

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 23rd September, 1970

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

*Return of Mr. J. B. Roberts*

THE PRESIDENT: Prior to proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I am very pleased to place on record the fact that Mr. J. B. Roberts, Clerk of the House, has today returned following exchange duty at Westminster. I feel sure members will agree that the knowledge gained by Mr. Roberts during his overseas tour of duty will be of great benefit to us all.

## QUESTIONS (2): ON NOTICE

### 1. FORESTS DEPARTMENT

*Purchases of Land*

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Forests Department purchased private property for the purpose of pine growing since the 21st January, 1970?
- (2) If so, what is the—
  - (a) locality;
  - (b) shire area;
  - (c) area in acres;
  - (d) date of purchase; and
  - (e) price paid per acre, in each case?
- (3) How many private properties are currently on offer for possible purchase by the Forests Department?
- (4) What is the Forests Department's current policy in respect of acquiring private land for pine growing?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Eighteen.
- (4) The purchase of properties at current market value assessed as suitable for the growth of radiata pine as and when funds are available, after they have been offered on the open market.

### 2. KANGAROO SHOOTERS

*North-west*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

How many kangaroo shooters own and operate freezer boxes in the following areas—

- (a) Murchison;
- (b) Gascoyne; and
- (c) Ashburton?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) Murchison—33.
- (b) Gascoyne—8.
- (c) Ashburton—5.

## BILLS (5): THIRD READING

### 1. Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

### 2. Honey Pool Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and passed.

### 3. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

### 4. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

### 5. Aerial Spraying Control Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

## LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Third Reading*

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [4.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.41 p.m.]: When the Minister replied to the second reading debate he dealt with one of the questions which I raised but he omitted to deal with the second one; namely, the effectiveness of the Trustees Act to cover the short-term investment of moneys.

My concern is that short-term investment now envisaged is a new form of investment of a type which is not covered by section 16 of the Trustees Act. This section covers and lists the more conservative types of investment, such as parliamentary stocks, public funds, government securities, first legal mortgages, debentures, and other securities.

The new form of investment will be as lucrative—if not more so—as the long-term investment provided for in the parent measure. Therefore, I am concerned whether the provisions of the Trustees Act are sufficient to cover the proposed short-term investment of money.

It is not trust money in the strict sense of the word, as I understand the position. The funds will comprise moneys which are lying to the credit of the organisation. This will be invested for the benefit of the

organisation and will be separate from the distribution of moneys to the public. This means that the Lotteries Commission will retain any profits which are made, provided it has in its possession the amount of capital which it is required to pay out at any given time. Therefore, the money will be invested for the benefit of the Lotteries Commission. It is not a trust, but merely a business investment, one might say. I would be pleased if the Minister could assure me, and more particularly the House, that the legislation does, in fact, do what it intends.

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [4.42 p.m.]: I apologise to the honourable member for not answering the query he raised when I was replying to the second reading debate. On two occasions since he spoke I have approached the Chief Secretary, who controls the legislation, and made known to him what Mr. Willesee had queried. I asked the Chief Secretary on both occasions whether he was satisfied that the Bill, as drafted, covers the situation. The Chief Secretary has assured me at each approach that the amending Bill will cover the position. I cannot add any more than that except to emphasise the assurance that has been given.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### **PETROLEUM (SUBMERGED LANDS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and transmitted to the Assembly.

#### **FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

##### *In Committee*

Resumed from the 22nd September. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 9: Addition of sections 93A, 93B, 93C—

The **DEPUTY CHAIRMAN**: Progress was reported on the clause to which Mr. Ron Thompson had moved the following amendment:—

Page 4, line 33—Delete the word "or".

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I suggested last night that I would have the matter checked; in fact, I have had it double-checked. The situation is as I described it yesterday. The amendment, if passed, would take the scope of the Bill beyond that for which it is designed. In other words, the scope of the measure would include all fields of home demonstrations and sales, which is not intended. The

measure has specific reference to hours of shop trading and the registration of businesses, as such.

Proposed new sections 93A, 93B, and 93C all have reference to shops. In fact, proposed new section 93C has a specific bearing on publishing or causing to be published statements which have certain implications. It is one thing to ban the publication of a statement which has certain implications, but another thing to prohibit home sales completely or to police properly things which are so published.

It is certainly not the Government's desire to prohibit all home sales. For example, home demonstrations on sewing machines, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and the like, are traditional. Quite frequently these items need to be demonstrated in the home and this is certainly the traditional method of sale. There are many other items, too, which members would readily call to mind.

The Government does not wish to tighten the conditions for selling motor vehicles and the like so that home demonstrations would be prohibited. The amending Bill will not necessarily prohibit home demonstrations, but it certainly will prohibit the publication of offers to sell away from the factory.

I repeat that I have not only had this matter checked, but double-checked by officers appointed under the Factories and Shops Act, as well as Crown Law Department officers. It is certainly not the Government's desire to restrict the sale of any item to the degree suggested by the amendment. I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment and will leave the Bill as it stands.

I feel I should repeat that the effect of the amendment would be to take the scope of the measure beyond that for which it is designed and it is not believed that the purport of the Act should be so extended.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am amazed at that statement, because of the remarks made by the Minister when he introduced the Bill. He said—

It has become evident over the past few years that there has been an increasing tendency for some retailers to circumvent the closing provisions of the Act, thus effecting sales of goods outside the prescribed trading hours. Such practices have become noticeable, particularly in the field of used motor vehicle trading, and it would seem that the 100 or more prosecutions undertaken so far this year have not deterred after-hours trading, which still persists.

I thought the Government was being honest in its attempt to try to stop the sale of motor vehicles outside prescribed hours. I believed that was the reason for the legislation.

If my amendment is not accepted by the Committee it will mean that the measure will accomplish nothing whatsoever. We will leave a loophole in the Act of which firms will take advantage. I would say, "Good luck to them" if they did take advantage of it, because Parliament should take the appropriate steps now to ensure that no loophole exists in the legislation.

I do not want to mention any trade name, so I shall invent one; namely, Auto Dealers. The company could insert an advertisement stating, "Ring Auto Dealers at this number for a demonstration today."

That is what will happen. If we are to tighten up the Act we should tighten it up sufficiently to stop after-hours trading. I am amazed that it is not the intention of the Government to stop after-hours demonstrations and trading. The Bill as it is at present, when it is incorporated in the Act, will not stop Sunday trading. It will prevent Sunday trading, by way of penalty, at the registered shop. However, instead of making sales from a registered shop a dealer could place half a dozen cars on the verge outside his house for the purpose of selling them and the factories and shops inspectors would be powerless to prosecute, although the police could prosecute under the Used Car Dealers Act. We believe in orderly trading, and if the law is not sufficient it is our duty, as members of the Opposition, to ensure that it is made sufficient.

I will not debate this matter at great length, other than to register my disgust that the Bill will not fulfil its purpose and that the Government is not prepared to accept the responsibility of providing orderly trading in this field. It is all very well to say that certain things may not be done, but several weeks ago a person knocked on my door at half past seven on a Sunday night. He tried to sell me white ant treatment for my house.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He must have known about you!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is what is happening in the retail trade. I can understand that there would be a reason for such a person to try to sell white ant treatment in other districts where there is much wood and sawdust, and where the people have sawdust on their persons! I intend to divide the House on this amendment because I believe the Government is missing a golden opportunity to tidy up the legislation. I thought the Government was sincere in its attempt.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is not my desire to delay the Chamber but I simply cannot allow the statements made by Mr. Thompson to go unchallenged. If we look back a little we will find it was never the desire of the Government to tie or pin down motorcar dealers. If members cast their minds back to the original Bill

they will see it was the desire of the Government to extend the hours in which motorcar salesmen could legitimately trade with the public. Despite the leading article in *The West Australian*, it was the decision of Parliament—not the decision of the Government—that the hours should be restricted—because the original Bill introduced last session contained a provision for Saturday afternoon trading.

The understanding reached with the industry was that if we policed the position more firmly to stop what was being forced upon the industry by the actions of some of its members, it would agree to Wednesday night opening. However, there has never been any desire to make this legislation operate in place of the Door to Door (Sales) Act. If pest control salesmen came to Mr. Ron Thompson's door, I take it the way to stop them would be to amend the Door to Door (Sales) Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I realise that. I brought it forward as an example.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The honourable member brought it forward as a red herring. It has nothing to do with the Factories and Shops Act, which deals with legitimate business premises. The honourable member is perfectly right when he says we will have the problem of second-hand car dealers parking their motor vehicles on the verge and putting a salesman there to sell them. The Government is fully aware of that; but this is not the legislation to cope with that problem. It is up to the local authority, which handles parking, to stop it.

I referred this matter to the best authorities we have and they advised me that the honourable member's amendment would extend the entire scope of the Act. At this stage it is not the desire of the Government—and I hope it is not the desire of the Committee—to extend the scope of the Act to cover matters previously outside its ambit.

If it is desired to introduce a Bill at some time to prevent the sale of goods from roadways—such as those people who sell oranges—

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is permitted.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes. Also, if it is desired to prevent car demonstrations at night, that is a different question. I want to stress that it has never been the desire of the Government to pin down and restrict the selling activities which the public apparently desire. That was a decision of Parliament—perhaps I should say it was a decision of another place.

The Hon. R. Thompson: All decisions arrived at in Parliament are decisions of Parliament.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The honourable member spoke about a decision of the Government, which is entirely different from a decision of Parliament.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I did not say that. I said, "the intention of the Government."

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: A decision of the Government could be easily changed by a decision of Parliament; that is what Parliament is for. A decision of the Government in relation to second-hand car dealing was changed by one section of the Parliament last session. The Government brought down this Bill in accordance with what appeared to be the wishes of Parliament last session. As far as we could see, it was as far as Parliament would let the Government go. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If I have any understanding of the printed or written word, the position is exactly the opposite to that expressed by the Minister. The Minister stated that if Mr. Ron Thompson's amendment is agreed to it will extend, and not restrict, trading—which is the spirit of this Bill. However, unless the amendment is accepted this clause, when it becomes a section of the Act, will be wide open to practices which Mr. Thompson wishes to restrict. In my view, the clause will be entirely ineffective. The Minister referred to extended hours. The extended hours as required by the Act are lawful.

This amendment does not relate to the question of whether the shop is legally open. That is not the situation which the Minister presumes. We are dealing with the time when shops are closed as required by the Act, and if advertised by statement or implication—

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is the crux of the matter.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Of course. It is an offence if a person advertises in any way which implies that a shop is legally open. That is what we are dealing with; not the validity of a shop being open, or the authority in the Act which permits a shop to be legally open. That is not the point.

This clause deals with the fact that a person shall not publish or cause to be published any statement which implies or suggests—and that is the crux of it—that the shop is open for business when it is not legally open for business.

It is foolish to suggest that if the amendment is carried it will have the effect of extending trading in places outside a shop. It has nothing whatever to do with that. The entire provision is absolutely and solely tied to advertising and has nothing whatever to do with the permissive right of legal trading hours. If a person dare suggest that he is legally trading by advertising hours outside the legal trading hours he is culpable. That is the situation.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am surprised at the Minister's reasoning and his reaction to the amendment. Amendments which we included in the legislation deal-

ing with estate agents were very similar in purpose to the amendment before us now. We prevented estate agents from using box numbers, and if they use telephone numbers they must publish the address of their premises.

If the provision with which we are dealing is outside the ambit of the Factories and Shops Act then those other provisions to which I have referred must be outside the ambit of the legislation dealing with estate agents. I agree it is an absolute safeguard and it will prevent people from operating illegally outside the Act by pretending they are selling from some fictitious address rather than from the shop itself. The amendment does not interfere with the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act; it merely indicates that a vehicle shall not be sold from any place but the shop.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We cannot have it both ways. Had Mr. Baxter listened to Mr. Wise he would not have contradicted what Mr. Wise said. I did not say Mr. Ron Thompson's amendment would extend trading; I said it would extend the scope of the Bill.

I did say, however, it would not make a skerrick of difference to the trading hours; that it only made it illegal to advertise. Let us talk about sewing machines rather than motorcars. Mr. Wise said, quite rightly, that this provision does not affect the position as to whether one sells outside or not. Mr. Baxter says it does. The amendment makes it illegal to advertise, and Mr. Baxter is advocating sales from outside the shop; which is opposite to what Mr. Wise said.

Mr. Baxter is wrong. The point is that this provision extends the Factories and Shops Act into the field of the legislation dealing with door-to-door selling. It is completely foolish to draw an analogy between this and the legislation dealing with estate agents.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The same principle exists.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It would be like drawing an analogy between this legislation and the Fisheries Act or the Pharmacy Act, which were referred to by Mr. Ron Thompson. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

#### Ayes—9

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. H. C. Strickland	(Teller)

#### Noes—14

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. G. Hishop	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. E. C. House	Hon. J. Heitman

(Teller)

Pais

Ayes

Noes

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery Hon. T. O. Perry  
Hon. R. F. Hutchison Hon. C. R. Abbey

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Naturally I cannot proceed with the further amendment I have on the notice paper. I am sure the Committee will realise what a mistake could be made in the future, because a person who now operates a shop within the prescribed hours of trading under the Factories and Shops Act need only take goods home and offer them for sale. This is not classified under the interpretation provision.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is the question before the Chair?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: My further amendment.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. F. D. Willmott): Did not the honourable member say he would not move his further amendment?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I said I would not proceed with my further amendment.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is, "That clause 9 stand as printed." The honourable member will address himself to the clause.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The interpretation provision in the Factories and Shops Act, as it relates to a "shop," reads as follows:—

"shop" means a building, room, stall, tent, vehicle, boat or other vessel, or place of whatsoever kind in, on or from which—

(a) goods are offered or exposed for sale . . .

It does not include a right-of-way—this does not come within the ambit of the interpretation—and I feel we have wasted our time considering this legislation as it is now framed.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

## CIVIL AVIATION (CARRIERS' LIABILITY) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 16th September.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [5.14 p.m.]: The Bill before us seeks to give effect to legislation which has been adopted by the Commonwealth Government. It is contemplated that similar legislation will also be introduced in other States of the Commonwealth. Several amendments are included in this measure which seeks to amend the parent Act of 1961.

I should imagine that one such provision would give some pleasure to Mr. Dolan who, on a number of occasions in this Chamber, has pointed out the incorrect use of the letter "s" in the word "license," when it is used as a noun. Mr. Dolan has suggested that the letter "c" be used and this is proposed in the amendment contained in clause 3 (b) of the Bill, where the correct use of the word "licence" is included.

Mr. Dolan must gain some small satisfaction from that in view of the campaign he has conducted in this regard over a number of years. This clause also brings charter operations within the scope of the Act. These operations have increased greatly in recent years.

The effect of the second main amendment in the Bill will be to include within the definition of "carriage" not only a charter flight but also what are termed "joyrides." At this stage I do not think it is out of place to bring to the notice of members the fact that next Sunday the Air Force Association is conducting an air show at the Jandakot Airport. At that show flights which would come within the scope of this legislation will be made.

The principal Act gives effect to Commonwealth legislation which, in turn, was introduced into Australia as a result of several international agreements. The first of these agreements was the Warsaw Convention of 1929, and a codicil to that agreement required that countries adopting the convention should state whether the provisions would apply to their State operations as well. The State Act has a specific section which provides that the provisions of the legislation shall apply to the Crown.

This agreement was amended by the Hague Convention of 1955. At that time some rewording of the provisions took place, possibly as a result of legal difficulties. The matter was also the subject of a conference at Guadalajara, in 1962, and the provisions were further amended by a Commonwealth Act of that year. The provisions were extended to include the actual carrier within the meaning of "contracting party." A holder of an airline license may contract to do certain work but the actual carriage of the people or goods could be undertaken by some other authority. At the Guadalajara Convention it was decided to bring such people within the provisions of the legislation.

These agreements served the purpose of extending airline operations on an international scale; they made them more attractive as an investment; and made it possible to obtain better insurance cover. While there are innumerable differences in the legal position in the different States it is difficult for airlines to operate, or to insure their operations at reasonable rates. Also, the agreements have limited the liability of operators to a figure that is perhaps questionable. The figures were fixed originally in 1955 and the Commonwealth

adopted the provisions by an Act passed in 1959. The conventions also prescribed uniformity with regard to passenger tickets, baggage checks, and waybills. If an operator wishes to use the liability provisions of the legislation he cannot convey a passenger or baggage unless the correct tickets and checks are produced.

The conventions also override any civil liability that may exist. In other words, no matter what local legal provisions may apply in respect of compensation, the airline operator's liability is limited to that provided for in this legislation. The Minister did not make it clear whether the level of liability we have accepted, which has been accepted by the Commonwealth, is the same as that which is accepted internationally—whether, in fact, the level obtainable in Western Australia is governed by some agreement which is made with other countries and to which the Commonwealth but not the several States of Australia is a party.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This is Australian legislation. We cannot legislate in respect of other parts of the world.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is quite true, and I am not questioning that aspect. However, I am questioning the level we have adopted here and I ask whether it is a level which has been agreed to internationally.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You mean is the monetary value of our liability the same?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes. Is it the same in all countries? I think it could be appreciated that the level of liability should be the same in all countries, and also that there should be uniformity between the States. Where we have an operation which is peculiar to this State only—and this legislation covers it—should we limit the liability that can be obtained in this State?

For instance, the Minister has informed us that the limit has been increased from \$15,000 to \$30,000. However, in a recent compensation case in New South Wales the sum payable for an injured hand was \$21,000. Also, in this State, a woman who suffered an injury recently received \$59,000 in compensation. If a person is killed in an aircraft accident, and he is the supporter of a family, the limit the dependants can claim from the airline is \$30,000. However, if the same person was killed at work, or in a car accident, and a claim could be made under the workers' compensation legislation, or the third party insurance legislation, the figure would be very much greater.

What I am questioning is whether it is necessary to limit the liability in this State, for operations within the State, to the same figure which is fixed in regard to operations between States or between countries. Why do our affairs have to be

so rigidly fixed to legislation over which we have no control? In this particular instance, I believe we have no control.

The original legislation was introduced by the present Minister for Mines in 1961. Mr. Wise spoke to the measure the day after the Minister introduced it. That did not give him a great deal of time to study the legislation, and there is a great deal to study on it. I have half a dozen books which deal with the Commonwealth legislation and the international agreements, and Mr. Wise would not have had much time to look at the information which was available.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I hope it was a sensible speech.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I found it extremely interesting, clear, and logical. In it Mr. Wise raised the question of Commonwealth-State relationships. The fact that the Act could be further amended by the Commonwealth, and regulations could be framed under that Act without being sighted by this Parliament, was also referred to. At that time members showed some concern regarding the matter. Dr. Hislop, who at that time had just returned from a C.P.A. conference, spoke to the Bill, as did Mr. MacKinnon and some others who are no longer members of the Legislative Council.

I do not think we can dispute the fact that airline operations are a matter which can be more effectively handled on an international scale rather than by the respective States; any rational person must concede this. The operations of all aircraft, whether operating intrastate, interstate, or internationally, are controlled in Australia by the Department of Civil Aviation. This is a Commonwealth department, and all airports, except two, are owned by that department—the two exceptions are State-owned. So while we must concede that such control can be more effectively carried out by the Commonwealth, I am of the opinion that there are many other instances where the authority of the States is being trespassed upon to an extent that is not necessary.

Under this legislation we are conceding our prerogative to the Commonwealth when we could still make our own judgments upon it. I would further point out that the Commonwealth legislation includes the international agreements as schedules to that Act. This is not the case with our own State Act; and I would suggest that it would be of advantage if the same practice were adopted with our Act. It would be a simple matter.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are you suggesting that the States could make international agreements?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No, I am not suggesting that, any more than I am suggesting that the Commonwealth can make international agreements.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Commonwealth can.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Commonwealth can include the international agreements in the schedules to its Acts. After all, the only reference in our Act is the provision stating that section 4 of the Commonwealth Act applies in this State. The reference does not detail the provisions of the Act, and if they were included as a schedule that information would be readily available to whoever had to refer to the Act.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is readily available in the place in which it belongs; that is, in the Commonwealth Act.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The details were not readily available here. They were obtained from the State Library and I ask: Why is this necessary? Surely we should be able to have ready access to the information in our State legislation. Why should we have to chase around to the State Library for the information? Why not have the information included in our State legislation? Then, when we wished to refer to the legislation, all the information would be available.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It does not fit.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I will not dispute with the Minister; I simply offer the suggestion that since the Commonwealth finds it convenient to include international agreements as schedules to its Acts, the same thing could be done with our own legislation.

In 1961 Mr. Wise pointed out that an amendment could be made to the Commonwealth legislation about which we would have no knowledge. This, in fact, seems to have happened. The 1962 agreement was incorporated in an amendment to the Commonwealth Act, but it does not appear in the amendment we have before us, or in any other amendment to the Act.

I do not wish to burden members with unnecessary material relating to this Act. The measures which are proposed will be of great benefit. I have pointed out that it is necessary for an operator, in order to obtain the protection of the proposed provisions, to ensure that his passengers have airline tickets bearing the necessary notice, otherwise he cannot claim the protection of the State Act.

I reiterate: Perhaps we are accepting Commonwealth control, or standards, when it is not really necessary to do so. When considering the limit of compensation which would apply to operations within this State, perhaps it would be more realistic to fix a figure to suit our own conditions.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. D. Willmott.

*House adjourned at 5.34 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 23rd September, 1970

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

### QUESTIONS (38): ON NOTICE

#### 1. ELECTORAL ROLLS

##### *Computer Setting*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Government Printing Office did some of the printing of the computer-set electoral rolls of South Australia?
- (2) Has he noticed the spacing in the computer setting in these rolls which results in easier reading and glancing through the rolls especially when looking for the first name(s) and/or address within the list or a recurring name such as "Smith"?
- (3) Would he consider having the computer setting (from which the offset printing is done) in the Western Australian State electoral rolls arranged the way that space should be left in each horizontal line between the surname—given names—address and occupation respectively, so that the first letter of all the given names and the first number or letter of all the addresses would be set in a vertical line on each page, thereby making the roll easier to read?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This has been brought to the notice of the Minister for Justice.
- (3) The matter will be considered.

#### 2. THE PATIENTS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA

##### *Credentials*

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he received or read a circular sent out by "The Patients Association of Australia" setting out its aims and objects together with an application for membership?
- (2) Has he any knowledge of this association and, if so, is he in a position to give the House its credentials?
- (3) Has he any knowledge who is sponsoring it?
- (4) Is he aware if it is a body corporate registered in any State of the Commonwealth?