

position purely because of an administrative practice which could be cleared up at the outset.

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

Mr. **RUSHTON**: Clause 35 contains provisions for the appointment by the Minister of any person as an inspector. These provisions need further consideration. An inspector should have some special qualities. As the Bill stands at the present time, the Minister may appoint any person. When the involvement of people, industry, local government, and the whole community is considered, the appointment of inspectorial staff requires special consideration and should be spelt out in greater detail when this Bill is debated in the Committee stage.

Clause 36 gives to an inspector and any person he may think competent the unqualified right to enter any premises. This has a bearing on the question of trade secrets and should be further considered in the Committee stage. It adds up to the fact that many clauses of this Bill need attention. I am touching briefly on only a few of them.

The question of who administers this legislation could possibly be further considered. Local Government has a big part to play, and we could be splitting the responsibility by having the Minister for Health administer the legislation when local government is more involved in it.

The next matter I wish to mention is the gazettal of various areas. Clarification is needed of the industries that will come under the legislation. It is necessary that this be known at the outset so that we have some understanding of what is to take place. The qualifications of the inspector should be designated and we should be told who will be employed in this very responsible task. A declaration should be made of what is and what is not acceptable noise. The Minister will argue that this will be worked out by the professional people, but surely the objectives should be spelt out in the legislation in more detail than they are at the present time.

We will move amendments in regard to the advisory committee. We will see what the Government has to say about them. Obviously, the advisory committee should be orientated more towards the practical. People will be involved in research and there may be considerable changes. We should have a positive approach towards this very important issue. We should think very carefully about the rights of the inspector and what he will be doing. These matters can be sorted out in the Committee stage.

The clause dealing with trade secrets is very weak and indicates that the Government treats this matter rather lightly.

I think the penalty under this clause is \$500. An industry that has a very important trade secret could be at a tremendous disadvantage when one considers the qualifications required of an inspector and what will take place in connection with this legislation. By and large, we need to think very deeply about this issue. Local government has been pressing for this legislation. It will need a great deal of goodwill to get the legislation off the ground. All concerned should have a clear understanding of it; otherwise it will bog down at the very outset.

I hope that the Minister handling this legislation will give consideration to the points I have raised. I also hope he treats the amendments we have on the notice paper with tolerance because our objective is legislation which is acceptable, workable, and of benefit to the community. As I said at the outset, my only intention is to indicate my support for this legislation during the second reading debate. I trust that during the Committee stage the Minister will give every consideration to our amendments.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Harman.

*House adjourned at 12.01 a.m. (Thursday).*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 26th October, 1972

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

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### *Postponement*

**THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE** (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.33 p.m.]: Mr. President, I ask permission to postpone questions on notice and any questions without notice until a later stage of the sitting.

The **PRESIDENT**: Permission is granted.

### BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

#### 1. Reserves (University Lands) Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), read a first time.

#### 2. Gold Buyers Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

# GREYHOUND RACING CONTROL BILL

## Third Reading

**THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS** (South-East—Chief Secretary) [2.36 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. Arthur Griffith made a few remarks in connection with this measure.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sorry, but I am having great difficulty in hearing the Minister.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I wish to assure the Leader of the Opposition pursuant to the remarks he has made on the Bill to control greyhound racing that the legislation will certainly be very strict. I consider it is the best in Australia.

Subsequent to the introduction of the measure into the Parliament it has been looked at by racing people from the other States, and they consider it is the best legislation in Australia. Therefore I believe we need have no fears that greyhound racing will not be well conducted and well controlled.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [2.38 p.m.]: I do not say it in any dramatic sense, but the moment has been reached when this House of Parliament, in any event, must decide whether or not we are to have greyhound racing in Western Australia.

I indicated with reluctance that I would support the legislation. I thought it fair to do this, purely because four or five other measures are consequent on the principal measure. However, I repeat again that I do not give my support with any enthusiasm whatsoever for reasons which I have already explained.

Even at this late hour I find it difficult to determine which way we, as legislators in the Legislative Council, ought to go. Yesterday afternoon I asked the Chief Secretary about venues for greyhound race meetings. He told me, and I accept his word of course, that no proposition in relation to venues had been made to him. I then asked him whether, to his knowledge, any propositions, talks, or negotiations had taken place with anyone else in the Government. I suggested to him that prior to the house being asked to agree to the third reading of the Bill he should make inquiries about venues. However, not a word has he said. All we have is a last minute statement that in the Minister's opinion, and in the opinion of somebody in the Eastern States, this is the best greyhound racing legislation in Australia. I am not in a position to comment on that statement, but I will again take the Minister's word when he says that an examination of the legislation indicates this to be so.

What about my request to the Chief Secretary that Parliament should have some say in the very important matter of race meeting venues for this sport? What of my suggestion that he ask his ministerial colleagues, and other members who may be in a position to help, whether or not any communication has been undertaken on the question of venues? Not a word about that. Does the Chief Secretary forget these questions, or does he deliberately do nothing hoping that we will let the issues slide, either as a result of positive despair or because we think the same as he does? Is it fair that we should be expected to have the same ideas as the Chief Secretary or that we should be expected to let these matters go?

The question of venues for greyhound race meetings is very important to the general public. I realise that under the provisions of the legislation the board has to do all sorts of things in relation to the administration of the sport. However, I know it is the Government's job to find the chairman, and the Chief Secretary has answered my question about this. A chairman, *pro tempore* or otherwise, has not been chosen. A qualified man in the Eastern States has been contacted and it is hoped that he may accept the position if the legislation is passed.

We hear many different rumours about the venues for the sport. People outside Parliament, as I said yesterday, are able to tell me of about six places where the meetings may be held. The Chief Secretary has told us, and we must accept it, that no discussion at all has taken place on the question of venues. No undertaking has been given to any person or organisation. May I take it that every Minister in the Government can say the same thing? I would like to know that, because if this is not so it strikes me again that there appears to be no basis of communication amongst the members of this Government. I hope I am right in assuming that no communication has taken place with any body or organisation in relation to venues, because if there has been communication, somebody is holding out on someone else. I know that one of the things which contributed to the Government of which I was a member losing office was that—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It did not have the right candidates.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would not take any notice of silly remarks like that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is very young, foolish, and inexperienced.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Young, but not foolish and inexperienced.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Only a very inexperienced member would interject in that way. I will let it go and return to the point I was making because I do think it is worth pursuing.

The previous Government was accused of being a secretive Government. Before the election I saw an advertisement in the Press which showed a room shrouded in darkness. One man was sitting at the head of a table and 11 other men were around it. I think this figure is correct because our Cabinet consisted of 12 members. The caption under this drawing said, "Keep it quiet, fellows. Don't tell anybody." What would the honourable member think of that? No comment.

The Hon. J. L. Hunt: "Keep it dark."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry I did not have the right expression. The honourable member must have known more about it than I. Perhaps he was consulted before the advertisement was drafted.

We cannot find out one of the important features of this legislation. Has anyone in the Government talked to any person or organisation about venues? The Chief Secretary says, "Not as far as I am concerned. I know nothing about it." I can take his statement in a number of ways.

The Hon. F. R. White: He said that he did not have the power to say.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Was that his remark? I do not know whether he said that or not.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We did not hear the interjection.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He may have said that he was not in the position to say.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If silence is strength, the strongest man in this place is the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I protest again: It is not good enough. Five months ago, and again yesterday, I indicated to the Chief Secretary that we wished to know something about venues. Am I to understand from his statement yesterday that the Chief Secretary is not in a position to tell us? He says that no negotiations have taken place. Are we to understand that this statement applies to every Minister in the Government? I want to know the answers to these questions. We are entitled to know.

I am prepared to pass this Bill in the knowledge that the board has certain functions to perform. It must license clubs and it must do this and that. However, I still want to know whether any Minister in the Government has had any conversation with any organisation in regard to greyhound racing courses. I asked the

Chief Secretary yesterday to seek the information from his colleagues if he did not know. If he has had insufficient time to ask his colleagues I can understand it. If he wants more time, we can adjourn the debate this afternoon. We are entitled to a more satisfactory answer.

I have been prepared to vote for the legislation in good faith. All members, and certainly the Ministers sitting in the front bench, know that members of the Government have to share confidences and secrets.

They are finding that out now if they did not know it before. I am not prepared to be charged with that responsibility and then be clearly told, "I am not in a position to tell you." I want to know the interpretation of that statement. If the Minister has not asked the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and other Ministers right down the line whether any negotiations have taken place—and we are given the categorical assurance that they have not been asked at this stage—I must take it for granted that no Minister of the Crown has had any negotiations with any outside body concerning a venue for greyhound racing in this State. Unless I am advised to the contrary, that is the point at which I must leave the matter, because I have indicated I am prepared to support the legislation.

As a member of this Chamber, and particularly as the Leader of the Opposition, it is of no use my being told that the Minister is not in a position to give information, because he does not know anything about the position. When I was a Minister in a Government, all the Ministers of that Government took an interest in these matters. We had a discussion concerning them around the table and any matter that was as important as the one we are discussing now, was discussed by all the Ministers.

I do not think it will do any harm for Mr. Stubbs to make a statement one way or the other. I have heard what the Chief Secretary has said to date, and for the fourth time I repeat that I accept that; but it will do no harm for him to say that the situation has now been reached when some negotiation has taken place between a Minister in the Government and one of the organisations interested in establishing a greyhound racing course on its land. The statement could be made, "Yes, basic talks did take place, but no arrangements were made." Let the Minister give us the basic information concerning any negotiations that have taken place. If the Minister feels he cannot do that this afternoon I will be obliged to sit down in my place completely dissatisfied with the conduct of this legislation and the answers that have been given to the questions members of Parliament have asked in this Parliament.

I cannot say, after the statement I made yesterday, that I will not support the Bill. I do not act in that way, but I am entitled to be supplied with some basic information. If the Chief Secretary cannot answer the question that has been put to him, I suggest that he approaches one of his members to move for the adjournment of the debate until he can give an answer, because it is not fair to the members of this Parliament for the Chief Secretary, after having been asked questions as late as yesterday afternoon, completely to disregard the questions—unintentionally or otherwise—and simply state, "This is the best legislation in Australia, and I move that the Bill be now read a third time," because that is exactly what the Minister did. I wish I had the same control over my feelings that the Chief Secretary appears to have.

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Upper West) [2.54 p.m.]: On the fate of the third reading of this Bill rests the fate of the five following Bills which appear on the notice paper. When this measure was before the House some considerable time ago I ventured the opinion that it was predominantly a taxing measure. The statement made by the Premier in one of the daily newspapers only recently confirms my opinion. If any member cares to read that statement he will note that the Premier spoke of the amount of revenue that will be derived from the passing of this measure when dog racing commences in Western Australia. I feel sure he was almost rubbing his hands in glee when thinking of the revenue the Government will receive from dog racing in this State.

If that is not proof of what I said on this Bill during the second reading debate some time ago—that it is predominantly a taxing measure—I do not know what is. We have heard that this is a poor man's sport. That is completely ridiculous. It is not a poor man's sport any longer, although it may have been 50 years ago. It is certainly not considered to be a poor man's sport today in dog-racing circles around Australia. It is said that the holding of greyhound racing meetings in country areas and in isolated places will provide an amenity for the people of the district. Let us look at the suggestion that greyhound racing may be conducted in an isolated area, in which there is only a small number of people. Members should not have the idea that the owners of dogs will not want some remuneration for their efforts and to recoup them for the cost of transporting dogs to the meeting.

No member of this House can tell me that any person can keep a dog for \$7 a week, because it just cannot be done.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans:** Why cannot it?

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** It will cost more than \$7 a week to feed a dog.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans:** Why will it? Tell us!

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** It costs that sum to keep a pet animal today.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans:** Turn it up.

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** It costs more than that a week to keep a pet dog in food.

**The Hon. R. Thompson:** That will be a good argument when you start talking about wages for workers.

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** This is a fact of life.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon:** Quiet! Mr. Dans is trying to make an interjection.

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** I am not worrying about Mr. Dans. Interjections are highly disorderly. As I was saying, these are facts of life. Let any member visit a supermarket and see the volume of dog and cat food that goes through on the trolleys. This proves my point as to the amount of money being spent today to feed dogs and cats and other pet animals.

If an owner desires to keep a greyhound in racing form it would be impossible for him to keep such a dog on \$7 a week if he wants to win races with it. If he does not wish to win races, of course, he can feed it on all the scraps of food around the place; but what is the use of his keeping a greyhound if it is not to win races?

Let us look at the matter in its true perspective. The Leader of the Opposition talks about the number of venues that have been suggested. During my second reading speech I mentioned a number of places, including Perry Lakes Stadium, Canning Showground, the Richmond Raceway, the Belmont Rugby Ground, the W.A.C.A., and one or two others.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans:** Rockingham.

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** I suggested all those places as being likely venues for greyhound racing in Western Australia. The Minister cannot tell me that the various organisations interested in greyhound racing have not already made representations to somebody in the Government with a view to ascertaining which of these places is to be the venue for greyhound racing. Can the Minister get up and tell me that these organisations have not made representations to somebody in the Government; that they have not asked that one or more of these places be made the venue for greyhound racing? Can the Minister say that in all truth?

**The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs:** The Minister does not tell untruths.

**The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** Can the Minister tell me in all truth that no organisation has approached any member of the Government to make representations on its behalf for one of these venues to be selected for greyhound racing meetings?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is asking the Minister to make an observation which at this stage he does not wish to make. I ask the honourable member not to ask the Minister such a question at this time, because he will reply in due course.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think the Minister is entitled to tell the House of the representations that have been made to any member of the Government on behalf of the various organisations. I feel I am entitled to ask that question. From the information I have this has already been done, and we are entitled to ask the Minister to confirm this information. We are also entitled to expect an answer.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What makes you say that you think it has already been done?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He did not say that.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you know it to be a fact or is it a wild statement?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He said he knew.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What about some proof?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister can answer my question when he replies to the third reading debate. I do not know whether Mr. Dans or Mr. Ron Thompson have taken over the ministerial role. They may do in the future but they should hurry because time is running out, and this will be there only opportunity.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: At least they will get an opportunity. I cannot see you people getting it for years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We know your eyesight is not too good!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There is little doubt that we have learnt to retain our sense of humour in this House and, accordingly, I do not worry about interjections such as those that have been made. I learnt very quickly to retain my sense of humour while I was in the Army. I do feel, however, that I am entitled to ask the questions I have, and I want the Minister to tell us that this is not a taxing measure. He can tell us that he disagrees with his Premier; that this legislation will not bring in \$800,000 by way of taxation on greyhound racing. I would like Mr. Stubbs to tell us that he disagrees with his Premier on this matter.

Let him also tell the House what the owners of dogs will do when a race meeting is held in Kununurra. They will surely want to recoup a few bob to compensate them for the cost of training and keeping their dogs. They must get something out of it. The same would apply to the owners and trainers of dogs in Mt. Tom Price. Let

the Minister tell us what will happen to the owners and trainers of dogs in these places, particularly when we know the costs they have incurred in the training of these dogs. Let the Minister also tell us about the economics of the position; because we have not been told anything yet apart from the fact that the Minister has said that this is the best piece of legislation in Australia.

That may very well be true, because the Government has had an opportunity to consider the legislation in relation to greyhound racing throughout Australia and it has been able to select the best from that legislation. That does not mean, however, that it will be the best when the legislation is put into operation, particularly with our limited population.

There is only a certain amount of money available in Western Australia for the use of each section of the community; whether it be used for horse racing, trotting, greyhound racing, a two-up school at Kalgoorlie, a casino at Mandurah, or anything else.

As I have said, there is only a certain amount of money available and no more than that amount can be spent. If greyhound racing or any one of the other betting activities is established in a particular place someone somewhere else must of necessity suffer. The Minister, however, has not told us anything about the ramifications of greyhound racing so far as Western Australia is concerned. I do not think he can tell us, because he has not studied the situation.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: If we did you would not listen.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We will listen to you.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister has not told us a thing about this aspect; all he has said is that he feels sorry for those who have bought dogs. I certainly have no sympathy whatever for the people who have bought these dogs.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: At \$7 a week neither do I.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister has done his best. He has been very honest and told the people concerned that there is no guarantee the legislation will be passed, and in this I agree with him entirely. But why should the Minister feel sorry for the people who have bought their dogs against the good advice which the Minister has given them? I feel no sympathy for them whatever. They have decided to take a calculated risk, as does any gambler, and if they lose as a result of it that is their concern.

I voted against the second reading of the Bill and I also propose to vote against the third reading; apart from which I will call for a division when the question is put.

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (Lower West) [3.06 p.m.]: I rise to speak because I want to defend the Minister in charge of the Bill, as I feel to some extent I am to blame for the situation in which he finds himself. Like other members here, I feel that Mr. Stubbs has the absolute courage of his convictions. He voted for the fluoridation of water supplies in this State and, as a result of this, I have never lost my admiration for him. Unfortunately, however, the Minister has been placed in a situation where at the moment, the Premier of the State would not say "Hello" to him if he could possibly avoid doing so.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member cannot reflect on a person from another place who is not here to defend himself.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON:** I withdraw the remark. It does, however, put Mr. Stubbs in a situation of great difficulty.

I happen to live in a town which lives on rumour. I refer, of course, to Bunbury, in which there are a number of people who are interested in greyhounds and greyhound racing. So much have these people lived on rumour that they asked me to meet them and talk to them, so that I may resolve some of the rumours. I did this, and at that meeting I said I completely believed in the integrity of the Minister in charge of the Bill and in what he was trying to do. That is still my opinion.

It would not be the first Bill, however, that this particular Minister has brought into this House on which he has had matters taken out of his hands and on which, to some extent, he has been overruled.

The town of Bunbury has lived on rumours for five months. I have been told in Bunbury that the Government is determined to get this measure through because, as Mr. Logan also said, it needs the money. I have also been told in Bunbury that greyhound racing venues have been tacitly agreed to, though not by Mr. Stubbs; because his name did not come into the rumour at all.

What I have heard may be only a complete rumour, but one is entitled to have this doubt. The Minister has said that this is the best piece of legislation in Australia, and I think he is right. I think the legislation is very good indeed, but we cannot escape the grave worry that such legislation is, in fact, only as good as the personnel who will be in charge of it.

My leader in this House—The Hon. A. F. Griffith—made some inquiries yesterday and asked whether the Government had made any initial approaches to people who may be in a situation to accept jobs

which will be available to control this particular sport and industry when it begins to function.

Apparently no initial approach has been made. The Bill has run a fair while and mainly because of the enthusiasm of Mr. Withers a number of us have been constrained, for one reason or another, to vote for the measure, and it looks very much as though the Bill will now succeed. I think it would need blind Ned to imagine that it will not have a fair chance of success. Accordingly one would imagine that the Government would have made some approach along the lines to which I have referred.

I do not know the feelings or worries of my leader, but I do know what my own worries are. I have observed the people who have been appointed to boards set up by the State Housing Commission, the Licensing Court, and the Metropolitan Market Trust, where straight-out political appointments have been made. I know that men with the intelligence of the Ministers of this Government would not have accepted some of those appointments unless they were under grave pressure.

I wonder whether the Minister will be in the position where he will be able to ensure that this legislation will, in fact, from an administrative point of view, live up to its expectations: the best to cover greyhound racing in Australia. However, whether or not it is the best legislation will depend on the people who are in charge. Words do not make an act; it is the administration.

Those are some of the worries I have, and that is why I have felt constrained to speak in great seriousness at the third reading stage of this Bill—which I seldom do.

My initial speech on this Bill, at the second reading stage, was a lot of nonsense. It may have amused a few members when I spoke about racing frogs as a prisoner of war. Since then I have seen the townspeople of Grimwade, who have been brought together because of a common interest in greyhounds. I saw the people of that town put on an exhibition of greyhound racing, which Mr. McNeill has already explained. I saw those people take the back wheel off a car and fit a drum to the hub. They attached a rope to the drum so that when the engine of the car was revved the rope wound onto the drum. A piece of rag was attached to the other end of that rope and that is what the greyhounds chased when they raced. The race which I observed was not very long, only over a distance of 180 yards. I understand that greyhound racing will be conducted over a distance of 300 yards. However, the exhibition was very interesting.

would be struck off the register. I would

It will be recalled that Mr. Arthur Griffith was able to gradually get information out of the Government regarding the money which will be involved in this sport. Another worry I have is that the small men will be literally squeezed out of greyhound racing because big money will be involved in the operation. A sum of between \$8,000,000 and \$12,000,000 is expected to be the turnover on the T.A.B., and the take from the clubs is expected to be \$120,000. As I said, a large sum of money will be involved.

I have decided to take the plunge and vote for this legislation because it seems to me it will bring some pleasure to the people who live in small isolated communities in my area. For that reason I have decided to vote for the measure.

As Mr. Logan pointed out, there is no doubt that greyhound racing will be a financial attraction for the Government. I can recall that when I was Minister for Health we had to consider the Grants Commission because we were a claimant State. You, Mr. President, would remember those days, and you will remember what a red letter day it was when the Premier of the State—Mr. David Brand, later Sir David—was able to lift Western Australia out from the influence of the Grants Commission.

In those days we had to constantly watch costs involved in hospital charges in this State. The Grants Commission made no pretence about the fact that the money paid to the New South Wales health services from one-armed bandits to cover hospital costs was regarded as a tax. The Government contribution was paid to the hospitals to ameliorate the costs of health services.

The Grants Commission regarded the one-armed bandits in the State of New South Wales as a taxing measure, and it made no allowance for the fact that the one-armed bandits could be providing pleasure. We did not have one-armed bandits and we had to have a charge in lieu. Part of the charge to people who went into hospital was to compensate for the fact that we did not have one-armed bandits. The measure before us is purely and simply another form of tax, and I think Mr. Logan was 100 per cent. right when he commented on that point.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I am glad it seems that I am right in some things.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I believe that many people living in small towns and small communities will derive some pleasure from greyhound racing. However, some aspects do worry me and I am delighted to see that the Minister is noting my remarks so that he can answer the points I raise.

I have reason to worry—based on past experience—that this legislation may fin-

ish up as not the best in Australia because of the personnel who will be in charge of its administration. I hope the Chief Secretary will have a say in the choice of personnel because I have a great deal of faith in him. I have reason to have that faith.

I hope The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs will be the person to make decisions when men are selected to administer the sport of greyhound racing so that the spirit of the words contained in this Bill will be lived up to. Those men must ensure that the measure is, in fact, the best in Australia and not just an airy fairy false impression that it is the best in Australia. It is known that a poor piece of legislation can work well if it is administered by a good man.

I think the aspect I have mentioned is tremendously important. Despite the misgivings which I have I intend to vote for the legislation, mainly on the basis of my trust in Mr. Stubbs and in my belief that he will be free from any persuasion from outside sources. I believe he will be able to pick men of integrity to administer greyhound racing, and I believe he will bear in mind that a number of members will be voting for this Bill—such as myself and The Hon. W. R. Withers—because of the pleasure it will bring to people who live in the smaller towns throughout Western Australia.

I hope that the people who will be in charge of greyhound racing will ensure that a prerequisite of the people who are to engage in this sport should not be big money and big authority. There should be room for people of limited resources so that they can enjoy the sport of greyhound racing.

**THE HON. J. HEITMAN** (Upper West) [3.18 p.m.]: I am taking this opportunity to say a few words on the Bill mainly because I was in the United Kingdom when it was introduced. I have not had an opportunity to speak until now, but I have received several letters, one of which I will read at a later stage of my speech.

I have been surprised to note that ever since this Government has been in office it has introduced various gambling Bills such as the one now before us. There has also been talk about a casino at Kalgoorlie. Also, housie-housie will be played on licensed premises where it will bring in a certain amount of revenue.

Surely we have sufficient sporting facilities in this country in which people can indulge without ever having to introduce greyhound racing so that people can gamble.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You do not have to go to a racecourse to bet.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I did not say that.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You are saying people will go to greyhound racing so that they can bet.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I am making this speech. I know there are plenty of places where one can place a bet if one wants to. Someone in the corridor would take one on. That is not what I am talking about. I feel there is already plenty of sport in the country without introducing greyhound racing with the idea of enabling people to make money out of it or just go on a betting cruise.

I would like to read a letter I received from a minister of religion in the Nollamara area. He wrote—

I wish to express my concern regarding the proposed greyhound racing legislation.

Having lived in N.S.W. and in Victoria I am amazed that a State Government, that is free from this community problem, should consider its introduction.

Gambling even in its present form is taking an uncalculated toll on our community. In my ministry in the Balga-Nollamara areas I am daily conscious of the wreckage of family and community that gambling leaves in its wake.

No doubt the Department of Community Welfare already is supporting many families because gambling has drawn away their resources.

The lobby has suggested that "greyhound racing is the poor man's racing sport". It is in support of the poor man's family that I plead with you to stand against this legislation in any form. In Victoria and N.S.W. I saw on many occasions the sad sight of men who cared more for their dogs than they did for their families.

I realise that the thought of increased revenue is tempting but this must be balanced against the increased expenditure in community welfare. My experience suggests that the profit and loss account will be in the red.

My experience in N.S.W. and Victoria shows that greyhound racing always leads to cruelty. I have seen too many mauled cats with clipped claws near greyhound training areas. The average owner cannot afford the luxury of a "tin hare" and so trains his dogs with the "real thing".

He asks that I vote against the Bill.

I attended dog racing in Ireland 20 years ago. I met the person in charge of a particular race track and he said, "We have been racing dogs here for a good while. It was a dirty game when we started but we have managed to clean it up a little." I noticed that no-one actually watched the racing. Those in our crowd were about

the only people who went out to the rail and watched the dogs. The other people never left the bookies, and immediately one race was finished they were ready to bet on the next one. If this is what is called a poor man's sport, I would like to know what is not a poor man's sport.

Last year we decided to have a look at greyhound racing in Victoria. We met the secretary of the club, who said, "Greyhound racing was a pretty dirty sort of game when we first started but I think we have one of the best set-ups in Australia at the present time. We seem to have blotted out all the things that made it a dirty proposition and we can honestly say the racing is now cleaner than it used to be."

Mr. Logan was quite right in saying that greyhounds which were fed on table scraps could not win a race. Greyhounds can be played around with if the people who run them are not straight. In Ireland, all dogs had to be in the care of the racing officials for 24 hours before a race to ensure they had the right sort of meals just prior to the race and were not overfed to prevent them from winning. The man in Melbourne told us the same thing. Dogs must be tied up in the kennels for at least 24 hours before a race if clean racing is desired. I suppose all these matters will be dealt with in the regulations. Once the racing control board is set up, the regulations will be promulgated and we will have a chance to look at them at a later date.

I do not think the Minister knows any more than I do about greyhound racing, but he knows, as I do, it is a gambling set-up. After hearing how much will be returned from greyhound racing, I feel sure it will not be a sport. It will be a money-making concern for the Government and for those who are rich enough to get into it. Many people will lose financially by investing in dogs. If this so-called poor man's sport starts in country areas, I wonder what problems will be experienced with dogs that are not looked after and do not receive the best attention and what steps will be taken to ensure they do not eat sheep to bolster their diet, which we are told would cost \$7 a week.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: You can buy a lot of ammunition for \$7. I suppose it will be a case of dog eat dog.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I will not vote for the Bill. There are plenty of other forms of sport without having something that will be a revenue maker for the State and a money spender for those who cannot afford it.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [3.27 p.m.]: Before this Bill passes the third reading stage I think members should give very serious consideration to whether or not they pass it. I would hazard a guess that more provision is made



for gambling on horse racing in Western Australia than in any other State of Australia, leaving out the one-armed bandits—the poker machines—in the other States. Under this Bill it is intended to extend the scope of gambling to greyhound racing.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: You have a vested interest. You have racehorses.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I have not a vested interest. I want to protect the people and the State. The fact that I own racehorses does not in any way alter my attitude to this legislation.

We already have plenty of horseracing—both trotting and galloping—in the metropolitan area and the country areas of Western Australia. We are adding bingo, and the next thing the Government will be introducing is a Bill for the introduction of one-armed bandits or poker machines. Then we will have the whole box and dice. People will go for their lives and gamble on anything they can. I would hate Western Australia to reach that stage.

Many aspects need to be looked at. Mr. Logan referred to the cost of keeping greyhounds. He said it would cost no less than \$7 a week, and members scoffed at him. Does any member really know what it costs to keep a greyhound?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That was their figure. I said it would be more.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr. Logan said it cost over \$7 to keep a family pet.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Mr. MacKinnon said these animals might be fed on kangaroo meat. To my knowledge the greyhound would finish up with plenty of tapeworms if it were fed on raw kangaroo meat. It is common knowledge that if animals are fed on raw kangaroo meat they will get tapeworms.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Dogs will also eat cooked meat.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes. I always feed my dog on cooked meat. He is only a sheep dog. He costs me a considerable sum each week. Added to the cost of feeding, there are many other costs incurred in keeping a dog.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Is that the one that looked like an Alsatian in 1963?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: For instance, if it is necessary to purchase an injection for the dog to keep him in the right condition for racing, the owner will soon find how expensive it is to keep a dog when he goes to a veterinary surgeon or a chemist to purchase the serum. I think some members of this Chamber would be staggered if they knew the cost of veterinary services for horses, and even household pets such as dogs and cats.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: You don't give your horses needles?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Chief Secretary refers to not giving injections to horses. I advise him that here and in every other State injections are given and drugs of every kind are administered to racehorses to keep them in peak condition and to ward off disease. For the information of the Chief Secretary, I would say that every stud horse on a breeding farm should have a tetanus injection each year, and not just one dose, but a double dose. It costs \$5 to \$10 to purchase the necessary needles. Single injections must also be purchased at different times. For example, I had a mare with a foal, and the foal broke its leg. I had to pay \$8.20 for an injection to dry up the mare's milk. Those are examples of what people in the racing game are up against as far as costs are concerned. They spend a tremendous amount of money on drugs.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: What about the problem in reverse?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am talking about drugs which are used to keep animals in a healthy condition and to ward off ailments and disease.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are the drugs produced in Western Australia?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, as far as I know they are imported. I do not think any drug is produced in Western Australia, but even if it were the price would still be the same.

So I think the people who are interested in keeping dogs for racing will find that their costs will escalate sharply. I know that those associated with thoroughbred racehorses and trotters have found that the costs are escalating.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: How much per week does it cost to keep a racehorse?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In the first stages, and with a good trainer, the cost is about \$140 a month. Then, once the horse is raced there are nomination fees, acceptance fees, losing rides—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is outside the range of the average income earner.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, and the same will apply to average wage earners when they commence to race dogs. They will find the expense is beyond their income.

The Hon. J. Dolan: The best trotter we ever had belonged to a working man.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Those people interested in racing dogs will find out just how expensive it is when they get into the game.

The matter of venues for dog racing has been raised by members. Although we have heard plenty of rumours about

venues, we have no positive idea of where they may be. Is it to be decided that existing racing circuits, such as Richmond Raceway in Fremantle, will be used?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Is that approved by Parliament for horseracing?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Did it come before Parliament?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, but we have heard a suggestion that it might be used for dog racing.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: We are talking about Richmond Raceway being approved by Parliament before it was opened as a trotting track.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It was approved by Parliament.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member please address the Chair.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, I apologise, Mr. President. I was referring to venues. If it is decided to situate the venues in areas where no facilities at present exist, greyhound racing organisations will be faced with the problem of raising money to provide a track with all the necessary facilities, including grandstands and many buildings to house not only dogs, but also the public.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That will create employment.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It will create a certain amount of employment in the initial stages, but very little afterwards. How much of that money will have to be borrowed? I cannot see the little people—who members have mentioned as those who will race greyhounds—raising sufficient finance to provide a track. The finance will have to come from a bank or a finance company, and the loan will have to be funded.

I take it that T.A.B. funds will be paid to dog racing clubs on the same basis as they are paid to other clubs at the moment; that is, so much of the money is required to be spent on increasing stakes, and so much is to be used for the provision of facilities. If that is the case greyhound racing clubs will find, as horse racing clubs have found, that they will not have sufficient money to meet their commitments. We have heard of a proposal that some of the money paid to racing clubs at the moment is to be taken away from them. If that move is successful the greyhound racing people will receive even less funds, and they will be in the same position as country racing and trotting clubs; that is, they will be unable to meet their commitments.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: If that is the case, the trotting people would welcome the greyhound racing people to share their facilities.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Who said trotting facilities will be used for dog racing?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not know what share the honourable member is talking about because at the moment there is nothing to share.

Many factors should be considered before the legislation is passed. The Chief Secretary said that I have a vested interest. Perhaps I have, but I am not thinking of that; I am thinking of the people of Western Australia and of all the families who will suffer hardship, as was mentioned in the letter read out by Mr. Heitman. Although greyhound owners may gain a small amount of pleasure from the sport, I can assure them they will receive more disappointments than pleasure once the industry gets into full swing. I could not agree more with Mr. Arthur Griffith that this game will fall into the hands of the big boys. The big boys will take out the money; not the man with two or three greyhounds in his backyard.

A further aspect is that the neighbours of people who own greyhounds will have to put up with the barking or baying of the dogs. I admit they have to put up with dogs barking as it is. I do not know whether a greyhound barks or bays.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Greyhounds do not bark.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Do they bay?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Yes.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Well, there is not much difference. I think I would prefer to hear barking, because I am accustomed to hearing dogs bark.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I would rather hear a dog bark than listen to some of the tripe I have heard in this place today.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Well, when I conclude the Chief Secretary can speak all the tripe he likes. I will leave it at that. I suggest to the House that more consideration should be given to the matter before the Bill is read a third time.

**THE HON. R. THOMPSON** (South Metropolitan) [3.40 p.m.]: The honourable member who has just resumed his seat made the comment that he was expressing concern on behalf of the people of Western Australia at the prospect of the introduction of greyhound racing. Likewise I express concern for the people of the State because I feel they are entitled to fall into line with the rest of the people of Australia.

Greyhound racing has been introduced in the other States, and probably at the time of introduction doubts were expressed in a similar manner. However, we have not seen State Parliaments attempting to abolish greyhound racing, firstly, because they must be satisfied with the way the sport

is conducted and, secondly, they must be satisfied with the revenue received by the Government.

It is quite fallacious to say that when greyhound racing was first mooted various bodies were set up, without any encouragement from the previous Government or this Government, in the hope of controlling that sport. Those bodies were set up, and to that extent they succeeded. We will probably know within half an hour whether or not greyhound racing is to be introduced in this State.

The argument has very largely centred around the venues for the conduct of greyhound racing. Initially three organisations were interested in conducting the sport, but now the number is down to two although I might be wrong in saying that. I have been approached by two of these organisations. I attempted to find out from the Chief Secretary, to whom I spoke personally, whether any venues had been selected. At the time he told me that no legislation had been passed, let alone a decision made on the venues.

When the Bill was drafted I spoke to him again and asked whether any particular group had been given the right to conduct greyhound racing in Western Australia. It is a reflection on the integrity of the Chief Secretary for members to examine and cross-examine him, and for them to claim that he should give some indication to the House as to where greyhound racing is to be conducted. The Chief Secretary has refrained from making any comment in this respect. Invariably his answer to any such query has been that he did not know, and the decision would be made by the control board when it was set up.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We should bear in mind that he had been asked whether any persons had approached him.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I shall deal with that, because I have a folder of Press cuttings before me. In *The West Australian* of the 14th August, 1971, appeared a report under the heading of, "Western Australian Cricket Association Will Welcome Dogs." Evidently that was when the National Coursing Association was making some overtures through Mr. Oliver Drake-Brockman. The report pointed out that as the W.A.C.A. was in debt to the tune of \$400,000 it would welcome greyhound racing being conducted on its ground.

This type of report appeared quite frequently not only in the newspapers and magazines of Western Australia, but also in those of the Eastern States.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you should take it for granted that we can all read.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There were also reports which suggested that the Canning Showgrounds had been selected by the Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association as its venue.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That might be a good choice.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I do not know. Since horseracing has been introduced into Western Australia I do not think any Government has tried to make a determination that a race track shall be set up at Wyndham, Bunbury, or some other centre.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you suggesting that any member of this House has made such a proposal?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No. Some members were trying to extract information from the Chief Secretary, but he was not in a position to give it for the simple reason that the provision in clause 6 sets up the greyhound racing control board, and clause 18 provides that the board may—

(a) register or refuse to register, and renew or refuse to renew the registration of,—

- (i) any greyhound;
- (ii) any lease agreement or training agreement relating to a greyhound;
- (iii) any owner, trainer or lessee;
- (iv) any greyhound racing club or greyhound trial track;
- (v) any other prescribed person or thing associated or connected with greyhound racing;

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Has any Minister been approached or pressurised to select any particular venue?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is not the responsibility of the Chief Secretary to do that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am as aware of that as you are.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It will be seen from clause 21 that the board will decide the courses on which greyhound racing will be conducted. The Chief Secretary has no power in this matter, for the simple reason that the control board will decide on the venues.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: To be strictly accurate the control board will advise the Minister.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is subject to the Minister. The Chief Secretary has expressed this view, and I accept his word. In the second reading debate he said, "The moment the control board is established I will be opting out."

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think he did say that, although I was not fully in favour of it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Chief Secretary said he would hand over to the control board. From my personal observations and from my understanding of his comments I believe that to be the factual position.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He cannot opt out.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Any matter might become the subject of dispute. If the control board did something wrong I agree the Minister would have a responsibility.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He cannot opt out.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Clause 21 states—

(1) No race meeting shall be held on any race course unless the race course is one licensed by the Board under this Parliament.

What is the use of anybody making representations?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: All Mr. Griffith asked was whether that had been done.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Some people have asked me, and I suppose they have asked him.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They have not asked me.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There are rival groups vying for the position. Before this legislation was introduced each of these organisations—in the meantime some of them have merged—looked upon itself as the most appropriate body to conduct the sport in Western Australia.

*Sitting suspended from 3.48 to 4.04 p.m.*

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Prior to the afternoon tea suspension I was making the point that various groups have interested themselves in selecting sites where they considered greyhound racing would be conducted in the hope that they would boost their own position by having control of the sport. However, in view of the legislation they have acted under a misapprehension. The control board will be the body responsible for control over every facet of greyhound racing in Western Australia.

I have heard no objection by any organisation, nor have I read of any in the Press, since these people have had an opportunity to study the legislation. Consequently it appears that greyhound racing will get off to a smooth start.

I want to conclude on another point. It has been stated this afternoon that the sport will be taken over by the big boys. I do not know what importance can be placed on that statement. Because I worked with some of them on the water-

front, I know that many of the prominent people in sport had humble beginnings. Despite this they have become prominent trainers, owners, and drivers. I could mention Jim Schrader, one of the most successful trotting trainers in Western Australia, and Bill Dillon who is probably our ace racehorse trainer. They were little people who commenced in a very humble way, but because of their skill and expertise they have reached their present position.

If the same situation applies in greyhound racing, what could be wrong with that? If a person shows initiative and skill and is prepared to spend the necessary time on the sport, this will react to the benefit of the sport itself. The public will know that the racing animals have been well prepared and they will therefore have a reasonable opportunity to obtain a return for any money they might invest.

On the other hand if individuals with no skill or knowledge are involved the public will be the losers. I am not advocating that these people should get big or get out. I do not want members to think that for one moment. The situation is that when the sport commences everyone will have an equal opportunity of success.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The crux of the matter is the number of venues to be established. How many are there in Tasmania, for instance?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I cannot say. I have attended greyhound racing only once and that was in Adelaide when I was accompanied by Mr. Williams.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How many tracks are there in South Australia?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: One that I know of. Mr. Williams may know if there are any more.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Two.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I know there is at least one because I attended it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This would indicate that there will be big tracks and not several small ones.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Let me hasten to add that when we attended the South Australian track it had been in operation for only 10 or 12 months and the progress made on the track was very good, although in comparison with our racing and trotting facilities those at the greyhound racing track would be regarded as rather poor. However, as I said, the track was new and it did not have much grass anywhere. It was situated some 40 miles from Adelaide, not right in the heart of the city.

Plenty of ready-made venues in our metropolitan area could be used if the control board so desired. I will now add

my personal plug. I would like greyhound racing to be conducted on the Fremantle Oval because I think it would give—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I have news for you. Your plug went over the Minister's head like cold water.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I know, because he has no say in this regard.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Did you ask Mal Atwell about that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He is interested in football in which players come and go. Greyhound racing will stay with us for a long time. I support the measure. I think enough has been said by me.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And by everyone else, too.

THE HON. F. R. WHITE (West) [4.10 p.m.]: I wish to reaffirm what I said during the second reading debate; that I am opposed to the Bill. I find it interesting to hear people referring to this sport as being one for the working man or poor man. So often we hear the little man is having a battle to pay his bills, and his family is suffering. The more gambling we allow the more encouragement we give to the worker to lose his money and the more his family will suffer.

Many people in contact with those who are less affluent will know of the number of children who go hungry. I can give instances of children who go to school without any breakfast or cut lunch and during their lunch break they must either steal someone else's lunch or search the rubbish bins for scraps.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is the fault of the parents, not the system.

The Hon. F. R. WHITE: It is all right for affluent people who have three meals a day and money in their pockets to say, "Go on. Let them gamble a little more." When I oppose this Bill I am thinking of the unfortunate innocent children who, if this Bill were passed, would have to go a little more hungry than they are at present.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think you should go the whole hog and ban racing and trotting too.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [4.11 p.m.]: I did not intend to speak again on this measure because my views have not changed since I last spoke. Greyhound racing is a wonderful sport, as I said in my initial speech. I have had experience with it since I was a lad. In conjunction with my parents I have owned and trained these dogs.

I rise to answer Mr. White. I am one of those poor children who has grown to adulthood. I came from a working man's family and I must confess that on some occasions we ate the same food as the

greyhounds, but that was only when they had grilled fish, which was very nice. The dogs enjoyed it too!

I hope the majority of members in this House will vote for the measure because greyhound racing is a wonderful sport. It brings enjoyment not only to adults, but also to children; it provides a family pet which is a fine breed of animal; and in addition it will bring revenue to the State. Once again, I support the measure.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East—Chief Secretary) [4.12 p.m.]: All that can be said about this Bill has been said and any further speeches would be merely reiteration.

In answer to Mr. MacKinnon, would he be satisfied if I appointed a gentleman acceptable to the Opposition parties as well as to our party, who has been in a very high office in this State, and who is not connected with the Public Service?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would be perfectly happy if I knew he was a man you chose.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: That is what I intend. I am not making any statement until the Bill is proclaimed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You know what I meant when I referred to a man you might choose?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I will be choosing him.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Don't let anyone put anything over you.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The man in question is of the highest integrity and was well thought of by the previous Government. He is one of the men I have in mind. Rumours have indicated that he would be a public servant, but that is not correct.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I know the man you mean.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I can assure members he will not be a public servant.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Let me assure you that if I thought you had chosen him without any outside pressure brought to bear on you I would be happy.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I have heard as many rumours as other members have about the possible venues. We could say that we have heard that such venues will be at places between Wyndham and Esperance and Kalgoorlie and Rottne, and they have been freely mentioned by many people. I can assure members that they have been talking through their hats because the venues will not be known until the control board is established, because the selection of venues will be its job. That answers that.

I want to stress that this matter has been discussed many times in our Cabinet.

I say right now that there are 12 men in Cabinet and I can assure this House that not one of those 12 men has made any commitments. Members of the Cabinet have not made any deals. As recently as afternoon tea I saw some of my ministerial colleagues and I have the authority to make this statement. There have been no deals made whatsoever.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is the answer we wanted.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: This is the situation, despite this talk about deals which has gone on for days and days.

Mr. Heltman mentioned cruelty to animals. The Government has brought in the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment Bill for the precise reason of stopping anything of this nature. Again, this has been done as a result of the research undertaken in other States and the criticisms expressed by people who said that cats and little dogs would be savaged. The legislation will overcome this.

The purpose of the Dog Act Amendment Bill is to allow for the control of dogs when they are being trained or walked. The local authority will be responsible for saying in what part of the municipality the dogs will be allowed. We can leave it to local government to police these provisions.

Can members imagine anyone paying \$200 or \$300 for a dog—in addition to a cost of \$7 a week for food—and allowing it to make a nuisance of itself by barking all around the neighbourhood? If I were to invest that amount of money in a dog I would look after it better than that.

Mr. Baxter talked about competition with racing. Trotting and racing in the other States live in harmony with dog racing. I think it would be extremely peculiar if the same situation were not to apply in Western Australia.

This is as much as I intend to say. These will be my last words on this subject: I give the assurance that no deals have been made by any member of Cabinet.

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

#### Ayes—19

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. V. J. FERRY	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. L. Hunt	(Teller)

#### Noes—9

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. J. Heltman
Hon. S. T. J. Thompson	(Teller)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

## PERTH REGIONAL RAILWAY BILL

### Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendment No. 1 made by the Council and had agreed to amendment No. 2 subject to a further amendment.

### BILLS (4): THIRD READING

1. Totalisator Duty Act Amendment Bill.

2. Totalisator Regulation Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), and passed.

3. Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment Bill.

4. Dog Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Assembly.

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### POTATO MARKETING

##### Amending Legislation

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

Adverting to my question of Tuesday, the 15th of August, 1972, it was advised in reply that it was hoped to introduce amendments to the Marketing of Potatoes Act, 1946-1966 as soon as possible. In view of the late stage of the present session of Parliament, is it still the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this year?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied: The honourable member was good enough to give me notice of his intention to ask this question. I am now in a position to advise—

It is intended to introduce amendments to the Marketing of Potatoes Act 1946-1966 as soon as practicable next year.

### QUESTIONS (2): ON NOTICE

#### ROADS

##### Denmark State Forest: Construction

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

(1) In regard to the construction of the new section of road through State Forest 42 (Giants Block) from the locality known as the Valley of the Giants to the South Coast Highway in the Shire of Denmark, is it correct that an original realignment survey for the new road to replace the old road

- (which contained narrow and sharply cornered sections) was cleared of timber and other vegetation before being discarded in favour of another new survey alignment?
- (2) Is it correct that the route of the first realignment survey joined the South Coast Highway at a dangerous curve with double white lines?
  - (3) Apart from clearing operations, was any road construction work undertaken before the route was condemned?
  - (4) Prior to any work commencing was the planning for the new road submitted to—
    - (a) the Shire of Denmark;
    - (b) the Main Roads Department;
    - (c) the Forests Department;
    - (d) the Tourist Development Authority;
    - (e) the Environmental Protection Authority; or
    - (f) any other body?
  - (5) If so, what was the reaction of each body?
  - (6) Who authorised the project?
  - (7) How was the work financed?
  - (8) On whose authority was the first realignment route abandoned?
  - (9) Has the new road on the second realignment survey been completed to an approved standard?
  - (10) What was the cost of work associated with the first realignment?
  - (11) What is the estimated or actual cost of work associated with the second realignment?
  - (12) In view of the apparently extensive and unnecessary desecration of timber and bush land in the area of this widely publicised tourist attraction, would it be considered prudent to appropriately notify tourists of the temporary loss of the Valley of the Giants until the area has been re-established?
  - (13) Having regard to the tourist value of our unique forest country, and the need to protect the natural environment, will the Government give an assurance that future road works will be undertaken only after responsible and proper assessment?
- The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:
- (1) The assumption is only partly correct. The first realigned road is 3.1 miles in length and extends westwards from the original road. The last half mile of this road was abandoned because of a potential traffic hazard at its junction with South Coast Highway.
  - (2) No. The first realignment joined South Coast Highway not on a curve but on a crest marked with double white lines because of restricted sight distance.
  - (3) Yes. The road was rough formed, drained and graded but not gravelled.
  - (4) (a) Discussions took place with the Denmark Shire Council regarding the proposed realignment.  
 (b) Yes.  
 (c) Yes.  
 (d) No.  
 (e) The Environmental Protection Authority was not constituted at the time of this roadway planning.  
 (f) No.
  - (5) (a) Denmark Shire Council—no objection.  
 (b) The Main Roads Department favoured the proposal subject to an adjustment of the alignment at its junction with South Coast Highway.  
 (c) The Forests Department favoured the proposal.
  - (6) The Main Roads Department in agreement with the Forests Department.
  - (7) A Main Roads Department grant to the Forests Department for expenditure by that Department on the Valley of the Giants Road.
  - (8) Only half a mile of the first realignment route was abandoned. This action took place at the instigation of the Main Roads Department.
  - (9) The second alignment has been cleared to an approved standard; further works including forming, draining and gravelling are programmed for 1972-73.
  - (10) The total cost associated with the first realignment was \$11,400 of which it is estimated that \$1,065 was spent on the section subsequently abandoned.
  - (11) The expenditure for the 1.25 miles of the second alignment is as follows—  
 Cost for 1971-72—\$611.  
 Proposed expenditure for 1972-73—\$5,650.
  - (12) Yes. The Tourist Bureau has in fact been notified that roading is in progress in the area. It should be noted that in addition to this, road signs have been erected notifying NO ENTRY to the abandoned section of the road.
  - (13) Yes. It might be noted that these roads are in a State Forest and the work was carried out by the Forests Department.

## 2. FAUNA CONSERVATION

*Operation "Noah": Ord Dam*

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON, to the Leader of the House:

Further to my question regarding Operation "Noah" on the 25th October, 1972—

- (1) As it was stated in answer to question (3) that "the major part of the rescue work ... is yet to be done", and yet in answer to (4) it is stated that the Department of Fisheries and Fauna has no allotment to continue this work, is it anticipated that the Treasury will allocate the money required?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "No", is it intended to abandon the project?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The Department is making a further approach to the Treasury for a specific allocation of funds.
- (2) Answered by (1).

# **PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER ACT**

## *Rules: Assembly's Resolution*

Message from the Assembly requesting concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

1. These rules may be cited as the Parliamentary Commissioner's Rules, 1972.
2. In these rules, the term "the Act" means the Parliamentary Commissioner Act, 1971.
3. The Parliamentary Commissioner may from time to time, in the public interest or in the interest of any department, authority, organization, or person, publish reports relating generally to the exercise of his functions under the Act, or with the prior approval of the Parliamentary Committee, relating to any particular case or cases investigated by him, whether or not the matters to be dealt with in any such report have been the subject of a report laid before either House of Parliament.
4. (1) The Parliamentary Committee shall consist of the person from time to time holding the following offices—

in the Legislative Council—  
The President,  
The Chairman of Committees,  
The Deputy Chairmen of Committees,

in the Legislative Assembly—  
The Speaker,  
The Chairman of Committees,  
The Deputy Chairmen of Committees.

- (2) At any meeting of the Parliamentary Committee five members shall constitute a quorum.

## *Motion to Concur*

**THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE** (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.30 p.m.]: I move—

That this House concurs with the resolution contained in Message No. 106 from the Legislative Assembly relating to the making of Rules pursuant to Section 12 of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act, 1971.

It is within the power of Parliament to make rules for the guidance of the Parliamentary Commissioner in accordance with the indication which was given at the time the Bill was before the House; namely, that it was the intention that the Parliamentary Commissioner would operate within rules of Parliament to be prepared in due course.

The rules now before the House have received the approbation of the Legislative Assembly and are brought to this Chamber for the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

The Parliamentary Commissioner Act, 1971, contains stringent provisions requiring the Parliamentary Commissioner and his staff not to divulge any information received by him or them under the Act. Section 8 (1) requires the Commissioner to take an oath to that effect, and section 23 provides—

- (a) Information obtained by the Commissioner or his officers in the course of, and for the purpose of, an investigation under this Act, shall not be disclosed except—
  - (i) for the purposes of the investigation and of any report or recommendations to be made thereon under this Act.
- (b) Any person who discloses information contrary to the provisions of this section is guilty of an offence.

Without this safeguard the Parliamentary Commissioner would not be able to obtain the information necessary to conduct a full investigation.

However, it must be borne in mind that these provisions bind the Parliamentary Commissioner and his officers, but they do not necessarily bind complainants who may divulge to the news media any information on the matter of a complaint—with the possible exception of information supplied to them by the Commissioner.



The situation could then arise that a complainant could give an unbalanced or inaccurate account of a matter to the news media, and the Parliamentary Commissioner would be powerless to protect either himself or the body which was the subject of the investigation from such inaccurate publicity.

Thus the Parliamentary Commissioner would be precluded by the provisions of the Act from presenting to the news media an accurate account of what had occurred. The only power he would have would be to table a report in Parliament, but the delay in doing this, more particularly if Parliament was not sitting, would make this course ineffective.

In New Zealand this situation was recognised and Rules of Parliament were gazetted, the power conferred being exercised when occasion demands. The rules are in similar terms to those originally presented to the Legislative Assembly.

An amendment made in the Legislative Assembly requires, however, that the prior approval of the Parliamentary Committee relating to any particular case or cases investigated by the Parliamentary Commissioner will be required before publication of reports takes place.

The Legislative Assembly has nominated the members of both Houses who will hold office on the Parliamentary Committee. In the Legislative Council they are the President, the Chairman of Committees, and the Deputy Chairmen of Committees. In the Legislative Assembly they are the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, and the Deputy Chairmen of Committees, and at any meeting five members shall constitute a quorum.

The Parliamentary Commissioner's prime duty is to report to Parliament, and it is not the purpose of these rules to alter that position. The powers given by these rules will be used only in exceptional circumstances, but will provide a useful safeguard in the public interest. The concurrence of this House is desired by the Legislative Assembly.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Leader of the Opposition).

## **INDUSTRIAL LANDS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.34 p.m.]: I can support this Bill in a few words. The Minister explained during his second reading speech that this legislation provides for the reconstruction of the Department of Development and Decentralisation. It also provides that the secretary of the board will become a member of the board. It is not necessarily an advantage to have the executive officer as a member of the board. However, I see no real

reason to object to the proposal. It has been explained that the secretary of the board has knowledge of facts which could assist the board in its deliberations and decisions. I am prepared to accept that statement, and accordingly, I support the Bill.

**THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE** (North East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.36 p.m.]: I rise to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support. I have noted his comments. I am sure that the appointment is in order and that the powers of the position will not be misused in any way.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee, etc.*

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

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), and passed.

## **LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *In Committee*

Resumed from the 25th October. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. R. F. Cloughton) in the Chair; The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Postponed clause 13: Section 33 repealed and re-enacted—

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Mr. Dans had an amendment on the notice paper, but I would like to move an amendment which is not on the notice paper. I have just discovered a discrepancy in the clause and I would like to draw it to the attention of the Committee.

Subclause (1) of clause 13 provides—

Where a packet licence is granted for a vessel not ordinarily engaged in the business of carrying passengers occupying accommodation in the vessel overnight or for an aircraft, the licence authorises the master or captain of the vessel or aircraft to sell and supply liquor, on the vessel or aircraft,—

And paragraph (c) reads as follows:—

in the case of such a vessel, if the licensee obtains a permit by virtue of subsection (3) of this section, during the hours and on the day and to the persons specified in the permit,

Subsection (4) of the Act deals with the permit, and not subsection (3) as mentioned in the Bill. Accordingly, I move an amendment—

Page 8, line 28—Delete the subsection designation “(3)” and substitute the subsection designation “(4)”.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I will accept the amendment. The honourable member is probably correct. This paragraph can be looked at further if necessary.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. R. F. Claughton): It could be left and altered in another place.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The Bill will have to be reprinted, and it is better to correct it now.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I move an amendment—

Page 9, line 1—Insert after the word “means” the following—

“the period between the hours of nine in the morning and midnight on a weekday; nine in the morning and eight in the evening on a Sunday and”.

I will not weary the house with a lengthy explanation of this amendment. The people who operate the ships to Rottnest Island are generally satisfied with the provisions contained in the Bill. However, it is felt that it would be better to define the hours.

The hours as stated in my amendment would apply to those vessels that hold a packet license in that area, with the added provision that a special occasion permit could be obtained.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Those hours would pertain to one particular license only?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you think that is fair?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not think it is unfair. I do not think it will interfere with normal trading of hotels, because many ships on the run to Rottnest Island would not sell one glass of beer. However, I will leave the decision on the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I do not agree with the amendment, for the reason that the Bill and the Act do not deal only with packets. They deal also with aircraft. Another point is that it is not dealing only with existing schedules for aircraft and packets; it will also deal with schedules that are not yet in operation. It would be a great mistake to take the jurisdiction away from the court. I do not think we should set any specified hours. That is the duty of the court in the case of packets and aircraft, and possibly in the case of packets and aircraft that are not yet operating.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Mr. Willmott practically took the words out of my mouth because his views are similar to mine. The court should be left to decide the hours. I suppose it is a question of

policy. There could be specific cases where drinking could take place outside the hours specified and the court would have jurisdiction to prescribe what those hours should be according to the circumstances. It should be borne in mind that this license can only be granted when the vessel is in motion. I do not think there is any injustice being done in the way the Act is being administered at present, and I would prefer to see the clause in the Bill remain as it is.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Generally, I do not speak on Bills dealing with this subject.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why break a good habit?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Because I am unhappy with the measure. This will confer certain benefits on persons who board these vessels. The moment they leave Barrack Street jetty they will be permitted to sell liquor from 9.00 a.m. until midnight, and they can do the same on Sunday. If any person wants to have a good Sunday's binge he can board a vessel at 9.00 a.m., and after it has left the wharf he is able to have 11 hours of drinking. In hotels liquor can be consumed for only four hours on a Sunday. Therefore, I cannot see why those people who board vessels should enjoy the benefits of these extra hours.

Amendment put and negatived.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not desire to proceed with the other amendment I have on the notice paper.

Postponed clause, as amended, put and passed.

New clause 8—

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I move—

Page 5—Add after clause 7 the following new clause to stand as clause 8:—

Section 23A added.

Special provisions where New Year's Eve falls on Sunday.

8. The principal Act is amended by adding after section 23 the following section—

23A. (1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, where—

- (a) the thirty-first day of December in a year falls on a Sunday; and
- (b) the holder of a hotel licence, a tavern licence, a limited hotel licence, a winehouse licence, a restaurant licence or a club licence is authorised, apart from this section, to sell and supply liquor during a continuous period of hours which commences after noon on that day and ends prior to midnight on that day,

the licensee is authorised by virtue of this section to sell and supply liquor from the expiration of that period of hours on that day until half-past twelve in the morning of the following day, if he has not later than the fifteenth day of December in that year given notice in writing to the clerk and the Commissioner of Police that he intends to sell and supply liquor under the authority of this section.

(2) Nothing in subsection (1) of this section authorises—

- (a) the holder of any licence to sell and supply liquor other than in accordance with the same terms, conditions, restrictions and limitations as are ordinarily applicable under this Act to the sale and supply of liquor by him on Sundays;
- (b) the sale and supply of liquor for consumption off the licensed premises.

This new clause has resulted from what was discussed in a previous Committee. The Australian Hotels Association raised the question with the Licensing Court and the deficiency in the Bill was recognised. The Licensing Court agreed that a difficulty did exist, and this new clause is the result.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This applies to when New Year's Eve falls on a Sunday?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Yes. Representations have been made to the Government by licensees of hotels and restaurants that the present provisions of the Liquor Act will prevent them from properly catering for the needs of the public on New Year's Eve, which in this year falls on a Sunday.

The relevant provisions of the Liquor Act in fact only enable such licensees to sell and supply liquor in two sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, none of which in the case of hotels, taverns or winehouses extends beyond 7 p.m.

Similarly licensed restaurants, limited hotels and clubs in their dining rooms can sell and supply liquor with, or ancillary to, meals not later than 10.00 p.m.

The Government agrees that there is a special case when New Year's Eve falls on a Sunday for persons to be able to take their entertainment in licensed premises until the time honoured hour of midnight and accordingly the proposed new clause will permit such licensees to sell and supply liquor until 12.30 in the morning of the

1st January on any occasion, when, like this year, the 31st December falls on a Sunday.

It is not proposed, however, to permit any licensee to sell liquor for consumption off the premises during the extended hours which the clause will provide.

Licensees who wish to take advantage of the provision will be required to notify both the court and the Commissioner of Police not less than fifteen days prior to the day in question.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I thoroughly agree with the proposed new clause. It is something that is needed, and representations have been made to me concerning it. I also agree with that part that limits the supply of liquor for consumption on the premises only. That is fair enough.

New clause put and passed.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I move—

Page 10—Add after clause 17 the following new clause to stand as clause 18:—

Section 39A added.

Special licence for West Australian Wine Festival.

18. The principal Act is amended by adding after section 39 the following section—

39A. (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act but subject to this section, a licence may be granted by the Court once in every calendar year to the West Australian Wine Festival Association Inc. authorising—

- (a) the Association; and
- (b) such vignerons and other persons associated with, or participating in, the wine festival conducted by the Association, as the Court thinks fit and endorses on any licence so granted,

to sell and supply wine and brandy in any quantity during a period not exceeding three days, for consumption on such premises as are specified in the licence, or in sealed containers for consumption off such premises, subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Court.

(2) A licence granted under this section shall be in the form approved by the Court for the purpose, and shall authorise the Association and the other persons whose names are endorsed thereon to sell and supply wine and brandy in accordance with

the provisions of the licence and the conditions imposed by the Court notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and notwithstanding that one of the days in respect of which the licence is granted may be a Sunday.

(3) Any application made by the Association for the grant of a licence under this section shall be in a form approved by the Court, and where an application is made in such a form, the Court may, if it thinks fit, grant the licence, but the provisions of Part IV of this Act, except insofar as the Court requires those provisions to be complied with, do not apply to or in relation to the making of the application for, consideration or granting of such a licence.

(4) A fee of five dollars is payable for any licence granted under this section, and no other fee is payable under this Act in respect of such a licence.

By way of explanation, I advise the Committee that the organisers of the Western Australian wine festival to be held during March, 1973, requested consideration to be given to an amendment of the Act which would allow wine growers to exhibit and sell their wares from stalls and booths at the festival in and around Caversham.

Similar type festivals are held in the Barossa Valley, South Australia, and at Rutherglen in Victoria. In each case specific provisions are included in the Liquor Control Acts of those States to enable the sale of liquor during the period of the festivals.

The matter was submitted to the Licensing Court which, after giving consideration to the request, recommended the amendment which is now on the notice paper.

This amendment was submitted to Cabinet and has its approval, and I have been asked to move it in this Chamber at this stage of the Committee's deliberations.

I am advised that the reason this amendment is before the Committee is that the Bill had passed in another place before the amendment had been agreed to by Cabinet.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: The Leader of the House has fully explained the new clause and I have no objection to it.

New clause put and passed.

Title—

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Mr. Arthur Griffith raised the question of the meaning of light refreshments. The term "light refreshments" is not used in the Liquor Act though I daresay it can be said to be anything which is not a heavy meal.

In regard to the type of light refreshments required to be available in cabarets, the Court requires applicants to supply a menu for consideration. Such menu must consist of three or four finger meals.

The holder of a winehouse license is only able to supply function permittees with wine and brandy which are the types of liquor authorised for sale by winehouse licensees. A function permit holder may, however, purchase requirements from more than one licensee for the purpose.

I would like to give members a menu which could perhaps constitute light refreshments. It is as follows:—

1. Chicken in Basket with Salad, whole chicken or half. \$2.00 and \$1.00.
2. Toasted Sandwiches, Ham, Cheese, Tomato 40c per round
3. Chickenburgers ..... 50c  
Hamburgers ..... 50c  
Cheeseburgers ..... 60c  
Steakburgers ..... 80c
4. Hot Pies and Pasties with Sauce ..... 30c
5. Coffee, Black or White ..... 20c

I have another menu which is perhaps a little more expensive. It is as follows:—

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| Chicken in Basket  |        |
| ½ Chicken surrounded with crisp salads and cheeses                     | \$1.20 |
| Cheese Board Selection of Australian and Continental cheeses ..... 60c |        |
| Tasty Cocktail Pasties, Cocktail Pies, per doz.                        | 50c    |
| Coffee   | 25c    |
| Tea  | 25c    |

This matter so interested me that I got in touch with the airways which provide meals of this nature and I asked the type of light refreshments they would serve on an aircraft. Qantas advised me that light refreshments varied throughout the world; that it depended on the custom of the particular country. I could get nothing specific from Qantas except that it supplied tea or coffee and sandwiches, or something similar.

I then asked T.A.A. if it could define light refreshments and I received the following information:—

- (a) Short trips: Tea or coffee with biscuits.
- (b) Longer trips: Tea or coffee with four points of sandwiches and possibly biscuits.

I think it would be dangerous to try to define light refreshments.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It could be anything except a knife and fork job.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The menu you read out is substantial.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: It is quite a big meal. I also gave an undertaking that I would make further inquiries into clause 27 (2b). I think Mr. Ferry had moved an amendment which he later withdrew after I had given him an explanation. I was specifically asked whether it had any relation to bingo. There is nothing in that clause to permit clubs to conduct bingo. Representations were made to the effect that many clubs, such as bowling clubs, are granted permits to conduct small lotteries. It was considered that it would be a serious situation if it were possible for them to dispose of those tickets in this type of lottery.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I thank the Minister for his comments. I raised another query on which I sought information and this dealt with section 111 of the Act which relates to the rationalisation of licenses. I would like to have some expression of current thinking in this matter, bearing in mind that there are a number of points throughout the State where there are a good number of licensees in certain areas who will be competing for the custom.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I think Mr. Ferry outlined the difficulties of licensees in localities where the population has declined for one reason or another. He proposed that a compensation fund should be provided to help in the re-establishment of such businesses elsewhere. I am advised that the question of a compensation fund was exhaustively examined by the committee appointed to inquire into the licensing laws of Western Australia and it was considered that the present provisions of division 111 of the Act contained adequate means whereby licensees could transfer from one district to another where conditions may be better and where their trading enterprises will not be subject to loss by a shift of population. Licensees are thus provided with the advantage of being able to transfer to an area protected from undue competition.

Mr. Logan cited the disabilities of the Geraldton Yacht Club and said that despite the fact that it had its own premises the club is required to obtain a provisional license to sell liquor if the club holds a function; and it is necessary for it to purchase liquor from a hotel. It is not possible to legislate for individual cases. At first glance the approach seems reasonable on the case as it was made out, but to cover this aspect it would be necessary to amend the Act. I do not propose to do so in this Bill but I will suggest to the Licensing

Court that it have a look at possible amendments which may be included in this type of legislation in the future.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

*House adjourned at 5.11 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 26th October, 1972

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

### **IRON ORE (McCAMEY'S MONSTER) AGREEMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Graham (Minister for Development and Decentralisation), and read a first time.

### **COAL MINE WORKERS (PENSIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

MR. MAY (Clontarf—Minister for Mines) [11.05 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

It has become evident that the following amendments are necessary to the Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act, 1943-1971, namely:—

1. Section 2—An amendment to cover the definition of "consultants" employed in the industry.
2. Section 9—Child Allowance—
  - (a) to make the child allowance a trustee payment to the parent or guardian; and
  - (b) to extend the payment of child allowance, at the Coal Mine Workers Tribunal's discretion, in order that the child may be assisted in obtaining a higher education.

For these reasons this Bill is brought before the House, and to give members a clearer understanding of the intentions of the proposed legislation, I make the following explanations.