of finance only. If we take away the financial problems they will do the job more effectively.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They are doing it at a loss.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have one other point to make. Some considerable time ago the control of country traffic was taken out of the hands of the Minister for Local Government and put into the hands of the Minister for Police. This was a detrimental move.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: How long ago was that?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I could not say offhand. I am simply saying that it was done. I do not blame anybody, but I say it was the wrong thing to do. When I was Minister for Local Government, I found I lacked the necessary authority to make some local authorities wake up to their responsibilities. The first suggestion I make at the moment is that we should hand the control of country traffic back to the Minister for Local Government, because that is his direct task. Secondly, we should increase the amount returned to local authorities on vehicle licenses to at least $5. It may be necessary to give them more to enable them to do their job properly. Let us co-operate on this matter instead of creating throughout the State ill-feeling which is most unnecessary. If we can work in a spirit of co-operation we could well go some way toward reducing the road toll. I oppose the measure.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Heitman.

House adjourned at 5.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 17th August, 1972

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

BASSENDEAN No. 2 TOWN PLANNING SCHEME

Subsidy for Deep Sewerage: Petition

MR. BRADY (Swan) [11.02 a.m.]: I present the following petition from the ratepayers concerned in the Bassendean No. 2 town planning scheme:—

> To the honourable speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament Assembled.
>
> We the undersigned petitioners being citizens of the Bassendean Shire (District of Swan) do hereby pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will assist in the development of the Bassendean No. 2 Town Planning Scheme by the providing a subsidy for deep sewerage as required by the appropriate government authority. The subsidy to cover the full cost of the deep sewerage throughout the entire scheme.
>
> Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will give this matter urgent consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

I certify that this petition conforms to the rules of the House. The petition has been signed by me and contains 153 correct signatures.

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

RIO TINTO MINING COMPANY

Iron Ore Proposals: Tabling of File

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [11.03 a.m.]: Yesterday I gave an undertaking that I would table the file on the Rio Tinto Mining Company's iron ore proposals. I now submit the file for tabling. *The file was tabled (see paper No. 288).*

ACTS AMENDMENT (ABOLITION OF THE PUNISHMENT OF DEATH AND WHIPPING) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General), and read a first time.

FUEL, ENERGY AND POWER RESOURCES BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 15th August. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. May (Minister for Fuel) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 9: Powers of the Commission—

Progress was reported after the clause had been partly considered.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 13 put and passed.

Clause 14: Members of the Fuel and Power Commission—

Mr. NALDER: When speaking to the second reading I predicted that the representative of the State Electricity Commission would probably be the general manager or the chairman. Later on, I think the Minister indicated by interjection that it would probably be the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission. Can the Minister indicate whether that is so, and whether the representatives of the

other two departments will be the Under-Secretary for Mines and the head of the Department of Development and Decentralisation? I think it would be as well for the Committee to know that the top men in those three organisations will be on the commission.

Mr. MAY: I confirm that the representative of the State Electricity Commission will be the general manager. The other two departments will be represented by the Under-Secretary for Mines and the Director of the Department of Development and Decentralisation.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 15 and 16 put and passed.

Clause 17: Delegation—

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to refer to subclause (2) of clause 17. The question of delegation is always a critical one which gives rise to some concern as to whether the power of delegation might go too far and the statutory body concerned might surrender some of its powers and responsibilities to a point of danger, thus defeating the purposes of the legislation. Subclause (2) reads—

> (2) A power or function delegated by the Commission may be exercised or performed by the delegate—
>
> (a) in accordance with the instrument of delegation; and
>
> (b) if the exercise of the power or the performance of the function in relation to a matter is dependent upon the opinion, belief or state of mind of the Commission—upon the opinion, belief, or state of mind of the delegate in relation to that matter.

This particular phrase is often used, but usually in relation to the body that has the right of delegation. I wonder whether the Minister can throw some light on this matter. It may be he has not had time to research it or has not noticed the import of it, but it seems to me rather odd that a delegate, who could be one person performing the role of the commission for the purpose of his delegation, could in fact exercise the power or perform the functions, in relation to a matter which is dependent upon the opinion, belief, or state of mind of the commission, acting upon the opinion, belief, or state of mind of the delegate himself in that matter.

It is normal in the course of deliberation that the commissioners may decide among themselves, because in the final analysis any matters reflect the opinion, belief, or state of mind of the people present at the meetings. When this power is delegated to a person or a group of people who do not in fact comprise the commission, it strikes me as going too far. It is not unprecedented to give a delegate the responsibility and the power to perform a particular function. I do not quarrel with this because it becomes completely impracticable if the commission does not have some powers of delegation. However, it is different when the delegate has to reflect "the opinion, belief, or state of mind" of the commission.

I wonder whether the Minister could give us some examples from the discussions which took place with his advisers of just what they have in mind? This power of delegation is not unusual, but in this case it appears to be going too far. The commission would not know what power it is giving to this delegate.

Mr. MAY: I am a little uncertain myself in regard to this clause except I was under the impression that the delegate will be a member of the commission. I feel it is essential that the delegate be a member of the commission. I am not *au fait* with the delegation of powers to any other person but I feel this is an obligation on the commission when it appoints a delegate.

I shall endeavour to ascertain this information for the Leader of the Opposition. As I have indicated I have quite a number of matters which I shall clarify during the third reading stage of the Bill. I am of the same opinion as the Leader of the Opposition; that is, the delegate should be a member of the commission.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would like to clarify this point so that the Minister is in no doubt as to where we stand. Subclause (1) provides that a delegate can be somebody other than a member of the commission—this is stated quite definitely. Then the commission may, with the approval of the Minister, delegate this power.

I do not think we should in fact make it impossible for the commission to delegate power except through a member of the commission because we do not know what circumstances may arise. I was hoping the Minister could give us an instance of a particular function which could be performed by a delegate.

I am concerned that the delegate may be clothed with the power to think for the commission in respect of something which is quite incapable of being reduced to a specific function. So far as specific function is concerned, it will be a matter of straightout practicalities to give somebody this responsibility but I am worried by the addition of these other words, "upon the opinion, belief, or state of mind of the delegate in relation to that matter," as representing the opinion, state of mind, or belief of the commission.

I believe this is going too far. I gather the Minister cannot give us an indication of the circumstances where delegation would take place but will do so later.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 18 put and passed.

Clause 19: Advisory Council—

Sir CHARLES COURT: From my reading of this clause I am not certain of the exact composition of the council. I understand certain people will be added to and taken from the council from time to time because of the varying specialised knowledge needed of council members.

The council will be composed of the commissioner or his nominee, permanent representative members, and co-opted members. I do not quarrel with the different classes of members because it would be quite crazy to have a whole host of people sitting in on deliberations when two-thirds of them have no expertise or information on the matter being discussed. For example, when discussing the subject of nuclear energy, people with specialised coal or petroleum knowledge might have no contribution to make and no interest in the discussion. Therefore it would be quite silly to convene a large permanent body with the necessity of making up a quorum. This would not be the original intention of the council concept.

I am trying to deduce from the wording of the clause the number of council members. I do not know if the Minister has been able to decipher this. Clause 21 (1) reads as follows:—

> (1) Each of the bodies following, that is to say—
>
> (a) the body known as The West Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Incorporated); and
>
> (b) the body known as The Chamber of Mines of Western Australia (Incorporated).
>
> has the right to submit to the Minister a panel of names from which a person shall be selected by the Minister for recommendation to the Governor and appointment by the Governor as a permanent member of the Council to represent the interests of the body by whom he was nominated.

This subclause may be read in two ways. It can mean that the Minister makes a selection of one from the panel of names to represent the Chamber of Mines and another selection of one from the panel of names to represent the Chamber of Manufactures. However, it may be read another way; that is, that the Minister may select one person to represent both bodies.

Mr. Hartrey: You could not do that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: In my opinion when matters such as this become arguable there is no end to the ambiguities which may arise.

Mr. Hartrey: It says a permanent member of the council representing the body by whom he was nominated. Obviously one man cannot represent two chambers. There have to be at least two representatives.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is how I read the subclause the first time, but it has been represented to me by a legal person that it could be taken the other way. Here we have two legal brains in conflict already.

Mr. O'Neil: That is not unusual.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am simply asking the Minister what he understands this to mean. I have no intention of moving an amendment, but in the spirit of co-operation which is inherent in this Opposition we are asking the Minister what he means.

I wonder whether the member for Boulder-Dundas can himself determine exactly how many members will comprise the council. I will leave it for the moment until I obtain the Minister's comment on this question of permanent members.

Mr. MAY: My understanding of the composition of the council will be the commission, which comprises the commissioner and the three members of the commission, and also the permanent member as indicated in clause 21. The other representative members will not be permanent members of the council.

Mr. Nalder: Did you say one permanent member under clause 21?

Mr. MAY: I am sorry, one from each chamber. There will be two permanent members, one representing the Chamber of Mines and one the Chamber of Manufactures, the commissioner, and the three members of the commission.

Sir Charles Court: I do not think the commission is on the council—only the commissioner.

Mr. MAY: Yes, the commissioner or the person he delegates.

Mr. W. G. Young: The commissioner and three permanent members will be on the council.

Mr. MAY: If I may clarify that, the only time that the three members or any of the three members of the commission can attend a council meeting on an authorative basis will be if the commissioner is not in attendance, and he nominates a delegate.

Mr. W. G. Young: He nominates a delegate in writing.

Mr. MAY: That is right. That is the permanent basis of the council and the other members will be co-opted according to what particular subject is to be discussed at the council meeting.

Mr. NALDER: An article appeared in *The West Australian* yesterday under the headline, "Fuel plan opposed by Nalder." At no time when I spoke in this Chamber did I oppose the Bill.

Mr. May: I agree.

Mr. NALDER: I did say that I felt the part of the Bill which refers to the council is unnecessary, at least in the initial stages, and I gave reasons. I still believe that the council will be unnecessary, possibly for some years. I object to the fact that the Press indicated to the public that I opposed the whole proposal, whereas I did not. I object to the fact that the detail of the Bill was not given in the Press article. It was made clear that a commission is to be established. Of course, we cannot appoint people without giving them some authority; and that authority is given to the commission. But the public have not been made aware of the personnel of the council or the commission. I have been questioned as to why I opposed the Bill, and I have answered that I strongly support the measure and that I believe it is necessary. I merely question part of it.

Paragraphs (c) and (d) of subclause (2) refer to representative and co-opted members of the council. The Minister has already mentioned that there will be three permanent members on the council with voting rights. One will be the commissioner.

Earlier in the Bill it is stated that the commission may co-opt people to discuss any matter with the commission or to provide any information the commission may require. In this clause we find the council is to be able to do the same thing. Reading further on I find that the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Mines may be represented by permanent members. The council may also call in representative members and co-opted members to discuss any matter. Representative and co-opted members will not have voting rights; they will merely advise the council.

In my view, allowing the council, as well as the commission, to have representative and co-opted members will make the whole proposal clumsy and top-heavy. The commission already has this authority; why give it to the council also? The commission may call in anybody from any Government department or from any industry to be a representative or co-opted member; yet the Minister intends to give this power to the council also. The commissioner is to be a member of the commission as well as the council. In my view this is a most cumbersome piece of legislation. I ask the Minister why it is necessary for the council to have this authority? I would like the Minister to tell us how many representative members will be on the council and what will be the position so far as co-opted members are concerned.

Mr. MAY: I think the apprehensions of the Leader of the Country Party are unjustified. The idea of having co-opted members is to ensure that the commissioner can call upon any person whom he feels may be of assistance to the commission.

Mr. Nalder: I am not objecting to that as far as the commission is concerned.

Mr. MAY: The honourable member mentioned the commission in the first instance. When we drafted the legislation we envisaged that when the commissioner arrives in this State he will not be fully conversant with the conditions.

Mr. Nalder: I am not criticising that.

Mr. MAY: I know; I am coming to the point made by the honourable member. We felt rather than restrict the commissioner we should have permanent members and also representative members on the council to give industry the opportunity to be represented and to provide advice. If we do not make provision for co-opted members the council may not be in a position to seek advice in areas we do not yet envisage. Uranium and nuclear energy, and tidal power, are not in operation in this State at present. We feel the council should have the benefit of co-opted members to advise it. The council will not be top-heavy because it will have only three or four people permanently on it. It will have representative members from the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Mines, but they will not necessarily be there all the time.

Mr. Nalder: You will have only three permanent members, and not three or four?

Mr. MAY: Yes. When discussing a certain item they will have the opportunity to call on people with a knowledge of that matter. At some later stage we may wish to bring in someone without voting rights who may give advice and then leave the meeting to enable the council to discuss the matter. I think this is a good feature of the Bill because it provides the flexibility we are looking for. We are making laws for somebody who has not yet arrived in Western Australia, and we must provide flexibility for him so that he may obtain the best possible advice from people who are at present in industry or who may be in industry at some future date.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 20 put and passed.

Clause 21: Permanent members—

Mr. MAY: The Leader of the Opposition has raised a point on this clause and I would like to speak in regard to it. The clause refers to permanent members, and to bodies known as The West Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Incorporated) and The Chamber of Mines of Western Australia (Incorporated) which have the

right to submit a panel of names, from which a person will be selected to be appointed as a permanent member of the council. As the clause refers to permanent members in the plural, there is ambiguity and I will try to clarify the position. My own thoughts on this are that there is a delegated member of the committee plus others representing the two bodies I have mentioned. This is indicated in clause 19 (b) which refers to permanent members in the plural. I will clarify this still further after discussion with Mr. Parker and report again to the Chamber on the third reading of the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 22 put and passed.

Clause 23: Nominations may be requested—

Mr. MAY: I move an amendment—

Page 15—Add after subclause (2) a new subclause (3) as follows:—

(3) (a) When the Minister considers that the interest of the employees engaged in any industry or commercial activity should be represented on the Council he shall, as the occasion requires, by notice in writing to the Secretary of the body known as the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia require that body to submit a panel of not less than three names within a period of thirty days after receipt by the Secretary of that notice from which a person shall be selected by the Minister for recommendation to the Governor and appointment to the Council by the Governor as representative of those employees.

(b) If upon the expiration of that period, or such extension of that period as the Minister thinks fit and is hereby authorised to grant, the Minister has not received the required panel of names, the Minister may recommend for appointment such person as he thinks fit.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I was hoping the Minister would give us some explanation of this amendment, because I believe if he desires to do this, not only in respect of the people specifically referred to in the amendment but others also, he could do it under another provision of the Bill, as has been mentioned by the Leader of the Country Party. There is already scope for bringing people onto the council, not as permanent members, but to further the function of co-operation, and so on. It is important that we understand the possibilities invoked by this new subclause, because I can visualise tremendous difficulty in regard to this matter which could completely defeat the purposes of the council.

I have worked on the assumption that the council has been introduced as a necessary and desirable piece of machinery to advise the commission on certain aspects of its work, and 90 per cent. of this advice would be of a technical nature. For instance, if we are to become involved in uranium development—enriched fuels, and nuclear power—we would be dealing with a different type of expertise than would be the case if we were dealing with natural gas or coal power stations. Likewise, if we are dealing with petroleum we are dealing with a different set of techniques than we would be if we were dealing with uranium, coal, tidal power, hydro-electric power, and so on.

I think the council would be acting in an advisory capacity in regard to technology and techniques of this sort, but this proposed new subclause introduces an entirely different aspect and I am wondering whether the Minister wants this introduced. It does bring in a role for the council beyond the one I have been supporting. Therefore, at this time, it is appropriate that the Minister should give the Chamber some indication of his thinking on the matter.

Mr. MAY: This subclause was omitted from the original draft of the Bill. The position has been spelt out quite clearly in regard to industry; that is, it was considered there may be someone from the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Mines who could be of assistance to the council, following which it became quite obvious that we should have somebody from the work force to give the council the benefit of his knowledge and advice. It is necessary to have men in the work force to put forward any views of the employees in regard to projects that are to be established in Western Australia. We have to get both industry and the work force on side if we are to have something on the Statute book that will be there for all time and will have a big impact on the development of Western Australia.

Following discussions with representatives of industry generally, no objection has been raised to this new subclause. Probably if it had been in the Bill from the beginning the Leader of the Opposition would not have expressed any concern. I can assure him it was a definite omission from the original draft of the Bill. We are keen to have this harmonious relationship between industry and the work force, because it will have a tremendous effect on the development of Western Australia in the future.

Mr. W. G. Young: My interpretation of this new subclause is that the representative of the work force would become a permanent member of the council. Therefore, would not the provision be better under clause 21? Is he, in fact, going to be a permanent member?

Mr. MAY: No, he will be a representative member and not a permanent member. He will have no voting rights and will be present only in an advisory capacity.

Mr. JONES: I support the amendment. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about the new provision because the T.L.C. is mentioned in it. To be fair to all sections of industry we must bear in mind that no opposition has been raised against representatives of the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Mines being included. At present the only fuel being produced to assist in power generation is coal, but that may not always be the position.

How closely associated with power generation is the Chamber of Mines at the moment? The only allegiance it has with power generation is in the use of fuel. I understand that perhaps only one of the coalmining companies is associated with the Chamber of Mines, but I could be wrong in saying that. I cannot see anything wrong with the proposition that the views of the employers in industry should be obtained, and therefore there should be no opposition to including a representative from the work force, because this will give the Minister an opportunity to obtain the opinions of all sections of the community.

Mr. HARTREY: I support the amendment in precisely the same spirit, but perhaps for different reasons from those expressed by the member for Collie. Many aspects of industry of vital importance to the work force are not always fully considered by all sections of industry. For example, safety and health factors in the industry and other provisions for the betterment of the work force and individual employees are essential; but one could scarcely say that the Chamber of Mines or the Chamber of Manufactures is very anxious about such aspects. They are more interested in the aspects that concern themselves, and rightly so.

One would not expect anything more from them, but one would expect a Government which professes to represent the interests of all sections of the community to give consideration to the conditions applying to the work force engaged in an industry covered by this legislation. That is precisely what the appointment of the member of the Trades and Labor Council will achieve.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not want to hold up this matter for any great length of time, but I want to make some points which should be recorded so that at a later date when the interpretation of our intentions is being submitted to some practical aspects we are not at cross purposes.

The member for Collie has missed the point completely as to why the Chamber of Mines and the Chamber of Manufactures are to be on this body, and the manner in which their representatives are proposed to be appointed. It may be that some of the coal producers are not members of the Chamber of Mines, but that is not the point. We are thinking here of something far beyond that.

Mr. Jones: I said at this point of time.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We are thinking of something far beyond this, where the companies or bodies represented by those organisations will have to provide practically 100 per cent. of the funds and the expertise to undertake the very costly search for petroleum, or the treatment of uranium and other minerals. Therefore they are being brought into the council for an entirely different reason from the reason which has prompted the inclusion of clause 23 (3).

I go back to the point raised by the member for Boulder-Dundas in relation to health and safety factors. I would point out that these aspects are covered by existing legislation, and they are completely foreign to the intention of the Bill.

Mr. Jones: No, they are not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, they are. This is a matter of great national as well as State importance, to develop a fuel, energy, and power policy to cover all fields of fuel, power, and energy.

Mr. Jones: Surely you will agree that the State's coal resources have to be considered.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Of course, they have to be. I want to explain clearly, so that we understand what we are doing, that what I said earlier still stands. The provision in clause 23(3) introduces an entirely different element into the council. The reason that I go along with the idea of the council is that I believe it to be a very flexible piece of machinery which will enable the commission to have access to various expertise, according to its needs and the programme currently under consideration. If a proposal concerns the treatment of uranium then the council will have access to expertise, and if it is one to develop hydro-electricity it will also have access to such expertise.

I have looked at the functions of the council as set out in clause 20; but this particular aspect in clause 23(3) is introduced, I presume, as a result of some political pressure. However, I would rather consider it on its merits. Clause 20 sets out the functions, and does not call for the type of representative that is sought in the amendment before us.

My main purpose in rising is not to oppose at this juncture the inclusion of clause 23(3), but to find out the circumstances, having regard for clause 20, when the Minister will invoke the provision in clause 23(3). If the Minister tells us the circumstances and gives us a hypothetical case it will help us in our deliberations.

I have no doubt that Mr. Parker and other officers advising the Minister have said that circumstances could arise where there was good reason to bring in these people as representatives of the Trades and Labor Council. If the Minister can give us a case as an example it will help. My understanding of the proposed council and of the provision in clause 20 is that normally there will not be any circumstances when the provision in clause 23(3) will be invoked.

Mr. MAY: We have to realise that this is a new type of function which is to be set up in Western Australia. On the introduction of any type of function—such as one applying to schools or pedestrian crossings—the people have to be educated on its use.

The idea of the amendment before us is to make sure that when council meetings are being held, and a point affecting the work force arises, the work force will have a representative to enable the workers to understand what is going on. I can imagine the commissioner will be seeking the advice of the Trades and Labor Council, because if we are to get this legislation off the ground successfully we will need harmonious relationship.

Sir Charles Court: Of course we do, but that is provided for elsewhere.

Mr. MAY: The Leader of the Opposition said he could not see anything in the functions of the council contained in clause 20 which requires the provision in the amendment. If he looks at clause 20(b) he will find that it states—

> (b) to make recommendations to the Commission on any matter pertaining to the present and future sources and supplies of fuel, energy, and power in and to the State;

So the member for Collie has raised a valid point.

I go further and agree that we have to look a long way ahead; and if we do we have to take both industry and the work force along with us. It is a very essential part of the legislation to make provision for the inclusion of a representative of the work force, not only for the purpose of giving advice, but also to be educated as to the type of work force which will be required in the future when we set up, for instance, a uranium enrichment plant, a nuclear power plant, or some other type of industry which has not as yet been established in Western Australia.

Mr. JONES: There is another facet to be considered. In the second reading debate I showed that even the State Electricity Commission was not fully aware of the coal reserves of Western Australia. Here is one instance under the amendment before us where the industry, through the representative of the employees, would be able to establish clearly to the commission that its assessment of the situation was astray.

This amendment will do no harm, and the representative of the workers will only be brought in where the Minister considers that to be necessary. I would point out that even when the present Opposition was in Government it followed the same pattern as is proposed in the amendment; and there have been numerous examples in various pieces of legislation where the representative of the Trades and Labor Council and other workers' organisations have been invited to participate in discussions the results of which finally ended up in Parliament.

I cannot see any inherent dangers in the amendment. I am still of the opinion that as soon as the T.L.C. is mentioned, all sorts of opposition from members opposite are expressed. It has been proved that the T.L.C. has been of tremendous advantage to this State when consideration was being given to the amendment of certain legislation. For that reason I still support the amendment.

Mr. NALDER: It is obvious to us what the Government now wants to achieve. To me, some of the verbiage in clause 23 (3) is quite unnecessary. I consider the words "When the Minister considers that the interests of the employees engaged in any industry or commercial activity should be represented on the Council" are superfluous, and I would request that they be deleted.

The Minister has told us that it is desirable for a representative of the Trades and Labor Council to be on the council; if that is his view then this representative should be made a permanent member of the council. I see no reason for the first few lines.

Sir Charles Court: It does leave him some discretion.

Mr. Hartrey: That would make him a permanent member.

Mr. NALDER: He is a representative member who will be a permanent representative member. The Minister said so.

Mr. May: He will be a representative.

Sir Charles Court: Not a permanent one.

Mr. NALDER: Clause 22 (4) refers to a representative member appointed to the council under proposed subclause (3). I presume that when that representative member is appointed he will be called to the council meeting when required.

Mr. May: That is right.

Mr. NALDER: That is what should be done under this clause.

Mr. May: That is right.

Mr. NALDER: Why say the Minister "may"?

Mr. May: It says "shall."

Mr. NALDER: But only when the Minister considers it necessary. Why not make the same provision as far as the other representatives are concerned? I am making this suggestion because I consider the verbiage quite unnecessary.

Mr. MAY: All I want to say in reply is that this provision was omitted. We referred the matter to the draftsman who supplied this particular verbiage. There was no direction at all from me or from Mr. Parker as to the verbiage. It covers the situation because it gives the Minister the prerogative. He shall do it if he considers it necessary. It was an omission previously and this is the reason for my insistence on its inclusion now.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 24 and 25 put and passed.

Clause 26: Meetings of the Council—

Mr. NALDER: Under this clause if the chairman of the commission cannot be present he can nominate a member of the commission or a member of the council to be chairman.

Mr. May: No, that is not right.

Mr. NALDER: Paragraph (c) provides that a council member nominated in writing by the Minister may preside at the meeting. In my opinion this clause restricts the commissioner and the Minister because their nomination must be in writing. Suppose a meeting is called at short notice—and this is quite likely—and the commissioner cannot be present, and a commision member cannot be present; then the Minister must nominate a council member but he must do so in writing.

Mr. May: There will be no meeting of the council unless either the commissioner or one of the members delegated by him to act as chairman is present. There will not be a meeting of the council unless it is presided over by the commissioner or one of the other members of the commission.

Mr. NALDER: Then what does paragraph (c) mean?

Mr. May: But the actual chairman of the council will be the commissioner, or, if he cannot attend, one of the other three members of the commission. The council is an advisory body only. The idea is to ensure that a member of the commission is chairman. A member of the council cannot be chairman.

Mr. NALDER: Then what is the interpretation of paragraph (c)? That paragraph is contrary to what the Minister is saying. It states very clearly that a council member can preside at a meeting if nominated in writing by the Minister. So the Minister is quite wrong.

The point I wish to make is that if a meeting is required urgently and none of the commission members or the commissioner himself can be present, the commissioner or the Minister must nominate someone in writing. The words "in writing" should be deleted. What would be the position if the Minister and the commissioner were away and therefore could not nominate another person in writing? The meeting could not be held.

I believe these words should be deleted so that the clause will be workable. At the moment it is cumbersome and could be unworkable. If my suggestion were adopted the Minister could ring someone or tell someone else to act and thus enable the council to meet and function. I can visualise that at times the council will meet illegally if those words remain.

Mr. MAY: I can see the point and I think it is well made. My own personal understanding of the operation of the council is that no council member would preside at a council meeting. It was to be either the commissioner or any of the other three mentioned. The other members can attend to ascertain for themselves what is going on.

I do not know the reason for this provision being in the Bill and if the Leader of the Country Party will go along with me I will inquire as to whether the paragraph is necessary. I will make any necessary explanation at the third reading stage of the Bill and, if appropriate, arrange for an alteration to be made in another place.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 40 put and passed.

First schedule put and passed.

Second schedule—

Sir CHARLES COURT: I invite the attention of the Minister to clause 3 of the schedule. Certain wording is used in this clause for which I cannot find a precedent. I refer to paragraph (b) which reads as follows:—

> is an undischarged bankrupt or has his affairs under liquidation by arrangement with his creditors.

This could be a form of legal drafting but I think the words, "under liquidation" in referring to a person are hardly appropriate. I do not think a person can be under liquidation. Corporate bodies can be under liquidation but a corporate body will not be appointed to the commission.

The provision may be of no moment but if it is wrong I suggest to the Minister that it could be tidied up in another place.

Mr. MAY: I will ensure that the paragraph is checked and if it requires amending that can be done in another place.

Second schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park—Minister for Health) [12.05 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

The repeal of section 289 of the Criminal Code means that the provisions of section 30 (1) (c) of the Mental Health Act will no longer cover those instances where it is suspected that a person is about to take his own life. There appears to be no provision in the Police Act which would enable a police officer necessarily to apprehend a person who, he believes, is about to take his own life.

It is therefore proposed that the position be clarified, and the police be enabled to take appropriate action in situations where it is believed that a person is about to attempt to take his own life, by the addition of the words, "or of attempting to take his own life" to section 30 (1) (c) of the Mental Health Act.

Such an amendment does not recreate the offence of attempted suicide, but simply adds an extra ground justifying action under this section of the Mental Health Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Dr. Dadour.

AUCTIONEERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [12.08 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill contains a small amendment to enable bloodstock auctions to be held during the evening.

Section 11 of the principal Act provides—

> No person shall act as an auctioneer after sunset or before sunrise on any day except for the purpose of selling freehold or leasehold lands or tenements or shares in any incorporated company, or wool included and described in a catalogue issued prior to and for the purpose of the sale of such wool.
>
> Provided that this section shall not apply to sales by auction held, with the approval of the Treasurer, at a bazaar or sale of gifts for charitable or church purposes.

It can be seen that bloodstock auctions which are held in the evenings in other States of Australia cannot be conducted during similar hours in Western Australia.

The breeding of bloodstock represents an important industry today. It is vital, particularly to country breeders, that the auctions be conducted at times and under conditions which will ensure a fair and adequate return. Stock breeders in this State believe that considerable benefits will accrue both to the vendor and purchasers by sales being permitted during the evening hours.

Accordingly, this Bill which has been drafted to allow this concession, is submitted for favourable consideration by members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. O'Connor.

NOXIOUS WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [12.11 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

Amongst its many other functions the Noxious Weeds Act has been designed to deal with the introduction and spread of primary and secondary weeds into the State.

Effective provisions exist in sections 26, 27, 28, and 29 of the Act as well as appropriate regulations to control the entry of stock, and over the last 10 years a considerable number of weed infested animals have been detected on arrival in this State. Because of this control it has been possible to prevent serious outbreaks of such weeds as Bathurst burr and Horehound and it is quite logical to assume that the strict and prompt action taken has also discouraged offenders and the proportion of infested stock has been considerably reduced.

However, the existing legislation is not sufficient to give adequate control over all sources of noxious weed introduction. Fodder, chaff seed, machinery, animal coats, and used sacks and wool packs are included in these sources of introduction not controllable under the existing Act except, of course, sacks and wool packs which are covered by regulation.

It is quite evident then that the existing legislation should be amended to afford more extensive protection to our primary industries and the Bill now before the House proposes amendments to the Noxious Weeds Act which would afford the exercising of full control over the imports

of such produce and articles as I have mentioned previously. It also seeks the power to destroy, as necessary, soil packing, material, bedding in livestock vans and similar materials found to be contaminated with the seeds of noxious weeds.

Provision has also been made in the Bill for increased penalties for breaches of the regulations.

The controls proposed are consistent with the requirements of the State in giving more extensive protection to primary industry from the introduction of noxious weeds through the many and increasing avenues of importation. I commend the measure to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. McPharlin.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Lands) [12.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that during the 1971 session, the Land Act was amended to provide for the relinquishment by the Crown of its right to the indigenous timber on alienated or partially alienated land.

When that amendment was drafted it was realised it would not include perpetual leases issued under the war service land settlement legislation of lands developed with funds provided by the Commonwealth.

It was necessary to refer the question of the deletion of timber reservation conditions from these perpetual leases to the Commonwealth authorities, and rather than delay the promulgation of the main legislation, it was proceeded with at that time in relation only to land affected by the Land Act.

The Commonwealth authorities have now advised there is no objection to the deletion of timber reservation conditions from perpetual leases.

Although the timber reservation conditions at present remain, the Forests Department is treating these lands similar to leases issued under the Land Act and is granting brands for the removal of timber thereon on application by the lessees.

This amendment will delete the timber reservation conditions from all perpetual leases issued under this Act or any Act repealed by this Act, and place the lessees of war service farms on an equal footing with other lessees. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Nalder.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION BILL

Second Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [12.19 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes the establishment of the existing Law Reform Committee as a statutory body. The provisions of the Bill broadly follow the pattern of corresponding legislation in other Australian jurisdictions, and in England, and are based on the recommendations of the committee, with one exception—that exception relates to the appointment of staff.

The Law Reform Committee is at present constituted according to a decision of Cabinet made on the 4th September, 1967. It was not intended that the committee should continue indefinitely under that authority.

In its present form the committee, which is a part-time body, consists of three members: a practitioner in private practice, a member of the Law School's academic staff, and a senior legal officer of the Crown Law Department.

I pay tribute to the previous Government—now in Opposition—for appointing such a committee, and to the members of the committee who, since 1967, have worked in the interests of good legislation. Many of the Statutes now on our Statute book are evidence of the good work that has been performed by the committee.

Each member acts as a chairman for a period of a year, and the committee has a full-time legally qualified research staff of four officers and a secretary-typist.

One of the tasks of the committee was to advise the Government on the nature of the legislation to set up a law reform body on a permanent basis. It did this in its annual report of last year. This assignment was given to the Law Reform Committee by the former Government.

In recommending the provisions of this Bill, the committee concluded that the existing procedure, with part-time members, was the most suitable for Western Australian conditions.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Most other jurisdictions have a judge as chairman but in the committee's opinion a part-time body would function more satisfactorily if it were independent of the judiciary, although giving the judges, together with other groups, full opportunity to comment on its working papers. That is the practice that has applied hitherto.

Under the present procedure, the committee submits to the Attorney-General topics which it thinks suitable for study, based either on its own considerations or on suggestions received from the judges,

the Law Society, or other interested persons. The topics to be studied by the committee are determined by the Attorney-General, who may include subjects other than those submitted by the committee.

The committee usually issues a working paper on each topic studied, setting out the results of its research and its provisional views. The working paper is then circulated to all those who may have an interest in the subject, both in Western Australia and elsewhere, and comments are invited. The matter is then reviewed by the committee in the light of comments received, and finally a report with recommendations is submitted to the Attorney-General.

A change of significance under the proposed new procedure is that all reports and recommendations will be presented to Parliament and will thus receive publicity; whereas under the present procedure the committee is permitted to disseminate information as to the contents of its reports only with the particular consent of the Government.

Law reform projects provide a valuable source of information to other law reform bodies and exchange of information and knowledge between such bodies is desirable. It is also in the interests of good public relations that those who have commented on the working paper should be given an opportunity to see the product of the inquiry. This departure from the present practice does not preclude the Attorney-General from having the commission express its views in a confidential report on a matter he does not wish to raise publicly.

Clause 15(1) provides that such officers and temporary employees as may be necessary to perform the duties conferred on the commission shall be appointed under and subject to the Public Service Act, 1904.

Members will recall that I mentioned earlier that the Bill followed the recommendations of the committee in all respects except one. The matter of the appointment of staff is the exception, and it is dealt with in clause 15(1), which provides sufficient flexibility to enable the committee to function efficiently and in a proper manner.

The need for continuing law reform bodies is accepted today. The usual course is to set up the body by Statute. This form has been adopted in the United Kingdom, in some States of the United States of America, in some Canadian Provinces, and in the Australian States of New South Wales, Queensland, and the Australian Capital Territory. In view of the invaluable work in law reform which is being done by the committee it is most desirable that a permanent body be established. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. R. L. Young.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [12.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The principle of preference in employment and promotion to unionists in so far as the Education Department's teaching staff is concerned has been a matter of contention for many years. Successive Governments have either adopted or rejected this principle and the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia is desirous of obtaining stability by the inclusion of this preference as a statutory requirement.

Mr. Rushton: Domination!

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The honourable member has not heard the speech or studied the contents of the Bill. His interjection shows how it is possible to jump to a conclusion.

The Bill now before the House has been designed to provide for a preference clause to be added to section 37AF of the Education Act, 1928-1970, and it allows for certain desirable exceptions and alternatives to meet the situation. In brief, the principles proposed in the Bill are—

(1) Where a member of the Teachers' Union is an applicant for a position he shall be preferred for that position above a non-unionist applicant.

Sir David Brand: That is very clear.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The other principles are—

(2) Applicants from outside the teaching service are to be considered as eligible for a position, notwithstanding the fact that they would not be members of the union if they had come from outside the service.

(3) Adequate provision is to be made for conscientious objectors to be accepted as eligible applicants.

Mr. Lewis: Before you sit down, could you tell me what proportion of teachers are members of the union?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I could not indicate this at the present time. However, I can obtain the information at a later stage. I commend the Bill to the House.

Sir Charles Court: It will not be long before the Government will be able to give the answer—100 per cent. The Minister told us to listen to the speech and it never came.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The honourable member was not listening.

Sir Charles Court: Much we weren't!

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Lewis.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th May.

MR. R. L. YOUNG (Wembley) [12.32 p.m.]: The Bill before us in regard to the laws in this State concerning liquor is a further small step along the path to civilised drinking. Since the time that liquor was first manufactured there have been laws or taboos in regard to the manner in which it should be drunk and what happens to the people who drink too much of it. As long as these laws and regulations have applied, some societies have said that the laws are outdated, outmoded, and uncivilised.

In many respects I feel it would be fair to say that this country—not this State in particular—suffered for many years under licensing laws which could only be described by the rest of the world as fairly laughable. In the main, I do not think this did a great amount of harm, but as society grows up the laws in relation to what one may or may not do of necessity have to become more relaxed and reasonable. It is in that context that I use the word "civilised" and not in a derogatory sense.

The Liquor Act which came into force on the 1st July, 1970, was in fact a fairly significant step forward in regard to the drinking laws of this State. But naturally, as with any other important legislation, any Act which attempts to bring together all the recommendations of various bodies to clean up a situation which has prevailed for many years must, of necessity, produce anomalies. This Bill sets out to overcome them. I say "sets out" advisedly because it would appear by the number of amendments on the notice paper that, without the amendments, it could be fairly readily said with some justification that the Bill is not a great deal of use. Various members have put amendments on the notice paper and, in fact, the Attorney-General himself intends to move amendments. All of these amendments attempt to make the Bill do what it set out to do.

In saying this I would like to suggest to the Attorney-General that when legislation of this type is to be looked at, organisations interested in liquor and the sale of liquor in this State would like to be consulted in respect of any amendments which are about to be made. Far be it from me to call myself an expert on this subject but I would suggest to the Attorney-General that any future amending legislation should be thoroughly investigated by the Attorney-General and representatives of the industry before the Bill is introduced in the House.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The rationale for introducing it in the last session was to canvass the views of those in the community who are interested—not only those in the industry.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: A lot of time, scissors, and glue, could have been saved if there were more preparation before drafting.

Mr. T. D. Evans: People other than those with a legitimate interest may have an interest.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I agree with the Attorney-General. The people who may be interested in this legislation extend far beyond those in the industry. However, I feel that the views of the industry should have been canvassed although not necessarily taken as gospel. I say this because the Bill will be the subject of a free vote. There is no secret in the Bill and no great ideas of political philosophy or Government policy. This is simply an attempt to clear the matter up and the more people who can be canvassed before drafting the better the result.

I mentioned that this Bill is to be the subject of a free vote. I would recommend that the members of this House consider the many amendments on the notice paper and the arguments which I have no doubt will be put forward by a number of speakers. In considering these arguments and amendments it would be very wise to recognise that each and every one of us has a responsibility to ensure that this legislation goes through unfettered by political proclivity or party pressure. In the final analysis, if a person is found guilty under the legislation of an offence which should never have been included, then each and every one of us is equally guilty for not having examined the legislation sufficiently to ensure this could not happen. In view of some of the stupidities which have become apparent since the introduction of the 1970 Liquor Act, we must endeavour to avoid a similar occurrence following these amendments.

Mr. Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Let me say quite clearly that I believe any branch of the Police Force has not only a right but an obligation to uphold the laws of the land. If, in the opinion of the police officers who have to administer this Act, the laws as laid down in the Act are being broken, then they not only have the right but the obligation to ensure that the laws do not continue to be broken. Therefore, it is reasonably absurd that police officers have to eat and drink at a restaurant for some hours to ascertain whether the person who has been supplying them with the liquor has not been breaking the law regarding liquor which is supplied ancillary to a meal. That is an absurd situation.

I take the point of the member for Boulder-Dundas, but I would mention to him that this situation is not the fault

of the policemen but the fault of each and every member of the House who passed that Bill. As members of this Parliament in a free vote, each one of us has the responsibility to see that situations such as this do not arise.

Mr. Hartrey: I agree.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: We are not all lawyers and it would be a happy situation if we had the knowledge of the member for Boulder-Dundas in handling legislation of this type. No member of this Chamber could examine a Bill of this nature and understand it completely.

Sir Charles Court: You are not suggesting we need 51 lawyers, are you? We would never get anything through.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I would not suggest that for one moment, I would simply like to have had a little more training. One thing is certain: If every member of this House accepts the responsibility to look at every amendment on the notice paper, even if there are 150 amendments, we will end up with good legislation.

Mr. May: I hope you are right.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I have mentioned the absurdities under the 1970 Act in regard to liquor supplied ancillary to a meal. This situation is to be remedied by the Bill introduced by the Attorney-General. Previously large areas of doubt existed as to whether in fact liquor was supplied ancillary to a meal. In my opinion those areas of doubt will be removed by allowing people on licensed premises to drink liquor one hour before commencing their meal; to continue to drink liquor throughout their meal, naturally; and by allowing them to continue to drink it on the premises until the time the establishment is allowed to remain open under the terms of its license expires. I think that is something for which the people of this State will be eternally grateful. I might also add the Police Force will be eternally grateful for it, too.

The second part of the legislation with which I want to deal in detail concerns juveniles. The 1970 Act permitted juveniles to enter any part of licensed premises provided they were accompanied by someone in authority, and to remain on those premises in the company of that person while he partook of a reasonable amount of refreshment. Unfortunately, it has been found that juveniles may enter areas of hotels which perhaps they should not, having regard for the comfort of both the juveniles and the drinkers.

As the Attorney-General pointed out, it would not be good to go back to the days when children were left in motorcars or to run around outside hotels. In fact, it is much better that children should accompany their parents and remain in their company inside a hotel or in a place such as a beer garden.

I do not think I can speak too harshly of any situation which allows people who might be weak in this regard to leave children in a parked vehicle while they go into a hotel to drink. Very few people realise the distress caused to children when they are left in such circumstances. Unfortunately, this situation is combined with the fact that parents who leave their children in motorcars almost certainly remain in the hotel for too long, thus adding to the distress of the children.

This Bill says that a child may enter licensed premises—but not public bars—and remain there in the company of a person in authority whilst that person partakes of reasonable refreshment, provided that the child enters a place in the hotel in which liquor is served only to persons seated at tables. In this respect an amendment appears on the notice paper in my name, which I will explain in more detail in the Committee stage.

Briefly, the idea of my amendment is this: There are very few areas of a hotel in which liquor is served only at tables. I think the Bill mentions, "sold and supplied." Invariably at such places there is also a bar at which a person may be sold or supplied with liquor—not necessarily for consumption there; but to which a person may go to purchase liquor and then return to his table. My amendment will have the effect of making it possible for the licensee to say, "In this particular area liquor may be consumed only by persons sitting at tables; but if you want to you may go to the bar and buy your drinks and take them back to the table."

Mr. T. D. Evans: Which amendment on the notice paper is this?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It is the amendment in respect of clause 26.

Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I now wish to refer to the clause relating to vignerons. I have spoken to the Attorney-General about this matter and he has agreed to bring forward amendments whereby it will only be necessary for a vigneron to be granted a license when he wishes to sell wine for consumption on his property. Therefore many of the notes I have prepared in respect of this particular license in some respects will no longer apply. Nevertheless I still feel obliged to point out that I have a number of amendments on the notice paper which will render it unnecessary for any such person to hold a license. I consider that to impose on a vigneron the necessity to hold a license at that particular time—or for that matter, having regard for the industry as a whole, at any time—is an imposition. The nature of the industry being what it is, this should not be tolerated.

It has been suggested—and I am inclined to agree—that it is all very well to insist that the holding of a license in certain circumstances will not create any hardship—particularly in view of the statement the Minister will make following the agreement he has reached with me—but when the matter as a whole is studied it could well be said that the imposition of a license on vignerons could be the thin edge of the wedge for the introduction of a wine-maker's license for any purpose whatsoever. It could well be that at some time in the future some form of liquor tax could be imposed on him.

We know that Governments—this present Government in particular—are always looking around to ascertain from where they can extract another tax, and it would seem to me that, with a stroke of a pen, the schedule to the Act that covers license fees in regard to liquor sales could well be amended and we could find that vignerons are placed in a situation where they are liable to the payment of a tax.

At this point I wish to say something about the wine-making industry in general. About 10 years ago I proffered some advice to a client of mine which I wish I had taken myself. I told him that he would be well advised to buy shares in any Australian wine-making company. The growth of the industry over the last decade can only be described as fantastic. In view of the drinking habits of the Australian public about 10 years ago, steps were taken to foster the industry and as a result the people's habits have changed tremendously. At one time a person was looked at askance when he took a bottle of wine into a restaurant, but now it is the accepted thing. Today people drink more wine with their meals than they did a decade ago.

The wine-making industry is one which should be encouraged. I would not hazard a guess at the percentage increase of wine produced in this country over the last decade, but it certainly is an encouraging increase. In that sense it is rather unique, because the habits of the Australian people have turned away from the traditionally large consumption of beer at any time—even with meals—to the habit of accepting wine as being the correct beverage to drink with meals. This is now regarded as being the "done thing."

I think it is pertinent to the debate to mention that this Bill was introduced on the 10th May. To my knowledge, up to the 14th August, the industry itself had not made any representations to the Minister as to whether it was in favour of, or was opposed to, the imposition of a license. As I have pointed out, I accept the fact that there are many people involved in the industry other than those who are engaged in the manufacture of liquor of any type; and their needs and protection must be taken into consideration.

It was passing strange to me, however, that the industry had not been consulted. From what I understand from my discussions with those engaged in the industry it became apparent that under no circumstances did the growers want the introduction of this form of license. To canvass that question, if we look at the Act, the Bill before us, and the amendments on the notice paper, I am sure we all agree there is no reason for a license being imposed in any circumstances. We know that a license applies to the vignerons who wish to sell wine for consumption on the premises; and that is the only time they need a license.

The only occasion I can imagine when a vigneron will want to sell bottled wine for consumption on his premises is, firstly, at a function on his premises—and in this respect I have an amendment on the notice paper which will cover that aspect, and with which I will deal in greater detail at a later stage—or, secondly, if he has a type of winehouse, the introduction of which we saw recently at Caversham by Waldeck Wines. Under these circumstances it is necessary for the vigneron to have a winehouse license, so it does not become a factor in regard to this argument.

All the vignerons to whom I have spoken —and I have spoken to many of them as well as to the representatives of the Wine and Brandy Producers' Association—feel that if this license is imposed the only circumstances it would be needed is when the vigneron or grower wants to sell the wine on his own premises at a function for consumption on the premises. For that reason I cannot see the necessity for this particular provision in the Bill. Although I realise that before any tax is imposed the matter has to come before Parliament, taxes seem to grow and it appears to me that a liquor tax will be the next step after the introduction of the vigneron's license.

Mr. Brady: There are problems of drinking associated with this industry.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That is an interesting point, because in the second reading speech of the Minister he dealt with this type of license. He said—

> Sales of liquor by vignerons and orchardists is not entirely satisfactory and, therefore, a form of license is proposed to remedy the situation.

When reference is made to a problem, we must find out what it is. Firstly the problem must arise, and secondly, the position must be explained. However, in the second reading speech of the Minister the statement I have just read out was the only reason he gave for the introduction of this license; and there was no other explanation. I am sure the Minister will go into this aspect in greater detail when he replies to the debate.

I agree there are problems associated with drinking in any form, but we as a Parliament must be made aware there are associated problems before we are asked to impose a license. It is best for me not to canvass this further until we hear the reply of the Minister to the debate; and I suggest the member for Swan do the same.

Mr. Brady: The Minister has experts to advise him and he would know.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am certainly not an expert in this field, but I have spoken to many experts and I have also received advice from many growers some of whom, no doubt, are the electors of the member for Swan. I do not know whether he has canvassed their views.

Mr. Brady: They have canvassed me. I have met them to discuss this matter.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The member for Toodyay has done likewise, and I think he might have arrived at the same conclusion as I have; that is, the vignerons are opposed to this license in any shape or form.

Mr. Brady: Not entirely. In certain circumstances they are agreeable to it.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I will listen with interest to what the honourable member has to say when he deals with that part of the Bill. Arising from the statements I have made in regard to the wine industry, I have placed quite a number of amendments on the notice paper dealing with the vigneron's license. In them I have moved for deletions in many clauses, and invariably they relate to the words which pertain to a vigneron's license.

In respect of what the Bill proposes in regard to vignerons I will quote again from the second reading speech of the Minister. Up to now it has caused me a great deal of confusion in attempting to understand what the Bill, the comments of the Minister in his second reading speech, and the amendments on the notice paper are trying to achieve. In his second reading speech the Minister said—

> A license is not required if the wine is consumed on the premises, or if the wine is not sold or supplied on any premises other than the vineyard where it is manufactured, or is not sold to the holder of a license under the Act or to the occupier of another vineyard or orchard where wine is manufactured.

This is rather incredible, because the Bill prescribes exactly the opposite.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Bill is to be amended.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I am aware of that. The Bill says that a license will not be required if the wine is not sold or consumed or intended to be consumed on the premises. In this respect the Attorney-General has placed an amendment on the notice paper. Clause 3 of the Bill goes on to provide that a license is not required if the wine is not sold or supplied on or from any premises, other than the vineyard or orchard where it is manufactured. Then follows the word "and" instead of the word "or." The provision in subparagraph (iii) states that a license is not required if the wine is not sold to any person other than the holder of a license under the Act.

Subparagraphs (i) and (iii) of clause 3(b) are in complete contradistinction to what the Minister said in his second reading speech. Although I am aware there are appropriate amendments on the notice paper, it is not easy for me to understand what is intended. Perhaps if this was a party Bill the position might be more reprehensible than it is; but the fact that there is to be a free vote on this issue makes the position merely inconvenient. In debating any legislation we have to have a starting point, and we have to know what the Government is seeking to achieve.

I must confess that until now I have been unable to find out what the Government is trying to achieve in regard to vignerons. Neither the Bill, nor the proposed amendments to the Bill, indicate anything in relation to what the Minister said in his second reading speech. We are now only just starting to see a glimmer of light as a result of a further proposed amendment. I am sure the proposed amendments do not correct the situation so that it will be in accordance with what the Minister said in his speech. When the Minister replies it will be interesting to hear what was intended in the beginning, and what is intended now in regard to vignerons.

I propose to move an amendment which will have the effect of deleting the need for the imposition of licenses of any form. The amendment will also change the hours of 10.00 a.m. and 10.00 p.m. during which a vigneron can trade to 8.30 a.m. opening and 8.30 p.m. closing. Those hours will comply with the hours of a licensed liquor store. A vigneron does not want to wait until 10 o'clock in the morning to start trading and he does not want to stay open until 10 o'clock at night. I think the Attorney-General will accept that my amendment is reasonable, and that the vigneron should be allowed to trade within the hours normally enjoyed by the store licensees.

A further amendment which I will move is intended to correct the strange situation where a person who applies for and is granted a function permit may hold the function at a vineyard, but he is not permitted to buy his wine from that vineyard. He must buy his wine from another type of licensee and, strangely enough, not from a winehouse licensee. It

it my intention to correct that situation because quite often the wine from the particular vineyard is purchased elsewhere and taken back to the vineyard for the purpose of holding the function. My amendment will allow the holder of the permit to buy the wine which is manufactured at the vineyard, and sell it there when he has a function permit. I think the Attorney-General would also agree with that principle.

I have mentioned those points because I will move to delete entirely the need for licenses, and it will be necessary for members to remember—if I am successful—that that anomaly will have to be cleaned up as well.

I will now deal with the purchasing of liquor on a Sunday in certain prescribed areas. The Act presently allows a person to buy one-third of a gallon of beer in prescribed areas on Sundays for consumption off the premises.

Mr. May: You are talking about sealed containers.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Yes, in sealed containers. The Bill now before us will amend the Act so that a person may purchase for consumption off the premises one-third of a gallon of beer, or any other liquid, in sealed containers. My amendment, to which the Attorney-General has intimated he will agree, is to change that provision so that a person cannot just buy one-third of a gallon of any sort of liquid to take away.

The purpose of my amendment is to allow a person to purchase one-third of a gallon of any liquor other than spirits. I do not want to deny the rights of a person who prefers to drink spirits, but if it is intended to place a limit on the consumption of liquor on a Sunday it would be ludicrous to allow a person to buy enough spirits to drink himself into oblivion.

One-third of a gallon of spirits represents two bottles of Scotch, and if a person drank that much liquor he would not be in any condition to turn up to buy more on the following day. However, my amendment is not for that purpose. I think the intention was to impose a limit on the amount of alcohol one could buy for consumption on a Sunday, and limit that amount of alcohol to the contents of two bottles of beer. However, there would be enough alcohol in two bottles of spirits to kill a man in half an hour.

Mr. Lapham: What was the object of the restriction in the first place?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I was not a member of this House when the Act was passed, but I imagine that it was the desire of the members who were here that people should not be able to make a joke of Sunday trading.

Mr. Gayfer: It did not make any difference. If the honourable member cares to have a look at the previous debate he will see that this point was well and truly thrashed out.

Mr. May: Do not forget that the financial situation of the person concerned will come into it. There is quite a difference in the price of two bottles of beer and two bottles of spirits.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: This Bill is not designed to take into consideration the pockets of the purchasers.

Mr. May: But a man would be limited in what he could purchase.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: We cannot say. The Minister is implying that we should canvass the idea of making laws for those without much money and laws for those with a lot of money.

Mr. May: I do not think there should be any discretion at all.

Mr. Gayfer: The Minister and I were left right on our Pat Malone on that point.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I understand the Attorney-General is quite happy with my proposed amendment.

With regard to canteen licenses, these are granted only in isolated areas such as the north-west, and they are granted usually to companies which set up canteens for the enjoyment of staff. The present Act allows the sale of liquor only to employees of the licensee company and to persons temporarily in the neighbourhood for business purposes. The Bill will expand the provisions of the canteen license to any persons living in the neighbourhood, whether for the purpose of business or not, and their families.

I would like to draw the attention of the Attorney-General to clause 9 on page 6 of the Bill. Paragraph (ba) will provide that liquor may be sold to any female not referred to in paragraphs (a) or (b) of section 28 of the Act. I know that the first half-dozen times I read this paragraph it meant exactly what was stated, but it could well be taken to apply to any female except those mentioned in paragraphs (a) or (b). If a female was an employee, or in the area for a reasonable purpose, she may be excluded.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The provision is not to exclude anyone; it is inclusive.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I know that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Any female who was an employee would be covered by paragraph (b) primarily.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: However, to save confusion I am suggesting it might be better simply to have it apply to "any female". Then there could be no confusion. The idea of the amendment is to allow persons who are in the area on business, or for the purpose of employment—and

their wives, girl friends, or any other females who happen to be in the area—to be able to go to that canteen. I think what the Bill proposes is reasonable.

In regard to cabaret licenses the present Act allows a licensee to remain open between the hours of 9.00 p.m. and 3.30 a.m. These are the licenses normally granted to places known as discotheques and the like.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What are they like?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I cannot remember. I have not been in one for a long time. The Bill aims to change the opening time to 8.00 p.m., leaving the closing time at 3.30 a.m. The amendment on the notice paper is designed to extend those hours and change them so that a cabaret may be open from 10.00 p.m. to 4.30 a.m.

I am in favour of leaving the Bill as it is because, if the hours are changed according to the amendment so that the licensee may open at 10.00 p.m. and close at 4.30 a.m., it seems to me it will only encourage people to stay in the hotels until the hotels close, thus having one or two more hours' drinking, then go to a discotheque and stay there for an extra hour until 4.30 a.m. At least 95 per cent. of the people who frequent such places would go to a hotel first. I do not believe in creating a situation that would preclude people from going to a discotheque earlier if they wanted to.

Mr. Cook: The point is that in fact they are staying at hotels until midnight because an increasing number of hotels are providing entertainment which enables them to remain open until midnight. They are not going to nightclubs and it is taking business away from the nightclubs.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That comes down to competition because, to be able to remain open until midnight, the hotels must provide entertainment. They must have live entertainment on the premises—usually in the form of a band which attracts young people to dance. If they could go earlier in the evening to a discotheque which has a band, they might go there rather than stay at a hotel. It comes down to private enterprise—the choice a person has between going to one place or another.

Mr. Cook: To be able to stay open until midnight, hotels must provide live entertainment, as the cabarets do. Previously the cabarets used the artists who played at the hotels until 10.00 p.m. The cabarets are now having trouble obtaining artists and hence difficulty in providing the live entertainment.

Sir Charles Court: The member for Wembley needs an extension of time.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Perhaps the member for Albany can explain this point later on in debate. All it amounts to is that people would be able to stay in discotheques for one more hour. It is not the opening time that affects that situation; it is the closing time. Instead of staying until 3.30 a.m. listening to the band, people would be able to stay until 4.30 a.m., and if people in such places are still able to listen to the band at 4.30 a.m. they are different from most other people. Members have probably seen people in those sorts of places.

I recommend that the Bill be left as it is because, the way it is drafted, I think it is fair and reasonable. It would become unreasonable if it were amended in the manner suggested.

Much has been said about packet licenses in respect of small craft operating on the river and on the run to Rottnest. These craft may be granted a packet license to serve alcohol while they are on a journey between the hours of 10.00 a.m. and 10.00 p.m. on week days and between 11.00 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. on Sundays. The Bill adds a special permit whereby the holder of a packet license may apply to the court and be granted a permit for special functions on the river or the ocean during hours which the court may lay down in the terms of the license. That seems to be fairly reasonable, but there has been a great deal of confusion about when a boat may sail and when it may not, and how many hours the bar staff are employed in actually serving liquor.

I will move an amendment to provide for the drawing up of a schedule of hours during which packet licenses may operate so that all the situations raised by members and the people who operate the boats can be looked at in depth by the court and considered as individual situations in respect of the individual operations of particular boats.

I have never liked allowing legislation to be taken out of this Chamber and put into the hands of someone else, but a unique situation operates in regard to packet licenses. To comply with what the industry and the traveller want, the licensed hours should be similar to those suggested by the member for Fremantle; that is, from 9.00 a.m. to midnight on all days. By doing that we would be saying a person on the water was one individual and a person on dry land was another individual.

Mr. Hartrey: If you are on the water you do not drink.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: When one is on the water one does drink. It is just not so enjoyable.

Mr. Jamieson: This also applies to State ships.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It also applies to aircraft. For that reason it would be much easier for the court to lay down a

schedule of hours and not have to consider a State ship in exactly the same terms as a ferry that runs from here to Rottnest, or a ferry that runs from here to Rottnest in the same terms as an aircraft that flies from here to Port Hedland. A schedule of hours would enable the court to consider every case individually.

Referring to the amendment proposed by the member for Fremantle, a packet licensee could obtain a license to sail a boat around the place and not actually put into port, in which case on every day of the week he could sell liquor from 9.00 a.m. until midnight. It does not seem to me to be fair that a person who happens to be on a boat should be entitled to three hours more drinking time in such circumstances.

Mr. Jamieson: What would you call such a function—a cruise or a booze?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It would probably be a bit of both. I will move an amendment in regard to packet licenses whereby the court will be empowered to write into the license a schedule of hours which will enable the licensee to work out the hours during which he wants to operate.

Mr. Fletcher: In effect, you are saying your proposed amendment would eliminate the need for my amendment?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: That is right.

Mr. Jamieson: Except that the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle would allow him to have the bars open when the boat is tied up to a wharf.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Not if the schedule does not say so. The Act stipulates that the boat must be on a journey, anyway, so the amendment does not affect that situation. The boat must be in motion, so that aspect does not enter into it.

Sir Charles Court: I think it is very important that it be not permitted while the boat is tied up, otherwise we will have all over again the old days of the *Zephyr* at Rottnest.

Mr. Jamieson: And the *Emerald* at Garden Island.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: For obvious reasons, it would be foolish to allow drinking while the vessels were tied up, particularly in the locations referred to.

The next aspect I wish to discuss concerns the Australian wine licenses—which used to be the ubiquitous wine saloons with which we all grew up.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Some of us did.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Well, certainly there were plenty of them around in the East Perth area where I lived as a lad. I think it was generally accepted in 1970 that the Australian wine saloon had just about had its day. The Bill introduced in that year forbade the continuation of these licenses beyond the 31st December, 1972. The present Bill amends that provision inasmuch as it allows the continuation of existing licenses beyond the 31st December, 1972, but no more licenses may be granted by the court. I think, when one considers that we now have winehouse licenses and that we are constantly trying to upgrade the standard of drinking and make it, as I said at the beginning of my speech, more civilised, it is reasonable to say that no more of these licenses should be granted.

I believe it is also reasonable to say that, provided the court has the power—which it has—to have a good look at the premises of an Australian wine saloon and to require upgrading as and when the court thinks fit, the existing licensees should be allowed to continue beyond the 31st December. However, in the Bill before us provision is made for a permit to be obtained by the licensee of such premises to enable him to serve light meals. This Bill—as does the Act—forbids the sale in an Australian wine saloon of anything other than cigarettes, tobacco, and Australian wine.

The amendment placed on the notice paper by the Attorney-General has the effect of abolishing the provision that the licensee may apply for a permit to serve light meals. Because of what the Attorney-General said about this matter in his second reading speech, and because of the nature of the Bill, I wonder whether in his reply the Attorney-General would explain why he is seeking to remove the right of a licensee to apply for a permit to serve light meals.

I think we can expect to see Australian wine saloons with us for a number of years to come; but I would hope that the Licensing Court continues to be most vigilant in its supervision of these licenses and that it requires upgrading of premises from time to time to ensure that they do not become —or remain—the type of places we knew them to be in days gone by.

I refer now to cabaret and restaurant licenses. The Bill extends to a number of people the right to object to the granting of a license. It allows objections to be lodged against the granting of either of those licenses by either the holder of a similar license in the affected area or an association of licensed persons, of which that particular licensee could be a member. The Bill also extends the right to object to holders of provisional licenses in the affected area and to residents of that area. That is all right; I think it is quite reasonable. However, I ask the Attorney-General to refer to clause 20 of the Bill, and particularly proposed new subparagraphs 55 (2) (ca) (ii) and 55 (2) (e) (ii) which use the words "by a resident of the affected area."

It would be inconsistent with the requirements of the Act if the holder of one type of license were able to object to the granting of a license of another class. I foresee

the possibility that a person could be a resident of an affected area and also a licensee of premises of another type in the affected area. I refer particularly to a hotel licensee who is living in his hotel and who finds that someone wishes to open a restaurant two or three doors down the road. As a resident of the area, the licensee may object. I think that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. I would recommend that some words—and I have not drafted an amendment in this respect —be added to the effect that that resident shall not be the holder of any other license.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I hope to have the opportunity to do that after you sit down.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I think I have covered the clauses of the Bill which write amendments into the Act. Any parts of the Bill to which I have not referred are those containing amendments which I think are self-explanatory and require little comment.

I intend now to explain the three new clauses I propose to move in Committee. I shall explain briefly what I intend to be the functions of the proposed new clauses. Firstly, I hope the Chamber will accept the new clause in respect of winehouses whereby a winehouse licensee may be granted an entertainment permit along the same lines as the licensee of a tavern. Tavern licensees and winehouse licensees are required under the Act to provide much the same sort of services, and to fulfil similar functions.

However, a tavern licensee may apply for an entertainment permit which allows him to stay open for a further two hours provided he provides live entertainment on the premises during those two hours. Yet a winehouse licensee is not entitled to do that. When one considers that a great number of people are now attending winehouses, one feels that this provision is unreasonable. Many people now attend winehouses because they are places of entertainment. They attend them not simply to drink, because they could go to a hotel for that, but to enjoy themselves in the intimate atmosphere of winehouses, which usually have an old-world air about them. They are cosy, comfortable, and homely and one may meet people there much better than in a hotel. I think people who attend winehouses are entitled to have the benefit of entertainment if the licensee wishes to apply for a permit for that purpose.

The second new clause I propose to move is in respect of persons who hold a function permit. Currently such people are required to obtain any liquor they want to use at that function from a number of different licensees. A winehouse licensee is not one of those.

I think it is unreasonable that a winehouse, which deals in the sale of wines, should not be one of the premises to which a function permit holder may go to buy the liquor he wants for his function. Therefore, I will move to add winehouses to the list of places from which a person may obtain liquor for the purposes of a function permit.

The third and last of my proposed new clauses is in respect of club licenses, and will enable those licensees to sell liquor to function permit holders under certain circumstances. It is fairly interesting to note that there are some places in Western Australia—and I will refer to a number of them in Committee and give details—such as Cunderdin and Meckering which do not have hotels but have clubs.

Mr. May: Cunderdin has a hotel.

Mr. Hartrey: And a good one, too.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Well, perhaps I have put my foot in it. I understood it did not. Anyway, Meckering does not have a hotel, nor does Calingiri. There could well be places in the north-west—and certainly there are mill towns in the south-west—where there are licensed clubs, but no hotels. If a person wishes to hold a function and is granted a function permit in any of those towns it means in effect that he must travel a fair distance to find a holder of a license from whom he can obtain the liquor to be sold at the function.

In some respects this is only natural, because the hotel could well be 15 or more miles away and he would then have to bring the liquor back again.

The purpose of my amendments is that if there is no hotel in the area a person holding a function license shall be permitted to purchase liquor at a club. I support the second reading of the Bill. I think it is a step in the right direction towards more civilised drinking. No matter how we go about trying to liberalise the law relating to liquor there will always be loopholes and problems.

I think this Bill seeks to clean up most of the problems that have arisen since the introduction of the 1970 legislation. I hope that if other amendments are deemed necessary they will be dealt with expeditiously as they arise and so avoid keeping those who are concerned with the legislation in a state of uncertainty.

Before I conclude I wish to return to what I said in regard to the Police Force. I am indebted to the member for Boulder-Dundas for the interjections he made at the time I was speaking, because I believe implicity in what I said; namely, that the police must, of necessity, carry out the law which we write in this place. Although I did not make myself clear at the time I did mean to say that I have always assumed that the Police Force acts on a complaint being lodged by some person concerning people who drink. There are always people who go to the Police Force and say, "The people in those particular licensed premises are serving alcohol at

times when they should not be serving it." All I was saying was that, in such circumstances, the police were acting on the complaints of those who ask the police to remedy such a situation, and the police, being bound by the Liquor Act, have to do just that.

In that sense, I am sure the member for Boulder-Dundas agrees with me. However, if a situation arose whereby members of the liquor squad were deliberately going out to find small loopholes in an Act such as this, or they were going about their duties in such a manner that they sought out loopholes in the legislation and went to the lengths they have done in some instances to catch people drinking at a table when it was considered that the consumption of the liquor was not ancillary to the meal they were consuming, then they would, in my opinion, be going too far.

When we consider any Act which has relation to the simple enjoyment of having a meal or consuming liquor, one must accept that it will never be perfect. We have not made this legislation perfect and we never will. The law has to be laid down and policed with that degree of tolerance so that the community has a nice place in which to live. I hope we have closed enough loopholes in this legislation to make it a little less cumbersome and to render the duties of the Police Force a little less onerous, and also allow the consumers of liquor to understand clearly where they stand in regard to the legislation. I support the second reading of the Bill for the purpose of moving amendments in Committee that will tidy it up.

MR. MOILER (Toodyay) [3.05 p.m.]: I wish to support the Bill in general and the further amendments foreshadowed by the Attorney-General. I would like to compliment the Minister on the way in which he has presented the Bill to the House. The measure has been before the Chamber for some three to four months, during which time all members of Parliament, and groups of people associated with the sale and production of liquor have had an opportunity to study it. The people concerned could thus make representations to the Attorney-General and their local members of Parliament as to how they consider the legislation could be improved.

Contrary to what was said by the member for Wembley, I consider that the Attorney-General's method of presenting the measure to Parliament is an excellent one, and he should be congratulated for the way he has indicated acceptance of the reasoned argument in support of or against the Bill he originally submitted.

I know that the member for Swan and myself have been mentioned in relation to the wine-making industry. In this regard both the member for Swan and myself, on at least two occasions, have had discussions with vignerons who produce wine in the Swan district, and we conveyed the feelings of that group to the Attorney-General. To a degree I believe we are responsible for some of the further amendments the Attorney-General has on the notice paper. It has been suggested by the member for Wembley that I, for one, would strongly oppose the licensing of vignerons. In one sense this is correct. I would strongly oppose the licensing of a vigneron who did not wish to sell wine produced by him for consumption on his premises. I am strongly opposed to the licensing of a vigneron who, at the present time, is not required to be licensed and who delivers wine to his clientele within the metropolitan area or anywhere else in this State, but who does not wish to hold a license to sell wine for consumption on his premises.

I am not opposed to the licensing of vignerons who wish to sell, for consumption on their premises, wine produced from their own vineyards. I think it is wrong to suggest that the vigneron who wishes to sell wine for consumption on his premises should not be granted a license.

I believe that a vigneron would be happy to be licensed if he is permitted to sell 26 oz. bottles of wine for consumption on his premises. This is only reasonable when we consider that to be permitted to do this at present a vigneron must hold a function permit for which he must apply seven days before the function is to be held, and pay a fee of $1.

I notice that the Bill seeks to increase this fee to $3, and that the license fee for a vigneron is to be $20. So it is quite simple to work out that he would not have the responsibility of applying for a function permit if he held a vigneron's license; and, if he were in the practice of applying for a number of function permits during a year, he would soon save more than the $20 license fee by not being obliged to apply for a function permit every time he desired to permit consumption of his product on his vineyard.

It is reasonable to say that provided those vignerons who do not wish to sell their product for consumption on their premises are not required to obtain a license, the principle of licensing is acceptable to those in the areas represented by the member for Swan and myself. It would be fair to say that the areas we represent would produce some of the finest wine in the world, and it is commendable that the vignerons are to be given the opportunity to promote their products.

The member for Wembley stated that the vigernons wished their trading hours to be changed from the present 10.00 a.m. to 10.00 p.m. to 8.30 a.m. to 8.30 p.m. I agree with the honourable member that it is reasonable that those involved

should be able to sell their wine during the hours which apply to licensed stores; that is, between 8.30 a.m. and 8.30 p.m. My amendment which appears on page 8 of the notice paper is designed to enable vignerons who do not wish their product to be consumed on their premises to continue under the present arrangements.

My amendment is similar to one the member for Wembley has on the notice paper, and I wish to indicate at this stage that I would be quite happy to withdraw my amendment in favour of his as they both have the same objective. Either amendment would enable the two groups of vignerons to act independently. Those who wish to continue as they are at present without a license would be permitted to do so, while those who wished their product to be consumed on the premises would also be provided for by way of obtaining a vigneron's license.

As I have already indicated I propose to support the Bill in general, but will also support one or two amendments during Committee.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [3.15 p.m.]: I did not think I would get it so easy!

Sir Charles Court: The member for Albany has made his speech!

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I thank all members who have contributed to this debate, having regard for the memory shaker the Leader of the Opposition gave me, but would particularly thank the member for Wembley and the member for Toodyay. I do not intend to cover all aspects of the Bill dealt with by members, but I wish to point out that the rationale of introducing the Bill in May and adjourning the debate until this time, was to enable not only those who have an immediate interest in the liquor industry, but also the community in general, to become acquainted with the host of ideas relating to sought and proposed amendments to the Liquor Act of 1970. Many of these proposals were received by my predecessor in this Government, and, indeed, I understand, some were received by the former Minister for Justice in the previous Government; and they all found their way into Crown Law Department files.

Not all the requests for, and suggestions concerning, possible reforms were made by those who might be said to have a pecuniary interest in the liquor industry itself. However, it was thought that the best way to deal with the subject was to make certain determinations of policy on points of conflict—one could not express two conflicting views in the one measure —and then collate all the ideas and suggestions in the form of a Bill and allow Parliament to examine it. Indeed, through members of Parliament, the community also has had the same opportunity to express views.

As a result, the Bill I introduced will be the subject of a series of amendments by the member for Wembley, the member for Toodyay, myself, and others; and this is as was expected.

I would like to mention briefly one or two points raised by the member for Wembley who touched extensively on the question of the wine industry and the interest of vignerons in particular. He indicated that this industry, rightly so, has flourished over the years and is still flourishing. It is rewarding to find it in this condition in Western Australia.

The member for Toodyay has clearly explained his thoughts, and they were similar to my own as I prepared this legislation, although I must admit that there's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip, and this applies also between a Minister and the draftsman. Sometimes the printed measures does not always convey the intention of the Minister concerned. In this particular instance I will spell out what is intended to be the rationale behind the treatment of vignerons generally.

The member for Toodyay has clearly indicated that he is one who has a proper and immediate interest in this industry because many of those involved in it reside in his electorate and the neighbouring electorate of Swan. He has explained that some vignerons do not desire to engage in the selling of their product for consumption on their premises, but wish to retain the *status quo*. For this reason a suitable amendment has been placed on the notice paper not only by the member for Toodyay, but also by the member for Wembley.

The member for Toodyay has indicated that he is prepared to refrain from moving his amendment and will support the member for Wembley in his pursuit of the amendment shown to clause 3 of the Bill. I indicate here that I, likewise, intend to support the member for Wembley because the amendment will, in fact, give effect to the policy decision that was made; namely, those vignerons who do not wish to be affected and who do not wish to come under the provisions of the Act but to remain exempt as they are now shall continue so to do. However, those vignerons who wish not only to sell their own product off the premises but to sell during ordinary trading hours for consumption on the premises, under certain conditions as the measure indicates, should be registered. It is suggested the registration fee should be the sum of $20.

This was one of the requests made by the Commissioner of Police who, in a report, made it known that there is feeling amongst some vignerons at least that they would like the right to trade in their own

product for consumption on their own premises. Generally, this is not permitted under the Act at the present time. The Commissioner of Police rightly pointed out, I felt, that if this practice is to be adopted there must be some method of distinguishing between those who will carry out the practice of selling for consumption on their premises and those who will not. I might mention that it was not suggested the practice be adopted generally, because some want it and some do not. Consequently, it was determined that the matter would be put before Parliament with the suggestion, in legislative form, that those people who wish to sell for consumption on their own premises should be required to pay a registration fee.

Some are desirous of doing this. In fact, some have equipped their vineyards with barbecue and other facilities to attract persons to come to their vineyards. This must be in the best interests of the wine industry and the tourist industry.

If people are permitted to do this but are deprived of the right of being registered, they must take out individual permits. Assuming that a function permit does not exceed the price of $1, if a person holds more than 20 functions per year he would be better off financially by paying the one registration fee of $20.

The member for Wembley spoke about the Australian wine license. I am grateful he has accepted the principle behind the right of allowing existing licensees to continue; namely, time will take its toll and they will be phased out. Many who were functioning in 1970 have, in fact, converted either to a winehouse license or to a store license. However, many others face a moment of truth at the present time. They have either failed to convert to another license or have been unable to convert because of the unsuitablity of their premises, the finance involved, or for some other reason. Up to date they have not been able to effect a conversion to another license and, indeed, conversion will not be possible by the 31st December, this year. They will find that the Australian wine licenses will completely disappear at that time.

For these reasons it was determined that, although the court will still be prevented from granting any further licenses of that type, those who have not converted should be allowed to continue. In time, this will be phased out.

The member for Wembley asked why it was found necessary to seek parliamentary approval to dispense with the need for these licensees to apply for a permit to serve light meals. Indeed, he answered the question himself when he commented upon his own amendment and also made reference to the fact that I have a similar amendment to withdraw from the Act certain trading restrictions in the matter of commodities other than liquor.

If these people are to have the right to carry on after the 31st December and are to be encouraged to upgrade their premises somewhat, we hope that by withdrawing these restrictions we may encourage them to provide other commodities for sale. In this way they could serve light refreshments without the need to apply for a permit to do so.

I do not wish to speak any further at the second reading stage. In principle this is a Committee Bill and, therefore, I consider I should now ask the House to allow the Bill to pass the second reading stage. We can then consider the amendments which are before us, or which may come before the Chamber, in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 6 amended—

Mr. McPHARLIN: Despite the fact this Bill has been before us for a number of months, I have not had the time at my disposal to study it in detail. For this reason I refrained from attempting to make a meaningful speech during the second reading. I do have one or two suggestions which I would like to put to the Minister and if he feels I have not been right up to the mark in speaking to the second reading, I apologise. I seek his guidance on a suggestion I will make. Clause 3(a) reads—

> (a) by adding after the expression "1921" in line four of paragraph (e), the passage ", or the sale, by auction, of liquor at a bazaar or sale of gifts where the whole of the proceeds are devoted for charitable, educational or religious purposes"; and

I suggest that after the words "sale, by auction" it may be desirable to insert, "by an unlicensed person of liquor which is the subject of a gift at a bazaar under a permit issued by a court."

The member for Wembley suggested it is desirable for us to make the laws which we pass in this Chamber easier for the police to administer. I think the amendment I have suggested would do just that. Section 6 (e) of the principal Act reads—

> Nothing in this Act applies to—
>
> (e) the sale of liquor by a licensed auctioneer, for some other person, under, and in accordance with, the provisions of the Auctioneers Act, 1921; .

It is at this point that my suggested amendment in clause 3 is proposed to be inserted.

I suggest to the Minister that after the words, "sale, by auction" the words, "by an unlicensed person of liquor which is the subject of a gift at a bazaar under a permit issued by a court" should be inserted. Bazaars are usually held to raise funds for charitable organisations, and if somebody came along with 50 cases of beer would the person selling the beer have to hold a license? I would like the Attorney-General's guidance on this point.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I am not quite certain what the Deputy Leader of the Country Party means. Section 6 (e) of the principal Act provides for an exemption and reads as follows:—

> Nothing in this Act applies to—
>
> (e) the sale of liquor by a licensed auctioneer, for some other person, under, and in accordance with, the provisions of the Auctioneers Act, 1921; .

Clause 3 proposes to add after this paragraph the following words:—

> or the sale, by auction, of liquor at a bazaar or sale of gifts where the whole of the proceeds are devoted for charitable, educational or religious purposes; and

Is the honourable member asking whether a member of a charitable organisation who has been presented with a supply of liquor to sell will be required to go to the Licensing Court to obtain a permit?

Mr. McPHARLIN: Can a person sell liquor at a bazaar without a license? In other words, if a charitable institution is presented with a supply of liquor to sell, would a representative of the organisation be licensed to carry spirituous liquors?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Yes.

Mr. McPHARLIN: A charitable organisation could auction liquor without a license? That is the point.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: If section 6 of the principal Act is amended as suggested, a person would not have to be licensed to sell liquor at a bazaar or a sale of gifts where the proceeds are devoted to a charitable, educational, or religious organisation. Any person, whether a licensed auctioneer or not, would be permitted to sell under those conditions. The clause does not spell out that the auctioneer must be licensed.

Mr. McPHARLIN: If the police came along and said, "You are not licensed and therefore you are breaking the law," that would be out of order.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I believe the person selling the liquor would have to show it was being sold at a bazaar where the whole of the proceeds were for a particular purpose.

Mr. McPharlin: I would like the Attorney-General to clarify this at a later date.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: There is an amendment on the notice paper in my name to delete subclause (3) and to add another subclause.

The Attorney-General and the member for Toodyay have indicated their intention to support my motion. I am rather relieved at this because later in the Committee stage I wish to say a little more about vignerons' licenses. Fortunately this may now be left to a later stage because the amendments I intend to move do not cut across the provisions the Attorney-General wishes to write into the Act in regard to vignerons' licenses.

The purpose of this subclause is to alter the trading hours for vignerons to bring them into line with the licensees of stores. The reasons for this were fairly well canvassed by both myself and the member for Toodyay in the second reading debate.

Proposed paragraph (h) deals with the sampling situation which is not legal under the Act at present. It is illegal for the vigneron to supply samples to prospective customers. Under this legislation it becomes legal to do so. It is interesting to note that if the Attorney-General's amendment relating to vignerons' licenses is accepted, a person holding a vigneron's license will be allowed to sell wine for consumption on the premises.

Mr. T. D. Evans: And off the premises as well.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Yes, and he may also provide free samples. If the Attorney-General's amendment is not passed, the situation would be that a vigneron who did not apply for a license would be able to provide free samples on the premises but would not be able to sell bottles of wine. Is that the situation?

Mr. T. D. Evans: That is right.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: This would appear to be an odd quirk of fate. I move an amendment—

> Page 2—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute the following paragraphs:—
>
> (b) by deleting the words "ordinary trading hours" in line two of subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (h) and substituting the passage "the hours of half-past eight in the morning and half-past eight in the evening on a week day other than Anzac Day;"
>
> (c) by adding after paragraph (h) the following paragraphs—
>
> (ha) the consumption, on a vineyard or orchard referred to in paragraph (h) of this section, by a prospective purchaser of wine manufactured thereon, of wine so-

manufactured which is supplied to him without charge as a sample of wine so manufactured.

(hb) the supply of wine by the occupier of a vineyard or orchard as a sample in accordance with paragraph (ha) of this section; or

Mr. T. D. EVANS: As I indicated at the closing of the second reading debate, I am quite in agreement with the principle enunciated in the proposed amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 23 amended—

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: I was interested in the comments made by the Attorney-General and the member for Toodyay in respect of vignerons' licenses. Clause 7 of this Bill is ancillary to the clause dealing with licenses. However, at this stage of the proceedings I intend to speak about vignerons' licenses because we must deal with them right now.

The member for Toodyay made the point that provided the Attorney-General's amendment is accepted any person who does not want to be licensed as a vigneron need not become licensed unless he wants to sell his own wine, on his own premises, for consumption on his premises.

The Attorney-General said much the same thing, and both these opinions point to the fact that if a person wanted to save money he need not apply for so many function permits if that were his desire.

We have reached the stage with this Bill of having it amended to such an extent as to protect fairly well the interests of the member for Toodyay. That of course is quite shrewd and is the way politics work. But the effect of it will be that the license requirement will be left in the Bill unless this clause is defeated. The argument is indicated that there is no real need for the license; it is to be left there purely to protect the interests of the member for Toodyay.

If the Attorney-General's amendment is accepted there is no need whatever for the vigneron's license. If this license becomes a *fait accompli* it will mean that there will be only three licenses applied for in Western Australia. The member for Toodyay, the Attorney-General, and everybody connected with the industry knows this to be so.

Accordingly it is farcical to me that this Parliament should make a mockery of this matter and say, "Let us write 10 sections into the Liquor Act and provide for a license that will not be used"; or will be used only for the purposes I have mentioned.

No other aspect need be considered after having written the words "vigneron's license" into the Act; and, having established the principle that there is provision for a vigneron's license in the Act from that point on we will be stuck with it.. It will only be applied for in circumstances where people want to sell wine for consumption on their premises.

As I have said, the only two circumstances I can imagine as this matter relates to a vigneron are, if he wants a license he will have to show it is for a function on his premises which is, I think, covered by another amendment; or if he wants to build a winehouse which will of course mean the issue of a a winehouse license.

So the words are to be left there for political purposes in the first case; and, secondly, having established the necessity for a winehouse license the situation could develop whereby this would be the thin edge of the wedge for a liquor tax to be levied at a later date. I do not think the industry is ready for this.

If the wine industry were having problems in the selling and distribution of its wines I would be quite happy to say the matter should be given fair consideration. The fact is, however, that this wine license, which we are being asked to agree to, is being written in for the purpose that has been expressed, and I do not think we should be parties to it, because it is absolutely unnecessary in itself; apart from which it is unnecessary as it relates to the great bulk of the people who grow grapes in the Swan Valley.

There will be only a few people who will apply for a license under this Act; the other great majority will not find it necessary to do so.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.07 p.m.

Mr. BRADY: The member for Wembley seemed to think that because only one or two vignerons might be interested in taking out licenses for the sale of their own wine on their own premises, this should not be any justification for the Government to impose a form of license for this purpose.

The honourable member made the point that the wine industry is expanding rapidly. At a meeting attended by the member for Toodyay and myself those present agreed at one stage that no license fee should be imposed; however, after some discussion they considered that they should not lose the opportunity to have the right to sell their own wine on their own premises. They held this view for two reasons: firstly, because of the phenomenal growth of the industry and the good prospects in the future, which will result in costly administration on the part of the Police Department; and secondly, because one or

two vignerons are selling their own wine on their own premises regularly. They felt that they would have no objection, if they could obtain a functional license from time to time as required.

The people who are engaged in the industry realise the great possibilities of expansion, and they are of the opinion that if they want to remain in competition with those who are holding licenses they themselves will have to take out licenses in due course; and if they do not they will have to obtain functional licenses for such occasions as domestic gatherings with friends and relatives. Such a license could cost $20.

Mr. O'Connor: There would be no need for a license where no charge was made at the function.

Mr. BRADY: I cannot imagine vignerons constantly inviting their friends along and not making a charge. They realise what a lucrative business this is, and that in time they will have to take out licenses to enable them to sell their own wine on their own premises.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I oppose the move made by the member for Wembley to have clause 7 deleted. This clause refers to section 23 of the principal Act which details the types of licenses, and the premises to be licensed. Clause 7 seeks to add a reference to a vigneron's license.

It has already been established that vignerons who do not wish to sell their own wine for consumption on their own premises are exempt from the provisions of the Act. Representations have been made to me that, nevertheless, there are some vignerons who do desire to sell their own product on their own premises for consumption thereon.

Likewise it has been represented to me that if there is to be a distinction between vignerons who do not wish to sell wine on their own premises for consumption thereon, and those who do, then for the better enforcement of the law and to ensure that order and decorum is maintained on the premises where the wine is sold there should be some form of licensing.

The member for Swan has clearly indicated that we are not dealing with the Bill only in relation to the prevailing conditions. The member for Wembley has indicated this is a flourishing industry, and we all hope it will continue to flourish. Irrespective of the number of vignerons who are desirous of availing themselves of the opportunity to sell their own product for consumption on their own premises by adding facilities to attract people, they should be given every encouragement; and provision should be made to ensure that this practice can be more properly regulated. I therefore ask members to vote for clause 7.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The member for Swan and the Attorney-General are deliberately trying to lead the Committee to miss the point. The member for Swan says there are many growers who want this license; and the Attorney-General says it has been represented to him that some vignerons want to be licensed to sell their own wine for consumption on their own premises. Let us be factual about this. If a license system is introduced under the Bill there will, in the final analysis, be only two or three growers who will apply.

Apart from a few of the big wine-making companies, to my knowedge there are no growers who will be prepared to apply for a license if they know and accept the facts: The position is that if they do apply for licenses to sell their own products on their own premises, other than at functions for which they have to obtain permits, they will be subject to police supervision and be required to provide facilities which in the main they cannot afford.

If the member for Swan and the member for Toodyay have made up their minds on this point let them tell their electors who are affected that if they want a vigneron's license they will have to come under all aspects of the licensing provisions.

If anyone out in the Swan Valley, or any other vigneron, applies for this license just for a function he will be up for the expense involved in new toilet facilities and new premises on which the wine will have to be drunk. He will also be subject to police inspection so he will not have a bar of such a license. Only two or three people will ever apply for the license and it is ludicrous for us to write provisions into the Act just for three people.

People will be able to apply for function permits if they want to sell wine. The member for Swan has referred to the situation where people were looking at what Waldeck Wines have accomplished. That company applied for a license because there was no other way it could sell wine for consumption on its premises. The small vigneron will not want to compete with that winehouse.

Mr. Brady: How do you know?

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: The people I have spoken to have said so. It is a waste of time talking about providing licenses for three people only.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again at a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr. Harman.

(Continued on page 2683.)

QUESTIONS (32): ON NOTICE

1. SAND PIT

Lillian Avenue: Transfer to Armadale-Kelmscott Shire

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Is the transfer in sight of the water board's Lillian Avenue sand pit at Kelmscott to the shire for recreational purposes?

(2) If not, what still needs to be done to bring about this desirable move?

(3) When can it be expected this sand pit will be available for playing grounds to be developed for use by the large number of families living adjacent to the pit?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) to (3) Sand is still required by the water board and the board is still awaiting the provision of an alternative site by the local authority.

2. HOUSING

Naval Base and Kwinana Projects

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) Does his interjection on page 2070 in *Hansard* No. 10 on Tuesday, 1st August, 1972: "It has the final say about where we build the houses." confirm that the Department of the Navy will decide the area in which the homes are built by the State Housing Commission for the Navy personnel serving at H.M.A.S. Stirling?

(2) Will he immediately take the initiative in negotiating with the Department of the Navy for the earliest commencement of as many of these homes as possible as a positive move to provide employment for the building employers and employees in the local area?

(3) Will he advise the House of commission's actual trading profit and loss position for the Kwinana residential areas since and including its original acquisition?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

(1) No. Under the proposed arrangements for housing of service personnel, the location of houses is a matter for State decision in consultation with the appropriate Commonwealth authorities.

(2) No. No formal request has yet been received from the appropriate Commonwealth authority for the construction of any houses for Navy personnel serving at H.M.A.S. Stirling.

(3) The commission operates on a State wide basis and its accounts are structured in total within the requirements of fund accounting, dictated by the Audit Act and other statutory requirements. Accounts have never been kept on an individual estate basis.

3. EDUCATION

Free Milk

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) How many school children receive free milk in Western Australia in the—
  (a) metropolitan area;
  (b) country areas?

(2) What is the cost of this free supply in the—
  (a) metropolitan area;
  (b) country areas?

(3) What are the transport and freight costs in the—
  (a) metropolitan area;
  (b) country areas?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) (a) Approximately 84,000 excluding kindergartens.
  (b) Approximately 46,000 excluding kindergartens.

(2) Total cost only available—$825,000.

(3) Total cost only available—$130,000.

4. EDUCATION

Free Books and Stationery Scheme

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Did the Government's recent attempt to implement free special issue stationery to primary schools by 1973 prove unworkable?

(2) What was the cost in time and materials in preparation and promulgation of these instructions?

(3) What is the actual minimum cost of student's special issue stationery requirements for each of Grades 1 to 7?

(4) In allowing $1 per pupil did the department state that special item issues should no longer be included on school book lists for the 1973 school year?

(5) From where were the balance of the needs to come or were the children to manage on an inferior inadequate supply?

(6) What is the actual position now pertaining to the implementation of free special issue stationery for 1973?

(7) How far has the Government's free books and stationery scheme progressed and what has been the cost to date?

(8) Is the Government's programme of free school books, etc. for primary school students by 1974 still being adhered to?

(9) What is the up-to-date estimated cost of implementing this programme?

(10) What value of free issue school books, stationery, etc. have been obtained in 1971 and 1972 school years to date from—

(a) Government printer and stores;

(b) private publishers and suppliers?

(11) Will he itemise the cost of implementing the free scheme since March 1971 including buildings, storage, printing research, administration, etc.?

(12) How many additional personnel has the Government engaged to implement the free school books and stationery scheme?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) No. Free educational stationery will be provided by 1973.

(2) An assessment of departmental time and materials in regard to these instructions is not available. Costs incurred at the Government Printer's Office amounted to $257.

(3) Some schools using bulk purchase and providing materials for a rich and varied programme have been charging $1 per student in all grades 1 to 7 in recent years.

(4) Yes. Headmasters were expected however to realise that there is a distinction between educational stationery, which will be supplied, and items of a personal nature (pens, pencils, rulers etc.), which were specifically excluded from the free book scheme.

(5) Answered in (3) and (4).

(6) Answered in (1) and (4).

(7) Stage 1 involving the supply of atlases, dictionary and reading materials has been completed. Materials for stage 2 are being printed and orders for other supplies are being placed. Expenditure, exclusive of administrative costs, is approximately $270,000.

(8) Yes.

(9) Costs to date, are in accordance with the original estimates of $670,000 in 1974 when the scheme is fully operative.

(10) (a) Nil.

(b) $270,000.

(11) It is not possible to assess the costs referred to as none of the items nominated has been provided and used specifically for the free book scheme.

(12) During the period 1971-72, the staff of the curriculum branch has increased by 6. This increase is not attributed entirely to the free book scheme as materials are being produced for achievement certificate, unit progress and other curriculum developments.

5. EDUCATION

Tertiary Students: Additional Government Assistance

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Will the Government give additional assistance to tertiary students for books, etc.?

(2) If so, in which way does the Government favour doing this?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) The Government's plan for free school books does not at present extend beyond the primary school level.

(2) Answered by (1).

6. DECENTRALISATION OF INDUSTRY

Rail Freight Concession and Government Assistance

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

(1) How many regional industries are still in receipt of the 10% rail freight concession given by the previous government?

(2) What number of regional industries have had the above concession cancelled?

(3) Is it correct that if a regional industry has not the ability to show an expansion programme, even though it is wholly manufacturing goods on its premises, that industry will not receive freight or other decentralisation concessions under his Government's new policy?

(4) If not, what is the correct position?

(5) Does the Government intend to grant these concessions to a new industry which might establish in competition with an existing industry already adequately servicing an area?

Mr. MAY (for Mr. Graham) replied:

(1) There are still 91 firms in receipt of the 10% rail freight concession.

(2) Fourteen.

(3) Rail freight concessions may be granted for a period of five years as an establishment or expansion incentive. They are not renewed beyond that period, but may be renegotiated in certain circumstances.

Financial assistance and interest subsidy concessions would not be applicable if expansion or diversification was not planned.

The 10% preference to regional industries on Government tenders for goods or services applies to new and existing manufacturers.

(4) See answer to (3).

(5) Generally no, but each case is treated separately.

7. YOUTH HOSTELS ASSOCIATION

Government Assistance

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Treasurer:

(1) What Government assistance, financial or otherwise, is given to the Youth Hostels Association?

(2) Is the Government considering assisting or alternatively giving further assistance to this organisation; if so, in what way?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) Considerable assistance, including provision of free office space and facilities, has been given over the years through the National Fitness Council. Also the majority of the association's hostels are unused schools in country areas, for which no rental is charged.

(2) No approach has been made for additional assistance and there is no reason to believe that this is required.

8. HOUSING

Bunbury: Vacant Premises, and Outstanding Applications

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) What types and numbers of each type of housing units are vacant in Bunbury?

(2) In what general localities are they situated?

(3) How many applications are outstanding in Bunbury for—

(a) rental;

(b) purchase;

(c) pensioner;

(d) single unit,

and what listing dates are being offered at the present time?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

(1)

Three bedroom individual houses	14
Three bedroom duplex houses	25
Two bedroom individual houses	1
Three bedroom apartments	18
Two bedroom apartments	35
One bedroom pensioner cottage flats	1
TOTAL	94

(2) South Withers—

individual houses	12
duplex houses	25
apartments	53
TOTAL	90
Withers—pensioner cottage ..	1
Carey Park—individual houses	3
TOTAL	94

(3) (a) 75.

(b) 75.

(c) 23.

(d) 15.

Listing dates:—

Four bedroom houses—September, 1971.

Three bedroom—July, 1972.

Two bedroom—June, 1971.

Pensioner couples—February, 1967.

Single pensioners—February, 1969.

9. HOUSING

Bunbury: Building Programme

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the anticipated State Housing Commission building programme in Bunbury for 1972-73 in—

(a) the various types of units;

(b) the general locations in which building will take place?

(2) What is the location and area of land held by the commission in Bunbury?

(3) Is the commission considering any further purchases; if so, to what extent?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

(1) (a) The commission has vacant houses in Bunbury and no building programme is intended at this point in time, but like all country centres the position at Bunbury will be kept under review.

(b) Answered by (a).

(2) For the future growth of Bunbury and its environs, the commission has acquired 2,873 acres, of which approximately 415 acres has been subsequently zoned industrial. Of the residential land, 120 acres is being planned for development when required.

(3) This information is confidential to the commission.

10. *This question was postponed.*

11. PERTH BOYS SCHOOL

Future

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Education:

(1) What are the current plans for the future of the old Perth Boys School in James Street?

(2) Is demolition likely to take place in the near future?

(3) If demolition is to take place, are there any plans to preserve any of the old features as an historic monument or in any way incorporate them into a rebuilding plan?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) It is proposed that ultimately the site of the old Perth Boys School will be part of the Perth cultural centre development and, as yet, no final plans have been prepared affecting these buildings.

(2) No.

(3) Refer to (1) and (2) above.

12. MARGARET RIVER HIGH SCHOOL

Works Programme

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Education:

Would he give detail of any works programmed for the Margaret River high school?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Change-rooms, showers and staff offices are listed for the Margaret River high school but finance precludes these works being undertaken in 1972-73.

13. PINE PLANTATIONS

Wellington Mills and Collie Areas

Mr. I. W. MANNING, to the Minister for Forests:

(1) What area of State forest in the vicinity of Wellington Mills has been cleared of natural bush for the purpose of planting pines?

(2) Approximately what acreage at Wellington Mills is now planted to pines?

(3) What further area is planned for clearing in the region south of the Collie River to the Shire of Dardanup boundary?

(4) Are Forest Department plans for clearing natural bushland subject to scrutiny by the Environmental Protection Authority?

(5) If (4) is "No" why is this not done?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Area of natural bush cleared for planting pines—816 acres.

(2) Area now planted—560 acres.

(3) Further area planned for clearing is under review, but will not exceed a maximum of 750 acres.

(4) No.

(5) This is not required under the Environmental Protection Act but close liaison is maintained between the Department of Environmental Protection and the Forests Department.

14. POLICE

"Aboriginal Consulate": Cost of Surveillance

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

What was the expense for the presence of police officers and police cars during the time when the so called "Aboriginal consulate" tent was pitched on the lawns of Parliament House?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

Nil. If further information is desired, the Member is referred to *Hansard*, Thursday, 3rd August, 1972, page 2165.

15. HOUSING

Increased Eligibility: Effect on Applications

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) With the increased maximum earnings for eligibility to apply for State Housing Commission rental and purchase homes, what is the commission's policy in regard to dealing with applications?

(2) Will the principle of "first come first served" still prevail if other required conditions are met, or will the "need" factor prevail?

(3) If the latter is the case, would he describe the conditions and circumstances taken into consideration by the commission in judging applications so that the public shall not feel and often unjustly accuse the commission of giving undue preference to some applicants?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

The reply to this question involves three foolscap pages and I request that it be handed in.

The SPEAKER: The answer will be tabled.

The reply to the question was tabled (see paper No. 290).

16. ABORIGINES

Visit to North Korea

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) Is it a fact that two Aborigines from Mowanjum Mission are currently visiting North Korea?

(2) If so, will he advise—
(a) the purpose of the visit;
(b) the duration of the visit;
(c) who is sponsoring the tour?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) To the best of my knowledge, no. Two Aboriginal men from Mowanjum Mission very recently were in Seoul, the capital of South Korea.

(2) (a) to attend the international training institute for world churches.

(b) The course was to be of 6 weeks duration. The men are due back at the mission this coming weekend.

(c) The Ecumenical Institute of Chicago.

By way of explanation, this information was provided by the Mowanjum Mission organisation although the arrangements were all made by the Ecumenical Institute not by the mission.

I am advised that the two men concerned expressed a wish to attend the course.

17. SCHOOL OF THE AIR

Travel Concessions for Students

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Are isolated children who receive school of the air tuition eligible for travel concessions when visiting the city during a vacation period?

(2) If not, and bearing in mind that certain concessions would be available if parents could afford to send their children away for educational purposes, will he give consideration to the matter?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Answered by (1).

18. ABORIGINAL MISSIONS

State and Commonwealth Grants

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

What was the value and purpose of—

(a) State grants;

(b) Commonwealth grants,

which were made available to Beagle Bay Mission, La Grange Mission, Lombardina Mission, Sunday Island Bardi Group, United Aborigines Mission (Fitzroy), Mowanjum Mission (Derby), Kalumburu Mission, Balgo Hills Mission, during the financial year ended 30th June, 1972?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

During the 1971-72 financial year the State Government allocated to La Grange Mission a grant of $15,000 for cyclone damage and to both Mowanjum and Balgo Missions grants of $10,000 each for experimental Aboriginal housing.

The Commonwealth Government granted a similar amount of $15,000 to La Grange Mission for cyclone damage and a further grant of $5,000 to Mowanjum Mission for experimental Aboriginal housing.

In addition it granted to the Sunday Island group $600 for boat charter.

The remaining missions named in the question did not receive grants from either source during the period specified.

19. PREMIER EXPORTS PTY. LTD.

Operations of Company: Inquiry

Mr. NALDER, to the Attorney-General:

Further to questions asked without notice on Tuesday, 8th August, 1972, concerning inquiries by the Commissioner of Police into the business activities of the wool firm, Premier Exports Pty. Ltd.—

(1) Does he know if a European wool buyer carrying out business with this firm is involved in a big financial deficiency?

(2) Has this buyer been to Australia?

(3) Has he been interviewed by officers of the Police Department?

(4) Can he advise whether another overseas buyer carrying out business with this firm is also involved in a loss?

(5) Has this buyer been to Australia?

(6) Has he been interviewed by officers of the Police Department?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

This question should have been directed to the Minister for Police. However, I am informed police investigation is proceeding and further information cannot be made available until inquiries are complete.

20. LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Reduction in Number

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

(1) With regard to the proposal to reduce the number of local government authorities, if a local authority proves to be viable will it be left alone?

(2) Will he notify any local authority of its deficiencies so that it will have an opportunity to remedy same and hence become viable?

Mr. MAY replied:

(1) No decision will be made until the report and recommendations of the Boundaries Commission are received.

(2) Municipal councils will have the opportunity to be heard in respect of any proposals before they are implemented.

21. PINE TIMBER

Pricing and Supply Policy

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Forests:

(1) Are 3 in. to 5 in. diameter pine trees cut from pine plantations classed as thinnings?

(2) Is he aware that the department is unable to supply sufficient timber to impregnation firms to meet normal production and market demands?

(3) (a) Are the thinnings, apart from the 2.5% used for fence posts, used for any other purposes;

(b) if so, for what purpose and what percentage of the total do they represent?

(4) (a) Has the price for thinnings risen from 16 cents each in 1970 to 22.5 cents to-day;

(b) if not, what is the increase and what percentage does it represent?

(5) Is he aware that the company may close unless a realistic pricing and supply policy is adopted by the Forests Department?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The department is able to supply sufficient timber to impregnation firms to meet all normal market demands.

(3) (a) Yes.

(b) Particle board production, approximately 95%.

(4) (a) No.

(b) Post prices were last previously adjusted in August 1967 and remained unchanged until October, 1971. The increase on 6 foot fence posts was as follows:—

3 in. to 4 in. crown diameter: increase from 16 to 17.6 cents (10%).

4 in. to 5 in. crown diameter: increase from 23 to 27.54 cents (19.7%).

3 in. to 5 in. crown diameter: new class-price 22.57 cents.

Prior to 1970 the principal company specified only 3-4 inch posts, priced at $16.00 per 100. They now specify 3-5 inch posts which are priced at $22.57 per 100.

(5) No. Some problems have arisen as a result of policies adopted by one purchasing company and a meeting is programmed for Friday 18th August between company and departmental representatives.

22. MINING

Royalties

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Mines:

What were the tonnages, the value in $A and the royalties for the following minerals produced in Western Australia for the year ended 31st December, 1971—

Alumina
Iron ore
Ilmenite
Rutile
Zircon
Monazite
Leucoxene
Nickel ore and nickel concentrate
Coal?

Mr. MAY replied:

	Tonnage produced long dry tons	Value $A	Royalties collected $A
Alumina	1,255,209.00	80,333,200	339,045.90
Iron Ore	51,204,000.13	385,009,040	21,497,907.05
Ilmenite	690,495.07	7,940,866	45,760.36
Rutile	218.75	29,008	32.74
Zircon	30,775.31	926,866	2,425.31
Monazite	3,090.28	447,876	2,231.86
Leucoxene	10,936.30	1,012,004	297.02
Nickel ore	82,219.17	2,993,040	105,424.70
and Nickel Concentrate	297,952.21	91,000,900	522,703.95

It should be noted that royalties collected in any year cannot be readily reconciled with the quantities produced or sold in that year as royalties are payable at various due dates, e.g. payment of most iron ore royalties is due two and a half months after the production or sale.

23. BROCKMAN HIGHWAY
Widening

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Works:

(1) Have estimates been made on the cost of widening the Brockman Highway from Bridgetown towards Nannup for approximately eight miles?

(2) If so, what is the estimate?

(3) When is it planned work will commence?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) The Bridgetown-Nannup Road is not a declared main road and therefore the responsibility for its construction and maintenance rests with the respective local authorities. However, the Main Roads Department has agreed to undertake an investigation and survey of the section of the road in the Shire of Bridgetown with a view to determining how the road can best be improved.

24. *This question was postponed.*

25. COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS
Accommodation: Applications and Vacancies

Mr. LEWIS, to the Minister for Education:

What is the number of applications for 1973 and the anticipated number of vacancies at each of the 14 high school hostels?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The applications have not been finalised at any of the hostels, therefore the vacancies for 1973 have not been established.

26. HOSPITALS
Acquisition of Buildings

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

(1) What are the criteria employed by the Minister when recommendation is received to purchase properties for a hospital?

(2) Is a feasibility study undertaken by the Medical Department or by the Minister?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(1) Need.

(2) Each property is inspected by the Property and Valuation Officer, Public Works Department. It must be suitable and the price reasonable before purchase is arranged.

27. *This question was postponed.*

28. BEECHBORO-GOSNELLS HIGHWAY AND BURSWOOD BRIDGE
Commencement of Projects

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister for Works:

When is it anticipated that work will commence on—

(a) the Beechboro-Gosnells controlled access highway;

(b) the Burswood Bridge and associated roadways in Rivervale?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(a) No date has been fixed for the commencement of this work.

(b) Subject to the provision of adequate funds in the next Commonwealth Aid Roads Act due in 1974 it is hoped that construction of the bridge will commence in 1974 and be completed within three years.

However, to allow settlement to take place beneath approach embankments a start has been made on the placement of sand fill.

29. MOTOR VEHICLES
Thefts

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

How many motor cars were reported to the Police as being taken in each of the years 1961 to 1971 inclusive, and how many of these cars were recovered?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

	Stolen	Recovered
Year ended 31st December—		
1961	767	758
1962	1,148	1,138
1963	1,187	1,162
1964	1,153	1,130
1965	1,253	1,228
1966	1,661	1,637
1967	1,775	1,750
Year ended 30th June—		
1968	1,960	1,905
1969	2,034	1,953
1970	2,251	2,099
1971	3,202	3,010

30. PRIVATE HOSPITALS
Number, Accommodation, and Charges

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister for Health:

(1) How many private hospitals were registered in Western Australia as at June 1972?

(2) What is the total bed availability of these hospitals?

(3) What are the usual bed charges per day in respect of terminal cases of elderly people in these hospitals?

(4) What is the bed availability for aged persons in these hospitals?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(1) General private hospitals 17
Private nursing homes 99

(2) General private hospitals 1,209
Private nursing homes 3,398

(3) The general range of fees is understood to be:—

General hospitals—$20 to $35 per day.

Nursing homes—$6.50 to $12.50 per day.

(4) In the main, nursing home beds are occupied by elderly people. Vacancies exist in a number of nursing homes.

31. HORSERACING AND TROTTING MEETINGS

Betting Facilities

Mr. BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) What is the present maximum number of—

(a) horse racing;

(b) trotting,

meetings which may be conducted each year?

(2) How many meetings in each category are provided with—

(a) bookmakers;

(b) on-course totalisator;

(c) Totalisator Agency Board, services?

(3) What was the turnover of each of the abovementioned betting facilities conducted on each category of meeting and what amount was paid to horse racing and trotting clubs, respectively in each of the past three financial years?

Mr. MAY replied:

(1) to (3) This information is not readily available, but will be conveyed to the Member as soon as it can be obtained.

32. *This question was postponed.*

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. PORT OF BUSSELTON

Closure

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

In view of the fact that there is a risk of the Busselton waterside workers being deregistered because of the decision to close Busselton as a port, will he give urgent consideration to revoking the proclamation at least until the rights of the men concerned can be clarified and their position thus protected in the meantime?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

No.

2. PARLIAMENTARY RESERVES BOARD

Powers

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

(1) Did the Parliamentary Joint House Committee make representations to the Government to take action in respect of a tent which was erected in the grounds of Parliament House?

(2) Did the Government decline to take any action available to it?

(3) Did not the Government advise the Joint House Committee that it proposed to establish a Parliamentary Reserves Board with appropriate powers to deal with this and similar situations?

(4) Were individual members of the Parliamentary Reserves Board invited to serve on that board?

(5) Did not the Government draft and recommend the form of regulations deemed appropriate to give the board the necessary powers?

(6) Does a board clothed with appropriate statutory powers need to consult the Government before exercising those powers?

(7) Was he being serious when he was quoted to have said, referring to a certain unengraved granite headstone, "It could in time have turned out to be of much interest to tourists"?

(8) Do his reported comments imply that he as Premier would have permitted the tent or the stone or both to remain indefinitely on the grounds of Parliament House?

(9) Do his reported comments imply that his Government will use any action available to it to inhibit the board from enforcing the powers vested in it by the Government?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No.

(3) Yes.

(4) Not expressly, but it was intimated to the Minister for Lands by the President, who is the Chairman of the Joint House Committee, that the suggestion that the members of the Joint House Committee be constituted a board of control apeared to suit the Joint House Committee's requirements.

(5) Yes.

(6) No.

(7) Yes.

(8) The tent, no; the stone, yes.

(9) The Government will present to the board a view that the stone, suitably inscribed, could be allowed to remain to mark a spot of historical significance—

Sir Charles Court: How silly can you get?

Mr. O'Neil: How stupid!

Sir Charles Court: You are making a nonsense of Parliament and the Aborigines.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Who is giving this answer?

Sir Charles Court: We were hoping you were.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I am giving it, and and not only giving it, but I am also pleased to give it.

Mr. O'Connor: Can other organisations plant one there, too?

Mr. Jamieson: Of course they can't! There are regulations.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: For clarity, it might be as well if I commence the answer again. The answer is—

(9) The Government will present to the board a view that the stone, suitably inscribed, could be allowed to remain to mark a spot of historical significance, similar to the stone in the footpath in Barrack Street.

Sir Charles Court: How stupid can you get? It is making a mockery of Parliament and the Aborigines.

Mr. O'Neil: "Historical significance"!

3. HOUSING

Increased Eligibility: Effect on Applications

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Housing:

As question 15, asked by the member for Floreat, and the answer given by the Minister are of considerable and continuing interest to all members of Parliament, I want to know whether the answer was handed in or tabled.

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

In reply to the member for Cottesloe, I would advise that I handed in the answer.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Does that mean it will be printed?

The SPEAKER: I directed that it be tabled.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Then may I direct a question to you, Sir? If the answer is tabled, does that mean there will be insufficient copies for members?

The SPEAKER: Members may obtain as many copies as they like.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Then it will be printed?

The SPEAKER: No, but members may obtain copies.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. T. D. Evans (Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 7: Section 23 amended—

Progress was reported after the clause had been partly considered.

Mr. MOILER: The member for Wembley suggested that the licensing of some vignerons but not others had been arranged for the benefit of the member for Toodyay. I cannot accept that; if it were arranged for my benefit I suggest it was also arranged for the benefit of the member for Moore, the member for Vasse, and the member for Stirling.

The purpose of this clause is to benefit vignerons throughout the State. I think it is fair to say that at least 10 per cent. of vignerons would apply for this license. It has been suggested that this provision has been put forward for the benefit of a few vignerons; but I suggest it has been put forward for the benefit of all vignerons —those who apply for licenses and those who do not.

If this clause is defeated and clause 27 is passed it would mean that wine produced in a vineyard could be consumed in that vineyard without any licensing. Quite a number of vignerons do not wish to have wine consumed on their premises. If it is necessary for them to have a license to consume wine on the premises, at least they will be able to say to a person who overstays his welcome after coming to buy wine, "I am not licensed so you cannot stay here and drink wine."

Mr. R. L. Young: You are quite wrong, because we have retained section 6 in the Act as a result of passing clause 3.

Mr. MOILER: It has also been suggested that if we include a vigneron's license future Governments could add further licenses. That is quite right; no Government can be sure of what another Government will do. If a subsequent Government wishes to raise a tax by licensing vignerons, it will do so regardless of what the present Government does. This Government is attempting to benefit the vignerons. I would like to think that in this case the Government is, for once, doing something just for me; but that is not so.

Mr. R. L. Young: "For once." You are right there.

Mr. MOILER: In all probability the cultivation of vines for the production of wine will virtually disappear in the Swan Valley area and the main production will be table grapes.

Progress

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

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS SYMBOL BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th August.

MR. WILLIAMS (Bunbury) [4.53 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The member for Bunbury.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not sure who you were going to call, because so many members were jumping up and down.

The SPEAKER: Nor was I.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Perhaps they are leaving to have their hair cut. I am sure the member for Ascot would welcome one! This Bill, introduced by the Minister for Labour several days ago, is a very small one to amend sections 5 and 21 of the Hairdressers Registration Act. I understand it is to be handled this afternoon by the Minister for Housing on behalf of the Minister for Labour.

As the Minister stated, the purpose of the Bill is to make provision for the appointment of a deputy chairman and deputy members of the Hairdressers Registration Board. It also provides for deputy members to be paid when they take their place on the board. The Opposition raises no objection to this. The objective is to overcome problems which may arise through the absence of the chairman and one or two members. At present no deputy chairman is available, and if one or two members are also absent it is possible that there would not be a quorum and therefore the board could not hold its meeting.

I wish to raise only one query, and I think the Minister for Housing will be able to answer it if he refers to his files. In the Bill before us subsection (8) of section 5 is repealed and re-enacted, and subsection (9) is repealed. The proposed new subsection (8) includes the provisions of the present subsections (8) and (9), and also makes provision for a deputy chairman and deputy members.

Section 5 (8) of the parent Act states—

> At any meetings of the Board the Chairman, or in his absence any member elected by the members present to act as chairman at such meeting, shall preside, and in case of an equality of votes the vote shall be declared in the negative.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I understand that to provide that at any meeting of the board where the chairman is absent and another member has been elected to take his place, and there is an equality of votes on a motion, the motion shall be negatived.

Mr. Bickerton: You are talking about when the chairman is absent?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes. Under the provisions of the parent Act if the chairman is absent another member would be elected to be the acting chairman and if there is an equality of votes the question shall be declared in the negative. I should not imagine that would happen very often. However, in the re-enactment of subsection (8) the reference to a question being decided in the negative when the voting is equal has been omitted. In his second reading speech the Minister gave no reason for this omission. I do not know whether or not it is an oversight.

Mr. Bickerton: I can see your point. I think I would prefer to get some information on this and reply at the third reading stage.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That is fair enough. That is the only point I wish to raise in regard to the measure. The other amendment, to section 21 of the Act, will allow the deputy chairman and deputy members to be paid for their attendance at meetings. With those few words, I support the Bill.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara — Minister for Housing) [4.57 p.m.]: On behalf of the Minister for Labour, I thank the member for Bunbury for his support of the measure. He outlined, as did the Minister when he introduced it, the reason that deputies are necessary. Apparently only recently the chairman attended an overseas conference and there was no-one to replace him. With regard to the other matter raised by the member for Bunbury, I have given him an undertaking that I will have the matter checked and will reply at the third reading stage. The honourable member has brought up an interesting point, and one of which I was not aware. I would prefer to receive some advice before answering 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.

House adjourned at 5.00 p.m.