

I plead with the Minister to have another look at this matter if he wants the legislation to go on the Statute book, and to work. The authority should know that it will be counted on, instead of having to deal with another tribunal which will have very little knowledge of the industry. Indeed, the Minister has indicated by interjection that it is not his intention that the person from his department will be an agriculturalist or a person experienced in the production side of the dairying industry. It is intended that he will be a person with some financial and economic background. In some respects that would be more logical.

The consumer's representative would probably know less than anybody else on the tribunal about the actual practical problems of the industry. However, the matter will be handed over to those people and if they say there is to be an increase in price the authority has to accept or reject that decision. We are trying to give the industry an authority in total, instead of in segments. I hope the Minister will agree to the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—21

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Mensaros
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Connor
Dr. Dadour	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Sibson
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. Stephens
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. McPharlin	(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Graham
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brown	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moller
Mr. Cook	Mr. Norton
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sewell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Harman
Mr. Fletcher	(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Sir David Brand	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Ridg	Mr. Taylor
Mr. R. L. Young	Mr. May
Mr. Thompson	Mr. T. D. Evans

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Progress

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

House adjourned at 11.53 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 10th May, 1973

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Esperance Shire

The Hon. J. DOLAN (Leader of the House): With reference to question 6 asked by The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth in the Legislative Council on Wednesday, the 4th May, in answer to part (3) of the question the figure given was in respect of the concessional feed wheat price for a declared drought area. The standard feed wheat price is at present \$1.87 per bushel.

CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION: FIRST PART

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.38 p.m.]: I move—

That during the remainder of this first period of the current session so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in any one sitting, and all Messages from the Legislative Assembly to be taken into consideration forthwith.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [2.39 p.m.]: It is not my intention to oppose the motion. However, I feel constrained to say that it was my understanding that the Parliament of Western Australia decided to have two sessions of Parliament in order to assist the passage of legislation and to assist members with their work in Parliament.

From memory, and the inquiries I have been able to make into this matter in the limited time that has been available to me, I do not think we have suspended Standing Orders in the first part of the session. We have almost invariably suspended them in the second part of the session. There was an exception at the time the Government found itself asking His Excellency the Governor to prorogue Parliament following the death of the Speaker in 1971, and in those circumstances we understood the situation.

Six sitting days remain after today until the 24th May, the day on which the Government has indicated Parliament will go into recess. I am sure the Leader of the House will not use the authority the House gives him in the passage of this motion to the disadvantage of members, generally, but I would like him to give us an indication of the Bills he expects to be presented to this Chamber between now and Thursday, the 24th May.

I really cannot see a great deal of advantage accruing to the Government from the suspension of Standing Orders at this particular stage. We are adjourning on the 24th May for purposes to suit the Government. We members of the Opposition would not mind a bit, I am sure, if Parliament were in session the week following Thursday, the 24th May. As a matter of fact, I can imagine some members of the Legislative Assembly being delighted at the prospect.

The Hon. J. Dolan: So can I.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If I were pushed very hard, I would be agreeable to coming back during that week. The Government, however, will lose its very slender majority.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You do not seriously think the Government would do that, do you? Why waste our time?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not seriously think it would.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Nor would you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Government's hold on the Treasury bench at the present time is so slight that it would not risk a situation like that.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You were in the same position a few years ago.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right.

The Hon. J. Dolan: So you are speaking from experience.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not quite, because we did not want to suspend Standing Orders. As far as I can remember, we did not have two sittings of Parliament at that time.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You introduced the two sittings of Parliament.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, and, personally, I think that was not a good thing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are all allowed one mistake.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the present Leader of the House were to open his heart to us, I do not think he would say it was a very good thing, either.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I am always opening my heart to you people.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Although it has not been interpreted in that manner, I am trying to be helpful, and I suggest to the Leader of the House, quite apart from this motion, that he give us an indication of the Bills we are likely to receive in the next six sitting days, so that we will have an idea of the work that lies before us. I would also like to renew to him my offer of co-operation, of which he has not taken a great deal of advantage up to date in respect of the notice paper.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I fell over backwards for you yesterday and you did not co-operate very much.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Did the Leader of the House fall over backwards yesterday?

The Hon. J. Dolan: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Did he hurt himself very much?

The Hon. J. Dolan: No. I never do. I am tough.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There lies the answer, I think. However, I do not want what I am saying to be misinterpreted. I am endeavouring to be helpful. Everybody would appreciate it if the Leader of the House would give us some indication of the legislation he expects us to receive. I repeat that, in having two sittings of Parliament, the first sitting was intended to be merely helpful. It was not intended that there should be a suspension of Standing Orders during the first sitting so that Bills could be rushed through. I understood Bills would be introduced and ample time would be given between the first and second sittings to consider important legislation.

To the extent we are able, my colleagues and I will co-operate with the Government, but we would like information about the Bills the Leader of the House expects to receive.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.46 p.m.]: I could not give the Leader of the Opposition the names of the Bills but I understand over 50 Bills are awaiting submission. It is quite impossible for that number of Bills to be carried through because we intend to rise on the 24th May—I will not repeat the reasons for that.

I remind the Leader of the Opposition that the two sittings of Parliament were introduced by the previous Government. I also remind him that Standing Orders were suspended during the first part in 1969-70 and also in 1972, so it is not unusual.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In 1972 the present Government was in office.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I said there was one exception.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Exceptions are often inclined to make a rule. I will be very co-operative. We have no intention whatever of trying to steamroll Bills through, but there are occasions when we can carry them through and take the second reading. If the Leader of the Opposition feels any Bills require to be adjourned for further consideration, I would agree to that being done. There are some Bills—perhaps there will be one today—which have not provoked any discussion

or opposition in another place, and in those circumstances I think it is desirable in the interests of expediency to take them through. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition we have no intention whatever of rushing Bills through.

Question put and passed.

NEW BUSINESS: TIME LIMIT

Suspension of Standing Order No. 116

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.48 p.m.]: I move—

That Standing Order No. 116, limit of time for commencing new business, be suspended during the remainder of this first period of the current session.

Question put and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Daily Issue and Delivery of Weekly Volumes: Motion

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [2.49 p.m.]: I move—

That this House requests the Joint Printing Committee to examine the possibility of a daily *Hansard* being produced, and to arrange for the earlier publication, and more expeditious postal delivery, of the weekly volume.

I move the motion because I believe a daily issue of *Hansard* would be of great benefit for two reasons: firstly, for the convenience of members of this Chamber, so that they may be informed of what is going on in another place; and secondly, to have written confirmation of the speeches that have been made in this Chamber.

As regards the first point, I find the general public is apt to group all members of Parliament together, regardless of whether they be in the Legislative Assembly or the Legislative Council. This may have been brought about by adult franchise.

However, I certainly find that the general public expects me to be informed about all Bills that are currently before the Assembly. I think perhaps this is brought about largely by the use of television and radio because the public are made aware of what is occurring in Parliament within a matter of hours. It is not good enough for members of this Chamber to have to read in the Press or hear on the radio what has occurred in the Assembly. Sometimes we find out what is going on in conversation with members of that Chamber. I feel a daily *Hansard* would at least provide us with that information much quicker.

Probably members will appreciate that last week *Hansard* did not reach this Chamber until Tuesday night. When I

am required to make up my mind regarding the policy I will adopt in relation to legislation I find it particularly difficult if I am not informed of what is going on. Probably Government members are made aware of proposed legislation by the Minister concerned long before the measures reach Parliament; but members of the Opposition must rely heavily upon the second reading speeches of Ministers. As a Legislative Councillor I find my task most difficult if I do not receive a copy of second reading speeches soon after they are delivered.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You could always ask us and we will give you our originals. They could be photostated for you in about five minutes.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is correct; one can also obtain a copy of a Bill which is before the other House, and also the second reading speech of the Minister. But on the other hand country members find it difficult to fit into the three days they are in Perth the sittings of the Chamber, telephone calls, and correspondence—for which one must join a queue upstairs.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: When have you ever had to queue up?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: One certainly has to wait some time before one's correspondence is returned. I find it very difficult to fit into the three days I am in Perth all the work that is required of me, and I have not sufficient time to chase up second reading speeches and Bills from another place. I feel a daily copy of *Hansard* certainly would be of great benefit to country members.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If that were impracticable would a tape be of any assistance?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Whilst that could be done, one must appreciate that tapes are much more difficult and expensive to install, and I think the written word is easier to deal with.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Plus the fact that the *Hansard* reporters make a much better job of the speech than the member who makes the speech.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Yes, I must admit that *Hansard* has that benefit.

Apart from that, members will be familiar with the printing of *Hansard* in Canberra. A daily *Hansard* is printed there and whilst perhaps it is not easy to produce, I think nowadays with modern printing methods it can be done. Unfortunately in this State the printing of *Hansard* seems to be just another job which the Government Printer must churn out in between other work.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Have you checked the cost of this with the Chief *Hansard* Reporter?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I must admit I have not done that. My motion requests the Joint Printing Committee to inquire into the matter because that committee is far more capable of doing that than I am. Members will realise that country members leave for their home towns on Thursday night and cannot take with them second reading speeches. So it is difficult for them to research the Bills which will be introduced into the Chamber in the following week. I believe we would not see so many adjournments of debates in this House if members could take with them daily copies of *Hansard*—even if we had copies of only two sitting days instead of three.

I think it is equally important for members in another place to be informed of the debates in this Chamber so that they know how we vote and the reasons for our vote on various Bills.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: Do you think that would have any effect on them?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I do not think it would have a profound effect on them.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: How do they get on in your home State of Tasmania?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I guess they battle rather hard.

The second point is that I feel it would be of great benefit to members to have written confirmation of the debates that occur in this House at an earlier time than they are made available at present. We often hear members make denials about what they have said. I admit one can call upon *Hansard* and obtain a pull of the exact words used. However, I feel a daily *Hansard* would alleviate these difficulties and would make available to us copies of second reading speeches made by Ministers in this Chamber much earlier than they are presently made available.

I know that one may obtain a photostat copy of speeches, but we find that our staff must spend a great deal of time making expensive copies of second reading speeches, whereas a daily issue of *Hansard* would be quite suitable to most members.

One of the most important advantages of a daily *Hansard* is that country members would be able to distribute copies of their speeches to the country Press. I find it most difficult indeed to have printed in the Press reports of what has been said in this House. I suppose one could photostat the duplicate copy provided by *Hansard* for correction purposes within a few hours of one's having made a speech; but I am afraid by the time the *Hansard* staff has corrected my speeches the copy looks a little rough. Of course, one may request a pull of a speech, but I find I seldom receive pulls before the following Tuesday,

when the weekly proof of *Hansard* is available anyway. Then again, a pull is so long that one cannot photostat it, so it is not at all suitable.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Whose speeches are you talking about?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: My own at the moment. I find that the country Press is particularly interested in what is said in the Parliament. The country Press relies upon district news for its circulation. I was rather horrified to find that the pre-Easter edition of *Hansard* arrived in the country only this week, and was too late to be incorporated in this week's country Press. Therefore, any relevant reports must appear in next week's edition of the Press and it will be five weeks before the public have the opportunity to read what was said in Parliament in the week before Easter. One could hardly expect them to be particularly interested in a debate after a period of five weeks has elapsed. A daily *Hansard* would be a great help in that respect, because news could be sent to the country Press and also to other interested people much quicker than is possible now.

We have only to look at the matter of the Firearms Bill. If copies of *Hansard* had been made available to interested people as the speeches were made perhaps additional points could have been raised during the debate in Committee or at the third reading stage.

Finally I would like to comment on the question of the availability of reprints of speeches. If a member requires a reprint of a speech it usually takes many months before he is able to get it. I gather that reprints are not made at the point when copies of *Hansard* are available, but in the bound volumes. I would point out that it is a very good speech that can stand reading three or four months after it has been delivered.

The Hon. J. Dolan: After three or four hours!

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I do feel that some effort should be made to speed up the printing of reprints of speeches appearing in *Hansard*. This is important to enable us to get matters over to the general public to indicate what members of Parliament are doing on their behalf. I believe a daily *Hansard* is of great benefit to let members know what takes place in another Chamber, to provide readily copies of debates, and to inform the public more expeditiously.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [3.01 p.m.]: I have no intention of opposing the motion. All it requests is that the Joint Printing Committee should examine the possibility of bringing out a daily *Hansard*,

etc. I think an examination of any matter is desirable. There are just a few comments I would like to make on the motion.

Firstly, I refer to the excellent work which the *Hansard* staff has done in this Parliament for a long period of years, and for the benefit of many hundreds of members.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We all feel that way.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: They have carried out their duties with complete satisfaction to all, and we appreciate that. The Commonwealth Parliament has introduced a daily *Hansard*, but it involves considerable cost to the extent that the *Hansard* staff has been almost doubled. There was also a need to install highly expensive printing equipment.

No doubt, the Western Australian Government Printing Office is keeping up with modern printing appliances, and I am given to understand that computers are being installed. All these things will help in the production of a daily *Hansard*. I feel it is desirable that an investigation be made, and that the Joint Printing Committee be requested to carry it out. For those reasons I do not oppose the motion.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [3.03 p.m.]: I have no argument either with the proposal to enable the Joint Printing Committee to investigate this matter. Just the same, I think it is an unreasonable request. I certainly do not go along with some of the reasons put forward by my colleague, Mr. Wordsworth, as grounds for moving the motion. In the years that I have been a member of this House the *Hansard* staff has been obliging to the nth degree.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I did not say they were not.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The members of that staff have been very obliging in meeting all requests that I have made for copies of speeches made by myself, or by members whether they be of this House or of another place. *Hansard* has been able to produce those speeches at very short notice, and copies have been made available on the occasions that I have made requests.

For the mover of the motion to suggest that a member of Parliament has to queue up at the office of the stenographers to take his turn in getting his correspondence or secretarial work attended to, he shows a complete lack of appreciation of what goes on.

I would be interested to find out the number of times on which the honourable member or any other member has had to queue up at the office of the stenographers to have his work done. I have been a member of this House for many years.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You have not represented a country electorate, so you do not know.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It does not matter whether one represents a metropolitan or a country electorate. I claim that I write as many letters as any other member. I was a member when there were only two stenographers available to members, but I was always able to get my work done in a reasonable time.

I have no argument against the desire of the mover of the motion to have this investigation carried out, but I certainly take exception to his suggestion of a lack of assistance from the officers mentioned by him in the course of his speech. I shall not vote against the motion, because it is probable that the Joint Printing Committee will welcome the opportunity to have some matter to investigate. Whatever be its findings, a report will be made to this House. I simply rose to comment on some of the excuses used by Mr. Wordsworth in an attempt to bolster his request.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [3.07 p.m.]: I would like to comment on what the last two speakers have said. They seem to have the impression that Mr. Wordsworth was critical of *Hansard*.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I said no such thing.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I realise it was not said.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Nor did I imply it.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The fact that both members commented on the excellent work of the *Hansard* staff seems to imply that Mr. Wordsworth is critical of the system.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You are saying something that is not correct.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I did not say the last two speakers were critical of *Hansard*. I said it seemed that the last two speakers thought that Mr. Wordsworth was critical of *Hansard*. I would like to comment that *Hansard* provides an excellent service, and its members are unsurpassed in efficiency.

I know that Mr. Wordsworth realises this also. All he is doing is to suggest that there could be a better way of getting the speeches back to members after they have been made, so that members will know what has gone on not only in this House but in the other place also, should they happen to be absent for an hour or so.

This week I was asked a question by some visitors to this House. I had stepped out of the Chamber for about a quarter of an hour, and during that time a debate was concluded and a vote taken on the voices. These people asked me what had happened, and I said I did not know. That was the truth. However, they looked at

me as though I was a fool. I do know that I felt a bit of a fool. It is possible that they could have asked me that question the following day; and if I did not have an answer I would have looked a bigger fool.

If the Joint Printing Committee decides to introduce a daily *Hansard* then a situation such as the one I have just mentioned would not be faced by members. I also agree with the comment of Mr. Wordsworth that when a country member goes into his electorate the people expect him to be familiar with everything that has gone on in both Houses of the Parliament. If we have a daily *Hansard* it would be possible for members to be aware of what happens in another place, and also to have a better insight into legislation being dealt with there. On many occasions I have been handed a note or I have paused to open a letter, and on reading the contents I have missed a point made by a member in his speech.

I think the motion is quite worthy. I understand fully what the two previous speakers have said and I agree with their points, but I would like to make it clear that Mr. Wordsworth has not denigrated any of the staff of Parliament House. I am sure that he and all other members admire their efficiency.

If the committee decides in favour of a daily print of *Hansard* I am sure it would recommend that the *Hansard* staff be increased and the necessary facilities provided so that the members of the *Hansard* staff could work more efficiently. Possibly this would lighten the load on them because, at the moment, I simply do not know how they cope.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would like to know where you would accommodate them.

THE HON. F. R. WHITE (West) [3.11 p.m.]: As a member of the Joint Printing Committee, I have no objection to supporting the motion because it is in the form of a request that the matters be looked into.

I take this opportunity to comment upon an interjection which was made, I think, by Mr. Ron Thompson when Mr. Wordsworth was speaking. The Minister said, by way of interjection, that a photostat copy of a Minister's second reading introductory speech could easily be acquired for a member's use. On one occasion I wanted this particular procedure to be followed but I was refused a photostat copy of the Minister's second reading speech. Eventually, I had to wait until I could obtain a pull of the speech from *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was not one of my speeches.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: To overcome this problem—which I think is of concern to many members—I would like to request that a copy of a speech made by a Minister of the Crown in this Chamber be made available in the ratio of one copy to every three members. I am sure members would appreciate this.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How long is it since you were refused a copy?

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: It would be some six to nine months ago.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [3.12 p.m.]: I think it is unfortunate that the subject of *Hansard* reporters has been brought up in the debate. I purposely kept my motion to the printing of *Hansard* and it does not reflect at all upon the *Hansard* staff.

The same applied in regard to the question of secretarial services. I was referring to the fact that members do not have a private typist available but, instead, they make use of the few typists who are available to do their work as well as the work of many other members.

Perhaps Mr. Clive Griffiths does not appreciate the difficulties which country members face. Usually they are not in the Parliament on Friday or Monday, and often they are not in on Tuesday morning. For example, my plane arrives on Tuesday afternoon.

This gives country members limited time and it is difficult to use the facilities which are made available to all members in the Parliament. These facilities are not readily available to country members once they leave Perth to work in their electorates.

I, too, admire the work which is done by the *Hansard* staff. In no way, do I reflect upon the members of that staff.

Question put and passed.

FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson (Minister for Community Welfare), read a first time.

FIREARMS BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [3.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [3.16 p.m.]: I wish to make one or two comments on the third reading. I want to make it clear that remarks made by members of my party during the second reading debate were intended to emphasise that we believe a

greater effort should be made to introduce a uniform Act which would be operative throughout Australia and so do away with the situation whereby each State either has no firearms legislation at all or one which is different from that of another State.

We also believe that greater emphasis should be placed on educating people in the use of firearms. It is not the firearm which is necessarily the problem but the individual who is in possession of that firearm.

To indicate to members that our thinking on this subject is not unique I shall refer to an article by an expert in firearms and their control. His statements are important because they emphasise and confirm the views expressed by my colleagues and myself during the second reading debate.

The article has been prepared by an individual who, as I have said, we consider is an expert on the subject. I quote—

In March, 1971, Chief Inspector Colin Greenwood, West Yorkshire Constabulary, completed a Research Fellowship at the Cambridge Institute of Criminology where he had been studying the relationship between firearms controls and armed crime.

It goes on to say that his report will be published in a future issue but that he was asked to give some comments on his findings to a particular magazine.

I will read some of the comments which Inspector Colin Greenwood made as a result of the research which he undertook at the Institute of Criminology. Amongst other things, he said—

Strict controls on rifles and pistols were introduced in 1920 and fifty years should allow of a sound appraisal of any problem.

He is referring to the situation in Great Britain. To continue—

Yet, time after time, additional restrictions have been imposed without establishing the need for legislation and without any attempt to assess the effect of existing legislation. There has been, in many quarters, an unquestioning presumption that armed crime can be curbed by restrictions imposed on legitimate users of firearms.

The facts offer not one ounce of support for such an assertion.

He then makes several other comments and adds—

Within these ever tightening restrictions on legitimate users, the criminal use of firearms has been growing at an alarming rate. For many years England had a rate of armed crime which was, by any standards, remarkably low. For example, in 1954, in the whole of the Metropolitan Police District, there were just *four* robberies

in which a firearm was used or carried and from 1947 to 1957 the figure never exceeded 30. In 1970, that figure was 274. Why? It cannot be that firearms were more difficult to acquire in 1954 than they were in 1970; tightening restrictions should have produced the reverse effect. Whatever the reasons, the policy of stricter controls failed to prevent a tremendous increase in the rate of armed crime.

There are, of course, those who will suggest that the situation would have been much worse if firearms had not been controlled. A complete answer to such a suggestion is impossible, but an indication can be found by looking at the position in relation to shotguns which, unless sawn off, were uncontrolled until January 1968. Throughout the period various reports indicate that shotguns featured in only a minor proportion of armed crimes and it was for this reason that they remained outside the controls.

The number of robberies in England and Wales in which shotguns were used in 1966 and 1967 was 53 and 59 respectively (15.5% and 21.3% of all firearms used). Controls took effect at the beginning of 1968 and the use of shotguns in robberies almost doubled to 98 cases and to 100 cases in 1969. Perhaps this was not the result anticipated by Parliament.

One of the arguments used to justify further restrictions on legitimate users of firearms is that, no matter how responsible the owner, the gun may be stolen and subsequently used in crime; indeed, it is often suggested that stolen guns form the basis of the criminal's armoury. The facts do not support this suggestion. Stolen firearms rarely feature in crime. The criminal who wants a gun simply buys one on the black market and the pool of weapons available to him is large and not diminishing.

If firearms controls are effective, then fifty years of controls on pistols should have substantially reduced the number of illegal weapons in circulation. It is fairly easy to establish the approximate number of pistols held on firearm certificates, but obviously impossible to establish the number of illegal weapons with any degree of accuracy. The number of pistols legitimately owned in 1969 was approximately 63,000. Since 1946 almost a quarter of a million illegally held pistols have been confiscated by the police and the numbers confiscated year by year do not diminish. If the numbers are not diminishing after a quarter of a million weapons have been taken from the illegal market, it must be continuously fed from various sources. It can surely not be doubted

that the number of weapons confiscated represents no more than the tip of the iceberg and the total number of illegal weapons almost certainly vastly exceeds the number of weapons held on certificate.

Bearing in mind the huge number of shotguns now in circulation, this evidence suggests that the tightest of controls would not seriously affect the criminal use of these weapons over the next fifty years.

Firearms legislation will generally be obeyed by the law abiding citizen but, by definition, a criminal is a person who does not obey the law. We now have fifty years of experience to show that the answer to the armed criminal cannot be found in tightening still further restrictions imposed on the legitimate user of firearms. The problem must be examined afresh and solutions more likely to produce results must be produced. The reason for the rise in armed crime is concerned with people, not guns. Just as many guns were available to criminals in 1954 as were available in 1970, yet very few chose to use them in the earlier years. The solution must be geared to the problem and the problem lies in the willingness of criminals to use extreme violence, not with the responsible citizen pursuing shooting sports.

This man is an expert; a person who has spent his life in the control and supervision of firearms. After 50 years of control he has come to the conclusion—and produces evidence to support it—that a criminal who wants to use a firearm will obtain a firearm whether we have the most stringent rules possible or no rules at all. It was on this basis that the argument was put forward by members of the Opposition.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Did the author of that article say whether the abolition of the death penalty may have contributed to the use of firearms?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He did not mention that. He said that in 1954 the practice was not to use firearms in most crimes. However, our attitudes have changed and the attitude of the criminal has changed. Today he has no hesitation in using a firearm to achieve his desires. That is what the author is saying. It is no good introducing very stringent rules because England has had these in force for 50 years. From 1946 to 1970, with a total of 63,000 licensed pistols, the Police Department confiscated 250,000. The confiscations are not diminishing.

I do not wish to commence the debate all over again, but this article was not in my possession during the second reading stage. I simply wish to emphasise to the Chamber that the Liberal Party does not suggest people should be permitted to use

firearms indiscriminately. We are not in support of every Tom, Dick, and Harry being able to obtain a firearm.

It is the opinion of the Liberal Party that firearm legislation should be uniform throughout the country. A person coming here from Victoria may have handled a firearms under the conditions applying there. He ought not to be adversely affected and have his firearm confiscated simply because he crosses the border from one State to the other and he cannot justify to the commissioner his reason for possessing it. This reason may have been acceptable in Victoria, but may not be acceptable here.

It is for this reason that we took the stand we did. We do not advocate that everyone should have a firearm simply because he has the whim to possess one. That is all I wish to say on that aspect of the measure.

In his speech closing the second reading debate, the Minister for Police made several comments, some of which I believe need to be answered. He referred to pressures which had been exerted on members by people who, for some reason or another, had taken an interest in the Bill. This pressure took the form of people filling the galleries of the Chamber. These people were interested in listening to what was going on in Parliament, and yet the Minister for Police indicated this was a form of pressure.

It was not considered to be a form of interest shown by people who were coming here to listen to legislation by which they might be affected. No consideration was given to the very right that these people have and enjoy to come to Parliament and listen to something that may vitally affect them and which happens to be under discussion at the time in this House.

Because such people happen to disagree with the point of view put forward by the Minister he suggested that the members of the Liberal Party were being subjected to certain pressures.

I take very strong exception to such an assertion, because I believe that not enough people come to Parliament to listen to the legislation that might affect them vitally and the reasons that may be given for the passing of such legislation. They should not have to rely on a biased point of view; on what somebody tells them in relation to the decision that may have been made in this Chamber. They should not be confined to having to listen to only one side of the story. It is highly desirable that people should come to this House and listen to what is said. We should not permit any suggestion that pressure is being exerted simply because people attend the Parliament to listen to the debates.

The Minister also made reference to a certain letter he read to the Chamber which he said had come into his possession. I have the relevant *Hansard* which contains his speech and if the Minister insists I will read it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I do not insist on anything.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I know that. However, if the Minister disagrees with what I am going to say I will take that as an insistence that he would like me to read what he said in his second reading speech, together with the reference he made as to how the officers of his department had obtained the letter after having seen it displayed in the window of a gunsmith's shop.

My leader (The Hon. A. F. Griffith) interjected and said, "Do you mean by officers of your department members of the Police Force?" The Minister said "Yes".

The Minister took strong exception to what was in the letter and suggested there was something wrong with the people who wrote it. It was a letter requesting people who shared certain views to come along and form themselves into some sort of organisation. That is all the letter purported to do.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Minister did not like what the T.L.C. was doing either.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not know whether the Minister did not like what was being done by the T.L.C., but no doubt he will have an opportunity to tell us about that later.

The Minister did, however, take very strong exception to the wording of the letter in question and suggested that because the people went to the trouble of writing the letter and making the suggestion they did, there was obviously some grounds for criticising them. He also suggested there was certainly some grounds for discounting any thoughts they may have had on the subject. The Minister said they had an ulterior motive, because they were affected by the outcome of the Bill before us. That was the Minister's reason, and he used words to that effect.

You will recall, Mr. President, that at the time the Minister was making his comments and at the time he read the letter in question the individuals who came to the House and seated themselves in the gallery during the course of the debate did not arrive at the time the debate started. They were under the impression that the debate would not commence until sometime later in the day, and not being familiar with the procedure in this Chamber they were not aware that the Bill could come on at any time and, accordingly, they were not in the gallery when the Bill came on and the debate com-

menced. So they were not in a position of being aware of the Minister's comments or his reference to the letter or, indeed, how he had obtained the letter.

Yesterday afternoon I had an interesting discussion with the person from whose premises the letter was obtained. Yesterday was the first opportunity—and this bears out what Mr. Wordsworth has been saying—that the people concerned were able to obtain a copy of *Hansard* and read what was said during the debate.

The fellow who wrote the letter said "How did the Minister for Police get that letter?" I replied that the Minister said that some of his officers obtained it from his window.

The Hon. J. Dolan: That statement was perfectly true.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Minister is prepared to say it is perfectly true without hearing what I have to say.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You said that is how I obtained it; I do not tell lies.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not telling lies.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I did not say you were.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Would you clarify it so that we will know what you are attempting to say?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In the name of creation why not give him a chance to do so.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If Mr. Thompson will stop interjecting so rudely I will tell him what these people said. Firstly they said the letter was never in the window of the premises concerned; secondly that the letter was removed without the permission of the owner of the premises.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Where from?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: From his office.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Who removed it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not prepared to say who removed it; the Minister can tell us from where he got it. The proprietor of the shop told me he had not given permission for the removal of the letter from his premises and he had no knowledge that the letter had been removed. The letter in question was in a prototype form which the person concerned was considering sending out to the people interested. It was in the office of the proprietor and he had no knowledge of its removal.

It is interesting to know that the day before the Minister had obtained the letter the members of the Police Force had taken a stock check in the shop. Apparently they do this periodically. When the Minister mentioned the letter he said

he did not have the time to find out from which shop it was obtained. This is certainly recorded in *Hansard*. He said it was in somebody's shop window and the officers from his department obtained it.

I do not suggest there was anything doubtful in the manner in which the Minister came by the letter. The person in question may be telling me a pack of lies, but I do not think he is.

I would be interested to know how the Minister and his officers got hold of the letter and if it was in the shop I would like to know what right the Minister had to take it.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Was it in the same premises to which the Minister referred?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Minister did not say from where it came except to say that it came from one of the gunsmiths in the town and that it was in the window of his shop.

I think the House is entitled to know how the officers from the Minister's department came by the letter when they did not get permission to remove it. If it were in the window the police would have had to get permission to remove the letter and take it out.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They did not take it out.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If it were removed illegally should not the matter have been reported to the police by the people concerned?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: What is the point?

The Hon. G. C. McKinnon: Might not be worth the trouble.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I told him when he spoke to me what he was entitled to do. I am bringing the matter to the attention of the House because the Minister took the trouble to read the letter and use it as an important part of his argument as to why we should support the Bill. He said that people who wrote letters such as that are people in whom we should not place a great deal of faith. That is why I raised the matter. The letter is of no consequence.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What you have said seems to suggest that the police may have acted wrongly, and that is serious.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member can draw his own conclusions. With those few remarks I support the third reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

LEGAL CONTRIBUTION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [3.41 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes certain amendments to the parent Act to enable more effective use of the Legal Assistance Fund by increasing its resources and widening the scope of its import.

By the existing definition in section 4, legal advice which is reduced to writing ceases to come within the definition of "legal advice" although the same advice would qualify if given orally. This anomalous situation can be rectified by the proposed amendment which simply deletes the word "oral" so that both oral and written advice would come within the scope of the definition.

The second amendment is also to section 4, which defines "legal aid". The definition of "legal aid" does not provide the power to grant assistance in legal matters unless such matters could be the subject of court proceedings, thereby preventing assistance in, for example, probate matters generally. Assistance in such areas is often necessary and desirable. It is proposed by the addition of paragraph (c) to make assistance available in a wider number of deserving cases.

The next amendment deals with the investment of the proportion of solicitors' trust accounts invested pursuant to the Act. Presently it is obligatory to invest with the banks where the legal practitioners maintain their trust accounts at the short-term interest rate as from time to time approved by the Reserve Bank of Australia. Some difficulty has been experienced in ascertaining the rate and consequently interest is being credited by banks at the rate applicable to fixed deposits for periods of three months.

The experience since the trust commenced shows a constant increase in the total amounts deposited to the credit of the trust. It seems unreasonable that this money should be considered to be invested for periods of only three months. An amendment to widen the class of investment will enable the trust to obtain a more realistic return from the investments and provide more funds for legal aid. Similar legislation in other States contains the powers now sought for the Western Australian trust.

The final amendment to section 39 of the parent Act simply allows legal assistance on matters other than court proceedings to which I earlier referred. This follows automatically from the adoption of the amendment to the definition of "legal aid" in section 4.

The Bill which seeks to improve the functioning of a very worth-while public service, is commended to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. I. G. Medcalf.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.02 p.m.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Minister for Community Welfare) [4.07 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments proposed in this Bill arise from recommendations made by the weights and measures authorities of all States, and are related to uniform alteration to laws on weights and measures and packaging. The formal conferences of those State authorities which are attended also by Commonwealth officers are complemented by meetings of the Standards Committee on Packaging, the main purpose of which is to set uniform standards in the packaging and marking of packaged goods, including metric conversion aspects.

The first amendment in the Bill inserts into the definition section of the Act a definition of "instrument". Two subsections also are added to explain the term "use for trade" and its implications. The ninth formal conference agreed to these definitions, and thus uniformity will obtain in the legislation of all States.

Section 21 deals with sales by net weight or measure. It is now proposed that when a package is used only for the purpose of transporting an article, the package itself may be marked with the gross weight, the form of such marking to be prescribed by regulation. Under this section at present, a person shall not sell an article by weight or measure otherwise than by the "net" weight or measure. The marking "gross" weight will, however, be permitted in the circumstances just mentioned. Part IIIA of the Act deals with prepacked articles and section 27B covers certain exemptions, with bread being mentioned specifically because the Bread Act has controlled aspects concerning bread.

The Bread Act prescribes weights at which dough should be weighed in the bakehouse for making into bread loaves and rolls, and sets the standards of dry matter content in loaves. Whereas reference is to loaves and rolls, and no other form of bread, in so far as control of weights and sizes is concerned, the definition of "bread" means all classes of that item excepting Vienna bread which is separately defined.

Factually, however, once bread is sliced it no longer comprises a loaf and it would not be practicable to ascertain the dry

matter content of a loaf once it is sliced. In effect, it becomes a package of slices of bread.

It is therefore proposed to remove "pre-packed sliced bread" from the exemption so that it can be regarded as a packaged item of food to which prepackage requirements will apply. Bread otherwise will still be an exempted item.

Great quantities of sliced bread are sold daily to consumers and surveys by departmental officers have disclosed that, in the main, net weight is not being marked on packages of this bread. In addition, check weighings have disclosed weight variations quite different from purported weights. It has also been found that packages of different types of bread, but of almost the same dimension, vary in weight to a marked degree.

The requirements for packaged sliced bread by the Weights and Measures Branch will be in line with what is happening in other States.

The denomination of weights in which sliced bread shall be packaged for sale in this State will be prescribed in the Weights and Measures (Prepacked Articles) Regulations. These weights shall be in accord with baked loaf sizes under the Bread Act as agreed in recent discussions between officers of the Department of Labour and representatives of the Bread Manufacturers' Union of Employers. These draft regulations when drawn up will be formally submitted to the Bread Manufacturers' Union of Employers for consideration and approval.

Section 27C requires names and other particulars of a packer to be marked on packages. This section is to be amended to provide that these requirements shall not apply in relation to articles packed outside of the Commonwealth. The obvious reason for this is that no State has jurisdiction over a packer outside the Commonwealth. It is considered that the source of packing is readily ascertained through the Department of Customs and Excise.

A further amendment will exempt an outer package used for the purpose of transporting only, as long as the inner article is marked as required.

Section 27G sets the penalties applicable where the true weight or measure of a prepacked article is less than the weight or measure of the article stated on the package. An amendment is necessary here in respect of subsection (5) (a), for the reason that both the imperial system and the metric system may now be used. The amendment makes provision for the metric equivalents of 250 grams and 250 millilitres respectively being included.

New section 27HA permits of articles being marked "net weight at standard condition".

In close relation to these provisions, a new section 27HB is to be inserted to provide for the method of determining the true weight of certain frozen articles and the like. Articles such as prawns and scallops are commonly frozen in water before being packed in cartons which are marked in net weight, with the result that difficulty is experienced in subsequently determining whether or not the weight statement is correct. It is intended that the regulations prescribe the manner in which the weight of such an article is to be ascertained, similarly as the existing regulations prescribe the form and manner with which the words "net weight at standard condition" or words to that effect are presented.

New section 27J contains prohibitions and restrictions in the use of certain expressions on packages. Such restrictions are defined in the section and further elucidated in the regulations.

Subsection (3) of new section 27J allows for the limited use of "restricted expressions" on packages, provided the net weight or measure of the contents of the package is in a size of print as specified, and further that the statement of content shall be marked on the package wherever the expression appears.

An additional subsection (3a) will ease the requirement so that the statement of quantity used will be shown only once on any panel of a package on which the restricted expression appears, even if such expression is used more than once on any panel of a package.

Yet a further subsection (5) is to be added to provide that where an expression which comes within the definition of a "restricted expression" is marked on a package containing more than one article, and the expression used relates to the size of each article, and to the size of each of the articles contained in the package, such expression shall not in these circumstances be "restricted" for the purposes of the section. An example is the use of such expressions as "family size biscuits", "king size cigarettes", or "giant size sardines", where the expression relates to each biscuit, cigarette, or sardine.

The repeal of subsection (3) of section 28 of the principal Act is consequential upon the insertion of the definition "Instrument" and the insertion of the new subsection (7) in section 4 explaining the term "use for trade". Finally, section 46 is to be repealed and re-enacted, consequential upon earlier amendments just referred to. The re-enactment explains the circumstances as to the possession by a person of a weight, measure, or weighing instrument which is evidence of possession for use for trade.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Minister for Community Welfare) [4.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill proposes to amend subsection (3) of section 6 of the principal Act, which defines the conditions upon which an action may be brought under the Act for the benefit of an illegitimate child.

The existing law provides that damages cannot be recovered by an illegitimate child in respect of his father's death unless—

- (a) the deceased — the father, of course—during his lifetime had contributed maintenance or agreed in writing to support the child; or
- (b) a court order for the child's maintenance had been issued against the deceased.

"The deceased" again refers to the father of the illegitimate child.

In conformity with other recent legislation applicable to illegitimate children—and approved by this Parliament—the Bill gives legal recognition to the parent-child relationship in cases where paternity is admitted by, or established against, the father during his lifetime and the father subsequently dies.

The amendment extends the relief available under the principal Act to a class of dependants who are not presently entitled to relief. Included in the class are those children who were conceived before marriage and have been deprived of a father by his unfortunate death prior to the intended marriage.

I believe members will support this Bill as a means of providing fair and reasonable treatment to a section of the community which is already handicapped. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. I. G. Medcalf.

SALE OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The provisions of section 17 of the parent Act were intended to safeguard the public from deceptive statements by unscrupulous land developers about projected amenities to be provided in residential areas. However, as a result of the requirements of the section being too stringent, enforcement is difficult.

This Bill proposes to repeal section 17 and re-enact it in a more reasonable and practical form. Protection would still be given to prospective purchasers who would have to be informed whether approval had been granted for the siting of the proposed amenity or that the vendor had no knowledge of such approval, as the case may be. The present wording of the section forbids the making of any statement regarding the amenity unless it is known that all authorities or all approvals have been given for the siting, construction, and operation of the amenity.

The amendment would allow land developers more liberty to discuss their developmental proposals with interested persons, while still affording the public protection from deceptive representations. I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. I. G. Medcalf.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is for an Act to establish the pre-school education board of Western Australia, to provide for the dissolution of the Kindergarten Association of Western Australia (Incorporated) and the discharge of the former functions of that association, to make provision for the maintenance and extension of pre-school education facilities, to regulate the conduct of pre-school education centres, and for incidental and other purposes.

In May, 1972, Mr. W. E. Nott, S.M., was commissioned to conduct an inquiry into pre-school education in Western Australia, resulting in a report and recommendations being submitted to the Government in September of that year. One of the terms of reference was to examine and report on the administration of the Kindergarten Association of Western Australia (Incorporated) and recommend, if found desirable, how it could be more solidly constituted as a voluntary organisation providing effective pre-school education predominantly for five-year-old children. The recommendation of Mr. Nott in this regard was that the present board of management of the association be replaced by a statutory board.

The full text of Mr. Nott's recommendations in this particular instance were as follows—

1. That the Kindergarten Association of Western Australia (Incorporated) continue to be the major agency for the administration of pre-school education in this State.

2. That the association cease to exercise control over the Kindergarten Teachers' College, the college council and other committees associated with the employment of teaching staff within the college, the recruitment and training of students, the payment of salaries to lecturers and allowances to students, the planning of courses and curricula, and like matters associated with the administration of the college.

3. That the present board of management of the association be replaced by a statutory board consisting of 12 members comprising—

- (a) the president of the association;
- (b) the treasurer of the association;
- (c) five members appointed for a period of three years—subject to being eligible for reappointment—by the Minister for Education, such members to be drawn from Government departments of the nature of the Treasury, Education Department, Crown Law Department, Community Welfare Department, and Mental Health Services;
- (d) five members nominated and elected by affiliated committees, affiliated groups, and affiliated kindergartens

4. The board to have the right to co-opt to its membership the chairman—or nominee—of any committee coming under its jurisdiction.

5. That members of the board of management be part-time, but in addition to the present full-time executive officer a full-time suitably qualified treasurer should be appointed to handle the financial affairs of the association.

In order to examine these recommendations a committee comprising the then Director-General of Education (Mr. Dettman), the then executive officer of the Kindergarten Association (Mr. Stapleton), the Director of Kindergartens (Mrs. Jones), and an officer of the Treasury Department, met on two occasions and subsequently was joined by the President, Vice-President, and Treasurer of the Kindergarten Association of W.A. (Incorporated) at further meetings. Arising from these meetings it was determined that a smaller board than that outlined by Mr. Nott should be established with the understanding that the board itself would be expected to form expert committees, from persons not necessarily members of the board, to plan for further educational needs in the pre-school area.

In this regard, I would draw the attention of members to clause 22 of the Bill, which provides that the statutory board may—and, if directed by the Minister, shall—constitute such committees.

It has been agreed that the functions of the board can be adequately administered by 11 persons comprising the following—

(a) Five persons to be known as “representative members” and described in this Bill, on the occasion of the first appointments to be made to the board, as being elected by and from amongst the persons who, immediately prior to the coming into operation of this legislation, were members of the board of management of the Kindergarten Association of Western Australia (Incorporated). Provision is made for subsequent vacancies which occur and details the requirements a candidate must possess to qualify for election. This provision is to be found in clause 11 of the Bill.

The reason is that, in the first instance, the board will be able to have an expeditious commencement, the representative members being elected by and from members of the present board of management of the Kindergarten Association. Thereafter such members will be elected by the parents and others who have the right to vote from time to time, as indicated. Clause 11 details the provisions relating to that aspect. To continue—

When the representative members are elected regulations will provide for the interests of the metropolitan and country areas to be represented. In this regard, I refer members to clause 11 (2). It is intended that the regulations will provide for three metropolitan and two country representative members; that is, five in all.

The draftsman has seen fit to make this power available by regulation which provides for flexibility, but there is no objection to their being written into the Act.

The other members of the board will be—

(b) Six persons, five of whom shall be nominated by the Minister for Education and comprising an officer of the Education Department with teacher qualifications and teaching experience; a graduate of an institution which provides teacher training in the field of pre-school education; a person who possesses academic qualifications in the field of early childhood education or guidance; a pediatrician or a person who has professional expertise in child health or child care; and a representative of the Under-Treasurer of the State. The eleventh and final member will be nominated by the Minister for Local Government and he will represent the interests of local authorities on the statutory board.

For a period not exceeding two years, the chairman of the board shall be appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister. After that period, the board itself will elect one of its own members to be the chairman. To cover those changed circumstances, the Bill expressly provides that, in the first instance, the chairman will exercise a deliberative vote only and, in the second instance, where the chairman is elected from the board, he will exercise a casting vote only.

When introducing this Bill in another place the Minister expressed his appreciation of the valuable assistance given by and suggestions from the board of management of the Kindergarten Association of Western Australia, Incorporated, executive members of the Pre-school Teachers' Union, Professor MacDonald of the University of Western Australia, and many other groups and interested persons, far too numerous to mention.

I commend the Bill to the House as a sincere and genuine attempt to regularise pre-school education in this State in a manner largely consistent with the recommendations of the Nott report.

In the light of experience with the legislation, it may well be demonstrated that further amendments may be necessary and only such experience could clearly indicate that.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. J. L. Williams.

SALES BY AUCTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Amendments

Amendments made by the Assembly further considered from the 18th April.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. J. M. Thomson in charge of the Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. F. D. Willmott): Progress was reported after The Hon. J. M. Thomson had moved that the following amendment made by the Assembly be agreed to—

Amendment No. 1.

Clause 5.

Page 3, lines 8 to 14—To delete paragraph (b) and to substitute a new paragraph as follows—

(b) immediately after each lot is purchased or passed in at such a sale, shall, under the respective headings in the register or book that are applicable, make or cause to be made an accurate entry of all the particulars and on the same day shall sign or initial such entries,

To which The Hon. F. R. White had moved the following amendment—

Insert after the word "sale" in line 3 of the proposed new paragraph (b) the words "or as soon as is practicable".

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I desire to ask Mr. White whether he will kindly withdraw his amendment in view of the fact that further discussions will occur later in this respect.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I moved my amendment to the Assembly's amendment to facilitate debate in an effort to resolve the problem we were facing. I understand discussions have taken place since and proposals have been made to rectify the stalemate. Without giving any indication that I will support forthcoming proposals, I seek leave of the Committee to withdraw my amendment on the amendment.

Amendment on the amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I seek leave of the Committee to withdraw my motion that amendment No. 1 made by the Assembly be agreed to. Further consideration has been given to the matter and I can see that the amendment is not practicable.

Motion (that the Assembly's amendment No. 1 be agreed to), by leave, withdrawn.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move—

That amendment No. 1 made by the Assembly be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment not agreed to.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The second amendment made by the Assembly is as follows—

Amendment No. 2.

Clause 5.

Page 4, after line 6—To add the following—

3C. (1) Where a sale by auction of cattle to which section 3A of this Act applies is conducted by a person whose license is held by him for the benefit of a firm or company under section twenty of the Auctioneers Act, 1921, any member of the police force of the State may, at any reasonable time, inspect all invoices, account sales and other records kept by the firm or company as the case may be concerning that sale.

(2) Any member of a firm or any company referred to in subsection (1) of this section—

(a) shall hold all invoices account sales and other records available for the purpose

of any inspection authorised by subsection (1) of this section; and

(b) shall, on the request of any member of the police force of the State produce the invoices, account sales and other records to him for that purpose,

and any member of a firm or any company failing to comply with the provisions of paragraph (a) or (b) of this subsection shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than one hundred dollars.

(3) Any person who hinders any member of the police force of the State acting pursuant to the power given to him by subsection (1) of this section shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than one hundred dollars.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move—

That amendment No. 2 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I draw attention to the fact that I wish to move an amendment to the Assembly's amendment. My amendment is not that standing in my name on the notice paper, but rather the one I have circulated. It is as follows—

That amendment No. 2 made by the Assembly be agreed to, subject to the following further amendment—

(1) Insert after the word "section" in the last line of paragraph (a) of proposed new section 3C (2) the words "for a period of not less than three years".

(11) Add at the end of the clause the following proviso—

Provided that the provisions of Sections 3A and 3B of this Act shall not apply to any cattle sales held within the precincts of the Midland Abattoir Board saleyards at Midland.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Can we deal with it in two parts?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. F. D. Willmott): Yes, I think it might be better to deal with it in two parts.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I believe the amendment should be dealt with in one part because it is only one amendment and there is a connection between the two parts. I hope, Mr. Deputy Chairman, you will put it in one part.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Upon examination, I agree with Mr. Medcalf that this is one amendment.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I am afraid I cannot agree with that because the first part of the amendment deals with the period for which the records shall be kept, and the second part is for the purpose of excluding the Midland Junction saleyards. I think the amendment has two separate parts.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I think this is a matter of the words we are using. I am content that the amendment should be debated in two parts, but for technical reasons it must be passed as one amendment. We have discussed this matter with the Clerk, and I hope that it will be put as one amendment.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Although the amendment is in two parts because the first part applies to the Assembly's amendment, and the other part applies to the Bill, I shall read the amendment proposed by Mr. Medcalf so that it does not appear in two parts. It will become one amendment. The amendment is—

Insert after the word "section" in the last line of paragraph (a) of sub-section (2) of proposed new section 3C the words "for a period of not less than three years", and amend clause 5 of the Bill as follows—

Add at the end of the clause the following proviso—

Provided that the provisions of sections 3A and 3B of this Act shall not apply to any cattle sales held within the precincts of the Midland Abattoir Board saleyards at Midland.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I move an amendment—

Insert after the word "section" in the last line of paragraph (a) of sub-section (2) of proposed new section 3C the words "for a period of not less than three years", and amend clause 5 of the Bill as follows—

Add at the end of the clause the following proviso—

Provided that the provisions of sections 3A and 3B of this Act shall not apply to any cattle sales held within the precincts of the Midland Abattoir Board saleyards at Midland.

As a result of lengthy discussions which have been held between members who are particularly interested in the Bill, it has been suggested that this is a satisfactory outcome of the amendments of the Assembly.

The effect of my amendment is to provide that where auctioneers are required to keep records—that is, invoices, account

sales, and other documents—they shall keep these for a period of three years. The amendments made by the Assembly require the auctioneers to keep these records indefinitely.

It is suggested that it would be adequate for any person who felt he had suffered damages as a result of the loss of stock or through some fraudulent action to be allowed three years within which to discover these facts and to bring the matters before the Police Department or the appropriate authorities.

By inserting the words "for a period of not less than three years" it means all records, accounts, documents, and invoices which are held by the auctioneers whether they operate at the Midland Junction Abattoir or in the country will be retained for not less than three years, and will be available during that time to the police or any other interested parties.

The second part of my amendment contains a proviso to the sections which require a register to be kept at auction sales of cattle to the effect that this shall not apply to auction sales of cattle at the Midland Junction saleyards. The reason for the insertion of this proviso arises from the additional amendment of the Assembly which requires auctioneers at the Midland Junction saleyards to keep their records for a period of three years. Because they have to keep all their invoices and accounts, it is unreasonable to ask them to keep a register in respect of the sales at Midland.

This means the auctioneer will be required to keep a record under section 3C, but he will not have to keep a special register as set out in sections 3A and 3B. In all other respects the auctioneer will have to comply with the other requirements, and in addition he will have to keep a register of sales in the country, at Robb Jetty, at bloodstock sales, at Royal Show sales, or anywhere else.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: I agree wholeheartedly with the first part of the amendment moved by Mr. Medcalf, but I would like to draw attention to the second part of it. If we look at the marginal note against proposed section 3A in clause 5 of the Bill we see the following—

Auctioneer to keep register of cattle sold by auction.

The marginal note to proposed section 3B is—

Power to inspect register of cattle sold by auction.

Those two provisions refer to the register which Mr. Medcalf's amendment seeks to exclude from being kept in respect of sales at Midland Junction.

Amendment No. 2 made by the Assembly commences with the words—

Where a sale by auction of cattle to which section 3A of this Act applies

....

If we read into that the amendment proposed by Mr. Medcalf we will have to add the following proviso—

Provided that the provisions of sections 3A and 3B and 3C of this Act shall not apply

I feel this goes too far.

Originally when the Bill was before this Chamber we agreed to it in the form in which it was transmitted to another place. However, the Assembly returned the Bill with amendments. I, together with other members, could not see anything wrong with the Bill as originally transmitted. I would prefer to see proposed section 3C omitted altogether and the amendment made by the Assembly disagreed with. Should that take place we would be back to where we started, and we would have a very satisfactory Bill.

We are dealing with the Assembly's amendment which proposes to insert proposed section 3C which Mr. Medcalf now seeks to amend. As proposed section 3C applies only to auctions of cattle to which section 3A applies, then under the proposal of Mr. Medcalf that proposed sections 3A and 3B shall not apply to sales at Midland it means that ultimately proposed sections 3A, 3B, and 3C will not apply to sales at Midland. I think this goes too far.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would ask for a ruling under Standing Order 295. We have an amendment which excludes sales at Midland Junction saleyards. I would ask for your ruling, Sir, as to whether the amendment moved by Mr. Medcalf is in order.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. F. D. Willmott): I shall leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 4.58 to 5.08 p.m.

Deputy Chairman's Ruling

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. F. D. Willmott): Order! The Minister for Community Welfare has asked for a ruling whether the proposed amendment is in order. I rule as follows—

The proposed proviso contained in the amendment is relevant to the subject matter of the clause and the amendment proposed by the Legislative Assembly. I therefore rule the amendment to be in order.

Committee Resumed

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Before the suspension, Mr. White raised the point that there may be some conflict between the use of the phrase "to which section 3A

of the Act applies" in the beginning of the Legislative Assembly's amendment, and the amendment proposed by me. This could probably be resolved by deleting the words "to which section 3A of this Act applies" and inserting a reference so as to restrict the meaning of "cattle" to the definition which has been adopted for the purposes of this Act.

However, I believe this matter deserves further consideration. It is unfortunate that I should have to say, so, but I can see no alternative other than arguing around in circles. In these circumstances, perhaps Mr. J. M. Thomson might agree to report progress.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by The Hon. J. M. Thomson.

EDUCATION

Boarding Allowances: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 17th April, on the following motion by The Hon. W. R. Withers—

That in the opinion of this House, the Commonwealth living-away-from-home allowances for isolated students to which a means test is applicable, unfairly discriminate against parents with incomes which are necessarily above the means test in remote areas with high costs of living. Accordingly, this House recommends the restoration of the State's living-away-from-home allowances to supplement those from the Commonwealth until such time as the Federal Government abolishes the means test.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.13 p.m.]: In commenting on this motion I would say at the outset that I do not dispute the comments made by Mr. Withers on the means test provisions in relation to wage levels and living costs in the northern areas of this State.

There is no doubt that many categories of workers in that area may not qualify to receive more than \$350 basic boarding allowance by virtue of the higher wage levels paid and the longer hours customarily worked in that area. However, I cannot agree that the appropriate course is for the State Government to supplement the Commonwealth scheme by paying an additional allowance free of means test.

While it is true that initially I expressed some doubt as to the effect of supplementary State payments on eligibility to receive Commonwealth grants, this point has been cleared up in the more detailed information since received from

the Commonwealth Government. However, it is unfortunate that a passing comment has been given such prominence as it is far from being the most important aspect of this matter as I will try to make clear.

It must be borne in mind that in introducing the scheme, the Commonwealth Government has been more generous than the State could afford to be. The highest boarding allowance paid by the State in respect of children from remote areas was \$310 for children in fourth and fifth year of high school who resided north of the 26th parallel. Parents of children attending primary school and in first to third years of high school from that area received \$260 per annum.

The basic boarding allowance to be paid by the Commonwealth free of means test, namely \$350, will mean that parents of children in fourth and fifth year of high school will be \$40 per child per annum better off and parents of children in primary school and years one to three of high school will be \$90 per child better off than under the old State scheme.

For those parents who are in a wage bracket that would involve them in serious hardship to send their children away to school, additional sums ranging up to \$654 per child per annum could be paid under the new arrangements.

Parents of children in other remote parts of the State will benefit to an even greater degree.

Therefore to summarise the position, without having regard for the means test, parents living in remote areas will benefit by amounts ranging from \$40 to \$140 per child—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That has already disappeared.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The honourable member may comment later. The degree of assistance could be much greater in cases of real hardship.

It must also be realised that the Commonwealth Government clearly expects that this scheme will replace existing State schemes and that the State's budgets will be relieved accordingly.

Although on the surface it would appear that the State has the financial capacity to supplement the Commonwealth allowances in view of the fact that we have been paying allowances up to this year, this is not a valid assumption. Western Australia, and indeed most other States, are experiencing serious financial problems in the face of steeply rising costs and we must look to the Commonwealth to provide additional financial assistance if we are to maintain services even at the present level.

There is no doubt that in considering our position, the Commonwealth Government will take into account the assistance it

is providing by taking over some State responsibilities such as boarding allowances and the proposed assumption of full financial responsibility for tertiary education. That Government would expect that the funds so saved would be available to meet other pressing needs which we would not be in a position to meet without extra assistance from the Commonwealth in one form or another.

If we were to continue to pay boarding allowances in addition to the Commonwealth grants, we could not expect the Commonwealth to provide us with additional funds for this purpose.

Put another way, it must be assumed that when the financial position of the States is being discussed at the June Premiers' Conference, I have no doubt that we will be expected to have available to assist our budgetary position, the moneys we have been relieved of by these recent Commonwealth initiatives.

We are therefore in no position to provide additional assistance by way of boarding allowances over and above the amounts to be provided by the Commonwealth.

We have been informed that the Queensland Government has chosen to do so. I can only assume that it is in a financially stronger position as a result of substantially increased Commonwealth assistance through the Commonwealth Grants Commission than we are in Western Australia.

Nevertheless, Mr. Withers has put forward a reasoned criticism of the means test aspect of the Commonwealth scheme as it applies to residents of northern areas. The point is no doubt true of the Northern Territory and outback areas of Queensland also.

It is a matter that should be represented to the appropriate Commonwealth Minister and the Minister for Education will undertake to take the point up with him to see whether some modification of the scheme is possible to meet the point raised by Mr. Withers.

What I wish to stress is that the Commonwealth Government has accepted from the States the responsibility to provide financial assistance to help parents living in remote areas to educate their children. The State does not have the financial capacity to take it upon itself to supplement Commonwealth payments now that that Government is in the field.

If we believe the new scheme has inadequacies we should take the matter up with the Commonwealth Government and endeavour to persuade it to our point of view. This the Minister will endeavour to do.

Yesterday Mr. Wordsworth raised the point that many parents were concerned because they had not yet received payment. Of course, the system has changed considerably with the takeover by the Commonwealth Government. Under the State Government scheme—and this applies to the previous State Government—the warden or manager of the hostel notified the department of the number of students who had applied for assistance. A cheque for the amount applicable was then forwarded direct to the warden. A general submission has been sent to the Commonwealth Government that the allowances should be forwarded direct to the hostel. It takes longer for the cheques to go through the parents, and some of the money may be lost in transit or withheld.

Mr. Wordsworth referred to some records of the Education Department which had been taken by the Federal Government. This is not so. The officer who is alleged to have informed the hostel warden that the Commonwealth had taken the records cannot be found in the head office. If the identity of this gentleman becomes necessary, perhaps Mr. Wordsworth will name him. However, since the information was not correct and can be refuted, it may not be necessary.

In order that the Commonwealth scheme may operate efficiently in the shortest possible time the Education Department offered full co-operation to the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth officers brought their photocopying equipment to the department and copied the records so that the collection of the information did not have to be duplicated. The State records never left the department.

These records covered students who received boarding allowances up to the 31st December, 1972, but they did not include applications made for the first time in 1973. In order that the Commonwealth officials could contact these people, the department allowed the Commonwealth to borrow the application forms to extract the information. The documents were returned to the department and were only held by the Commonwealth for a day or two. I therefore advise that Mr Wordsworth was misinformed and the State Education Department has all its records intact.

I would like to refer to a question asked in another place today and to the answer given to it. This will show members what has happened with the applications. The first part of the question was as follows—

Has he received, as reported in *The West Australian* on 8th May, 1973, a submission by the Country High School Hostels Authority to alleviate the problem arising from

alleged tardy payments of Commonwealth subsidies which replaced in the current school year the State living-away-from-home allowances?

The question was answered, "Yes". The second part of the question reads—

If so, could he describe the main points made in the submission and/or could he table the submission?

The answer to this was as follows—

The submission drew my attention to the financial hardships suffered by a number of hostels because of the changeover to Commonwealth assistance. Hedland and Esperance hostels were mentioned in particular.

These were the two hostels which seemed to be in the greatest financial difficulty. The answer continues—

The submission also referred to the fact that under the State scheme, allowances could be paid direct to the hostel whereas the Commonwealth made payments to parents. As this is the full basis of the submission it is not necessary for it to be tabled in the House.

Part (3) of the question was as follows—

Is it a fact that the Commonwealth appropriate authority has not paid any subsidy as yet to parents for the 1973 school year?

And the answer to this is most illuminating. Members must be aware that parents also have an obligation. This is not a one-way process. We cannot expect Government departments to be 100 per cent. efficient unless they receive co-operation. The answer reads—

No. The Commonwealth Department of Education in Perth despatched 5,600 applications to parents in mid March 1973. To Monday 7th May, 1973 only 1,672 had been returned and already 1,083 cheques have been despatched to parents. The balance of the claims received has either been approved or is under consideration.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I will bet that the applications were not air mailed—they were probably sent by surface mail.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The honourable member may express his views later. I am speaking of facts.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I am asking were the applications sent by air mail?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I am sure that of these 1,083 cheques which have been sent, many have been sent to parents of children in the North Province. These parents filled in their application forms and they have received their cheques.

Parts (4) and (5) of the question were as follows—

Has he or will he make representation with the Federal Minister in this respect?

What were or will be the substance of his representation?

And the answer to these questions was—

In view of the prompt action taken by the Commonwealth authority in approving claims and despatching cheques to such a high percentage of applications received, representations to the Federal Minister, in regard to payments, are not necessary. The State Education Department has discussed with the officer-in-charge, the desirability of direct payments being authorised to the hostels. The Commonwealth is considering this request.

As I have said, a general submission has been made to the Commonwealth and this requests that allowances are paid directly to the hostel.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You have not replied to one point I made in my speech. You have read out questions asked in another place. I asked why the State Government did not inform the hostels before the 4th April that it intended to make payments to parents.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I could not tell the honourable member. I am provided with this information from the Minister.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You could ask him to reply to my queries.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: He certainly will. A lot of the things the honourable member spoke about have not been replied to. I will see this is done at the next sitting of the House.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: From what we hear the Minister wouldn't know.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Even if I know nothing, it is probably a great deal more than the honourable member knows.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You know I was referring to the Minister for Education in another place.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. DOLAN: This information was supplied to me not only by the Minister for Education but also by a high-ranking official of the department.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: He does not know what he is talking about.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: He has been handling this matter for more years than the honourable member has lived in the State.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: We live in the area; we know what is going on.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Yes, a temporary resident. In conclusion I would like to say that statements have been made about

the attitude of the present Government. I need hardly point out that the welfare of all the children in this State, no matter where they live, is one of the Government's prime considerations. The Government has not at any time done anything that could have been done more expeditiously in view of all the circumstances.

This item has been brought up on the notice paper so that at least an interim report would be available. If the member who moved the motion is unhappy about it he will soon have an opportunity to reply and mention some of the aspects about which he feels aggrieved. For my part I will certainly bring to the notice of the Minister for Education the aspects about which members feel unhappy and ask him to refer the matters to his department and see what can be done.

However I do not propose to stand up here and be shot at when I am answering questions and supplying information on behalf of another Minister. I have received information on this question, but I cannot enlarge on the information I have already given, although I do feel there needs to be some further elaboration on the matters referred to by Mr. Wordsworth.

Perhaps I will have to ask a member on this side of the House to speak on my behalf and exercise my authority to enable him to say certain things in order that members might be informed of the position.

I tried to get the information from one department at 4.52 p.m. but I was unable to do so. I do not know what time the department knocks off but I was not able to get the information I required. Had the information been available I would have made it known to members when I got up to speak.

I will, however, ask one of our members to secure the adjournment to enable this information to be placed before the House prior to any speech which the member for the North Province wishes to make. I feel it is only fair to the House that it should be apprised of information on all the matters that have been raised.

The honourable member I have nominated for the purpose will be able to give at least some, if not all, the information required.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Thank you. Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. F. Claughton.

SCIENTOLOGY ACT REPEAL BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson (Minister for Community Welfare), read a first time.

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE**1. KANGAROOS***Declaration as Vermin*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Have kangaroos ever been declared Vermin under either the Agricultural Protection Board Act, or the Vermin Act?
- (2) (a) Are kangaroos at present declared vermin under the Vermin Act; and
(b) if so, in what districts?
- (3) Does the Vermin Act or any regulation made thereunder permit the variation, either by reduction, restoration or increase, of the bonus payable for kangaroos destroyed?
- (4) (a) Is any bonus presently payable under the provisions of either the Agriculture Protection Board Act or the Vermin Act for kangaroos destroyed; and
(b) if so,
(i) what are the districts;
(ii) what is the rate of the bonus;
(iii) under which of the Acts referred to is the bonus payable; and
(iv) what authority is responsible for payment?
- (5) If the answer to (4) (a) is "No"—
(a) when if at all were bonuses last payable for kangaroos destroyed;
(b) in what districts were the bonuses paid;
(c) what were the rates of the bonus at that time?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes, under the Vermin Act.
- (2) (a) Yes, some species are.
(b) Jungle, River Wallaby or Schimidar-tailed Wallaby (*Macropus agilis*) is declared vermin in the municipal districts of Broome, West Kimberley and Wyndham.
Kangaroos, Red, Blue, Marloo (*Megaleia rufa*) and Hill, Euro, Biggada (*Macropus robustus*) are declared vermin in the municipal districts of Ashburton, Boulder, Broome, Carnarvon, Cue, Hall's Creek, Laverton, Leonora, Marble Bar, Meekatharra, Menzies, Mount Magnet, Mount Marshall, Murchison, Nullagine, Port Hedland, Roebourne, Sandstone, Tableland, Upper

Gascoyne, West Kimberley, Wiluna, Wyndham and Yalgoo.

- (3) No bonus is paid at present, but the Vermin Act gives power to pay bonuses.
- (4) (a) No.
(b) Not applicable.
- (5) No bonus has been paid on kangaroos under the Vermin Act by the State Government or the Agriculture Protection Board.

2.**KANGAROOS***Meat and Skins: Export*

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN, to the Leader of the House:

Further to reply to part (3) of my question No. 11 on 18th April, 1973, when the Leader of the House stated "Unaltered at the moment but to be acceptable to the Commonwealth Government some slight modification may be required". Is he in a position to say what the slight modifications are?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

The Commonwealth Government is seeking more modifications than previously anticipated to the various systems of kangaroo management in Australia. Those which would affect this State's programme are as follows:—

- (1) The lifting of the declaration of kangaroos as vermin.
- (2) Uniform control and monitoring machinery throughout Australia.
- (3) Explanation of research programmes to include population assessments.
- (4) Some modification of annual quotas to include those kangaroos taken under the damaged licence system.

3.**EDUCATION***Uncontrollable Children*

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In view of the answer given to my question number 6 of Tuesday, 8th May, 1973—
(a) what special treatment will be given to the boy; and
(b) where will the treatment be given?
- (2) If no uncontrollable children have been reported from the Pilbara or Kimberley in the past two years, would this be a record for an area of this size?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) (a) The child is at present in the Wyndham Hospital under the care of the Community Welfare Department.
- (b) The nature of further treatment is dependent on testing and professional advice.
- (2) Comparative statistics on an area basis are not maintained.

4. CHILD WELFARE

Institutions

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

In view of the reply to part (2) of my question number 6 on Tuesday, 8th May, 1973—

- (1) How many children committed to the care of the department have been placed in a treatment institution of the Community Welfare Department from:—
 - (a) the Kimberley;
 - (b) the Pilbara?
- (2) For what period of time did each child receive treatment?
- (3) Did any of the committed children have any uncontrollable behaviour patterns in their school classes prior to being committed to the care of the department?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON replied:

- (1) (a) 25.
- (b) 16.
- (2) Average length of stay for children admitted to treatment institutions during the two year period 1970-72 was:

Hillston	76 days.
Nyandi	93 days.
Riverbank	150 days.
- (3) Yes, 19.

5. PRIVY COUNCIL

Appeals

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In view of the newspaper reports which indicate that the State Government intends to be represented in any proceedings brought before the Privy Council to determine questions in relation to the Commonwealth Government's proposed legislation to control the sea bed beyond low water mark, how does the State Government reconcile any such decision with its stated policy that the right of appeal to the Privy Council should be abolished?

- (2) If the State Government believes it is necessary to invoke the assistance of the Privy Council when its rights have been overridden or disregarded by the Commonwealth Government, does it not believe that similar opportunities of appeal to the Privy Council should be available to private citizens whose rights or interests may be overridden or disregarded by governments?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter proposed by the Tasmanian Government to be referred by petition to Her Majesty for decision involves important questions as to territorial boundaries. The only judicial forum constitutionally equipped to give advice on the matter is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The procedure involved is quite distinct from matters which currently may be taken on appeal to the Judicial Committee by governments or private citizens, and no conflict is seen between this procedure and the stated policy of the Government that Australian courts should determine appeals from the decisions of other Australian courts.

6. ABORTION LAW REFORM

Addresses to Schools

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Leader of the House:

Further to the reply to my question No. 3 on Wednesday, 9th May—

- (1) What was the topic of the seminar mentioned in the Minister's reply to part (1) of my question?
- (2) Who advised the children that attendance was optional?
- (3) How many children decided not to attend?
- (4) (a) Did the school staff accept the children's word that they should not attend; or
- (b) was a written authority requested from their parents?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) "Faith Alive—The Jesus Revolution".
- (2) The Deputy Principal.
- (3) All 5th Year students in attendance on that day elected to participate.

(4) (a) Yes.

(b) No written authority is required for exemption from attendance at such voluntary seminars.

House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 10th May, 1973

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

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Land Control Bill.
2. Salvado Development Bill.
3. Land Commission Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Davies (Minister for Town Planning), and read a first time.

MURDOCH UNIVERSITY BILL

Second Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [11.06 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill for the establishment of Murdoch University is one of the most important and, I am sure, the most welcome pieces of legislation to be brought down in this part of the session of Parliament.

The growth of the State in population and its increasing social, cultural, and industrial development have meant an increasing demand for tertiary education, with mounting pressures on the established institutions. This was recognised by the committee appointed in 1966 by the then Premier to report on the future needs of Western Australia in tertiary education, which recommended that a college of the University of Western Australia should be established in the metropolitan area, south of the Swan River, in 1975.

The Senate of that university later recommended that instead of this college a new university should be planned. The then Premier was informed that the Senate had been impressed by the significantly new approach to planning and development which had emerged where a university had been autonomous from the beginning and that its recommendations were based very much on the university's concern that full opportunity should be taken for a fresh approach to the role of the university today and how this role should be performed.

In the light of this recommendation, and having regard also for the decision that the fourth veterinary school in Australia should be established in Western Australia at the new university, the Brand Government, with the support of the then Opposition—the present Government—established in June, 1970, a planning board which was charged to develop plans for a university to be called Murdoch University in honour of the late Sir Walter Murdoch.

Under the Murdoch University Planning Board Act of 1970, the board was given the responsibility to plan for the first phase of development of the Murdoch University and to execute plans approved by the Minister and the Australian Universities Commission for that first phase.

The board was authorised to make appointments to Murdoch University and it was also required to make recommendations to the Minister on the form of legislation required to establish the university.

The stage has now been reached where academic, physical, and financial planning is well advanced and funds have been provided through the State and Commonwealth Governments for the implementation of plans for the university to open in 1975. A number of key appointments have been made and the appointees to foundation chairs are taking up their appointments; so the time is approaching when it will be appropriate for the planning board to be replaced by a body charged with a continuing responsibility for the development and activities of the university itself. The lack of full university status is in fact already creating some problems in relationships with other universities and with bodies such as the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee and the Association of Commonwealth Universities.

The planning board has carried out its obligation to recommend on the form of legislation to establish the university by presenting to me early this year a comprehensive report, on the basis of which the present Bill has been drafted. I must also acknowledge the advice given by the Tertiary Education Commission and the suggestions and representations which I have received from many individuals and bodies interested in the new university.

The most important parts of this Bill are those dealing with the government and organisation of the university. The Bill proposes the establishment at Murdoch University of the two-tier pattern of university government common to Australian universities and, in fact, to most universities in the English-speaking world. This pattern comprises a governing body, to be called the senate, supported by a senior academic body, to be called the academic council, which will be responsible to the senate for academic affairs. The senate