

In conclusion, I draw the attention of members to the four points which constitute the second part of the amendment. The Premier stood in this Chamber tonight and indicated that the Western Australian Government, despite its alleged concern for refugees and for orphans, could not confirm whether even one cent had been contributed by this State to the national relief fund. Other State Governments have already indicated how much they are prepared to donate. This proves the superficiality of the concern this Treasurer shows for this issue.

Sir Charles Court: Can you deny that we have co-operated with the Commonwealth Government? Ask your Prime Minister!

Mr BRYCE: Members opposite must face the reality that the true meaning of their policy and their objection to the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam could lead only to a bloody solution instead of a peaceful political solution to the war. They now must face the realisation that the logical extension of their policy is the recommitment of young Australian soldiers to that war. They cannot sustain the arguments they have advanced recently in this place without appreciating that this is the logical conclusion. I was—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [6.08 p.m.]: I wish to second the motion and, in so doing, address a few remarks to the House.

Point of Order

Sir CHARLES COURT: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, can we be advised on the motion before the House, because the honourable member actually moved a motion different from the one that has been circulated among us. I presume that you will want to incorporate the interpolations in the motion and we do not have a copy of it before us.

Mr Bryce: What a scurrilous statement!

The SPEAKER: Order! I was not completely aware that there was an interpolation. In retrospect, and having regard to the fact that the member for Ascot has done this, I believe that, in all probability, there are interpolations which will have to be incorporated in the motion. Because of this, as Speaker, I do not want to rule it out of order.

Sir Charles Court: We are not asking for that, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: However, I believe we can accept, in a practical fashion, the fact that the motion is 99 per cent in the same form as it was when it was handed to me as Speaker. Nevertheless this is a warning that when a motion is read, it should be read as such.

It has now been brought to my notice that the amendment is not signed, and therefore propose to discuss the matter briefly with my Clerks and while doing so I ask members to remain in their seats.

After consulting my Clerks I find that the situation is somewhat different from that which I was putting before the House in that I understand that in the past interpolations have been made that have not been incorporated in the motion moved. I also understand that, on occasions, amendments have not been signed at the time but were signed subsequently.

Speaker's Ruling

In the circumstances I rule that the motion is in order, and I warn the member for Balga that if he wishes to continue speaking next week he should ask the House for leave so to do.

Point of Order

Mr HARMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, if the member for Balga asks for leave to continue his speech next week I will need the concurrence of the House.

The SPEAKER: That is so.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr B. T. BURKE: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. I will follow your suggestion and ask leave of the House to continue my remarks at a later time.

The SPEAKER: The member for Balga seeks leave of the House to continue his speech on the next day of sitting. Is leave granted? If there is a dissentient voice leave cannot be granted. Is there any dissentient? As there is no dissentient voice leave is granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.14 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 15th April, 1975

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Presentation to Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator: Acknowledgment

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. Griffith): I have to announce that I have in company with several members, waited on His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator, and presented the

Address-in-Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, agreed to by this House, and that His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply—

Mr President and honourable members of the Legislative Council: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty The Queen, and for your Address-in-Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened Parliament.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

POLICE

John Martin Best: Assault Charge

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Police:

Further to my question without notice to the Minister for Justice on Thursday, the 10th April, 1975, and having regard to his reply, will the Minister institute proceedings to appeal against—

- (a) Magistrate C. A. Fisher's decision in the case, the Police Department v. John Martin Best, of J. M. Best Holdings Pty. Ltd., in which he found the defendant not guilty after he had admitted to the offence;
- (b) the awarding of costs amounting to \$150 against the Police Department?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

On behalf of the Minister for Police I thank the honourable member for prior notice of the question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (a) and (b) The decision is on the grounds of provocation and there appears to be no grounds for an appeal.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 26th March.

THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [4.45 p.m.]: The Opposition finds nothing wrong with the Bill's provisions which are not of a controversial nature. To refresh the memories of members I would point out that the Bill concerns amendments to the Friendly Societies Act which seek to make some laudable changes under which the societies will be given the opportunity to increase their good works because they will be able to erect and maintain holiday homes for the benefit of their subscribers. In addition, those lodges which are comparatively small will be able to amalgamate in order to obtain enough capital with which to erect and maintain the holiday homes.

The Bill will also allow the societies to carry out a function similar to that of insurance companies; that is, to give advances on policies which are worth more than \$500, although they cannot enter contracts beyond \$6 000 and they must leave \$200 in the accounts.

Another clause which will be of benefit to the societies and which, apparently, they themselves requested, contains a provision to enable more frequent valuations to be made to assess what members should contribute and what the societies should pay in the way of benefits.

The only clauses from which the societies' members will gain any mileage are clauses 3 and 4, clauses 1, 2, and 5 being merely machinery clauses. We support the Bill.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (West) [4.47 p.m.]: I wish to raise a query with the Minister. When the friendly societies are given the power to erect and maintain holiday homes, whom will the homes benefit? The Minister may not be able to supply the information at the second reading stage, but perhaps he could do so at the third reading stage.

I would also like him to indicate how many homes the societies believe they will be able to erect in the future, because I draw the attention of the Minister and the House to the fact that many organisations, such as unions, and so on, have had areas of land at Point Peron, near Rockingham, allocated to them, on some of which holiday homes have been built. I question whether these homes benefit the ordinary run-of-the-mill member of the organisation concerned.

It appears that the friendly societies would have many thousands of members all told, and if the societies are able to build three or four holiday homes each, this will not make a very significant contribution towards the provision of holiday homes for ordinary members; and this is a fairly important point. It could be said that over a period a large number of homes will be erected, but I rather think the situation will be similar to that of "jobs for the boys". It could well be a case of "holiday homes for the executives and a few people in the know".

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [4.49 p.m.]: Mr Abbey has raised a point which intrigues me. In his speech the Minister said that the first priority, as it were, regarding these homes, would be the members and their wives, etc., and then if any vacancies occurred, the general populace would be considered. However, I can envisage the problems referred to by Mr Abbey and I think that what he has said should be noted.

I am likewise intrigued by the clause covering the referral of the funds to an actuary. The Hon. Grace Vaughan said this provision was made at the instance of

the friendly societies, yet the Minister went to great pains to point out that the idea originated in his department. There seems to be a clash about where the matter originated but it is true that up to the present time the superannuation funds have had a circulatory effect, as it were, through reference to an actuary every five years.

It is a fact that the funds should be referred to an actuary more often to keep up with inflationary trends. Most actuarial valuations are now down to three years. The Bill states that the actuarial valuation is to be made at any time considered necessary by the Friendly Societies.

I hope the trustees of the superannuation fund do not overdo the actuarial valuations because it is very expensive to have them carried out, and although from the point of view of inflation the changes might appear to be paramount at the present time, in my opinion a little caution should be exercised in regard to the number of referrals, and regard should be had for the financial structures in the community at any time.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan) [4.52 p.m.]: Along with the Hon. Grace Vaughan, I support the Bill, particularly the concept of the provision of holiday homes.

During the debate Mr Abbey raised the question of holiday accommodation at Point Peron. Since 1958 I have been associated with holiday accommodation in two areas at Point Peron, and if the friendly societies run their holiday accommodation with the same degree of efficiency as do the Seamen's Union and Waterside Workers' Union—I can speak for no other organisations—I can assure the House they will be doing a very good job. Not only have the unions I mentioned provided holiday accommodation for their own members at minimal cost, but I can say without fear of contradiction that they have also provided holidays for hundreds of people outside the unions without cost.

If the Friendly Societies start in a small way and gradually increase their activities in this area, and if they do what those unions have done, people who would not otherwise be able to do so will be able to go away and enjoy a holiday at the least possible cost. A number of organisations in this State and other parts of Australia provide the same kind of service.

I commend the Bill to the House and hope it has a speedy passage.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [4.53 p.m.]: I thank members for their contributions to the debate on this small amendment to the Friendly Societies Act. In some respects it is an important Bill.

Mr Abbey raised a query as to who would benefit from the holiday homes. As pointed out in my second reading speech, friendly societies in the Eastern States of Australia have rendered worth-while assistance in providing such holiday homes. Subparagraph (1) of subsection (1) of the proposed new section 7 sets out who will benefit from the homes. It states—

- (i) for the purchase or use of land and buildings for the establishment, management and maintenance of holiday accommodation and ancillary facilities for the use of members and their families and the families of deceased members, and such other persons as the rules of the society may specify;

The Bill contains a definition of "Member". It is therefore clear that members and their families, and the families of deceased persons, in the first instance, will be in a position to use the holiday homes which are available, and secondly holiday homes may be made available to such other persons as the rules of the society may specify. It will be a matter for the societies as to who may use the holiday homes.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: Have they any land on which they can build the houses?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not know whether they have any land at the present time. I think the societies are building up their funds with the idea of purchasing land and building holiday homes on it at a future date. In the past, no legislation existed under which this could be done, and as I understand the situation no land has been accumulated because no power existed to build holiday homes.

Mr Gayfer referred to the provision for actuarial valuation which the department suggested be incorporated in the Bill in the interests of the friendly societies. It is proposed to reduce the interval between actuarial valuations to three years, and if that is found to be unsuitable the valuations may be carried out even at yearly intervals if the funds reach the stage where that is considered necessary. It is not intended that actuarial valuations be made just for the sake of having them made. The trustees will decide when an actuarial valuation is necessary to enable the funds to continue in financial order.

With those remarks I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 26th March.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.00 p.m.]: This is a very small Bill which amends five sections of the principal Act. The first section of the Act to be amended is section 41, and the amendment will allow local authorities to increase rates charged for the maintenance and servicing of sewerage schemes. In his second reading speech the Minister said no increase had been made to the rate since 1950, and the purpose of the amendment is to allow it to be increased from 3.5c in the dollar to 12c in the dollar on annual valuations, and from $\frac{3}{8}$ c to 3c in the case of unimproved capital valuations.

At first glance one would think the increase is reasonable, bearing in mind that no increase has been made since 1950 and that in the meantime we have experienced inflation, with rising wages and costs. Although I have not immediately available the areas in which rate increases have taken place, I point out that in all probability rates have increased in all local authority areas in Western Australia. However, ever so much more important than that is that there have been increases in valuations during that period of time. So the insignificant increases mentioned by the Minister are not so insignificant. The sewerage rate has been increased from 3.5c to 12c in the dollar on annual valuations—an increase of nearly 300 per cent. Similarly, the unimproved capital valuation rate has increased from $\frac{3}{8}$ c to 3c, and that is a pretty steep increase when one considers the increases in valuations which have occurred over the years.

I do not represent any of the local authorities which will be affected by this amendment, but I find they number 16 in all. The local authorities which have made use of the provisions of the Health Act to construct sewerage schemes are as follows—

Town of Narrogin
Denmark Shire
Corrigin Shire
Northam Shire
Wagin Shire
Katanning Shire
Mandurah Shire
Wanneroo Shire
Town of Gosnells
Town of Kalgoorlie
Carnarvon Shire
Cunderdin Shire
Dumbleyung Shire
Boulder Shire
Kent Shire
Dalwallinu Shire.

The local authorities which currently operate under this section of the Act are—

Town of Narrogin
Town of Kalgoorlie
Carnarvon Shire
Cunderdin Shire
Dumbleyung Shire
Boulder Shire
Kent Shire
Dalwallinu Shire.

I would like the Minister to tell us—because I think the House should know—just what this increase will mean in cents in the dollar since 1950, taking into consideration the increase in valuations which has occurred during that 25-year period. I have lived on my property for 14 years, and during that period the local authority has decreased the rate in the dollar because of the high valuations we are laden with every three years. The valuation of my property has probably increased by 500 or 600 per cent over the last 14 years. I cannot speak authoritatively, but I would imagine taxation valuations have increased similarly in country areas, and that the amount being recouped for maintenance and servicing of sewerage works has increased by an amount which was not anticipated in 1950, but which represents a real increase today. I hope the Minister is able to give me the information I require in that respect.

Section 158 of the Act is also to be amended by this Bill. The amendment increases the fee payable to local authorities to cover the supervision of standards of hygiene and accommodation in lodging houses. The fee has not been increased since it was set at \$2 in 1911, and it is now to be increased to \$20 on a sliding scale having regard for the size of the establishment. I have no objection at all to that amendment. Proposed new section 182A provides that the Governor may make regulations for the purposes of proposed new subsection (13) of section 182 which deals with the ventilation of space set aside for more than three vehicles.

The amendment to section 182 of the Act is most necessary in my opinion because, as I understand the situation, the amendment is directly related to subsection (7) (c) and (d). The marginal note to section 182 is, "Definition of nuisances", and the paragraphs to which I have referred read as follows—

(c) is not with regard to the inmates sufficiently supplied with fresh air; or

(d) is not so ventilated as to render harmless, as far as practicable, all gases, fumes, dust, or other impurities generated in the course of the work carried on therein; or

Those provisions deal with buildings, generally. The amendment is designed in the main to deal with underground or undercover car parks, and also home garages in which three vehicles are kept.

I accept it is good that underground car parks should be covered because a great quantity of fumes could be detrimental to the health of people using the car parks particularly in moist and heavy weather similar to that we are experiencing today. The facilities should be constructed in a proper manner to ensure that fumes do not build up.

However, I cannot see that this amendment to the Health Act to include garages constructed underneath homes, will have a great bearing on the elimination of accidents. As an illustration, I point out that if a person is tuning up a single car in a garage without proper ventilation and the motor is left running for any period of time his health could be detrimentally affected. He could even die if the garage is not sufficiently ventilated; and especially if it is a rainy day and he is using electricity for an extended period of time.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Isn't this generally covered under the uniform building by-laws?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, that is the point I am coming to. I am giving illustrations to make my point. Secondly, at present we see some very luxurious split level homes being constructed on sloping blocks, and these are constructed in such a manner as to leave a considerable space under the house. I visit such a place regularly. The owners of the home have a space beneath it large enough to hold six cars, a pool table, and a cellar—all in one area.

I think it is a bit silly to include this provision in the Health Act. It would be better to include it in the uniform building code. The uniform building code should be amended to conform with the regulations which will be made under the Health Act, so there will be no doubt that underground garages below homes must be ventilated to a standard sufficient to enable people to enjoy this space.

In the home to which I have referred, two or three cars could be started up while another person is playing pool. As far as I recall this area has no ventilator because it was initially constructed as a cellar. As an afterthought the people knocked out the front walls and installed garage doors; and now they have space for six cars, a pool table, and a cellar, and there is still plenty of room left. I know the uniform building code does not fall within the responsibilities of the Minister for Health, but I would urge him to refer the matter to the responsible Minister to ensure that it is tidied up. Many building inspectors are concerned more with the building code than with the Health Act and, therefore, we should go about achieving the desired result in the proper manner.

I view this legislation as being similar to saying, "Children shall not fall into swimming pools and drown"; because that

situation applies in respect of the amendment. Many young people would not be aware of the danger of motorcars in poorly ventilated places, but if garages are constructed in such a manner as to allow for a cross-flow ventilation I do not think we would have much to fear.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Of course, there is a similar provision in the Act now in section 182 (7) (d).

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I read out that provision. Paragraph (d) is virtually the operative provision in the Health Act in this respect, because it deals with buildings, generally; but now we are being specific and including garages and car-parks, which are outside the general range of buildings.

I imagine this legislation would also cover aeroplane hangers, because aeroplanes would be tuned up in those places.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Provided, of course, you could call an aeroplane a vehicle.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: One can. If the Minister looks at the Firearms Act he will find that an aeroplane is a vehicle.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I think it is, too.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: A push bike is also a vehicle.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: A wheelbarrow!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: A person who is found to be under the influence of liquor while in charge of a push bike is subject to the same fine as a person who is found to be in charge of a motor vehicle in the same circumstances.

As I have said, proposed new section 182A makes provision for regulations to be made in respect of new subsection (13) of section 182.

The proposed amendment to section 191, which relates to offensive trades, also contains an increase in registration fees. This makes provision for the substitution of \$100 for \$10—which is the present maximum levy for such registration. There are just one or two questions I would like to ask on this aspect.

I can see the merit in the proposed amendment, and although \$100 is the maximum, it is not necessarily the amount that will be levied. One could ask, however, what would be the position in connection with the Midland Junction Abattoir, or Robb Jetty—as offensive trades—as compared with, for example, a piggery? What would be the registration fee in each of these cases? Will it be graduated accordingly? Before the legislation was drawn up there must have been some ideas in the minds of the Minister or the departmental officers.

We could also consider the example of the local fish and chip shop and compare it with a crayfish or prawn processing works. In such cases would the fee be \$10 for one and \$100 for the other or would it be \$100 for both?

Another example that I could mention is what I consider to be one of the most offensive trades in Western Australia. I refer to a small insignificant plant that manufactures chemicals. All the industry established at Kwinana seems to get the blame for the acrid smell which emanates from this small works.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It was established at Kenwick.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The plant was at Kenwick, where it killed all the vegetation.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Not quite.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: At the time the plant was moved to Kwinana, some 10 or 12 years ago, the Press seemed to blow up the fact that the emission from this plant was killing all the vegetation.

I certainly agree with the views expressed by the property owners at Kenwick who said that the emissions were rusting the fences on their properties. This was very true, because brand new galvanised fences that have been constructed around Kwinana have been rusted by the emissions from this plant; the galvanising has been burnt right off.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The salt air would have had some effect. I represented Kenwick when all this was going on.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is still a honky sort of place. As I have said, most of the industry throughout Kwinana gets the blame for the acrid fumes which are emitted from this small works. I did not intend to go into any great detail on the question of this chemical works. One could, however, compare the manner in which it creates a nuisance as an offensive trade as against a fellmongering work several miles up the road. These works are of equal size. What I would like to know is whether the place that creates the greater nuisance will be charged the same fee as the small fellmongering work which does not create quite such a nuisance.

Apart from those comments I support the legislation, though I would like some answers to the questions I have raised.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [5.20 p.m.]: I rise to support the measure if only because the Minister saw fit to mention my name in the last paragraph of his second reading speech where he indicated that I should welcome the legislation.

I am not sure whether I welcome the measure. I do support it, because I feel it is one that will go part of the way towards alleviating the concern felt by local authorities in respect of their financial commitments in relation to the carrying out of the various functions which they are committed to carry out by the provisions of the Local Government Act.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: And other legislation.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is so. The reason the Minister mentioned my name was that I had written to him in response to some approaches that had been made to me by certain local authorities asking whether I could induce the Government to make a greater contribution to them to assist in their carrying out the additional functions for which they have become responsible as a result of the various pieces of legislation that have been passed in recent times. For example, one of the local authorities referred to the ever-increasing burden of work it was having to carry out as a result of the following pieces of legislation—

- Lighting and Ventilation Requirements (1971).
- Food Hygiene Regulations (1973).
- Noise Abatement Act and Regulations (1974).
- Liquor Act and Regulations (1970).
- Hairdressing Establishment Regulations (1972).
- Private Hospital Regulations (1970).
- Public Buildings (Electrical) Regulations (1970).
- Caravans and Camps Regulations (1970).
- Laundries and Bathrooms Regulations (1972).
- Cigarettes (Labelling) Regulations (1970).
- Construction Camps Regulations (1970).
- Infectious Diseases (Inspection of persons) Regulations (1971).

These are some of the pieces of legislation that have been upgraded or introduced since 1970, which have placed a burden on local authorities and which has prompted their request to me to see whether or not the Government cannot make some sort of contribution.

I wrote to the Minister and he indicated that with the responsibility of administering the various Acts went the responsibility to finance them. The particular local authority to which I referred did not quite see eye to eye with the Minister in respect of this matter. However, after looking at the Bill I find that in two of the three

cases the fees that can be charged have not been altered since 1911. It would seem, therefore, that on this analogy the local authority would not be able to look forward to any increase before the year 2034—that is if we consider the previous time element.

Seriously, however, I think the upgrading of the fees that can be charged is contrary to what I understood Mr Thompson to say when he referred to the fact that they were steep increases. It does not mean the local authorities have to charge the maximum prescribed fees, because what the provision actually says is that they can charge certain fees not exceeding the amounts stipulated.

In other words, from my observation of the Bill—and the Minister will correct me if I am wrong—it is not intended that all local authorities will immediately increase the sanitary fees to 12c and 3c respectively as provided in clause 3. This merely makes provision for some leeway for years to come. In other words it will be some years before it will be necessary to again amend this legislation.

Certain local authorities may see fit to charge only 1c instead of the 3c and, in a couple of years' time, they may increase it to 1½c and eventually to the 3c that is allowed. We reach the state of affairs that if the financial situation is such that another amendment to the Act is necessary we will have the same legislation before us.

That is the situation as I see it in relation to clauses 3 and 4; not necessarily that every local authority will immediately increase its fees to the limit specified in the Bill.

Clause 7 provides that the amount that can be charged now is \$100 instead of \$10 or such lesser amount that may be prescribed.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: This is answered in the last paragraph of my second reading speech.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am sure it is. Clauses 5 and 6 concern the ventilation of car parks. I have made certain inquiries in the time that has been available to me and the people of whom I have made my inquiries, including the master builders, expressed some interest in the matter. They have all indicated that the legislation is desirable and that the buildings—particularly those buildings in which there are car parks, and not necessarily public car parks but customer car parks—should be ventilated, because there will be a heavy build-up of carbon monoxide. One of the comments that has been made to me in respect of this matter is that it will mean the setting up of another Government department to ensure that the legislation is policed and because of this, one or two people have expressed some reluctance to this provision. They feel that while the legislation is necessary the

creation of another Government department to police the Act should be avoided if the policing can be adequately carried out under the existing set-up.

All in all, the people from whom I have made my inquiries have no objection to the legislation and accordingly I support the measure.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [5.29 p.m.]: I view clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill with some alarm, because they affect two of the largest areas of my electorate—the Town of Kalgoorlie and the Shire of Boulder. Although the increases provided do not appear to be very great, I do feel that an increase of 400 per cent in both cases is considerable.

Like the Leader of the Opposition, I also ask the Minister whether he could give some indication as to what the average increase will be in some of these areas. I cannot be as optimistic as Mr Clive Griffiths and say that the shires will not shift overnight to the maximum of the charges prescribed. It has been my experience in a number of cases that if one gives somebody an inch he will take a yard—or should I say if one gives somebody a millimetre he will take a centimetre?

I know that the rates in my electorate are exceptionally high, particularly the rates in the Shire of Boulder where a sewerage system is under construction. I am frightened to hazard a guess as to where the position will finish up in the future.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: We might all end up in the sewerage system.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: I agree. The increase in costs is causing trouble to local authorities, and by the same token increases in charges will cause many people to get into difficulties. Although I acknowledge that charges have to be increased and that most Governments are reluctant to impose such increases in excessive amounts, I do not suppose we can do very much about these increases except to examine them carefully.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is a simple answer; the shires will only charge the amount they require to fund their commitments.

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

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 20th March.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [5.32 p.m.]: The matters dealt with by this Bill are largely domestic to the University of Western Australia.

I am advised that they had been considered and approved by the previous Government, the Tonkin Government, 12 months ago; therefore my party has no objections to the proposals contained therein.

THE HON. M. McALEER (Upper West) [5.33 p.m.]: In supporting this Bill which is really a tidying up arrangement, I would like to make one or two comments. I refer to the proposed amendment to section 41 which provides that the University of Western Australia may present a report of its activities separate from the Auditor-General's report, which is necessarily issued many months after the end of the university year.

I believe that is the intention of the university to present reports on its activities quite soon after the end of the academic year, because if they are not presented at that stage there is a serious loss of interest in such reports.

All members who have had experience of reading reports of Government departments, boards, or local authorities which are at least 12 months—and often up to two years—out of date in some parts will appreciate the loss of interest. I would like to commend the University of Western Australia in making this special effort to get its reports out at the earliest possible moment.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [5.34 p.m.]: I intended to comment on the very point that has been raised by the previous speaker. I was rather horrified to learn that where previously the University of Western Australia was given three months after the end of the university year to present its reports, it now seeks to have the time amended to "as soon as practicable after". I agree that three months after the end of the university year might prove to be awkward, as this period takes in the Christmas holidays and the staff might experience trouble in preparing the report in time. However, I think the wording "as soon as practicable after" is too wide.

I suggest to the Minister that while we should agree to the wording "as soon as practicable after" the date should be set at not later than the 30th June each year; in other words, the period should be extended by three or four months. I think that deadlines should be adopted when it comes to presenting reports to Parliament. I would hate to think that the income tax legislation contained a provision with the words "as soon as practicable after". I certainly think that guidelines should be laid down for the university. Other than that, I agree with the amendments in the Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [5.35 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the measure. I hope that the Bill will be passed in its existing form. I do not know why some people have taken it for granted that the period will be longer than three months; in fact, it is not. To some people the minimum always seems to become the maximum. The term "as soon as practicable after" means that the university will be trying to get out its report within three weeks of the end of the university year. That is highly desirable and encourages efficiency. The Bill ought to be left as it is.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 22nd April.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.39 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 15th April, 1975

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

CANNING RIVER RECLAMATION

*Relocation of Kwinana Freeway
Extension: Petition*

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [4.31 p.m.]: I present the following petition relating to the relocation and redesign of the Kwinana Freeway extension—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled

We, the undersigned citizens of Australia do humbly petition the Parliament of Western Australia that it might take such steps as may be necessary to relocate and redesign the proposed extensions to the Kwinana Freeway, so that no part of the Canning River or its foreshores may be used for roadways. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

I have signed the petition to indicate that it is in conformity with the rules of the House. The petition contains 3 286 signatures.