Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 9th August, 1979

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

ELECTORAL: ABORIGINES

Disenfranchisement: Petition

MR TONKIN (Morley) [2.19 p.m.]: I have a petition from 949 citizens of Western Australia which reads as follows—

> To the Honorable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assemble:
>
> We, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia are concerned that the West Australian Government is proposing amendments to the Electoral Act in order to disenfranchise illiterate Aboriginal voters. We believe a democratic Government should protect and facilitate the voting rights of all people regardless of race or literacy.
>
> Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly and I have certified accordingly.

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

(See petition No. 81).

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Security Agents Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Police and Traffic), and read a first time.

2. Local Government Act Amendment Bill.

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

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES TRIBUNAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer [2.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The aim of this short Bill is to sever the remaining statutory links which exist between magistrates and the Public Service.

In this aim the Bill is complementary to the Public Service Act, which was passed by Parliament last year, and the Bill currently before the House which proposes amendments to the Stipendiary Magistrates Act.

The action proposed by this Bill represents the final step in the process to remove from legislation any connotation that magistrates are civil servants. Members will recall that in 1977 the State Full Court made a clear distinction in this regard. As the Bill complements other legislation, it proposes only minor changes to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Act.

As a first step, the Bill proposes that reference to stipendiary magistrates be deleted from section 6 (1) (c) of the present Act. This action removes the remuneration of stipendiary magistrates from determination by the tribunal.

A reciprocal effect is then achieved by the proposed amendment to section 7 (1), which adds stipendiary magistrates to the list of persons whose remuneration is subject to recommendation by the tribunal. The result of these changes would be to place the fixing of remuneration for stipendiary magistrates on the same footing as for judges.

Reference to stipendiary magistrates is also deleted from section 10 (4) (b). Under this section, the Minister is required to appoint a person nominated by the Chairman of the Public Service Board, to assist the tribunal in its inquiries relating to remunerations paid to stipendiary magistrates and others. This deletion removes a further connection between the Public Service and magistrates.

I would again invite members' attention to the fact that this Bill is proposed as a final step in severing any statutory links which exist between magistrates and the Public Service.

Just to refresh the minds of members on the matter, I should like to point out, as I am sure members will appreciate, that in the case of Supreme Court and District Court judges, the tribunal makes a recommendation only and does not make an actual determination. Therefore, we are now adding stipendiary magistrates to the list of those who have a recommendation and not a determination as to salary. I am sure members are clear about the situation which exists, which is that if Parliament wants to object to the recommendations it is open to do so; otherwise the recommendations become effective after the

prescribed period. Determinations come into effect when made.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Police and Traffic) [2.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As from the 29th May, 1975, provision was thought to be contained within the Road Traffic Code for the Commissioner of Police to authorise and regulate, in the interests of public order and safety, processions and parades as well as people addressing those events from any private or public place.

In June, 1976, it was found that regulations made under the Road Traffic Act for that purpose were *ultra vires* the Act. As it was necessary to restore that authority to the Police Force to be able to regulate such matters, Parliament enacted section 54B of the Police Act.

The House is well aware of the incident which took place at Karratha on the 11th June, 1979, which I do not propose to delve into as it is still a matter before the courts and to which the *sub judice* rule applies, save to reaffirm that this Government will neither interfere nor give directives to the Commissioner of Police or the courts as to do so would create, in the true sense of the expression, a police state.

It seems to me that in recent times there appears to be developing a deliberate attempt to place a disparaging label on a proven principle of our society. I have in mind the current practice of some people who purposely complain of "repression" when they are talking about the supremacy of the law. Apparently to them, any law enforcement function is repressive. The distinction is clear—the law and its enforcement are pillars of freedom, not repression.

The Government wishes to state emphatically and unequivocally that vigorous, effective law enforcement is not repression; rather, it is an integral part of a free society and it is necessary for our survival. This becomes clearer with every demonstration. There can be no freedom and there can be no liberty without supremacy of the law. And we cannot have supremacy of the law unless the law is enforced.

I believe that this State offers more peaceable remedies for grievances, real or imagined, than any on earth. Our country's history is filled with the records of satisfactory and peaceful solutions to apparently irreconcilable differences. This is the strength of democracy—its capacity to accommodate a range of sharply divided opinion. Reasonable men advancing reasonable arguments need never resort to unlawful acts.

Mr Pearce: Why are you changing the Act then? They are purely rubbishy clichés.

Mr O'NEIL: The year 1892—87 years ago—saw the introduction of the Police Act, which then, as now, contained authority for the Commissioner of Police to give directions and make regulations for the route and pace to be observed by all vehicles, horses, and persons, and for preventing obstruction of the streets and thoroughfares by processions, meetings or assemblies, or in case of fires; and to provide for keeping order and preventing obstructions of thoroughfares surrounding public buildings and offices and other places of public resort, as well as preventing interference or annoyance to persons engaged in religious worship and preventing obstructions on and near the water during regattas.

Mr Skidmore: Are we getting a history lesson?

Mr O'NEIL: That is correct, because apparently a number of people need to look at our history.

Mr Pearce: You know perfectly well what the problems are. Why do you not get on with it?

Mr O'NEIL: This Government does not intend to erode the authority of the police to exercise control of public places in the interests of public convenience and public safety.

Mr Skidmore: I would not think that it would.

Mr O'NEIL: I thank the honourable member. At least that is one point on which we agree.

However, this Bill provides for the updating of the law. The Police Act currently contains a patchwork of modernly drafted provisions dealing adequately with present-day problems alongside sections drafted and applicable only, if at all, to conditions of an age long past.

The Police Act is presently under review by the Commissioner of Police and the first stage of that review was dealt with last year by this House in regard to disciplinary procedures. It is possible that other matters may be dealt with during this session.

This Bill will now create a flow from section 52 to section 54B and in doing so will indicate clearly what are "public places" and "public meetings".

It will provide for notification in regard to public meetings in public places, the granting of approval for such events, with or without

conditions, as well as allowing the commissioner to delegate his authority in such matters.

Dealing with the Bill in greater detail, it provides for the definition of a thoroughfare, an omission in the interpretation section of the present Police Act, although other sections refer to thoroughfares. This proposal does not affect the main principles contained in the Bill.

I have mentioned previously that some parts of the Police Act contain a patchwork of old and modern provisions. The present section 52 clearly falls into that category.

Mr Skidmore: It should be repealed.

Mr O'NEIL: The marginal notes indicate the purpose of the section; that is, to prevent obstructions in the streets during public processions, etc. Apart from some outmoded provisions, the section contains matter more appropriately placed in another section of the Act; hence the proposal to repeal subsections (2), (3), and (4).

Mr Pearce: Why did you stand by section 54B if it was so outdated?

Sir Charles Court: Why don't you listen?

Mr O'NEIL: I happen to be talking about section 52.

Mr Pearce: I understand that. I am talking about the whole Police Act, not bit after bit.

Sir Charles Court: The truth is showing over there.

Mr Pearce: You had to wait until the Premier came back before you could back away. There is no point in giving a history lesson.

Sir Charles Court: We can see how you are reacting.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Deputy Premier resume his seat? There will be ample opportunity for members of the House to make any point they wish on this particular Bill after it has been introduced.

Mr O'NEIL: It is always important for members to understand what the Bill is all about before they start criticising.

Mr Pearce: We do now, but it is three months too late.

Mr O'NEIL: Before I was interrupted I had just said that the present section 52 falls into the category of those parts of the Act which are, in essence, a patchwork of old and current provisions.

In order to assist members, I now propose to indicate exactly how the new section 52 will read if amended along the lines proposed in this Bill. It will save members the job of cutting up the Bill.

Mr Skidmore: You are all heart!

Mr O'NEIL: I want to make sure members really know what they are talking about.

Mr T. H. Jones: You didn't know when you were introducing the amendments. That is the problem.

Mr O'NEIL: Section 52 as amended will read as follows—

> 52. (1) The Commissioner of Police, from time to time, and as occasion shall require, may give instructions to members of the Police Force for the purpose of regulating the route and pace to be observed by all vehicles, horses, and persons, and for preventing obstruction of the streets and thoroughfares by processions, meetings, or assemblies or in case of fires, and to provide for keeping order and for preventing any obstructions of the thoroughfares in the immediate neighbourhood of all public buildings and offices, theatres, and other places of public resort, and in any case where the streets or thoroughfares may be thronged or may be liable to be obstructed, and to prevent any interference with or annoyance of any congregation, or meeting engaged in divine worship in any building consecrated or otherwise, and for keeping order and preventing obstructions on and near the water on which any sporting event or other assembly is held, but no such instruction shall be given for the purpose of frustrating the operation of section fifty-four B of this Act.

Mr Pearce: Why are you changing it then?

Mr O'NEIL: To continue—

> (2) A member of the Police Force acting in accordance with instructions given under subsection (1) of this section may give such directions as may seem expedient to him to give effect to those instructions.
>
> (3) Every person who, after being acquainted with the same, fails to observe or contravenes any directions given under subsection (2) of this section commits an offence.
>
> Penalty: One hundred dollars.
>
> (4) The power vested in the Commissioner of Police by subsection (1) of this section may be exercised by any member of the Police Force of or above the rank of sergeant duly authorised by the Commissioner of Police for the purpose.

I now come to the apparently not-so-well understood and it seems to me all too frequently,

wittingly or unwittingly, misinterpreted section 54B of the Act.

The Bill before the House proposes to repeal section 54B and re-enact it with amendments.

Mr Bertram: On what date?

Mr O'NEIL: I believe that the method employed by the draftsman in this instance provides for an easier examination by members of all the proposals than the usual type of amendment. It was an appreciation of this fact that persuaded me to read to the House how the proposed new section 52 would appear when amended.

I will now as simply as possible explain what proposed new section 54B purports to do.

There will, in future, be a requirement to give notice to the Commissioner of Police or other authorised officer of an intention to conduct a procession or a public meeting in a public place. I stress the words "a public meeting in a public place."

Mr Carr: Will they all be defined?

Mr O'NEIL: Yes, it is in the Bill and section 54B in its new form is completely printed in the Bill, as I have just said. Although the member for Geraldton was a member of the profession to which I once belonged, on this occasion he would receive only two out of 10 for comprehension.

Mr T. H. Jones: You are very aggressive.

Mr O'NEIL: It therefore follows that public meetings in private places and private meetings in public places are not to be subject to such notification.

Mr T. H. Jones: You are adopting a very aggressive attitude, and we are not even debating it yet.

Mr Pearce: Having said all this you still haven't explained much.

Mr O'NEIL: The member for Collie could have fooled me if members opposite are not debating the subject. What is all the babble from over the other side, then?

Several members interjected.

Mr O'NEIL: For the benefit of those who still do not understand the situation, I repeat: It therefore follows that public meetings in private places and private meetings in public places are not to be subject to such notification. Although adequate notice is required—namely, four days—provision is made for shorter notice if agreed. Clearly such things as Anzac Day commemorative services in Perth or Christmas pageants and the like or other more or less regular occurrences of that nature require adequate notice to enable the police to deploy their forces in order to regulate those events. Four days' notice may not be necessary for other events or in other locations.

The information required to be supplied in such detail as practicable, is necessary to allow for such deployment and to provide to the authorised officer information which in the first place would enable him to ascertain whether or not he has any grounds for withholding permission—there are constraints applied to such a decision—

Mr Skidmore: It is certainly well known to those who were charged.

Mr O'NEIL:—and, in the second place, to determine what conditions, if any, may be in the permit which, incidentally, must be in writing.

Where permission is given, and except in relation to ambulance, fire, and police vehicles, immunity is granted to participants in respect of what would be otherwise breaches of laws relating to obstruction, but certainly not in respect of all the laws of the land.

The section also will provide for offences. It is pertinent to point out that the present proposal, that an offence is committed only after the offender has been acquainted of the fact, is a provision currently obtaining but which, in the recent controversy, has again—either wittingly or unwittingly—been overlooked by those who have attacked the present law.

In order to obtain a clearer understanding of the principles involved and the relativity of the proposed new law in this State to that in other parts of the Commonwealth, I would commend to members the "Review by the Attorney General of the Commonwealth and the Attorney General for Western Australia of the Laws in Relation to Public Assemblies" which has been made public and which I propose to table at the conclusion of this speech.

In my opinion the Bill is superior to the legislation in any other State. I am sure when its full text is understood, all reasonable people will accept that it takes full account of the need for freedom to discuss public issues on the one hand, and the need for the preservation of public safety and the convenience of the public on the other.

I commend the Bill to the House and ask permission to table the paper to which I referred.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 268).

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. H. Jones.

CENSORSHIP OF FILMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Chief Secretary) [2.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The amendment proposed in this Bill is aimed at bringing our legislation into line with that which operates under the Commonwealth.

Film censorship is carried out by a Commonwealth-appointed board which acts for all States. Where a film has been classified by the board, the owner may seek the review of the classification by the appeal censor. A fee of $50 must be lodged with the appeal.

The Commonwealth legislation provides that in the event of a successful appeal the fee is refunded. This does not apply under the legislation of this State.

The amendment would provide for the return of the fee in the case of films reviewed for this State where appeals were completely or substantially upheld.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Hodge.

ACTS AMENDMENT (POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION) BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [2.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

I am introducing this Bill on behalf of the Minister for Education.

The Western Australian Post-Secondary Education Commission has been in operation in its present form for over 2½ years, and as a result of the experience gained it is considered desirable to make some amendments to the Act to promote the more efficient operation of the commission.

In November, 1978, the Minister for Education wrote to post-secondary education institutions seeking their views on the effectiveness of the Act, and in framing the present Bill consideration was given to the responses received from the various institutions. The amendments proposed will not change the fundamental purpose of the commission as a planning and co-ordinating authority, but it will assist the Government and the commission to overcome some difficulties that have become apparent.

Section 6 of the Act dealing with the composition of membership of the commission is to be repealed, and a new section 6 will be substituted. This amendment will reduce the membership from the present chairman plus 14 members, to that of a chairman plus 11 members. In addition, the present categorisation of membership by post-secondary education sectors will be abolished. The 11 members will be persons selected for their knowledge of and interest in education, community affairs in the city and country, employment problems, or government. Not more than four of these persons shall be persons actively engaged in post-secondary education as members of staff.

This change is being made because the Government believes that the commission is unnecessarily large, and that the categorisation of membership has proved unnecessarily cumbersome. In restricting the number of persons who can be directly engaged in post-secondary education to no more than four, the balance of the commission in favour of members drawn from outside direct involvement in the institutions will be preserved.

The matter of staff industrial conditions in post-secondary education has become increasingly complex. The commission already has the responsibility of advising governing authorities of institutions on the terms and conditions of appointment and employment of staff, and on claims related to such terms and conditions. The Government is of the opinion that the Minister should be kept informed also on these matters and therefore paragraph (e) of subsection (2) of section 12 is being amended in part to require the commission to undertake that responsibility also.

The Act has not contained any clause which will enable the commission to delegate its powers to any committee or to the chairman. This has resulted in some time-wasting procedures whereby even some minor matters have had to be considered by the commission when they could well be handled by the delegation of authority. Hence Clause 8 of the Bill will add a new section 13A to the Act to give to the commission the power of delegation in the usual terms and with the usual safeguards.

There has been some confusion about the right of the commission to consult with institutions in the various sectors, particularly as the method of operation of the Commonwealth with the sectors differs considerably. Hence an amendment is being proposed to add a new section 14A, that will enable the commission to require consultation with any institution on matters that are relevant to the function or duties of the commission.

There have been some difficulties with adequate co-ordination of activities at the State level, in part because of the lack of clarity of the responsibilities of the commission with respect to some sectors, and in part again because of the differing ways in which the Commonwealth Government deals with the various sectors of post-secondary education. The Government believes that since all institutions are established under State legislation, and since all institutions engage in teaching activities of students who are almost entirely within the State, it is reasonable to expect co-operation and co-ordination of developments in all sectors. Hence a new section 14B is being added to require all post-secondary education institutions to advise the commission of any representation it proposes to make to the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission or its agencies and to obtain the views of the commission on those proposed representations. In addition the commission will be entitled to obtain information from institutions that may be reasonably required in the performance of its functions.

The Bill also proposes amendments to the University of Western Australia Act and the Western Australian Institute of Technology Act.

These Acts have not been amended as yet to indicate that with respect to certain responsibilities of the senate and council respectively, those bodies are subject to the provisions of the Western Australian Post-Secondary Education Commission Act, 1970. Those institutions were in operation prior to the establishment of the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission which was the predecessor of the Post-Secondary Education Commission and hence such sections are not in the Acts of those two institutions. The Acts governing Murdoch University and the colleges which were passed through Parliament subsequent to the establishment of the commission do include such sections, and the opportunity is being taken in this amendment to clarify this aspect.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Pearce.

STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.49 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Act now requires all horses to be branded with the owner's registered brand which consists of an arrangement of two letters and a numeral. Branding is compulsory.

Since 1977 the Western Australian Trotting Association has required all horses registered with the association to be individually identified with a number registered with the association. The numbering system used is the Alpha-Angle system. It denotes the State where the animal is bred as well as the horse's individual identification number.

As the Act now stands these horses also have to be branded with the owner's registered brand. The association has therefore requested that its branding be accepted in lieu of that laid down by the Act.

Provision already exists in the Act for stud cattle to be marked by a breed society mark in lieu of the owner's registered brand. It is relevant therefore to extend this provision to stud horses so that owners registered with a breed society may have the option of identifying their horses with the brand of the society in lieu of using the registered brand.

The WA Trotting Association is recognised by the Royal Agricultural Society as a body which carries out the registration of a particular breed or strain of horse; that is, standard bred pacers.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans.

HONEY POOL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Following the Governor's assent to the Honey Pool Act, 1978, action was taken to draft regulations which would enable the election of the new board of directors.

It was intended to proclaim the Act and to effect the gazettal of the regulations at the same time, with the object of enabling the board to take office from the 1st July, 1979. However, during drafting of the proposed regulations my attention was drawn to an important technical difficulty in the Act because of the use of the concept "prescribed participant".

The present legislation relates the eligibility of participants to a pool, whereas it is the intention of the board of the Honey Pool to relate participation to the delivery of honey to the immediately previous pool, or pools, within the previous financial year.

The new definition of "prescribed participant" which is now proposed remedies this problem and clearly specifies eligibility in a manner which is in full accord with the policy of the Honey Pool.

I am informed that the criteria for establishing eligibility for a pool have been debated within the industry and are fully accepted by participants. Voting entitlement is also dependent upon the volume of honey delivered by a participant to a pool or pools within the previous financial year.

The Bill also makes explicit the power of the Governor to appoint a chairman as distinct from the power to appoint directors, and effects an interim continuation of the present board so that the eligibility of persons to vote for or stand as directors can be ascertained within the criteria adopted by the directors for such eligibility.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans.

ACTS AMENDMENT (MASTER, SUPREME COURT) BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Chief Secretary) [2.54 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Master of the Supreme Court is a public servant responsible for the administrative functions of the Supreme Court. He is assisted by three deputy masters who are all legally qualified, but neither the master nor the deputies are members of the Supreme Court. The master and his deputies are administrative officers.

There is a steadily increasing infusion of Federal jurisdiction into the judicial work of the Supreme Court and this is likely to increase still further as the scope of the Commonwealth law extends and the State Supreme Court is invested with Federal jurisdiction in respect of it.

The Government believes that in the interests of public convenience and the economical management of the courts, the vesting of Federal jurisdiction in the State courts is a trend to be encouraged, but at the same time it presents a problem when the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is being exercised by the master, as that office is presently constituted. Under the Commonwealth Constitution all Federal jurisdiction must be exercised by the court through its judicial and not its administrative officers.

This problem can be overcome if the Supreme Court can be so constituted that it includes the master. He would then be in the position where he could exercise the duties of his office without regard to whether State or Federal jurisdiction was involved. Victoria took this step in 1975 and it is considered that example should be followed in this State.

The purpose of this Bill can be stated in brief terms as reconstituting the Supreme Court so that it includes the master. This would have the effect of making him a judicial officer.

The amendment proposed would mean that the judges of the Supreme Court would be relieved from more or less all the procedural chamber work, which they currently undertake. Work which is not of this kind would still be dealt with by judges as part of their ordinary civil lists. Duties of an administrative nature, probate work, taxation of costs, and passing of accounts would be assigned to the principal registrar or one of the other registrars.

In making the master a constituent member of the Supreme Court, it has been necessary to include provisions covering the qualifications required for such an appointment, together with the conditions of service applying to that office. These various aspects are covered by the proposed sections 11A and 11B.

If the present occupant of the position of master is appointed to that position, superannuation will continue as if he were a public servant, but it should be noted that if at some future time an appointee is not a public servant prior to his appointment, he would be entitled to pension rights in the same manner as a judge.

Provisions are also included to cover the retirement of the master at the age of 65, but this will not prevent him from completing proceedings which are outstanding at the time he turns 65 years of age or the time at which he elects to retire if this is earlier.

The proposed section 11D covers the matter of temporary appointments of acting masters during the absence or indisposition of the person holding the office of master. It has also been considered desirable to include a provision which will enable acting appointments to be made on either a full or part-time basis. This will enable the proceedings to be heard and completed before the person who held the office as an acting master.

As members will appreciate, several Acts of Parliament contain references to the master, and because of the proposal to make him a member of the Supreme Court some reorganisation of duties between the master and the registrars has been necessary. Certain of the master's present

functions relating to the legislation listed in the proposed section 11E(2) would still remain within his jurisdiction.

The principal amendments are to be made in the Supreme Court Act. However, certain other references to the master in Acts as detailed in the long title to the Bill are to be amended and the functions dealt with by the principal registrar or the registrars as the case may be. The details of the amendments to those Acts are contained in parts II to XVII of the Bill and relate solely to the reorganisation of duties.

Resulting from his appointment as a member of the Supreme Court, the master will be entitled to perform certain functions and the rearrangements of duties are detailed in the Bill.

Some of these amendments also relate to functions which were formerly performed by the master and which will now be handled either by the master or a registrar.

An amendment in the Bill to repeal and re-enact section 155 of the Supreme Court Act deals with the establishment of the offices of the principal registrar and such other registrars as may be required. These officers are currently public servants subject to the Public Service Act and they will remain so.

As the master will become a constituent member of the Supreme Court, it is no longer appropriate for the persons holding the office of deputy master to be known by that name, and it is proposed that there will be a principal registrar and other registrars as may be required. This will ensure there is a distinction between the master in his judicial role and the registrars who are responsible for the execution and administration of court matters.

In closing, it is emphasised that the master in this new role will not be a Supreme Court judge. His principal function will be to relieve the judges of work which is mainly procedural in character and which they currently undertake, and so enable them to concentrate on the contentious matters which arise and require the attention of a judge.

The proposals contained in this Bill represent an important reform in the organisation of the Supreme Court, the beneficial effects of which will be felt for many years to come, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion Mr Bertram.

LAND TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 12th April.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [3.00 p.m.]: This Bill has been on the notice paper for quite some time. The amendment it contains is a small one only, and one which I believe should have been included in some form when the Act was rewritten in 1976.

Members will recall that prior to the proclamation of the Act in 1976, unless property ownership changed during the current financial year, it was not necessary for an owner to submit a return. After that time there was an amendment to the amount of property one could hold without being required to lodge a return; the limit for a home site lot was extended to five acres.

It was then required that all owners of land, other than those exempted—that is, the owner of a home site of up to five acres—must submit land tax returns each year. I do not believe that this provision was given much thought during the drafting stage because it has caused a considerable amount of work to the public and to the department.

When introducing the Bill presently before us, the Treasurer said that the Act had helped to bring about a firm bank of information on taxable lands. I do not know whether it has done that yet. Many people are lazy when it comes to submitting returns, and I would like to ask the Treasurer whether the department carries out a check in this regard, and that if such a check is carried out, why did we need the 1976 legislation to bring these records up to date?

I do not think we can rely simply on the honesty of the individuals to provide us with a bank of information. Probably many people are not submitting returns. I am aware that there is a penalty for not submitting a return, but is such a penalty ever imposed?

One would have thought that in 1976 it would have been better for the Commissioner of State Taxation to set aside a section of his department to find out which owners should be paying this tax rather than to have requested the amendment with a view to bringing his records up to date. I have no doubt that his records are more up to date now than they were before 1976, but it seems to me it was a cumbersome way to go about it. If other departments relied on such a procedure, we would be filling in forms all day long. In fact, it seems to me it is rather like the Brazilian idea where the people volunteer to pay taxation. I must

admit that one incurs certain penalties if one is not a volunteer—but this is only found out later in life.

People are notoriously lazy about filling in forms and, as I have said before, it will be difficult to know whether the records of the department are as up to date as we would wish.

The amendment now before us is a more sensible method of overcoming the problem. The department will not be cluttered up with unnecessary mail, and it will not cause any worry to the taxpayer who forgets to put in a return. Although I was aware of the legislation when it was introduced in 1976, I myself forgot that I owned a block of land down the coast. When I was reminded of the fact that I had not submitted a return, I hastened to do so but I did feel that the return was a waste of time because my ownership of the property had not changed for many years and there was no necessity for any departmental action. This indicates that there must have been some form of check in the past and we must wonder why a double check is necessary.

In my opinion this amending Bill will be well received by the public. The fewer forms one must fill in regularly the better. The amendment appears to be a sound one, and therefore, the Opposition supports the Bill.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [3.08 p.m.]: I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill, and I now respond to his request for some comment regarding the procedures involved.

It is a fact, of course, that the department does not rely entirely on the returns submitted by taxpayers. If it did that, I am afraid it would be short of a great deal of tax. A system of checking and cross-checking is being carried out all the time.

When the legislation was introduced in 1976 it was thought necessary to tidy up the whole situation, particularly as it was intended that the department would be moving to computerisation to an ever-increasing degree. In fact, when I introduced the new legislation in regard to land tax, I said that computerisation was part of the programme, and that some of the provisions in that legislation were directed towards that end objective.

If we go back to look at the original Land Tax Assessment Act of 1907, we see that it contained a provision for the lodging of returns. However, over the years the practice has been that a return is necessary only when a change has occurred. The public being as they are, and not everyone being as methodical with his records as he perhaps should be, it is fairly certain that many people would not remember that they must lodge a return when there has been a change and unless an agent or someone else prompted them, they could omit to fill in the return—not in a deliberate way, but rather in an unwitting way.

When the major review of the Act was being considered, the commissioner explained to me that it was desirable to start again. For that reason I explained very explicitly to the Parliament at the time that the Act would be amended after a transition period.

I think it was mentioned at the time that efforts had been made to draft transitional legislation so that at the end of the period we would not have to come back here. However, after discussion I agreed that would only cause confusion, because some people would place more emphasis on the transitional legislation than the basic legislation. Therefore, we went about it in the manner we have done, and I think it makes sense. It has satisfied the commissioner because he is now in a better position so far as his records are concerned.

However, I would not like people to think that by ignoring the law and ignoring their responsibility to go to the department they will avoid paying tax, because very few people have escaped the payment of tax simply by not submitting a return. Sooner or later they are caught up with. There are complications, too, because it is not unusual for some land to change hands two or three times in the one year, for a variety of reasons.

I can assure the member for Welshpool that the department does not rely on returns being submitted. In fact it carries out cross-checking constantly, and this action will be intensified and made more persistent and more complete when the records are taken over by the computer.

The time is opportune to introduce this amendment to make it possible for the commissioner to relieve persons or classes of persons from the necessity to submit returns. I emphasise to members that the Bill merely gives the commissioner authority to relieve persons of that responsibility; it does not actually write into the Act that no longer must people submit returns.

I thank the member for Welshpool for his support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Sir Charles Court (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 24 amended—

Mr JAMIESON: Proposed new subsection (6b) says that "notice" means public notice or notice in writing served on the person or persons to whom the notice applies. I think perhaps in this case it should be a little more specific, because "public notice" could be taken to mean the *Government Gazette* or some such publication that not many people look at.

We have had a great deal of legislation which has stated that "public notice" means a notice printed in a newspaper freely circulating within the State. The Treasurer will appreciate that this term has been used quite often. I am sure the commissioner would give notice in a newspaper, but it seems strange that it is not clearly specified in the measure. We are dealing with the general public rather than that section of the pubiic who are liable to read the public notices in the *Government Gazette*. I would like the Treasurer to comment on whether he thinks it would be better to include a reference to the notice being published in a newspaper freely circulating in the State.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I assure the member for Welshpool that the commissioner has always ensured that the general public have been given adequate notice. In this case, it would not be a matter simply of putting a notice in the *Government Gazette*. The words used in the Bill are used in quite a deal of legislation concerning tax matters. It is not expected that the commissioner will want to give notice of this sort very often. If the procedures are operating smoothly I should imagine he would want to do it as seldom as possible.

I refer to the fact that the commissioner may by notice relieve any person or class of persons from the obligation to furnish annual returns and may, by further notice, reimpose that obligation. The instance that is of most importance to the taxpayer is when the commissioner reimposes an obligation. I can assure the member that ample publicity will be given to reasonably vigilant citizens. Notice will not be confined merely to the *Government Gazette*, because I should imagine the number of people who read that publication for the joy of reading it would be minimal!

I assure the member for Welshpool that this provision is adequate and that precautions are taken to ensure that taxpayers receive reasonable notice.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [3.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Since the Committee stage I have been able to locate a paper I was seeking in order to answer the question raised by the member for Welshpool. The paper confirms the advice I gave; however, there will be cases where notice will be directed to the individuals concerned. That does not present any problem. The commissioner has confirmed that public notice is given by way of advertisements in city and country newspapers. In addition the formal, legal notice will be given in the *Government Gazette*.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BULK HANDLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 12th April.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [3.20 p.m.]: At the outset I would like to point out the Opposition is and always has been sympathetic to the problems of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. In fact, during the time of the Tonkin Government extensive negotiations were entered into to assist CBH in the arrangement of finance to construct the bulk handling facility at Kwinana. Subsequently, when further difficulties were encountered, the same Government hastened through legislation to convenience the CBH board. We retain a keen interest in the operation and organisation of CBH and recognise the need to have a grain handling association which is as efficient as possible, in the interests of the grain producers.

I suppose it is fair to say that, as a grain handling authority, CBH is at least comparable with those organisations operating in other States. In that regard the industry is quite fortunate. If CBH is to maintain that position, a high degree of efficiency and low operating costs must be fostered.

The measure now before the House is in line with the objective of assisting CBH in its operation. In this particular instance, it deals with the amount of water rates CBH is called upon to pay. The Minister indicated in his second reading speech that a water rates assessment usually is based upon the rental value as related to the capital value of a property and that under this formula CBH would be called upon to pay some $132 000 in rates in the year ended the 30th June, 1978. The Minister did not refer to the exact quantity of water used by the authority. Obviously, it would not be comparable with the amount used by an abattoir or a similar industry, which uses water extensively. The water used at the CBH installation at Kwinana is purely for domestic and personal use. It is true that the garden area around the installation is quite extensive, but I understand the water used for this purpose is derived from an underground source.

However, $132 000 is a considerable amount to pay for a service which, in effect, is not being fully utilised, but which results from the fact there is a $38 million capitalisation at these works. The legislation seeks to reduce the rate paid by CBH to 25 per cent of the rating using the formula specified in the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act; this seems to be a reasonably fair approach to the situation. I would appreciate an indication of the total quantity of water consumed at the CBH installation; this would enable members to appreciate fully the nature of the problem.

I have no doubt that the problem at CBH which this legislation seeks to rectify epitomises the situation which exists elsewhere, to the disadvantage of comparable organisations and bodies. The same anomalous situation no doubt would apply to private individuals. Perhaps it should be the Minister for Works or his representative in this Chamber who is handling this Bill, rather than the Minister for Agriculture.

I ask the Minister in his reply to give some attention to answering my specific queries, not the least of which is: Are similar concessions granted elsewhere in industry and if so, to whom? It is not a case of the Opposition begrudging a reasonable and justifiable concession to CBH; rather, it is a matter of examining the overall perspective of the situation to ascertain whether there are any other organisations or individuals who are disadvantaged in a similar way, although perhaps not to the same extent. Such people would have a logical and reasonable case on which to base a similar claim for a reduction in their water rates.

The Opposition does not object to granting CBH a concession of this nature. We do not cavil at a measure designed to promote greater efficiency in an essential service. I would like the Minister to inform me whether his department or any other department has carried out a survey to determine whether or not other businesses in the metropolitan area are disadvantaged in a similar way. If such a survey has been carried out, we should like to know the results. To what extent are these people disadvantaged and has there been any attempt on the part of the Government to resolve that situation?

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [3.27 p.m.]: I support this amending legislation; it is a commendable attempt to assist the operations of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. At the moment, CBH unfortunately is involved in a demarcation dispute between two unions which is preventing grain from being handled and exported. This situation was one we did not wish to see occur, because it was calculated that with a normal rate of grain sales and exports and with a normal harvest next year, CBH would have sufficient storage facilities to cater for the needs of the farmers. Had the seasonal conditions not reacted adversely against the graingrowers, and with a normal shipping programme, the situation could have been handled quite adequately.

Unfortunately, however, the demarcation dispute is continuing and is causing a hold-up in the handling of grain. This means, of course, that CBH is not generating its usual income from sales and has had to increase its debts to pay costs. By reducing CBH's water rates to 25 per cent of the normal figure of $132 000—the authority will still be required to pay some $33 000—CBH will be assisted in meeting costs and charges it is not able to service from income. As a shareholder of CBH, like many other members in this House—

Mr Jamieson: You are declaring an interest in the Bill!

Mr McPHARLIN: I suppose one could say I have a pecuniary interest; however, I would not be the only one in this place who has such an interest.

Naturally I am concerned, not only with the interests that one might have personally, but also with the interests of all graingrowers. This is a move in the right direction.

The handling authority is regarded as not only an efficient handling authority but also, I believe, it has no peer anywhere in the world as far as handling grain is concerned. We, as growers who have contributed to it over many years, are very interested in its continued operation. Any measure that can be applied to allow the organisation to continue as the efficient handling

organsiation we know it to be is supported by all those growers who are involved in the payment of tolls and who contribute to the funds which pay for the operation of the system, its building programmes, and the other debts incurred by the organisation.

It is with pleasure that I support this amendment. It is one that I think all graingrowers will endorse.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [3.31 p.m.]: I too support the Bill.

I want to take a little latitude and indicate that organisations of this type and the Government should not become involved in demarcation disputes. I discovered that to my regret early in my career as the Minister for Electricity. Such bodies should keep right out of disputes of this kind.

There might be criticism of waterside workers or the AWU in relation to their handling of the situation. However, it is a dispute between them. When a third party becomes involved, it is like trying to separate a man and his wife when they are fighting. Both parties are liable to turn around and whack the intervener. I would be very careful if I were in such circumstances.

I think the organisation and the Government would be well advised to keep away from demarcation disputes. The Federal and State industrial courts made that point clear. It was indicated that the part played by CBH in the sacking of the men should be ended. That indicates a good line of thought on the part of the industrial courts.

I wish to return to the subject matter of the Bill. I know you, Mr Speaker, would not like me to continue with a debate on the merits of the waterside workers' dispute and whether the waterside workers or the AWU were right. I would not like to become involved in that sort of debate because one body or the other would probably keelhaul me after I had expressed a view along either line.

The matter which concerns me in relation to this Bill, despite my general support for it, is whether it opens a Pandora's box so far as the Metropolitan Water Board is concerned. I asked questions as late as yesterday on this subject because I had been contacted by a young fellow who owned a block of land at Booragoon. He was charged a considerable amount for a vacant block of land that he was holding. He is only a young person who contemplates marriage and building on the block ultimately. He is being charged a considerable amount in rates. Of course, he is also paying the fixed charges that apply to the home where he is now living in Attadale.

This young man is receiving no benefits in relation to the rates he is paying. Co-operative Bulk Handling has a water connection, but would not be able to use the water that would be available. Because this young man's block is not connected to the mains, he feels that it is unjust that he should be paying high rates on the property. At its present residence CBH has its own reticulation system. It may use only the ordinary, domestic supply, and not exceed $40 fixed charges.

Some properties are positioned in such a way that they are receiving no benefit but they are paying the rates. The people have complained, "We are not using it. Why should we pay for it?" That is the problem faced when a pay-as-you-use system is in force in combination with a ratable system.

There are no problems in this regard in relation to the provision of electricity. That is all on the basis of pay-as-you-use. I realise there is a fixed charge on the electricity, or what one might call a minimum charge. If electricity mains run past a home but the home is not connected, the owner does not have to pay anything.

All this leads to a position, as the member for Warren pointed out, where there may be other people who deserve a concession as much as CBH. If the concessions were extended, of course, the Metropolitan Water Board would start to scream to high heaven because its finances would be raped and its overall charges would have to be increased. Then, of course, there would be further complaints against the Government. So it goes on and on.

When a Bill like this passes through the Parliament, people regard the organisation as having a lot of money, whether it has or not. Whether the money belongs to the shareholders does not matter. The people are comparing the position of that organisation with their own positions; so their objections are quite justified. If this is the case, we may be starting something that we will regret in the long term.

However, I would agree that where there is little chance of high usage, and primary producers could be affected by loading additional costs onto them, some action must be taken. Apart from anything else, the effect on the economy is vital. The organisation must be able to continue selling wheat and other produce. We all know this.

I hope that sweet reason prevails in respect of this type of move, and that we do not have too many of them. It may be that some people

will feel aggrieved that they are not receiving the concessions that the CBH organisation is to receive under the provisions of this Bill.

MR TONKIN (Morley) [3.37 p.m.]: Briefly I would like to refer to a matter that has been referred to by other speakers today: the question of the demarcation dispute that is continuing and is involving two unions and CBH.

For many years it has been the attitude of the Australian Labor Party that demarcation disputes are undesirable. Such disputes will be lessened to a considerable extent if there are larger unions based on industry and we move away from the old craft unions which are often so small. This has been prevented by the attitudes of the conservatives in the State Parliaments and in the Federal Parliament. In those places, the conservative parties have consistently set their faces against the easy amalgamation and moving together of the various unions. This has been seen consistently, at least since the end of World War II. At the moment, we are seeing the kind of dispute that can occur.

I would urge the conservative parties, if they are conscientiously concerned about lessening the number of industrial disputes, to reconsider their policies in respect of trade union amalgamations. Then there would be a more orderly system of industrial relations in this country.

If we want to consider a model upon which we could base some of our ideas, we could do worse than consider West Germany where, as is well known, the trade unions are large, very few in number, and very stable. That kind of development is something we as a community should be looking at seriously.

The Opposition has been consistent over decades in respect of this matter as have the conservative parties; but we believe the conservative parties would do well to look again at this whole situation.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture)[3.41 p.m.]: I thank members for their contributions, even though much of what they said did not relate to the amendment to the Act which we are debating. I thank them for their advice regarding the industrial situation with respect to CBH and the unions involved in the demarcation dispute, but I shall not be taking that advice. I reiterate: I support the stand by CBH in its pursuit of justice.

The matter of the variation of rating for CBH is one to which most members have given their tacit agreement, and I thank them for that. CBH is in a unique situation inasmuch as it has a very high capital installation, as is well known to the member for Warren. I take cognisance of the fact that when his party was in government it assisted CBH in attaining its goal of establishing that facility.

This Government is continuing to support CBH and in turn is supporting the producers of grain in Western Australia who are in fact one of the major contributors to our export earnings. With this in mind, the Government realises some concession is due to a company which uses a very minimal amount of water. I cannot give the actual usage, but I can assure members it is minimal; it is purely for domestic use. As such the Government considers that CBH is in a situation where, with tremendously high capital cost buildings of $38 million, if the normal procedures of the Metropolitan Water Board were used in the calculation of rates—that is, 4 per cent of the capital value of the building by 8.7c in the dollar—there would be an intolerable burden placed on the company.

I realise there are other businesses within the metropolitan area which could claim similar disadvantage, but I reiterate: this is quite a different set of circumstances, because this is a growers' co-operative which contributes so much to the export activities of Western Australia. Every burden placed on these contributors detracts from the advantage they have geographically in supplying produce to some of the countries close to Australia.

At this stage not only do we have a geographic advantage, but also I am assured by CBH that there are countries which prefer to get supplies of wheat from Western Australia because of the protein content. The matter of other concessions does not come within the ambit of my portfolio, and the reason for this concession is entrenched in the Co-operative Bulk Handling Bill and is an indication of the Government's attitude to this association.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.04 p.m.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

SUNDAY ENTERTAINMENTS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th April.

MR HODGE (Melville) [4.44 p.m.]: The Opposition has no objection to this Bill which we believe is a fairly minor machinery one. However, we feel the Government should undertake a fairly wide review of the parent Act rather than just tinker around with minor amendments.

I agree with the remarks made by the Chief Secretary when he introduced this Bill that a significant change has taken place in the community's attitude to entertainment on a Sunday and like matters. In view of this changed attitude, we feel that the legislation could be reviewed thoroughly.

While we have no objection to the Bill, during the Committee stage debate I will raise some queries about clause 3. We are rather concerned about the amendments which appear on the notice paper in the name of the member for Cottesloe. At this stage we certainly do not agree with the amendments. However, we would like to hear the remarks of the honourable member before we comment further.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Chief Secretary) [4.46 p.m.]: I am somewhat surprised at the response of the member for Melville to this proposal. I want to point out that this Bill was introduced some time ago—it appears as No. 2 in the schedule of Bills and it was introduced into this House on the 5th April, 1979.

I appreciate that the Opposition has no objection to the Bill, and in fact, as the honourable member said, it is simply a tidying-up provision. However, it is in fact creating, in a separate Statute under the supervision of the Chief Secretary and his department, a provision which appears currently in the Police Act.

The honourable member made certain references to the parent Act, and I would like to point out to him that this is the parent Act. It is the first Act for this purpose. He suggested that the parent Act ought to be reviewed, but this is the time for review because it is the introduction of the parent Act.

Mr Pearce: He means the matter—not the parent Act. You don't want to get us to disagree now, do you?

Mr O'NEIL: It is so long since the introduction of the Bill that I had to check the second reading speech myself. The legislation is an attempt to regulate more clearly the matter of Sunday entertaiment. There is a changing community attitude in regard to Sunday entertainment, and I mentioned during my introductory speech that some changes which appear to be a little more realistic in modern times have taken place by administrative directive anyway.

This is purely an administrative Bill which removes a provision from the Police Act and enshrines it in a Statue of its own under the supervision of the Chief Secretary. I thank the honourable member for his support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Clarko) in the Chair; Mr O'Neil (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Public entertainments on Sundays, Christmas Day and Good Friday restricted—

Mr HASSELL: I move an amendment—

> Page 2, line 16—Insert before the word "keeps" the word "knowingly".

The purpose of the amendment is quite straightforward. I was a little surprised when the member for Melville indicated some concern about these amendments. They are designed to give protection to an owner or lessee of premises who may be prosecuted for what could be quite a serious offence in terms of the penalty, which could be $500 or a term of imprisonment. The amendment is designed to ensure that such a person cannot be convicted unless it is proved he has committed the offence deliberately, knowingly, and with intention.

The word "knowingly" is recognised by law and has an established meaning. Although I do not want to stray, it seems to me that my second amendment to paragraph (b) is more important; but the effect is the same in both places.

Mr O'NEIL: I indicate that I am prepared to accept the amendment, for the reasons stated by the member for Cottesloe.

Mr HODGE: The Opposition does not agree with the amendment. The inclusion of the word "knowingly" would make it almost impossible for a conviction to be sustained. As the member for Cottesloe would know, it is an extremely difficult matter to prove that someone broke the law knowingly and with intent. I agree with the member that the penalty is rather harsh. Perhaps

it would be more in order for him to move to amend the penalty, particularly where it refers to six months' imprisonment with hard labour, which seems rather draconian for these days.

It seems strange that the Government is prepared to agree to the inclusion of the word "knowingly" in this case when the next item of business on the notice paper deals with the Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act, in which the Government is proposing to remove virtually the same word. In the latter case the Government is proposing to remove the words "to his knowledge". The penalty in that case is not $500 but $5 000; yet the Government proposes to strengthen the legislation, whilst making it more difficult to sustain a conviction in respect of the Bill presently before the Chamber.

Mr HASSELL: The use of the words, "with or without hard labour" does not mean much, because I understand in practice there is no such thing as hard labour in our penal institutions. I am surprised that the member for Melville wants to make it easier to secure convictions in respect of what is considered to be basically a social offence. I am grateful to the Government for accepting my amendment.

The member for Melville says my amendment will make it almost impossible for a conviction to be secured. I do not agree. If we consider the Police Act and the Criminal Code and other Acts—especially older Acts—we will see that the element of "knowingly" is included in respect of many offences. Certainly in respect of criminal and quasi criminal law it is entirely appropriate that a person should be convicted only if he does something knowingly or with intention.

I believe the amendment provides proper protection for persons who may be prosecuted for what is basically a social offence, but for which the penalty may be significant. I am not very concerned about the penalty because courts have the capacity to impose an appropriate penalty according to the circumstances of the case. Even if the penalty were expressed at $50 000, it would really provide the court only with an indication of the gravity with which Parliament views the offence, and it does not mean the court must apply that penalty.

Mr BERTRAM: I would be able to understand the debate better if the expression "social offence" could be defined. It seems to me that the Government is anxious to see that clause 3 is given some teeth, and to demonstrate to the public that any breaches of this proposed Act will be severely dealt with. It appears also that the Government—up till the time the Minister indicated his acceptance of the amendment—

Mr O'Neil: Do you agree with the amendment? That is what the Committee is discussing at the moment.

Mr BERTRAM: At this stage I do not because I do not understand some of the things which have been said. To me the point raised by the member for Melville was an interesting one. He cannot understand—and nor can I—why the element of knowledge is being deleted from one law and inserted in another in consecutive Bills.

Mr O'Neil: Are you going to oppose this one and support the next one?

Mr BERTRAM: I did not say that.

Mr O'Neil: I will lend you two bob to toss up.

Mr BERTRAM: The Minister knows that I like to support nearly everything he does. He made a terrible botch of section 54B of the Police Act, but on other occasions he has been f.a.q.; and on some occasions he has reached the dizzy standard of being above-average.

This is an important clause; the Government has made that clear by attaching a significant penalty to it. I would like the information which the member for Melville sought. Why does the Government require knowledge in respect of this Bill, whilst in respect of the very next Bill on the notice paper knowledge will not be required?

The reason the word "knowledge" was not inserted in the first place, I believe, is that the Crown Law Department draftsman, having been told by the Minister the objective at hand, decided the word should not go in because it would then make it a much more practical provision. Generally speaking, "knowledge" is very important, but here it has been removed. I imagine in the first instance it was removed for very good reason and the Opposition would like to know what that reason was before the word "knowingly" is inserted.

Mr HODGE: I was not convinced by the argument of the member for Cottesloe. I think it is good to have a loosening of the restrictions on entertainment on Sundays and the other days mentioned. I do not know whether they are "social crimes" or not. Certainly, of about 400 applications which have been made to the Government, only about two have not been approved; so, it does not seem to be a great problem area.

If we are going to have a law, it should be enforceable. By amending clause 3 in the manner sought by the member for Cottesloe, the law will be ignored and almost unenforceable. A law such

as that is not worth having on the Statute book. I do not agree that we should make a law for the purpose of window dressing and then not be able to enforce it and be required to turn a blind eye to the things it purports to control.

Clause 3 goes on to specify that the Minister may publish in the *Government Gazette* lists of specified persons or classes of persons and specified places or classes of places for specified public entertainment which are not to be subject to the provisions of this legislation. As yet, the Minister has not enlightened us adequately as to what he has in mind; I would be interested to hear a full explanation of this provision.

Under the definition of "public entertainment", already there are exempted the arts, ethics, literature, science, social duties or any matter of public interest. So, it seems that quite a few areas of entertainment already are excluded from the provisions of this legislation, and I would be grateful if the Minister would give us a little more information on this point.

Mr O'Neil: I cannot do that until we are finished with the amendment. We are dealing with a specific amendment moved by the member for Cottesloe. At the conclusion of that discussion, I will be happy to provide an explanation.

Mr BERTRAM: Is it the Government's intention to approve of the playing of league football matches on Sundays?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Mt. Hawthorn to relate his remarks more closely to the amendment before the Chair. I do not see any direct relevance between the playing of football matches on Sundays and the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr BERTRAM: That was the only point I wished to raise, Mr Chairman.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr HASSELL: I move an amendment—

> Page 2, line 26—Insert before the word "hires", the word "knowingly".

I indicated earlier that I thought this second amendment was in most respects more important than the first. Clause 3 (1)(b) states—

> being the owner of any place, or the agent of such owner, hires, lets or causes or allows to be kept, opened or used that place or any part thereof for the purpose referred to in paragraph (a) of this subsection . . . .

We could have a situation where an owner could be letting out a place without being aware of what happens. It is important that in such situations, the prosecution be required to establish that he knew what he was doing, and that he was not misled and did not get himself into trouble unknowingly.

I referred earlier to this being a "social crime"; perhaps it would be more accurate to describe such offences as "victimless crimes", because there are no victims involved.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr O'NEIL: I now have the opportunity to respond to some of the other matters raised by members. The member for Melville asked what were the classes of entertainments which may be excluded from the provisions of this clause. There could well be a class of entertainment which can be nominated to be excluded. A number of activities now take place on Sunday afternoons for which an admission fee is charged, principally sporting events which are seasonal in nature and, of course, these activities are excluded. That is the type of entertainment which may be granted a kind of blanket exemption. Some entertainments already are quite evidently eligible for such an exemption, but others may become eligible in due course.

Mr Jamieson: Presumably you would grant a blanket exemption to Sheffield Shield matches.

Mr O'NEIL: Yes, that is the sort of thing we have in mind. The member for Mt. Hawthorn referred to the playing of league football matches on Sundays. Even currently, exemptions are granted to the performance of Australian National Football League championship matches on application from the WANFL. For example, there is to be a match played in Western Australia during the football carnival at the end of this year for which a request has been received to permit it to take place on a Sunday. However, this is not a normal Western Australian league game but a game between teams from different States. That matter currently is being considered on an individual basis.

Mr Jamieson: It looks like being played between Canberra and Tasmania.

Mr O'NEIL: That is the type of entertainment which may be exempted on a specific basis, as they are now. However, I make the point that for each such occasion there is a requirement for an application to be made for that form of entertainment to continue.

I doubt at this stage that blanket approval will be given to the WANFL to allow it to conduct league football matches on Sundays. Several other associations play football on Sundays and they would certainly raise objections to such a proposal. I think the member for Welshpool would know the associations to which I refer. We

have a desire to avoid any possible conflict in the attraction of spectators to these matches.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 12th April.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.11 p.m.]: The principle contained in this amendment is not a new one. Indeed, it is applied already in the cases of other funds of an industry nature.

The amendment purports to retain the existing Cattle Industry Compensation Fund, but to allow the interest that has accrued from that fund as invested to be used for other purposes. Broadly, that is the intention of the amendment. However, there has been a problem in that certain producers and producer organisations—the Farmers' Union being a case in point—were of the opinion that the fund should remain inviolate and untouched in any way. It was felt that the fund should be used only for the purposes of compensation for diseased animals. However, I believe that this objection has been overcome and the majority of growers would go along with the concept that is embodied in this amendment.

The compensation fund is based on a payment of 0.3c in every dollar. The fund has accrued a sizeable amount and the investment returns have become quite significant. The funds could be used in a wide range of beneficial projects. The decision on these matters would be left to the discretion of the Minister as the legislation now stands.

There are certain areas in which there should be reconsideration and perhaps reconstruction. There is the question of whether the funds should or could be used for such things as the development of a meat classification scheme. This could be unacceptable because of the nature and the purpose of the parent fund. It would be morally indefensible, at least, to use it for purposes that do not fall within the original intention expressed at the setting up of the fund.

The reserves are considerable—in the order of $800 000. There will be a large sum available for the purposes envisaged in the Bill. Therefore, I would like the Minister to answer two questions. Firstly, I do not think it is satisfactory for the interest on the fund to be used for "useful purposes" or a generalisation of that type. There has been controversy in the past over the use of portion of this fund or its interest for other than specified purposes. It would be worth the Minister's while giving a reassurance on that matter.

The second question deals with the representation on the small advisory committee. Who does the Minister have in mind for appointment to the small advisory committee which will give him guidance in the use of the moneys accrued? If the purposes cannot be specified, at least the representation of the interested organisations will give a degree of assurance that the growers will have some say at least. If it is at all possible, the Minister should advise not necessarily the specific members he envisages appointing to the advisory committee but at least the sources from which the members will be derived.

Those are the two questions that need to be answered to obviate any abrasiveness and misunderstanding that might arise in the future. Answers to those questions would give a more complete picture of the overall operation of the scheme as it is envisaged.

On the basis I have outlined, the Opposition is happy to support the amendment before the House.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.16 p.m.]: I thank the honourable member for his support of the very small amendment to the Act. I will endeavour to allay any fears he may have in regard to the administration of the interest from this fund.

Incidentally, since the introduction of this Bill some months ago, the fund has grown considerably. A lot of cattle have come onto the market. There has not been a tremendous amount of compensation paid out; therefore, there will be a considerable amount of money available for the purposes which have been set out in the Bill.

No item of expenditure will be able to be made without the permission of the Minister. However, as is the case with the pig industry fund, I would envisage that the committee would be made up of producers and representatives of producer organisations. The committee would make recommendations, but, incidentally, recommendations are not always accepted. Only recently there was a case in which a recommendation was made for the use of moneys from a trust fund. The use was considered to be outside the guidelines set down in the Act, and such use was subsequently rejected.

Therefore, I can give the member the assurance that there certainly will not be any misuse of the money gleaned from the interest on this considerably large capital fund.

Mr H. D. Evans: What does the fund stand at now?

Mr OLD: It is of the order of $1 million. On top of that, $300 000 has been invested.

The time has been reached, as the member well knows, when the incidence of brucellosis and tuberculosis in Western Australia has become fairly rare. As a result claims for compensation are rare. In fact, in the year ended the 30th June last compensation for brucellosis was of the order of $104 000, and for tuberculosis it was about $15 000. The payout has been fairly small. In addition, of course, there is the contract labour for TB testing. The total outlay from the fund was of the order of $450 000.

The fund is increasing. Members would agree that, rather than having this money lying idle, it would be better applied to the good of the industry.

I thank the honourable member for his support. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 24th April.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.22 p.m.]: The Minister outlined the purposes of this Bill in his speech which he made on the 24th April and which can be found on page 643 of *Hansard*. The Opposition supports the Bill which might be described as one which brings the Act more up to date and incorporates the principal matters relating to magistrates into the one Act rather than having them overflowing into other legislation.

The Minister tells us, and we know this is so, that reference to magistrates in the Public Service Act was removed recently and this Bill is a follow-up in that it seeks to remove any suggestion of any remaining nexus between magistrates and the Public Service Act.

It is highly desirable that there should be, and there should be seen to be, no link between magistrates and the Public Service, a fact which was recognised in South Australia quite some years ago when the Dunstan Government introduced legislation to correct this matter. It seems to me to be by far the most important aspect of this Bill that magistrates should be quite separate from the Public Service situation and therefore given a greater degree of independence. That is the way it would appear and to my mind that is most desirable. The Opposition supports this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), and transmitted to the Council.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st May.

MR McIVER (Avon) [5.26 p.m.]: This Bill has been on the notice paper for some considerable time and all members of the House are aware of its importance. The Opposition has no objection to the Bill at all; however, I do have certain comments to make.

The Bill itself is an amendment to the Western Australian Marine Act, which is a very comprehensive Statute. The regulations contained in the Act are most complex. I am sure the Minister would agree that to be able to understand the Western Australian Marine Act in its entirety one would most certainly need to be a bush lawyer to understand the regulations contained therein.

The first criticism I have of this Bill is that what is in fact needed is a new authority, particularly when we realise the number of craft

which use the Swan River at present and when we consider that this number undoubtedly will rise in the very near future. What is contained in the Bill is of merit. When one reads the Minister's speech it is difficult to object to the regulations and the objectives contained therein. This is certainly so when we consider a city such as Perth, which boasts of its Swan River in tourist brochures in an attempt to attract people from all over the world to our State.

If one looks at the number of people who use pleasure craft on the Swan River at the present time, one can see the necessity for the introduction of this Bill. It would be hypocritical for the Opposition to oppose this measure. However, we feel when a boat owner registers his craft he should be issued with an authoritative form which sets out the regulations governing the use of boats on the Swan River at the present time. Many people in Western Australia do not know how to use their boats properly on the river. I would defy any member of Parliament to explain the full complexities of the Western Australian Marine Act. The Government should set out in layman's terms what is required of boat owners. The Government is always accused of exerting bureaucratic influence, but I feel it is necessary for an authority to be set up so that boat owners understand the regulations. I do not believe anyone could disagree with the regulation relating to infringement notices, boats without owners, or boats which are being sold.

My only objection is that many people who presently own boats do not know how to use them properly. I would encourage all boat owners to join boating clubs in order to obtain the assistance of people who have been associated with boating for many years. If they do this, people will be able to obtain full enjoyment from the large sums of money they have spent purchasing their boats. All boat owners should be associated with boating clubs which have been controlling boating on the river for a long period of time. All Western Australians are very proud of the Swan River.

I trust the Minister will give consideration to what I have said. I have made my comments in all sincerity. I believe a separate authority should be set up, because of the growing number of licensed boats operating on the Swan River. If this were done, there would be no necessity for these people to be involved in the complexities of the Western Australian Marine Act.

People who retire to Rockingham, Mandurah, and similar places, and purchase a boat for the first time, should be able to consult an authority to ensure they do not infringe the regulations. In his second reading speech the Minister outlined the necessity for the introduction of this Bill. I support it, with the reservations I have mentioned.

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [5.35 p.m.]: I would like to support my colleague, the member for Avon, in saying that the Opposition does not intend to oppose this Bill; but I would like to make one or two comments in a slightly more critical vein than the comments made by my colleague. I suggest that it is not before time that the Government is taking action to provide regulations which will govern the activities of pleasure craft on the Swan River. However, I feel this measure is the first of a long series of band-aid measures we are likely to see in this Parliament dealing with boat owners.

The fact of the matter is, there has been an explosion of ownership of private pleasure craft in the last two or three years, and because we have so few waterways essentially available close to the metropolitan area—that really means the Swan River and Cockburn Sound—there are more boats than available water space. Judging by the two amendments to the Western Australian Marine Act which we have before us, it would seem the Government intends to try to increase the number of regulations to make a very large number of boats fit into a very small number of boating spaces, without providing the necessary facilities for the boat owners in these areas.

As an example I shall take one of the absurdities found in the Minister's second reading speech where it is indicated that boating fees have had to be increased and a more efficient way of imposing fines must be approved in order to obtain adequate finance. The Minister lists three ways in which it is intended that this should be done. One of these relates to registration offences. In this particular case the boat owners' registration fee has to be doubled in order that we may more efficiently control and catch the people who do not pay the fee in the first place. That is not a particularly smart way of solving the problem. The way I have set out this matter is perhaps rather unfair, because offences relating to speeding and mooring are included also.

The mooring situation on the Swan River is rather chaotic; therefore, although I support the approach taken by the Government, I hope it will not stop it from attempting more seriously to regulate what will happen to private pleasure craft in the near future.

I should like to refer to the comments made by the member for Whitford in the Address-in-Reply debate yesterday. The Government must take some degree of responsibility for the provision of facilities for boat owners, perhaps from the boat

licences. The member for Whitford and the member for Karrinyup indulged in a little exchange of congratulations and pleasantries, because of the way in which the City of Stirling had contributed to a boat ramp constructed in the Shire of Wanneroo. However, it must be said that most of the people who will use that boat ramp do not come from either the City of Stirling or the Shire of Wanneroo. It seems perfectly reasonable that boat owners all over the State who are paying a licence and registration fee, should be prepared to contribute part of that fee towards the provision of these facilities which are used by all boat owners in the State.

I notice the member for Rockingham is making approving noises. He is in exactly the same situation. Some of the most important boating facilities close to the metropolitan area are in fact provided by the Shire of Rockingham and yet they are used by people, 90 per cent of whom come from outside the area of that shire. I do not see why one local authority, because it happens to be on the coast, should be using its own funds to provide facilities for the whole of the State.

In my opinion, it is important that the Government should use a portion of the boat registration fees for the provision of facilities which all people in the State use. I should like to speak on behalf of my own constituents in the electorate of Gosnells who have complained about the boat ramp on the Swan River in East Fremantle which I believe is provided by the East Fremantle Town Council. However, this facility is used by people from Gosnells and they have complained to me about it.

The East Fremantle Town Council has insufficient funds to provide a proper facility, so every time someone wishes to go to Rottnest he has to queue up at the ramp for about an hour before he can get his boat into the water. Therefore because of insufficient parking facilities, people are fined $10 for illegal parking and using that particular facility. The State Government is not participating or endeavouring to provide the necessary facilities.

The East Fremantle Town Council holds the view that it provides adequate facilities for the people in its area. However because the river is within its local government area it must provide a facility which will be used by people from the entire State. These are the sorts of preventive areas that the State Government should be looking at rather than trying to add band aids to the existing Act, and making it more expeditious to fine people. The problem of offences occurs because the facilities become crowded, not because people wish to break the law. It is as a result of this that people who use this facility are forced into minor infringements of the law.

The Government will feel considerable pressure from the pleasure-boat owners who are irate about having to pay these increased licence fees. The offences are committed in essence, not because of any fault of the boat owners, but merely because of circumstances. This is the point I wish to make.

I do not intend to oppose the Bill, but I am not particularly happy with it because it does not go anywhere near far enough towards recognising the problems which are building up as a result of the crowding of our waterways. The problems are also faced by other craft owners who use the waterways.

I hope the Government is turning its attention to other improvements it can make in addition to those provided under the legislation before us. However, from my experience with the Government I would say it is probably not.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [5.41 p.m.]: I appreciate the remarks the member for Avon and the member for Gosnells have made about this legislation. They obviously see the need for the Government's proposal. I wish to address my remarks to the point raised by the member for Avon which relates to the seriousness of the developments within this sport or recreation—whatever one likes to call it—and the future safety of people using these pleasure craft. The number of owners is increasing very rapidly. I assure the member for Avon that I will take his remarks into account when developing these recommendations. I thank those members for their remarks.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st May.

MR McIVER (Avon) [5.43 p.m.]: Before discussing the contents of the Bill I wish to comment that whilst the debate on the suburban rail service has been continuing we have forgotten our ships. I indicate to the Minister that the Opposition is not opposed to the Bill in its present form but requires clarification of some important aspects. Naturally, the Bill deals with changes of certificates for people associated with ships, such as captains and fourth-class engineers. As members are aware, ships are required to be registered with Lloyds of London. With regard to

the requirements set out in the Bill concerning fourth-class engineers, will this be in accord with the insurance conditions set down by Lloyds of London for the movement of ships in Fremantle Harbour? In asking for clarification on this point I am not trying to embarrass the Minister in any way. The purpose is to endeavour to assist the people concerned—which this Bill seeks to do—bearing in mind the situation at the present time, and looking to the next two or three years when in view of the fuel situation the movement of ships may increase.

The Opposition recognises what the Government is endeavouring to do and as long as the insurance conditions with Lloyds of London are not affected, we support the Bill.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [5.46 p.m.]: I thank the honourable member for his contribution to the debate. The changes are required as a result of the advances in technology.

My understanding is that this action does not alter the cover with Lloyds of London. I will certainly check that point again to ensure that there is no doubt about it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Transport), and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Young Children Accompanying Door Knockers

972. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) Has his department had any complaints about religious door to door callers taking very young children with them on their rounds?

(2) What action, if any, can the department take to discourage this practice?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) No.

(2) It would be very difficult to discourage this practice. The Department for Community Welfare can take action only when it considers that a child is in need of care and protection. In the context of the question, it would mean that a child would have to be found in such circumstances as to indicate that the mental, physical or moral welfare of the child is likely to be in jeopardy. Any such case would have to be established before a special magistrate in a Children's Court.

LIQUOR: BEER

Low Alcohol Content

973. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Is he aware of a statement by the chairman of the Senate standing committee on health and welfare in Perth recently that State laws stipulating a minimum alcohol content for beer are one of the main obstacles in the way of encouraging brewers to develop low alcohol beer?

(2) If "Yes" is he prepared to consider amending the regulation Q.04 004 which stipulates that "Beer shall contain not less than 42 ml/litre of alcohol at 20°C," as a possible means of facilitating a wider production and consumption of low alcohol beer?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The regulations under the Health Act have been amended to allow for a lower alcohol strength beer.

HOUSING: FLATS

Balga: Aboriginal Tenants

974. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) Can he say how many flats are currently vacant in the Mia Mia complex in Balga, and for what length of time each has been unoccupied?

(2) Can he confirm that the State Housing Commission plans to place more aboriginal tenants in this complex?

(3) If "Yes" to (2), how many more units is it intended to allocate to aboriginal tenants?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) Of 130 units in the Mia Mia complex there are, as at the 9th August, 1979, 18 vacant units.

Of the vacant units there are:

11 under maintenance

7 under offer.

Of the 11 units under maintenance, the vacant periods range from 1½ weeks to 7 weeks.

Of the 7 under offer, the vacant periods for 4 range from 2½ weeks to 5 weeks, and for the remaining 3 the vacant period averages 12 weeks—whilst 2 offers on each have been made, they have not previously been accepted because they are upper floor units.

(2) The commission has no specific plans for the placement of aboriginal applicants in any of its apartment complexes as aboriginals, like all other applicants considered suitable for housing in apartment accommodation, are eligible to be assisted in any of the commission estates.

(3) Not applicable.

HOUSING: TENANTS

Anti-social Behaviour

975. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is he aware of possibly increasing problems for neighbours living in the vicinity of those State Housing Commission tenants, in many cases aboriginal tenants, in terms of the aggravated anti-social behaviour and disturbances emanating from the occupants of these premises?

(2) Has any investigation or study been made into the effects on aboriginal and other families placed to live in suburban situations who are apparently, in some cases even after several years, not able to cope with normally accepted community standards?

(3) What consideration is being given to neighbours caught up in such situations who are not even able to sell their houses and move away?

(4) What use is being made of the homemaker service of the Department for Community Welfare, the consultative committee on community relations, the Aboriginal Housing Trust, and the Aboriginal Advancement Council, in helping to resolve the apparently increasing neighbourhood problems arising from some aboriginal families who have been placed in suburban houses in the metropolitan area?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) I am aware there have been some problems, but these are not of an increasing nature so far as aboriginal tenants are concerned.

(2) When problems occur, each case is examined to establish the nature of the problem, and where necessary, the commission initiates remedial action.

(3) All cases are treated on their merits. Where necessary, special considerations are taken when it comes to the re-letting of the property.

(4) Use is made of the homemaker service of the Department for Community Welfare and any other organisations interested in the welfare of aboriginal people, where appropriate. However, it remains the right of the individual to accept these services.

TRAFFIC: LIGHTS

Alexander Drive-Gordon Road Intersection

976. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Can he say whether further consideration has been given to the need for the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Alexander Drive and Gordon Road?

(2) When is it anticipated that traffic lights will be installed at this intersection?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) and (2) Latest examination of information available does not indicate that the installation of traffic signals can be justified now or in the near future.

977. *This question was postponed.*

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Construction Safety Advisory Committee

978. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Since the 2nd February, 1978 upon which occasions has the construction safety advisory committee met?

Mrs Craig (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

Since the 2nd February, 1978, construction safety advisory board meetings have been held on the 28th July, 1978, and the 2nd February, 1979.

POLICE: PROSTITUTION

Policy and Penalties

979. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

(1) Is he aware of the different approach taken by the stipendiary magistrate on the one hand and certain justices of the peace in the Kalgoorlie court of petty sessions on the other hand over the fining of women engaged in the running of premises for prostitution?

(2) What is the policy adopted by the police in respect of the arresting and bringing before the court of women operating the Kalgoorlie Hay Street brothels?

(3) Does the Police Force enforce an unofficial code of conduct in respect of the running of such brothels?

(4) What action will the Government take to put an end to the lottery whereby certain brothel keepers are being fined $5 for the same type of offences the other brothel keepers are being fined $150?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) Yes, from various newspaper reports.

(2) A policy of containment.

(3) Yes.

(4) A reference to penalty by lottery is a slur on the bench. Penalties imposed are a matter for the courts to decide.

TRANSPORT: TAXIS

Licensing

980. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Did the Taxi Control Board consider an application for licensing of vehicles for private taxis in June or early July of this year from an applicant not currently operating private taxis?

(2) If so, who was the applicant?

(3) Did the Taxi Control Board negate the initial application at the meeting?

(4) If "Yes" to (3), was the Taxi Control Board directed or requested to reconsider its decision?

(5) If "Yes" to (4), by whom?

(6) Has the Taxi Control Board discussed the application subsequent to its initial discussion of the applicant?

(7) If so, when?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) The board did consider an application for an exclusive type limousine service at its meetings in May and June, 1979.

(2) Mrs Nicole Dehring.

(3) At the June, 1979 meeting, the board considered the overall concept of use of an exclusive type limousine hire service. Owing to the early departure of one member of the board when a vote was taken, an equal vote was recorded by the six remaining members. Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of section 8(3) (b) of the Taxi-Cars (Co-ordination and Control) Act, the vote was determined in the negative. Consequently, Mrs Dehring's application was refused.

(4) As a result of an appeal to me by Mrs Dehring against the refusal, the board was requested to reconsider the concept of use of an exclusive type limousine hire service.

(5) By me.

(6) and (7) Yes. At its meetings in June and July, 1979.

981. *This question was postponed.*

WATER SUPPLIES: RATES

Rebates: Pensioners

982. Mr DAVIES, to the Treasurer:

(1) Is he aware that the acting general manager of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board advised the Under Treasurer by memorandum on the 14th February, 1979 that the practice of granting rate concessions to pensioners owning property under purple title was contrary to the Acts Amendment (Pensioners Rates Rebates and Deferments) Act, 1977?

(2) Is he aware also that the Under Treasurer stated in a letter to the acting general manager of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board on the 23rd March, 1979 that "the continuation of the granting of the concessions to purple title holders has been declared contrary to the provisions of the Act"?

(3) Why did the Government fail to make public the decision to withdraw the concessions at the time the Under Treasurer advised the acting general manager of the Metropolitan Water Board?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) Although I had not seen the specific interdepartmental minute referred to, I had been made aware of the problem which had arisen. This was that the practice of granting a rebate or the right of deferment of rates by administrative decision to eligible pensioners owning properties under purple title jointly with non-eligible persons was not only contrary to the Act, but could also impose a liability on the other participants in the purple title.
It has always been the Government's desire to extend the concession to pensioners in this category as evidenced by the practice of granting the concession by administrative decision wherever the component of rates levied on the whole property for which the pensioner was liable, could be identified. However, the Government obviously could not do so if that action imposed a legal liability on all other participants in the title, as could be the case with deferment, or if the rebate could not be identified with the pensioner within the total rate bill levied on the property.
It must be borne in mind that the responsibility for granting a rebate falls on local authorities—although the cost is borne by the Government—and there are obvious difficulties for authorities rating on the unimproved land value in those cases where a pensioner owns a unit under purple title in a multi-unit block and the distribution of the total property rate is determined by an internal arrangement.
For this reason the Government considered that it had no alternative but to cease granting the concession administratively while seeking a lawful way of giving effect to our desires to grant the concession.

(2) Yes.

(3) The problem was referred to Cabinet in October 1978 when most rate assessments for 1978/79 had already been processed. It would have been most inequitable to change the practice at that stage of the year and it was, therefore, decided to make the change from the beginning of the next rating year when all pensioners concerned were advised of the position.
As it happens, we now hope to find a way to give effect to our desire to provide the concession and, for this purpose, legislation will soon be introduced with effect from the 1st July, 1979.

EDUCATION: PRE-PRIMARY

Centre: Bicton School

983. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it a fact that Bicton children who wish to attend a pre-primary centre are required to travel outside the area to centres located in Attadale, Richmond, or Palmyra?

(2) Is it a fact that there are empty rooms available at the Bicton Primary School which could be easily and cheaply converted into a suitable pre-primary centre?

(3) Is it a fact that the Bicton Primary School parents and citizens association have written to him requesting that he establish a pre-primary centre at the Bicton Primary School?

(4) Does he intend to comply with the parents and citizens association request?

Mr Old (for Mr P. V. JONES) replied:

(1) Richmond and Palmyra pre-primary centres are outside the district but the Attadale centre was built originally to provide for children from Bicton and Attadale school intake areas.

(2) Rooms are available but conversions can be expensive depending on the services required.

(3) Yes.

(4) The matter is being investigated.

ABATTOIR: MIDLAND JUNCTION

Pig Floor

984. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) (a) Since the closure of the pig floor at Midland abattoir have serious difficulties in slaughtering large pigs in the beef floors of other abattoirs been encountered; and

(b) if so, will he give details of these difficulties, in particular the effects on export?

(2) (a) Is it proposed to operate the pig floor at Midland Junction Abattoir; and

(b) if so, what are the details under which it will operate?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) (a) and (b) Some difficulties in having large pigs slaughtered in export abattoirs have been encountered this week. I have asked the Meat Industry Authority to examine these problems and to report on this matter.

(2) (a) and (b) It is not proposed to operate the pig floor at Midland unless a level of throughput which would be sufficient to avoid large operating losses is guaranteed.

TRANSPORT

Southern Western Australia Transport Study

985. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

With relation to stage 3 of the Southern Western Australia Transport Study report, is it proposed to close the Wonnerup-Nannup and Pemberton-Northcliffe railway lines?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

In view of the SWATS report observations, the lines concerned are being evaluated by Westrail.
However, there are no specific proposals to close these lines.

ANIMALS

Circus

986. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) (a) Are the owners/managers of circuses which are based in other States, but travel interstate, required to register exotic animals in their show with any particular authority; and

(b) if so, with what authority in each State?

(2) (a) Is it necessary for the sale, change of ownership, loss or death of such animals to be reported and recorded; and

(b) if so, with what authority?

Mrs Craig (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

(1) (a) Yes.

(b) The control of exotic animals in circuses comes under the control of the following authorities—

(i) Department of Agriculture in each State where they are exotic animals which come under the control of the Commonwealth Quarantine Act;

(ii) The Agriculture Protection Board in Western Australia where they are exotic animals declared under the Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act, 1976;

(iii) The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife in Western Australia where they are exotic animals that have been declared under the Wildlife Conservation Act, 1950, to be an animal whose habits and nature might in the opinion of the Minister become or threaten to become injurious to fauna.

(2) (a) Yes.

(b) To the relevant authority or authorities described in 1(b).

MINING: GOLD

Telfer

987. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) What amount of gold in weight and approximate value was recovered from

mining operations at Telfer in the fiscal years—

1977-78;
1978-79?

(2) What amount of royalty was received from the Newmont company by the Western Australian Government for both years above?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) 1977-78 7 533.254 kg $35 970 000
1978-79 5 675.381 kg $35 913 000

(2) None. I note however with interest from the question of the honourable member that his and/or the ALP's policy apparently is tending to introduce royalty on proceeds of goldmining.

ABORIGINES: RESERVES

Broome

988. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) How many Aboriginal reserves are located within a 10 kilometre radius of Broome?

(2) What is the average population domiciled on these reserves?

(3) Has his department received adverse reports regarding the sanitary conditions on these reserves?

(4) What action has been taken in response to these reports?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) There are two residential reserves located in the Broome townsite and a transient camping reserve on the outskirts of Broome.

(2) There is an average of 100 residents on each of the residential reserves and an average of 12 residents on the transient camping reserve.

(3) Yes. The department receives periodical health reports on all reserves under its control. The last health inspection on Broome reserves dated the 29th May recommended improvements in cleanliness and maintenance to the ablution facilities and grounds of the three reserves.

(4) A plumber has been engaged to rectify plumbing faults. A local Aboriginal group, the Milliya Rumurra, has contracted to clean up the grounds of the reserves. It is anticipated that this group will also tender for the removal of car bodies and painting the facilities. Reserve residents are members of this group and the funds raised by this venture will be used in their programme to assist in the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

New Zealanders

989. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Is he able to advise the number of New Zealanders who have entered the work force in Western Australia and, if possible, give a breakdown as to where they have been employed?

Mrs Craig (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics collects data relating to the number of New Zealand born persons in the Western Australian work force.

Since February, 1978, it has been collected on a monthly basis in the labour force survey.

Persons born in New Zealand in the Western Australian work force:

February 1978	7 700
June 1979	10 900.

The labour force survey is not cross-classified in a manner which would indicate where they have been employed.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Pilbara Living Costs

990. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Is he aware that a recent survey has been conducted by the Western Australian Institute of Technology into living costs in the Pilbara, and if so, would he table a copy of that report?

Mrs Craig (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

The most recent WAIT survey related to living costs in the Pilbara of which I am

aware was commissioned by Australian Mines and Metals Association. The survey was conducted by WAIT-Aid in September, 1978. The results of this survey have not been made public and remain the property of the member companies concerned.

HUMAN ECOLOGY FUND

Research at University of Western Australia

991. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Premier:

(1) In view of the stated fact that the American central intelligence organisation set up a secret front group called the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology, renamed the Human Ecology Fund in 1961 and that they were given a grant of $US 10 780 towards research at the University of Western Australia in 1957, will he advise who was responsible for securing this grant?

(2) (a) Have further grants been made; and

(b) if so, who was responsible for securing those?

(3) Will he advise full and exact details of nature of expenditure of grant, to include any experimentation carried out, any unwitting victims, and the information supplied?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) to (3) If the honourable member will supply me with the evidence to support the assertions he makes in part (1) of his question, I shall have some inquiries made.

HEALTH: DENTAL THERAPY CENTRES

Mobile Clinic

992. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Health:

Is he now in a position to be able to advise me as to when the mobile dental therapy clinic will be made available to service the Darlington, Koongamia, Glen Forrest and Helena Valley Primary Schools?

Mr YOUNG replied:

The service for Darlington, Koongamia, Glen Forrest, and Helena Valley Primary Schools is expected to commence in October, 1979.

ENERGY: SOLAR

Solchem Electric Generator

993. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Is he aware of a solar energy power plant known as 'Solchem-Solar electric generators'?

(2) If "Yes" what research has been carried out regarding such proposed solar energy power plants with a view to their ultimate use in Western Australia?

(3) Is it a fact that it is claimed that energy is stored largely in the form of molten eutectic salt and that this stored heat energy is made readily available by heat pipe techniques?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) There are many suggested processes for producing energy by solar means and this is one of them. Both the Energy Commission and the Solar Energy Research Institute are keeping abreast of the large number of such proposals to ensure that the State is able to make use of those developments that prove practical and economic.

LAND: NATIONAL PARKS

Millstream

994. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

(1) (a) Has the Public Works Department advised the Government that consideration could be given to the inclusion of Palm pool in the proposed enlargement of the Millstream national park?

(b) what is the Government's attitude to the inclusion of this feature in the park?

(2) (a) What is the current situation concerning the enlargement of the Millstream National Park;

(b) will he please table a plan showing the proposed boundaries of the park presently under consideration?

Mrs Craig (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

(1) (a) and (b) Cabinet agreed to an enlargement of the Millstream National Park to include Palm Pool in August, 1976 and a public announcement to that effect was made on the 26th August, 1967. Tabled herewith is copy of the press statement.

(2) (a) Action to proclaim the extended national park has been delayed whilst negotiations have been taking place between the National Parks Authority, the Lands Department, and the lease-holder of Millstream station.

(b) Yes.

The statement was tabled (see paper No. 269).

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Construction Safety Act: Inquiry

995. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Upon which occasions has he, or his immediate predecessor, directed an inquiry to be held before a stipendiary magistrate and two other persons appointed by him pursuant to section 37, subsection (1) of the Construction Safety Act?

Mrs Craig (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

The results of investigations into accidents to which paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 35 of the Construction Safety Act applies have made it unnecessary on any occasion to direct an inquiry to be held pursuant to section 37 of that Act.

PENSIONERS: RATES

Rebates

996. Mr HARMAN, to the Treasurer:

(1) Was the decision to rescind rate concessions to pensioners owning property under purple title approved by Cabinet?

(2) If "Yes" when was the decision made?

(3) Is it a fact that the Government did not intend to amend the legislation so as to restore the rate concession to pensioners owning property under purple title?

(4) If the Government intended amending the legislation, why was a circular from the Secretary of Local Government sent to all municipalities as late as the 25th July, 1979 with the instruction that no concessions on rates should be granted to pensioners owning property under purple title as from the 1st July, 1979?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) On 4th October, 1978

(3) The Member for Maylands is referred to my reply to question 982 on today's Notice Paper from which it will be apparent that there was no ready solution to the problem which could be effected in legislation. However, I repeat that the Government has always wished to extend the concession to eligible purple title holders, and we continue to search for a way of doing so which will not impose financial obligations on other people.

This has culminated in our decision—already announced—to introduce legislation which is being drafted. Its complexities are such it might take a little longer to finalise but it will be retrospective to 1 July, 1979.

(4) Not applicable.

997. *This question was postponed.*

ANIMALS

Deer Farming

998. Mr McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) As deer farming is being developed in Victoria and the other States of Australia, will consideration be given to allow deer farming in Western Australia?

(2) What markets are available for the velvet from stags, and what is the current market price?

(3) Is there any evidence that the Asian market will strengthen?

(4) Is there a venison market in Australia?

(5) What markets for venison are available in—

(a) West Germany;
(b) Holland;
(c) Sweden;
(d) Switzerland;
(e) France;
(f) Western Europe;
(g) Scandinavia;
(h) the United States of America; and
(i) Hong Kong.

Mr OLD replied:

(1) Although there are currently no plans to allow deer farming in Western Australia, a close watch is being kept on the development of the industry in New Zealand and the Eastern States.

(2) The market for velvet is a highly traditional one and is largely for use in oriental medicines, tonics, and foodstuffs. The major importing countries are Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan, Japan, Malaysia, and Singapore. Current market price is in the vicinity of $120 per kg depending on quality.

(3) This information is not available despite consistent efforts by New Zealand to obtain it.

(4) There is currently a small restaurant and hotel market for venison. No quantitative survey of Australian demand has been conducted.

(5) This information is not readily available.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ROAD: FREEWAY

Fremantle-Perth Railway Reserve

1. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Has the Minister seen the article in today's issue of the *Daily News* referring to the fact that a freeway is already being planned along the Perth-Fremantle railway route?

(2) If the Minister has seen the article, can he supply any background information?

(3) Is there any truth in the rumour that the initials of the FOR movement stand for "Friends of Rushton"?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) and (2) I did read the reference to the freeway claim and it was particularly interesting to me. Obviously, it came from a source which had been supplied with the relevant information.

My understanding is that the Government has approved permission through my colleague, the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning, for the MRPA to consult with municipalities along the Fremantle to Perth railway line in order to obtain background information. Research has been going on for a considerable number of years towards a recommendation for a reasonable transport service for the area between Fremantle and Karrinyup.

It would appear to me that we could enter a period during which time so-called statements from interested people, made about this previous research, will be subjected to various pieces being picked out. Many of the statements involved in the research have been made over a long period of time in an attempt to find a solution to the very vexed problem of avoiding heavy transport having to use local roads, such as Servetus Street and Davies Road. It was against the intention of the Government that heavy traffic should be diverted along Servetus Street and the coastal roads.

The Government directed that attention should be given to the inclusion of the railway reserve in the considerations of the planners so that the very best service could be provided for the people, not only in the area between Perth and Fremantle, but also for the whole of the metropolitan area relating to the original transport provisions.

I suggest various people will be picking out odd proposals from the examination of the railway reserve. There will be all sorts of conjecture and suggestions that the Government is acting prematurely whereas, in fact, the Government has directed the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning to obtain proposals from the MRPA, in conjunction with interested municipalities, regarding the best possible regional transport service for the area between Fremantle and Karrinyup.

(3) It has been suggested that the initials "FOR" stand for "Friends of Rushton". This suggestion has come from many people who recognise that the Government is doing a tremendous job in making Westrail freight more profitable, and is entering into a programme of purchasing new suburban passenger railcars.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Meeting of Government and Opposition

2. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

(1) Is he concerned that the State's unemployment has increased sharply, going strongly against the national trend, so that this State has by far the worst unemployment figure at 7.2 per cent of the work force?

(2) Will he agree that a team of appropriate Cabinet Ministers meet with a team from the Opposition to sit down to develop a method of improving this wholly unacceptable situation?

(3) If so, could he expeditiously name a date and make the necessary arrangement so that both Government and Opposition may get together in the spirit of compromise for the good of all people of the State and, in particular; the good of those who, through no fault of their own, have been unable to find employment?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) The member for Morley raises this question of unemployment in relation to today's announcement. First of all, I remind him that the reason for the sharp increase in Western Australia's percentage is directly related to a number of predictable items. The Minister for Labour and Industry, some three weeks ago, foreshadowed the results at the end of July because of a number of situations. What has come out is only in accordance with that prediction. Members have to realise that if we are to have devastating strikes in major industries, such as the Hamersley strike—and others—immediately there are far-reaching consequential and adverse effects, not only in respect of the industries themselves, but also in the industries which serve and supply them. The essential industries are basic to our economy, and in many cases the service industries have suffered so far as their employees are concerned and so far as the firms are concerned, even more than the industry directly involved.

I want to emphasise this fact because it is about time people realise that when we have these devastating stoppages in major industrie the flow-on is disastrous. Many people are stood down immediately because of stoppages and they have to seek relief when they cannot get other employment.

It seems to me there has been a set of exceptional circumstances including a set back because of drought conditions and the resulting cut-back in country employment about which already we are moving to attempt to relieve. In addition, we have the seasonal workers such as those involved in the rock lobster industry.

Mr Pearce: What, about 100 workers?

Sir CHARLES COURT: There are more than 100 people involved, and they are just as important whether it be one, 100 or 1 000! There is also a cut-back in the slaughtering industry. If all these matters are taken into account, members will see from the analysis that employment has been quite stable until the extraordinary situations which have arisen. I am pleased to say, from research the Gvernment has already done, there are signs that many people who had to be stood down in some service and supply industries, because of strikes, are already finding their way back into employment.

(2) The answer to the second part of the question is "No".

(3) This part of the question has no application.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Economy: Vulnerability

3. Dr TROY, to the Premier:

My question follows, to some extent, the reply given to the question asked by the member for Morley. I consider the answer to that question to be

unsatisfactory. For example, in this State we have 8 per cent of the population of Australia, but over the last 12 months we have had 82 per cent of the increase in the number of unemployed in Australia.

The Premier has implied that strikes are the cause of the increase in unemployment. I suggest, and I pose the question to him, that as a result of the spectacular growth in export industry in the 1960s we have an economy which is very vulnerable in the present state of decline in world markets.

Could this be the cause of the problem?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I have done my best, during the course of the presentation of the question by the member for Fremantle, to reconcile his statement that we have 8 per cent of the population and 82 per cent of the unemployed. That is beyond me. However, I remind the honourable member that if he is looking at the employment he should consider this State's performance against that of the other States in the time we have been in government. He will see it is by far the best. It is necessary to see the positive side as well as the negative side of unemployment.

I gather the import of the other part of his question is that because we accelerated the trade of this State so strongly when we were in government in the period 1959-1971 we have now left ourselves in a depressed condition; in other words, we have damaged the export industry of today. I cannot follow that.

Our rurual industries are running at a record level as far as exports are concerned. On present indications they will be cut back next year because of drought conditions, although we hope not. The performance in recent months has been running at a record level. At the same time this State is exporting very large and increasing tonnages of minerals, apart from the fact that had we not had the devastating strike at Hamersley for 10 or 12 weeks, exports would have been continuing from there in that time.

I cannot follow the reasoning of the honourable member's question but if I have misunderstood it no doubt he will put it on the notice paper.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Meeting of Government and Opposition

4. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

The Opposition is disappointed with the Premier's answer to my earlier question and with the fact that he has decided to score some points. We are quite prepared to admit that industrial disputation may have an effect and that is why we raised questions yesterday and the day before that about the reasons for it. The Premier declined to answer the questions. At this time what the people of Western Australia have a right to expect is leadership, not political point-scoring.

Will the Premier reconsider his answer in which he said he will not sit down with the Opposition in a spirit of compromise and consensus, let his temper cool, forget his political party, put the people of Western Australia first, and agree to such a meeting?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I think you would excuse me, Mr Speaker, if I said the question was not worth answering. But I will answer it to the extent that I think the honourable member is just trying to play games and that he should have a greater sense of responsibility. We happen to be the Government; it is our responsibility and we accept it. A State cannot be run and governed with the type of action the honourable member contemplates. It is more in sorrow than in anger that I answer the honourable member. As far as we are concerned, we will accept full responsibility and the Opposition can go about its role, making its own comments in its own time; but as far as its being involved in government, heaven forbid!

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE: WATERSIDE WORKERS

Comments of Minister for Transport

5. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Why was it necessary for the Minister to make the inflamatory statements after inspection of the Ports of Broome and Derby about the actions of the waterside workers when he knew full well that the State ships had been exempted from the recent national dock strike?

(2) How does he reconcile his statement that "the proper procedure for resolution of disputes is through the process of conciliation and arbitration", when it was at that time CBH which would not accept the decision of the double umpire; that is, the State and Federal arbitration officials' decision?

(3) Will the Minister give an undertaking not to make such statements, which have concerned greatly those employed on the wharves in the north of the State, without being fully informed on such problems?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

(1) to (3) I received this question a few moments ago. I am indebted to the member for Welshpool for asking the question because it allows me to elaborate on what proved to be a very vexed question regarding the servicing not only of State ships in northern ports but also of other shipping which is needed to call at Wyndham particularly to handle the export of beef from that region. I am also indebted to the honourable member for handing me a copy of the Press statement I made after I had been to Wyndham. During my visit to the north I was made very conscious of the fact that the recent strike in which the waterside workers had tied up every State ship in Fremantle had disrupted the time schedules of the State Shipping Service, and people indicated to me that if this action continued it would not be very long before they could no longer support a service which they had held very dear, and a road service would be much more reliable in these circumstances. It was very clear to me that it was a warning that if more reliable time schedules for the State ships into these ports could not be achieved we would be placing the service in jeopardy.

The new container port at Wyndham was deliberately constructed, at the considerable expense of something like $1 million to the taxpayer, to encourage the pastoral industry and help beef producers in the Kimberley to export their beef to a wider market. It was very saddening and very bad, I believe, that at the very beginning the ship which was to clear the port of beef was in fact held up and took only a certain proportion of the containers. If I remember correctly, some containers of prime beef for Sweden were left behind. This export was arranged for ongoing transfers. It was to go to Hong Kong and from there by another shipping line to Sweden. These orders were cancelled.

It can be seen how destructive the industrial action is of efforts to build up a meat trade and encourage the pastoral industry of the Kimberley to greater production. When I was at Wyndham, which was only a week ago today, I observed $5 million-worth of port developments to enable two ships of a certain size to berth at the same time. I visited the container port, which I think will give great opportunities for the development of the Port of Wyndham. The waterside workers were at that time holding a meeting to decide whether or not they would service the *Ellen Bakke* which was calling to pick up something like 600 tonnes of tallow and 1 850 tonnes of beef from the meatworks. The meeting was taking place in the shed on the wharf during my visit.

Point of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, are we going to get the Minister's life story?

Mr Jamieson: May I have a reply to my question?

The SPEAKER: Will the Minister resume his seat? I did not hear what the member for Warren asked.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It is the circumloquacity of the Minister and his approach to this question which concern me.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to condense his answer.

Questions (without notice) Resumed

Mr RUSHTON: I am answering the question as to why it was necessary for the Minister to give the statement he did after the inspection. I conclude by saying that at the meeting the waterside workers decided to remain on strike for another 24 hours while they inspected the meatworks to see whether there was any capacity for storing meat.

I understand the strike went on. It was my belief that there was capacity for the storing of meat for two days before the meatworks would have gone out of business, and the pastoralists were holding stock back. That was the reason I was incited to make my statement. I would dearly love to find a way to bring sanity to that port, and if I can I will do so.

MINING: URANIUM

Export

6. Dr TROY, to the Premier:

(1) In his capacity as representative of the Government, has the Premier entered into negotiations with any country for the purpose of exporting uranium from this State to any other part of the world?

(2) If so, which country?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) I made it very clear in a number of public utterances while I was abroad and at home that I have talked to people who are potential customers for our Yeelirrie uranium. More specifically I am thinking in terms of Japan, France, and Germany. There is no secret about that. Those countries, and particularly Germany and France, are committed, by necessity, to a very large nuclear energy programme, a programme that will expand increasingly because these countries are under the threat of the Soviet probably controlling the whole of North Africa by about 1990, if not before. The only petroleum they will obtain from that area will be by "grace and favour", and there will be no grace and no favour.

LAND: VALUATION

Consultation with Local Government

7. Mr WILSON, to the Premier:

When does the Government propose to respond to a request from the Local Government Association and many concerned local government authorities urging delay in the implementation of the Valuation of Land Act to allow for adequate consultation with local government authorities on this matter?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I do not quite know what the honourable member is referring to when he talks about a request for consultation because there was consultation. In any case, I already have approval, which is not now necessary, to expedite the passage through this Parliament of the amendments to the Valuation of Land Act on the assumption at that time that we may have had some delay with the Address-in-Reply debate. That approval is no longer necessary, and the second reading of the Bill involved is now on the notice paper of the upper House for next Tuesday. I think that Bill adequately covers the question as to how and at what date valuations can be applied.

MINING: URANIUM

Export

8. Dr TROY, to the Premier:

I would like to ask the Premier a further question. Has he held any discussions, either here or in Israel, with a Mr Modai, the Israeli Minister for Energy, in relation to the export of uranium?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I had a long consultation with the gentleman who holds the portfolio of energy and a number of other matters in Israel. In the course of that discussion we discussed the whole ramification of energy policies of Israel and Australia, and more particularly Western Australia.

I can say that the question of uranium, or anything else relating to nuclear energy such as yellow cake or enriched uranium, was not the subject of discussion with the said Minister. We discussed other matters of direct concern to Israel and Australia, and in particular the progress his country had made in the field of solar energy.

Of necessity Israel is indulging very heavily in solar research, and the request was made for us to exchange with them any expertise we had developed in this field and as a result for our research and vice versa.