

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 22 September 1981

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

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION FUND

Trustee: Resignation of Member for Collie

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I have received the following letter dated 21 September—

The Speaker,
The Hon. Ian D. Thompson
Parliament House
PERTH 6000

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I hereby tender my resignation as the Parliamentary Labor Party Trustee on the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund.

It is with deep regret that I have to take this action as I have been a Trustee for many years.

The events within the State Parliamentary Labor Party of last Friday clearly demonstrate that I do not have the confidence of the majority of my Parliamentary colleagues and as a consequence, I have no alternative but to submit my resignation.

Yours sincerely,
Tom Jones.
MEMBER FOR COLLIE.

OFFICES OF PROFIT SELECT COMMITTEE AND PRINTING COMMITTEE

Member for Swan: Resignation

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I have also received the following letter, dated 22 September—

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly,
Parliament House,
PERTH. W.A. 6000

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I wish to inform you that it is not my desire to continue to represent the Australian Labor Party on:

(a) The Joint Select Committee inquiring into the offices of profit; and

(b) The Printing Committee.

I, therefore, resign from those Committees.

Yours faithfully,
J. E. SKIDMORE, M.L.A.,
MEMBER FOR SWAN

PARLIAMENTARY LABOR PARTY: CHANGES

Personal Explanation

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [4.33 p.m.]: I seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and members for the courtesy you have extended to me to make a brief personal explanation.

It will be obvious to all members of the Chamber that there have been some changes on this side of the House. I take this opportunity to assure the Government and the public of this State that if an enthusiastic and competent Opposition is an essential part of the democratic process, the members who sit on this side of the Chamber will play their part in the months to come.

I wish also to say publicly and to place on record my great appreciation of the effort of the former Leader of the Opposition during the months he led this very proud party.

To the members who sit behind me and with me, I simply say this: If we stand united, the moral thrust of the position we occupy will repel any political philosophy that is placed before us.

I thank members for their courtesy.

MEMBER FOR SWAN

Resignation from ALP: Personal Explanation

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [4.35 p.m.]: I seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Mr SKIDMORE: The change of leadership in the State Parliamentary Labor Party has caused me great concern. The manner in which the successful pair, the member for Balcatta (Mr Brian Burke) and the member for Ascot (Mr Mal Bryce) went about the removal of their leader, the member for Victoria Park (Mr Ron Davies), in my opinion left much to be desired. Their actions reek of insincerity and disloyalty, not only to the Australian Labor Party, but also to its constitutionally elected leader at that time. I have no time for such people who use these despicable tactics for the furtherance of their own selfish interests.

Further, the State Parliamentary Labor Party clearly ignored its own rules by failing to carry out the requirements of rule No. 19. When I raised this point at the Caucus meeting the chairperson admitted that I was technically correct in my point of order, but that she would rule against me and allow the meeting to proceed. This was a flagrant disregard of the State Parliamentary Labor Party's rules.

Further, I believe that under the leadership of the member for Victoria Park the Australian Labor Party was making steady electorate gains and there were no good or valid reasons that he should have been deposed. The ambitious opportunism of the successful pair, the member for Balcatta and the member for Ascot, was against the interests of the Australian Labor Party as a whole.

Mr Speaker, because of these factors, simply stated by myself, I find that I no longer wish to remain a member of a party that condones such actions.

Mr Pearce: You will be no loss.

Mr Harman: And you are no gain, either.

Mr SKIDMORE: If persons seek to get loyalty, they should show that they are prepared to give loyalty. I have given my loyalty to date to the Australian Labor Party, but my conscience and principles do not allow me to give that loyalty to the new State Parliamentary Labor Party leadership. I wish to advise the House, therefore, that I resigned from the Australian Labor Party this afternoon and wish to be recognised in this place as an Independent Labor member.

Mr Grill: You are a rotten little scab!

Mr T. H. Jones: You ought to talk!

EDUCATION: FUNDING

Petition

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.38 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

TO:

The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament Assembled.

We the undersigned, citizens of Western Australia, wish to protest against the severe cuts in education spending presently being implemented by the State Government in areas of Primary, Secondary and Technical Education.

We appeal to the Government of this resource-rich state to continue to invest such moneys as are necessary to maintain at least the current level of spending. Preserving the quality of education for the members of the younger generation of this community should be the Government's first priority.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition is signed by 321 people and I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 96.)

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Redistribution: Notice of Motion

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [4.39 p.m.]: I give notice that, at the next sitting of the House, I will move—

That in the opinion of this House:

1. The proposals for redistribution of electorates as gazetted the 28th August demonstrate the fundamental corruption of the electoral system and the inability of the Electoral Commissioners to ensure a fair distribution while restrained as they are by the gerrymander provisions of the Electoral Districts Act.
2. The responsibility for reform resting solely with the Government, the Government should immediately amend the Electoral Districts Act so as to end the scandalous manipulation of voters' rights which now exists and to provide a fair and democratic system based on votes of equal value for all citizens.

Points of Order

Mr CLARKO: Mr Speaker, I ask you to examine the Notice of Motion which has just been put before the House with a view to determining whether it is appropriate to have the word "corruption" used in the way it is in the motion.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: On the same point of order, my research indicates that precedent clearly shows that if the word "corruption" refers to a person or persons it has previously been held to be out of order. If it has been the case that the word "corruption" has been used in connection

with a system, it has not been held to be disorderly.

The SPEAKER: I will give consideration to the points of order raised and will give my ruling later in this day's sitting.

Mr HASSELL: Mr Speaker, in considering that matter I ask you also to consider whether the terms of the first part of the Notice of Motion—I do not have a copy in front of me and I had no notice of it—are such that the implication of the resolution proposed reflects upon the integrity of the electoral commissioners—

Mr Bryce: Rubbish! You are making a fool of yourself.

Mr HASSELL: —the Chief Justice, the Chief Electoral Commissioner, and the Surveyor General.

Mr Bryce: Quite the contrary.

Mr HASSELL: If it be that that is so, you might consider it in terms of its being in order or not.

Mr Bryce: They are honourable men.

The SPEAKER: I give the undertaking to the House that I will consider the point raised by the Chief Secretary.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Reports

MR WATT (Albany) [4.42 p.m.]: I present the 17th report of the Public Accounts Committee and move—

That the report be received.

Question put and passed.

MR WATT (Albany) [4.43 p.m.]: I move—

That the report be printed.

Question put and passed.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 17 September.

MR I. F. TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie) [4.45 p.m.]: I wish to make some comment on this Bill. As I represent an electorate which has approximately 28 hotels and taverns, nine licensed stores, 16 licensed clubs, and a number of licensed restaurants, I feel I am well qualified to participate in the debate.

The liquor industry itself comprises small businessmen who employ a large number of people in the labour force of Western Australia. I believe the hotel industry alone employs up to 8 000 people throughout the State and has an

investment of about \$450 million. The hotel industry has been facing some difficulty over the past few years, difficulties that to some extent can be blamed not only on the industry itself, but also on the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has put a great deal of pressure on the hotel industry by way of an excessive excise tax. This has forced up to excessive levels the price of alcohol used in all alcoholic beverages. As a result the industry has found itself with a great many problems.

Another problem facing the hotel industry, and one which may be related to something which it can fix, is that the industry is no longer associated with the family. It seems the hotel industry may wish to cater for families, but families have moved away from the industry. I can remember many years ago when on a Sunday in Kalgoorlie my father would play cricket and after the match our family and all the other families involved would retire to a local hotel beer garden. The parents would have a drink and the kids would play a game of cricket; but beer gardens are things of the past. The hotel industry should look at itself and decide to cater for families as well as for single people and also for those people who are not interested in taking their families along for a drink.

The Bill before us to some extent will assist the hotel industry, and the Opposition approves of that assistance. At the same time some of the assistance could be seen to be at the expense of licensed stores. We have had strong representations from the Licensed Stores Association in relation to the trading of packaged liquor on Sundays. It does not seem unreasonable to us that the licensed stores should be given the opportunity to trade in packaged liquor on Sundays at the same time as hotels. It would make for more competition.

The licensed stores also are facing difficulties with trading from Coles and Woolworths supermarkets which underprice some of the liquor they sell. They are able to carry those prices by the very fact they are able to add to the markup on other goods sold throughout their stores. It seems to be unfair competition on their part; nevertheless, it is a difficult form of competition to prevent.

There are parts of the Bill with which the Opposition disagrees. One such part deals with occasional permits. The hotel industry in particular cannot see the need for five days' advance notice to be given rather than the present 48 hours for these occasional permits. It may be necessary the first time the hotel or tavern applies

for an occasional permit for it to give five days' notice so that the premises can be checked out to ensure they are suitable; but in the situation where repetitive permits are required it does not seem necessary for five days' notice to be given. On many occasions it would be almost impossible for that sort of notice to be given.

Another portion of the Bill which does surprise the Opposition relates to the statement by the Chief Secretary that the Government and its supporters—I did not realise the Government had too many supporters—have decided there should be no amendment to the Lotteries Control Act in relation to the playing of bingo on licensed club premises. We believe it is necessary for the future of these licensed clubs, and in particular many sporting clubs throughout the State, that bingo be allowed to be played on licensed premises. I understand the member for Fremantle will be further addressing himself to this matter at some later stage.

The member for Welshpool raised a subject with respect to reception lodge licenses. We believe that if necessary these lodges should be allowed to trade later than eight o'clock on Sundays.

It is a pity that people attending a Sunday wedding—a large number of weddings these days take place on Sundays—should be required to complete their festivities at 8.00 p.m. Room seems to exist for a provision to allow the festivities to continue after 8.00 p.m. by enabling the holder of the licence to claim additional hours past 8.00 p.m.

Another provision of the legislation which gives quite a deal of concern to the Opposition is that which relates to an increase in the minimum membership fee club members will be required to pay. The minimum at present is \$2, and it will be increased to \$20. I am surprised that some Government members have not objected strongly to this provision because the increase will be 1 000 per cent. This provision indicates the lack of flexibility and interest shown by the Government in regard to clubs which have as their members pensioners, juniors, and associates. The Government wishes to penalise everyone for the sins of a few. The committee which considered this provision obviously did not take into account the situation which exists in a large number of clubs. Many members of clubs pay a lot less than \$20 for their membership. I know that the workers' club at Boulder, the Mines and City Workers' Club, requires its members to pay an annual subscription of only \$10; and the workers' club at Norseman imposes a similar fee. Many clubs are in the same situation, and they have

been able to survive on those fees. The proposed provision does not seem to be necessary. The Opposition has proposed an amendment to make the minimum fee \$5, although as the matter is further considered that figure may be altered.

The points I have made indicate the provisions of the legislation to which the Opposition objects. Many others will receive the Opposition's support, but it does not seem necessary to take up the time of the House to indicate them. It is better for us to refer to the ones of which we do not approve in the hope that the Government will take some action to remedy the situation.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [4.52 p.m.]: This legislation reminds me of a previous occasion when similar amending legislation came before the House. At that time the debate ensued along non-party lines and went on for many hours.

I will deal with particular provisions in the legislation. Spirits such as whisky, brandy, and rum are referred to in the second reading speech. It is said that the National Health and Medical Research Council is endeavouring to set standards in regard to the permissible strength of these spirits. It is necessary to have standardisation, and hopefully it will be recommended that the permissible strength of these spirits be decreased because of the problems which they cause to people who indulge in them to excess. If the council recommends a reduction I am sure it will be welcomed and accepted by many people, particularly country people.

The general trend of the legislation seems to support a relaxation of trading hours which will make alcohol more freely available. We are all aware of the tremendous problems associated with the excessive use of alcoholic beverages, not only in this State, but also in the others and in many parts of the world. I am not entirely satisfied that the trend in this legislation is in the right direction.

I understand that in some countries liquor outlets are open almost 24 hours a day. However, in those countries certain regulations restrict the use of alcoholic beverages a little more than we restrict their use. In some countries the age at which a person can indulge in alcoholic beverages is not as low as 18 years, as is the case in Australia. Young people are not capable of handling liquor, but because of the lowering of the age at which people can drink liquor, more young folk do so. The statistics show that the use of alcoholic beverages has a great effect upon the incidence of road accidents generally, and road accidents causing fatalities. We know that in the

majority of road accidents the use of liquor has been a contributing factor.

If we are to allow alcoholic beverages to be more freely available we ought to consider other ways of controlling access to those beverages by the younger generation in the hope of decreasing the devastation on our roads. It has been suggested that if we allow liquor to be more freely available we should consider increasing the legal age for alcoholic consumption to what it was before, or an age close to that. In that way alcoholic beverages would not be as easily accessible to young people.

The misuse of alcohol is one of the great problems in Australia—one of the great problems in many countries. It causes problems not only on our roads, but also to family life, hospitals, etc. I am one of the people fully in favour of not making alcoholic beverages more accessible to people on Sundays and, in fact, on other days, when those people want to imbibe so much.

The Air Force Association Western Australian Division (Inc.) is restricted by the federal constitution of the Air Force Association, and therefore a provision has been included in this legislation so that the Western Australian division will be able to obtain a club licence. It will be able to trade in the way it desires, and I believe that is an acceptable proposition to most members of this House who are aware of the association's situation.

Vignerons who satisfy the Licensing Court that their premises are suitable, and that sufficient demand exists, will be entitled to sell bottled wine on Sundays for consumption on and off their premises, which will make it far easier for people to buy and consume wine. That situation will not in any way foster the health of those people, but will increase the carnage on our roads. This provision will not reduce consumption of alcoholic beverages which have a devastating effect upon people inclined to drink them too freely.

The provisions relating to an increase from \$2 to \$20 in the minimum annual membership required to be paid by members of licensed clubs was mentioned by the previous speaker, and has been referred to me by several members of clubs in my electorate. They have voiced the opinion that the minimum amount of \$20 is too high. The provision will apply to all members of licensed clubs, including associate members. The club members who approached me asked whether consideration could be given to lowering the amount. A proposed amendment on the notice paper states a figure of \$5; and I will be most interested to hear the Minister's comments in

regard to that because \$5 seems to me to be a more appropriate amount.

I am not very excited about the easing of the restrictions on the availability of liquor and would prefer the restrictions to remain as they are.

MR PARKER (Fremantle) [5.01 p.m.]: Last week the member for Welshpool spoke at some length, and very comprehensively, about this legislation and indicated those parts on which the Opposition has formed an attitude and, in general terms, indicated that the opposition would support this legislation to the second reading stage, but that some amendments would be made during the Committee stage. There are already some amendments on the notice paper.

There are some aspects of the Bill on which we have made a party decision and there are other aspects which will be free for individual members to deal with as they see fit.

I wish to detail a few matters which were of concern to me when the committee of inquiry report was first released. I have in my electorate probably more licensed clubs and licensed premises per square mile than has any other area of the State. There are some 20 licensed clubs situated in my electorate and a number of other forms of licensed premises such as hotels and taverns. This is hardly surprising when we consider the strength of the community in Fremantle and the number of organisations which exist there. I believe it is a sign of a very vigorous community because many of those clubs are not used principally for licensed purposes, but for other social purposes such as sport, recreation, etc.

I circulated a copy of the committee of inquiry report to all those people I thought would be interested in this legislation and held a meeting with some 17 representatives of licensed clubs to discuss with them various proposals which were mentioned in the report.

It is fair to say that probably all members have received voluminous correspondence from various organisations which are concerned with and involved in this area, including the Association of Licensed Clubs. In general terms, the clubs were somewhat dissatisfied with the report as it was brought down by the committee of inquiry.

As the member for Welshpool said last week, it would have been more appropriate had the views of the representatives of the licensed clubs, the AHA, and licensed store owners been received. They would have been better satisfied if the Government had agreed to the request of the Opposition that there be a committee of inquiry into the Liquor Act similar to the Adams Royal

Commission which brought down the proposals which resulted in the 1970 Liquor Act, rather than the somewhat secretive way in which the Government went about this change to the Act on this occasion.

Of course, what the member for Welshpool meant was that the report contained the views of those people who are involved in the enforcing and policing of the Act rather than an overview of the community as a whole and what would be beneficial to the community and to the liquor industry.

Whilst I do not agree with a number of the comments made by the member for Mt. Marshall, it is certainly true that there are sections of the community which are very disaffected with the changes proposed.

One aspect of the report that the representatives of the clubs were very keen about was the suggestion that the Government should pursue the question of allowing bingo to be held on their premises. The members of this House who have clubs within their electorates, particularly sporting clubs, will recognise the fact that many of those clubs are in a dire financial position. In a submission to the inquiry one organisation suggested the reason for this was financial mismanagement. I would dispute that strongly and say that in the case of sporting clubs particularly, one of the direct reasons for financial problems is the need to keep or attract footballers to Western Australia. Very often clubs have to keep their players from going to Victoria, or have to bring them back from Victoria.

In many instances clubs have to go to private sponsors in order to ensure that they are able to keep the best of their footballers, or to attract other footballers to their clubs. They often have to pay transfer fees for footballers.

In my electorate we have two clubs in that situation—the South Fremantle Football Club and the East Fremantle Football Club. The South Fremantle Football Club is in severe financial straits. The suggestion was put to me that the clubs be able to allow bingo to be played on their premises because it would be an additional source of revenue for them.

In South Australia where this is possible, I understand the Norwood Football Club makes \$100 000 a year from bingo being played on its premises. When we consider the way in which football club premises are utilised during the week, except for training nights and other functions, we realise there would be more than ample opportunity for the premises to be used for the playing of bingo.

The member for Welshpool said that the Government was adopting a double standard on this matter. He said it had a policy of toleration and containment rather than a policy of stating a fair and straight law and then allowing it to be properly implemented. It is unfortunate that the Government has chosen this line with respect to the question of licensed premises as well as the areas of prostitution and gambling. It is not interested in having decent laws properly enforced.

As a result, we have seen the proliferation of beer ticket machines and whilst they make some money, they are not likely to compensate for the revenue loss as a result of our not allowing bingo to be played on licensed premises.

The member for Welshpool was strongly opposed to that and we in the Opposition have considered whether we ought to be moving an amendment to make it possible. Of course, the position is that whilst there may need to be an amendment to the Liquor Act, the principal amendment would have to be moved to the Lotteries (Control) Act.

When the Lotteries (Control) Act amendment of 1972 was introduced by the Tonkin Labor Government, it originally allowed for the playing of bingo without restrictions, provided a licence was issued. However, the Legislative Council inserted a clause which said it was not to be played in any place which was licensed under the Liquor Act of 1970.

The committee of inquiry was very clear in its view and recommended strongly that bingo be allowed to be played on licensed premises which were clubs—in other words, clubs which held a licence by virtue of the fact that they were clubs—but not hotels or other forms of licensed premises where it was not permissible to play bingo. That position was advanced strongly by the committee of inquiry and was supported by the Association of Licensed Clubs.

I have had discussions with a considerable number of representatives of those licensed clubs and as a result, at an appropriate time, I intend to introduce a private member's Bill to seek to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act to allow that aspect of the inquiry's recommendation to be effected.

I imagine there are members on the other side of the House who are as concerned in this matter as I am. When the Minister replies, I shall be interested to ascertain whether the same situation applies with Government members as it does with this Bill; that is, whether the voting will be on non-party lines when I propose amendments to

the Lotteries (Control) Act, bearing in mind it will not be an amendment to the Liquor Act.

Mr Hassell: Is this Bill dealt with on non-party lines?

Mr PARKER: The Labor Party as a whole has decided on certain aspects and for the rest the members will be free to state their own position.

Mr Hassell: Having bound your members to certain aspects of the matter, it is a bit much to ask me to tell you that we will have a free vote on something you are interested in.

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: The Chief Secretary said that this Bill would be dealt with on a non-party basis. That is an interesting comment for him to make because in the first place, the Liberal Party propaganda says that its members are always free to vote as they wish. One has to admire the honesty of the Chief Secretary when he announced this Bill.

Mr Stephens: That is unless they have preselection.

Mr PARKER: The member for Subiaco, or Wembley whichever it may be, might be interested in that aspect of it. The Minister was at least honest in indicating implicitly that members are normally not free to vote as they wish. The exercise in Subiaco is testimony to that.

Mr Hassell: Testimony to the opposite, as you well know!

Mr PARKER: The Chief Secretary announced, of his own volition, that his members are free to vote on non-party lines with regard to this Bill—and presumably he will not change that announcement as a result of the statements made by the member for Welshpool last week—so it is logical for him to make the same announcement regarding Lotteries (Control) Act amendments which might flow from this Bill, because after all, that will be similar legislation.

I believe it would be opportune for the Minister, in reply, to put the Government's position forward on that particular piece of proposed legislation.

The licensed clubs would be very well served if bingo were allowed to be played on their premises. I suggest that members who have association with clubs in their electorates—particularly sporting clubs which may be close to being bankrupt, such as was the case with the Subiaco Football Club—should discuss with club representatives whether they wish to hold bingo nights on their premises.

I feel this is one of the ways in which the clubs can survive; otherwise they may have to turn

themselves over to sponsors as is the case with some American baseball clubs and British soccer clubs.

The serving of liquor at these clubs is at best a marginal proposition because the sale of liquor is no longer one of the profitable aspects of the clubs. It is just a service—one of many services offered by clubs to attract members. It is just one of the many profit-making exercises they use—particularly league football clubs—in order to pay for sportsmen, which is perhaps an unfortunate turn of events. Nevertheless, the cost is often exorbitant, and there is nothing we can do about it. I suggest members of this House would be well advised to take cognizance of the views of the clubs within their electorates on this matter.

The second aspect of the legislation is the question of a minimum membership fee for clubs. The Government told us that the reason for the amendment to the membership fee from a minimum of \$2 a year to a minimum of \$20 is that some clubs have used this provision to admit, as the committee of inquiry put it, "disco" members. I am not exactly sure what a "disco" member is, but it appears to be a person who virtually becomes a member of a club for a night to gain admission to a disco or similar function. If that is happening, it appears to me that it is abuse of the current provisions of the Act, and not something for which all clubs ought to be penalised.

A great number of clubs, quite legitimately, have membership fees which are much less than \$20 a year. These clubs admit members on a legitimate basis, and they do not abuse the system in the way the committee of inquiry—and presumably the Government—has suggested.

In my own electorate the Fremantle Workers' Social and Leisure Club charges a membership fee of \$4 a year. If the House agrees to the amendment of the member for Warren which appears on the notice paper, even that membership fee would rise to \$5. I am sure that would not be too great an imposition on the members of that club. However, as the member for Kalgoorlie has pointed out, an increase in fees from \$2 a year to \$20 is a 1 000 per cent increase and it seems to me there is no justification for it at all.

Mr Blaikie: How many members would the Fremantle Workers' Social and Leisure Club have?

Mr PARKER: I do not know the precise figure, but it has 300 or 400 members. It may be slightly more than that.

Mr Blaikie: I would be very interested to find that out. I am rather sympathetic to your argument.

Mr PARKER: In due course I will let the member for Vasse know the precise membership. I understand that the Boulder workers' club has a membership fee which is less than \$20—I understand it is \$10 a year. Many other clubs charge similar fees.

Neither does the Government's proposed amendment make allowance for clubs which charge higher fees, but which have differential fees at a lower rate for people such as pensioners. The Government has suggested an amendment which would allow honorary life members who currently pay the minimum fee of \$2 a year to be exempted from paying the \$20 a year. In fact, they would not need to pay any fee at all. However, clubs will not necessarily want to make all the people currently paying less than the general fee honorary life members. In many cases the title of "honorary life member" is conferred on members of a club for service to that club. If the Government's amendment is carried, the clubs would be forced into the position of charging such people as pensioners, unemployed youth, and junior members, a minimum fee of \$20 a year, unless it declares these people to be honorary life members. That would be an extraordinary situation. At least the current position gives clubs a discretion in regard to the fees they charge, as long as the minimum is \$2 a year. Of course the discretion will still exist, but the minimum fee will be \$20 a year.

As I mentioned, the Chief Secretary will say that clubs can make such people honorary life members and, if the Government's amendment is accepted, they will not have to pay a fee at all. Such a course would, however, leave out a great many other people who may have difficulty in paying an annual fee of \$20. There may well be the problem to which the committee of inquiry referred, but surely that problem ought to be dealt with in another way and the penalty ought not to be applied to other clubs which have not abused the Act.

I am aware that the wording of the Liquor Act and other statutory provisions which apply to licensed clubs make it difficult for these clubs to determine the precise proportion of the overall fee to be charged which can be held to be a fee for the purposes of the Liquor Act. Such a club is the University of Western Australia Student Social Club which operates a licensed club which is popularly known as the university tavern. Once one is a member of the Guild of Undergraduates of UWA, one normally becomes a member of that

club. I think the Guild of Undergraduates of UWA charges an annual fee of approximately \$80 or \$90; and of that fee, \$2 is for membership to the social club tavern for people who opt to join it. If this particular provision is passed, the Guild of Undergraduates of UWA will have to impose a surcharge of \$20 on its overall fees for membership of the social club, or alternatively, it will have to find some other way to operate this club. I do not think the members of that institution would be very happy if this particular provision means the closing down of the guild tavern. I suggest that Government members ought to give serious consideration to this aspect before adopting this particular provision in the Bill. I hope Government members will consider passing the member for Warren's proposed amendment which appears on the notice paper and which would increase the minimum fee from \$2 to \$5 a year.

I wish to deal with the various petty restrictions which the Government seeks to impose for no apparent reason. For example, the Association of Licensed Clubs requested that on certain nights licensed clubs be eligible to trade until 2.00 a.m. The present position is that licensed clubs may trade until midnight only. As the Association of Licensed Clubs pointed out, for no apparent reason the committee of inquiry suggested that the eligibility for trading should be extended to 1.00 a.m., but not to 2.00 a.m. as requested. It may be that the Government was trying to act like Solomon by going halfway towards meeting this request. However, there seems to be no valid reason for the decision.

The Australian Hotels Association and the restaurant owners have complained about certain aspects of the Bill. I suggest that a number of petty restrictions will still remain after the passage of the legislation. These restrictions do not assist in any way in public or community control over the sale of liquor. The only effect they have is to make life more difficult for various people operating in this industry, such as the licensed store owners, members of the AHA—the hoteliers themselves and members of the restaurant division—and the licensed club owners.

I must admit that when I considered these submissions, I had a particular leaning towards the views of the licensed clubs. In most cases licensed clubs are community organisations and they are operated by people who stand to gain nothing whatever from them. Many of these people work for very long hours to advance some community, sporting, or recreational interest for themselves, their family, or their community. Their views ought to receive serious consideration.

This is not to say that I believe the views of other organisations should not be considered seriously also.

In my own electorate I have received telephone calls from the AHA—the hotels and restaurant division—complaining about the operation of some licensed clubs which allegedly have infringed upon the provisions of the existing Liquor Act and which are taking trade away from members of the AHA. When I discussed these complaints subsequently with members of the Liquor and Gaming Branch of the Police Force, I received great co-operation in ensuring that such situations do not continue. So I am not unaware of the views of many private operators in the industry about what they see as unfair competition from the licensed clubs.

It is important for us to consider seriously the situation of the licensed clubs. First of all, people involved in liquor activities at clubs are likely to be much more responsible than people in some other situations. I say that because members of licensed clubs drink with their friends, their peers, and people with interests similar to their own.

We have quite a few ethnic clubs now, such as the Fremantle Italian Club. People drinking in such clubs are likely to be much more restrained than are the drinkers in the public bar of some of the reasonably rough hotels around the metropolitan area. We should give serious consideration to the views of the members of these clubs who are not in the industry for themselves, but who are in it because they represent communities of interest, either ethnic, local, or sporting.

This legislation has a number of very good features, and we intend to support its second reading. I do not agree with the views expressed by the member for Mt. Marshall that the eligible drinking age should be raised from 18 years to something closer to 21 years. I venture to suggest it would be a very brave Government indeed that adopted such a suggestion. I cannot believe this Government or this Parliament would agree with it. However, such a matter is of particular concern while there is ready availability of liquor in the community.

I suppose one could say that liquor will now be more available than it has been in the past, but it is my view that the proposed extensions to trading in liquor are very sensible ones. Certainly it seems sensible to extend Sunday trading in liquor. However, the Government does not seem to have made any commensurate commitment to deal with the undoubted problem of alcoholism in the community. In this regard I agree with

(121)

temperance organisations and similar bodies which are concerned with the way the liquor problem is dealt with in the community. I agree that the treatment of alcoholism is not a part of this legislation, but in general terms the Government has not adopted a positive approach to this aspect. Were it to do so, there would be far fewer problems with the operation of the Liquor Act and with the operation of premises licensed under the Act, and far fewer complaints from people in the community about the easing of restrictions under the Act.

I am disappointed personally that licensed clubs will not be permitted extended trading hours on Sundays. Originally licensed clubs were the only licensed organisations allowed to trade on Sundays, then amendments were introduced to the Act, and hotels and taverns were permitted to operate in a similar way. The licensed clubs felt that their advantage had been taken away from them and that they would lose their fair share of the market. I am not as concerned about that complaint as about the view put forward quite cogently by the licensed clubs that if they were permitted to trade from, say, 11.00 a.m. until 8.00 p.m. on a Sunday, they would be able to provide a better service to sportsmen belonging to sporting clubs. As members know, sporting activities finish at different times on Sundays, and people engaged in these sports may not be able to avail themselves of a drink at their club at the conclusion of a game. There are already severe restrictions as to who may and who may not drink at licensed clubs, and it seems to be rather petty to restrict them in this way. Even if the hours were extended for sporting organisations only, the clubs would be happier.

I agree with my colleague, the member for Kalgoorlie, who referred to the vexed question of whether liquor stores ought to be able to trade on Sundays. On the one hand, one can understand the argument put forward by the liquor stores that they are being discriminated against unfairly because their competitors in packaged liquor sales will be able to sell liquor on an unrestricted basis on Sundays. On the other hand, the Opposition generally and the Government—according to the remarks of the Minister for Labour and Industry a week or two ago—are opposed to a general extension of trading hours in retail operations. Although the Retail Traders Association is one of the organisations which is upset that the liquor stores will not be able to trade on Sundays, it has also been the most vigorous in its opposition to any general extension of trading hours. It seems to me there is a lack of logic there. I understand the concern of these operators about their share of

the market, but I do not think the inroads into their trade will be as severe as they believe.

I do not think people will take to buying large quantities of liquor on Sundays. As liquor sales will not now be restricted to beer only, I believe people will take the opportunity to purchase a bottle of wine to have with their lunch. However, as the member for Welshpool said last Thursday, most people will not purchase large quantities of liquor on Sundays.

With those comments, and with the reservations I have expressed, I indicate the Opposition supports the second reading of the Bill.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [5.29 p.m.]: I would like to make a few comments about the proposed amendments to the Liquor Act. In regard to Sunday trading, I notice that the committee of inquiry, having considered the matter, decided not to change the hours. I assume that the committee was against the proposal to extend the hours. For my part, I am pleased that the hours of Sunday trading will not be extended because, in my view, Sunday is a special day. That view is shared by many people.

The committee must have taken some notice of that fact. It must have followed the long traditions in this State. The hours of trading for hotels and the like have always been fewer on Sundays than on other days of the week.

However, I notice with concern that this Bill includes the proposition that the limit of two bottles of beer on Sundays be abolished, and that there may be unlimited sales of packaged beer, wine, and spirits. I am opposed to that because it will lead to an increase in drinking, and that will lead to a lowering of the level of safety on our roads on Sundays. As I understand it, the number of accidents on the roads on Sundays is lower than on the rest of the weekend, and that must be related, in part, to this restriction.

I was not a member of the Parliament when the two-bottle limit was introduced. If I had been here, I would have voted against it. I accept the argument that once two bottles of beer are permitted, one should be able to purchase a bottle of wine. However, I will not embark on that philosopher's slippery slope.

Some years ago we extended the hours of trading on Sundays. I believe that the hours today are adequate. There can be no powerful argument for people being given an opportunity to purchase unlimited quantities of beer, wine, and spirits on Sundays. A large number of people in our community have no problems with this law,

because if they wish to drink packaged liquor on a Sunday, they purchase it beforehand.

In addition, I do not support the proposition that, because the hotels will be given an unlimited opportunity to sell packaged beer, wine, and spirits on Sundays, in turn we should approve the opening of liquor stores in order that they might compete with the hotels. To be consistent, I oppose both those arguments.

I am not one of the people who favour greatly the extension of the working week into Sunday. In the same way, I believe that there are special aspects in regard to drinking on Sundays in public places. We should not turn the Australian working week into one in which we have most of our community working on Sunday. Sunday is a wonderful opportunity for people to mix with their families in their own homes or the homes of their friends. I am not opposed to their drinking on Sundays; but it is preferable that they do it in the company of their friends and their families. That is advantageous to them and the whole of society.

I do not accept for one minute that we should abolish the two-bottle limit because it is difficult or impossible to police. If one held to that view, one would immediately—

Mr Davies: Abolish prostitution!

Mr CLARKO: —abolish the requirement for people to drive at 60 kilometres an hour in the metropolitan area, or 80 kilometres an hour on the freeways because, frankly, nobody polices the limits. Although there is not much policing of people driving at more than 60 kilometres an hour in the metropolitan area, that is not a reason that the law should not exist and apply to people. The argument regularly put forward for the abolition of the two-bottle limit is specious.

In regard to the lowering of spirit strengths for whisky, rum, and brandy in Western Australia, presently each of those have higher levels than those applying in the rest of Australia. I support the suggestion by the Australian Hotels Association, amongst others, that the levels in Western Australia should conform with those of Australia. I know that that could not be done under this Bill, as the Minister said in his second reading speech. One would have to amend the food and drug regulations under the Health Act.

However, I believe that the committee of inquiry was wrong in its recommendation on this. The Government should give consideration to amending the Health Act to provide for uniformity in spirit strengths. I am aware, of course, that the National Health and Medical Research Council is seeking to standardise the

strength of spirits in Australia and that, therefore, the Government believes that we should await the council's findings. However, there is no need to await those findings. We should take the decision now.

I do not accept the decision to reject the recommendation for the playing of bingo on licensed club premises. I see no harm in allowing bingo to be played on those premises. A section of the premises could be delicensed for the time being, with temporary arrangements being made, if it was desirable that alcohol not be consumed in association with the playing of bingo. However, I see no harm in the playing of bingo on licensed club premises.

By the way, bingo is the most tedious gambling game in which I ever participated. When I was in the citizens' Air Force, I was at the RAAF base in Darwin, and once a fortnight the staff were allowed to play bingo. Hundreds of people would gather in a hall to compete for major prizes of \$500, and \$100 a line. That was probably 10 or 15 years ago. However, I found bingo to be most boring. Some people like it; and if they like it they should be allowed to participate in it.

Bingo does not involve large sums of money from the point of view of the player. I cannot understand how a person is likely to reach the terrible situation about which we heard some years ago in relation to the English housewives. One can spend one's pay packet at the TAB every Friday or Saturday in one go; but when one has to pay 20c for a card at bingo, it is not easy for one to spend a large sum. The State of Western Australia will not be brought down by our allowing the playing of bingo on licensed club premises.

The playing of bingo would give vitality to certain clubs. Some sporting clubs particularly would be better off if the people were encouraged to play bingo on their premises. In my electorate, some people play bingo in the most decrepit halls around the place because they cannot afford to have better premises. At the same time, a number of sporting clubs in the area are empty while the people are playing in broken-down halls. Why should not the people be able to go to the sporting clubs, which are usually equipped with excellent facilities, carpet on the floor, good heating in winter, and so on? They would be able to play bingo in better conditions, and that would provide more revenue for the clubs.

For my part, I do not believe that we have been helpful to the people who like to play bingo. The licensed clubs would be better off if consideration

had been given to the recommendation of the committee of inquiry.

I wish to raise also the discretion to be given to licensees in regard to the number of bars that they may open. Under the Bill, they will be given an opportunity not to open all their bars; and in some circumstances, that is quite reasonable when one considers the labour costs. However, the aspect with which I disagree is that the legislation provides that the public bar shall be kept open. Presumably the purpose of that is that alcohol will be sold at the lowest price. However, the sorts of people who would be interested in attending hotels at the times when these restrictions are in effect may be those who have travelled a long distance, and who want the choice of not being in a public bar. Under the legislation, hotels may have only the public bar open, and the saloon or lounge bars may be closed.

People travelling long distances might not want to go into a bar which was very large and crowded, where the people were rowdy, where the dress was rather unkempt, and where the language was a little unsavory. Such people might like the extra comfort of a saloon bar or a lounge, and then they would be happy to pay the higher prices: I hope that the situation in which only public bars will be open does not develop.

I realise that this provision will be used on certain occasions only; but some people will not have the opportunity to drink in the surroundings they prefer. If they are prepared to pay the extra money, they should have that privilege.

By and large, many aspects of this legislation are good ones; but I am strongly opposed to the matters I have raised, and particularly the abolition of the two-bottle limit.

MR CRANE (Moore) [5.40 p.m.]: I, too, would like to make some comments on the Bill before the House, and support it generally. I would like to mention some matters raised by some of my constituents, and by some clubs in my electorate.

I cannot agree with the comments made by the member for Karrinyup regarding the two-bottle limit. Under the proposed legislation, people will be able to obtain an unlimited supply. Whilst I am not propagating the use of liquor on Sundays in copious quantities, I can see the stupidity of people being able to buy two bottles only at a time when it is well known that people drive from hotel to hotel, and acquire the required amount eventually. Our laws should have common sense attached to them.

Mr Pearce: That wasn't your attitude last week. You opposed the drugs last week.

Mr Stephens: But that was last week.

Mr CRANE: Listen to the pipsqueak over there. His ears are flapping again.

Mr Pearce: If your tongue was not flapping, our ears would be resting.

Mr CRANE: I appeal to you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Nanovich). The Standing Orders provide that members have the right to stand and address this House without continuous interjections. This happens whenever I am speaking.

As I was saying, our laws have to be sensible laws, and people will abide by them. This will be a sensible law, and it will be welcomed by many people.

As I said, I am not interested in propagating the sale of liquor on Sundays, or at any particular time; but I do come down very strongly on the side of common sense. It has been inconvenient for people not to be able to buy a bottle of wine or a bottle of spirits on Sundays when one has visitors. One can have a bottle of wine for dinner—

Mr Blaikie: Particularly for medicinal purposes!

Mr CRANE: Particularly for medicinal purposes, yes. Therefore, the amendment to the legislation is based on common sense.

Mr Pearce: Are you aware that cannabis is used for medicinal purposes often?

Mr CRANE: The member for Mt. Marshall referred to our increasing the drinking age from 18 to 21 years. I commend him for his suggestion, but realise that it is not possible to do this; and we can hope only that responsibility will be accepted by the people running the clubs and the hotels. However, it is difficult for those people to know whether the customers are eligible, as far as their ages are concerned. I understand his feelings and I agree with them; but I realise it is not possible to introduce such a suggestion at this time, because the people will not accept such regressive legislation.

Leave to Continue Speech

Mr CRANE: I move—

That I be given leave to continue my speech at a later stage of the sitting.

Motion put and passed.

Debate thus adjourned.

(Continued on page 3846).

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES: REDISTRIBUTION

Notice of Motion: Speaker's Ruling

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I have been asked to rule whether or not the words used in a Notice of Motion delivered this evening by the Leader of the Opposition are in order. The Notice of Motion reads—

That in the opinion of this House:

1. The proposals for redistribution of electorates as gazetted the 28th August demonstrate the fundamental corruption of the electoral system and the inability of the Electoral Commissioners to ensure a fair distribution while restrained as they are by the gerrymander provisions of the Electoral Districts Act.
2. The responsibility for reform resting solely with the Government, the Government should immediately amend the Electoral Districts Act so as to end the scandalous manipulation of voters' rights which now exists and to provide a fair and democratic system based on votes of equal value for all citizens.

Two objections have been raised; namely—

- (a) that the word "corruption", in the way that it is used in the Notice of Motion, may not be in order; and
- (b) that the first part of the motion reflects upon the integrity of the electoral commissioners, one of whom is the Chief Justice of Western Australia.

I shall deal with the second objection first. Casual criticism or reflections upon our judiciary are highly disorderly. Such matters can be raised only by way of specific substantive motion and not, in my opinion, by way of a passing reference in a motion chiefly dealing with another matter.

However, my study of the first part of the Notice of Motion reveals no reflection upon the integrity of the commissioners. The criticism contained in that paragraph is aimed solely at the electoral system.

I turn now to the objection to the word "corruption". It is the practice of this House not to permit words to be used in a Notice of Motion if those words would be regarded as unparliamentary in the normal course of debate.

I am aware that in this House, particularly in recent years, various rulings have been given concerning this word.

At an earlier stage this evening the Leader of the Opposition contended that the word "corruption" was not regarded as objectionable if it were an accusation against a system. With this contention I find I must disagree. I refer the House to *Hansard* of 2 September 1975, page 2430. There it will be found that the words "It is electoral corruption" were used by the member for Ascot, presently the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The words were objected to and Speaker Hutchinson upheld the objection, ultimately censuring the member for Ascot for his refusal to withdraw the words.

On 6 April 1976 it is recorded in *Hansard*, page 276, that the member for Morley used the word "corrupt" in the sense of "corrupt laws, devised by a corrupt Parliament". Again an objection was taken and again Speaker Hutchinson upheld the objection, requiring the member to withdraw the words, which he did.

Based on these quite clear precedents I must rule that the phrase in the Notice of Motion which refers to the "corruption of the electoral system" is not in order to stand as part of the notice.

Members may recollect that a somewhat similar problem was before the House on 28 October 1980, and I refer to *Hansard*, pages 2666 and 2667. On that occasion at my request the member for Gosnells amended his notice to omit the words against which I had found it necessary to rule. I make the same request of the Leader of the Opposition.

Notice of Motion: Amendment

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [7.36 p.m.]: I seek leave of the House to substitute the word "distortion" for the word "corruption" in the notice of motion.

Leave granted.

ACTS AMENDMENT (MINING) BILL

Second Reading

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Mines) [7.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill before members is for the purpose of amending the Mining Act 1978, and the main areas in which changes will be made are as follows—

- (1) The transfer of oil shale exploration from the Petroleum Act to the Mining Act;
- (2) amendment to the private landholder provisions to protect the rights of bona fide farmers;
- (3) amendment to the compensation provisions in relation to pastoralists; and
- (4) other minor amendments to facilitate the introduction of the new Act and to transition from the 1904 Act.

Oil shale exploration is currently administered under the Petroleum Act 1967, and the exploration techniques and subsequent mining of oil shale are the same as those applying to coal; that is, open-cut operations. As it is impossible in many cases to differentiate between the two substances, conflict could arise where virtually the same substance is being sought by two different operators—one under the Petroleum Act, and one under the Mining Act.

The proposed amendments include oil shale in the definition of "minerals", with consequent amendments where necessary to the Petroleum Act 1967.

As already approved by this Parliament, the Mining Act 1978 currently allows private land in the categories of yards, gardens, orchards, vineyards, or under cultivation, etc., to be included in a mining tenement at the time of grant; but no prospecting or mining can be carried out on such land, nor within 100 metres of such land, without the consent in writing of the owner and occupier, unless the warden is satisfied that such consent has been unreasonably refused.

The amendments proposed will provide for the consent in writing of the owner and occupier being a prerequisite to the inclusion of this type of private land in a mining tenement at the time of grant, unless the grant is restricted to land which is more than 30 metres below the surface of the land. This is the situation currently operating under the 1904-1970 Act.

The legislation will also allow the land above 30 metres to be included subsequently in the mining tenement, provided the consent of the owner and occupier of the land has been obtained.

Where compensation to pastoralists for any damage to improvements on their pastoral leases caused by the holder of a mining tenement is concerned, the Act will be amended to allow compensation where a pastoralist suffers any substantial loss of earnings by any mining carried out by the holder of a mining tenement.

The provisions as amended will give specific power to the warden to fix compensation in the

absence of agreement between the parties, with a right of appeal to the Supreme Court against the warden's decision.

In introducing the amendments as outlined, the opportunity has been taken also to make other minor amendments to the Act which are considered necessary so far as the transitional provisions are concerned. These amendments include provisions—

to ensure that all land the subject of an agreement with the State will be protected in the transition of the new Act;

to provide a procedure for dealing with applications for mining tenements over land which has been exempted from the operations of the Act;

to allow the Minister a discretionary power to exempt holders of exploration licences for iron ore from having to relinquish areas after the end of the third and fourth years of the term of licence;

to allow for reinstatement in certain cases of prospecting licences and miscellaneous licences which have been forfeited;

to include exploration licences in the provisions for forfeiture for non-payment of rent;

to relate exemption of expenditure conditions to sums of money, rather than to periods of time;

to clarify that section 112, which allows the Crown to remove rock, stone, clay, sand, or gravel from prospecting licences and exploration licences for use for any public purpose, does not apply where such licences are on private land;

to provide for priorities of applications for mining tenements according to the time and date of marking off, lodgement, etc.

The opportunity has been taken to review the transitional provisions to ensure that the change-over is achieved with the least possible inconvenience to industry, and to eliminate any unnecessary workload on administration.

Under schedule 2 of the transitional provisions, applicants for mining tenements pending at commencement date are given six months in which to lodge substitute applications under the 1978 Act.

With the backlog of applications currently outstanding being in excess of 30 000, this procedure is neither practicable nor desirable. The schedule will be amended to allow all outstanding applications to be dealt with to conclusion, as if the 1904 Act had not been repealed.

In addition, current holders of licences to treat tailings will be allowed to continue to hold such licences on the same terms and conditions as they now hold them under the 1904 Act.

Other amendments have been made with a view to clarifying any matter where doubt exists, or where it is considered necessary and expedient for the smooth change-over from the old to the new legislation.

For further clarity, the second schedule will be repealed and substituted with a new schedule incorporating the amendments to enable the provisions to be more easily understood.

As previously stated, the Petroleum Act 1967 is also to be amended, to transfer oil shale to the Mining Act.

Consequential amendments to protect current holders of exploration permits under the Petroleum Act, who have programmes geared for the search of oil shale, and to make provisions for them to transfer to Mining Act titles if they so wish.

The opportunity has been taken also to amend the fees under the Petroleum (Registration Fees) Act 1967 to come into line with fees which have been increased in the equivalent Commonwealth legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grill.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR CRANE (Moore) [7.43 p.m.]: In continuing my remarks on this legislation, I wish to mention two areas which cause me some concern. These matters have been brought to my attention by people who are directly concerned in the running of clubs.

I refer firstly to the minimum fee of \$20 for membership of a club. This has been increased from \$2. A 1 000 per cent increase is tremendous.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Outrageous!

Mr CRANE: It is an unacceptable increase though I would not go so far as to say it is outrageous. I think "ridiculous" is a better word.

For those reasons, I cannot support that part of the legislation. I believe it will cause considerable concern to many clubs.

It has been suggested that the minimum fee is used as an excuse to allow people in for just one night, or for some specific purpose. However, most of the clubs are honest organisations and do

not use the minimum fee for that purpose. Knowing people as I do, I am aware there are always people who try something which is rather devious in the eyes of other people, and it may be that some clubs are using this practice.

I am concerned for the clubs which see this fee as a terrific impost on the running of their organisations. I believe the Government has erred in bringing forward an increase of this magnitude and I do not find myself in support of that particular part of the legislation.

The Government should allow some tolerance and flexibility in the hours in which licensed sporting clubs are permitted to open their bars. For example, at the Sun City Country Club at Yanchep, the bars are open on Sundays from 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. and from 4.00 p.m. to 7.00 p.m. Very few people wish to use bar facilities from 11.00 a.m. to noon. However, many people come in about 2.00 p.m. and must wait until 4.00 p.m. before the bar is open and they can partake of some refreshment. The country club has not asked me to make representations to the Government to have its trading hours extended; however, it believes the Government should give some consideration to allowing some flexibility. We should treat these people as though they had some intelligence, and were able to run their own businesses.

I would suggest, as an example, that they be allowed to open their bar from noon until 1.00 p.m. and from 3.00 p.m. until 7.00 p.m. The total hours would be the same, but the club would be allowed some flexibility. There may be very good reason that the club will not be allowed this flexibility; it would need to be a good reason to convince me. I have no doubt that the Minister is listening intently to what I am saying and that he will answer my query when he replies to the debate.

I wish to comment also on the matter of bingo; this has been mentioned by other speakers in this debate. I do not intend to go overboard one way or the other on this matter. However, several clubs in my electorate have contacted me expressing the desire to be given the opportunity to organise bingo evenings on their premises. The Government does not wish bingo to spread throughout the State, and be run on a grandiose scale. However, I see nothing wrong with a club organising its own bingo evenings for the benefit of the local community. As has been mentioned earlier in the debate, many organisations are forced by the law to hold bingo evenings in premises which leave a lot to be desired. Most licensed club premises today are very modern and

up-to-date and offer a very acceptable venue for such activities.

The member for Karrinyup said that bingo did not turn him on; it does not turn me on, either. However, many people derive a great deal of pleasure from playing bingo and I see nothing wrong with their being allowed to spend 20c a time on bingo rather than bet their housekeeping in one fell swoop on a horse, and lose the lot. There is no difference between one type of gambling and another. It is like honesty: There are no shades of honesty; a person is either honest or dishonest. Equally, there are no shades of gambling.

For my part, I am not convinced that we should continue to refuse people permission to conduct bingo evenings in their licensed clubs. The Government should adopt a common-sense attitude to this matter. If a law is sensible, people will accept it; it may be harsh, but at least it must be sensible. As long as these bingo evenings are organised by local people for the benefit of the local community, they should be permitted, and I ask the Minister to give consideration to this matter.

Mention was made earlier in the debate about licensed clubs being allowed to close down portion of their premises, if they so desire, for reasons of saving on staffing and overheads during quiet periods. It was mentioned that problems could be associated with this provision.

I know many people like to go into hotels or taverns and head for a quiet bar so that they may enjoy a drink and a talk with their friends without being bombarded with loud music or conversation in an atmosphere so thick with smoke that it can be cut with a knife. If these licensed premises are allowed to close these "selective" bars—for want of a better term—many people will be disadvantaged. I believe this provision is unreasonable, and needs close examination.

With those remarks, I generally support the legislation, with the exception of the proposal to increase the minimum fee to \$20.

Mr Pearce: Are you going to vote against that provision?

Mr CRANE: I am on my feet speaking, so the member for Gosnells can just shut up. He will get his opportunity to enter the debate. He already has had a fair bit to say, and he seems to want to take up everybody else's time as well. So, if he does not mind, he should shut up and stay right where he is.

As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted, I hope the Minister gives consideration also to allowing more flexibility in

the times licensed premises are allowed to open their bars. I was requested to bring this matter forward and I was hoping my request would be treated with respect, and that I could put it forward without interruption.

Mr Pearce: You are pathetic.

Mr CRANE: I have raised this matter on behalf of the people I represent, whom I am proud to represent in this place.

With those remarks, I support the legislation.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [7.55 p.m.]: I rise only briefly to point up a situation which has been touched upon by the member for Fremantle and the member for Karrinyup. In the case of the member for Karrinyup, I only infrequently find myself in agreement with him.

Mr Clarko: At least you can be right some of the time.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: However, on this particular issue we find we are kindred spirits, although I would not couch my position in terms as mild as those used by the member for Karrinyup.

I refer specifically to the absurd situation which exists in respect of the prohibition on the playing of bingo on licensed club premises. Although it may be a relatively minor matter, that absurdity is a significant reflection of the Government's whole attitude to the contradictions which are rife in our community and which are expressed in the attitudes displayed in laws governing gambling to which this Government, and this Minister in particular, seem to cling so dearly.

What is wrong with the proposition that bingo be played on licensed premises? As has been explained by the member for Karrinyup, if we are so concerned about the proposition, parts of the licensed premises can easily be partitioned off to allow the licensed sections to be shut off from the area in which bingo is played.

In fact, the situation as it now persists is ludicrous, because that is what is really happening. The Macedonian community—an extremely fine group of Australians—which has its headquarters in North Perth, manages to make about \$50 000 a year from bingo which is played in its lesser and lower hall immediately beneath the licensed premises it maintains. If that in fact is not a partitioning of parts of the licensed premises, I am not sure what it is.

I suppose this minor aberration on the part of the Government, and this Minister in particular, pales into insignificance when we see the Minister seriously advancing a proposition that, in respect

of gambling, the Police Force shall be not only the law enforcers, but also the lawmakers; that is what in fact this Minister has maintained time and time again when he says that the prosecution and the containment of the pursuit of illegal gaming activities are largely left to the discretion of the Police Force. In a minor way we see mirrored in the Minister's attitude towards the playing of bingo on licensed premises that contradiction in fact.

I am not sure whether the Minister seriously advances the proposition that policemen should be lawmakers, but certainly, by the attitude he expresses in respect of the gambling operations which are flourishing in our community, he is doing just that when he says it shall be left to the Police Force—at its discretion—to prosecute or otherwise deal with the perpetrators of these activities.

It is quite plain that for a number of reasons it is desirable that bingo should be permitted under supervised circumstances to be played on licensed premises. As has been pointed out by the member for Fremantle, the inability of football clubs to follow this harmless pursuit has meant that strains on their budgeting place at risk to those foraging sharks of the VFL many of our best footballers. It is as a direct result of the inability of football clubs to raise funds by, amongst other things, this harmless pursuit of playing bingo.

The most worrying thing, apart from the fact that there seems to be implicit in the Chief Secretary's position the proposition that policemen shall be lawmakers as well as law enforcers, is the hesitancy of this Government to endorse any occurrences that threaten the legalised gambling it has established so successfully in our community.

When we analyse and examine the situation, we realise the Chief Secretary's and the Government's strong stance invariably seems to be against propositions that threaten the Lotteries Commission, which is the mainstay of the hospital system, and the TAB, which is such a flourishing concern for the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Do not we all remember that when the Totalisator Agency Board was first established we were told agencies were not to be established adjacent to or as part of licensed premises? Has not that gone by the board? If any member drives down Fitzgerald Street in Perth he will see that quite recently, in the most vivid expression of the abrogation of that principle, a TAB agency has been shifted across a road so it can be part of a hotel on the opposite corner.

The Government is not dinkum. This Minister in particular—so quick to draw his pen to produce long missives in self-defence whenever a daily newspaper dares to criticise his stand—is being as insincere as the Government he represents.

The truth is that this Government will countenance gambling of a multitude of varieties provided the gambling does not endanger those avenues of fund raising that provide the government with so much of its finance, and provided the Government is able to assure itself of a share of the proceeds.

There is no good reason not to allow bingo to be played on licensed premises. There is considerable community support for permission to be granted to allow bingo to be played on those premises. I hope members will support the stance taken by the member for Karrinyup and supported by me on this occasion.

MR EVANS (Warren) [8.03 p.m.]: There are several matters to which I would like to refer and the first of these is in connection with what is a fairly severe travesty of justice, and I will explain my reason for making that statement. It relates to the Government's intention to increase the minimum fee that may be levied by clubs from \$2 to \$20. It is a fairly steep increase of 1 000 per cent. I would like to explain the position of clubs which have been established in the lower south-west in very isolated circumstances. The clubs represent virtually the entire social life in some of these small towns. I refer in particular to timber centres such as Northcliffe, Nyamup, Quininup, Deanmill, and Pemberton.

There are few enough amenities in these places and these workers' clubs have sprung up since the 1950s to serve a most valuable role. In some places they are the only social centre available to residents of these towns. The first of these clubs was established as a co-operative effort by the workers of the timber mills in those areas with the assistance of the management. Pemberton and Shannon River were the first places where such clubs were introduced. Once established they sprang up in fairly short order, over a couple of years, in the other centres to which I have referred.

Some centres are still a considerable distance from established taverns and hotels. When the Shannon River mill was operative the people there were in excess of 60 kilometres from the nearest tavern or hotel. Nyamup and Quininup are in excess of 30 kilometres and Deanmill is around seven kilometres from established taverns or hotels. There are hotels in Pemberton, Northcliffe, and Walpole, but the clubs provide a

little more than the hotels do. For this reason they have a very important social purpose to fulfil.

Because of their isolation, difficulty is experienced in establishing recreational and social amenities in these areas. Dart clubs have become part and parcel of the club occupation. They have winter competitions which are very keenly contested. They provide at least one excellent night out for people who otherwise would have little preoccupation. It should be borne in mind that in some of these places the television coverage is very poor indeed. Perhaps one reasonable night of television reception a week is all they can expect.

Mr Blaikie: They are the focal point of the communities.

Mr EVANS: The clubs also provide billiard and snooker facilities. Weekly competitions are held which are the highlight of the week for a large percentage of people in the area. The competitions are of a high standard and are fiercely contested, and some of the skilled participants take part in the south-west championships. So the clubs provide darts, billiards, and snooker. The club at Pemberton provides a library as well.

I want to draw to the attention of members those people who are served by these clubs and who will be affected if the fee imposed is to be \$20. The normal wage of people in the timber industry, bearing in mind it is one of the lowest paid in the State despite the level of skill required, is based on a minimum wage with a structure for margins. So in the main we have a group with a take-home pay of between \$120 and \$160 a week. Overtime and other considerations can increase that total, but that is the basic wage structure.

That being so, it is difficult to understand why a mandatory minimum fee of \$20 should be set. I have checked with most of the clubs in my area and found that the nomination fee at Quininup is \$1 and the annual fee is \$5. At Nyamup, Deanmill, and Northcliffe the nomination fee is \$5 and the annual fee is \$5. The Pemberton club, which offers additional facilities, charges \$10 for the nomination fee and \$10 for the annual fee. So the increase will be significant and is certainly grossly unjust to a section of our community that can ill-afford it.

Mr Shalders: Even the fellow who works the twin saws, considering his skills, is poorly paid.

MR EVANS: His wage is certainly low in comparison with the skills he needs, and we are talking about the doyen of the industry. He is not recompensed for the dangerous and arduous work he performs.

Will the \$20 include the nomination and annual fees? Will the fee take away the flexibility a club might have to bring in a variation of fees for juveniles, associates, or pensioners?

Mr Coyne: And country members.

Mr EVANS: A mandatory fee of \$20 seems grossly unfair. All this can be extended to a number of sporting associations also which, once again, cannot be described as wealthy. What is the real purpose of this provision? In his second reading speech the Chief Secretary said that the section of the Act dealing with membership of licensed clubs will be amended to provide for a minimum annual membership of \$20. He said that the present fee of \$2 is too low to prevent the practice of clubs signing in visitors as provisional members. I do not think that is the reason at all. There is very little likelihood that the bulk of the country clubs to which I have referred would want to take advantage of the fear the AHA apparently has. An increase of 150 per cent to \$5 is far more reasonable.

Mr Cowan: Still too much.

Mr EVANS: It is a reasonable compromise, and most clubs would be charging in the vicinity of that amount. I do not think the men running the clubs will object to a figure of \$5. We cannot condone the figure of \$20, an increase of 1 000 per cent. It has not suddenly been introduced to overcome a special situation that has only recently occurred.

The whole history of club trade and the problems associated with it have been around for years, so the Minister and his Government cannot defend this proposal even though they may be looking to the interests of and some anomalies experienced by the AHA. It is for that reason the compromise of \$5, as I have shown in my amendment on the notice paper, ought to be carried by this House.

A distinction can be made between certain types of clubs. I am a member of the Manjimup Country Club which charges approximately twice the proposed minimum for club membership, but that club provides a wide range of facilities including a golf course, a bowling green, squash courts, a swimming pool, and a bar. I emphasise that a distinction can be made between certain clubs. The members of small clubs usually are not in a position to pay a high fee. This proposed provision is one which needs to be amended.

I refer to another matter to which reference must be made. The increased minimum fee will discourage people in country towns to join local clubs. If the fee is too large it will deter people from joining. They will go to premises which are

less salubrious and, perhaps, less favourable. As a consequence the discipline necessary for young people will not be imposed as it is in clubs.

The discipline at clubs is good because it is imposed in an acceptable way. The managers of clubs are elected by the members. For that reason the managers are highly respected, and notice is taken of them. They have the opportunity to discipline members by expulsion or, perhaps, by other methods. An ordinary member would not want to be expelled from his club, and for that reason I feel club membership should not be discouraged. I ask members to bear in mind also that clubs offer an opportunity for social interaction of a nature more preferable to that found in other premises. Any active policy to discourage membership of these clubs should be opposed by each member of this House.

I ask members to bear in mind that some clubs are in isolated places such as Quinup and Nyamup. The timber mills already have difficulty in encouraging workmen to stay in the areas. It is a continual headache for the managers of these mills. If we are to encourage decentralisation and assist the local industries of isolated areas we would be advised not to discourage membership of local clubs. For the reasons I have outlined the House should not accept the provision for a \$20 minimum membership fee.

I refer now to the submission by the Australian Hotels Association that the 48-hour notice of a requirement for a special licence be increased to five days. The Opposition does not support the provision to increase the period of notice. In that regard I speak on behalf of many country people. Their distance from the city is an inconvenience, and the imposition of a five-day notice will cause problems.

The situation is not as straightforward as some members may think. In regard to a permit to extend premises a five-day notice period certainly is legitimate and acceptable. However, if a written application for a special licence follows a similar special licence being granted six months previously, the requirement for a five-day notice certainly would not be acceptable. The condition of the clubs' renovations and facilities already would be well known, and there would be no need for an examination as to the suitability of the premises. The record would be established. The procedure should be automatic as to whether a special licence is issued, and therefore a five-day notice requirement would be unnecessary.

I hope the Government takes some action to decrease this period of notice to 48 hours. It

would be rather difficult to defend the passing of this provision.

I applaud the Government for its move to take away the requirement that on a Sunday hotels sell only two bottles of beer to each customer. This provision has not been enforced—it has become a farce. A person who wants more than two bottles of beer has no difficulty getting them because he can go to another hotel or get somebody else to buy those bottles on his behalf. A law that is not enforceable is a law which should not be on the Statute book. As a consequence the Government's move is in the right direction, and the Government deserves recognition for it.

The points I raised in connection with the statutory minimum fee for club membership show that the provisions proposed by the Government are totally unacceptable. The points I raised in regard to a special licence should be heeded and the provision in the Bill altered to fit special circumstances which may arise.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [8.22 p.m.]: I have risen to speak on this matter not because of the scurrilous and untruthful remarks made only a few days ago by the member for Ascot, and not because I have any personal interest in the Liquor Act. I have risen to speak on this measure because of approaches made to me by the people I represent. It is therefore appropriate for me to make comments on this Bill.

Unlike members who have spoken against the Government's decision not to allow bingo on licensed premises, I support the Government's decision.

Mr Parker: Why do you think it is a valid decision?

Mr BLAIKIE: I ask the member to wait until I develop my argument. Bingo is another form of gambling. Although some people say it does not "turn them on", or words to that effect, it is a form of gambling enjoyed by a certain section of the community. It is a medium for raising revenue which should be left to charitable organisations which do not have access to licensed premises as is the case with social or sporting clubs.

Mr Parker: The sale of liquor has become marginally profitable these days.

Mr BLAIKIE: I assure the member that the clubs with which I have been associated clamoured for liquor licences to get them out of financial problems. The member knows as well as I do that the attainment of a liquor licence adds to the problems that some clubs have. However, that argument does not convince me to support the playing of bingo on licensed premises. It is a medium of raising revenue which ought to be left

to senior citizen's groups and other such organisations without access to the revenue-raising medium of alcoholic beverage sales. If bingo is allowed to be conducted on licensed premises, charitable organisations will lose the benefits they presently receive from bingo.

Mr Parker: That is not really the case. Football clubs and the like in South Australia make a considerable amount of money out of operating bingo, as also do the charitable organisations.

Mr BLAIKIE: Be that as it may. Reference was made to bingo being played on substandard premises. I assure members that at clubs in my electorate where bingo is played the facilities are excellent. The sailing club does not have a permanent liquor licence—occasionally it obtains a licence for specific functions—and certainly does not obtain a licence for occasions when bingo is played. I support the Government's move not to accept representations that bingo be allowed on licensed premises.

I refer to the provision of the legislation which will allow vignerons to sell bottled wines on Sundays for consumption on and off their premises, within specified hours approved by the Licensing Court. They must satisfy the court that their premises are suitable, and sufficient tourist demand exists for the sale of the bottled wines. The vignerons will have to determine whether it is viable to open their premises on Sundays. It will be seen whether sufficient tourist trade exists. The provision will have a marked effect in my electorate, as many members would realise. Numerous vineyards exist, and many new vineyards have been opened, in my electorate.

Mr Parker: I was in your electorate on Sunday and it looked as though this new provision was already in force.

Mr BLAIKIE: Be that as it may. I believe the vignerons operate within the law and operate with discretion. They have a great deal of regard for the law. I believe the provision is a move in the right direction and will be of benefit to the general community.

The people who purchase wine from vineyards on Saturdays and Sundays normally are family people. The wine is not purchased for consumption there and then. An occasional sample may be taken, but most of the wine is taken home and used during the course of the following week, month, or six months, as the case may be. If there is such a thing as a desirable drinking pattern, the operation of vineyards fosters that pattern. The people who purchase these wines certainly act in a responsible manner.

I am not enamoured by the proposal to allow the unfettered sale of bottles of beer on Sundays. It will have an adverse effect generally and, in particular, on the number of road accidents already occurring. A distinction can be drawn between allowing vineyards to open on Sundays, and allowing hotels to sell any amount of alcoholic beverages on Sundays.

One point I will certainly be raising in the Committee stage, and a point that has been referred to already by the member for Warren, is the increase in the minimum annual fee from \$2 to \$20 for membership of licensed clubs. I do not support the proposed increase.

Mr Evans: You are on side with us tonight?

Mr BLAIKIE: I do not know whether I ought to be on the same side as the member for Warren. He has had a little difficulty in the last week or so. It may be that we share a point of view. The increase is prohibitive, and I will speak further on this matter during the Committee stage.

Mr Barnett: Will you be amending it?

Mr BLAIKIE: No, I will not.

Mr Barnett: Will you be voting for the lower rate?

Mr BLAIKIE: I will not be voting for it then.

Mr Barnett: Well, do not be so hypocritical.

Mr BLAIKIE: If the member for Rockingham is prepared to wait until the Committee stage—and I trust he is still in the Chamber at that time—

Mr MacKinnon: He does not like waiting.

Mr BLAIKIE:—I will certainly be making my contribution to that particular clause, and a very positive contribution.

Mr Barnett: But will it include voting for the amendment?

Mr BLAIKIE: I will come back to the point. There was a great deal of validity in the comments of the member for Warren. He told us that in his electorate the licensed clubs had become a focal point of the community. The same situation occurs in my electorate. We have licensed clubs at Cowaramup, Margaret River, and Capel. Each club is of major importance to the community surrounding it, and has held the community together when times have been bad, either socially or financially. The clubs have solidified community attitudes.

Certainly licensed clubs in country areas have a morale-boosting effect. So the \$20 minimum annual fee, as proposed in the Bill, is not justified, and during the Committee stage, I will oppose that clause. This Bill was introduced as a non-

party Bill. The Liquor Act traditionally has been non-party legislation, with members having the opportunity to exercise their own discretion and a freedom to vote the way they please.

Mr Carr: Is that different from the vote you usually have?

Mr BLAIKIE: Certainly I hope members opposite have the same discretion. With those few remarks I support the second reading.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [8.33 p.m.]: It always amuses me to hear members on this side of the House speak about having a free vote. It was my understanding that members of political parties on this side of the House always have a free vote. So I do not see the reason for the necessity to remind members, and particularly Government members, that they have a free vote in relation to this legislation because it tends to indicate that they do not always have a free vote.

Mr Watt: Has any member of your party ever had a free vote?

Mr COWAN: Certainly we do.

Mr Watt: When have you ever voted differently from your deputy leader?

Mr COWAN: Twice.

Mr Watt: I certainly do not remember those occasions.

Mr COWAN: Probably the member for Albany does not remember them because he is not a very observant fellow. If he looks through *Hansard*, he will see that it is recorded there.

Mr Tonkin: When has the member for Albany ever voted differently from the Premier? What hypocrisy!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order!

Mr COWAN: It is quite clear by now that members in this place are opposed to the concept of increasing the minimum membership fee for clubs. Anyone looking at the amending provision will discover that it is a classic case of Government overkill. In a previous clause it will be seen that provisional members will now lose the exemption from following the normal course when applying for membership. I think that will be sufficient to achieve the Government's objective. Those clubs that are always able to obtain maximum membership will have difficulty admitting provisional members. Under this Bill a person who is nominated as a provisional member must submit an application to a particular committee or body of the club to have that provisional membership approved. That should be sufficient to prevent an abuse of this facility.

The decision of the Government to make it necessary for a person applying for provisional membership of a licensed club to follow the normal practice of submitting a nomination for membership to a particular committee before acceptance, should be sufficient to dissuade clubs—and particularly those in the metropolitan area which always have a maximum ordinary membership—from taking advantage of that provision in the Act. It is ludicrous for the Government to add to that provision by forcing clubs to have a minimum membership fee of \$20. Certainly I will oppose any increase in the minimum membership fee, which is now \$2 per year.

It would have been easier to expand the list of sports so that competitors in those sports do not have to be signed in as guests of members.

The member for Warren, like other members representing rural constituencies, has covered most of the issues to which my constituents would object. However, at the risk of boring the House, I would like to repeat them.

The period necessary for an application for a special permit has been increased from 48 hours to five days. I would have hoped the Minister was cognisant of some of the disadvantages faced by country people when applying for such a licence. It is sometimes necessary to travel in excess of 100 kilometres to obtain a special permit. It takes long enough to obtain a permit now when we consider travelling time, postage delays, etc., without the prescribed period of time included in the Bill. I am at something of a loss to understand the restrictions placed on games such as bingo. I will give my understanding of the situation, and the Minister can tell me whether I am incorrect.

A sporting club with an unlicensed club permit to have liquor on the premises is able to operate in the hours of its choice. If it wished to, it could operate over the same hours as those of a licensed club. However, because it is an unlicensed club and has an annual unlicensed club permit, it can choose not to serve liquor on particular days and on those days it can allow bingo on its premises.

If I am correct in this assumption, why is it that licensed clubs cannot designate a particular area of their premises as an unlicensed area for a prescribed period of time so that they could conduct bingo? With some justification, some organisations cry poverty, and my scheme would allow them to sell liquor at particular times and in certain areas, and also to conduct games of bingo on their premises in prescribed areas. Although it is not a hobby I would pursue, bingo is enjoyed by some people. I cannot see why bingo games

cannot be carried on in this way. There would be no fear of the matter getting out of hand. I will be very interested in the Minister's comments on that proposal.

Perhaps the major changes proposed in this legislation are those relating to Sunday trading. I welcome the relaxation of the Sunday trading laws. For six days of the week members of the public are expected to be able to exercise restraint and not show signs of alcoholism or inebriation, and then suddenly, on the seventh day, they are subjected to limited hours in which to enjoy themselves socially. If one's social enjoyment happens to be having a beer at a licensed club or a hotel, why is it different on a Sunday? We are expected to exercise self-discipline on six days of the week, so why is it necessary to have that discipline forced upon us on Sundays because of a restriction in trading hours?

For the same reason I fail to understand why the choice to open on Sundays was not extended to liquor stores. Such a decision should be up to the individual proprietors. If a person wishes to open his store and sell liquor on a Sunday, surely that is his prerogative.

I support the majority of the Bill, but certainly I will oppose the provision relating to the increased minimum membership of licensed clubs. I look forward to the Committee stage debate.

MR WATT (Albany) [8.43 p.m.]: I feel I ought to make a short contribution to this debate. I find very little to argue with in most of the comments of the members who have spoken so far. However, I cannot agree with one or two of the statements made, and feel I should express my point of view on these.

Possibly I would be recognised as having somewhat wowserish tendencies when compared with those of some other members of this place, and probably those tendencies will be demonstrated in some of my comments.

Before I make my contribution, I would like to comment on some of the cross-Chamber interjections which occurred a few moments ago relating to the so-called free vote of members on this side of the House. It makes me laugh to hear members of the Opposition speak about Government members not being able to vote according to their consciences. In my 7½ years in this House, the only Opposition member I can recall who has voted against his party was a former member for Boulder-Dundas (Mr Tom Hartrey).

Mr Parker: The point we are making is not that we are not generally bound to vote along party

lines, but that you say you are not so bound when in fact you always do vote that way.

Mr WATT: When I have occasion to differ I am free to do so. That is the difference between members on the opposition side of the House and members of the Government.

Mr Wilson: When have you done so?

Mr Shalders: Check the record in the Council.

Mr Parker: Check your record.

Mr WATT: I would like to turn to the Bill. The first issue I want to discuss is that of Sunday trading hours. I want to commend the Government on its decision not to recommend any extension of Sunday trading. My thoughts coincide with those of the member for Karrinyup on this matter.

It is increasingly disturbing that family life in our society continues to deteriorate. There are many pressures on family life, and amongst the biggest of those is alcohol. It would be a shame if on the one day of the week that some families have to spend together, the time should be eroded further by the extension of hotel hours. For that reason, I am particularly pleased that no change has been proposed.

This will not make any significant difference to the road toll, as has been claimed by some speakers. My concern is that people should be less likely to be lured away from home, but should spend time with their families.

It follows logically from that that I should make known my views on the two-bottle limit. I do not support the liberalisation of this provision. Quite frankly, it would not bother me a scrap if no liquor was sold on Sundays. Of course, in all of these things, once a situation has been established for a period of time, it is difficult for it to be restricted. Obviously I am obliged to accept that the position will not be changed. The fact that a law does not work properly, or is difficult, if not impossible, to enforce, is not sufficient reason for me to say that it should be scrapped. That is giving in too easily.

In this day and age, if anything seems to be too difficult, we simply legislate to make it easier. That is taking the easy way out. We should have a day in the week when we can ease up on some of these things. It is ridiculous for anybody to claim that one needs to be able to dive down to the pub for a bottle of beer because somebody drops in for tea. Goodness gracious, if one cannot plan ahead a little better than that, perhaps it would not be a bad idea to have a meal without a couple of bottles of beer.

The question of the playing of bingo on licensed club premises has been raised. Perhaps my wowserish tendencies might now appear to be somewhat inconsistent, because I support the call for the use of licensed club premises for the playing of bingo—

Mr I. F. Taylor: Good from an electorate point of view.

Mr WATT: —provided that proper controls are placed on it. It has nothing to do with the electorate point of view.

Mr Parker: The controls could be placed on it by the issue of a permit from the Lotteries Commission.

Mr WATT: Absolutely. Some people are concerned that the playing of bingo will grow into a national pastime like the National Lotto Bloc, or that we will have people on football ovals with giant bingo boards operated in some marvellous technological way. The member for Geraldton laughs at that, but that was a concept espoused by one of his predecessors on that side of the House, Herb Graham. That was one of his ideas.

Mr Brian Burke: A good member, too—an excellent member.

Mr WATT: I am not in a position to comment on that. The idea of that sort of activity in bingo is not very likely. The playing of bingo should be controlled to the extent that the stakes are small, the number of games is limited, and, if necessary, sections of the premises are delicensed, as the Minister suggested in his second reading speech.

One of the reasons I support this matter is that a large number of clubs have a seasonal activity. Take, for example, a bowling club which has a membership of predominantly middle-aged to elderly folk. Of course, bowling is a summer sport. During the winter the clubs like to keep their membership and have their premises used. One way of keeping them together is to play carpet bowls, and things like that. However, sooner or later people become tired of doing the one thing, and there is a need to provide a diversion.

As far as I am concerned, the playing of social bingo would provide a very valuable outlet in helping the club to retain its members. Quite frankly, if I had to make a choice between members going to a club and boozing or playing bingo, I would prefer that they played bingo.

Now I shall deal with the provision of reception lodge licences. This is a sensible idea, because a number of private reception lodges in the past have not been able to operate with a licence of their own. They have had a function permit,

which means that they have had to buy liquor or have their clients provide the liquor. The clients have had to bring the liquor in, and take away the amount not used; and there has been waste and inconvenience. If the owner of a reception lodge were able to handle the supply of liquor, he could simply charge the client for the amount used. He would not have to be rushing around, perhaps obtaining a little extra in case the supply ran low. That would make a lot more sense. These people should be able to have a separate licence to conduct their businesses properly, to the advantage of their clients.

In relation to the vigneron licences, as members would be aware there is an increasing wine-producing industry in the lower great southern. A number of wineries have been established in the region. There is no doubt that this has increasing value as a tourist attraction. Therefore we are pleased that tourists to the lower great southern will have the opportunity to visit the wineries and drink wine on the premises on Sundays, if they wish.

This is not the same type of activity as people going to a hotel and staying there for hours. Simply, the people will go and taste a few wines, and then decide which ones they want to buy and go on their way. That will help in providing an interesting activity for the tourists on holidays.

With those comments, I indicate my support for the second reading.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): The member for—

MR SPRIGGS (Darling Range) [8.53 p.m.]: Darling Range!

Mr Brian Burke: I cannot believe it—a maiden speech!

Mr SPRIGGS: Perhaps this will come as a surprise, but I decided I had better make a few comments.

Mr Brian Burke: Are you running for the leadership?

Mr Bryce: Spriggs for leader!

Mr SPRIGGS: I will take a few minutes only, firstly to indicate my support for the majority of the Bill, and secondly to indicate my opposition to certain clauses of it.

I do not support in any way the proposed increase in club membership fees from a \$2 minimum charge to \$20. I might inform the Opposition it is my intention to vote against that particular clause.

Mr Evans: What clause is that? You are voting against it?

Mr SPRIGGS: I will vote against it. The licensed clubs in this State do a tremendous job. Not only do they provide a social outlet, but they carry a great burden sportswise that would otherwise fall on the Government or local authorities. There is no need for the Government or this House to impose any minimum fee on the clubs that are playing that role. That responsibility should be left to the clubs; and the setting of such a fee should not be determined by this legislation.

To the surprise of the Opposition, I indicate I intend also to support any amendment relating to the playing of bingo on licensed club premises. The only effective way to police bingo in clubs is by permitting it to be played within the bounds of a licence. In that way, it can be controlled. At present clubs in the city have proved that bingo can be played on a far greater scale than it would be if it were controlled in a licensed area.

I do not intend to say any more at this time. In the Committee stage, if amendments are moved on the two points I have raised, I intend to support them and vote against the present clauses.

Mr Evans: That is the end of you.

Mr SPRIGGS: The member for Warren should not talk about the end. My position could not be much worse than his.

Mr Evans: We will wait for the Committee stage.

MR SHALDERS (Murray) [8.57 p.m.]: I express my general support for the second reading of this Bill, and I wish to comment on some of its facets which I do not support.

I am pleased that the Government is getting rid of what I have always regarded as the ridiculous two-bottle limit on hotel sales on Sundays. This is an anomaly. One argument against it is that one would not say to a retail store, "During your normal trading hours you can sell anything you like to the customers, but on Thursday nights when you have late night shopping, you can sell only one cake of toilet soap to each customer". I have always believed that the two-bottle limit was ridiculous; and I am pleased that it is being lifted. The hotels will be able to trade in their total range of goods during their full range of trading hours. For that reason, I am a strong supporter of that provision.

I was surprised at the remarks of the member for Karrinyup when he said that he would like to see fewer people working on Sundays. When one comes from a tourist town like Mandurah, where the industry depends on the Sunday trade, one knows the people are delighted to be working on Sundays.

Mr Parker: The only tourist attraction in Karrinyup is the member. He is something like Madam Tussaud's.

Mr SHALDERS: I do not agree with that. The member for Karrinyup is an excellent member of this House. He will be here as long as, if not longer than, the member for Fremantle who might find himself in the shadow Ministry this week and out of it next week, depending on the numbers game played by the Opposition. A "shadow" is something that has no substance; and that describes most of the shadow Ministers.

Mr Bryce: That was a nice and cutting remark.

Mr SHALDERS: I am sorry if I have hurt the feelings of the member for Ascot.

I agree with the member for Karrinyup in his comments about the alcohol level of spirits. They should be uniform throughout Australia. I trust that some action will be taken in the not-too-distant future to rectify that particular point.

There has been a lot of controversy about the playing of bingo on licensed club premises. I am well aware that when bingo was introduced it was designed specifically to assist small organisations, which did not have a licence to sell alcohol, to raise funds.

I accept that was the reason it was introduced at that particular time and the reason was valid, but circumstances have changed. It is a long time since bingo was first introduced into Western Australia and the time is now appropriate for the legalisation of bingo on licensed premises.

Mr Parker: All licensed premises or just clubs?

Mr SHALDERS: In licensed clubs. The reasons for this have been set out clearly by the members for Warren and Albany. We have small communities, such as those referred to by the member for Warren, where the local club is the focal point for social activities in the district. Bingo provides a means by which funds can be raised within the community, whether those funds go to the club, the PCAs, or to some other body. The club is the focal point to which people can go and play bingo, and thus funds are raised for a particular organisation.

The member for Albany said some clubs, such as bowling clubs, are of a seasonal nature and bingo provides a means by which the members can be kept together in the off season. Therefore, bingo is seen not only as providing an interest to club members, but also as being useful for raising funds. I am happy to say I will support the legalisation of bingo in licensed clubs.

I am pleased to see the amendments in relation to private hotels. Amendments to section 27 of the

Act relate to the provision of food and the sale of liquor in these places and I shall support the changes proposed in the legislation in this regard, as I hope will all members of the Chamber.

I am opposed to the minimum fee of \$20 for licensed clubs. Such a fee is much too high and I shall be interested to see the amendments which are moved in this regard. I find myself in general support of the member for Warren. Most licensed clubs probably have a minimum fee of approximately \$5 and if an amendment were moved to change the fee to that sort of figure I would be inclined to support it.

I am aware the minimum fee at the present time is \$2, but I do not think many clubs would charge such a low fee. A fee of \$5 would find general support and I am sure few members would oppose it.

I, like many members of the House, have received submissions from the Licensed Stores Association of WA which wants its members to be able to trade on Sundays. My initial reaction is to oppose that. I am aware the association argues that, if we allow unrestricted bottle sales in hotels, it will affect liquor store sales. However, hotels have been working under unfair restrictions up to the present time and my initial reaction is to oppose trading by liquor stores on Sundays. I shall discuss the matter with the association and ascertain the reasons it wants the Government to alter the legislation. Therefore, I shall make up my mind on this matter at a later time when I have had the opportunity to discuss it with the representatives of the association.

With those comments of general support and an indication of the areas in which I do not agree wholeheartedly with the provisions in the legislation, I express my support for the second reading.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Minister for Police and Traffic) [9.04 p.m.]: I thank members for their comments on the legislation with one exception and that relates to the comments by the Leader of the Opposition. The new Leader of the Opposition could not restrain himself from seeking to seize upon the opportunity provided by this debate, which until then had been conducted on the plane on which it should have been conducted, to leap in and try to score cheap political points about the legislation. It is appropriate I should reply to those cheap and twisted political points, because they were inaccurate and, I suppose, they represent the beginning of the style of which we shall see more and more from the Leader of the Opposition when

he attempts to misrepresent the position of the Government and my position.

Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, I make the point at the outset that the legislation has not been introduced as a Government measure, although he tried to say it was a Government measure. It has been introduced in response to an inquiry and the recommendations of that inquiry and it has been introduced here, so far as we are concerned, on the basis of free debate, as is the tradition with liquor legislation.

The Leader of the Opposition tried to make something of what he said was an absurd situation regarding the prohibition of bingo in licensed clubs and the attitude of the Government to gambling. As I said in my second reading speech, the decision to bring forward the recommendations of the committee of inquiry, without the recommendation as to bingo, was a decision of the Government and its supporters. It was not a Government decision on Government legislation in the usual way.

Mr Parker: What do you mean when you say the "Government and its supporters"?

Mr HASSELL: I can say only that we have no Government decision on the matter and if, in the course of this debate, some proposition is put forward, as the member for Fremantle has indicated he intends to put forward in a separate Bill, it will be considered at the time. It has nothing to do with general issues as to gambling, as the Leader of the Opposition in his little foray in trying to make a big fellow of himself as the new leader suggested, nor has it anything to do with the police and their role as enforcers of the law.

Indeed, this legislation has nothing to do with the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that we believe the police should make the law as well as enforce it or that we leave it to the discretion of the police as to whether people should be prosecuted. The comments made by the Leader of the Opposition were manifest misrepresentations of the Government's position and what has been said by me and the Government.

I just wondered why the Leader of the Opposition did not tell us, when he leapt in to make these kinds of statements on a Bill which, up to that point, we had been debating in the correct manner, the official attitude of the Opposition on some of these issues. While we have heard so much about what is wrong with the Government's policy which has served this State well for 40 or 50 years, we have heard from the

Opposition only shaded implications of what it believes. It appears from what we can glean from the comments made, gambling will be legalised under Opposition policy, including the introduction of poker machines.

Mr Brian Burke: Who said that?

Mr HASSELL: That seems to be the implication.

Mr Brian Burke: You are a fake!

Mr HASSELL: We also know the member for North Province has made it clear he believes in the legalisation of prostitution. We have noted it is the Opposition's policy to decriminalise homosexuality.

Mr Wilson: You voted for that.

Mr Brian Burke: You supported it yourself. You are a bigger fake than we thought!

Mr HASSELL: We have also heard from the Opposition spokesman on education that members opposite believe in abortion, because they are so deeply opposed to the material put forward by the Right to Life Association concerning this matter.

It is all very well for the new Leader of the Opposition to stand up here when we are trying to have an intelligent debate about the Liquor Amendment Bill and launch into a number of irrelevancies—

Mr Brian Burke: What are you doing? Don't be so stupid!

Mr HASSELL: —about my attitude and that of the Government to the issues of gambling and law enforcement, but I did not think—

Mr Brian Burke: That is your Achilles' heel!

Mr HASSELL: —I should let it go without a reply. I have made the reply that I regard the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition as being inaccurate and a twisting of the truth.

Mr Brian Burke: "A twisting of the truth"! If you can't stand the heat, don't go into the kitchen, brother!

Mr HASSELL: The Leader of the Opposition is aware of this and he was just trying this as a cheap political stunt tonight—

Mr Brian Burke: Rubbish!

Mr HASSELL: —to convince his colleagues he is a great, new hero of a leader. If he had made one—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I prevail upon members of the Opposition to desist from interjecting and to allow the Minister to make his speech.

Mr HASSELL: Had the Leader of the Opposition made one single contribution to the debate on the Liquor Amendment Bill, his speech may have been slightly relevant, but he did not. He simply played this little, political game and the debate, which had otherwise been carried on in the way it should have been carried on, was diminished by his actions.

Mr Brian Burke: You seem mildly annoyed, my friend.

Mr HASSELL: I want to turn to the comments made by many members of the House in relation to this legislation. I say at the outset I do not intend to support precisely what has been put forward or to defend it in all aspects. It was put forward for debate, it has been debated, and it has been shown that members from both sides will want to amend some aspects of the proposals. So far as I can assist in bringing about orderly amendments which fit in with the drafting of the legislation and the way in which it should be administered, I shall do so.

In a general sense when we are dealing with this liquor law, we must look at the various positions which are put forward by groups which have an economic interest in the impact of the law. The history of the liquor law has seen changes in the fortunes of various bodies. For example, the clubs were once in a very privileged position in terms of their rights to trade. They had many rights, none of which has been diminished, but the effect of those rights has been changed, because others have gained similar rights. That applies in relation to Sunday trading.

Something has been said about the position of licensed stores. Their big breakthrough in economic terms came in 1970 with the enactment of the liquor legislation then, which allowed them to go into single bottles and to deal in trading hours which were favourable to them.

In the period since then the licensed stores have gained some 48 per cent of the packaged liquor sales market in this State. When the committee inquiring into this legislation made its assessment, it had in mind that background of change and also the difficulties of some and the gains of others. Indeed, the committee has come forward with a reasonable balancing without recommending changes which give any particular group, whether it be licensed stores, clubs, hotels, or taverns, a particular advantage.

I want to mention also the committee itself, because some criticisms have been made by the members for Welshpool and Fremantle of the structuring of the committee. Those criticisms were a repetition of remarks which have been

made since the committee was established. The committee was considered by the Government to be adequate in all the circumstances. The circumstances were that we had a major structural change to the liquor law only 11 years ago. That restructuring brought about great changes in the habits and the commercial practice of the liquor industry.

There is no great pressure within the community for any similar extent of structural change. Certainly that was evidenced by the nature of the debate we have had on the recommendations brought forward by the committee. In reality, only two or three issues of significance have been debated. They are the matters which affect clubs, including the bingo issue, and the trading of licensed stores. Apart from that, we have not seen emerge in this debate, or in the suggestions of members from either side, any evidence of some major deficiency in the structure of the liquor laws. That of itself affirms that our decision to have a limited inquiry was a sufficient and appropriate decision at that time. We have not lost anything by not having a Royal Commission of inquiry as occurred some years ago.

Mr Parker: You will find a lot of disaffection which currently exists within a lot of economic groups mentioned and also from some of the social groups such as the temperance bodies would have been lessened had there been a public inquiry.

Mr HASSELL: I do not accept that the member for Fremantle is right in suggesting either that there is a great deal of disaffection or that there would have been less had there been a greater inquiry. Whatever one says or does or however far an inquiry is conducted, in the end decisions have to be made which will disadvantage one group as against the other. If we were to extend the hours of trading for licensed stores on a Sunday and allow them full Sunday trading, there would be unhappiness on the part of the tavern keepers and hotel keepers. If clubs everywhere were given privileges as to trading, it would affect the others. It would not matter how full the inquiry, at the end of the day those decisions would leave one group not satisfied that it had got enough.

I will go back to the comment I made before. I believe the committee we had working on the job did a very good job in assessing the extent of change which should be made at this time. In the debate in this House there does not seem to have been any marked disaffection from members representing various interests to the basic recommendations of the committee. In fact, there seems to be support for one area of the

committee's recommendations in relation to bingo, for example, where the recommendation has not been brought forward in the legislation.

Mr Parker: Bearing in mind that the Minister brought this legislation forward for debate as opposed to Government legislation, why does that particular recommendation need to be brought forward?

Mr HASSELL: I have already explained that to the House. I have said that the Government members did not want that brought forward into the House. That was a decision which was taken by a very significant majority of Government members. I have to say that in view of some of the comments that have been made by my colleagues tonight, I wonder exactly where it came from, but perhaps they sit in another place.

Mr Parker: I think people have been getting at you.

Mr HASSELL: However, I make the point again that it is not a matter on which I stand here saying that we are committed to one position or another. So far as the Government is concerned, the issue will be decided in this House in the debate without our seeking a direction from the joint Government parties in relation to the matter.

Mr Parker: That will be the position with my private member's Bill?

Mr HASSELL: No, let me make it clear to the member for Fremantle that I have no authority, as he would know and understand, to commit the Government or joint Government parties to any particular decision on a Bill which is not here. I cannot tell him what the answer would be in relation to that.

The other point I wanted to make about the committee itself relates to the suggestion of the member for Fremantle that the committee was secret. It was not a public inquiry, but it was not a secret committee. It held discussions with any party it needed to see. Submissions were made to the committee. Some people asked to see the committee. Most of those who wanted to see the committee did so. In some cases members of the committee did not meet people who had made a submission which appeared to be put very clearly. However, it was not a secret committee and did not operate in that way. It is not accurate to suggest that it was.

The matter of the minimum fee for clubs has been an issue which has been much discussed in the course of today's debate. I want to deal with that briefly, although clearly we are going to deal with it much more in the Committee stage. Members are clearly concerned that the effect of raising the minimum fee as proposed in the Bill

will be adverse in the case of many clubs because they have lower membership fees and have special categories of lower membership fees which are less than the minimum proposed to be prescribed. The Opposition has put forward an amendment to reduce the proposal from \$20 to \$5. The existing minimum fee is \$2. Some members believe that no minimum should be prescribed or, at most, the present provision should prevail.

Mr Blaikie: Hear, hear!

Mr HASSELL: I think that when we get to the Committee stage we should make a clear decision on the options, these being \$20, \$5, or \$2 as it is now. I have drafted an amendment to make it \$10. In the light of what has been put forward tonight, I do not propose to move that amendment because I do not think it would meet the points that have been made in the House.

Mr Brian Burke: We don't either.

Mr HASSELL: The reason for the committee putting forward the recommendation was to strengthen another proposal which, with the \$20 minimum fee, was designed to ensure that the special privileges given to clubs under the Act, the special provisions which apply to them, and the basic concept of club membership are maintained. What is obviously occurring on a pretty large scale, particularly at some very common sporting events, is that on match days many people who have no real relationship with members of the sporting clubs concerned are being admitted to membership on the basis of becoming members for the day by paying a fee. They are not guests of members. They are not being signed in as guests of members. They are not operating as guests of members. They are really becoming members on this temporary basis.

Mr Parker: I think the Minister is confusing two issues. There is another amendment which deals with people on sporting occasions such as that where at the moment they do not have to be signed in at all under any circumstances as long as they can be said to be associated with a member of the team.

Mr HASSELL: That is right, but I am not confusing the issues. They are both related to the same objective. The objective of both amendments was to deal with that issue, firstly, by removing the exception in favour of provisional members being nominated in a normal way provided they be dealt with on the same basis as other members, and, secondly, to put in a minimum fee as a back-up so that those provisions could not be so easily avoided.

Mr Parker: On this particular aspect of the \$2 and \$20, the committee in its recommendations

seemed to be more concerned with things like discos, cabaret nights, and that sort of thing.

Mr HASSELL: My understanding is that it is all tied up with the same issue. The member for Merredin said it was a classic case of Government overkill. It is not that at all. I just say again for his benefit that it is not a matter of Government overkill. We have brought forward the recommendation. It has been shown in the debate to be not acceptable. It has some deficiencies, and I want to find a proper solution so that the real issue which the committee properly has drawn to our attention is dealt with and at the same time clubs are not disadvantaged by having to exclude members on economic grounds or clubs are required to raise fees contrary to their will, as may be the effect.

Mr Parker: We would be quite happy for you to defer the Committee stage of the Bill so that proper amendments could be drafted which would deal with that.

Mr HASSELL: I am not sure that we need to make any deferral. It may well be that the second amendment in this area may suffice.

Mr Parker: What is the second amendment?

Mr HASSELL: The second amendment as to the admission of provisional members being required to be admitted to membership in the same way, may well suffice to deal with the problem. The House is left to choose between the \$5 amendment proposed and leaving it as it is at \$2 minimum. We will deal with that further in the Committee stage.

The points that have been made in relation to bingo have been noted by me. It is clear that some members believe that bingo should be permitted in licensed clubs, and others do not. On my understanding, the practice of playing bingo occurs in the case of some football clubs now which operate the game in areas outside the licensed areas of their club premises. What has been feared by many people in this regard is that the combined league football clubs will effectively take over the bingo market by conducting a huge operation and thereby eliminating the benefits which were originally intended to go to small clubs and the charitable types of groups. That issue remains to be decided. I do not think the House requires any further advice from me on it, except that when and if provisions relating to it are brought forward, we will want to be sure that, if they are going to be adopted, they will be subject to an appropriate regulatory system.

As to Sunday trading, some opposition has been expressed to the removal of the limitation on packaged liquor sales on Sundays. That

opposition has been linked to the proposition that it will increase in some way the road toll and increase drunkenness on roads. I would be personally very concerned if that were to be the case. As members well know, I very strongly supported the actions of the Road Traffic Authority in working very hard to reduce the road toll, particularly that associated with drinking and driving. There is no possible doubt that the measures that have been taken in pursuing various campaigns in the last 12 months have materially reduced the extent of drink-driving offences.

Regrettably, the level of tragedy continues in that field and demonstrates the need for the continuation of those measures. A fortnight ago, on the weekend, we saw the horrendous result of accidents in which several of the drivers and victims of road accidents were very substantially affected by alcohol. One victim had a blood alcohol content of 0.4 or in excess of 0.4. It is hard to believe that this person was still alive without even the effects of the accident. Then there were two other cases involving blood alcohol levels in excess of 0.2. I do not believe that the sale of packaged liquor on Sundays will increase this problem.

On the contrary, it is more likely that it would reduce the road toll because people would be encouraged to drink in their own homes. It is really a moot point. It could not be argued to finality either way. People who drink to the extent that they get drunk have the opportunity to do so now with the Sunday trading of hotels, taverns, and clubs and nothing in this legislation is likely to extend that opportunity.

The matter of spirit strengths is again one which has been mentioned. I believe it would be desirable if the spirit strengths of this State were brought into line with those in the other States. As I said in the second reading speech, work is being done in an attempt to establish an Australian standard on a health basis with the responsible authorities in all States. The Minister for Health will be involved in this. At the appropriate time we will be bringing forward such amendments, but the work has some way to go as yet. I do not think we can advance it at this stage. The view I am expressing—and which has been expressed by some members—is different from the recommendation of the committee.

Another matter mentioned by at least two members was that of the proposed change to require five days' notice for a special permit as distinct from the present 48 hours. I appreciate the difficulties stated by the member for Warren and the member for Merredin in suggesting that

this imposes special difficulties for people in country areas.

The people who have to travel some distance to obtain those permits might be, to some extent, inconvenienced for the same reason they would be if they had to give five days' notice. There is a need for five days' notice so that proper investigations of the application can be made. The reason for this amendment is to enable those proper investigations to be made in the city and the country.

I am advised that a number of not altogether acceptable practices are followed in relation to the obtaining of these special permits. Suggestions have been made that it is someone's birthday and so on, and it has been found that it is not the case. The police have an obligation to investigate those applications because they are meant to be special permits for special occasions.

Under the present provision, if notice is given on a Thursday night—that is the 48 hours for a Saturday night—the police have an obligation to make the investigation and have only one working day, Friday, in which to make it and, if they object, to take the matter to the Licensing Court.

Mr Parker: What about the suggestion made by the member for Welshpool last week with regard to the initial stage when a hotel applies for a permit? Five days may be appropriate then, but thereafter it could revert to 48 hours.

Mr Evans: They would know the state of the buildings and the adequacy of the facilities and surely when the next one comes up in six months' time they have the information already.

Mr HASSELL: That is not the only consideration. The reason for the application must be considered as well. I studied the suggestion made by the member for Welshpool and I do not think the matter can be dealt with in that way. It must apply not only to the first application but also to subsequent ones. The point has been raised by the committee that more time is needed.

If there is concern about this we could adopt some provisions which are parallel to others in the legislation. I have asked for some drafting to be done on this subject in which seven days' notice should be given which, at the court's discretion, may be reduced. That applies in another area of the legislation and it would allow the police to do their job. *

The police have an obligation which we have imposed on them and, I repeat, these are special permits, which must be investigated. In order that this may be parallel with other provisions in the legislation, the notice should be not five days, but seven days which would give the Licensing Court

the discretion to reduce the time in particular cases of inconvenience. I will have some amendments prepared so that the matter can be brought forward if it is the wish of members.

Mr Parker: Are you going to deal with the matter of reception lodges on Sundays?

Mr HASSELL: This is a new provision.

Mr Parker: At the moment one can have a reception on a Sunday and get someone else to obtain a licence and it can go on as long as one wishes. The idea of the provision is to allow a reception lodge owner to have everything under his control. It seems silly he should have to close down at eight o'clock.

Mr I. F. Taylor: A couple can be married at five o'clock, attend their reception and have to leave at eight o'clock.

Mr Parker: Or alternatively they would need a second licence.

Mr HASSELL: I have studied that point and I do not think what has been said is correct. At the moment I do not have my notes on that subject, but I will have them ready when we reach the Committee stage. It is my understanding the reception licence will cover the situation.

I thank members for their contributions to this legislation which has been generally well received, although there are some reservations in certain areas. As we move through the Committee stage there is no doubt those reservations will be dealt with and we will seek to make amendments which are appropriate to meet the needs of the industry, at the same time recognising the fact that it is regulatory legislation and the provisions we impose have to be enforced by the Police Department and the Licensing Court.

We must ensure that the provisions inserted allow for a practical approach to the enforcement of the law because clearly it is not acceptable to make it impossible in terms of enforcement. That leads us to the issue raised on the membership fees for clubs.

I commend the Bill to members, bearing in mind we will deal with certain issues in the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Watt) in the Chair; Mr Hassell (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Repeal of section 3—

Mr PARKER: Section 3 of the principal Act is to be repealed by this clause when in fact it is an index of the schedule to the Act. I ask the Minister why we should delete what would appear to be a reasonably helpful portion of the Act?

Mr I. F. Taylor: You are doing a lot of this lately.

Mr HASSELL: I have not noticed this in relation to any other legislation. It is proposed that the provisions will be replaced by an index at the commencement of the Act.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 11 put and passed.

Clause 12: Section 24 amended—

Mr McPHARLIN: This clause deals with the deletion of the two-bottle limit and makes it open for the sale to take place of any quantity that a person wishes to purchase. I am not in favour of this move, realising that the two-bottle limit was open to abuse and that anyone with a carload could go from hotel outlet to hotel outlet and pick up more than just two bottles.

I object to the principle of making alcohol more accessible on Sundays because of the impact on the road toll. Statistics have shown that since the introduction of drinking on Sundays, the road toll has increased and on this premise I am not in favour of allowing the unlimited purchase of alcohol on Sundays, as proposed in this clause.

The road toll is a matter which causes a great deal of concern. The Minister has expressed concern from time to time as have others in authority in the community who have the responsibility to control such matters.

It is this aspect of the Bill which does not appeal to me; it will make it easier for people to purchase large quantities of liquor on Sundays. People can buy as much alcohol as they want from Monday to Saturday; surely we should have one day a week on which the sale of liquor is controlled. This aspect of the Bill does not meet with my approval.

Mr CLARKO: I share with the member for Mt. Marshall the view that we should not move to abolish the two-bottle limit of beer sales on Sundays to allow unlimited liquor sales. I have often had people say to me that the present system is unfair to those people who might like to buy a bottle of wine on Sundays. Those people have truly won the "pools" because now they will be able to buy not one bottle of wine, but a whole case of wine. In two weeks' time, if one is a Claremont supporter, one will be able to buy a case of champagne on the Sunday. In fact, he will be able to buy a shipload, should he so desire.

Mr Shalders: What will they be drinking at Bassendean?

Mr CLARKO: Up at Bassendean, they will be able to buy cases of beer. I do not think that is a suitable situation, therefore I move an amendment—

Page 5, lines 23 to 27—Delete paragraph (b).

If successful, my amendment will retain the existing situation where the maximum allowable sale will be two bottles of beer on Sundays, with no spirits or wine allowed to be sold.

I understand the two-bottle limit on Sundays was an old practice on the goldfields.

Mr Parker: A lot of old practices on the goldfields seem to be brought to the metropolitan area.

Mr CLARKO: I am informed that the then member for Murchison (Mr O'Brien) introduced a Bill which contained this limit. He claimed it was the only cure for miners' headache.

Sir Charles Court: He termed it "fracture headache".

Mr CLARKO: When asked why he needed two bottles, he said that the other bottle was for his wife. He drank one bottle and went to bed with his fracture headache and she woke up in the morning with a headache and drank the other bottle.

Mr Bryce: You would not have won a seat in the Murchison, either.

Mr CLARKO: Perhaps not. I am trying to say, firstly, that we should not move away from the existing two-bottle limit, and, secondly, and more importantly, that I may have been persuaded by the people who say the legislation is unfair to those who drink wines or spirits to the extent that I could have supported a move by the Government to extend the two-bottle limit to apply to wines and spirits. However, the Government has not done that; it has moved to allow an open go on all sales of liquor, which I cannot support.

Those people who regard Sunday as a special day, and those people who accept that hotels and taverns have not been able to sell more than two bottles of beer to each customer on Sundays in the past should support my amendment.

I rest my case.

Mr HASSELL: I do not think the amendment moved by the member for Karrinyup is sufficient to achieve his purpose; I believe he will need to move to delete paragraph (a) as well. Section 24 of the existing Liquor Act states—

24. (1) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, an hotel licence authorises the licensee to sell and supply liquor, on the licensed premises,—

- (a) at any time, to a lodger of the licensed premises;
- (b) during ordinary trading hours;
- (c) if the licensee has elected, under subsection (6) of this section, or is required, under subsection (5) of this section, to do so—

It goes on to refer to Sunday trading hours and then states—

for consumption on the premises, only;

In other words, that creates the authorisation to sell for consumption only on the premises. Paragraph (a) of the Bill seeks to delete the words "for consumption on the premises, only", and if those words are left in, the restriction on sales will continue.

That may not be the only issue, but I simply draw attention to it because if the member for Karrinyup wishes to achieve his objective he will need to consider the matter.

Mr NANOVIH: I support the Bill in its present form. Originally, I opposed the introduction of the two-bottle limit. Some years ago, the Act was amended to allow hotels to operate Sunday sessions and to permit them to sell two bottles of beer to each customer. I thought at the time it was a stupid amendment because it was a system which could be abused freely. I wonder whether the Government erred in allowing the sale of bottled beer at Sunday sessions. I believe that, just as in the cases of the butcher, the baker, and the milkman, we should consider Sunday a free day in the hotel industry. As it is today, hotels must employ staff on Sundays, which is a costly business. Perhaps it is not in the best interests of the hotel industry.

It has been said that this provision, restrictive as it is, drains profits from licensed clubs; they have their problems in meeting their commitments, although I concede a club is a little different from a hotel or a tavern.

I believe that either we do not allow the sale of packaged liquor on Sundays, or we scrap the

restriction completely, and allow an open go; it should be one or the other. Perhaps I would have been prepared to support an amendment which sought to disallow in total the sale of liquor on Sundays; however, I certainly cannot support the amendment moved by the member for Karrinyup.

Mr PARKER: I oppose the amendment moved by the member for Karrinyup and support the provision contained in the Bill. The member for Welshpool clearly outlined the Opposition's position; namely, that we support the abolition of the two-bottle limit. It seems to us that the limit has no current credibility and no reason exists for its maintenance. The points raised by the member for Karrinyup bear dealing with. Firstly, judging by Press comments on this matter, I would not like to be the member for Karrinyup if his amendment were carried and he went over to Rottnest Island in a few weeks' time. I do not think the licensee of the Rottnest Hotel would employ him as a bouncer.

Mr Clarko: We cannot allow mobs to decide what should be in the legislation.

Mr PARKER: I agree with the member for Karrinyup. Nevertheless, there are valid reasons that his amendment should be rejected. Firstly, I do not believe there is anything in the existing legislation which is logical. What is the difference between allowing the sale of two bottles of beer and the sale of two bottles of wine or spirits, or between two dozen bottles of beer and two dozen bottles of wine or spirits? Once the principle has been created, there is no reason for a limitation on a particular quantity.

We believe that if a person wants to buy a certain quantity of liquor on a Sunday, that is entirely up to him. The hotels are open for restricted trading, anyway; there is no additional obligation on the hotels to open and there is certainly no obligation on people to go down and purchase their alcohol on Sundays. We are simply allowing people a greater degree of flexibility. No principle is involved because the principle is already established. People already can buy alcohol for consumption off the premises on a Sunday. It is rather like the question of Bernard Shaw and the woman on the train. I do not

believe we will see a situation where people go to the hotels on Sundays and buy cases of alcohol.

However, if we in Fremantle decide we have to do that in both a week and a fortnight's time and the legislation is passed by then, I do not see anything wrong with it, particularly bearing in mind the point made by the member for Albany about family life. Family life would be enhanced if people were able to buy liquor and take it home rather than go to a hotel, where no change is to be made, and drink the liquor there.

There is no logic in the position being put that the two-bottle limit should not be abolished. The member for Welshpool outlined our position on Thursday. We believe the two-bottle limit ought to be abolished and the amendment proposed by the Minister supported.

Progress

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

House adjourned at 10.03 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Panel Beaters: Rates

1887. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) What is the current hourly rate paid by insurance companies for repairs by panel beaters?
- (2) Who fixes this rate?
- (3) How often is it adjusted?
- (4) What factors are taken into consideration in fixing such rate?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Hourly labour rates for repairs by panel beaters are not fixed by legislation and repairers are at liberty to negotiate their own rates with clients. However, I understand that the Western Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce has an arrangement with the State Government Insurance Office, which appears to set the standard in these matters, to arrive at an equitable rate based on the Motor Traders Association Manual for repairs. The present basic rate is \$13.90.
- (3) No fixed time, but usually every six months.
- (4) Market conditions, award rates, etc.

FIRES: FIRE BRIGADES BOARD

Officers

1888. Mr TONKIN, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) With respect to Western Australian Fire Brigades regulation No. 133 which states that, "No officer or fireman shall (c) supply information to the Press", is he aware that there is concern that councillors in local government and other persons who have been elected to represent the people cannot discharge their responsibilities if they are prevented from speaking freely, especially in cases where representatives of the news media may be present?
- (2) Is he concerned with the abrogation of the right to inform the public about a service for which the public have paid and are paying?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) and (2) A fire brigade employee speaking as a local authority councillor at a council meeting is not necessarily in breach of regulation 133. That question would arise if he used information gained as a fire brigade employee in his capacity as a local authority councillor.

I deplore the actions of any employee who uses a position of trust to criticise his employer with bias and denigrate the employer who pays his wages. Such a situation would not be tolerated elsewhere in the community, and will not be accepted in the Western Australian Fire Brigades.

Local Government is well represented on the Fire Brigades Board and that is the appropriate forum for the referral of matters affecting local government in the operations of the fire service.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Turnover

1890. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) With reference to his answer to question 1827 of 1981 relating to TAB turnover, could he detail the commercial reasons for not disclosing the total turnover of the Totalisator Agency Board in Kalgoorlie/Boulder?

- (2) If not, why not?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) (a) Confidentiality of the business affairs of persons operating agencies of the board under licence;
- (b) security;
- (c) the board does not maintain statistics relative to the turnovers of separate areas or regions as it has been found they serve no useful purpose.

- (2) Answered by (1) above.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS

Right to Life Association: Film

1905. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Who are the members of the health advisory committee referred to in answers to questions on 16 September 1981?
- (2) What were the recommendations made in regard to the visual presentation on abortion sponsored by the Right to Life Association?
- (3) How many slides make up the visual presentation?
- (4) Is there a set pre-recorded text accompanying the presentation?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The members of the Health Education Advisory Committee are—

Dr R. L. Vickery (Chairman).
 Dr J. Henzell, Acting Director
 Community and Child Health
 Services.
 Mr L. Pavy, Superintendent of
 Physical Education.
 Mr J. Newby, Superintendent of
 Curriculum.
 Mr R. Waugh, Board of Secondary
 Education.
 Dr J. Pougher, Co-ordinator
 Community Development
 Centre.
 Dr P. Howat, Acting Head
 Community Health Sciences,
 WAIT.
 Mrs M. Sclanders, Health
 Education Unit.
 Mr P. Frizzell, Executive Officer.
 Mrs J. Bunbury, Acting Chief
 Health Education Officer,
 Health Education Unit.
 Dr K. Carruthers, Acting Deputy
 Commissioner, Department of
 Health and Medical Services.

Of these members, the last six named were able to attend the showing of the presentation by the Right to Life Association.

- (2) May I direct the member to question without notice 420 on page 3295 of Hansard.
- (3) Approximately 30.
- (4) Yes.

HOSPITAL: SIR CHARLES GAIRDNER

Podium and Ward Block

1906. Mr HODGE, to the Treasurer:

How much has been paid each year for funds borrowed to build the ward and podium block at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

As set out in the General Loan Fund Estimates, the funds available for the hospitals capital works programme during the construction period of the ward and podium block comprised General Loan Fund advances (including allocations of Commonwealth capital grants), Lotteries Commission's contributions, Commonwealth grants under the hospitals development programme and loans raised by hospitals. It would obviously be a pointless administrative exercise to allocate notional proportions of interest bearing and non-interest bearing funds to individual projects and accordingly no dissection of these funds is made by projects. The hospital fund meets the interest and sinking fund contributions on loans provided from the General Loan Fund on a total basis. As at 30 June 1981 the total indebtedness for General Loan Fund advances amounted to \$184.8 million and the interest and sinking fund contributions for 1980-81 were \$14 537 210 and \$1 164 198 respectively.

HOSPITAL: SIR CHARLES GAIRDNER

Podium and Ward Block

1907. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

When will the ward and podium block at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital be opened?

Mr YOUNG replied:

The building is being progressively handed over to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. The first handover occurred on 7 September 1981, and the respective departments are progressively occupying the building.

ROAD

Warton Road

1908. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware of a dangerous bend on Warton Road, Forrestdale, approximately one kilometre from the Forrest Road turnoff?
- (2) Will he take action to have a warning sign placed on both approaches to the bend?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Appropriate symbolic curve warning signs, and associated directional hazard markers, were erected for both approaches to the location on Friday, 11 September 1981.

CEMETERY

Pinnaroo Valley Memorial Park

1909. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Master Monumental Masons Association has made representations to her concerning the provision of a lawn area at Pinnaroo Valley Memorial Park suitable for headstone development?
- (2) Is it a fact that she gave an undertaking to the abovementioned association that she would develop a portion of the cemetery for headstones?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "Yes", why has she not taken steps to implement the proposal?
- (4) If the answer to (2) is "No", will she please provide details of her discussion with the association?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) to (4) I would not be in a position to give any such undertaking and I have not done so. However, the Pinnaroo Valley Cemetery Board gave a commitment to develop portion of the cemetery for headstones subject to the provision of funds for the purpose and I have informed the Master Monumental Masons Association accordingly.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: ACT

Section 329

1910. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Local Government:

Insofar as section 329 of the Local Government Act is concerned—

- (a) what is a country district;
- (b) what is a regional district;
- (c) what is the difference between a country district and a regional district?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (a) A county district is an area comprising the whole or portions of the districts of two or more municipalities which have agreed to form a county council for the purpose of carrying out specific functions in the county district;
- (b) a regional district has the same meaning as a county district;
- (c) there is no difference.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: ACT

Section 329

1911. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Local Government:

Further to the brief reference in her second reading speech on the Local Government Amendment Bill (No. 3) that deficiencies had been identified in the existing provisions of section 329, will she please provide details of the difficulties being experienced?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

Section 329 is deficient in that although it provides for the establishment of regional or county councils, it does not contain detailed machinery provisions covering their formation and operation. These deficiencies will be apparent when a comparison is made between the existing provisions of section 329 and those of the Bill.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: ACT

Reprinting

1912. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Local Government:

When is it intended that the Local Government Act will be reprinted so that all recent amendments can be included within the one document?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

Procedures for the reprinting of the Local Government Act, including any amendments that may be passed during the current sitting, are already in train. The reprinted Act is expected to be available in the early part of next year.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: LAND

Kenwick

1913. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Following representations to her regarding the estate of the late Mr S. A. Miskavicz by the Kenwick Ward Progress Association, what information has she received from the Gosnells City Council regarding the actual ownership of the land situated at Brixton Street, Kenwick, on which a public road has been constructed on alleged private property?
- (2) As this affects the ratepayers of this area, what action does she intend to take regarding this matter?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) The City of Gosnells has indicated that the land in question is still registered in private ownership.
- (2) The problem is one for the City of Gosnells to resolve and I am satisfied that it is taking appropriate measures to do so.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Canal Developments

1914. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is it a fact that a canal project is proposed for stage 3 of Clifton Park at Australind?
- (2) Is it on the flood plain of the Collie River?
- (3) Have plans been submitted to the Government for this proposed canal development to proceed?
- (4) What is the Government's attitude to the proposal?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (3) Yes.

- (4) The application was deferred pending completion of a flood study. It should be processed in future in accordance with procedures set out in the report of the steering committee on canal developments.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Rockingham

1915. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that the Rockingham Senior High School students begin their school day at 8.30 a.m.?
- (2) Is he also aware that due to the inability of the Metropolitan Transport Trust to provide sufficient buses in the Rockingham area, some 30 or more students from Warnbro area are unable to arrive at school before 8.40 a.m. to 8.45 a.m.?
- (3) As the MTT is currently re-negotiating its Rockingham timetable, will he arrange for immediate meetings to be held between the school and the MTT in an endeavour to provide the extra bus needed and obviate the need for students to arrive at school, missing part of the first period?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes. I understand the altered starting time of 8.30 a.m. was decided on by the then principal in the knowledge that it would not be possible to re-organise bus schedules to be as convenient as they had previously been, or to provide special buses.
- (2) and (3) Students from Warnbro can use normal bus services to travel to Rockingham Senior High School arriving either about half an hour before or a little after the 8.30 a.m. start and information on the services available has been conveyed to all concerned by the MTT.

I think the member will appreciate that it is not feasible to run an extra bus at additional cost, when the normal service is adequate.

ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS

Expenditure

1916. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

Relative to the South Perth Zoo and the amount of money spent so far on the ten year programme since 1974, would the Minister provide details of the expenditure?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

Expenditure on embodiment of development plan, so far, amounts to \$1 381 166. Major projects completed, comprise—

| | \$ |
|--|---------|
| Nocturnal House | 256 911 |
| Great Ape Precinct | 564 263 |
| Aviary Complex | 147 140 |
| Administration Building and Admissions Office | 300 347 |
| Public Amenities Building | 112 505 |

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Safety Bay

1917. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he received an approach from the Safety Bay Primary School Parents and Citizens' Association for financial assistance to provide two basketball/netball courts on the southern boundary of the school?
- (2) Is he aware that although Safety Bay Primary School only has one court at this time, most other adjacent schools have three courts of this type?
- (3) As the Rockingham Shire Council has indicated to the parents and citizens' association it is prepared to assist on a 50/50 basis to provide two courts for the school, is the Education Department prepared to assist with funding for the other 50 per cent?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (3) The Parents and Citizens' Association of the Safety Bay Primary School has suggested that the Shire of Rockingham and the Education Department each pay 50 per cent of the cost of providing two netball courts at this school. Under its subsidy scheme the Education Department is willing to provide up to \$2 000 on a dollar for dollar basis, to match funds raised by the school.
- (2) The Education Department provides hard standing areas at schools. In newer schools there are up to three, one for each cluster. They are not specifically netball courts as each is intended as a playing area for classes in the adjacent cluster.

It is understood that this school has access to shire courts close by.

LIQUOR

Taverns

1918. Mr JAMIESON, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Why are licensing fees on taverns payable on 31 January, 30 April, 31 July and 30 September, instead of four even periods?
- (2) Would he give consideration to requesting the Licensing Court to alter these dates to spread them evenly throughout the year?
- (3) Have there been many complaints about this levying of charges?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) This provision applies to all kinds of retail licences and derives from the Licensing Act prior to the enactment of the Liquor Act in 1970. The reason for its adoption is not known.
- (2) Clause 84 of the Liquor Bill, now before the House, provides for payments to be made before the last day of October, January, April or July, or one payment before the last day of July in each year.
- (3) No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: RATES

Pensioners

1919. Mr CARR, to the Treasurer:

With reference to the scheme which allows pensioners to receive a rebate of council rates, does this scheme apply to pensioners who are owner-occupiers of home units:

- (a) where rating is on unimproved capital value and one account is sent to the body corporate, to which each home owner contributes his share;
- (b) where rating is on annual rental value and separate accounts are sent to each unit owner?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (a) and (b) I am advised that the form of account issued by local authorities does not depend upon the type of rate valuation used but upon the form of ownership.

When home units are on strata title, separate rate assessments will normally be issued for each unit.

If the home unit owners are tenants in common of undivided shares—so called "purple" titles—one assessment only will normally be issued to the management committee. However, if one or more of the home unit owners are eligible pensioners wishing to claim the rates concessions, the local authority will arrange for separate rates assessments to be issued if all the tenants in common are agreeable.

This procedure applies whether rates are assessed on unimproved capital value or annual value.

TRAFFIC: DRIVERS

Offences

1920. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is it a fact that where a motorist is found guilty in a District Court in his absence of a traffic offence, the offender is advised by mail of the monetary penalties but not the details of any suspension or cancellation of driver's licence which the motorist is asked to ascertain for himself?
- (2) If "Yes", would he take the necessary steps in future to ensure that such

offenders are advised in specific terms of all the penalties that have been imposed?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Notices of fines and costs which are posted to defendants include details of licence suspensions. However, the suspension operates from the date imposed by the court. It is for this reason that all summonses for traffic offences include a warning that it is the offender's responsibility to inquire as to licence suspensions on the day of the court hearing.
- (2) The onus of determining whether a suspension has been imposed must remain with the offender.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Government: Use

1921. Mr CRANE, to the Treasurer:

- (1) In view of the stringent budgetary controls necessary at this time and the need for all Government departments to examine their budgets and set their priorities in terms of cuts which are inevitable, how many Government heads of departments and other personnel use Government vehicles to travel to and from work in the metropolitan area?
- (2) What are the names and positions of these personnel and the departments in which they work?
- (3) How many vehicles are involved?
- (4) What is the annual cost of these vehicles?
- (5) (a) What is the highest and lowest salary bracket of those personnel; and
(b) the average yearly salary they receive?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (5) As the details required to answer this question are not centrally maintained, any project undertaken specifically to obtain the information sought by the member would be a lengthy and time consuming task.

The Government has announced its intention to appoint consultants to carry out a study with a view to ensuring maximum efficiency in all aspects of State Government vehicle operations.

It is anticipated that the type of data sought by the member will be collected and analysed by the consultants and will be included in their report at the conclusion of the study.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Community Youth Support Scheme

1922. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Was a Victorian Government plan to replace the Commonwealth youth support scheme shortly to be scrapped by the Commonwealth Government discussed by Federal and State Labor Ministers at their meeting last Friday?
- (2) If "Yes", what was the outcome of any such discussion?
- (3) What attitude did he take towards any such proposal, and what views, if any, did he put on behalf of the Western Australian State Government about the abandonment of the Commonwealth youth support scheme?
- (4) Were any other proposals on the possible replacement of the Commonwealth youth support scheme put before the meeting?
- (5) If "Yes", what were these proposals?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The Victorian Minister did suggest that a youth support scheme be introduced.
- (2) State and Commonwealth Ministers agreed to consider this suggestion and to support it in broad principle subject to clarification and the right to amend the overall proposal and/or the detail.
- (3) I agreed to consider and broadly support the proposal subject to examination of the detail, the right to suggest alterations and on the clear understanding that any scheme would have to be funded by the Commonwealth. I suggested that a working party of Commonwealth and State officers could perhaps investigate the matter and report back.
- (4) No.
- (5) Not applicable.

TOURISM

Right to Life Association

1923. Mr PEARCE, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is it a fact that the WA Tourist Bureau is sponsoring or assisting the Right to Life Association in its national conference in Perth next month?
- (2) If so, what form does this sponsorship or assistance take?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Department of Tourism has provided assistance by overprinting one of its standard promotional brochures for the National Convention of the Australian Federation of Right to Life Associations.
This assistance is provided by the department as part of its endeavours to attract visitors to the State, to many and varied organisations. Similar overprinting of brochures has been carried out in recent times for—
 - (a) The 1981 Festival of Perth program of Ansett Airlines.
 - (b) The XXII World Veterinary Congress (1983).
 - (c) The 25th National Convention of the Gideons International in Australia.
 - (d) The 13th Annual Congress of the Australian Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis.
 - (e) The 12th International Conference of the International Cartographic Association.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LAND: FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Advertising

511. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

I refer him to recent publicity concerning the activities of a developer selling land at Lake Cogrup to buyers in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur.
In view of the great harm which could be done to WA by the distribution of misleading material to potential investors, what steps is the Government taking to establish the accuracy of material presented and to investigate the bona fides of the project?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I know nothing of the deal to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. I understand that in the *Daily News* last night there was some reference to a deal, which seems to answer the description of the one to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. I have not studied it personally, but I certainly will have a look at it to ascertain whether there is any suggestion of misrepresentation.

HOUSING: INTEREST RATES

Mortgage Assessment and Relief Committee

512. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can the Minister outline the actions of the mortgage assessment and relief committee since it was established?
- (2) How many applications for assistance have been referred to the committee to date and with what result?
- (3) How is the committee implementing its assessment role?
- (4) What has been the experience of the lending institutions since the recent interest rate increases?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) The committee was established at a special meeting of the building societies advisory committee with me on 20 August 1981.

Since then the following activities have taken place—

21 August—A letter was forwarded to all building societies and banks enclosing a copy of my Press release on the matter. The lending authorities were told that a set of guidelines was being prepared, and that any referrals to the committee are to be made by the lending authorities.

3 September—A copy of the basic guidelines as set down by the committee was forwarded to all building societies and banks.

10 September—The second meeting of the committee was held at which—

The basic guidelines were confirmed.

It was decided to prepare and distribute to the lending institutions standard forms for processing applications for assistance.

It was also decided to ask lending institutions to provide details regarding—

- (a) current trends in arrears;
- (b) comments regarding reasons for arrears;
- (c) evidence of over commitments on hire purchase, or other forms of borrowing;
- (d) other relative comments.

17 September—A further letter was forwarded to building societies and banks enclosing copies of standard forms to be used, and seeking information to assist in the committee's assessment of relief needed.

21 September—At a meeting of the committee at which representatives of building societies and consumer affairs were in attendance, 12 applications for relief were considered.

- (2) 79 applications have been or will be referred to the committee for consideration. Of the 12 already examined, five have been approved, three declined, and four deferred for further information.
- (3) Lending institutions have been asked to keep statistics and to notify the committee for the period ending 31 October the number of applications for relief received, the number assisted by rearranging mortgage repayments, the number referred to the committee, and the number not needing assistance.
- (4) Up to 18 September, the Perth Building Society had received 156 applications for assistance. Thirteen were subject to restructure arrangements, 56 will be referred to the committee, and 87 did not qualify. Of those not qualifying, the ratio of repayment to income in the main was not higher than 27½ per cent when the new interest rates were taken into consideration.

Since mid-July Town and Country Building Society's loans counselling officers have interviewed approximately 250 purchasers. Apart from restructuring many loans, 22 applications are in the process of being referred to the committee.

Point of Order

Mr EVANS: Is a Minister entitled to take the opportunity provided by questions without notice to make a major policy statement or explanation which he could not make on a previous occasion?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Warren is correct in that a Minister is not permitted to use question time for that purpose. However, it is my view the Honorary Minister is not using it for that purpose, although his answer seems to be rather long. I ask the Honorary Minister to draw his answer to a conclusion.

Questions (without notice) Resumed

Mr LAURANCE: I have mentioned most of the major building societies. The other building societies have had a similar experience and the response from terminating building societies has been minimal. One application from the TLC Terminating Society was received today.

LAND: FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Advertising

513. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Has he asked his department to look at the misleading nature of advertising being distributed by Satterley Crofts Real Estate, about the Lake Cogrup project?
- (2) Does the Consumer Affairs Bureau have any jurisdiction over advertising outside the State by developers of Western Australian land?
- (3) What steps will be taken to inform prospective local purchasers about the pitfalls associated with this development?

(122)

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) No, I have not asked the department to do that at this stage. However, I have written a note asking the department to obtain details. The Bureau of Consumer Affairs usually follows up these matters and I shall find out the details from it as soon as I can.

LAND

Lake Cogrup

514. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) In view of the potential problems with Lake Cogrup estate because of low water levels, the delicate nature of the environment, and heavy expenses for provision of power and water, what steps are being taken by her department to ensure that developers do not provide information about developments which is misleading and not in accordance with town planning and local shire rules, when they are at the stage of only preliminary approval?
- (2) Has she received any representations from the Shire of Murray or the developers on this matter?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) I have not received any representations from the Shire of Murray or from any person since the publicity in relation to this matter was released. The member asked also what conditions were imposed. Had he read the article clearly, he would have seen it was indicated that, because of the fragile nature of the environment and the high water table, many conditions were imposed and those conditions were arrived at in consultation with the Department of Conservation and Environment and the Public Works Department. It must be realised there will be no title to any of the land in question until such time as the diagram of survey has been lodged with and approved by the local authority. Therefore, although it can be said people are attempting to sell some land, there is certainly no availability of title to that land, nor will there be until all conditions are met.

TRANSPORT: AIR

Kimberley

515. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Transport:

With reference to the Government's decision to allocate the Kimberley RPT service contract to Amity Aviation—

- (a) what criteria are necessary to be fulfilled for a licence to be granted to operate an RPT service in remote areas of WA;
- (b) what has prompted the Government to make a decision to allocate a contract for the Kimberley RPT service before the air transport review findings have been released?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (a) and (b) I acknowledge the concern expressed by the member for the service to which he referred and it is also of much concern to me. Therefore, I ask the member to put the question on notice and, if he does not have time to do so today, I shall undertake to give him an answer at this time tomorrow.

COURT: LICENSING

Alpak Pty. Ltd.: Laverton

516. Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Referring to the recent refusal by the Licensing Court to grant a packaged liquor licence to Alpak Pty. Ltd. of Laverton could the Minister give the reasons for the application being refused?
- (2) Is he aware that the decision indicates a continuing protective attitude in favour of the hotel establishment that has failed to measure up to the needs of the community over the past seven years?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that as far back as 1974, Mr R. Floyd, Manager of Windarra Nickel Mines, made a submission outlining the deficiencies he thought existed and which he felt should be corrected to service a modern community being established at Laverton?
- (4) Does the Minister realise that the rejection of a packaged liquor licence

curtails the opportunity for the Laverton business district to achieve a \$500 000 commercial development in the form of a 12-unit motel, licensed restaurant, fast food outlet, and packaged liquor licence complex which would enhance the town's tourist attraction and at the same time realise the aspirations of the community to enjoy the benefits of a major social function facility?

Mr HASSELL replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) The reasons of the Licensing Court for refusing the application by Alpak Pty. Ltd. for a store licence in Laverton were given in its decision dated 8 September 1981, a copy of which is tabled.

There is no evidence of any impropriety on the part of the court which made its decision on grounds available to it under the Act. The court is bound by the Act. If there is any error of law in the decision the applicant may appeal.

- (2) The court's decision does not indicate a protective attitude in view of the court's recent order to the licensee of the hotel in Laverton, under part V of the Act, requiring him to extend the hotel.
- (3) Mr Floyd's submission is known to the court, but it is noted that he did not give evidence in the recent proceedings.
- (4) The court is bound to proceed under the legislation. Although, certainly, matters of judgment are involved, it can only allow developments which, considered in the context of the application, are permitted under the Act.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 96).

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Right to Life Association: Film

517. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Education:

This question refers to earlier questions I have asked regarding the visual presentation on abortion by the Right to Life Association. In view of those

questions, as a result of an answer to a question asked today, it appears three of the six people on the health advisory committee who recommended certain changes to that presentation were doctors, and in view of the fact that on 26 August last the Minister indicated the committee wanted changes to be made to the presentation and that it should be modified in order that it would conform with acceptable departmental standards, can the Minister tell us why no changes have been made and will the visual presentation be withdrawn until the recommendations of the health advisory committee and the undertaking given by the Minister have been complied with?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Firstly, I wish to point out to the member the film will certainly not be withdrawn. Secondly, the health advisory committee made some recommendations and suggested the presentation be modified. Indeed, it has been modified, as I have mentioned already, by limiting the period the slides are shown on the screen. Other objections were made, but these are covered by the explanation of the audiovisual presentation which takes place at the beginning of the procedure. The presentation was produced in America and the legal implications do not apply in this State. I understand that the presentation has been going on now for approximately 10 years and up until relatively recently, to my knowledge, no complaints of any kind had been made.

Mr Davies: What modifications have been made?

HEALTH

Medical Board of WA and Medical Defence Association of WA

518. Mr HODGE, to the Honorary Acting Minister for Health:

- (1) What arrangements exist between the Medical Board of WA and the Medical Defence Association of WA (Inc.) regarding the sharing of office space?
- (2) If the two organisations referred to above share the cost of office rent would he please provide details of the total amount paid and the share paid by each?

- (3) If the two organisations share or jointly employ staff, would he please provide details as to how many are involved and what proportion of salary or wages are paid by each employer and approximately how much time is spent by each employee working for each employer?
- (4) What arrangements exist between the two organisations, to share the cost of telephone, electricity, postage and other items associated with running an office?
- (5) Does the Medical Defence Association of WA (Inc.) supply and pay for all its own stationery requirements.

Mr LAURANCE (for Mr YOUNG) replied:

- (1) to (5) The administration of the Medical Board of Western Australia and the Medical Defence Association of Western Australia (Inc.) is performed by a firm of chartered accountants. I am advised that both the board and the association are treated as separate clients of the practice and there is, therefore, no common arrangement made in respect to the sharing of costs or office overheads.

The staff of the practice is engaged on duties associated with not only the Medical Board and the Medical Defence Association but also other statutory boards and clients associated with the practice.

In regard to confidentiality of information, the practice is bound by the ethical requirements of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia and also is fully accountable to all boards and associations and other clients they represent.

In the case of the Medical Board and the Medical Defence Association, each of these bodies is separately responsible for any direct costs such as stationery, printing, etc.

STOCK: SHEEPSKINS

Treatment

519. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he received reports and/or samples of wool which show effects of treatment by the chemical "Clout" and which could not be removed in scouring attempts by the Australian Wool Testing Authority and Westwool?

- (2) In view of possible widespread damage and possible astronomical cost to the Western Australian wool clip, will he now place restrictions on the sale of "Clout" in this State?

Mr Pearce: "Woolgate"!

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) To the best of my knowledge, I have not received any samples that have been tested by the Australian Wool Testing Authority. I did receive some samples of wool today but they certainly did not have that tag on them—maybe they have and maybe they have not been tested.

Mr Brian Burke: Don't be so definite!

Mr OLD: I have advised the member previously on several occasions that we have sent wool to CSIRO for testing. I have asked him to be a little patient until the results of those tests arrive. Until the results of those tests arrive it is not my intention to ban the sale of "Clout". I have explained to the House on several occasions that the effects of "Clout", some of which are deleterious, certainly are not at this stage treated as being serious enough to ban the sale. The primary producers of this State have been warned on several occasions of the effects that "Clout" can have on the scouring of wool. It is a commercial judgment, and if we find there is in fact a serious problem within the industry, we will give consideration to banning the sale of "Clout".

Mr Evans: When will that be?

Mr OLD: When CSIRO gives us the results of the tests.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Right to Life Association: Film

520. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

Regarding the visual display which has been widely presented to schools by the Right to Life Association, in view of the Minister's changing attitude to this matter as evidenced in answer to questions by myself and my colleague, the member for Victoria Park, and particularly in view of suggestions that some of the slides involved in this presentation have in fact been faked and that the material presented along with these slides—the sound section—is not factually accurate, will the Minister

reconsider the refusal he gave me some time ago when I asked would he arrange for this audiovisual presentation to be shown to all members of Parliament so that we can more properly decide whether we wish to take further action in regard to this presentation, which affects the children in our schools?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I can well understand the member for Gosnells' attitude towards this film, bearing in mind the recent ACTU motion to the effect that there should be abortion on demand—

Mr Pearce: I am concerned about the children who come home crying from school after seeing this obscene show.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pearce interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Gosnells interjects again I will take some action. I have been on my feet for several seconds trying to maintain order and he persists in shouting across the Chamber, a standard of behaviour I am not prepared to accept. I want to warn members of the House that if interjections occur whilst Ministers are answering questions, I will terminate questions without notice for the day.

Mr GRAYDEN: To continue: I can understand the attitude of the member for Gosnells to this particular question, for the reason I have outlined. I say, however, that if he wants to see the film, all he need do is ring the Right to Life Association. I would imagine this film has been around for at least 12 years and has been shown in schools throughout Western Australia, as far as I am aware, without any complaints at all until recently. If the member wants to see it, I can assure him that the members of that association will be most happy to bring it to this House. Members of the House will have the opportunity then to see it.

As far as I am aware, all sorts of programmes are designed and put forward for our schools by the pro-abortion lobby. So far I have not referred them to the health advisory committee. If this sort of questioning

and criticism persists, quite obviously, I will have to do that. If one side is presented in our schools, it is desirable that the other side also should have the opportunity to present its case. I emphasise that before this presentation is shown in those schools where the principals want it to be shown, it is pointed out that it was produced in America and therefore does contain some inaccuracies. Those inaccuracies are of little consequence in relation to the presentation as a whole. I, for one, certainly would not accept the allegations which the member for Gosnells has made in respect of certain aspects of slides being faked.

SALES TAX

Federal Budget

521. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the State Government support the Fraser Government's decision to impose sales tax on books, which is tantamount to a tax on knowledge?
- (2) Has the State Government made any endeavour to convince the Fraser Government of the error of its decision to impose a wide-sweeping system of increases in sales tax?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Regarding the imposition of a sales tax on books and other materials, I have not made a specific representation to the Prime Minister. In fact, I have not made any representation to him in detail regarding sales tax. I did express publicly my concern about the procedures adopted and the strategy used by the Commonwealth Government in arriving at its balanced Budget. Beyond that I remind the member that it is not my province to formulate the Commonwealth Budget even though I take exception to some of the measures in it and some of the techniques used to determine it.

I reiterate that I have not made any specific representations to the Prime Minister, but have expressed myself publicly on the method used by the Commonwealth to arrive at its balanced Budget.

STOCK: SHEEPSKINS

Treatment

522. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he made an approach to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation requesting that it treat as a matter of utmost priority the completion of tests in regard to wool treated with Clout?
- (2) If he has not done so, will he?
- (3) Otherwise, is he content to go along with the attitude he expressed in his previous answer that we will have the required answers when the tests are completed?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) to (3) One would gather the impression that the only person in this House who sees any urgency in this matter is the member for Warren. I assure him that an approach has been made to the CSIRO. Certain arrangements were made with the CSIRO through the Australian Wool Commission a long time before anyone started to express concern about the effects of Clout on wool.

Mr Evans: What about on skins?

Mr OLD: I am referring only to wool. The matter was taken up with the CSIRO through the commission and a degree of urgency was expressed. I assure the member that as soon as the results are received from the CSIRO we will advise the industry of them.

SALES TAX

Federal Budget

523. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

Perhaps I misheard the Premier's answer to the question posed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I ask: Does his Government support the Fraser Government's decision to impose wide-ranging sales tax measures which will affect a number of items including books?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

If I omitted to answer that part of the question of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I am sorry. I had no intention to avoid that portion of the

question. I thought I made myself clear in saying that I expressed concern in regard to aspects of the strategy employed and the detail followed by the Commonwealth Government in arriving at its Budget. However, I can amplify the point. Approximately \$500 million was basically taken from the States on 4 May, and much has been said about that. The Commonwealth will raise approximately a further \$500 million from sales tax to enable it to balance the Budget. Of course, I am talking in round figures.

My view of the matter was that if the Commonwealth wanted to change its taxing policies, that is the Commonwealth's decision, not ours. I do not have to explain that change. If it is to change

its taxing policy away from a greater emphasis on direct taxation to indirect taxation, I believe it should have coincided the increase in indirect taxation with a decrease in direct taxation. I repeat that it is not for me to draw up the Federal Budget.

Mr Brian Burke: You don't mind trying to do that most times.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have been vocal in expressing my disapproval of what the Federal Government has done—especially in connection with the States on 4 May and 19, and 20 June. Having said that, I again remind the Leader of the Opposition that, thank goodness, the State Government does not have the responsibility of drawing up the Federal Budget.
