

Legislative Council

Thursday, 1 November 1984

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ELECTORAL REFORM

Petitions

On motions by Hon. Garry Kelly, the following petition bearing the signatures of 215 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

The Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

WE, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia request the following electoral reforms:

1. The right of each elector to cast a vote equal in value to each other vote cast in elections of Members of State Parliament.
2. That Legislative Councillors be elected to represent regions using a system of proportional representation such as is used in Senate elections.
3. The retirement of half of the Members of the Legislative Council from each region at every election. (ie: simultaneous elections).

And that the above reforms be decided by the people voting at a referendum.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will every pray.

(See paper No. 251.)

A similar petition was presented by Hon. K. Hallahan (204 persons).

(See paper No. 248.)

CREDIT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Credit (Administration) Bill.
Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Consumer Affairs), and transmitted to the Assembly.
2. Equal Opportunity Bill.
Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and passed.

SMALL BUSINESS GUARANTEE BILL

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [2.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide authority for the execution of guarantees for the repayment of loans made to owners of small businesses. The proposed scheme resembles one established by legislation in New South Wales.

The main feature of the Bill is as follows—

Clause 3 defines "small business" as a business enterprise that firstly—

is carried on for the purposes of manufacturing or processing goods or for any other prescribed purpose;

For the purposes of determining the eligibility of the applicant's activities regulations to the proposed Act will detail specific industry classifications in accordance with the Australian Standard Industrial Classification—ASIC—published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Specific reference to the ASIC industry classifications in the regulations eliminates the need to define eligible activities by way of a wordy definition which may be open to interpretation and legal argument.

Industries embraced under the scheme include manufacturing, processing, mining and mineral exploration, construction, transport and storage, the wholesale and retail trade, and a wide range of service industries. Almost all trading businesses will be eligible with the exception of agriculture, fishing, forestry investment businesses, financial institutions, hospitals, and a number of personal services.

Specifically excluded also will be a business which would qualify for loan or grant assistance under section 14(3)(m) of the Western Australian Tourism Commission Act, 1983.

The second part of the "small business" definition in clause 3 is a business enterprise that, in the opinion of the Minister for Industrial Development—

- (i) is a small business enterprise;
- (ii) is not a subsidiary of, or does not form part of a larger enterprise; and
- (iii) is managed personally by at least one of the persons entitled to a share of the profits of the enterprise.

This definition is reasonably similar to the definition of "small business" included in the Small Business Development Corporation Act, 1983, and I believe provides some flexibility to the Minister administering the scheme.

Clause 4 (1) states the Minister may execute a guarantee in favour of a lender for a loan made to the owner of a small business, provided he is satisfied that—

- (a) the sole ground for the prior rejection of the loan proposal by the lender was the insufficiency of the security proposed by the borrower and in all other respects the lender accepted the loan proposal as a viable proposition; and
- (b) the loan moneys are required for capital expenditure or working capital for the establishment of a small business or the expansion or diversification of an existing small business.

Guarantees will not be available—

for the purchase or takeover of an existing business.

to refinance existing debts;

to overcome a short-term liquidity problem; or

if the applicant has adequate business or personal assets to enable the loan to be obtained under the lender's usual guidelines.

Other criteria of a general nature not included in the Bill, but which will be considered when assessing applications for assistance include whether—

The proposal will mean a net increase in employment opportunities;

the applicant is viable and capable of servicing existing borrowings and the new borrowings requested;

the business owner has a reasonable level of equity in the business having regard to the circumstances.

Although clause 4(1) refers to the execution of a guarantee in favour of a bank or another person or body of persons, whether corporate or unincorporate, emphasis will be given to

implementing the scheme through the trading banks, and guarantees will normally be available only through this source. However, consideration may be given to providing guarantees to other financial institutions in special circumstances.

Clause 4(2) restricts the amount of guarantee assistance for each applicant to an amount prescribed in the regulations. It is proposed to limit the guarantee assistance to \$100 000 with terms up to 10 years. Guarantee assistance will normally be restricted to term loans or overdraft accommodation and up to 100 per cent of the loan may be guaranteed. The interest rate charged and the terms of lending must be acceptable to the Minister.

Clause 4(3) limits the total amount of guarantee assistance which may be provided under the scheme, excluding guarantees no longer in force, to such amount as the Treasurer may from time to time declare by notice published in the *Government Gazette*.

Clause 5(2)(a) gives the Minister authority to direct the lender to take such securities as required from the applicant for repayment of the loan.

Clause 4(2)(b) provides that the guarantee shall not be enforceable against the Minister until the lender has taken appropriate recovery action under all other securities held by the lender in respect of the guaranteed debt, therefore, the State would only be called upon to meet a shortfall—if any—on the guaranteed loan, in the event of the failure of the business, and after all other securities held by the lender are realised.

The operation of the scheme is as follows—

Applicants present a detailed proposal for a loan to a bank or financial institution;

if the proposal is not approved, solely on the grounds of insufficient security, the applicant may then complete and submit to the bank or financial institution a form of application for a small business guarantee. The form of application will be available from the banks, or from the Small Business Development Corporation;

the bank or lending institution assesses the application in respect of the eligibility criteria, and if satisfied completes an appropriate application form for guarantee assistance. This form, together with a copy of the application received from the applicant, is forwarded to the Small Business Development Corporation;

Department of Industrial Development evaluation officers attached to the Small Business Development Corporation will examine applications received from the banks or lending institutions to see whether they comply with

Government policy and report and recommend to the Minister those applications which warrant approval;

guarantees issued under the scheme are to be executed by the Minister, and are only collateral security to the lender's primary security taken over the assets of the applicant.

Compared to guarantee or residual indemnity assistance available under the Industry (Advances) Act, the scheme is not restricted to the narrow range of industries as defined in that Act, and provides assistance to nearly all types of small businesses.

The scheme is targeted to assist small businesses at the time of greatest need either to start up a new business or to expand operations of an existing business.

Other advantages of the scheme include—

Removing uncertainties as to which industries may qualify for assistance;

maintaining the existing client/bank relationship as all approaches for assistance must be made through the applicant's bank which will administer the lending in the normal manner;

facilitating access to finance on reasonable terms by small business;

reducing administration procedures by the State and the time involved in giving a firm decision on applications received.

The scheme is not simply to assist small businesses in the metropolitan area and is to operate on a State-wide basis, including areas which may be considered as remote.

All branches of the major banks throughout the State will be provided with full details of the scheme, and owners of small businesses, even in remote areas, may apply for assistance under the scheme through their local bank.

The Government sees this Bill as another firm step on the path to providing worthwhile support to small business. As such it is expected the Bill will lead to positive results in expanding the small business sector and the creation of more employment opportunities.

I therefore commend this Bill to the House.

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

DISTRICT COURT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

DENTAL PROSTHETISTS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 31 October.

HON. GARRY KELLY (South Metropolitan) [2.46 p.m.]: My contribution to this debate will be fairly brief. Much of the debate by those opposed to the Bill has been absurd. Members have followed the irrational approach which has been generated by the Australian Dental Association. I have a pile of letters from dentists who have made some outrageous comments regarding the proposition that dental technicians should be able to deal directly with the public. I cannot believe that the objections which the dentists have can be taken seriously, or that those opposed to the Bill in this House can be taken seriously.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! The member is trying to make a speech. Audible conversation is unparliamentary and unacceptable.

Hon. **GARRY KELLY**: I objected last night when Hon. Phillip Pendal was making an outrageous claim that allowing dental technicians to deal directly with the public is equivalent to a car mechanic performing brain surgery. If that is the sort of thing which has characterised the debate this far, I do not think this House should be hoodwinked into going along with it.

Hon. **P. G. Pendal**: That was my point; not the dental lobby's.

Hon. **GARRY KELLY**: I realize that, but it is in keeping with their approach.

Hon. **P. G. Pendal**: I got a little extravagant there.

Hon. **GARRY KELLY**: I am glad we agree on something.

Hon. **P. G. Pendal**: It is about neurosurgeons.

Several members interjected.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order!

Hon. **GARRY KELLY**: I could understand it if Western Australia was the first jurisdiction in a comparable country to adopt this legislation. I could then understand some of the entrenched opposition to it. But let us face it, this legislation has been around in Tasmania since the 1950s, and it applies in New Zealand. I understand it applies also in Great Britain. In those places people are still living. There has not been a noticeable outbreak of oral cancer. In fact, the point I tried to make to Mr Pendal last evening is that if his story about oral cancer were true, surely there would have to be an increase in cancers in those jurisdictions which allow dental technicians to deal directly with the public.

As I understand it, the incidence of oral cancer has in fact declined over recent decades. On a statistical basis, to say that allowing dental technicians to deal directly with the public will lead to an increase in oral cancer is fatuous. There is no evidence to support it.

Dental technicians have been allowed to deal with the public in New South Wales for approximately 12 years. Surely over that time, if the fears which are held by the dental profession here have any substance, there would have been some indication in New South Wales of an increase in mouth disorders and, in particular, in oral cancer.

The other point which has aroused a great deal of objection and opposition is the so-called grandfather clause. This Bill is simply making legal what people are in fact doing. It is making legal the practice by which people who want dentures go direct to dental technicians in ever-increasing numbers. In any transition it is ludicrous to expect that dental technicians who have been trading directly with the public for many years should all of a sudden have to go back to a tertiary institution and obtain a paper qualification. Paper qualifications are important and they are an indication that a professional person has been trained in a certain discipline; but in this case the application of the grandfather clause is rather limited anyway. However, to expect someone who has been dealing with the public and producing dentures for many years to obtain a paper qualification for something for which he is well and truly qualified by experience is ridiculous.

I direct the attention of the House to the criteria which will apply to the grandfather clause. First of all, the grandfather clause will apply for only 12 months, so that once the legislation is proclaimed there will be 12 months within which dental technicians who wish to enter into the practice of dealing directly with the public may register and be licensed. The grandfather clause is for only 12 months; it is not for forever and a day.

In his speech Hon. Peter Wells asked what criteria would be used to determine that technicians should be registered. The criteria will be as follows: The prosthetists must have been continually engaged dealing directly with the public for not less than five years and the criteria will include signed declarations by the prosthetist or the technician—it is a statutory declaration, so it is made on oath—that he has practised in that way for over five years; properly kept records of accounts, taxation returns, and signed declarations from clients over a five-year period must also be produced. Therefore, a technician will be allowed to register

if he has satisfied that combination of criteria. I think that is reasonable.

Hon. P. H. Wells: As far as the work of a professional person is concerned, who will examine it to see whether the work that has been done over the last five years was done correctly?

Hon. GARRY KELLY: A tribunal, board, or committee, will be set up. It will have input from the Commissioner of Health. It will not license people willy nilly, so there will be safeguards and licensing will not be automatic.

In conclusion, I will not traverse the technical aspects as to why technicians should be covered. However, we should ask ourselves what will be the situation if this Bill is not passed.

Hon. P. H. Wells: The same as it is now.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Precisely! The situation will be the same as it is at present. People will be going illegally to technicians to get their dentures and the technicians will not be registered. There will be no overseeing or regulatory body to monitor the technician's performance, so the present situation will obtain. In other words, there will be little or no control over the actions of dental technicians dealing directly with the public.

A little commonsense should be applied here. Several jurisdictions have been named in this country and overseas where technicians are allowed to practise in this way and nothing untoward has happened. Therefore, all reasonable expectations are that nothing untoward will happen here.

Commonsense must be applied. When this Bill is passed the sun will still rise in the morning and set in the evening. People will be able to obtain their dentures at a reasonable price. There will not be a rapid increase in pathology of the mouth, whether it is cancer or any other disease. Once again I do not think that the opposition which the dentists have mounted can be taken seriously.

I ask the House to look at the practicalities of what it is doing if it rejects the Bill. Nothing will change, except that there will be no legislative control over what is happening, so by passing the Bill the Commissioner of Health will have a say as to who will and who will not be able to deal directly with the public.

For those commonsense reasons, I ask the House to pass the Bill which has been presented by the Government.

HON. JOHN WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [2.56 p.m.]: I am baffled by the last remark of Hon. Garry Kelly. I have never heard it said on this side in this Chamber or outside that the Opposition intends to reject the Bill.

Hon. Garry Kelly: I did not say that either.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Yes, the member did; he said it twice. That is not my purpose in standing on my feet this afternoon to speak to the Bill.

Hon. Garry Kelly: If I said that, I hope I am wrong.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: I have not been here a great length of time, but I have been here long enough to be able to pass the remark I am about to make: Apart from the Dog Act and the Dividing Fences Act I have never heard so much heat generated by quite a small and innocuous Bill.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Hear, Hear!

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: We are in agreement again. Hon. Garry Kelly agrees with Mr Pental; Mr Pental agrees with him; and now we are agreed.

Much heat has been generated because of a lot of misconceptions, and the misconceptions come from one side desiring this legislation, because a few of them have made promises to get this in, and the other side is thinking, "Let us think what the snags are".

I was thrilled when Mr McKenzie told us he has had his present set of choppers for 20 years and they were made by a dental technician. I assure him that the bits and pieces I have in my mouth have been changed seven times in 20 years. They were all made by dental technicians, but designed by dentists. This is where the great point at issue lies in the debate.

I would not for one moment suggest that the dental technician is not a very skilled person; nor would I suggest that he cannot make a full denture. By a full denture, I mean a full denture. However, not for one moment would I suggest that that technician could make a partial denture without the design co-operation of a dentist.

Hon. Phillip Pental mentioned yesterday that he had spoken to and received a letter from Professor Lewis. I have spoken to Professor Lewis and I learnt much from him, much that I did not know previously about partial dentures and their fitting.

It is pathologically true that the mouth can change shape within a day or even within less than a day. I have proof in my eternal bank debit that my mouth changes shape from time to time and adjustments are necessary. The design of partial dentures is an engineering feat. If I could use a simple analogy, it would be this: We see some beautiful brickwork around the State in various buildings. We have what I consider to be a very beautiful Narrows Bridge which you, Sir, use

daily. The people who poured the concrete and sank the casings to construct that bridge were every bit as responsible for it as those who designed it.

Hon. Peter Dowding: In which portion of the mouth does this bridge figure?

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Bridgework. My point is that the designer and the skilled craftsman combine their skills to give one the end result.

One or two things have to be said. All members of the Opposition whom I have heard speaking so far may have clouded the issue a little, but if we look at their speeches very carefully we see they came to the point where this contentious clause about grandfathers comes in. I wondered where it was generating from, and then I realised that if the man were perfectly competent as a dental technician, he would have the most awful job proving that over the last five years he had been working legally. How will he prove that? He will not ask Mr McKenzie to go back to him because Mr McKenzie has not been back to him for 20 years. Will he have to approach each patient and say, "Would you make a statement that I have done this and that for you in that time?". The man is in a cleft stick, poor chap. He has been operating illegally. Will we go down to the Taxation Department and say, "Can we have a look at the various returns to establish the fact that so-and-so was in business five years ago?" It is a technical legal point which requires some thinking about.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: How did they establish it in other cases, such as with the Chiropractors Act?

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: They had already been registered.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: Well, before they were registered?

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: There was a register of chiropractors containing names of chiropractors who, in the majority of cases, had attended the American colleges which were not recognised in Australia at the time.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: Mr Martinovich had not been to any American colleges.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Mr Martinovich had a reputation, I suggest, over 20 years, and was recognised as a practising chiropractor. He advertised that fact.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: Wasn't he in the same position as the dental technicians today?

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: No, dental technicians today do not advertise, but the old Martinovichs used to advertise their skills. There

is a slight difference there. It has been hard to find reliable precedents.

The Tasmanian precedent of 27 years ago is available. The legislation has worked excellently in that State. I was in Tasmania recently and made inquiries there and found that it has worked very well but, from the word go in Tasmania—this is a fact that members are not bringing out—there was no grandfather clause in the legislation. They had to be qualified and I know why. A little more recently than 27 years ago, I discovered that the South Australian Parliament had the equivalent to dental prosthetists' legislation. The South Australian Parliament made this determination on 21 September 1983.

Hon. P. H. Wells: Comparatively recently?

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: It was comparatively recently, yes. I do not care whether the Government was Liberal, Labor, or Callithumpian! I am rather concerned about what the SA Government did about it when it discussed the Bill. I am not for one minute suggesting—please do not misinterpret this—that we should do the same thing; however, SA referred the matter to a Select Committee for inquiry and report. The report was brought out and I will not go through it. For members' reference it is the report of the Select Committee on the Dentists' Act Amendment Bill 1983.

I would recommend that members think about two or three paragraphs. Paragraph 3 says—

The Dental Board should be responsible for the registration of clinical dental technicians acting on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

That is the same thing as we are doing. It continues as follows—

and a separate register should be established for clinical dental technicians.

There is nothing wrong with that. It goes on—

and applicants for registration should be required to have completed a number of courses.

It then goes on to state that the courses shall be as follows—

- (a) This course should be operated by the Department of Technical and Further Education at the School of Paradental Studies at Gilles Plains.
- (b) The intake to the course in 1984 should be 10 students with a further 10 students commencing training in 1985.
- (c) Subsequently, the South Australian Health Commission's proposed Dental

Policy Committee should study the effectiveness of the programme.

- (d) The course should be open to all dental technicians who wish to apply, but applicants would need to satisfy such other mature age entry requirements as the educational institution may specify.
- (e) The course should be between 120 and 150 hours duration of supervised clinical experience augmented by seminars at which candidates would be required to make presentations.
- (f) The course should be funded on the "user pays" principle. The estimated cost of conducting each course is \$12 000 to \$15 000, or \$1 200 to \$1 500 per student.
- (g) A certificate of proficiency should be presented by the Department of Technical and Further Education upon successful completion of the course.

I cannot see any fear for any dental technician in Western Australia because the Opposition and the Government have joined forces in saying that the dental technicians are perfectly competent people. They are good people, and they know what they are doing. I do not disagree with that point one iota. What has a dental technician got to fear in taking a preferred examination as soon as he wants to, as soon as it has been laid down or established? They are important matters for dental technicians. They say they have not got a worry in the world about this legislation, that they could do the job standing on their heads, or words to that effect—I do not mean physically, but metaphorically. We have nothing to fear by including that provision to protect the public.

The final worrying point I have is that I am only a consumer of dentistry. I think Hon. Fred McKenzie said last evening that dentists used standover tactics and frightened people. I cannot remember the exact words he used. I inform Mr McKenzie that dentists have always frightened me, yet no profession since the 1900s has worked harder at reducing pain than has the dental profession. It was unheard of years ago for a person even to have a filling. The tooth was given a quick yank out and that was the end of the problem. They were popularly known as "fang farriers". They used to drill teeth with a pedal operated, not electric, drill, and it would crunch through one's teeth and burn one's gums, and that made one apprehensive about dentists.

Hon. P. H. Wells: Are you trying to turn people off dentists?

Hon. P. G. Pandal: I can feel it now!

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Dentists have improved no end. Once the ultimate torture was to have a dentist send a drill through the front of one's teeth in order to get one to talk about something. It is now 1984, and if people have any apprehensions about dentists, as it were, I can assure them that they will drill one's teeth gently and one will not hear anything. My dentist even clamps earphones over patients' ears and the patient listens to a piano concerto or another tape. This is rather good because it is the sound of the drill that worries the patient. A patient knows the drill is creating a hole somewhere or excavating a bit of enamel in the mouth.

Hon. P. G. Pental: They won't do that for Mr McKenzie when he goes to the dentist!

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Mr McKenzie is a fortunate man. He has a robust constitution. He has an oral cavity which does not very often change shape internally.

Hon. P. H. Wells: A nice smile!

Hon. P. G. Pental: He is not denying it either.

Hon. G. E. Masters: More than that, he plays to the gallery.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: All of us would remember that good series "Steptoe and Son" and in which one of the Steptoes bought a cart full of reject dentures and tried to sell them.

What does worry me about this whole matter is that we are not experts in this field. We do not have the expertise to discuss the highly professional technicalities. I am worried that the Council of Health Professions of Western Australia sounded a warning on 24 September and expressed its grave concern about this Bill. All that the council based its concern upon was that it wanted adequate training or proof of competence. I cannot see that we are poles apart in this House. Everyone has agreed that the technicians do a good job and that they are part of a dental team. Nothing in this Bill forbids them carrying on as they have been doing in making dentures and partial dentures, and repairing dentures. They provide a very good service, particularly at weekends.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They have not officially been allowed to deal directly with the public, they have been doing it underhand.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: That is correct. It is alleged they have been doing it underhand. When I spoke to the technicians, they admitted that some of their members had carried out this sort of practice. I accept their word and Mr McKenzie's word. I doubt very much that any technician worth his salt would object to being examined to

find out whether he satisfies a certain standard. My conversations with representatives of their association have led me to believe they would welcome such an examination. I think that is the only point at issue with this grandfather clause.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They will get that.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: It takes too long. In another Statute I have here from Tasmania, it says such people should stand aside from that practice until they pass the examination. To stand aside did not mean, as Mr Kelly incorrectly said, that they would be left destitute. There is still work available for them to do. There is no point in ploughing over this ground, but I have a letter here from a dental technician who objects most strongly to the fact that the technicians want this avenue of work. That is one technician, and he objects because he was not consulted by his colleagues.

So it is not all black and white; we have some very grey areas in this and I shall be interested to see how the Committee deals with this problem, having received a fair warning from health professionals, and I am not talking about the dentists. I am referring to the Council of Health Professions of Western Australia. If we disregard that body's advice, we, as a House, should take over the whole of the Health Commission because there is no problem we cannot solve—we are saying professional advice is not worth the paper it is written on.

I support the Bill. I do not intend to go into a long diatribe about it because it is essentially a Committee Bill.

HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [3.15 p.m.]: I rise to support this Bill. As Hon. John Williams said, for a small Bill it has created a lot of controversy. That is understandable because the dentists believe themselves to have been wronged in the matter. Unfortunately, their campaign has taken on a level of almost religious fervour and has perhaps overstepped the mark on numerous occasions.

Earlier this year I met the representatives of both the dental profession and the technicians. Different gentlemen introduced me to each group. The person who introduced me to the dentists was a man of some standing in the history of health administration in this State, and the other was a representative of the WA Chamber of Commerce and Industry who handles business affairs for the technicians. Both groups were introduced to me as free enterprise people, the epitome of what the Liberal Party is about. They then proceeded to tell me what terrible people those on the other side were.

Basically both are small business people working through their own enterprise and efforts. This probably gives people on my side of politics a problem to grapple with in relation to which side to take, if sides are to be taken. I do not believe sides should be taken, but a tremendous amount of pressure has been put on people on all sides of politics by certain members of the dental profession to turn this straightforward Bill relating to the ability to provide a health service into a political argument.

It has been put to me by certain dentists that all dental technicians are rabid socialists. It has been said also that all dentists are card-carrying Liberals. Those are propositions I cannot accept for one good reason—my dentist, whom I respect, is a Labor Party voter and makes no secret of telling me that every time I go to his surgery. I stick with him, but he certainly cannot be held to be a strong supporter of the Liberal Party.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: At what point of the treatment does he convey that to you?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Right through. He intends to keep my custom, so he does not dig too deeply with the drill. In fact, at odd times he swings towards my side of politics. The introduction of Medibank was one such occasion. I have not seen him since Medicare was introduced, so possibly he may be deserting his corner, but knowing him he will go back again.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: We are about even because my dentist votes Liberal!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I do not believe it is a very proper way to pursue a campaign to reduce it to a political issue. I do not believe it is a political issue, it is a matter of facts. I join with those Government members in objecting to some of the techniques which have been used in this campaign. One morning I received on my desk here in Parliament House three letters. They must have been posted together because they came through the mail together and they were sitting on top of each other. Each was in the same brand of envelope. I had a look at the paper, and as some of my colleagues will be aware, I know a little about paper. They were all written on the same type of paper and typed on the same typewriter with the same typeface daisy wheel. They each bore a different address in a different part of the metropolitan area and each was signed by a different person. The words varied slightly. For people to think that we would be so stupid as to accept as genuine, letters on the same paper, in the same envelopes, and written on the same typewriter, but with different addresses and names, is to take our intelli-

gence a little cheaply. I object to that very much, as I do to some of the newsletters I have seen.

It has been suggested to me that I should make some personal assessment of how many people pass through the dental surgeries in my electorate between now and the next election. It is another suggestion to which I take exception.

For some time now I have let it be known that I intended to support the Bill, though initially I took an open position on it. When I was approached by both groups, I said that my position was neutral and I needed to be convinced by whatever group needed my support.

Certain requests that I have made about the changes to the legislation have not been answered by the dentists, but in fact, every request I made to the technicians to whom I have spoken have been answered clearly, concisely, and without any pressure. I compliment them on the way they have conducted themselves.

The main turning point which made me decide to support the Bill and to support the technicians in what they are seeking was the fact that I asked representatives from the dental profession to provide me with examples of problems that have been created in New South Wales, Victoria, and also Tasmania, where dental technicians have dealt with the public. I asked that question of more than one representative from the dental profession and I did not receive any answers. In other words, they were not able to provide me with details of problems that have been created. I posed this question early in the piece when the dentists did not want this legislation passed at any price. If terrible things are to happen as a result of this legislation, surely they would have happened in the other States where this legislation has been passed.

In fact, one gentleman to whom I spoke said that he could not tell me anything that the technicians had done wrong, because if he did the technicians would tell me some of the things that the dentists had done wrong. They were not the words of a man who had a strong case to put forward.

Chiropractors have been mentioned as a parallel. The previous speaker mentioned that chiropractors were in a different situation to dental technicians because they were allowed to advertise and they did advertise. My recollection is different from that of the previous speaker. I understand that they were not allowed to advertise, and that it was illegal for them to do so. I remember the police setting traps for people like Chris Martinovich.

In my young hockey days I had a friend who was a State hockey player and he suffered an

injury. The doctor told him that that was the end of him as far as sport was concerned. He went to Chris Martinovich, received treatment, and the following year he was back in the State hockey side again. The treatment had to be done under the lap because Chris Martinovich was not permitted to give treatment and receive payment for it. My friend was considered to be a write-off as far as his doctor was concerned, but he was able to represent Western Australia in hockey again following treatment from a chiropractor.

At the time we recognised chiropractors we were given exactly the same forecast of doom from the doctors that we are now being given from the dentists about dental technicians. We were told that people would be walking around crippled from having their backs manipulated and that there would be a boom in sales of walking sticks. The reality is that it did not happen. There would be very few members in this House who have not had either a friend or a member of their family receive treatment from a chiropractor. This year was the first time I attended a chiropractor. Some five years ago I injured my back when lifting something from the back of my truck. The doctor told me that I was over 40 and that I would have to expect these sorts of things to happen. He told me not to lift heavy things or push cars. I was on my back for a fortnight and he said there was nothing he could do for me.

For many years I have been suffering from migraines. Recently I was driving through Phil Lockyer's electorate with another person and in the course of conversation migraines were discussed. The person with me mentioned a certain chiropractor and suggested that I visit him. A few weeks later I suffered a migraine and I visited the chiropractor who was recommended to me. I mentioned the fact that I had suffered a back injury five years ago and an X-ray of my back was taken. The chiropractor told me he could fix the problem, but that it would not be fixed permanently. He manipulated my back and since then I have had no trouble and I have hardly suffered from a migraine since I had that treatment. When the chiropractors' legislation was being debated in this Parliament, members of the medical profession were telling members that if the legislation was passed it would bring disaster to many people.

We are often told that we must accept the opinions of experts. I accept them as opinions, but not as gospel, and time will prove some opinions to be wrong.

By saying this I am not reflecting on the integrity of these people. I have my rights as an individual to make a judgment and that judgment is that I do not accept all opinions.

It has been mentioned that cancer of the mouth is one of the big problems. An example which has been raised in the last few days, but which had not previously been brought to my attention, although obviously to the attention of other members, concerned a person who was suffering from an ulcer of the mouth. He visited a dental technician and received a modified denture and some months later he visited a dentist who diagnosed his problem as cancer of the mouth. It appears that the words, "some months later" could be significant. There is nothing to prove that if the person had visited a dentist initially that the dentist would not have treated the ulcer in the same way as it was treated by the technician or in the same way I have had ulcers treated in the past.

The ability of a professional person to recognise a cancer is something that concerns me. Over recent months I have visited the doctor in the practice I attend a number of times. I have sat opposite him and approximately 1.5 metres away from him on each occasion. During this time I had a lump growing on my nose. It continued to grow and I became very worried about it. I told the doctor about my concern and he said, "Yes, it looks like a cancer". I told him that that was what I was concerned about and asked him what should be done. He said that he thought he would burn it out. However, after thinking for a while, he said, "No, I will not burn it out, I will send you to a specialist."

I am not reflecting on the ability of my doctor, but he had sat opposite me on several occasions and he did not notice anything wrong with my nose. The specialist to whom I was sent looked closely at my nose and said that he would cut out the lump. He made the arrangements for me to attend a certain hospital. On examination at the hospital the specialist noticed that I had another lump on my nose and he suggested that he should cut it out while he was on the job. I said, "Okay."

I went back to see him on the next Monday after the two little growths had been sent to the pathologist. He said, "Yes, that was a cancer, too." Here we had a general practitioner—a fairly well-qualified medical guy—who firstly, had been looking directly into my face and not noticing something which, on closer examination, he perceived to be a cancer. Then we had a specialist looking specifically at it but not noticing another one some quarter-of-an-inch away from it. Therefore, I have very serious doubts that dentists will notice specifically everything wrong inside a mouth that dental technicians will not observe because they are human.

In the campaign by some members of the dental profession, they have even convinced themselves

that they are perfect. They say the only way we can protect the public is by supporting them, and rejecting the dental technicians. I do not accept that. My experience over the last couple of months with a doctor and then a specialist is that professional, highly-trained people do not always notice what is directly in front of them. Very few dentists in Western Australia are actually equipped to make dentures. They send off to the technicians to have them made. The people who pay \$400 as against \$300 for dentures and say it is because they want the top quality work and are paying for the experience and the professional knowledge of the dentists are fooling themselves, because the reality of life is that the same people do the work.

Very often, the dentures are not touched by the dentists until they are actually fitted in the mouth and the person goes away with them. Beyond that, the actual design work is carried out by the technicians. I believe that some of our dentists would like us to believe that they sit down with a drawing board and T-square and do a detailed drawing of every set of dentures obtained. However, it is not done that way. The dentists make moulds which they send off to the technicians, with some notes. They do not do detailed working drawings. I do not think one receives more value by having a dentist put wax in one's mouth and take a mould rather than the technician doing it.

If the Bill is passed, I will still continue to go to my dentist and have my teeth made by him, because I am in the habit of doing that, and I have a good relationship with the dentist. I will not race off to a dental technician. However, I will not go to a dentist because I believe I receive superior treatment. I know some dental technicians, and I would be quite happy for them to make my dentures.

Another matter which I have not heard raised is that at present many dentures are being imported from Asia. We have no control over the standard of manufacture or the standard of people making them. It is the case that, with some of those dentures, a dentist must alter the mouth to make the mouth fit the denture. There is no guarantee of the qualifications of the people making those dentures. The fact that dentists have to alter mouths to make the dentures fit does not appear to be a very good argument for the case that the dentists have put to us.

The question of qualifications has been raised. I am probably bringing down thunder on my head by saying this, but I do not believe our children are receiving a much better education since we have increased the standard of qualifications for teachers. The consumers at the end of the edu-

cation system try to fit currently-educated people into their work force, and they find that it is very difficult to employ people who can spell adequately or write neatly on forms. I think members would agree, from the point of view of the consumer, that we have not gained very much from having four or five-year trained teachers. Perhaps we might be training teachers to fit people for their leisure time and things like that; but I doubt whether we are improving the standard of the system by improving qualifications.

Many people in this debate have admitted that they are taking the arguments to the extreme. I will take one of my arguments to the extreme. We have heard several members saying that it would be absurd if we allowed untrained people to have access to other people's bodies. We read a lot in the newspapers about in vitro fertilisation. Are we reaching the stage at which one will require medical training to procreate? Everyone will have to use in vitro fertilisation if one has regard for the risks involved in the natural form of procreation!

I agree it is taking it to absurd lengths to say that, but it is also absurd to say that dental technicians should not have access to the human mouth. The absurdity of my illustration matches exactly some of the other arguments put forward, and my argument has as much validity as do those arguments.

I intend to support one of the amendments of which Hon. Peter Wells has given notice. I intend to support his move to increase the number of people on the board, and also to specify their qualifications for the board. I am prepared to go along with the Government's proposal for partial dentures, and for the technicians to be given permission by way of an endorsement after satisfying the board that they are capable of doing so. At a later stage, this legislation will probably be brought back for amendment to require qualifications for people producing partial dentures, as education in the field of dental prostheses increases.

In the meantime, I am prepared to go along almost entirely with the Bill, with the one amendment that I intend to support. If anything of a minor nature happens during the Committee stage, I might make a minor change to my stand. With that reservation, I support the Bill.

HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan) [3.38 p.m.]: I intend to support the Bill, and I support it very strongly as a matter of principle. That principle is founded on experience.

I have had false teeth since the age of 13, and I have been through the hands of many dentists and many technicians. Without taking anything away

from the dentists, I can assure the House that the greatest service I have received has always been from the technicians.

I had all my teeth taken out when I was 13, and I received very good service from a dentist. However, once my mouth and gums had been allowed to settle down for six months or so, the dentist passed me into the care of a quite elderly dental technician. The service I received from that bloke was tremendous, particularly in view of the fact that my mouth was continually changing its shape at that young age. That man did not have high tertiary qualifications but he had much knowledge, achieved over a number of years.

I touch on the point made by Hon. Ian Pratt, that the more highly qualified persons do not necessarily provide, in this case, a better prosthesis than those without high tertiary achievements. Much of the skill in making prostheses is in the hands, not necessarily in the brain.

I wore artificial legs for quite some time and the best service I received there came from a limb maker who actually learnt his trade as a matter of necessity in Changi prison. He was a man by the name of Sid Gorrige, and he may well have been a friend of Hon. G. C. MacKinnon. This man, as far as I am aware, had no tertiary qualification. He lost his leg during World War II and was taken prisoner at Singapore. He was forced to make his own prosthesis in that place. Having made that, he found there were a number of other people who came to him and sought a similar service. That is where he learnt the trade.

I have spoken to a number of dentists and dental technicians. I guess a lot of nonsense is being said which does not bear any relevance to the factual situation. For instance, one dental technician who has been operating for quite some time informed me that he has a very good liaison with dentists. There have been times when he has picked up a patient's impression and noted problems in the mouth that the dentist had not picked up when he was taking the impressions or examining the patient's mouth. The technicians have a good liaison with the dentists and refer these things back to them.

I wish to refer to a letter which was sent out to a number of people in my electorate. Their names were taken from the electoral roll and the letter was sent out to those people with some interest in health services. I wish to quote from parts of the letter as follows—

The Government has introduced a Bill relating to dental technicians which concerns me as it allows for the registration of some

dental technicians, regardless of education qualifications.

If passed, a particular clause in the Bill would enable a person, who had been operating illegally, by dealing directly with the public regarding dentures for a five year period, to apply for registration as a dental prosthetist.

In a period when increasingly higher educational qualifications are being demanded in most health areas, the Dental Bill provision seems strange.

I will skip a couple of paragraphs here. It continues—

I am fearful that the move could undermine the public's confidence in our health services as people generally assume that the authorities will allow only qualified personnel to operate.

Further on it states—

In view of the importance of the issue, I am considering a number of amendments to the Bill, with the aim of ensuring that, as at present, only qualified people are authorized to practice.

I am a little bit "dirty" on that letter because it could give some members of the public the impression that absolutely no qualifications will be required to allow the public to deal directly with the dental technicians. That is not true. We understand, and people who have spoken on the Bill understand, that it does us no justice when misapprehensions like this are given to the public. I am sorry that letter did come from a colleague in the Legislative Council. I am pleased to say a number of people to whom that letter was sent did contact me to say they did not believe the Government was going to be silly enough to do that, as indeed it is not.

Hon. P. G. Pental: I wish we had that confidence.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Who wrote that silly letter?

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: My colleague, Mr Wells.

Hon. P. G. Pental: It is an excellent letter.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: It depends on how one balances things, and I do like to balance things when I put them to the public for their consideration.

I reiterate my support for this Bill. I do that with good reason. As a young child of 13 I can assure the House it did cause me quite some pain and embarrassment to have false teeth fitted. I

have a lot of praise for that particular dentist and most importantly, the dental technician with whom I directly dealt because of his common-sense approach at the time.

I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.

[Questions taken.]

HON. PETER DOWDING (North—Minister for Planning) [4.03 p.m.]: This is an interesting debate, because unlike the Hon. Graham Edwards, I have had no experience with dental prosthetists. My experience with dentists has been as limited as I have been able to make it over the last 41 years. I make the point however that the debate has a very familiar ring about it.

I think one of the most penetrating comments made in the whole debate came by way of interjection from Hon. Mark Nevill when Mr Pental was posturing very strongly on the basis that the experts told us that the dental prosthetists, the technicians, were not able to cope with the tasks that this Bill might permit them to cope with, and indeed there were many dangers for the public if we were to pass such legislation, and how did we know this? Because the experts told us, and the experts should be relied upon.

Hon. Mark Nevill interjected and pointed out that that was not the stance taken by some members during the debate about the Bill to permit or to refuse to permit advertising of smoking.

The Hon. Phillip Pental must have done cartwheels during that debate to avoid the compelling medical evidence about the evils of that practice and the very real risks that followed from smoking and from advertising smoking. Yet, here he is trotting out a serious learned dissertation about the evils of letting dental technicians participate in the practices that this Bill would permit them to participate in.

What was very interesting about the speech made by Hon. Ian Pratt was the fact that he acknowledged that at times, the holding of a qualification, particularly a tertiary qualification, does not necessarily give the holder the complete knowledge and understanding of the issues concerned. The evidence which members opposite strongly refused to address in relation to the explanation of the dental technicians' rights and entitlements, was the evidence that in some States of Australia this has been the practice for many years. There is simply no evidence that it has led to problems on the part of the public.

Of course in every profession there are people who do not succeed. Every profession I know has at some time or other had members who faced

negligence actions, and of all the negligence actions instituted there are a number which are successful. It is not enough—with all due respect to Mr Pental—to produce evidence of one, two, or five occasions on which there has been a particular type of problem and say "Is not that evidence to suggest that dental technicians cannot perform these tasks?" Dental technicians, like all professionals, and all people involved in performing duties, sometimes do not perform them properly.

What was distressing for me, as a person who has not a great deal of experience in this area, was to hear Opposition members, who opposed the extension of powers, come up with so little to support their argument. Of course the dentists would oppose the extension of powers of the technicians.

I can recall, closer to home, the positive hysteria among the legal profession in 1974 when we had a debate about the setting up of the Australian Legal Aid office. I can recall legal practitioners, who were wont to maintain a calm, cool, and conservative exterior, behaving like rabid protesters over what they saw was the end of the legal profession and the end of the right of the public to choose, and so on, and so forth.

We saw the same sort of behaviour from the legal profession with the legislation to extend the settlement agents powers. Some of that legislation I have problems accepting, because I did not believe at the time, and do not necessarily believe now, that the proper safeguards were built in.

Hon. Tom Knight: You did not support me when I got up and spoke against it.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Well, Mr Knight, I did in my heart.

The other example is of course the debate about Medibank when we had the medical profession claiming all sorts of dire consequences for the public and themselves. In reality, the dental profession is a profession which serves the public, and which will continue to serve the public, but like all professions that have a monopoly, it is very sensitive to any incursion into that monopoly.

Where there is good reason for maintaining strict professional standards, any incursion into that monopoly should be very carefully considered. In this instance, we have, firstly, the fact that dental technicians are active in the area in this State, secondly, we have the evidence that they are active with legislative approval in other States, and, thirdly, no-one in this debate has produced evidence to suggest that there were problems by reasons of the technicians' involvement.

The other comment Hon. Ian Pratt made—it is a rare occasion that I rise to support his

remarks—was about the longbow and he gave the example of our procreative activities no longer being a matter of joy, but being a matter controlled by some highly qualified doctor. In fact, the higher one goes in medicine, the more qualifications one has, the more one goes into the hospital system with the money and the technology, the more one finds arguments for any sort of process being dealt with only by those with high qualifications. We can find arguments, for instance, in the hospital system in Western Australia for broken arms being dealt with only by people with orthopaedic qualifications. If a person lives in Marble Bar and breaks his or her arm, the nursing sister would attend to it. There is no evidence that nursing sisters are unable to identify a very serious fracture. Hence, when someone is in Port Hedland hospital the available medical practitioner who sees that person treats that person. Yet, one would find oneself at the top of the tree at Royal Perth Hospital.

Are we any better off in terms of our health by reason of all of that? I do not believe that the evidence exists to support that proposition.

Legal aid was threatened, allegedly, by the legal profession. Yet, now its members would march in the streets if it were taken away from them.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: They are qualified lawyers. What about law clerks?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I am getting to law clerks; do not steal my thunder. Paralegal people such as law clerks, solicitors' clerks, and the like, have been long accepted in the legal profession. In fact, in the UK, it is quite a regular event for paralegal workers without qualifications, but with simple long experience, to operate in law offices.

The fact is that people like Hon. Phil Pandal simply swap the ship, depending on their argument. It is clear that many dentists are very strongly against this legislation and Hon. Phil Pandal argues very eloquently against any extension of it.

Members have not presented me with evidence of the evils that will result from the activities of dental technicians being recognised. The reality is that people should have a choice. If there is negligence on the part of a technician or on the part of a trained dentist, consequences flow. How many of us have children who are now being urged to have orthodontal treatment at enormous cost. When I was a child I had never heard the word "orthodontal". No child received orthodontal treatment. I suspect it is a fill-in position for dentists as a result of the improvement in children's teeth and dentists have had to have another practice at high cost, a practice which will no doubt be

beneficial in the sense that children will all have perfectly formed bites, their jaws will be wonderfully angled, or their teeth will look good on television.

However, we can all get along with those imperfections. The evidence in other States suggest that we can get along with those imperfections.

Hon. Bill Stretch took a position, which in my view, is unsupported by any evidence. He said that if we introduce dental technicians into this field, or give them the power to operate as they are operating and as is proposed in the Bill that they will operate, it will somehow spell the death knell for country towns. That is an extension of the argument that the dentists use to maintain what is a protected and privileged position. There is no evidence that that occurred in the States in which technicians operate. There is simply no evidence to support it. Hon. Bill Stretch produced no evidence to support it. He simply put it up as a proposition. He said it was a logical extension, if we take what is happening in country towns and carefully dissect it.

The Government has no desire to take any steps which will result in the death of country towns. I think our record in supporting rural and remote areas is very good. It is unfortunate that we should reduce the debate to those sorts of accusations. In my view, we need to look at the real issue and consider what the service would be like to a community which needs dental prosthetists. That is what is lacking in most of the comments made by Hon. Bill Stretch. He raised issues relating to risks of cancers not being diagnosed and so forth. I bring him back to the issue. If that had occurred in other States, why is he unable to present us with evidence.

The Government believes that this piece of legislation is important. It is sorry that it has been reduced to a bit of political one-upmanship by those members of the Opposition who have obviously taken fright. Not all of them have done that. I admire the ones who have not. Some members of the Opposition have obviously taken fright at a lobby as wealthy and powerful as dentists. They have supported unsubstantiated arguments which have raised spectres of fear for which there is no evidence.

The Government commends the Bill to the House in form in which it has been presented.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ACTS AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL PROVISIONS) BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. J. M. BERINSON (Attorney General), read a first time.

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [4.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend both the Local Government Act and the Local Government Amendment Act (No. 2) 1984.

Members will recall that part II of the latter Act, which was enacted earlier this year, includes provisions which introduce the adult franchise concept into municipal elections commencing from the annual elections to be held in May 1985.

At the time that legislation was before Parliament, the Minister for Local Government gave an undertaking that the Government would introduce further amendments in this session to provide for the automatic enrolment of owners of rateable property on the municipal electoral roll. This Bill principally fulfils that undertaking.

The electoral rolls will be prepared generally in accordance with the existing provisions with the residents' roll being derived from the State electoral roll, and the owners and occupiers' roll being derived from the records of the local authority.

The existing provisions provide for owners and occupiers to apply for enrolment. With the automatic enrolment of owners, this procedure will not apply, and will result in many names being duplicated on the residents' roll and the owners and occupiers' roll.

To ensure that a person's name appears once only on each relevant ward roll, it will be mandatory for the residents' roll and the owners and occupiers' roll to be consolidated as from the annual elections to be held in May 1986.

The Bill provides an option to the clerk to conduct the 1985 annual elections and any other elections held during the ensuing 12 months using both rolls, or alternatively consolidating them into one roll prior to polling day. This option was found necessary because it became evident that some councils would be unable to achieve the consolidation of rolls by 1985.

Where the clerk uses the two rolls for the purposes of an election, the Bill sets out an administrative procedure to be followed which requires the use of the residents' roll as the principal roll,

and the owners and occupiers' roll as a secondary roll. This procedure is designed to assist electoral officers during the course of polling.

Because of the procedures required, the residents' roll and the owners and occupiers' roll will still be used for the purposes of the election; that is, for preliminaries before the election day, such as postal, absent, and early voting, prior to those rolls being superseded by a consolidated roll. Any marks made on the first-mentioned two rolls to indicate a vote has been cast must be transferred to that consolidated roll prior to polling day. This will also help in the conduct of the election and remove concern that the new roll system will facilitate multiple voting.

The compilation of the owners and occupiers' roll under the proposed provisions will also provide for this roll to be used for the purposes of a loan poll.

The amendments passed earlier this year allowed for regulations to be made to permit the preparation of a suitable roll for the purposes of conducting a loan poll. However, as the clerk will now be required to prepare a full roll of owners for election purposes, the Bill proposes that that roll be used for the purposes of conducting a loan poll. In effect, the Bill returns the situation to that which previously existed.

In addition, the Bill corrects two anomalies brought to the Minister for Local Government's attention in respect of the electoral provisions of the Local Government Act.

First, the nomination form prescribed under regulations requires the signature of a candidate, or his agent, to be witnessed, and it is believed that this is an appropriate requirement. However, the Act presently does not require such witnessing and the Bill seeks to rectify that situation.

Secondly, the right of an elector to cast an absent vote—that is one which may be cast at the office of any council other than that for which the election is being held—is restricted to an annual election. As has been rightly pointed out, it is an anomalous situation where an elector can cast a vote for an annual election for a particular council, but cannot do so in respect of an extraordinary election being conducted in the same municipality on the same day. The Bill proposes the removal of that anomaly.

Members' attention is drawn to the fact that part II of the Local Government Amendment Act (No. 2) is due to come into operation on 15 November 1984 and it is therefore necessary to amend that Act to provide for automatic enrolment for owners and bring such amendments into operation prior to that date.

In fact, the Bill proposes that the relevant amendments will come into operation from the date of assent, and I bring this point to the attention of members to highlight the urgency of the legislation and to ensure that the automatic enrolment of owners is suitably accommodated.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. G. E. Masters (Leader of the Opposition).

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS AGENTS AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from 24 October.

HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [4.27 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to mention a few items of concern to people I represent in the south-west. One matter has given me some concern for a good time. I have mentioned it in the House on a previous occasion, but it deserves following up.

Only recently I asked a question regarding Government funding for driver education in secondary schools. The answer was that the Government was providing no funds this financial year for that particular scheme. In other words, the Government gives its blessing to that scheme where students attending senior high schools may be accorded the privilege of motor vehicle driving tuition subject to the generosity of schoolteachers at the respective schools, the P & C associations, service clubs, and the like, but the Government itself cannot see its way clear to fund that sort of programme. That is very disappointing.

There are difficulties, of course, in implementing such a scheme, but it is deserving of concern. The Government, at the present time, does give schools wishing to conduct driver education programmes approval, with the following provisos. One is that all police traffic and national safety council requirements on licences and permits are complied with. That is reasonable. The second is that the scheme is financed from school funds, and no financial assistance is available from the Education Department.

It is hard to understand why the Government has not followed this through more vigorously to try to arrive at a more acceptable solution, where students may be given the opportunity to become efficient and responsible drivers. The Government

is quite callous in not assisting young people in that way.

I must compliment the Government on its drive and energy in promoting road safety and endeavouring to cut down the casualties on our roads and highways. Having said that, it seems strange that the Government does not take the same sort of enthusiastic step to encourage young people to use those roads in a responsible way. That indicates a deplorable inconsistency in the Government's thinking.

Over the years many thousands of high school students have benefited from driver education under this scheme. I mentioned the training that has been possible through the generosity, goodwill, and backing of the schools. I must mention also the participation of teachers at those schools and the motor firms which have either donated motor vehicles or made them available on very generous terms. The P & C associations, service clubs, private citizens, and the like who have assisted in this area must also be mentioned.

Yet despite all this goodwill and participation, the Government has washed its hands of the scheme. I guess the Government will say that it is still considering it and that is fair enough; but it is not pursuing the scheme with the vigour that it should.

The Minister for Education (Mr Pearce) is on record in answer to a question I asked in this House some time ago as saying that the scheme was really elitist and would benefit only privileged students. That is a rather shallow sort of response and the Minister cannot be given much credit for it. There is no need to have that sort of attitude in respect of this scheme. Scope is available to provide services throughout all the schools in Western Australia with a little Government assistance.

Those schools which have the benefit and backing of the local community are very highly commended for their responsible attitudes to such an undertaking. It would need only a comparatively small sum of money from Government funding to make this scheme available to more schools and certainly more students throughout Western Australia.

The scheme has operated for a number of years, and to the best of my knowledge, some 18 000 students have benefited from the training since the inception of this scheme in 1967. That is a great number of people who have had the benefit of being trained correctly and who have been encouraged to act responsibly on the roads.

Unfortunately, the casualty statistics for road users are pathetically loaded in favour of those in the younger age group. This scheme can only be

commended and I again put forward the suggestion that the Government establish pilot projects in a number of schools.

In the first instance, I suggest a minimum of 10 schools. The Government should provide \$8 000 for each school, and that would cost \$80 000 for the first year of the pilot scheme. If one wanted to extend the scheme to 20 schools, it would cost \$160 000 for the first year. That is a small price to pay for a pilot scheme which has tremendous merit and which will help our young people and the community generally, because we will reduce the number of casualties on the road and, by that means, we would certainly save \$80 000 or \$160 000. That saving would be achieved very quickly by the reduction of the carnage on our roads.

In general terms the tuition provided by the course comprises 12 hours of theory; 12 hours' observing in a vehicle; and six hours behind the wheel in a driving supervision situation. Of course the programme varies from school to school according to the school's resources.

I understand that the Narrogin Senior High School has been participating in such a scheme and each student involved pays a fee of \$15 for the course, irrespective of the time it takes to learn to drive. So whereas there are guidelines in respect of the number of hours, they are flexible as far as the Narrogin school's scheme is concerned. I commend the people involved for that, but it has only been possible because the P & C Association has got down to miscellaneous fund raising, a local firm has lent a car, and the school is responsible for maintenance, petrol, and licensing. A fairly comprehensive programme is provided, so those involved should be commended.

The Merredin school has a scheme along somewhat similar lines where each student pays a fee of \$20 for a set period of approximately eight to 10 weeks. The driver-instructor is voluntary and the staff who take the course become instructors.

The local community in the Merredin area is very upset that the Government will not contribute to this scheme and I can understand that.

The Busselton High School has had a continuing scheme for a number of years, but here again it has been able to survive purely on the goodwill and generosity of the local community. I commend that community on maintaining that scheme.

Similarly, the Bunbury Senior High School has a student driver scheme which operates as a result of the availability of a second-hand car provided by one of the local rotary clubs. It is highly commendable for one of the service clubs to be involved in that way. Of course, the funding comes

from the school resources as well as from the local community.

It is worthwhile for the Government to pursue this matter. It may be true that initially only a limited number of students will benefit. However, in how many facets of our society do we see the implementation of a new scheme or the expansion of a good idea by means of a pilot programme, before such a scheme is applied on a wider basis. The Government is being very neglectful in not pursuing this project.

Another matter which continues to concern me in regard to the south-west region based on Bunbury is the provision of more adequate headquarters for the State Emergency Service. We all know that at times of natural disaster, the State Emergency Service performs a wonderful and necessary function within the community of people throughout the State. However, the Bunbury headquarters in the south-west region have been neglected for some time and I have been pressing the Government to fill that void.

There is a framework of headquarters which serves the south-west and upper great southern region in a combined way, and more recently the Government has instituted a complete review of the State Emergency Service. I commend it for that, but that review has been going on for a long time. I am not quite sure of the exact timespan of that review, but my information is that it is almost complete.

I certainly hope that review is almost complete and that as a result of it a positive move will be made to service the people of the south-west with headquarters based at Bunbury or nearby.

It is not good enough for this situation to continue. There are other emergency groups in other centres and they perform in their local areas. However, the position to which I refer is a regional overview concept which should take place in regions throughout the State so that the work of the State Emergency Service can be co-ordinated properly in times of civil emergency.

I notice provision in the Budget to upgrade the radio communications for the Busselton voluntary group and I commend the Government for that, but that is being done in only one minor area. We need a greater thrust to help the total area.

I turn now to the Bunbury police area. The staffing of that area has remained static for a number of years, although the population has been increasing in the region. The number of permanent residents is increasing at a rate of approximately 1 000 a year and then we must take into account tourists, weekenders, holidaymakers, day trippers, and the like.

The Bunbury police area is finding it a little difficult to service the total community as it would like to do. I merely add that in my view the police officers and the organisation in the Bunbury area are doing a sterling job for the community and I commend them for their very effective work. They have a good record in that regard, but they need help quickly. There has been a spate of vandalism and other crime in the area in recent months and the police have been very quick to act and clean up many of those misdemeanours.

I come back to the point that the Government has been neglectful. I keep reminding members that prior to the last State election, the Labor Party promised to put in three new police stations, one based at Dardanup, one at Boyanup, and the third at Capel. All of these currently fall within the Bunbury police area. If it is good enough for the Labor Party to promise to put in three police stations prior to the election, it is good enough for it to increase the staffing at the Bunbury police station to compensate for its inability to meet its election promises. Surely that is a reasonable proposition. I would expect the Government to support its Police Department in Bunbury and give it as much help as possible.

I also wish to refer to the Geographe Bay area of the south-west coast. That area of coastline is devoid of safe anchorage for small craft. For a number of years now plans and many investigations have been made to establish a safe anchorage particularly for fishing craft and for the safety of the men who man those craft. A number of schemes have been suggested, one of which was that there should be a specific facility for fishing boats. Another suggestion was that there should be a specific facility for pleasure craft. My view is that in the immediate future we should have a combined facility in Geographe Bay between Cape Naturaliste and Dunsborough to meet the need. The Government has been procrastinating on this issue. In this area of the Budget provisions, no mention whatsoever has been made of providing funds to create this facility.

Some few years ago, members of this House and the other place joined in a study of the south coast fishery, and arising from those discussions, the urgency of this small boat harbour facility down at the lower south-west coast became evident. Bunbury, of course, has facilities, but it is a long way from Cape Naturaliste if one is in trouble. Certainly servicing the fishing industry is not economical if one has to go from Bunbury down to the very south-west tip of the State and back again. It is just not on when one is competing on the commercial market.

An undertaking has been given by the Opposition that a boat harbour facility will be placed at Geographe Bay in the first term of its office upon return to Government. That is a firm commitment and I commend the Opposition for it.

Another issue in the lower south-west is the need to renew the hospital at Margaret River. The hospital is 60 years old and it has served the district admirably during that time. It has been blessed with some very dedicated and competent staff; good doctors have attended to the patients in that area. They still do. Of course, it has reached the stage in life when it certainly needs to be replaced, not only as far as the structure itself is concerned, but also in regard to the facilities in that hospital, which I suggest, need to be upgraded. Therefore an undertaking has again been given by the Opposition that during its first year in office, upon returning to the Treasury benches, a new hospital will be constructed at Margaret River to replace the old one.

Under the Budget papers and Estimates, the Government has made provision to extend the hospital at Augusta and I commend the Government for that initiative. That facility is needed at Augusta. It has a very good hospital, small though it may be, and it is well-served by doctors. There is a justifiable need for an expanded facility in that hospital and it is to be provided.

However, the Margaret River Hospital, I suggest, has a greater need and I am surprised that the Government did not find it appropriate to provide funds for at least a start on the Margaret River hospital in this year's Budget because the Government knows the priorities. The medical department I am sure, could show the Government the necessary statistics of this hospital to indicate that improvements are necessary. That will be done when the Opposition gets back into Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: If!

Hon. Lyla Elliott: It will be a long time coming.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Don't be so sure. I don't like to see you over-confident.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is interesting that the "Bunbury 2000" concept is doing quite a lot of things in the Bunbury region, but particularly in Bunbury itself, and the people outside the immediate area of Bunbury are looking very critically at the Government's performance.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Egged on unfairly by you.

Hon. G. E. Masters: What a disgraceful thing to say. Why would Mr Ferry do a thing like that?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I support the concept of "Bunbury 2000" because I represent that area,

and I am very grateful for what the Government can do down there, but quite frankly, it is not delivering the goods.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Would you like to tell that to the South West Development Authority?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It disappoints me that the Government is not able at all to deliver the goods at the moment. I mentioned the Margaret River hospital and the boating facility as examples.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: How long have you needed them?

Hon. Graham Edwards: Eighteen months!

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Mr Deputy President, (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) it is marvellous, is it not? I will not worry about those interjections. The point is that the people in the south-west perceive the "Bunbury 2000" concept as being based solely in Bunbury, and the Government is getting the cane from many other districts, and indeed regions around Western Australia including Albany, Geraldton, perhaps the Goldfields, and other places. These people believe the Government is pouring too much money into Bunbury and their area is being neglected.

I do not mind how much money the Government is pouring into Bunbury or the province I represent. I think it is great. I therefore support any improvements in that regard. The fact is that the Government is more concerned with Bunbury proper and its immediate perimeter than it is with places further afield, and it will pay the price for that.

I therefore ask the Government to spread its provision of amenities more widely to give balanced development. The south-west does support the City of Bunbury. Without the region itself, Bunbury city would be nowhere near its current size or have such importance. The region has backed it up, as has the industry and the population throughout that territory.

The Government needs to widen its eyes a little bit and to move its sights up to wider horizons and do a better job.

I support the Budget.

HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan) [4.48 p.m.]: I wish to take the time of the House for a few minutes to refer to recent comments which have been made by some members of the Law Society, two Perth barristers, to wit, that the law which prevents defence lawyers from questioning women as to their previous sexual experience in rape trials is too restrictive.

The West Australian of 27 October carried an article indicating that, at a seminar held in Perth by the Law Society, two lawyers referred to the

fact that the 1976 amendment to the Evidence Act had placed hardship on the accused person in sexual assault or rape trials. The comment was made that Parliament in 1976, when the law was amended, had been influenced by a vocal minority of frustrated women. Indeed, a comment was made in the Press that not only were the women frustrated; but they also had had some questionable sexual experiences themselves. I must say at the outset that the law which was amended in 1976 was amended for very good reason.

It has been implied in those comments that convictions have been recorded against accused men because they were unable to cross-examine women about their previous sexual experience. That may be true; it may be that some convictions were recorded in those circumstances. That does not necessarily mean that the accused were innocent. I am not referring to any particular case, so I am not suggesting that any particular people were guilty or innocent. The fact that they were unable to use this particular evidence and a conviction was recorded does not necessarily mean the accused were innocent.

It was also said at the seminar that defence counsel regarded a general attack on a woman's moral virtue as being counter-productive. I concede that in many cases that may have been so. However, this still went on, and if anyone who doubts that it did and that it was flagrantly abused in many cases, I refer to a report in *The Australian* of 1 October 1976, about the time these amendments went through this Parliament. The report is headed "Judge slams law in rape case" and it states—

A JUDGE yesterday criticised the present system of rape trials after hearing a case in which the defendants declined to be cross-examined and the victim was subjected to more than 1 600 questions.

Mr Justice Lee said in the NSW Supreme Court in Sydney that the victim's sex life could be raked over, her reputation made public property and her claims attacked notwithstanding the truth of her allegations.

Yet, at the same time, the accused men could exercise the privilege of refusing cross-examination.

The judge made the comments when sentencing three men to prison terms for what he described as a criminal and cowardly attack on a 19-year-old girl.

He said that during a nine-day trial the girl had been asked nearly 1 650 questions and the men, through their counsel, claimed she was a liar in asserting she had been attacked.

The article goes on to say the men declined to give sworn evidence themselves. It was also reported in *The West Australian* on the same date, that that situation has been rectified in this State, but I mention it purely to indicate that the opportunity was taken in many a rape trial to question a woman mercilessly as to her previous sexual experience with a view to destroying the credibility of her evidence.

The law prior to 1976 certainly needed some rectification. It permitted a woman claiming to have been raped to be cross-examined during the trial, firstly as to her general reputation or moral character, to show she was a prostitute or that her behaviour was similar to that of a prostitute, also as to acts of sexual intercourse between her and the accused on other occasions, and finally as to sexual intercourse between her and other men. Although she was allowed to call evidence to contradict the allegations of her general moral character or that she was a prostitute and had had previous sexual intercourse with the accused, she was debarred from calling evidence to rebut the claim that she had had sexual intercourse with other men. It was in that last category of being accused of having sexual intercourse with other men that she could not contradict the evidence and it was usually most devastating as far as she was concerned. It was most unnecessary as far as the trial was concerned and most resented by the women victims in rape trials.

These questions were allowed on the assumption that if she had had prior sexual intercourse with other men it tended to show she would be untruthful or unreliable. In other words, it would destroy her credit at the trial. In the United Kingdom a report was produced under the chairmanship of Justice Heilbron in which it was said that this assumption that a woman, having had previous sexual intercourse with other men, meant she was an untruthful or unreliable witness was an anachronism, and such cross-examination was no longer needed in order to protect an innocent man. It merely had the effect of distressing the complainant and confusing the jury.

In 1976 the State Government decided it was necessary to make some changes. The changes reduced the harassment and embarrassment which was occasioned to women in these cases—the women who were the victims of rape offences. The changes also related to other sexual offences besides rape, offences such as indecent assault and attempting, conspiring as to procuring indecent or offences. Both at the committal stage and at trial, a woman's previous sexual experience with persons other than the accused could no longer form part

of the evidence or be subject to cross-examination, unless a judge or magistrate gave leave.

The suggestion that the Government acted because of a vocal minority of frustrated women is laughable. It is true that representations were made not only in Western Australia, but all over the English speaking world by women's groups asking that something should be done about this situation. The action taken not only here, but in other States, and in the United Kingdom, was taken out of a real concern for the victims of brutal crimes, and that was the sole and basic reason for that action. This was an Australia-wide movement and it also occurred in the United Kingdom and that is referred to in the report I mentioned.

The reason for taking action was a realisation that women ought to be treated more fairly in the future—that is, after 1976—than they had been in the past. It was realised they should be given more consideration in those cases, and that the existing law was a legacy of past times. Tasmania, Victoria, and South Australia had reports from their law reform bodies at about the same time we were moving, and we had the benefit of those reports. Several other States have since legislated; we were about equal first with South Australia in legislating to amend the Evidence Act and the Criminal Code. The amendments were based on Law Reform Commission reports of the time.

Law reform bodies all over Australia recommended that changes should be made to the law in order to lessen the likelihood of the complainant's being subject to unnecessary harassment during the proceedings. This type of evidence was considered unnecessary by law reform bodies and judges, who believed it was not required for the proper defence of the accused. This was weighed up carefully at the time and discussions were held with lawyers in this State. No real objection was raised and it was felt that the restrictions were desirable and necessary.

In fact, exceptions were allowed in the legislation. It does not mean that under no circumstances can evidence be given concerning the woman's previous sexual activities; for example, evidence of her relationship with the accused and previous sexual acts with him can still be given. There are other circumstances in which evidence can be adduced, for example, evidence of similar facts in similar situations, such as where a woman has intercourse with various members of a bikie gang and one is accused of rape. She may say she did not consent to the one act of intercourse, although she consented to the others. It is clear and proper and permissible then that the evidence of her acts of intercourse with the other members

of the gang can be given as part of the trial of the one accused.

There are circumstances in which, because of consideration of the need to ensure that a person is indeed guilty before he is judged guilty, this evidence may be permitted.

The action taken at the time was not as a result of the statements made by various women's groups. There was a real consideration for the need to take some action in the interests of women who were being put upon. There is no reason however, that the Law Society if so minded should not look at this question again. If any parts of this new law are in any respect confusing, it would be useful for the society to have a look at them but as far as the general principle is concerned, it would be a retrograde step to go back to the old law which I have outlined, and one which I believe our community would not tolerate.

HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS (North Metropolitan) [5.00 p.m.]: In speaking to this motion I would like to commence by congratulating the Treasurer, Brian Burke, on the presentation of his second Budget. I further congratulate him for the manner in which he compiled this Budget. The Treasurer has shown this State that this Government does not make autocratic decisions which are isolated and divorced from political responsibility, but that it is a Government that is reflecting a financial plan based upon and drawn up with community involvement. I refer to the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Primary Industry Association, the Trades and Labor Council of WA, and other organisations which assisted in compiling the Budget in terms of their input. It is a credit to the Treasurer that he sought the views of these organisations and trusted them in giving those views.

I was interested to hear Hon. Phil Lockyer say, when speaking to this motion, that he and Graeme Campbell, the Federal MP for Kalgoorlie, had taken a bipartisan approach in connection with an issue they were dealing with in their overlapping State and Federal electorates. It might interest Mr Lockyer and you, Mr President, to know that that bipartisan approach is not restricted to the country. I sought a similar non-political approach to a vexatious problem of safety; that is, the issue of guarded school crosswalks.

A number of my constituents were quite concerned that funding for guarded school crossings was being rejected because of the lack of funds and because of the cutbacks by the Government in this area. That is not true. If my memory serves me correctly, I recall Hon. Phil Pental quoting in

a local newspaper that that sort of thing was happening. However, when the facts were pointed out to him, he issued a subsequent Press release pointing out the error that he had made. It is commendable that politicians are prepared to do that sort of thing.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Especially Liberal politicians!

Hon. P. G. Pental: Thank you Mr Edwards, I appreciate that.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I contacted 55 primary schools and a number of high schools in my area to seek their input to a meeting to which the Minister was invited. In endeavouring to obtain a bipartisan approach I invited not only my own political colleagues to that meeting, but also members of the Opposition. Indeed, a budding politician, a City of Stirling councillor who is seeking election to the Federal Parliament, was encouraged to attend the meeting and he made a considerable input to it.

The current situation in regard to guarded school crossings is one that the Government has relied upon for a number of years—something in the vicinity of 21 years. However, the situation was revamped in 1980, and the Government now relies upon advice from independent committees. There are two committees involved and one is the school road safety advisory committee which was set up in December 1980. Members of that committee comprise representatives of the Police Force, the Education Department, WACSSO, the Town Planning Department, and in some instances, Westrail.

The second committee is known as the school crossing road safety committee. It is an action committee and is represented by the Police Force, the Main Roads Department, WACSSO, relevant Government departments, and again Westrail, where necessary. This committee considers the approval or rejection of applications, but it does not consider funding in its deliberations. Every judgment it makes is made on the ground of merit.

Despite the existence of those committees, there is still great concern expressed in the community over this issue, and it is something which has interested me for many years. I was very pleased to call the meeting to which I have referred. The Minister advised the meeting that the Government is prepared to review the whole system, and that it has appointed an officer from the Police Force on a full-time basis to head that review. Inspector Bob Warner will be assisted by members of the State school advisory committee, along with representatives from the Main Roads Department, the Police Force, the Education Department, and

Westrail, where applicable. I believe that Inspector Warner has a great interest in this matter and is looking at a number of innovations which have taken place in the Eastern States over recent years.

Some matters which have been looked at include the utilisation of parents and schoolchildren on a voluntary basis to man crossings that are judged to be less dangerous than those which are manned by paid attendants. I wait with some impatience the outcome and recommendations of that review committee. It is an unenviable task that the Minister has set for that committee.

I turn my attention now to something which is very close to my heart and that is the situation which confronts disabled persons in the community. It is very encouraging that in recent times there has been a greater recognition of the problems experienced by disabled persons and a greater consideration of some of those problems.

I would like to refer to a couple of examples of this recognition and consideration. Myer (WA) Stores in Karrinyup and Fremantle will be opening on Tuesday 4 December between 6.30 p.m. and 8.30 p.m. specifically to allow disabled persons to visit the stores and shop in an environment where they do not have to compete for parking and with people. The staff of both these stores will be working on a voluntary basis and I think it is commendable that people are prepared to offer their services on this occasion. Gestures like this assist disabled people to become part of the Christmas scene and, more importantly, to become part of it on an independent and individual basis. I congratulate and commend Myer and its staff on the steps they have taken.

While I am talking about shopping centres, one of the sore points in relation to disabled persons is the selfish able-bodied people—the most ignorant people of dubious parentage—who persist in parking in disabled parking bays which are clearly marked and set aside for disabled persons. Disabled people use these parking bays for a number of reasons. Many disabled people, and particularly those with ambulatory problems, find it extremely difficult to carry parcels for long distances. That is just one reason that disabled parking bays are installed, providing access to shopping.

I am quite pleased that the Minister for Local Government (Mr Jeff Carr) is undertaking a search of the Local Government Act, and he is prepared to recommend ways to overcome this problem. The people who seem to become most upset about the practice of pinching these parking bays are not the disabled persons, but the able-bodied persons. If we want to tackle the problem

and solve it, it must be done with a degree of co-operation on all sides.

Hon. Tom Knight: They could shift the cars away with a tow truck, because they are illegally parked on private property; but the stores feel they will lose customers if they carry that out against their other customers.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I do not subscribe to the thought that one should be able to tow vehicles away because they are illegally parked. At times, people are disabled temporarily. I would think that a pregnant woman in the later stages of pregnancy could be regarded as disabled. I would hate to see someone like that finding that her car had been towed away.

An infringement notice is issued, and if the person has good reason for parking in the disabled parking bay, but does not have a sticker on the car, the case can be argued with the local council. I am not aware of any local authority which has enforced a penalty or proceeded with a prosecution when the person has had good reason for parking in a disabled bay.

I will give a couple more examples in the community of the provision of facilities for disabled persons. One that springs to mind is the action taken by the West Australian Football League prior to the grand final. The football viewing area used by most disabled persons is very accessible. It has a lift and toilets for the disabled. It was rather unfortunate, though, that in planning this area the league did not make available any tiered seating for disabled persons. The situation arose in which disabled persons were sitting in wheelchairs behind, and on the same level, as people sitting in front of them, who may well have been taller. Other people, and particularly children, were often hidden behind concrete pylons. From time to time they could catch a glimpse of the football through the viewing space made available to them.

This was pointed out to the league and, as I say, I was very pleased when it took action by pulling out the existing seating and making space available for more wheelchairs. That enabled many more people, and particularly the children who love football as much as anybody else, to view the grand final fully. I would think that the facilities now provided by the league are second to none in Australia. I hope it will not be very long before the people at the Western Australian Cricket Association take heed of the example set by the league and follow suit.

One other matter relates to the Orchard Hotel. Members would be aware that, in a time when unemployment is prime and people have to compete for jobs, it becomes much harder for disabled

persons to compete on an equal footing. I am pleased that the Orchard Hotel in Perth, which will be completed shortly, has a quota system for employing disabled persons. A percentage of the staff is to be made up of disabled people. That does not mean that, just because one is disabled, one gets a job with that company. However, it means that the company provides a greater opportunity for competent disabled persons to find a place in the company's employment. This is another creditable example of how some people in the community like making things easier for disabled persons.

I congratulate the Cabinet for its recent decision to set up a task force to consider equal opportunity legislation for disabled persons. I am pleased that I will be the convener of the task force, the terms of reference of which are as follows—

1. To consult associations and informal groups of disabled people about equal opportunity legislation on the grounds of physical or mental impairment or psychiatric disorder.
2. To examine comparable legislation from overseas and interstate.
3. To establish principles of equality in fields such as:
 - (a) Access to buildings.
 - (b) The provision of facilities in work places.
 - (c) Flexibility of working hours and organisational practices.
 - (d) Parity in employee benefits.
 - (e) Other matters deemed relevant to the Working Party.
4. To make recommendations to the Government about the above matters.

Some disabled people in the community were disappointed that they were not catered for in the Equal Opportunity Bill which recently passed through this Parliament. Initially I argued that it should cater for them; but the problem is a massive one, and it requires a great deal of deliberation and consultation with the people who can best put that sort of legislation into effect. I have never believed that one solves a problem by legislating against it. Legislation seeking equal opportunity must have the support of the majority of people, otherwise one is really wasting time.

It is my hope that the legislation to be proposed by the task force will have the support of the majority of the community, and particularly of employers. As I have said in this House before, any prospective employer could not go past a dis-

abled person, because generally disabled people are much better workers, much more competent, and much keener than the average person. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to take up this challenge, and I look forward to dealing with it.

Another committee with which I have been involved is the one established by the Minister for Sport and Recreation (Mr Keith Wilson). The committee was formed to consider professional boxing in this State. Members might be interested to know that between about 1976 and 1982, professional boxing experienced a period of inactivity. A resurgence occurred in the 1980s, and the number of promotions increased rapidly throughout 1983 and into 1984. It is unfortunate that, not only in this State and in this country, but also across the world, more than one faction seems to be involved in boxing, and faction fights develop. Mr President, as you were involved in the noble sport, you would be aware of that. The environment in which boxing was conducted in this State contained a myriad of rumours, innuendos, and factions, with one faction having a go at another faction.

It was in that context that the referees and judges amateur association made representations to Mr Arthur Tonkin (the member for Morley-Swan), who made statements in Parliament and wrote to the Minister for Sport and Recreation in 1983 requesting that boxing in this State be investigated. The Minister agreed, and the committee was set up.

As chairman of that committee, I was rather disappointed to find that at times a number of undesirable things happened in boxing in this State. The committee found it was highly probable that at times appropriately qualified doctors were not in attendance at bouts; that necessary medical and other safety equipment was not available; that unfit boxers were entering the ring; that mismatches were occurring; that boxers were allowed to fight after consuming quantities of alcohol; that the standard of fitness of referees and judges was questionable; that boxers were encouraged to "take a dive"; sham bouts were occurring; and boxers were not being paid the amount of money promised.

The list continues—

Boxers were paid in drugs, women and in kind rather than in dollars.

Boxers after being knocked unconscious were fighting and sparring almost immediately.

Medical cards and medical histories of boxers were non-existent.

Boxers were not turning up to fight.

Boxers were demanding additional payments immediately before they would enter the ring.

Publicity and advertising was misleading especially with regard to main event boxers.

Heavy gambling involving promoters, trainers and boxers, occurred.

Drugs were involved.

Crowd behaviour was unruly with several ugly scenes occurring, and so on.

It was because of the findings of this committee that re-investigation into that legislation to provide control of professional boxing in WA was undertaken. It is for that reason that I am now raising this matter because this will come to the attention of members and it is something I hope they will look at.

A Western Australian boxing commission will be established to carry out the functions as determined by the professional boxing legislation, enforce the rules, regulations, and role descriptions as determined by the Minister, and make recommendations to the Minister on matters pertaining to professional boxing.

Membership of the Western Australian boxing commission should comprise the following persons—a medical practitioner nominated by the Australian Medical Association; a member of the WA Police Force senior to the rank of inspector, nominated by the Commissioner of Police, preferably with a knowledge of boxing; a director of the Department for Youth, Sport and Recreation or his nominee; a representative of the boxing fraternity; and, if necessary, such persons as the Minister thinks fit.

The functions of that commission would be to advise the Minister on matters relating to professional boxing, and enforcing the legislation, rules, regulations, and role description as detailed by the Minister, formulating and maintaining the rules and regulations under which all professional boxing bouts, exhibitions or tournaments must be staged, and shall include, most importantly, the issuing of licences and permits; the allocation of judges and referees; the monitoring and administration of all bouts, exhibitions; and tournaments; establishing proper penalties for misconduct, rule violation, and so on. The boxing commission would also be responsible for the establishment of all medical requirements and medical examinations as they are deemed necessary.

Further recommendations suggest that the boxing commission would formulate and maintain one set of rules for professional boxing in WA and to

that aim a person from Bunbury by the name of Bill Ivory who has had much experience in boxing—members may know him; he is probably one of the most respected persons in this field in WA—was approached by us to draw up a set of rules under which all professional bouts should be held. It was further suggested that before any professional bout could be staged, the promoters would need to seek a permit from the boxing commission. It is further suggested that all persons requiring specialist expertise, who are involved in staging professional boxing bouts, exhibitions, or tournaments and who hold the appropriate qualifications as established by the boxing committee, will be eligible for any licence. Such persons would include the referees, judges, trainers, monitors, time-keepers, matchmakers, and others.

Another issue which falls within the terms of the report and which I want to briefly discuss is the matter raised by Mr Lockyer in this House some time ago when he expressed concern that the boxing commission may prevent the staging of boxing bouts on licensed premises. I assured Mr Lockyer at that stage that the task force had no preconceived ideas, but would look at the matter closely. The recommendation is that no venue should be automatically excluded from staging professional boxing bouts, exhibitions, or tournaments. That is notwithstanding the fact that the commission generally felt that hotels did not provide the most conducive environment in which to stage professional boxing due mainly to the behaviour of the crowd before, during, and after the boxing tournament. Alcohol also is an integral part of the boxing environment, and few alternative venues were available in which to stage professional boxing. Some hotels pay for professional boxing to be staged on their premises, while promoters must outlay fairly large sums of money to hire alternative venues.

Crowd control is a key issue in relation to venue. It was seen that while the hotels did not provide the best environment, it was not considered that they should be automatically excluded. The issue of control over boxing is an important one where those bouts are staged in a hotel or in some other area. The majority of people involved in professional boxing in this State are good, honest, hard-working people, who are dedicated to their professions. It is very important that we accept the recommendations of the report so that boxing is not only honest in fact, but is seen to be an honest game for those people who really do have an honest, open, hard-working, and dedicated approach to the sport.

I seek leave to table this report.

Leave granted.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 253).

Debate Resumed

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I thank the House for its indulgence and draw the attention of members to the issues I have raised. I would be happy to discuss these matters at any stage, if members have any problems, once they have read the report.

I support the Bill and in doing so commend the Premier and his team for the magnificent money management and Budget they have been able to come up with in the last 12 months.

HON. C. J. BELL (Lower West) [5.31 p.m.]: Before I commence my comments on the Budget, I would like to commend Graham Edwards for the issue he has raised about the disabled. I believe there is a growing awareness in our community about the problems disabled people face in moving about our community in an acceptable manner. I can assure the member that as far as I am concerned he will receive all the support I can give to ensure, as far as possible, that these people are not disadvantaged unduly.

I must say that I, like Mr Knight, become very angry when I see able-bodied people parking their cars in an area reserved for disabled persons. I think that shows gross ignorance, but unfortunately there is very little we can do to control that sort of behaviour. I assure the member he has my support and I am sure the support of the members on this side of the House as well.

Hon. Graham Edwards: I appreciate your comments.

Hon. C. J. BELL: I would like to refer to some areas which concern me and which are contained within the Budget. I would like to refer to the area of Mandurah and the problems which face that region.

There is no doubt that Mandurah has some substantial problems to overcome. It is undoubtedly a major recreational area for the people of Western Australia, but it has some real problems which have to be faced up to. I applaud the Government for setting aside money for the environmental study of the Dawesville-cut proposal. However, it will take at least two years before any water comes into the estuary and there are some aspects of that area which need immediate attention.

The mouth of the Mandurah estuary has always had problems with silting up. The sum of \$200 000 has been provided in the Budget for the Mandurah entrance channel. There will ultimately have to be an entrance to the Mandurah estuary,

regardless of whether the Dawesville cut proceeds. Several factors need to be borne in mind with that entrance channel, because it will need to be of a certain depth and a safe navigable channel.

One of Mandurah's hopes is that when the 1987 defence of the America's Cup is held, a challenge will be based from Mandurah. That will mean that it is essential that a channel be provided into that estuary to enable it to take a 12-metre yacht. That can only be done on the basis of providing a permanent entrance, of the required depth, regardless of what other problems need to be faced.

A hydrological survey of the area a couple of years ago clearly indicated that there are two restricting factors in the exchange of water between the Mandurah estuary and the ocean. One is a bar and the other is the Sticks Channel. There is a necessity for a permanent entrance of a reasonable depth in that area. It is my belief that there is a need for a permanent opening of the bar and a programme for the dredging of the channels in the estuary to ensure that the water exchange is maximised, to the benefit of the estuary. It will not solve the problem, but it would be a significant step forward. I think it will be done eventually, regardless of whether the Dawesville cut is made.

The use of coastal superphosphate for the farmland surrounding that area has been recommended. A survey which was conducted recently indicated that only 60 per cent of the farmers in the area used some of the coastal superphosphate and suggested that most of the fertiliser used is of the new variety.

Farmers are a conservative group and must have a very good reason to change their farming practices. Farmers have always battled to have a dollar to spend and have always invested their money back into their farms. They rarely live rich. They do not change their farming practices unless they are sure that the new practice is the right and proper one and will not have a detrimental effect on their farms.

I think the Government should have ensured that the new superphosphate was no dearer per tonne. I have heard the statement that the farmers will not use as much superphosphate, therefore it will cost less per hectare to fertilise.

That does not wash among many of the farmers.

With a better exchange at the entrance of the estuary and the Dawesville cut, we would see a beneficial effect on the surrounding area. I think there is grave concern amongst some of the people in the area that the Dawesville cut will specifi-

cally alter the environment and change the marine population which currently lives in the Peel and Harvey Inlets. I do not know whether that is true, but undoubtedly the \$900 000 budgeted for by the Government will help come up with some answers, and some decisions will be made for the community.

I will now talk about several other aspects of the Mandurah area. I am pleased to see that the Glencoe Primary School had been allocated \$180 000 for further buildings in the school. I was speaking to the headmaster the other day, and while he was very happy for that money to be spent at his school, there are several other headmasters in the area who are not so happy.

In the southern areas of Mandurah there needs to be planning now to site an additional primary school in the new developing areas because the population is growing rapidly. Very large numbers of young families with young children are moving into the area and if we do not plan now we will be caught with the problem of an over-populated school, and will end up destroying the very good environment that currently exists at the Glencoe school.

Whilst on the subject of education I would like to move on to two other schools in my electorate. Unfortunately the report is not nearly as good. The Waroona Primary School has been an area of concern and need for a long time. I believe that my predecessor, the Hon. Neil McNeill, when he was in this place, sought and had reached agreement for that school to be re-established on a new site. It still has not happened, and the parties are arguing about the value of a block of land. It is a town block and I understand the site is being sold for \$25 000. It has been claimed that that is too much. The land adjoins the community recreational areas. It is quite farcical to be arguing about a few dollars. I think a cost of \$25 000 for five or six acres in a town area adjoining recreational areas—a fact which will minimise the cost to the Public Works Department by providing recreational facilities necessary for a modern school—seems quite reasonable. When next year's Budget is to be drawn up I ask that some attention be given to this matter because it has been a long-running saga. I almost despair of it and wonder how long the Waroona people will wait. I think Hon. Lyla Elliott probably attended that school, and it has not altered much since that time.

The Pinjarra Senior High School is another problem area. Its current enrolment is 530 students. It was approved for renovations and additions some three or four years ago. No money has been spent in the last two Budgets, of which I am aware, and I believe the year before no money

was spent. There are a number of temporary buildings which are in a poor state of repair. That is unsatisfactory. They are hot in the summer and cold in winter, and basically in poor condition.

The administration buildings at Pinjarra Senior High School are, on my information, dilapidated and very unsuitable. The whole school needs rebuilding. The current buildings have problems with traffic noise, and unless that problem is resolved, that will undoubtedly reflect on the ability of the staff to perform their task properly. The deputy headmistress has indicated to the Shire of Murray that the facility itself and the equipment provided for business studies is so bad that she could not in any way recommend the students she turns out to enter into competition with those from other schools who are so much better equipped. Urgent attention is required for that building because if we keep on as we are, handicapping these students at that school, then we are condemning them to a disadvantage in the marketplace when they face up to the day when they need to go out into the work force and earn a living.

The Boddington school has its particular problems and is due for major renovations or new buildings in a couple of years. The problem is the very limited area of land around it. The Boddington community is a very interesting one in that it is traditionally a farming area which has had an influx of mining people. Those people have traditionally lived in an urban type community and they are not prepared to accept the old country school concept. They expect the standard of facilities for education to be up to those in the metropolitan area or in a major regional centre. There have been a lot of new houses built in the town and Boddington is becoming a very attractive place to visit. Any members who are proceeding south down Albany Highway may like to deviate into Boddington and have a look. It is, as I said, a very attractive spot, and motorists are able to come out through the Williams end after a pleasant jaunt through the site at the northern end of the conveyor belt which feeds Worsley in the near vicinity, a refinery which is a very major facility.

There are proposed goldmines in the area, and most people are not aware of that. Also, major drilling is being carried out for that purpose.

I was very pleased to see in the Budget a sum of money for improvement to the Boddington water supply. It is a town which has outgrown the original concept. Suddenly this small rural community has burgeoned out and it has a much greater need than formerly for money to be allocated to it to ensure that the town has an

adequate water supply. I do not intend to talk any more about that aspect. I now intend to go on to a couple of other issues.

Perhaps I can start by voicing one of my criticisms of the Budget. In the paper entitled "Supplement to Loan Estimates Speech" presented by the Premier there is a section headed "Quarry Joint Venture". It states—

During 1983-84, Westrail and Quarry Industries Ltd agreed to establish a jointly owned company—Western Quarries Pty Ltd—for the purpose of quarrying stone in the Avon Valley and transporting the product by rail to a distribution depot at Kewdale. An amount of \$3.4 million has been provided for this project this year.

I can see no reason whatsoever for public money to be expended on a project such as this. It is an absolute waste and I will repeat that statement again and again. To put another quarry in the metropolitan area is an absolute waste of the taxpayers' money. We currently have three major companies operating. We have an oversupply of capacity, and it seems to me that someone must have decided it was a good idea. There appears to be no logical reason for it. The figure I have had quoted to me is of a \$3.4 million cash expenditure. A further sum of money will be spent in the workshops converting the old Koolyanobbing wagons to handle this product. That is fine. I guess the workshops need to be kept working, but it should have been costed into the system.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: What else would you have done with it?

Hon. C. J. BELL: I suppose they could carry Mr Gayfer's record grain crop.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They tell me that is impractical.

Hon. C. J. BELL: It seems to me that when we can spend \$3.4 million in cash, plus a very substantial amount of money that is included in departmental expenditure on the workshops to get back to the figures we have had of \$2.7 million over five years, it appears to be an extremely poor job. I continue to quote from the same document to make the point—

As well as providing an opportunity for a profitable return on the capital invested significant traffic will be directed to rail, with additional financial returns. The transport task will be performed by a standard gauge unit train operation. Initially, twenty bottom discharge wagons. . .

Western Quarries Pty Ltd will be the sole supplier of concrete aggregate in the metro-

politan area to Adelaide Quarry Industries Ltd. . .

That worries me. The interpretation I place on it is that the supply of that product will not be open for competition.

In the metropolitan area today we have a substantial number of quarries. I have a letter here which I will table, if required, which is in response to my approaches to some of the other quarry operators in the area to determine the situation. It is addressed to me and reads—

Further to your telephone requests, we have read the ERMP for the Toodyay Quarry, August 1984, together with the Premier's comments contained in the Supplement to Loans Estimates Speech concerning a quarry joint venture.

We were initially hesitant in making any public comment on a proposal from a competitor, but as there are several significant errors in the ERMP we feel obliged to respond.

The principal error in the ERMP is in the vital section 2.1 "Reserves and Demand". It is stated that the justification for a new quarry is that

"Although most of the existing quarries appear to have large reserves of suitable rock, the operators still need to ensure that long-term reserves are accessible and capable of being extracted economically. The recent negotiations by the Readymix Group to secure additional reserves at Gosnells (B. J. O'Brien and Associates 1982) are one example of this concern."

Our recent negotiations were not to secure "additional reserves at Gosnells" but rather to ensure a more coherent arrangement of long-term planning of land use at Gosnells as our ERMP (May 1982) made clear. We have reserves which will suffice for over 100 years although naturally, in the ERMP, we concentrated on the initial 20 years divided into 5-year planning intervals.

I have contacted our colleagues responsible for major quarries in the metropolitan area and find that they consider they have reserves in hand sufficient for the following years based on their average off-take for the last ten years:

Herne Hill—over 100 years

Maddington—40-50 years

Byford—over 150 years

Plus:

Readymix Gosnells—more than 100 years

Readymix Bullsbrook—over 100 years

Therefore it is quite clear that with these reserves and with the potential use of our Bullsbrook quarry (which is licensed but not yet used) the claims repeatedly made in Section 2.1 of the Toodyay Quarry ERMP are quite in error.

Page 9 of the ERMP states that "The existence of this (i.e. Toodyay) operation could reduce the pressure to develop new quarries in the sensitive Darling Scarp area". You will see from the discussion above that there is in fact no such pressure to develop new quarries other than those already licensed and we fear that this appeal to the emotions is quite misplaced.

Furthermore, the Toodyay Quarry ERMP has correctly pointed out that the aggregate demand in the Perth region has stagnated in recent years (page 6) requiring a throughput of about 2 million tonne per annum. We, therefore, fail to see how in such a relatively stagnant market a case can be made to open up yet another quarry other than those already licensed, particularly one in the scenic confines of the Avon valley. Table 2.1 of the ERMP compares the number of quarries in Perth with those in other cities and in some curious way concludes that Perth requires more quarries. This is as meaningless a comparison as it would be if we pointed out to you that there are about 30 licensed quarries operating in the rest of Western Australia versus 3 just for the central population of Perth.

With regard to the Premier's budget speech, we as a company are perturbed to learn that the Westrail-Quarry Industries joint venture—Western Quarries Pty. Ltd.—will "provide Westrails track ballast requirements in the metropolitan and surrounding country areas" without the current operators and suppliers of this demand for over 25 years having the opportunity to competitively tender for this public-funded requirement. We are keen to learn the definition of "surrounding country areas" as we, as a company, have invested heavily in the business of contract crushing in order to continue providing rail ballast throughout the country areas of Western Australia, as we have done for over 20 years.

I trust this answers your queries. Should you require any further information do not hesitate to contact me direct.

Yours faithfully,

Signed

G. J. Greig

General Manager

That clearly illustrates a real concern for the expenditure of public moneys.

There is a market for two million tonnes of aggregate in the metropolitan area per annum, suggesting that this new quarry will have a throughput of 200 000 tonnes to 400 000 tonnes per annum. That is a significant segment of the metropolitan market. It means some of the production is not forthcoming; it will mean a lay-off of staff, because one does not keep that sort of staff if one is not getting production, or alternatively there must be an additional market.

The essential principle ought to be that no Government should be involved in private enterprise where there is sufficient competition. I believe that situation applies in the supply of road metals and road ballast in the metropolitan area.

I will now touch, in the few remaining minutes, on one other aspect which I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and that is agricultural education. It has been of considerable concern to me over a long period of time that agricultural education in Western Australia is going backwards—and I really mean going backwards. It is quite a disaster.

There is a very real need to ensure that the people who enter the agricultural industry are trained at the appropriate levels. We do not have the facilities in Western Australia to do that job. It is really a disaster area. If the same applied to the trade skills—Mr McKenzie is well-aware of the position in Midland Workshop and other areas—there would be a huge difficulty. But agriculture is such a diverse area that it is not co-ordinated. Nobody seems to be able to get hold of it and understand it.

Take the Muresk Agricultural College. Many people think it provides all our needs. Unfortunately that is not true. I remember Hon. Mark Nevill making some comments with regard to some significant alterations at WAIT. It is a tragedy, but the current administrative structure is such that Muresk is a division of the engineering faculty at WAIT. That is the significance attached to agriculture in this State. It has no separate standing, no autonomy as such. In fact I understand the attention it receives is so minimal

that it puts tremendous pressure on the college, even to the point where it is not fulfilling a need.

I understand the proposal is that the entry standards are raised to a 270 aggregate of the leaving marks. This effectively eliminates 70 per cent of the applicants.

The other aspect is: What is Muresk doing? Some 30 per cent of Muresk students are doing an equine course—horses. It seems to me that is not really what we are on about. The situation as far as agriculture in Western Australia is concerned is that we have agricultural education at high schools. The schools do an excellent job within a limited capacity, providing introductory courses for agricultural education. But that is not the point which really needs to be addressed. There are three levels in agricultural education which must be addressed.

Firstly, there is a need to ensure that we have trained technicians in the industry—that is to say operators in the field to learn to handle the machines, understand what they are doing, and know what the industry is about. They have a skilled job to perform nowadays. They have headers worth \$160 000 or \$180 000 to operate.

They need to understand machinery. They need to understand what they are doing when they go into a paddock of grain or deal with any other agricultural commodity. We also need the practical management level of farming. Managers and owners need to have different skills which enable them to understand, in the modern business world, how to cope with a business structure which may have an annual income in excess of \$1 million.

The practical farm management level is an essential part of agriculture and needs to be addressed. No institution in this State caters for that need and it is essential that that problem is addressed.

On the third level of agricultural education we have Muresk college which trains people to the level of professional agricultural adviser, whether for banks, Government departments, or to give professional agricultural advice in other areas. Muresk college does that to a limited degree.

I draw the attention of the House to the Victorian situation and I quote from the Victorian College of Agriculture and Horticulture directory of courses for 1984. If we could find anything like this in Western Australia I would be very pleased. The directory of courses reads as follows—

ADVANCED EDUCATION

Diploma of Applied Science (Agriculture)

Diploma of Applied Science
(Horticulture)—Amenity

Diploma of Applied Science
(Horticulture)—Food Prod'n

Ass. Diploma in Farming Management

Ass. Diploma in Horse Management

TECHNICAL & FURTHER EDUCATION

Diploma of Dairy Technology (follows Cert. of Dairy Mfr.)

Middle Level Certificates

Certificate of Dairy Technology

Certificate in Farming

Certificate of Business Studies (Agric. Secretary)

Certificate of Horticultural Studies

Middle Level Further Certificates:

Further Certificate in Farming

— * Dairy Farm Management

— * Beef Management

— * Sheep Management

— Pastoral Management

— Cropping & Grazing Management

— * Farm Financial Management

— Pig Management

Further Certificate in Recreational Turf Management

Further Certificate in Landscape Technology

Special Purpose Courses:

Farm Machinery Operation & Maintenance

Safe Use & Handling of Explosives in Agriculture

Artificial Insemination of Sheep & Cattle

Beekeeping

Special Purpose Short Courses:

A wide range of highly specialized courses.

That is the sort of curriculum which we require for agricultural education in this State. I would like to see our Government take up the challenge and meet the need in that field. If it does so, it will be providing a service for an industry which is desperately in need of assistance. The agricultural industry has a high income producing capacity in this State and its educational requirements should be met.

I have a couple of other hobby horses on which I shall undoubtedly get an opportunity to speak at a later date. However, I wanted to make those points that, while the Budget has addressed some

of the problems which I perceive, there are many others which need to be examined. I urge the Government to take these matters into consideration in the forthcoming year to ensure that these issues are addressed for the long-term benefit of our State.

I support the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Neil Oliver.

House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS

Great Cats Appeal

367. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

- (1) When was the appeal to build the new accommodation for the Great Cats at the Zoological Gardens launched?
- (2) Did the Government of the day commit the Treasury to support the project?
- (3) If so, on what grounds?
- (4) What public response by way of donations, goods or services have been forthcoming in each half year since the appeal opened?
- (5) Who is the current chairman since the death of Sir Arthur Griffith?
- (6) Who is on the committee?
- (7) What are the current activities to raise funds?
- (8) When is the project expected to be completed?
- (9) What is the Government's policy as to supporting this and other capital works at the zoo?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) 20 August 1982.
- (2) The Government agreed to match private contributions on a \$-for-\$ basis up to a total State contribution of \$250 000. As a result of a shortfall in the public subscription the State's contribution was increased to \$280 000.
- (3) Government support was given in view of the significance of the project and the value of the zoo to the community.
- (4) It is not possible to determine the timing of the receipt of donated goods and services other than to say they were all received in 1983-84. Should the member specifically require details of cash receipts on a six monthly basis the information could be provided at a later date. The following public contributions have been received—

Year ended 30-6-83	\$93 800
Year ended 30-6-84	\$146 900

- (5) Mr W. L. Grayden, M.L.A.
- (6) Messrs D. W. Bibby, W. Boland, W. L. Grayden, W. N. Morrison, C. R. New, J. A. Roberts, Sir Kenneth J. Townsing, Messrs R. H. C. Turner, D. Whitely.

- (7) It is expected that the \$10 000 still required for the project will be raised by way of public donations.
- (8) The complex has been completed and will be opened by the Minister for Lands and Surveys on 17 November 1984.
- (9) An undertaking to provide \$1 million over the financial years 1982-83—1984-85 was met this year by the provision of \$300 000 for capital works. The needs of future capital works will be subject to normal budgetary processes.

369. *Postponed.*

LAND

National Parks: Yalgorup

370. Hon. C. J. BELL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Are there current proposals to re-arrange the northern end boundaries of the Yalgorup National Park south of Mandurah?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) what are the names of the land owners involved; and
 - (b) what area is involved from each land owner?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. Through Mandurah Town Planning Scheme No. 11 which was gazetted 5 October 1984, and which has been negotiated over a number of years between the National Parks Authority, Town Planning Board, Department of Conservation and Environment, the Shire of Mandurah, and privately commissioned consultants, part of the north-eastern boundary of Yalgorup National Park is proposed to be rationalised by an exchange of land between the Authority and private landholders.

This exchange is being co-ordinated by the Lands and Surveys Department, and will depend on Parliamentary approval.

- (2) (a) and (b) The National Parks Authority does not possess this information as it has dealt only with the Town Planning Board, other Government departments and the representatives of all owners within scheme No. 11.

It is understood that the Lands Department is surveying the area of the proposed exchange.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: LEGISLATIVE REVIEW AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Reports

371. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Local Government:

(1) Has the Minister seen a copy of the following Legislative Review and Advisory Committee reports—

(a) report No. 5 Town of East Fremantle; and

(b) report No. 6 Shire of Wanneroo?

(2) What action has he taken in relation to each of the above reports?

(3) What action is he going to take in relation to each of the reports?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) to (3) I am advised that the Minister for Local Government has not yet had these matters drawn to his attention, nor to the attention of his department.

Steps have been put in hand today to obtain sight of the reports and the questions posed will then be addressed.

372 to 375. *Postponed.*

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Architectural Division

150. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

Is the Minister involved in the reorganisation of the architectural division of the Public Works Department?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

No.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Architectural Division

151. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

In the event of some of the architectural division work force of the Public Works Department losing their jobs, which is quite possible, will the Minister then become involved?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The decision which has been taken by Government is that there should be a section involved in the restructuring of the architectural division of the Public Works Department, a section which will centre on redeployment and retraining. To the extent that the activities of that section can be assisted by my department, it certainly will be.