop.

An amount of $358 000 has been allocated for improvements to navigational aids at Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, and Shark Bay.

The co-ordinated program of improvements to fishing industry facilities throughout the State, will be continued this year with the allocation of $2.1 million.

The provision includes an amount of $820 000 for the new fishing boat harbour at Esperance and $371 000 for the completion of the jetty and lead lights at Greenhead.

An amount of $325 000 is provided to enable work to proceed on the construction of the new harbour in Johns Creek at Point Samson, and $150 000 is allocated so that work may commence on the establishment of berthing and servicing facilities for larger fishing boats, at the Albany Town Jetty in Princess Royal Harbour.

At the Fremantle Fishing Boat Harbour, $84 000 will be spent on improving service facilities at the land backed berth.

Improvements are also proposed at Carnarvon, Denham, Port Denison, Emu Point, Albany and Seabird.

A sum of $1.5 million is provided for the relocation of the Cockburn Sound recreational boating facilities at Woodman Point in Jervoise Bay, and amounts of $157 000 and $56 000 are allocated for the provision of boat launching ramps at Busselton and Exmouth respectively.

The reconstruction of the Como Jetty is proposed to be undertaken this year at an estimated cost of $148 000, of which half is to be contributed by the South Perth City Council.

A sand bar pilot study of the Mandurah entrance channel will be carried out, at an estimated cost of $86 000.

In addition to the above works to be undertaken by the Public Works and Harbour and Light Departments, works totalling $5.8 million are proposed by the various Port Authorities.

The Fremantle Port Authority will continue with the reconstruction of berths 4 and 5 at an estimated cost of $2.5 million in 1981-82 to provide for the handling of additional containers and mixed cargo. This work is expected to be completed in 1982-83.

Education

All proposed works were subject to rigorous scrutiny during the preparation of the Budget because of the financial constraints imposed by the Commonwealth Government. Nevertheless by judicious allocation of funds available and by effecting economies wherever possible, the Government is satisfied that it has framed a sound building program for schools this year.

We have budgeted for total expenditure of $25.7 million on primary and secondary schools and $12.1 million on technical colleges in 1981-82.

Features of the program include attention to the needs of the growing technical area, recognition of the growth in secondary school enrolment, expansion of special education facilities and a continuation of our liaison with local authorities in the joint provision of community facilities.

Five new primary schools, a special school and a new high school will be opened in 1982 to cope with changing population distributions.

Primary schools are scheduled to open at Leeming, North Forrestfield, North Mandurah, Hawker Park in Warwick and Yangebup.

The new high school due to open in North Albany next year will cost an estimated $2.6 million in this financial year. It will cater for about 150 pupils in Year 8 next year and provide relief for the Albany Senior High School.

A further $540 000 has been allocated for a special school under construction at Safety Bay and a provision of $400 000 has been made for commencing a special school at Coolbinia adjacent to the Sir David Brand Centre. This latter school will be a valuable support for the Centre and is being built as part of a long standing agreement between the Education Department and the Spastic Welfare Association.

Six high schools will have additional stages added at a total cost of $3.6 million this year and 10 other high schools, including Karratha, will have substantial additions carried out.

In 1981 Wickham was raised to the status of a District High School and $1.3 million has been allocated this year for the construction of permanent secondary buildings. Construction will also commence on a secondary annexe for the Broome District High School.

Replacement of older buildings at Belmont Senior High School will commence with $800 000 being expended this year. Major improvements are scheduled for Donnybrook and Gingin District High Schools.

At a number of primary schools there will be upgrading and additions. Esperance, Glen Forrest, Grovelands, Kalbarri, Hollywood, Boulder and Subiaco are some of the schools which will benefit from this program.

We are pressing ahead with camp school facilities for the Kimberley and Pilbara Regions although plans have had to be modified because of the substantial costs involved in providing such establishments in remote areas.

The policy of working with local government authorities to pool resources for the development of school/community facilities will continue. The highly successful hall/gymnasia program is proceeding and the joint school/community library being built at the Lesmurdie High School is yet another achievement in this policy of sharing facilities.

Recycled water reticulation schemes for recreation facilities at South Hedland and Karratha, provided in co-operation with Local Authorities, are also examples of shared school and community effort for mutual further benefit.

In this Year of the Handicapped six special schools have been opened, four of them in country locations. Although some are operating in temporary facilities they will be placed in better accommodation during 1982.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report, that except in new and developing areas, the Government's pre-primary program has caught up with demand.

We feel proud of our efforts to bring one year of informal educational experience to children one year below school age.

The $287 000 allocated in the Estimates this year will continue this program and enable the purchase of transportable centres for new areas and the upgrading of some older pre-primary centres.

From 1982, two under-utilized high schools, at Tuart Hill and Bentley, will begin a program of

phased conversion to senior Colleges. I am pleased to be able to say that it has been possible to allocate funds for consequential modifications needed at the Leederville Technical College, Bentley and Tuart Hill Senior High Schools.

The importance of technical education in the community is continually impressed on us by the need to have a well-trained work-force. The demand for capital for this sector of education is continuing to grow.

This year it is intended to carry out major works at the Eastern Goldfields, Rockingham and Thornlie Colleges and for the Technical Extension Service. Other work will be undertaken at Albany, Bentley, Bunbury, Fremantle, Geraldton, and a site acquired for the Midland College.

At Fremantle, the library and workshop extensions will add facilities essential to the growth of the College.

The Geraldton projects include completion of catering instruction facilities, and Stage II which provides for Agriculture, Marine, Tourism and Computing Studies.

The Government is pleased to announce developments of a new kind at Collie and Esperance. In these centres, where a separate technical college cannot be justified at this time, a new scheme is to be tried. A technical annexe is to be built to complement facilities. which are available in the high schools. So far there have been discussions with community and school representatives in both towns. It is hoped that if this development is successful, it can be introduced in other towns in the future.

Work will continue this year on the construction of the Hedland and Karratha Community Colleges with expenditure of $5.6 million and $2.3 million respectively.

Expenditure on capital works for education facilities represents a significant proportion of the State Budget. My Government is confident that this is a very sound investment in the future of Western Australia.

Housing

The State Housing Commission plans a program of $50.5 million which includes a proposed allocation of $7.65 million from the General Loan Fund.

Last year I spoke of the increasing difficulty of providing sufficient funds to mount an adequate welfare housing program. Today I have already referred to the fact that the State's general purpose capital funds had been cut by the Commonwealth Government by almost 50% in real terms since 1975-76.

When I delivered the Budget Speech on Tuesday I spoke at some length about the deteriorating financial position of the State compared to the Commonwealth Government. I do not intend to cover that ground again.

Today I merely draw your attention to two figures. In 1977-78 this State received $38 million from the Commonwealth Government for welfare housing. This year we will receive $27.3 million—a reduction of 50% in real terms. I believe those figures themselves are eloquent enough.

Despite the curb on our general purpose capital funds again this year the proposed allocation to the State Housing Commission is $1.5 million more than last year.

The Housing program this year includes the construction of 500 new dwellings with 59 to be built in the North West, 171 in the Metropolitan and Country areas, and 270 units for the home purchase scheme.

In addition, the Commission's Aboriginal Housing program includes 64 home dwellings plus 17 units in village construction.

Land acquisition and development costs are estimated at $12.9 million for the current financial year, and will provide serviced blocks for the Commission's building program.

The program of upgrading and additions to older style properties will also be maintained.

Fifty percent of the advance from the Commonwealth under the 1981 Housing Agreement will be directed to the Home Purchase Assistance Scheme.

The Government Employees' Housing Authority's proposed work program is estimated to cost $11.7 million of which $3.25 million is proposed to be met from the General Loan Fund.

Company contributions of $1.2 million will provide accommodation for government personnel whose duties are directly related to the development of the North West Shelf Gas under the Woodside Agreement.

The total amount allocated will permit the construction of 140 new units of accommodation.

The Industrial and Commercial Employees' Housing Authority will continue to concentrate its activity in the North West of the State. Substantial resource development projects in the North West are contributing strongly to continued interest in the Authority's activities in these regions.

The Authority's proposed expenditure program of $3.4 million will enable it to commence

construction of 50 new dwellings and to purchase 26 residential building lots.

Other Buildings

Construction on the Alexander Library Building will commence this year at an estimated total cost of $29.5 million. This building will accommodate the headquarters of the State Library Services and be the centre of acquisition, storage, maintenance and distribution of books. There is provision for a reference and research library, including the State Archives, Film Archives and Battye Library which contains a comprehensive collection of the State's historical documents.

It will also provide services to attract to the Cultural Centre a wide variety of people of differing tastes and interests. It will have lending services for children and adults including an Ethnic Lending Library. All services will provide a stimulating range of library-related activities.

The building will be of five levels with direct access from car parking underneath. It is another major contribution to the Cultural Centre precinct and will compliment the new Art Gallery Building.

*An amount of $7.3 million has been provided for the completion of the District Court Building. This building will accommodate 26 courts including Supreme, District, Local and Petty Sessions Courts for civil and criminal cases.

Ancillary accommodation provided includes chambers for Judges and Magistrates, Libraries, Practitioners' Lounges, Jury assembly facilities and Defendants' holding areas.

The movement of Judges, Jurors and Defendants are separated to provide secure access and circulation within the building and to the courts.

The planning of this building involved a departure from the traditional court-room layout, and resulted in an asymmetrical design locating the Judge, Witness, Jury and Defendant in a design which is unique. It has received the approbation of Judges and other members of the legal profession.

*The allocation for Police works in 1981-82 is $1.7 million and new works include replacement of the Station Lock-up and Quarters at Beverley and Pemberton.

*Work will commence this year on a Merredin Regional Office for the Department of Agriculture and will include Laboratory and Testing facilities. The estimated cost of this facility is $800 000.

*Work will also proceed on Stage II of the Laboratory additions at South Perth at an estimated cost of $342 000.

*A sub-regional permanent Magistrate's Court will be commenced at Armadale this year. The estimated total cost of this facility is $650 000.

*New government offices will be provided at Derby and Midland. These offices will provide accommodation for a number of government departments providing regional services.

*The Forests Department will prepare 5 500 hectares of land for hardwood forest regeneration in 1981-82 and 2 500 hectares for softwoods, increasing to 3 000 hectares in future years.

Conclusion

That concludes my survey of the Capital Works Budget for 1981-82 and I now turn to the main purpose of the Bill which is to appropriate from the General Loan Fund the sums required to carry out works and services detailed in the Loan Estimates.

Of the total finance required for the planned works program, an amount of $151 474 000 is to be supplied from the General Loan Fund.

Full details of the program are set out in the Estimates together with the source of funds employed. The amount to be provided from General Loan Fund, which is subject to appropriation in this Bill, is clearly identified.

Supply of $75 000 000 has already been granted in the Supply Act, 1981 and the Bill now under consideration seeks further supply of $76 474 000. The total of these two sums, namely $151 474 000 is to be appropriated for the purposes and services expressed in Schedule 1 of the Bill.

As well as authorizing the provision of funds for the present financial year, the measure seeks ratification of amounts spent during 1980-81 in excess of the Estimates for that year. Details of these excesses are given in Schedule 2 of the Bill.

I think I have mentioned on a previous occasion for those who might be fairly new to the Estimates, that it often takes a little while to identify the total program with the actual amount that is provided in the General Loan Fund itself because of the number of sources from which funds flow to undertake our capital works programs. If any members find difficulty in identifying these various sections, I suggest they

contact me, and either I or one of the Treasury officers will be only too pleased to trace through the flow of money from the various quarters and the disposal of that money. It might be that when one has a look at the capital works programme, it appears on the surface that we have done better than was expected. This is because of the higher amount of special infrastructure money, with heavy spending this year on the North-West Shelf pipeline. I sound a note of caution because the vital sector namely, the General Loan Fund sector which comes from the vote from the Loan Council, is the one that has been most severely cut and the one about which we have launched the most criticism against the Commonwealth Government. It is important that members realise that not only does this reduce the amount of General Loan Funds that we have for vital things like schools, hospitals, and the like, but also it means that the contribution that the Commonwealth makes as part of that vote is reduced accordingly.

Under an arrangement made a few years ago, because of an anomalous situation that existed in the funding of General Loan Funds, the Commonwealth agreed to supply $1 in $2,—or $1 in $3, whichever way one likes to look at it—and that was supplied as a non-interest bearing, non-repayable loan. I know that sounds Irish to most people, but for some technical reason, it had to be expressed that way. In other words, for all practical purposes it was a grant.

Mr Pearce: That sort of phrase would be outlawed in our anti-discrimination legislation. Don't get stuck into the Irish like that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: From my point of view, whether it is called a non-interest bearing non-repayable loan or a grant, I could not care less, as long as we get more from it! If the General Loan Fund allocation is cut down automatically it cuts down the amount that comes to the States by way of that non-interest bearing non-repayable loan or grant, whichever way one likes to put it.

> I commend the Bill to Honourable Members and in doing so request leave to table the General Loan Fund Estimates of Expenditure for the year ending 30 June 1982 and a copy of the Loan Estimates Speech.

The General Estimates of Expenditure for the year ending 30 June 1982 were tabled (see paper No. 522).

The Loan Estimates Speech 1981-1982 was tabled (see paper No. 523).

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

PAY-ROLL TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [11.50 a.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

As members will appreciate, the three Bills I am about to introduce are the Bills that flow from the Budget. It was felt desirable to bring them in as quickly as possible so that members would have a chance to consider them at the same time they consider the Budget, plus the fact, of course, that we wanted to get them passed as soon as practicable to allow the administrative machinery to operate in time for the legislation to be understood and also for the collections to take place.

This is the first of three measures designed to give effect to the Government's taxation proposals as outlined in the Budget speech.

The main purpose of this Bill is to provide relief from pay-roll tax to certain small business proprietors in particular and to grant a concession to all other businesses currently paying pay-roll tax.

Under the existing legislation, taxpayers receive a basic exemption of $72 000 such that no tax is payable in respect of annual pay-rolls up to that figure.

For pay-rolls above that level, the basic exemption or deduction is reduced by $2 for every $3 by which the annual pay-roll exceeds $72 000, tapering to a then flat deduction of $32 400 on annual pay-rolls of $131 400 or more.

It is proposed to increase the basic exemption from $72 000 to $102 000. As at present, the deduction will be reduced by $2 for every $3 by which the annual pay-roll exceeds $102 000.

This will have the effect of increasing the minimum flat deduction to $36 000 which will apply to pay-rolls of $201 000 or more.

As a result of the proposed changes, businesses with pay-rolls of $102 000 or less will not be liable for pay-roll tax. The increase in the basic exemption will mean that 750 businesses currently paying tax will be exempted whilst all employers with annual pay-rolls in excess of $102 000 will have their annual tax bills reduced by amounts ranging up to $2 500.

For example, a business with an annual pay-roll of $150 000 would currently pay tax amounting to

$5 880 whereas under the new scale, the tax bill will be reduced to $4 000, a saving of $1 880.

As has been the case in previous amendments, special provision again has been made to ensure that no taxpayer will be required to pay more tax than he would have been liable to pay, had the law not been amended by the proposals now before the House.

This situation could arise in certain cases in the transitional year because of different limits and concessions having to be applied to each of the two six-monthly periods.

The main type of taxpayer who could be disadvantaged is the seasonal employer where the bulk of the taxable wages is paid in the period from 1 July 1981 to 31 December 1981.

An example of a case in question would be a seasonal employer who will pay taxable wages of $108 000 in 1981-82 of which, say, $84 000 would be paid in the first six months and only $24 000 in the second six months.

If the law is not amended, he would be entitled to the deduction applicable to his taxable wage level for the full 12 months and under these conditions his tax bill for 1981-82 would be $3 000.

However, because of the changes to be made in the law, his assessment must be divided into two separate periods and, therefore, the deductions are apportioned.

In his case, this means for the period ending 31 December 1981, he would be liable for tax of $3 390, but in the second period ending 30 June 1982, he would be exempt because the taxable wages paid would be below the proportion of the increased deductions.

Therefore, in such a case, the change in law would disadvantage the taxpayer to the extent of $390 in 1981-82.

This result is inconsistent with providing further relief from tax and it is necessary to include a provision in the Act to enable the taxpayer to apply for a refund of any amount overpaid.

I think members will recall that every time we have brought forward similar pay-roll tax amendments we have had to go through the procedure of providing for the transitional period to avoid anyone being penalised unfairly, if he is a seasonal employer.

The provision limits the refund or rebate to sums in excess of $10, as the time involved in the preparation and processing of an application for a small sum in most cases would be more than the amount of the refund and, therefore, an uneconomical procedure for both the taxpayer and the department.

In addition, the Bill contains a number of other provisions which are necessary as a result of the changes in the amounts previously referred to as they regulate the submission of returns and prescribed deductions to be made from taxable wages.

In order to calculate the annual deductions applicable to the various situations in which pay-roll tax is levied, formulae are employed.

The Bill also provides for the amendment to the legislation to apply on and from 1 January 1982.

Therefore, in the transitional year, the legislation before members has been structured to divide 1981-82 into two parts, with one adjustment at the end of the financial year.

The first part covers the period from 1 July 1981 to 31 December 1981 and the second part from 1 January 1982 to 30 June 1982.

The reason for the division is that different limits and concessions will apply to each period.

Annual adjustments to tax payable are necessary under the exisiting law and will continue to apply in future.

The need for the annual adjustment arises from the taper nature of the deductions which, when taken in conjunction with wage fluctuations in monthly periods, makes it impossible to determine the precise amount of deduction entitlement until the end of the year.

As the legislation also contains grouping provisions, and groups are to receive the same concessions as other taxpayers, the Bill includes similar provisions and formulae for calculations of the tax in these situations.

The opportunity also has been taken to effect certain other minor but necessary amendments.

As the legislation now stands, any alteration to the allowable deductions requires, because of the differing amounts and periods of time, not merely a substitution of those amounts and dates, but almost a complete repeat of all of the existing sections and subsections.

It is proposed to streamline the procedure by incorporating amounts and dates in a schedule to the Act rather than including them in the body of the Act itself.

Members will appreciate the fact that in the past we have had pages and pages of legal verbiage which was necessary every time we had an amendment. As I mentioned previously, it is now intended that we have a schedule which will make it easier when amendments are made.

In addition, certain subsections which were transitional provisions in 1971 are to be repealed as they no longer have any application.

Objection and appeal provisions are to be modified so that uniform procedures and requirements will in future apply to all taxing legislation.

At the same time, it is proposed to include a provision in the Act, similar to other legislation, whereby the Commissioner of State Taxation be allowed to state a case for the court as this is a simpler and less expensive method of obtaining the court's interpretation on the matter.

Certain definitions are to be updated, one being the result of a change to another Act and two others to cover weaknesses in the law brought to light by attempts to avoid the revenue in other States.

Another section is to be amended to prevent the use of exempt institutions in schemes to avoid the payment of tax.

Some other sections are to be amended to update the filing of returns and to improve the inspection and recovery provisions of the legislation.

In regard to the inspection provisions, it is proposed to allow the commissioner greater flexibility in the conduct of investigations.

This has become necessary as it has been discovered that many taxpayers are evading the payment of tax and it is essential, both on the grounds of equity and for the sake of the revenue, to locate these tax evaders as soon as possible.

The proposed amendments will considerably increase the number of inspections and so speed up the collection of the additional or evaded revenue.

It is also necessary to effect certain amendments to the grouping provisions of the Act.

One such amendment is to protect the revenue by making all members of the group jointly and severally liable for the payment of any outstanding tax.

Another proposed move is to clarify those sections relating to the exclusion of certain businesses from the grouping provisions of the legislation.

As the law now stands, there are three separate sections containing varying criteria for grouping businesses, but there is only one generalised exclusion provision.

This has made difficult the administration of these provisions of the Act and, therefore, it is proposed that each of the three grouping sections will have its own exclusion provision.

This move will not only clarify the situation, but also will more easily enable each case to be judged on its own individual merits.

The cost to revenue of the proposals contained in this Bill is estimated to be $1.9 million in the current financial year as they will apply only for part of the year, and $4.4 million in a full year of operation.

As previously stated, the Bill contains proposals to reduce pay-roll tax in accordance with the announcement made when introducing the Budget.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bateman.

STAMP AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [12.03 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a further measure required to implement the revenue proposals which I outlined when presenting the Budget and is intended to give effect to changes in rates of stamp duty in five main areas.

At the same time, it provides for a concessional rate of conveyance duty for certain home purchasers and for persons buying into a small business.

The first of the proposals is to increase the rate of stamp duty charged on all credit and rental transactions and on hire-purchase and credit-purchase agreements.

The Bill proposes to increase the basic rate of duty on these transactions from 1.5 per cent to 1.8 per cent which, for short-term transactions, will mean a monthly rate of 0.15 per cent up to the maximum of 12 months, at which time the duty equates to 1.8 per cent overall, should the transaction run the full term.

It is proposed to apply the new rate to all transactions entered into on and from 1 December 1981 which is expected to result in additional revenue of $1.9 million in this financial year and $3.7 million in a full year.

Credit unions have enjoyed an exemption from the stamp duty charged on credit and rental transactions since 1971.

The exemption was granted at that time on the basis that credit unions were non-profit organisations in the sense that they were a co-operative movement.

However, credit unions have grown in volume of business and in numbers, and now actively compete with other lending institutions for investments. They have also expanded their services and facilities to the extent that they are not readily distinguishable from other financial institutions.

In fairness to other financial institutions with which they compete, the exemption from stamp duty can no longer be justified. It is therefore proposed to abolish the exemption and so place credit unions and other financial institutions on a common footing.

It is relevant that credit unions are liable for all other forms of stamp duty.

I would also point out that the recent increase in the declared rate of interest to 17 per cent, which is the level above which the duty is charged, will mean that most lending transactions made by credit unions will be outside the scope of the Act as the majority of their transactions are still at interest rates below the declared rate.

Consequently, the removal of the exemption will not mean any substantial gain to revenue. In fact, it is estimated to be only $38 000 in 1981-82 with $76 000 in a full year.

The second proposal seeks to increase the stamp duty charge on cheques and other bills of exchange not chargeable at the *ad valorem* rate of duty, from 8c to 10c.

This will place Western Australia on the same basis as all other states except Tasmania, where an increase to 15c recently has been announced.

The present rate has been unchanged since January 1975.

It is proposed that the new rate will apply from 1 January 1982 and it is expected that the increase will yield an additional $800 000 in 1981-82 and $1.7 million in a full year.

The third proposal is to introduce a new scale of charges for conveyances of property with a special concession for the genuine home purchaser and persons buying a small business.

The stamp duty currently charged on conveyances is $1.25 per $100 or part thereof up to a dutiable value of $10 000. For higher values the rate is $1.50 per $100 of the dutiable value in excess of $10 000.

The proposed new scale of duty lifts the basic rate to $1.50 per $100 or part thereof for dutiable values up to $80 000, to $2 per $100 from $80 000 to $100 000 with the rate progressively increasing to $4 per $100 for dutiable value in excess of $500 000.

It will be noted that the proposed increase in duty payable is minimal for values up to $80 000. Indeed the duty payable on a conveyance of $80 000 will rise by only $25.

On a conveyance valued at $100 000 the proposed increase in duty payable is still only $125, but of course the increased duty payable becomes more substantial as values increase above that level.

In constructing the new scale of duty the Government has been conscious of the inflation of property values in recent years and has been concerned to avoid increasing the burden of duty on genuine home buyers and purchasers of small businesses.

In part this has been achieved by tapering the new scale of duty so that increased duty payable on values represented by the great majority of home and small business purchases is minimal. However, an additional concession is proposed which will have the effect of reducing conveyance duty paid in many cases even compared with the present scale of duty.

The Bill provides for a rebate of duty to purchasers of a property which is to be used as the principal place of residence and for buyers of small businesses where the dutiable value is $50 000 or less.

The proposed rebate of duty will reduce the rate of duty payable under the new scale from $1.50 per $100 of dutiable value to $1.25 which is the present rate or duty applying only to values up to $10 000.

The effect of the rebate will be that duty payable on transfers of properties valued at $50 000 or less will be up to $100 lower than at present.

It will be necessary for purchasers who consider themselves eligible for the rebate of duty to lodge a statutory declaration with the documents at the time of assessment of duty. This will ensure almost immediate cash benefit to elegible persons.

Examples of application of the rebate to eligible persons are as follows—

conveyance of $30 000—rebate $50
conveyance of $40 000—rebate $75
conveyance of $50 000—rebate $100.

Consequently, although the Bill proposes substantial increases in conveyance duty on higher dutiable values, many genuine home buyers and purchasers of small businesses will pay less duty than at present. Even on home purchases where the dutiable value exceeds $80 000 the additional duty payable is small in most cases.

Mr Brian Burke: May I interrupt you to ask a question? People in the north-west where an average home costs far more than $80 000 are concerned. Have you considered this matter?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, we did consider it, but we consider that the problem of administration is almost insurmountable and it was thought better to have a uniform figure; we will rely only on a statutory declaration that people can lodge when the assessment is made. It would be almost automatic that they receive the benefit of a rebate.

The net effect of the proposed new scale of duty after allowing for the rebate will be to yield additional revenue of $5.5 million in 1981-82 and $11.3 million in a full year.

The fourth proposal seeks to bring the rate of duty on motor vehicle licences and transfers more into line with the rates charged in other States by increasing the duty from 75c to $1.50 per $100 or part of the value of the vehicle.

At present the legislation sets an upper limit on the duty payable by fixing a ceiling of $20 000 on the dutiable value. No other State provides for a ceiling on the duty payable and given the increase in value of many private and commercial vehicles in recent years, a considerable amount of revenue is lost in Western Australia because of this provision.

It is therefore proposed that no limit on the taxable value will be prescribed in future except in the case of trucks and buses where a ceiling figure of $60 000 is to apply.

As members will recall, I outlined these measures when presenting the Budget and I will not repeat what I said then.

However, I should point out that even at the proposed higher rate, the duty payable in Western Australia would be generally less than in other States with the exception of Queensland where a rate of $1 per $100 applies.

The new rates, which are proposed to operate from 1 January 1982, are estimated to yield $4.4 million this financial year and $8.7 million in a full year.

The final proposal contained in the Bill seeks to increase the rate of duty chargeable on leases or agreements for leases.

The current scale of duty is 25c per $100 for one year leases, 50c for one to three year leases, 75c for a period in excess of three years, and 50c per $100 for an indefinite term lease. All of these leases are calculated on the basis of annual rent.

The practice in most other States is to charge duty at a specified rate on the total rent with varying arrangements made for indefinite term leases which is a more equitable arrangement for dealing with leases of different terms.

Accordingly, it is proposed to base stamp duty in this State on total rent for definite term leases at the flat rate of 35c per $100 of total rent payable.

In the case of indefinite term leases it is proposed to retain the present basis of assessment on the annual rent at a new rate of 70c per $100.

A lease for less than one year is to be charged at the same rate as any other definite term lease on the imputed rent for one year. This retains the current practice and deters artifical avoidance schemes.

It is proposed that the new rates will apply from 1 January 1982 with an expected additional revenue yield of $250 000 in 1981-82 and $500 000 in a full year.

In all, the additional revenue to be gained from the measures I have outlined and which are contained in the Bill will raise an additional $13 million in the current financial year and slightly in excess of $26 million in a full year.

The additional revenue is essential in the current financial situation to maintain the level of services which the Government is bound to provide for the people of this State.

I therefore commend the Bill to members.

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

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [12.16 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is the third measure required to implement the Government's revenue proposals.

The purpose of the Bill is to increase the present *ad valorem* licence fee relating to sales of tobacco products from 10 per cent to 12½ per cent.

Although the proposed move from 10 per cent to 12½ per cent seems a significant increase, it should be borne in mind that this is the only adjustment that has been made to the fee since the legislation was enacted in February 1976, some 5½ years ago.

Currently, the legislation provides for the licence fee to be determined as a basic bi-monthly licence fee of $20 plus 10 per cent of the value of

tobacco products sold by the licence holder during a specified period.

Members no doubt will recall that earlier this year, the previous basic annual fee of $100 was changed to a bi-monthly amount of $20 with the conversion of the annual licensing period to a bi-monthly system.

It is proposed that this legislation will apply from 1 March 1982. As this operative date coincides with the commencement of the new bi-monthly licensing system, it is, therefore, the most appropriate date.

As the legislation now stands, any licence to be issued for a bi-monthly period commencing on or after 1 March 1982 will be based on sales made in a preceding period of two months.

For the licensing period, commencing on 1 March 1982, the licence fee is based on sales of tobacco products made in December 1981 and January 1982, and the fee is payable by 15 February 1982. Consequently it is to be expected that licence holders will seek to recover the additional licence fee in the price charged for tobacco products on and after 1 December 1981.

The increased licence fee should result in additional revenue of $1.4 million for this financial year and $2.8 million in a full year.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

COLLIE COAL (WESTERN COLLIERIES & DAMPIER) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Resources Development) [12.19 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill places before the House the third of three similar agreements which the Government has negotiated with major participants in our Collie coalmining industry.

It is a Bill ratifying an agreement between the State of Western Australia and the company known as Western Collieries & Dampier Pty. Ltd.—to which I will subsequently refer as "the company".

The first two of the three agreements referred to were executed in 1979 and have now been respectively ratified by the Collie Coal (Western Collieries) Agreement Act—No. 4 of 1979—and the Collie Coal (Griffin) Agreement Act—No. 82 of 1979. These Acts were assented to on 17 May 1979 and 11 December 1979 respectively.

In November of 1979, when introducing the legislation, the Minister informed the House that the total estimated coal resource at Collie was estimated to be 1 915 million tonnes. This estimate remains unchanged, according to current advice from the Geological Survey Branch of the Department of Mines.

The Minister also quoted the following estimates of extractable coal in the Collie basin, either measured, indicated, or inferred, which had been delineated to the end of 1978 under then governing economic conditions—

Open cut 286 million tonnes
Deep mine 119 million tonnes
A total of 405 million tonnes

These figures also were obtained from the Geological Survey Branch, which has recently confirmed that the assessment of 1978 is still considered to be an appropriately conservative overview of extractable coal under current economic conditions.

In quoting these figures I would, however, emphasise that the operating companies have engaged in extensive exploration in the Collie basin. Their assessment will be reviewed in due course, but the companies are confident that improved mining methods, and the further delineation programme, will result in a significant increase in the amount of coal that will ultimately be economically recovered from the Collie deposit.

It also would be appropriate for me to advise members of some other potential coal resource developments within the State.

Although actual coalmining is still confined to the Collie basin in the south-west, active exploration is spread far and wide. Exploration is in progress in many areas of the State, stretching from prospective sites near the south coast, to an area of the Canning basin, north-east of Derby.

For example, in the Eneabba area of the northern Perth basin, a vigorous exploration programme is continuing on a deposit that indicates promise for an open cut mine, leading to a commercial development.

There is also much activity in the sedimentary areas between Esperance and Norseman, where further exploration is being conducted following the location of seemingly large, near-surface lignite-type coal deposits.

These previously mentioned potential additional reserves at Collie and elsewhere are of importance because of the Government's firm committal to base the State's electricity production on coal fuel. There has already been a very dramatic

growth in the industry with the advent of the commissioning of further generating units at Muja Power Station, and the conversion of units from oil to coal firing at Kwinana.

In addition, the Government has announced recently that construction of an additional major coal-fired power station at Bunbury has been planned and that the coal consumption is expected to build up to an estimated 5 million tonnes per annum when the station is in full production in the early 1990s.

For these reasons, the development of the Collie field is of major significance to the State's energy scene, and it is pleasing for the Government to have progressed to this third agreement which relates to the orderly development of this important coalfield.

I turn now to the specific provisions of the Bill before the House. The agreement provides an obligation on the company, similar to the two previous agreements, to reserve for the needs of the State Energy Commission 50 per cent of the extractable reserves of coal from time to time existing within the coalmining lease to be operated by the company. This provision is based on the broad policy guideline that half the Collie coal resources should be reserved for electricity generation, and half for use by industry.

The agreement also contains a requirement for the company and the State Energy Commission to enter into mutually acceptable commercial arrangements for the supply of coal to the commission during the entire term of the agreement, which is 42 years.

It also requires the company to prepare and submit to the Minister responsible for the administration of the Act an overall scheme for the exploration, development, and rehabilitation of the coal resource for the projected period of 42 years of the agreement, the coal resource comprising the areas under application, or now held as coalmining leases. The overall scheme is to include provision for progressive rehabilitation of mined areas within the coalmining lease, whether they are mined by the company or previously mined by some other party.

The main objectives in rehabilitation will be to return mined areas to a safe condition, and to achieve vegetation growth on mine spoil dumps and to generally restore a habitat as close as possible to that which existed prior to mining operations.

As with the two previous Collie coal agreements, the merit of this overall scheme provision is that it establishes a general development framework which will be of value to both the company and all Government departments and instrumentalities servicing the Collie community.

The taking of full account in the overall scheme of plans to rehabilitate progressively past and future mines areas is seen as being a very significant ingredient of the overall scheme. Under the agreement, the company has an obligation to submit on or before 31 December 1982 detailed proposals for the conduct of operations for an initial 15 years. The proposals must include details of measures to be taken for the mining of coal by open cut and deep mining methods; evidence that the coal needs of the State Energy Commission have been met for the 15-year period; the total tonnage of coal proposed to be mined for sale to all purchasers; the processing of coal; and measures to be taken for the protection and management of the environment, including rehabilitation and/or restoration of the mined areas. The proposals also must provide details on roads, power supply, timber clearing, collection and disposal of water, any other works, services or facilities—including railway—required, use of local professional services, labour and materials, and finally, details of any leases, licences, or other tenures of land required from the State.

Provisions similar to those contained in other ratified agreements for consideration and implementation of proposals and for submission of additional proposals are contained in the agreement.

The company is required to submit further proposals for the balance of the term of the agreement from year 16 to year 42.

Protection and management of the environment is specifically provided for in the agreement. In respect of the aforementioned proposal to be submitted on this matter, the company is required to carry out a continuous programme of investigation and research, including the monitoring and study of the environmental impacts from implementation of its proposal.

The agreement stipulates that the company will report annually on its activities, and at three-yearly intervals a more detailed report on environmental investigations and rehabilitation management is required. Arising from the detailed report, the Minister may notify the company that he requires additional detailed proposals for the management and protection of the environment.

The company is obliged under the agreement to provide a detailed plan of the proposed mine development and coal production from

commencement of operations for the ensuing five years, and thereafter at five-yearly intervals.

The normal provision for use of local professional services, labour, and materials, is also included in the agreement. The agreement contains full provisions governing roads, rail, electricity, water, and forests.

Before dealing with the remaining important provisions of the agreement, it would be appropriate if I now mention the plan referred to in the agreement under the definition of "mining areas".

Unfortunately the plan has not yet arrived at the House. I hope it will arrive this afternoon before the House adjourns, when I will seek leave to table it. If not, I will seek leave to table it as soon as possible.

Members of the House will note from that definition that the areas coloured green on the plan are those over which the company held coalmining leases at the date of execution, and the purple areas are those for which the company had applied for coalmining leases at that same date. They will hold these coalmining leases and applications until the all-encompassing coalmining lease is issued pursuant to clause 21 of the agreement. The areas outlined in yellow are those in which the company cannot carry out any operations without the prior consent of the Minister, if the Muja power station water supply is likely to be interfered with.

In adverting to the provisions of the agreement, I now draw members' attention to the section of the agreement through which the company can apply for and be granted a coalmining lease. This lease may include so much of the green and purple areas as the company desires. Before the granting of such lease is effected, the company must surrender the coalmining leases it previously held and, upon the granting of the lease, the rights of the company in respect of the green and purple areas not to be included in the coalmining lease shall cease and determine. The term of the coalmining lease shall be for a period of 21 years, with one right of renewal for a further period of 21 years.

The agreement stipulates that the sale of coal for export is prohibited without the consent of the Minister. This provision is common to the three Collie coal agreements, and emphasises the Government's desire to cater for the future energy requirements and industry needs of the State. If the company wishes to sell more than the approved tonnage in years one to 15, the Minister's consent shall first be obtained.

The remaining provisions of the agreement are common to agreements of this nature between the State and other resource developers, and I believe they are understood by members of the House.

The Bill completes the exercise of committing the Collie coalfield under three State agreements, which is seen by this Government as being a significant step forward in the overall programme for orderly development of this very important coal resource, and ensuring that Collie coal is most efficiently developed for use by the SEC and local industry.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

BILLS (2): MESSAGES

Appropriations

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Appropriation (General Loan Fund) Bill.
2. Collie Coal (Western Collieries & Dampier) Agreement Bill.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE BILL

In Committee

Resumed from 14 October. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Clarko) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Minister for Labour and Industry) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

Progress was reported on clause 1.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: General application—

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

> Page 3, line 5—Insert after the word "date" the following passage—
>
> , but in the case of an accident which occurred before that date only if that injury was an injury under the Second Schedule of the repealed Act .

This is to make sure that the clause applies to people injured after the date of the proclamation of the Act, and that people who were injured before that particular time will have schedule 2 applying to them.

Mr SKIDMORE: I question the wording of the proposed amendment. As a matter of consistency, the use of the word "injury" twice in the third line is not correct. Rightly, it should be "disability".

Perhaps the Minister may consider that. Under the old Act, of course, the word "injury" was used: but in both instances in this Bill the word "disability" should be used.

Mr O'CONNOR: I must concur with what the member for Swan has said because the word "disability" is used in the rest of the Bill. Therefore, for the sake of uniformity, I have no objection to changing the word.

Mr PARKER: As I understand it, the Minister is inserting these words after the word "date" without actually deleting the words which are in the present clause. If that is the case I do not think the clause will make much sense; at least, that is my understanding of the situation.

Mr O'CONNOR: Further to the member for Swan's query, having again considered the matter it can be seen that this clause is referring to the present Act. That being the case, the word "injury" is the correct word to be used in the amendment. However, I am still prepared to do as I have suggested.

Mr Skidmore: I agree with what you are saying: but this is to be the new Act and we are going to have the word "injury" put into it.

The CHAIRMAN: After a quick consideration of the matter it appears to me the amendment is acceptable as it is only an insertion of words. For the information of the member for Fremantle, I indicate that matters of grammar and punctuation can be attended to without the need for amendments to be moved.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have discussed this matter with the Parliamentary Draftsman and members of the Opposition, and I have been assured that this is the correct wording to be used to achieve what is desired.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

> Page 3, line 37—Insert after the word "clauses" the passage "4.".

Mr PARKER: The Opposition has no objection to this amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I move an amendment—

> Page 3, line 40—Insert after the word "work" the words "on or after the proclaimed date".

Mr PARKER: We have no objection to this amendment. Whilst I am on my feet I will take the opportunity to refer now to clause 10 which this amendment affects rather than speak when that clause comes up. I am not certain why the Minister has decided it is necessary to have three different clauses in the Bill to deal with clergymen.

Mr O'Connor: There are certain Acts that cover some clergymen who come within the Workers' Compensation Act and certain Acts which do not.

Mr PARKER: It seems to me that clause 10 could apply to all clergymen. I do not see why we need a clause applying to Baptists, Anglicans, and other denominations. It would seem to me that a properly worded clause could be framed to cover all denominations. I will not make a big fuss about this because it really does not matter, but at present the way it is handled does seem to clutter up the Act. It would have been far more appropriate to have a properly worded clause 10.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 5: Interpretation—

Mr PARKER: There are a number of things I wish to say to this clause and a number of amendments I wish to move. After my initial remarks I will move my first amendment so members may comment on it. Firstly, I point out that this is a very important clause and gives the definitions which are crucial to the operation of this Bill. The number of definitions has been substantially increased in comparison with the number in the previous Bill which came before us in the autumn session. A number of definitions have been included as a result of submissions made and amendments placed on the notice paper by the Opposition as well as a number which came about as a result of consultations and negotiations in which the Government concerned itself.

In his second reading speech the Minister referred to the increased child's allowance. The Opposition has no lack of support for this increase, but it wonders why it was necessary to choose an amount of $15.37. In the old 1904 Act it was an amount of $14 plus some odd cents. We wonder why the figure was not rounded off to $16. It seems the Government has been a bit stingy in not doing that. The Minister has apparently worked out the figure on a mathematical basis, having indexed the old figure over the years.

In general the definitions are a lot better and the definition of "mesothelioma" is one we have wanted for some time. This applies also to the definition of "self-insurer".

Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr PARKER: Prior to the luncheon suspension I was talking about this clause in general terms

and referred to some of the concerns we in the Opposition have in regard to various aspects of it. The first point about which we are concerned is the definition of "prescribed amount". Due to the effluxion of time since the Government introduced its first Bill, the quantity of the "prescribed amount" has increased from $51 000 to $58 000.

Mr O'Connor: The precise figure is $58 805.

Mr PARKER: The notional prescribed amount has increased from $41 000 to $46 000 and that is a considerable improvement.

The second aspect is that the rate which is to be used for the indexation of the prescribed amount has been altered from the minimum wage for adult males to the average weighted award rate for adult males in Western Australia. As I said during the second reading stage, we wanted the figure to remain at the average weekly earnings, which is the present position; but we recognise that at least this is an improvement on the proposition which was before us when we were discussing the first Bill in May.

Indexing will now take place so that each year the figure of $58 805 will increase. When we discussed workers' compensation in May, the amount was to stay at the quoted figure for a considerable period of time. Under this Bill, the amount will continue to increase, but at a much slower rate. Therefore, in 1981 dollar terms, the effect of that will be to reduce the prescribed amount from $58 805 to $46 000 in real terms.

Mr O'Connor: You are saying that is what we are doing now?

Mr PARKER: Yes.

Mr O'Connor: That is right.

Mr PARKER: We in the Opposition oppose that and, as we said, this is one of the principal reasons we opposed the second reading of the Bill and that we will continue to be very concerned about the legislation. Effectively it means that, over a nine-year period, the sum of the prescribed amount will be reduced by $12 000 in real terms. We oppose that move.

The prescribed amount was inserted as a result of an inquiry by a bipartisan committee of the Legislative Council. It was inserted at the time with the consent of all parties in this Parliament. We do not believe we have been shown any reason to change the position. That is one of the gravest areas of concern we have with this Bill.

Another very grave area of concern is the definition of the term "worker". There is on the notice paper in regard to subcontractors an amendment which will be moved at the appropriate time and I believe one of my colleagues in the Legislative Council intends to move an amendment in relation to this definition and the Government is considering that currently. In either event, the definition which is contained in the Bill before us does not cover the situation with regard to such workers, but I shall return to that matter when I move my amendment.

Perhaps at some stage during our consideration of this clause the Minister could explain to me the purpose of the definition of "treatment and attendance". The definition reads as follows—

> "treatment and attendance" includes treatment by way of rehabilitation and attendance for that purpose;

It appears this may be an example of excessive legalism in the Bill. It seems to me there is no point in defining "treatment and attendance" especially when it means just that. I cannot see the point in having that definition, but maybe the reason for that is I am not a lawyer.

Returning to the definitions of the different categories of health care professionals, in all instances with the exception of chiropractors, the Bill before us improves the definitions of the various health care professionals who operate in this field. The definition in relation to medical practitioners has not changed very much, but, in the case of a specialist, it appears the definition in that regard is essentially that which was proposed by way of amendment by the Opposition when we debated this matter in May. We support the changes which have taken place there. The definition of a "physiotherapist" is a new one and we support it.

Representations have been made to us—no doubt they have been made to the Government also—on the question of occupational therapists. It is our intention, probably in another place, to move an amendment to the first schedule in order that occupational therapists may be included. The submissions of the occupational therapists are rather lengthy, but they essentially boil down to one major point, which is that they want to be able to operate in this field and they want the legislation to provide them with the ability to be paid as occupational therapists. I was not aware the services of private occupational therapists were used to any great extent in this field, because most of the treatment of that nature would be—

Mr O'Connor: I do not believe they have made any representations to me, have they?

Mr PARKER: I understand they have and I have a copy of a letter the Minister wrote to them.

Mr O'Connor: Was that of recent times?

Mr PARKER: The letter written by the Minister was dated 4 September. This matter does not relate specifically to this clause, but I am advised by my colleague that, if we change the schedule and allow occupational therapists to be paid a fee, we will probably need to insert a definition of "occupational therapists" in this clause. Perhaps that matter can be dealt with as we debate the Bill.

I was not aware there were any fee-for-service occupational therapists, but apparently there are some. The vast majority of occupational therapists' treatment will be covered by the Bill as it presently stands because most patients will use the services of occupational therapists in a rehabilitation centre or a hospital. The occupational therapists usually are salaried employees, so few problems should occur. It seems that some occupational therapists are paid on a fee-for-service basis; so I cannot see why they should not be regarded the same as physiotherapists, chiropractors, and others.

Mr Hodge: What about speech therapists?

Mr PARKER: I was not aware that some speech therapists were paid on a fee-for-service basis.

Mr Hodge: Some are.

Mr PARKER: Most speech therapists would be covered by this legislation because most are salaried employees and give treatment in hospitals. I would agree with the member for Melville that speech therapists as well should be covered if they desire to operate on a fee-for-service basis.

The definition of the term "chiropractor" in this Bill is very much more restricted than the definition in the Bill which came before us in May of this year. The first way in which it is restrictive is that it applies only to chiropractors registered in this State, whereas the Bill before us in May applied to chiropractors registered in other States. The second way it is restrictive relates to the way the definition is worded. It means that only chiropractors approved by the Workers' Compensation Board are entitled to be regarded as chiropractors for the purposes of this legislation. Of course, that means that such chiropractors will be the only chiropractors entitled to receive payment and therefore effectively perform part of their role within the sphere of workers' compensation.

It has been put to me that the Chiropractors Registration Board legislation does not contain sufficient disciplinary powers for the board to discipline chiropractors when it sees fit; and that therefore there is a need for workers' compensation legislation to cover the situation. It has been said that in some circumstances workers' compensation legislation is required to cover chiropractors not registered with the board. Subsequent to my having those things put to me I obtained information to the effect that the Act covering the Chiropractors Registration Board is inadequate. That fact is generally conceded, and much pressure has been brought to bear by the Opposition and chiropractors upon the Government to change that Act, but that pressure has been unsuccessful.

While everyone concedes that the Act covering the board is inadequate it has been accepted that the board has the power to discipline chiropractors, and, indeed, it has disciplined some. I understand that recently it struck the name of one chiropractor off the register and suspended another. If that did occur it can be seen that the board has the power to discipline chiropractors and has demonstrated a desire to do so. There is no point whatsoever in restricting chiropractors when no other member of the health care profession is restricted, whether he be a medical practitioner, a specialist, a dentist, or a physiotherapist. I daresay that if reference was made in this legislation to occupational therapists the restrictions to which I have referred would not apply to them either. Therefore I intend to move the proposed amendment appearing in my name on the notice paper.

The definition I propose is similar to that which the Government had inserted for physiotherapists and which I suggest is totally suitable. My proposed amendment would ably suit the situation. It would apply only to people registered as chiropractors. It has been said that some States do not have legislation to register chiropractors; therefore, a person coming from such a State would not be covered by this legislation because he is not a registered chiropractor. Therefore I move an amendment—

> Pages 4 and 5—Delete the interpretation "chiropractor" and substitute the following—
>
> > "chiropractor" means a person who is resident in the Commonwealth or a Territory of the Commonwealth and is registered as a chiropractor in accordance with the laws of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth:

Mr O'CONNOR: I oppose the amendment moved, and I wish to give some reasons for that during the next two or three minutes. Much has been said by chiropractors in regard to aspects of

the previous and the present Bills. I have a letter before me from the Australian Chiropractors' Association dated 15 October. The second paragraph states—

> The proposed Bill appears to take away some rights and privileges of chiropractors who are essentially primary contact practitioners. This is proposed despite the fact that this mode of practice has been customary under workers compensation for over a decade. As far as chiropractors are aware there have been minimal grounds for complaint.

That statement is totally untrue. The issues in the Bill presently before us are the same as those in the present Act; therefore I believe chiropractors have misled members of Parliament and other members of the public to whom they have sent letters regarding the issues involved.

In the past, under the existing legislation chiropractors have not been allowed to diagnose suspected health problems. The Bill presently before us follows exactly the same course. For chiropractors to make the statements they have has been misleading. They have misled members of Parliament and the public, which gives no credit to their association.

Chiropractors in many ways do a good job for the community, and ought to continue as they have in the past. They have assisted many people and will do so in the future, but the type of information they have passed to people recently is below the standard which we ought to accept from them.

The member for Fremantle referred to occupational therapists. He said that they ought to be covered when giving treatment on a fee-for-service basis. At page 12, line 37 of the Bill it is stated that the term "treatment by way of rehabilitation" means any treatment of a kind approved by the Minister by notice published in the *Government Gazette*, and that would include occupational therapists. I do not believe there will be any problem.

The definition of "chiropractor" in the Bill is adequate. We must realise that not all States have accepted chiropractors by way of legislation.

Mr Parker: That would be covered by my amendment. If a State has not accepted chiropractors, people from that State cannot be registered as chiropractors, and therefore would not be accepted in this State.

Mr O'CONNOR: Even if a State has accepted chiropractors that does not guarantee that its chiropractors are proficient. We must maintain a standard in this State. Why must we accept a standard used in another State when that standard may be below that of ours?

Mr Parker: We do that for doctors, dentists, and others.

Mr O'CONNOR: For a long period the AMA has had appropriate standards. That is a fact, whether or not the honourable member likes the AMA. A number of States do not have legislation governing chiropractors; therefore we must maintain the standard we have reached in this State for the benefit of the public and registered chiropractors. If we say we will accept standards set by another State, and those standards are below ours, we would be lowering our standards. I cannot agree that we should accept standards of other States, and I do not believe that the member for Fremantle really believes we should.

Mr Parker: I didn't say other States have lower standards.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member does not know whether standards in other States are lower.

Mr Parker: Only one State does not register chiropractors, and in all the States which do register chiropractors the conditions are basically the same as ours except that different groups of people are allowed to be registered so long as they are highly trained in the field.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Chiropractors Registration Board in Western Australia does not have disciplinary power.

Mr Parker: How did it strike this fellow off recently?

Mr Hodge: A fellow was struck off recently—just last month.

Mr O'CONNOR: The legislation covering chiropractors does not allow the board to take disciplinary action against one of its registered members.

Mr Hodge: That is not true.

Mr O'CONNOR: Is the member sure on that point?

Mr Hodge: I am positive.

Mr O'CONNOR: Would the member put his seat on the line to support his contention?

Mr Hodge: I know the board struck off a chiropractor.

Mr O'CONNOR: Was the chiropractor registered?

Mr Hodge: Of course he was.

Mr Pearce: Ask the Minister for Health.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am informing the Chamber of the information I have. My understanding is along the lines I have indicated. The legislation

before us is sufficient. If we were to say that a chiropractor can diagnose complaints, we would be allowing him to diagnose heart attacks.

Mr Hodge: That is not right.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member knows that would be the case. If a chiropractor can diagnose, he can do so for anything. The amendment would not restrict him.

Mr Parker: We are defining a chiropractor in terms of the registration.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is not so according to this amendment.

Mr Parker: In my amendment a chiropractor would be defined correctly, and he would be controlled by the Statute governing his profession.

Mr O'CONNOR: If a chiropractor is allowed to diagnose he will be able to diagnose all complaints. Does the member suggest that a chiropractor would be allowed to diagnose a back ailment as being caused by a kidney problem?

Mr Parker: I didn't say they could.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have no objection to chiropractors; I believe they play a great part in our community, but they should not be allowed to diagnose complaints as they carry out their job for the purposes of workers' compensation. I believe we have other people who can do this. I oppose the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle.

Mr SKIDMORE: I support the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle. The Minister amazes me with his rather puerile and futile attempts to try to justify the Government's stand. He says he is not against chiropractors and then proceeds to give a reason that they should be restricted much more than other professional people. He suggests that because a dentist has no restriction placed upon him such as a chiropractor has under this proposed definition in the Bill, that dentist is in a position where he can diagnose a heart condition and send a diagnosis on that basis to the board. How stupid and irrelevant can we get? That is just not on. Maybe that could apply to a GP or a medical officer, who of course, could deal with back injuries and the like.

I point out to the Minister that this is not fair on those people who can solve workers' problems in the way that chiropractors can. A chiropractor solved a back problem of mine which doctors could not solve for seven years. The chiropractor was able to fix me up and I have not had any trouble for five years. That was a chiropractor who was not at that time recognised by any board, and he is still practising today. So these people are going to be bound by the wishes of the commission on the flimsy basis that the Minister put forward, which I just cannot accept.

Mr O'Connor: They can operate now under the Bill under the same conditions. Don't say they can't, because they can.

Mr SKIDMORE: The point I object to most strongly in the proposed wording in relation to chiropractors is that their professional capacity will be subject to the approval of the commission. That is what the Minister wants to be able to do.

Mr O'Connor: Is that different from the present situation?

Mr SKIDMORE: What for?

Mr Parker: There is no definition of "chiropractor" in the current legislation.

Mr O'Connor: All we are doing is defining a doctor and a chiropractor.

Mr SKIDMORE: The Minister is not defining what a chiropractor is in that sense. There will be a definition as to what a chiropractor is and then the Minister is saying he will not be a chiropractor if the commission says he is not. That is exactly what he is doing: Taking away from the chiropractor the ability to practise his profession. Let me tell the Minister that many workers' compensation claims have been brought to my notice over many years. One of them was from an ex-president of the Trades and Labor Council who was also previously a member of Parliament, and that case clearly indicated to me the practice of some medical practitioners in treating people with bad backs and so on, which was absolutely diabolical in a medical sense. Workers in many instances have come to me and said that they have been able to go to a chiropractor and in a matter of weeks their problems have been solved.

We will have this situation of chiropractors being bound by a decision of the commission as to whether or not they are professional people. I object strongly to that. If the Government wants to act against a profession, why does it not legislate against dentists? They could be bound by the provision. Why not bind the medical profession to the commission?

Mr Pearce: A lot of them do not belong to the AMA.

Mr O'Connor: Chiropractors do not.

Mr Pearce: A lot of doctors do not either. If one writes asking for disciplinary action to be taken the AMA writes back and says the doctor is not a member of the organisation.

Mr Grayden: The AMA is not a disciplinary body.

Mr Young: That is not the avenue to go to. It is the Medical Board. You should know that, with your training.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr SKIDMORE: Thank you, Sir; I can now complete my speech. It is completely unfair that this condition should be imposed upon chiropractors. If there is a reason for it, why will the condition not be imposed on other professional people in the same manner? When it comes to the question of discipline, does the Minister suggest that if a chiropractor quickly solves a worker's problem by visitation and consultation the chiropractor can go to the board and say, "I have solved Joe Brown's problems by whatever means were available and this is the diagnosis of his condition and the way I have been able to solve it"? Is the Minister saying that the commission can at that time say to that chiropractor, "That is absolutely wonderful, but we are not going to give you any money for your services under the Workers' Compensation Act because we do not recognise you as a chiropractor"? That is exactly what this means; there is no question about it. When we come to the question of discipline, discipline for what?

Has the commission the right to discipline a profession? A chiropractor should be accepted as a person who practises the profession in which he has been registered. Surely it should not be left to the board. If the present Act is insufficient on the question of discipline, it is about time the Government undertook to change the Act so disciplinary measures can be undertaken; but certainly it should not use it in this way.

I feel very strongly about this because I can assure the Minister that the doctors who manipulated and tried to fix my back made a flaming mess of it for seven years and achieved absolutely nothing. I went to a chiropractor at the time and got relief within four visits and have since been free of any pain or trouble at all. I will tell the Chamber what used to happen: I could be walking down the street and collapse and fall on the ground and not be able to get up.

Mr Old: I have seen blokes like that.

Mr O'Connor: Are we altering the legislation to allow that to be done?

Mr SKIDMORE: Not at all. I have the greatest regard for the chiropractor and his professionalism. There is no need for that professionalism to be questioned by the insertion of a clause which says that the commission may or may not recognise that professionalism. The Minister is not doing this to the medical practitioner or dentist. Why does he want it included in the case of chiropractors? What will it achieve? Will the Minister be saying to somebody who has been satisfactorily treated, "Sorry, even though you are cured, it is not compensable by the Act"? For heaven's sake, let us have a bit of sanity; I wholeheartedly support the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle. It is a sensible, lucid, and logical thing to do. It uses terminology which is used throughout the whole of this Act.

If a person is registered in the State in which he is practising and comes to Western Australia, his legal right to practise here should be recognised by the commission. The commission should not say, "Okay, you can come in or you can stay out". We object to that.

As the member for Fremantle has quite clearly indicated, if there is no registration in another State, that person will not be able to practise in this State under the Act and will not be recognised under this new Act. Whether the standard is lower or higher is not the point. I suggest there are good doctors and bad doctors, good dentists and bad dentists, and good chiropractors and bad chiropractors; but that has nothing to do with the relevance of the question before us now, which is a question of registration in this State.

The Government should not deny an injured worker the opportunity of going to any chiropractor registered in any State in the Commonwealth of Australia to seek relief for his injuries, because that is his intrinsic right under the Act. I wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Mr HODGE: I also support the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle and I agree with the remarks of the member for Swan. The Minister has not advanced one logical reason yet—

Mr O'Connor: You have not listened, that is why. You would not know.

Mr HODGE: The provision is highly discriminatory and unfair against chiropractors. The Minister has not advanced one logical reason. He obviously has not read the Chiropractors Act or the Chiropractors Registration Board rules. I can assure him I have studied them very closely.

Mr O'Connor: You should learn them if you have studied them. Learn them as well.

Mr HODGE: I have learned them; I know them. I will quote a few to the Minister in a moment.

Mr O'Connor: Are you saying they have got these in all States?

Mr HODGE: Every State except Tasmania has registration boards set up to deal with this.

Mr O'Connor: In other words, all States have not got it.

Mr HODGE: All States except Tasmania.

Mr O'Connor: Have a look at the amendment you have here and explain what you are saying.

Mr HODGE: I have read it. If there is no registration in Tasmania, a chiropractor practising in that State will not be recognised in Western Australia.

Mr O'Connor: You will accept any standard.

Mr HODGE: The Minister has no confidence in the Government of Tasmania. He thinks it will register anyone as a chiropractor.

Mr O'Connor: I want to understand what you say.

Mr HODGE: Why is the legislation not consistent? Why are not physiotherapists, dentists, and medical practitioners treated in the same manner as chiropractors? If the Government is prepared to accept another State's standards for physiotherapists, I suggest it is being very unfair in relation to chiropractors.

Mr O'Connor: If we do not know what the standards are, how can we?

Mr HODGE: We can easily find out what other State Government standards are in relation to chiropractors.

Mr O'Connor: How can you say that if they do not have a standard?

Mr HODGE: Every State except Tasmania has a Registration Board.

Mr O'Connor: You are not suggesting that in everything we do we should follow the other States?

Mr HODGE: I am not suggesting that at all.

Mr O'Connor: You are saying that anything is good enough for the people of Western Australia.

Mr HODGE: If the Government accepts all other health care professionals, it is clear it is discriminating against chiropractors.

Mr O'Connor: Don't talk rubbish!

Several members interjected.

Mr HODGE: The Chiropractors Registration Board in this State does have the power to discipline chiropractors, and it does perform that task. No-one has been more critical of the chiropractors board in this State than I have. I believe it needs to be reconstituted with new legislation. It would then be more efficient and effective, especially if it did not have to use the 1964 legislation, under which it operates now. Nevertheless, the legislation does provide for the disciplining of chiropractors. I will quote section 18(1)(h) of the Chiropractors Act 1964 as follows—

> Subject to that Act, the Board may, with the approval of the Governor, make rules—
>
> (h) prescribing the professional and ethical standards to be maintained by chiropractors and for regulating the manner of making to the Board any charge or complaint against or concerning a chiropractor or a student, and the inquiry by the Board into that charge or complaint, and for fixing penalties in relation thereto;

Section 18(1)(j) states—

> (j) relating to the registration (including the initial registration), suspension and deregistration of chiropractors; and

And, it makes rules regarding all those matters. For the benefit of the Deputy Premier it has made rules, and I will quote from the Chiropractors Registration Board rule 14(1) which states—

> 14. (1) Where, after holding an inquiry in pursuance of these rules, the Board is satisfied that a chiropractor is guilty of misconduct to the prejudice of other persons registered under the Act, it may—
>
> (a) reprimand the chiropractor;
> (b) order that his licence to practise chiropractic be suspended for such period as it thinks fit; or
> (c) order that his name be removed from the register,
>
> and shall furnish in writing to the chiropractor the reasons for its decision.

So, that really puts the lie to what the Deputy Premier has claimed: that is, that the board does not have the power to discipline chiropractors.

Mr O'Connor: You stoop to these things.

Mr HODGE: It exercises that power and only recently a chiropractor was deregistered.

Mr Clarko: Why?

Mr HODGE: He was interfering with a female patient. It was quite right that he was deregistered. More recently a chiropractor has been suspended for a period of one month for misconduct of a less serious nature.

Mr Parker: The Deputy Premier received the wrong information from the Minister for Health.

Mr Clarko: Is it possible for that man who was deregistered to work on a day-to-day basis?

Mr HODGE: He can do some sort of work, but he cannot work as a registered chiropractor.

Mr Clarko: He cannot put his shingle out, but he can do everything else.

Mr Parker: The member for Karrinyup should realise that, if this amendment is carried, he will not be able to practice under those circumstances with regard to workers' compensation.

Mr HODGE: That is correct, because he will not be recognised under the workers' compensation legislation. The Deputy Premier made a ridiculous claim about chiropractors diagnosing a kidney disease or other medical ailments. What the chiropractor can and cannot do is set out quite specifically in the Chiropractors Act. If we look at the definition of "chiropractic", as defined in section 4, we note it means a system of palpating and adjusting the articulations of the human spinal column by hand only, for the purpose of determining and correcting, without the use of drugs or operative surgery, interfering with normal nerve transmission and expression.

So, it is ridiculous to say that chiropractors will try to hold themselves out as medical practitioners and give advice or try to diagnose other medical ailments.

Mr Young: Where does it say that he is qualified to diagnose an illness or some default of the spinal system?

Mr HODGE: I just read the definition.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! I ask members who are interjecting to refrain, especially when I am calling the Committee to order.

Mr HODGE: The Minister for Health is very antagonistic to chiropractors. We all know that and we all know that certain senior officers in his department are antagonistic towards them also.

Mr Young: There is only one person in this Chamber who has a thing about chiropractors.

Mr HODGE: The Minister for Health, the Deputy Premier, and the member for Bunbury have not advanced one good reason for this discriminatory type of definition of "chiropractor".

Mr Young: I hope the Committee notes that you are right off the track.

Mr Brian Burke: Give him a go!

Several members interjected.

Mr Young: If I got to my feet the member for Melville would not answer my questions.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I remind members that they are all able to speak during this stage; therefore, there is no need for interjections and cross-Chamber conversations. I suggest members allow the member for Melville to make his speech.

Point of Order

Mr TONKIN: I do not think the Minister for Health is listening to your comments.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

Committee Resumed

Mr Brian Burke: The Minister for Health has made his first 15-minute speech.

Mr HODGE: Not one concrete reason has been advanced by members of the Government. In his speech yesterday the member for Bunbury said something, but was not game to come out into the open and say what he meant. I will quote from part of his speech as follows—

> As recently as a couple of days ago certain chiropractors approached me. They said they were most disappointed that chiropractors would not have the right to write workers' compensation certificates. A few remarks must be made about this matter. Within the chiropractic profession some problems exist. Some members of the profession do not do all the right things, and perhaps some do not have appropriate training and expertise to be regarded as highly professional and well trained chiropractors.

He then goes on to say how bad he thinks the Chiropractors Act is.

Mr Parker: He is saying he doesn't trust his own legislation or his own board?

Mr HODGE: That is precisely what he is saying.

Mr Parker: They ought to discipline their own members.

Mr HODGE: They have no confidence in the Chiropractors Registration Board. The Government should introduce decent legislation to try to regulate the chiropractic profession. We are working under 1964 vintage legislation which has been amended once since then, and that was only a half-hearted affair. It did not make any major changes to the profession in this State.

Mr Young: It was a brilliant piece of legislation.

Mr HODGE: It was a dreadful piece of legislation.

Mr Young: It is a difference of opinion, that is all.

Mr HODGE: This is a blatant move against chiropractors. I can only reason that the Secretary of the AMA (Mr Haywood) has leant heavily on the Deputy Premier. We know he is a prominent member of the Liberal Party. He attends policy-making committee meetings.

Mr O'Connor: Before you sit down, is there any member of the Chiropractors Association who is a member of the ALP?

Mr HODGE: I would not know.

Mr O'Connor: Then you are not a very knowledgeable person.

Mr HODGE: I am not saying that there are not chiropractors who are incompetent, who are negligent or do not do the right thing, but there are also many medical practitioners and others in the medical profession who do not always do the right thing. There are many negligent and dishonest medical practitioners around. However, that does not mean we should penalise the whole profession by adopting very discriminatory definitions in this legislation. That is precisely what the Deputy Premier is doing here because he and the Minister for Health have a personal prejudice against chiropractors.

Mr Young: Just so that you do not get away with that for the third time, I want to state—

Mr HODGE: The Government is ignoring the chiropractors' legislation and is adopting this discriminatory measure—

Mr Young: —that is absolutely untrue. I just don't happen to have a hangup about them like you do.

Mr HODGE: —against chiropractors and I would like to hear the Minister for Health who has wasted half of my time. Why does not the Minister get up on his feet instead of wasting my time?

Mr Young: You did the wasting—you still have two minutes left.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am amazed at the comments made by the member for Melville. He goes along and throws slights on the medical profession.

Mr Parker: You can talk about throwing slights. We have caught you out on this. You are embarrassed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am not embarrassed at all.

Mr Parker: You are obviously embarrassed.

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not mind taking as much time as I need because I am not embarrassed and I support the chiropractors because they do an excellent job in many ways. The member for Melville has slipped into the medical profession and said that its members are no good.

Mr Parker: He did not say that at all.

Mr Hodge: You didn't listen.

Mr Parker: He did say that like any other profession, some of its members may not be up to standard, and they continue to practice.

Mr O'CONNOR: Did he say that about chiropractors?

Mr Hodge: I did say it.

Mr O'CONNOR: If I was not listening to the honourable member, no-one could blame me really because he went off the track so much. People in all professions sometimes step out of line. I am one who believes that we should have the best for the people of the State. I have no objection to chiropractors treating people. However, let us look at the measure before us compared with the previous legislation.

The definition in the Bill commences—

> "chiropractor" means a person who is resident in this State—

I do not see anything wrong with that at all.

Mr Parker: You are talking about the Bill at the moment.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is right. The definition continues—

> —and is registered as a chiropractor under the Chiropractors Act 1964 and holds a licence to practise chiropractic issued by the Chiropractors Registration Board constituted under that Act and who is approved by the Commission to practise chiropractic for the purposes of this Act:

Mr Parker: That includes the interstate practitioners and all people the board does not like.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have set a standard in this State. Do members opposite want us to drop that standard?

Mr Parker: At the moment people can obtain chiropractic treatment in this State and they are compensated for it under the Workers' Compensation Act. You are going to stop that practice.

Mr O'CONNOR: If the people in New South Wales were allowed to drive through a residential area at 200 kilometres an hour, should we accept that?

Mr Pearce: They are not allowed to do that.

Mr O'CONNOR: In view of the interjections, I do not intend to say any more.

Mr SKIDMORE: As everyone knows, I shall be leaving this place shortly and all I can say is that if the conduct of this Committee this afternoon is up to the standard expected of legislators by the public, there is not much chance for the public at all. It is patently clear that when someone from this side of the Chamber puts up a logical argument, Government members lampoon it—they make a joke about it.

Mr O'Connor: You would not let me talk.

Mr SKIDMORE: I never said a word while the Minister was talking. The Government's attitude is to get the Wizards of Oz on the Government back bench to lampoon proposals put forward by the Opposition, with the intention of killing them.

I am one of those people who believe that chiropractors will be done a tremendous disservice if the Minister will not accept the fact that the Bill before us will mean that chiropractors will no longer be recognised as professional people, even though they are registered as chiropractors under the Chiropractors Act.

Mr O'Connor: Where does it vary from the present Act?

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not care whether it varies upside down, inside out, or anything else.

Mr Young: That is a good argument!

Mr O'Connor: It does not vary.

Mr SKIDMORE: The stupidity of the Minister for Health is self evident in the way he conducts himself in this House. The sooner he shuts up the sooner we will get the Committee back on the rails.

Mr O'Connor: Who, me?

Mr SKIDMORE: No, the so-called Minister for Health.

Mr Young: You are not doing a very good job, Jack.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): Order! The Minister will not refer to another member by name.

Mr Young: I was just trying to be friendly.

Mr SKIDMORE: Here we go again—have a go at the member for Swan and lampoon him too! I was trying to make it clear that the Minister for Health has, under his control, an Act which registers chiropractors, and under that legislation they are recognised as professional people. The Minister for Labour and Industry now wants to have legislation which is going to deregister chiropractors most effectively.

Mr Young: You are so wrong.

Mr O'Connor: It will leave it as it was.

Mr Parker: That is not true, that it is leaving it as it was.

Mr O'Connor: The only difference is the definition.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not concerned whether or not it is leaving it as it is.

Mr O'Connor: You differ from the member for Fremantle.

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not know whether I do differ from the member for Fremantle but I am trying to bring some sanity back into this debate. As I have said, the measure is discriminatory. If it becomes an Act it will mean effectively that a professionally registered chiropractor will not be recognised as a professional person under the workers' compensation legislation. Even if the chiropractor says he is registered, those responsible for the legislation will tell him they could not care less. So the chiropractor's registration becomes meaningless and worthless. That is a travesty of justice. If that is so we will take away the discriminatory power the board has and say to the chiropractors, "Go back to the jungle". That is what the Minister is accusing us of doing here and yet, by his very actions, he is doing the same thing.

I understand the Opposition's point of view. The Opposition is not suggesting any lowering of standards. In fact, the matter of standards, in a legal sense, has nothing to do with this clause. The commission will not need to give any reason to anybody, least of all to the chiropractors it refuses to recognise. There can be no appeal against a decision of the commission. A person refused recognition cannot approach his own board, because this legislation does not recognise the board. This clause is stupid in the extreme, and is a travesty of justice. The Minister for Labour and Industry should show some sense and accept the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle.

Mr PARKER: I put forward a rational and logical argument in favour of my amendment, and it has become perfectly obvious during the course of this debate that the Government and the Minister are not aware of the position with regard to the operation of chiropractors in this State. The Minister has changed the reason for his opposition to our proposal.

The situation is that chiropractors are registered in this State, and in all the other States except one. The Opposition is the last group of people likely to say that the standards set by the manner of that registration or by the composition of the registration board in this State are

appropriate The member for Melville has been campaigning for a considerable period to have the Act upgraded and extended. In fact, I understand it is the Government which will not move to extend the Act, even though it has been before the Chamber on numerous occasions since I have been a member, and amendments have been moved by the member for Melville.

Mr O'Connor: I am glad to see someone standing up for him; he needs it.

Mr PARKER: The member for Melville can look after himself very adequately, and I am sure the attitude he expresses is also that of the community generally.

We accept that chiropractors who are not registered in another State should not be recognised for the purposes of the Workers' Compensation Act in this State, because they must be registered here to be able to operate as chiropractors. A requirement of the definition we have put forward is that they be registered under the system or systems which operate in other States and the Commonwealth, exactly the same as with physiotherapists, doctors, and dentists.

Our amendment is perfectly logical and clear. It is clear the Chiropractors Registration Board has the power and the will to discipline its members and, indeed, on some occasions it has disciplined people.

Our amendment is in the same terms as the Government's own proposal relating to the definition of physiotherapists, doctors, and dentists. In addition, it takes into account the fact that there are different practices operating in different States, and that only people who are registered will be recognised and that people who are not registered, and who may practise in some other form in the community, will not be recognised for practice in terms of the Workers' Compensation Act. A later amendment will provide that in their field of competence they will be able to issue appropriate certification, and so on.

There is no logic in the Government's position. There is no logic, for example, in the belief of the Minister for Health that there is some problem about the diagnostic ability of chiropractors. If that is his position, he should be opposing the Government's drafting of this clause because that clause allows for people who are registered and approved to be recognised as chiropractors for the purposes of this Act. The Minister for Health cannot at the same time defend the Government's proposition and say there is no diagnostic ability contained within the Chiropractors Act.

The Minister for Labour and Industry says, "Where are we changing it? What is the problem with regard to the current legislation?" The current legislation, as the Minister conceded, does not contain a definition of "chiropractor". Because of that, the definition which is accepted is the generally accepted community definition of the term. Mr Chairman, that might even allow in the sorts of people about whom you were complaining in your interjection earlier in the debate. Under the current legislation, even those people might be recognised.

Mr Hodge: They are.

Mr PARKER: We are not proposing to revert to that situation; we are strengthening the Government's legislation. The Government's amendments to the Act will restrict the notion of what is a chiropractor from the accepted community sense of that person, thereby ensuring, for example, that a worker who moves interstate or for some other reason happens to be interstate will not be able to receive treatment from a chiropractor in another State because that chiropractor will not fall within the definition contained in the Minister's Bill.

Mr O'Connor: If they had any sort of disability, they would not want to travel interstate.

Mr PARKER: One can travel even when one has a back injury; it is not ever present.

Mr Old: Obviously you have never had one.

Mr PARKER: That is true.

Mr O'Connor: Be careful!

Mr PARKER: I will not go down any dark lanes with some members opposite. As to the sort of back injury to which the Minister for Labour and Industry is referring, I am not too worried about that either, and, in any event, I do not think a chiropractor would be of much assistance in such circumstances.

Our amendment will sort out all the problems which exist with regard to defining who is and who is not recognised as a chiropractor pursuant to this legislation. It will improve the current legislation. Indeed, the Government's proposal is infinitely worse than what is contained in the current legislation because unquestionably it will have the effect of severely restricting those people who can be recognised as chiropractors and imposing the condition that before they can be recognised as such, they must be approved by the board.

I suggest, therefore, that the Government give serious consideration to accepting my amendment.

Mr HODGE: The Deputy Premier said earlier that he did not want to accept the standards imposed by registration boards in other States. However, this clause will reject not only the standards set for chiropractors in other States, but also those applying in this State. The Minister is not prepared to accept the judgment of the Chiropractors Registration Board; he wants to superimpose over the board the judgment of the commission.

So, even if a person is accepted by the Chiropractors Registration Board in Western Australia as being worthy of registration, the commission will have the power to say, "Even though you are registered for the practice of chiropractic, we do not think you are fit to practise, and we do not intend to recognise you". That is a very serious mistake by the Minister.

It is possible under the present workers' compensation legislation for a person who is not registered as a chiropractor to do work in workers' compensation cases. I go to a person who regularly does chiropractic work at the request of the insurance companies, because he usually achieves good results, and he charges very small fees. I have attended this person a couple of times, and he is extremely good. He is not registered with the Chiropractors Registration Board, but under the present system he is allowed to be consulted in workers' compensation cases. He should be registered by the Chiropractors Registration Board. When the Labor Government comes to office, we will change the legislation to ensure that those sorts of persons are registered quite properly.

Mr MacKinnon: Tell him not to hold his breath.

Mr HODGE: I can assure the Honorary Minister I will be doing it in the not-too-distant future.

The member for Fremantle's point is perfectly valid. This amendment will tighten the present situation and ensure that only the people who are registered will be able to be employed as chiropractors under the terms of this legislation.

We have mounted a clear and cogent argument for this amendment. I hope members of the Committee will give it consideration and support it.

Mr YOUNG: Because there has been reference to chiropractors, I asked the Minister handling this Bill to allow me to make a small contribution to this debate.

The amendment of the member for Fremantle would have the effect of changing the definition of "chiropractor" from that which restricts the definition to those registered under the Western Australian Act and approved by the commission—

Mr Hodge: That is the crucial part.

Mr YOUNG: That did not prevent the member for Melville from using it as the vehicle for the usual comments that he tends to make in respect of chiropractors generally, and their relationship to the medical profession. No-one in this Chamber would be surprised that he used the opportunity to tout his usual diatribe in respect of chiropractic, because he happens to have a thing about it.

Mr Hodge: Your few weeks in hospital did not do you much good.

Mr O'Connor: Maybe if you had a few weeks there it would improve you.

Mr YOUNG: It did not do anything to restrict my recognition of the things that the member gets up to in this place.

The amendment proposed by the member for Fremantle would open up the definition of "chiropractor" to include anyone registered under any Act in the Commonwealth or a Territory of the Commonwealth, and who was registered as a chiropractor in accordance with the laws of any State or Territory of the Commonwealth. In other words, he is suggesting that the definition of "chiropractor" should be dependent on the whim of any Legislature in this country at any time—

Mr Parker: Have you read the definition of "physiotherapist"? Precisely the same thing applies.

Mr YOUNG: I am speaking about this clause of this Bill. The member for Fremantle is asking for the approbation of this Chamber in respect of his amendment, and I am speaking about his amendment.

Mr Parker: I support your definition of "physiotherapist". I suggest you look at it to see why I have moved the amendment in the form I have.

Mr YOUNG: The member for Fremantle expects the Chamber to accept that any Legislature in any State or the Commonwealth at any time can determine who will be entitled to be a chiropractor within the meaning of the workers' compensation legislation in this State.

Mr Parker: As they can with doctors and physiotherapists.

Mr YOUNG: That is a different case from the question of the Physiotherapsists Act v the Chiropractors Act.

Mr Parker: It is not exactly the same provision as this.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Previously I have found the member for Fremantle to work well in Committee. However, he is becoming extremely persistent in his interjections—

Mr Parker: He invited me to answer him.

The CHAIRMAN: The member will not interrupt me while I am speaking. If the person who is speaking accepts the interjections, I will allow them; but it is obvious that the Minister does not want to accept them. The member for Fremantle will have an opportunity to make his comments.

Mr YOUNG: If the proposed Act provided that a chiropractor under the definition in the Act could be a chiropractor registrable anywhere at any time under the laws of any State, one would have to consider that amendment and what the member for Fremantle wants the Chamber to do in a subsequent clause. I know it is not appropriate to talk about other clauses at this stage, but I refer to the wording of clause 59 as it would read if the member for Fremantle's amendment were carried.

Mr Hodge: That is what the Government wanted a few months ago.

Mr O'Connor: It is not in the present legislation or the proposed legislation.

Mr YOUNG: The Chamber ought to understand that that is not what this Government wants to achieve in respect of this Bill. The member for Fremantle and the member for Melville are not arguing simply in respect of who ought or ought not be a chiropractor. They are arguing the philosophy that if the Chamber was silly enough to accept the amendment, any other State could determine the qualifications of any chiropractor at any time.

Any Government at any time could, according to its whim, allow a person to act in exactly the same way as a chiropractor is entitled to act under this Bill. In other words, not only do they want a chiropractor to have all the powers under clause 59 in regard to verifying incapacity, but they want the people of Western Australia, in matters under the Workers' Compensation Act, to be bound by a decision of a person who is not qualified medically, and who does not have the capacity to diagnose.

Mr Skidmore: How does he do it if he does not diagnose? Does he not diagnose the problem?

Mr YOUNG: I cannot accept the argument of the member for Swan that because a chiropractor has the capacity to treat and manipulate—and all the other words used by the member for Melville when he quoted from the Chiropractors Act—he has the capacity to diagnose a particular injury beyond any shadow of doubt in the same way as a medical practitioner has to make the certifications that are required in the part covered by clause 59. Whether the members for Swan and Melville like it or not, a chiropractor is not a medical practitioner; he does not have the qualifications to diagnose as a medical practitioner is bound to have and is qualified to have by virtue of his training. Further, there is no way a chiropractor will ever have those qualifications until he becomes a medical practitioner and understands not just the particular parts of the body he treats but also the effect that treatment has on other parts of the body.

It is patently absurd for anyone to suggest that we ought to amend the Act to give any other Legislature in this country the power to say who will be qualified when we are going to argue the point in clause 59 that a chiropractor ought to have the widesweeping powers the member for Fremantle wants him to have. The member for Fremantle is suggesting not only that a virtually unqualified person should have this diagnostic capacity and the right to make out the certificate required by clause 59, but he asks us also to allow any other State Parliament in this country, which is outside our power, to determine what persons we will allow to do that. If members follow what the member for Fremantle really wants to achieve instead of just looking at the definition, they would have to reject his amendment as being absurd.

Mr PARKER: Firstly, on the question of other Legislatures deciding who is and who is not acceptable in this State, the definition I have proposed for chiropractors is based on the definition which the Government itself has worked out for physiotherapists, doctors, dentists, and specialists, and which involves Legislatures in other States. The Minister for Health asks, "Why should we let Legislatures in other States go ahead and determine standards for this State in respect of chiropractors?" but he does not say that with respect to those other professions I listed.

It would appear to me that what the Minister for Health and the Minister for Labour and Industry are saying is that they do not have much faith in the reputability of our chiropractors or the people who govern them.

Mr Young: Which other profession do you want to have the right to give a certificate under clause 59?

Mr PARKER: It is perfectly obvious that the Government does not trust either its own Chiropractors Registration Board or those boards in other States. It is just as likely that in another State a decision will be made that the standards required to become a medical practitioner will be lowered to a level which is unacceptable to this State. For instance, the Premier of Queensland wanted to let some crank by the name of Milan Brich practise in that State. This man was claiming to be curing everyone of cancer while he was ripping them off for hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr Nanovich: Do you reckon Tronado is doing the same thing?

Mr PARKER: The Premier of Queensland went to great lengths in an effort to have that man practise in that State. It was only because the then Liberal Minister for Health in Queensland refused to put up with the Premier's wishes that he was not allowed to practise. So we may have found the situation where the definition of medical practitioners included such cranks as Brich. With the track record of the Premier of Queensland, I would not be surprised if that State eventually allows witch doctors to practise as medical practitioners.

The Minister for Health is not suggesting we make medical practitioners in other States subject to the approval of the workers' compensation assistance commission even though it has been shown in at least one other State that the Premier of that State wants to lower the standards to an unacceptably low level. The Minister for Health is making that suggestion only in regard to chiropractors.

The second point I wish to take up in reply to the Minister for Health's comments is his statement that the logical conclusion to my amendment is that it is the same as the amendment to clause 59. I do not apologise for the amendment I have placed on the notice paper to clause 59 and I will deal with it at the proper time in accordance with our Standing Orders. However, it is by no means essential that both amendments are accepted; certainly this amendment has a much broader effect. Even if my amendment to clause 59 were defeated, there is still good reason for having this amendment carried.

This amendment relates to who may work in the workers' compensation area generally, whether or not they have the right to issue medical certificates, or whether a worker who is injured can deal with a chiropractor in another State. If the Government has its way a worker will not be able to go to a chiropractor in any of the other States even for non-diagnostic medical care and even if my amendment to clause 59 is rejected.

Mr Young: The major thrust of your amendment is that anyone registered in any other State can come here and do that under clause 59.

Mr PARKER: That is not so with my amendment to this clause. The Minister for Health was not listening to me when I dealt with the argument about that.

Mr Young interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Fremantle will resume his seat. I call on the Minister for Health to cease his interjections.

Mr PARKER: Obviously the Minister for Health was not listening to me when I dealt with the point about clause 59 earlier. I pointed out then that this amendment and my amendment to clause 59 are independent issues and do not rely on each other. If the Minister for Health feels strongly about my amendment to clause 59 I am sure he will have something to say at the appropriate time. However, my amendment to this clause can be carried and my proposed amendment to clause 59 can be defeated and there would still be a substantial impact on continuing treatment and continuing non-diagnostic treatment of workers by chiropractors. That is the major impact of this amendment; the major impact is not in regard to first medical certificates at all.

It seems the Minister for Health is prepared to accept unquestionably Mr Bjelke Petersen's witch doctors as medical practitioners, but he will not accept chiropractors.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr PARKER: I do not believe the Minister for Health understands the amendment or the needs and desires of workers in this State to be treated by chiropractors if they so desire. No-one can accuse me of having a "thing" about chiropractors. This is the first occasion in this place that I have spoken about them. On this occasion I do see a good case to defend them, and where I see a good case—unlike the Minister for Health—I like to support it.

Mr Young: You have been caught out.

Mr PARKER: No, the Minister has been caught out.

Mr Young interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! For the last time I ask the Minister for Health to cease interjecting.

Mr PARKER: The Minister for Labour and Industry and the Minister for Health were not even aware of the provisions in their own chiropractic registration legislation. They are the people who have been caught out, because they came here and tried to tell us there were no disciplinary provisions in that legislation and, therefore, they needed the authority of the board to override it.

Not one scintilla of evidence has been put forward at any stage of the debate by the Ministers to justify their position. They have not tried to justify the words at the end of the proposed definition which are, "and who is approved by the Commission" etc. The Ministers have not attempted to justify the definition, because they cannot. They have concentrated on what they think is a weakness in my amendment which we have shown conclusively is not a weakness, and they have not in any way attempted to justify the wording of their own definition of the word "chiropractor".

Mr SKIDMORE: I point out at the outset that at least I am prepared to look at this matter in a serious way as compared with the attitude which has been adopted by some members opposite. It seems to me the Government wants to try to set itself up as the only Government in Australia which has exempted itself of its responsibility in regard to the professionalism of chiropractors.

Firstly, I should like to cite the position which obtains in Queensland which was referred to by the member for Fremantle. I do not hold with the actions taken by the Premier of Queensland who saw fit to allow a charlatan to operate in his State. However, setting aside the Premier, the Queensland Government has adopted a realistic attitude to the registration of its chiropractors.

Had it not done so, the community in Queensland would have been shouting loud and long about the fact that the professionalism of chiropractors was not being looked after properly. One would assume the Queensland Government to be the most conservative Government in Australia.

One could apply the same arguments to Victoria where chiropractors are registered. If I remember correctly when the legislation in regard to chiropractors was debated in this place, it covered rather extensively a number of the provisions contained in the Victorian Act. Therefore, the situation in Victoria cannot be too bad if this State was prepared to adopt some of the provisions applicable there.

I have no doubt South Australia is in the same category. The States to which I have referred are governed by either Liberal Governments, Liberal-National Country Party Governments, or whatever; they are certainly not governed by Labor Governments.

New South Wales has a Labor Government and it has been instrumental in changing some of the aspects relating to the registration of chiropractors. In Tasmania there is no registration as such, but, as the member for Melville said, the Government there would not take any action contrary to the wishes of the people of that State.

The Minister for Health adopted lampoon tactics and led us up the garden path on this matter and did not increase his standing by his behaviour.

I shall turn now to the objection I have on this matter. Chiropractors in this State are registered by a board under the Chiropractors Act. However, under the Workers' Compensation Act, the commission will not recognise a chiropractor, and his right to practise his profession will be removed. That is quite wrong.

Whether we like it or not, members should realise we are not dealing with pieces of machinery; we are dealing with people who are entitled to receive treatment from professionals. The Minister for Health does not add to the stature of his position when he denigrates provisions in the legislation of other States. The Minister for Labour and Industry cannot hold himself up to be anything other than a pig-headed, bloody-minded individual who will not accept an amendment, because, if he does so, he considers it will be a retraction of the stand he has taken.

Several members interjected.

Mr Young: I thought you were against them, not us!

Mr SKIDMORE: I am an independent Labor man and well members opposite know that.

Mr O'Connor: For how long?

Mr SKIDMORE: That is a matter of my opinion and that is where it will stop.

Mr Brian Burke: Why don't you listen to the subject we are debating and let it stop there?

Mr SKIDMORE: The Minister is all the things I said he is, because he is not prepared to accept that the comments made by members on this side of the House are logical and should be accepted. The chairman of the commission will be able to say to any chiropractor, "I accept you for what you are as a professional person." I doubt the commission would want the power to determine

whether or not a chiropractor is a professional person.

Dr DADOUR: I shall try to put this matter into its proper perspective. I do not criticise you, Sir, but we seem to have roamed far and wide on this matter and it is clear members see this amendment as having far-reaching consequences.

My understanding of the position is that the definition of a chiropractor or physiotherapist must be set out in the legislation. It appears we are arguing about the difference between a medical practitioner and a chiropractor.

Mr Parker: That is not what we are arguing about at all.

Dr DADOUR: Apparently some members seem to believe the activities of a medical practitioner and a chiropractor are synonymous.

Mr Hodge: You are on the wrong clause.

Dr DADOUR: We have been debating this clause all day and members have been referring to this issue. The member for Melville is making a criticism of the Chair. This has all been mentioned.

Mr Hodge: Not from this side.

Mr O'Connor: They don't like a bit of professionalism in the game!

Mr Brian Burke: We have not had much of it.

Mr O'Connor: Your fellows have done most of the talking.

Dr DADOUR: I simply want to put the situation in its correct perspective. A medical practitioner is trained to make diagnoses and that can be one of the most difficult situations a doctor faces. If a person has a pain in the back it does not necessarily mean it is due to the accident or trauma in which he may have been involved.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are debating the deletion of certain words and it is conventional in the Committee stage to allow debate to take place on the words which are proposed to be inserted subsequently. In effect, as I understand it, we are really debating the question as to whether we shall have a definition of "chiropractor" as set out in the Bill or whether we should envisage the wider definition proposed by the member for Fremantle, and the debate should be confined to that.

Dr DADOUR: Thank you very much. However, it seems that I will be the only member restricted. I will try to keep to the point which is whether the registration of chiropractors is equal throughout Australia. Obviously, after the discussion that has taken place, we know that the registration of chiropractors is not equal throughout Australia because one State does not even register chiropractors. There is no consensus on the standard that should apply.

Medical practitioners throughout Australia must conform to the same standard; however, I cannot legally practise in another State without first becoming registered in that State.

Mr Parker: That is very sensible of them.

Dr DADOUR: As someone mentioned earlier, I might have trouble being accepted in the banana State. The medical profession has a system whereby external examiners—practitioners from each State and other countries—try to maintain in our universities a uniform standard so that the product they turn out is equal.

In regard to this legislation the uniformity of standard for chiropractors is the main point. When we reach clauses further on in the Bill we will realise that it was not necessary to have this amendment moved or argued.

For the reasons I have given I cannot see why we should accept this amendment.

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for Subiaco for giving us his knowledge on this subject and throwing some professionalism into this matter.

I for one am not prepared to have our State's standard for chiropractors lowered to that pertaining in any other State. The amendment states—

> "chiropractor" means a person who is resident in the Commonwealth or a territory of the Commonwealth and is registered as a chiropractor in accordance with the laws of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth;

I quoted the amendment so that all members are fully aware of its wording. If the Queensland or Tasmanian Governments decided that a chiropractor could be a person who had one year's or even one day's experience in the chiropractic field, we would have to accept that standard if this amendment were accepted, and that would be disastrous for this State.

Members must understand that the definition in the present Act is little different from the provision in the Bill before us presently, except that we designate who is a chiropractor and who is a medical practitioner. The legislation presently before us is superior to the Bill introduced earlier this year and takes nothing from chiropractors in this State.

I oppose the amendment and hope all members will support me.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18

Mr Bridge	Mr Melver
Mr Bryce	Mr Parker
Mr Brian Burke	Mr Pearce
Mr Terry Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr A. D. Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Grill	Mr Tonkin
Mr Harman	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

Noes 22

Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Trethowan
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Watt
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams
Mr Mensaros	Mr Young
Mr Nanovich	Mr Shalders

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Jamieson	Mr Laurance
Mr T. H. Jones	Mr Sodeman
Mr Bertram	Mr P. V. Jones
Mr Barnett	Mr Crane
Mr Evans	Mr Coyne

Amendment thus negatived.

Progress

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

NEWSPAPER LIBEL AND REGISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

Second Reading

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Deputy Premier) [3.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Under section 16 of the Newspaper Libel and Registration Act 1884 as amended by the Ministers' Title Act 1925, the printer of every newspaper is required to send at least one copy of it to the Chief Secretary.

The newspaper is actually signed by the printer and must contain details of his employer.

These papers which really have value only for their archival interest are at present sorted and stored at the Chief Secretary's Department and then each month delivered to the Library Board of Western Australia.

The board's interest in these newspapers can be appreciated because they provide a progressive picture of Western Australia, its development, and its history.

To avoid duplication of handling and overcome a potentially serious storage problem in the Chief Secretary's Department, it has been decided to present this amendment which will require the newspapers to be delivered direct to the Library Board of Western Australia. The matter has been discussed with the Library Board and it has readily accepted the proposal.

The amendment will reduce costs and duplication of work and storage areas.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [4.16 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Question put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the House divided.

Remarks during Division

Mr Bryce: You had better start behaving yourselves. What a complete farce it is!

Mr Young: You are going to guarantee total silence at question time in the future!

Mr Bryce: What sort of Parliament in the world would you expect to find that kindergarten expectation, for God's sake!

Mr Grill: When things get hot they become loud mouths!

Result of Division

Division resulted as follows—

Ayes 22

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Mr Clarko	Mr O'Connor
Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Trethowan
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Williams
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders

(Teller)

Noes 16

Mr Bridge	Mr Melver
Mr Bryce	Mr Parker
Mr Brian Burke	Mr Pearce
Mr Terry Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr Tonkin
Mr Grill	Mr Wilson
Mr Hodge	Mr Bateman

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Laurance	Mr Jamieson
Mr Sodeman	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Bertram
Mr Crane	Mr Barnett
Mr Coyne	Mr Evans
Mr Watt	Mr Harman

Question thus passed.

House adjourned at 4.19 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

STATE FINANCE: CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Wages and Salaries

2162. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

(1) What was the total amount of expenditure on wages and salaries from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the year ended June—

(a) 1974;

(b) 1975;

(c) 1976;

(d) 1977;

(e) 1978;

(f) 1979;

(g) 1980;

(h) 1981?

(2) What is the estimated expenditure on wages and salaries from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the year ending June 1982?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) (a) to (h) Statistics of expenditure on wages and salaries are collated by Treasury from returns from all departments, authorities, and hospitals financed in whole or in part from Consolidated Revenue. It should be noted that all expenditure on wages and salaries is included even though only part of the authorities' expenditure may be financed from Consolidated Revenue.

Collection of these statistics commenced in 1974-75 and the data has been progressively improved over that period. A change in the structure of the figures this year has resulted in a revision of the series back to 1974-75 and the revised figures are supplied in response to the question.

It is important to note that changes in the use of contract staff as against wages employees by departments and authorities and *vice versa* and other variations of this kind can result in the figures being not strictly comparable from year to year.

In relating the figures to total expenditure, variations in accounting procedures must also be taken into account. Thus total expenditure from 1976-77 on is not comparable with expenditure in earlier years because of changed accounting resulting from the introduction of the hospitals cost sharing arrangements. This change results in an apparent but not real reduction in the proportion of total expenditure spent on salaries and wages from 1976-77. The figures are as follows—

	$ million
1974-75	483.0
1975-76	604.5
1976-77	685.4
1977-78	786.4
1978-79	877.3
1979-80	989.5
1980-81	1 127.9

(2) $1 284 million, including the Budget provision for wage and salary adjustments. This latter figure is a Treasury estimate which will be subject to variation when actual returns are received from departments and authorities next year.

STATE FINANCE: CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Wages and Salaries

2163. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

(1) What is the estimated increase in expenditure on wages and salaries from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1981-82?

(2) How much of the estimated additional expenditure on wages and salaries identified in (1) is attributable to—

(a) award increases in wages and salaries;

(b) increases in the number of Government employees paid from the Consolidated Revenue Fund;

(c) incremental adjustments to wages and salaries?

(3) What is the number of additional staff positions to be paid from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1981-82, for each department?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) $156.1 million.

(2) (a) $136.4 million to meet the full year cost of adjustments granted in 1980-81 and provision for expected increases to be awarded in the current year;

(b) and (c) the additional sum of $19.7 million is in effect a balancing item covering the net increase in Government employment, incremental adjustments and all other factors including temporary assistance, the whole adjusted for savings likely to arise from temporarily unfilled vacancies. No accurate segregation of this figure can be made.

(3) Details of numbers of additional staff in specific areas have been given in the Budget speech. In most other cases, a monetary provision is made and additional staff numbers are subject to investigation by the Public Service Board before increases in establishment are approved.

STATE FINANCE: CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Wages and Salaries

2164. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

(1) What was the total increase in expenditure on wages and salaries from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1980-81?

(2) How much of the additional expenditure on wages and salaries identified in (1) was attributable to—

(a) award increases in wages and salaries including increases as a result of wage indexation adjustments;

(b) increases in the number of Government employees paid from the Consolidated Revenue Fund;

(c) incremental adjustments to wages and salaries?

(3) What was the number of new staff positions filled in 1980-81?

(4) What was the net increase in the number of Government employees paid from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1980-81, for each Government department?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) $138.4 million.

(2) (a) $136.7 million;

(b) and (c) See answer to question 2163.

(3) Staffing details for departments are in two categories; namely, establishment and pay-roll. The establishment is the approved strength of a department and the pay-roll the number of staff that are being paid at any one time. Staff changes occur from resignations and retirements and appointments to fill vacancies and increases in establishment. Because of the many changes taking place it is not possible to clearly identify the number of new staff positions actually filled during the year.

(4) Statistics are maintained of the number of employees appointed under the Public Service Act—the Public Service—and the number in total Government employment. Statistics are not compiled of the number of employees paid from Consolidated Revenue principally because of the numbers of temporary or part-time employees that are engaged from time to time by major departments such as hospitals, Education, and Public Works.

HOUSING: INTEREST RATES

Mortgage Assessment and Relief Committee: Guidelines

2198. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is he aware of problems being suffered by home buyers affected by high interest rates as a result of unemployment or sickness?

(2) Is he also aware of a reported increase in the number of home buyers abandoning mortgage insurance policies against unemployment and sickness because of increases in mortgage repayments?

(3) In view of such reports, will he review the guidelines laid down for lending authorities in referring people to the mortgage assessment relief committee so that those affected by unemployment and sickness are not excluded from consideration for relief?

(4) Will he seek the co-operation of lending authorities in mounting a campaign to ensure that home buyers are thoroughly informed about mortgage insurance against unemployment and sickness?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

(1) to (4) Insurance against unemployment and sickness is not a compulsory cover as is property insurance by conditions contained in mortgages, and mortgage insurance on advances made by building societies where the loan exceeds 75 per cent of the value of house and land.

Insurance against unemployment and sickness is by personal choice of a home buyer, and even though some lending authorities do arrange such cover on behalf of borrowers after consultation with them, I believe that this type of cover included with the many other forms of insurance should remain a voluntary decision of each home buyer.

STATE FINANCE

Public Building Programmes

2210. Mr WILSON, to the Treasurer:

(1) What was the final cost of the metropolitan water centre, the new Western Australian Art Gallery and the restoration of His Majesty's Theatre?

(2) (a) What is the estimated final cost of the new Education Department office building, the new District Court complex, and the Alexander Library?

(b) What funding was allocated for these three projects in 1980-81 financial year and what are the budgeted amounts for expenditure on these projects in the 1981-82 financial year?

(3) (a) What other major public building projects are presently under construction or due to get under way in the 1981-82 financial year:

(b) what is the budgeted expenditure on these projects for the 1981-82 financial year?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) Metropolitan Water Centre — $14 813 091

Western Australian Art Gallery — $9 967 875

His Majesty's Theatre — restoration — $9 957 429.

(2) (a) The Education Department building is being built by the Superannuation Board and is estimated to cost $20.3 million.

District Courts Complex—$26.1 million.

Alexander Library—$29.5 million;

(b) amount expended on the Education Building in 1980-81 was $9 454 150 and it is estimated that $10.4 million will be expended on this project in 1981-82. Details of expenditure on the other projects named are given in the General Loan Fund Estimates.

(3) (a) and (b) This information is provided in the General Loan Fund Estimates.

FUEL AND ENERGY: SEC

Accounts: Period

2211. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) Can he confirm that State Energy Commission accounts, which are supposed to be issued every two months are now being sent out for periods as short as 54 days?

(2) Can he also confirm that the account period is becoming progressively shorter?

(3) Is there any minimum period of days for which a two-monthly account may be issued?

(4) Can he guarantee that any consumer will receive a maximum of six accounts for any one calendar year?

(5) Has the commission given any further consideration to the possibility of issuing monthly accounts?

(6) What is the commission's current attitude to the question of introducing monthly accounts?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) Two-monthly accounts are issued on the basis of a nominal 40-working-day cycle. This results in slight variations in the period of individual accounts depending on the number of weekends and holidays in the period.

In practice, account periods normally vary between 56 days up to a maximum of 66 days over the Christmas holiday period.

To ensure customers are not disadvantaged by these variations, accounts are calculated on a daily basis. The fixed charge, for instance, is calculated in terms of cost per day for the number of days covered by the account.

Account periods shorter than 56 days only occur where there is a rearrangement of the meter reading sequence.

(2) No variations from the procedures outlined above have been introduced.

(3) Normally 56 days.

(4) No. As explained in (1) above, the use of a 40-day reading cycle does result in some variation from period to period. However, this does not affect the total charges paid.

(5) Yes.

(6) At this stage, monthly accounts instead of two-monthly would be uneconomic and are not being considered further.

HOSPITALS: SIR CHARLES GAIRDNER AND FREMANTLE

Beds

2212. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

(1) How many new hospital beds are to be opened during the next 12 months—

(a) at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital; and

(b) at Fremantle Hospital?

(2) How many beds are to be closed in the next 12 months at—

(a) Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital; and

(b) Fremantle Hospital?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) (a) Detailed studies are currently in progress between hospital and departmental officers to determine the level of staffing which can be funded from the 1981-82 budgetary allocation now approved; when these studies are completed, the precise number of additional beds which can be opened and fully serviced will be known;

(b) 186.

(2) (a) Dependent upon the outcome of studies referred to in (1)(a);

(b) 179.

POLICE: ACT

Section 54B

2213. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

(1) Is it fact that the Police Department has refused a permit under section 54B of the Police Act to allow students from Mt. Lawley college to march down the Mall to Forrest Place carrying flags of different countries as part of Universal Children's Day, a function of the United Nations Association?

(2) Is it fact that the Perth City Council raised no objection to the march which was to have been held on Saturday, 17 October?

(3) Is he prepared to review the Police Department decision?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(1) The United Nations Association and UNICEF made application for permission as required under section 54B of the Police Act to conduct a public procession to, and public meeting in, Forrest Place, between the hours of 11.45 a.m. and 12.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 21 October 1981.

The stated purpose was to celebrate Universal Children's Day.

The applicant estimated the numbers of participants in the procession as approximately 80 persons, with an additional 20 persons at the subsequent public meeting.

The application did not specify the participation of specific numbers of students of a particular college; i.e., Mt. Lawley college.

(2) The application was for Wednesday, 21 October 1981 and not 17 October—Saturday.

It is understood that the Perth City Council has not granted permission for Forrest Place to be used for this event.

Explanation: It is possible that the dates referred to are incorrect—a flag-raising ceremony is conducted annually at Perth City Council concourse to celebrate United Nations Day—a function which requires no permit under section 54B of the Police Act, as it is conducted on council grounds and not in a public place.

(3) When the applicant was originally advised of the decision on the application, he was then invited to discuss the matter further with the police, but immediately refused and said that the arrangements were cancelled. The offer of discussion remains open and I have no doubt that satisfactory alternative arrangements could have been or could be made.

WATER RESOURCES: MWB

Employees

2214. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Water Resources:

(1) Further to my question 1179 of 1981, have circumstances altered where water resources employees at Northam may now be retrenched?

(2) If so, why, and what circumstances have brought about retrenchments?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) and (2) There is no present intention to retrench water supply staff at Northam. Any such move is always dependent upon work to be carried out on subdivisions.

STOCK: SHEEPSKINS

Treatment: Tests

2215. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Are trials connected with the effects of Clout and the use of a changed formula of Clout being carried out in Western Australia?

(2) If "Yes"—

(a) on how many properties are such tests being carried out, and where is each located;

(b) are officers of the Department of Agriculture involved in these trials, and if so, how many;

(c) what cost, and by whom will the cost be borne?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) Three properties—

(i) South Kojonup;

(ii) Mt. Barker;

(iii) South Stirlings;

(b) yes; five officers as a small proportion of their normal duties;

(c) the estimated operating cost to the department is $1 500 which will be recouped from the manufacturers.

HEALTH: DISABLED PERSONS

Children

2216. Mr HERZFELD, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Does his department pay a conveyance allowance to parents of handicapped children?

(2) If so, under what circumstances?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) and (2) Yes, a conveyance allowance may be paid if the student meets the conditions specified in regulation 13. A copy of this regulation is made available to the member.

RECREATION

Woodman Point

2217. Mr A. D. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Recreation:

(1) With respect to the buildings on Woodmans Point, formerly the Commonwealth quarantine station, what is the present estimated cost of bringing the buildings and their immediate environs into full utilisation by community groups?

(2) What sum, if any, is it anticipated will be spent in this financial year to upgrade these facilities?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) The lowest tender in May 1981 for kitchen block was $133 000 and for water supply and extras was $7 000, totalling $140 000.

(2) This has been considered within the context of the capital works budget for 1981-82 which will be brought down by the Premier.

WATER RESOURCES: EFFLUENT

Point Peron: Pipeline

2218. Mr A. D. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Resources:

With respect to the proposal to construct a sewerage outfall pipeline from Point Peron, would he table a plan which would show generally the presently considered route of any associated pipeline as between the South Coogee sewage treatment plant and Point Peron where that pipeline traverses the City of Cockburn and Town of Kwinana?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I have arranged for a set of plans, which show the route presently under consideration for the proposed Woodman Point to Cape Peron effluent pipeline, to be forwarded to the member.

ROAD

Cockburn Road

2219. Mr A. D. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

What part of Cockburn Road, City of Cockburn, will be widened and/or realigned during this financial year?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The section from Beach Road to the southern access to the marine platform fabrication yard.

HOUSING

Metropolitan Area

2220. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

What is the present average density of urban development in units per hectare for the Perth metropolitan area?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

As at June 1980, based upon Australian Bureau of Statistics' figures and Town Planning Department estimates, the average number of dwelling units per hectare in the Perth region was 6.7.

WATER RESOURCES

Leakages

2221. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Water Resources:

What was the level of leakage of water from the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board's operations in total, as a percentage, in each of the years from 1976 to 1981?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Not known. However, pilot studies have indicated leakage losses at approximately 0.5 per cent from the Board's system with another 2 to 2.5 per cent within the consumers' systems.

SEWERAGE

Metropolitan Area

2222. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Water Resources:

(1) Are all new housing developments within the area of operations of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board sewered when subdivided?

(2) If "No"—

(a) what proportion is not sewered;

(b) in what areas are such unsewered subdivisions; and

(c) what alternative methods of sewage disposal are provided for these subdivisions?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) No, but the Government's recently announced policy is that, unless special conditions exist, sewerage is mandatory for new urban subdivisions within the metropolitan area.

(2) (a) The precise information is not readily available;

(b) hills areas, sewer backlog areas on coastal plain;

(c) septic tanks.

HOUSING: SHC

Employees

2223. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

(1) Has a committee been established to investigate uniformity charges for Government housing?

(2) What is the present position regarding possible increases in rents for employees occupying State Energy Commission houses?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Rents for all accommodation provided to Government employees, including State Energy Commission houses, will rise progressively to equate with rents charged, for similar accommodation by the Government Employees' Housing Authority. Increases will occur every six months commencing from 1 January 1982 at the rate of $6 per week until reaching GEHA rent.

A Press release announcing these changes was issued by the Premier on 22 September 1981. A copy is tabled for the information of members.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 524).

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Electrical Goods: Sales Tax

2224. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

(1) Is it a fact that many electrical stores have increased their charges on electrical goods, in some instances by an extra $10, to cover the proposed sales tax, which to date has not been passed to allow such increases?

(2) If customers buying electrical goods at such stores are advised that this is the reason for such charges, can they lay complaints with his department with a view to having such stores prosecuted?

(3) If "Yes", to whom do they complain?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Not known, but the Bureau of Consumer Affairs has not received formal complaints.

(2) Any complaints, if lodged, will be looked at on their merits.

(3) To any complaints officer in the Bureau of Consumer Affairs.

ROAD: GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY

Greenmount

2225. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to my question 481 of 1981 relevant to the escape route on Great Eastern Highway, Greenmount, and his answer given to me that this matter was under consideration by the Main Roads Department, can he now tell me when the department intends to provide this escape route?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The Main Roads Department has been undertaking ongoing investigations including overseas inquiries, in an endeavour to resolve the problem of the escape route.

There does not appear to be any easy solution, but I have asked the commissioner to review the situation and to expedite his report.

TRAFFIC: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Great Eastern Highway: Midland

2226. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Transport:

On 3 June 1981 I received a letter from the Commissioner of Main Roads relevant to the crosswalk that is located in Great Eastern Highway, Midland, opposite the Centrepoint shopping centre. Certain action was promised—that is, the upgrading of the present road system to a one-way traffic flow along Great Eastern Highway—this work to be carried out in 1981-82. Will he now ascertain the present position and establish for me when it is anticipated that this proposed one-way road system will be completed?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The Commissioner of Main Roads has advised me that the one-way pair through Midland between Morrison Road and Sayer Street could be brought into operation in March 1982.

LAND

Yallingup Beach Road

2227. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has freehold title been granted for Lot 4422 Yallingup Beach Road on which the caves caravan park at Yallingup is situated?

(2) If so—

(a) what type of lease previously applied;

(b) when was the application for freehold title made;

(c) when was the application granted;

(d) what conditions, if any, were attached to the application when granted?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

(1) No.

(2) (a) A special lease under section 116 of the Land Act for the purpose of caravan park;

(b) an application for freehold title was made in 1979 and refused on the grounds of insufficient development. A further application was made on 21 April 1981. It has been established that the development on the southern portion of Sussex Location 4422 is sufficient for freehold and it is the Lands Department's intention to advise the applicant that freehold of the southern portion only will be arranged;

(c) and (d) answered by (b).

ABORIGINES

Pre-pre-school Centre: Innaloo

2228. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) Did his department formerly provide accommodation for an Aboriginal pre-pre-school group in Innaloo?

(2) Did his department support a submission for this group to be provided with premises in a State Housing Commission house in Innaloo?

(3) Is his department presently seeking alternative premises in Innaloo or that vicinity for the pre-pre-school group in association with a homemaker service centre?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(1) The Aboriginal pre-pre-school group in Innaloo did use my department's homemaker activity centre at Innaloo three mornings per week. The department no longer leases these premises.

(2) An officer of my department did ask the State Housing Commission whether they could allocate a house in the Innaloo area for use as a homemaker activity centre which the Aboriginal pre-pre-school group could share.

(3) My department is seeking alternative premises in Innaloo for use as a homemaker activity centre which the pre-pre-school group could possibly share, but to date has not acquired same.

ABORIGINES

Pre-pre-school Centre: Innaloo

2229. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

(1) Did the State Housing Commission reject a submission supported by the Department of Community Welfare for a house in Diana Street, Innaloo to be used as an Aboriginal pre-pre-school centre and homemaker service centre?

(2) If "Yes", and if this house continues to be unoccupied after being vacant for several months, what was the reason for this rejection?

(3) Has the commission previously agreed to co-operate in making premises available for such centres?

(4) Is the commission providing premises for such groups in other areas, and if "Yes", where are these centres located?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The house in question is now occupied. The delay in reletting was due to the extensive renovation work and the number of declines to accept from listed applicants.

(3) The commission does make accommodation available for community purposes when the demand lists permit and the commission is the predominant owner as in large rental estates.

(4) Community Project Allocations in Metropolitan Area are

Unit 34 Modena Place, Balga Mia Mia Residents Assoc.

Unit 54 Lawrence Street, Bayswater Kardee Co-Op

Unit 10 Banjine Road, Koongamia Valley Activities Centre Tenants Assoc.

Unit 1 Rudkin Place, Koondoola Community Health Services

Unit 107 Clare Court, Lockridge Senior Citizens

Unit 56 Parakoola, Lockridge Lockridge Tenants Assoc.

Unit 78 Clare Court, Lockridge Morley Workshop Centre

Unit 25 White Court, Karawara –Aged Citizens

Unit 18 George Street, Belmont Womens Learning Centre

Unit 56 Ridley Way, Medina – Dept. Community Welfare Day Care Centre

Unit 64 Medina Avenue, Medina – St. Vincent de Paul Counselling Centre

Unit 19 Aruma, Beaconsfield Mobile Kindergarten.

EDUCATION: TEACHERS AND AIDES

Pre-pre-school Centres and Kindergartens

2230. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Will teaching and teaching aide positions associated with Aboriginal pre-pre-school centres and mobile kindergartens be maintained at their current levels in 1982?

(2) If "No", what changes will be made?

(3) What responsibility is taken by the Aboriginal early childhood branch in assisting teachers in Aboriginal pre-pre-school centres and, in particular, in helping groups to locate premises in which to operate?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) The Aboriginal Early Childhood Section gives assistance and guidance to teachers in Aboriginal pre-pre-school centres. It also assists in locating premises in which centres operate. The responsibility rests mainly with the groups themselves to select a facility which they consider provides a familiar comfortable environment.

HOUSING: LOANS

Low Interest

2231. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

(1) Can he confirm that funds for Government low interest home loans for applicants earning less than $240 per week have been fully expended and that such loans are only currently available for applicants earning $240 or more per week?

(2) If "No", why is such information being given to applicants by building firms and lending authorities, and what is the actual situation regarding such loans?

(3) How many loans have been granted since the announcement of the Government's assisted home loan programme several weeks ago, to –

(a) applicants earning less than $240 per week;

(b) applicants earning more than $240 per week?

(4) What is the total value to date of loans granted in each of these categories, and what is the amount of Government home grant money expended to date in relation to (3)(a) and (3)(b)?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

(1) and (2) Concessional interest rate loans under the home purchase assistance scheme have been offered to prospective home buyers from the loans priority list to cover loans equal to the $8 million which was allocated to terminating building societies for 1981-82. The terminating societies are presently interviewing applicants and processing applications, withdrawn applications being replaced by others from the loans priority list.

Subsidised loans through permanent building societies to assist first time home buyers where the breadwinner's weekly income in the metropolitan area exceeds $240 per week, but is not higher than $300 are still available, and inquiries regarding these loans should be made direct to the societies.

(3) (a) and (b) Administration procedures adopted do not allow for details of loans approved under the various schemes to be readily available.

(4) Of the $8 million of home purchase assistance account loan funds allocated to terminating societies, $546 697 has been paid to the societies to complete purchase arrangements and pay progress payments to builders. As subsidy payments will be made to the permanent societies on a quarterly basis, no payment has been made to date, and none expected to be made until after the December quarter.

HOUSING: FLATS

Balga

2232. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is the State Housing Commission aware that a number of flats at 34 Garrick Way, Balga, do not have flyscreens to the kitchen windows?

(2) If "Yes", in view of some cases where the families of newly arrived tenants include babies and young children, will he ensure that the commission gives prompt attention to the installation of flyscreens where required in this block of flats?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

(1) Yes. Commission apartments are not fitted with flyscreens unless installed by the occupant.

(2) The availability of funds is not sufficient to provide flyscreens on apartments at this time.

LAND

Sussex Location 4567

2233. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

In respect of the application—dated 30 July 1979—for granting freehold status for Sussex Location 4567 special lease 3116/5137, will the Minister indicate why the Lands Department was not prepared to grant the freehold title?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

Special lease 3116/5137 over Sussex Location 4567 contains the following clause which was acknowledged by the present lessee when acquiring the lease in 1979—

> The conversion of this lease to freehold title will not be considered.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MINING: DIAMONDS

Marketing

627. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

(1) Is he aware of the conflicting views which have surfaced between the Prime Minister and Mr Anthony (Deputy Prime Minister) as Minister for Trade and Resources in recent days concerning the marketing of Australian diamonds?

(2) Does the State Government accept that it may be in the best interests of all Australians for some form of control over the export of Australian diamonds to be introduced?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) I know of no conflict between the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister on this particular question.

Mr Bryce: You should read their answers in Federal Parliament.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have only seen what is in the media as well as a transcript I have in my office of what the Prime Minister said today on the question that was asked by Mr Keating about Mr Anthony. I cannot see any conflict in the matter at all, but I will obtain a transcript of what Mr Anthony said; I can hardly imagine there is any real conflict about it. As I understand it, the Prime Minister was saying he would not agree to a proposition whereby the control of the project was in the hands of the De Beers.

Mr Bryce: Marketing and export.

Mr O'Connor: De Beers was the word used.

Mr Bryce: Yes, De Beers.

Sir CHARLES COURT: As I understand it, he was talking about the control of the project.

Mr Young: The marketing.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Whether it is the marketing or the actual production matters not; I can assure the member that there is absolutely no possibility of De Beers controlling the Argyle project. Before the Prime Minister had answered any questions today I had announced and made a Press release that we are at a very advanced stage of negotiating a formal agreement which will then be brought to the Parliament, assuming we can negotiate conditions that are acceptable to us so far as infrastructure, royalties, marketing, and processing are concerned. They are not all of the factors, but they are the ones that present the greatest difficulties in reaching finality. I have announced that and I have indicated also to the Prime Minister in very clear terms that this is a Western Australian project. We will negotiate how this project is developed and will negotiate such things as royalties, the processing components, and the like.

Mr Bryce: What about export control?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am just coming to that. I want to put it into clear perspective that this is a Western Australian project. It is a mining project that we will negotiate our way and we will not brook any interference from the Commonwealth so far as the negotiations on the project are concerned. Marketing is another matter. We have made it very clear to the company that marketing conditions and arrangements will have to be defined in the agreement and in the machinery that is set up for the project so that we are not locked into a situation for today only, because circumstances change. Some people use CSO and then use something else and then go back to it. This is only natural. We want to have the best of all worlds. This is where the Commonwealth comes into it. It could, if it so desires, impose export licensing; that is the point at which it has some control because under the Constitution it has the right to nominate export controls. We do not like some of the methods it has used in the past. We certainly will not tolerate the ways used in the time of R.F.X. Connor and the Whitlam Government, but we have managed to work out our differences of opinions with the present Commonwealth Government in respect of export licensing.

Mr Bryce: Not in respect of much else!

Sir CHARLES COURT: But on that point of the member's question, the Commonwealth Government has a constitutional right. My understanding is that if and when there is any problem about it it will be worked out by consultation between the Commonwealth Government and the Western Australian Government.

I want to get back to the point that it is a Western Australian project and will be developed by our methods and to our standards. If, on the other hand, the Commonwealth Government is not satisfied when it comes to the actual marketing and export, we will talk to them about export controls.

MINING: DIAMONDS

Agreement: Ratification

628. Mr GRILL, to the Premier:

(1) In view of the Premier's Press statement released today concerning the Ashton Joint Venture wherein he states that the Government would soon be ratifying an agreement which would now confirm the rights of Ashtons to take up its mineral claims at Argyle, does the Premier mean that the Government is about to retrospectively legislate to grant the disputed diamond lease at Argyle to Ashtons despite any decision of the Supreme Court?

(2) If so, on what basis would the Government justify such unprecedented action?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) I think the member should get my statement into proper perspective. If he wants a copy he can have it.

Mr Grill: I have it right here in black and white.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I did say we are at an advanced stage in the negotiations with the company, and that is correct. The actual agreement that is negotiated will be presented to the Parliament for ratification. It is not a question of circumventing anybody, going behind anybody's back, or being retrospective in any way at all.

Mr Grill: Look at the third paragraph.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Wait a minute. We will sort out the entitlements of the joint venturers. One of those entitlements will be its title to a mining area. This is the normal procedure. If we did not do it this way, we would have no negotiations at all because as soon as a Government started to negotiate somebody could take action—whether it was right or wrong is not that important—and everything would stop. We have the right and responsibility to negotiate to draw up the conditions under which the area will be developed and operated; what the mining titles will be, what processing will take place, what the venturer's obligations will be, what royalties they will have to pay, the infrastructure, the venturer's commitments, and a whole gamut of things.

Mr Bryce: What happens if Ashtons lose the claim?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Bearing in mind that this company has operated quite legally within temporary reserves that it was given under the Mining Act in 1979, and that it was first in time, it is the Government's responsibility to negotiate such an agreement and spell out the conditions which will then be brought to the Parliament for ratification. No Government can stop somebody who wants to bring forward litigation to try to get someone else's mining claim. No-one can stop that. That is the citizen's right and it is up to people to follow the process of the law. However, it is equally the responsibility of the Government to protect those who have rights. I would have thought the member for Yilgarn-Dundas would have been the first to acknowledge that to ensure that important developments are not halted because of this sort of thing.

I remind the honourable member that it is very important this whole question be dealt with quickly, so that the people who are legitimately in the area and who have explored legitimately under the temporary reserve, invested a great deal of money and found diamonds, should have the right to develop the claim according to the conditions which are laid down and which are acceptable not only to us but to the Parliament also.

Mr Brian Burke: Even if it is illegal? Even if the Supreme Court finds in favour of the applicant?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Heaven forbid that we should set ourselves up in this place as judge and advocate of such things. I am informing the House of the facts of the situation. The company has a temporary reserve and in fact I think it has a number of temporary reserves which it has explored. It is the Government's responsibility to spell out the conditions, in an agreement, and bring it to the Parliament. If someone decides to take legal action on his own initiative he has the same right as anyone else to take such action; it is not for us to say. But it is our responsibility, if this State is to have a reputation as a place in which to invest, to get on with the job. The member for Kimberley would know of the great concern expressed in East Kimberley about the possible frustration of this project, because of the legal action which has been taken. Last Sunday representations were made to me by East Kimberley citizens in an effort to impress on me the need to get the agreement finalised so that they could get on with the job. That is what we will do. If the Parliament does not accept the agreement we will deal with the situation at the time. In the meantime, we intend to get on with the job.

HEALTH

Quo Vadis Centre

629. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Can the Minister confirm the fact that this afternoon a number of staff at the Quo Vadis Centre were given termination notices?

(2) If so, can he inform us how many have been given termination notices, and for what reason?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) and (2) I cannot confirm what has happened at the Quo Vadis Centre this afternoon, but I was advised that certain members of the Alcohol and Drug Authority would be meeting with the staff this afternoon as a result of an arrangement which was made with the union which represents the workers at Quo Vadis.

As a result of its independent investigation, the ADA was convinced that the Quo Vadis Centre was not providing the sort of treatment programme it thought the centre should provide. So, the ADA had to tell the staff there was a possibility some people may lose their jobs. An arrangement was made that such an announcement would not be made before 26 October. However, I understand there were subsequent arrangements made with the trade union whereby members of the authority would make an announcement immediately after the release of the Budget. I understand that meeting was to take place today. I wish to make it clear to members of this House and to the people of Western Australia that not only is the future of the Quo Vadis treatment programme dependent on the financial situation with which the State is faced and the amount which has been allocated for that centre, but also the future of the treatment programme and level of staff of Quo Vadis has to be evaluated in accordance with the value of the treatment and the possibility of improving efficiency in that area.

The trade union representatives and all those involved with the treatment of residents at Quo Vadis were aware of the arrangements which had been made to inform the staff, and the authority made it clear when the announcement would be made. I understand full co-operation has been given at these meetings. I would imagine that certain people have been informed of the likelihood of their future employment, and everything which can be done by the authority to ensure re-employment of those who might lose their jobs will be done.

EDUCATION: PRE-PRIMARY

Centres: Northern Corridor

630. Mr WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Education:

The subject of my question is the comment in today's edition of the *Daily News* which reports that the member for Gosnells said that parents and children were queuing at 5.30 a.m. to enrol at Government pre-primary schools.

Surely this cannot be a fact. I ask the Minister for an explanation of this?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I have seen the report which is ill-informed and exaggerated.

Mr Pearce: You did not know about it yesterday when I asked you a question.

Mr GRAYDEN: I inform the member for Gosnells that today the Director General of Education contacted the principal of the school involved.

Mr Pearce: Which school is it?

Mr O'Connor: You should know.

Several members interjected.

Mr GRAYDEN: Goollalel. The problem is not nearly as dramatic as the member for Gosnells would have us believe.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members are well aware of the rulings I have made in respect of question time. I do not intend to sit here and attempt to listen to questions being asked or answered amidst a hubbub of interjections. On this occasion the interjections are from both sides of the House. I will terminate questions without notice if they continue.

Mr GRAYDEN: The problem is not anywhere as dramatic as the member for Gosnells would wish everyone to believe. The situation has developed because the pre-primary unit can accommodate 52 children only. After the first 52 children were enrolled the principal listed the names of parents who wished to enrol their children and had not been able to do so. Those parents have been assured that once a clear indication of the exact number is known, every effort will be made to place them at centres in the near vicinity. If the numbers warrant it,

the principal has been advised he will be provided with a transportable classroom to accommodate all those involved.

Several members interjected.

Mr GRAYDEN: Any parents who fit into this category have been asked to contact the Regional Director for the North-West Metropolitan Region (Mr Malcolm Bennett).

Several members interjected.

Mr GRAYDEN: It appears the parents have been ill-informed about the time enrolments would be taken at this centre as the staff involved do not commence work until 9.00 a.m. Also, as the vacancies have already been filled there is no first-come first-served rule applying.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pearce: You are an absolute fool.

Mr GRAYDEN: Is it possible for the member for Gosnells to keep quiet for one moment?

Mr Nanovich: It is impossible with a mouth such as his.

Mr GRAYDEN: All children will be adequately provided for as soon as the final numbers are known. It would seem therefore that this is another illustration of ill-informed grandstanding by the member for Gosnells.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Orders of the day!

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE: TERMINATION

Point of Order

Mr BRYCE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, may I draw your attention to the time and to the small number of questions that have been asked.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRYCE: This requires co-operation from both sides of the House.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat. I am quite aware of the time and that four questions only have been asked and answered. I am aware also that I gave a clear warning that if further interjections continued during the asking and the answering of questions I would terminate question time.

Mr Grill: It was the Government members—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is true that there were interjections from the Government benches and I drew attention to that when I issued my warning.

Mr Bryce: This place is becoming a kindergarten.

The SPEAKER: Order! I want to point out that there are at least three members on the Government side who have indicated that they wish to ask questions and they have also been denied that right. Question time will be conducted in a proper manner.