

to the work which he, as Minister for Local Government, had done during the latter years in this State.

Everyone liked Gilbert Fraser. I feel I should recall an instance which indicated what type of man he was. The portfolio of local government, as the Premier said, is not an easy one. It has many difficulties. On one occasion when I was about to become involved in some conflict, Gilbert Fraser, as Minister for Local Government, came to me and gave me all the kindly advice that was needed; and at the same time he offered to do all that was necessary to get me out of trouble. This did indicate his kindness, his tolerance, and his capacity to look on both sides of a question. Perhaps in the political world we do not have enough people like him.

I join with the Premier in conveying to Mrs. Fraser and members of her family our deepest sympathy. Words are inadequate to convey fully our feelings; for I am sure, from this Parliament, apart from members of the Cabinet and people of Western Australia, comes a very real feeling of sympathy and sadness over the fact that one who worked so hard in the interests of this State has passed on before his time.

THE HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling): I would like to support this motion. I always looked on Mr. Fraser as a fair-minded and logical-minded man; and that enabled him, as was quite apparent, to see both sides of a case. Being able to see both sides of a case, and having that type of mind and kindness of nature, he was well suited to give fair judgment on it.

What most of us admired, in addition to those characteristics to which reference has been made, was the very great fortitude with which he endured the ill health he suffered in the last few months. I think no-one can underestimate that. Even when he was in attendance in this House towards the end of the time when he was here, it was quite apparent to us that he was suffering very considerable strain. That had gone on, I understand, for a period of many months.

Taken by and large, the State has lost a very fine man and a very good servant. We all join in tendering our heartfelt sympathy to his widow and family.

Question passed; members standing.

House adjourned at 4.46 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 5th November, 1958.

CONTENTS.

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Milk, sale in "Tetra Pack"	1914
Native welfare, inmates of Alvan and McDonald Houses	1915
Metropolitan Transport Trust, payment to shareholders of bus companies	1915
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Close of session, anticipated date	1915
RESOLUTION :	
Legal Practitioners Act, amendment of Barristers' Board Rule 30	1961
BILLS :	
Wheat Industry Stabilisation, 1r.	1915
Totalisator Duty Act Amendment, 3r.	1915
Traffic Act Amendment, 3r.	1915
Cancer Council of Western Australia, 2r.	1915
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 2r.	1919
Town Planning and Development Act Amendment, 2r.	1920
City of Perth Parking Facilities Act Amendment, 1r.	1921
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2r.	1921
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment (No. 2), Assembly's message	1925
Licensing Act Amendment, 2r.	1925
Bank Holidays Act Amendment, 2r., defeated	1929
ADJOURNMENT, SPECIAL	1961

The **PRESIDENT** took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

MILK.

Sale in "Tetra Pack."

1. The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has the attention of the Minister for Agriculture been directed to a new retail milk pack known as "Tetra pack"?

(2) Has any application been received asking permission to market whole milk in a "Tetra pack"?

(3) If the answer to No. (2) is "Yes," what is the price allowed to be charged for one pint so packed?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) The same maximum price as is allowed for milk sold in bottles which, in the metropolitan area, is 9½d. per pint.

NATIVE WELFARE.

Inmates of Alvan and McDonald Houses.

2. The Hon. H. L. ROCHE asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many coloured children can be accommodated at—

(a) Alvan House;

(b) McDonald House?

(2) How many of such children are now accommodated at—

(a) Alvan House;

(b) McDonald House?

(3) What has been the average number at each institution each year since they were established?

(4) What methods are followed or procedure adopted by the Department of Native Welfare to obtain inmates for these institutions?

(5) Are prospective inmates or their parents advised in advance that payments are expected from them?

(6) If so, in what form is such advice submitted? Can a copy be made available for perusal?

(7) Referring to my questions, answered on the 23rd October, what are the boarding allowances totalling £1,288 11s. 6d.?

(8) Are they collected on some prescribed scale, or how otherwise?

(9) Where does the inmate obtain money to pay them?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) (a) 18.

(b) 10.

(2) (a) 11.

(b) 6.

(3)

Alvan
House

McDonald
House

1950-51	7	—
1951-52	11	4
1952-53	13	6
1953-54	14	6
1954-55	16	8
1955-56	11	7
1956-57	9	7
1957-58	9	7

(4) Inmates are selected from applicants who express a desire to obtain secondary education and would benefit therefrom.

(5) Where the parent is employed, he is requested to contribute towards the costs before the child is admitted.

(6) The advice is verbal.

(7) The amount received from the Education Department is boarding away from home allowance.

(8) Prescribed scale.

(9) See No. (7).

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST.

Payment to Shareholders of Bus Companies.

3. The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) In respect to bus companies already taken over by the Metropolitan Transport Trust when is it anticipated that shareholders in such companies will receive payment for their shares?

(2) Have valuations of the assets of such companies been arrived at?

(3) What is the anticipated payment to shareholders?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) As soon as all transfers and legal procedure have been completed.

(2) Valuations of the main assets have been made.

(3) It is not possible at this stage to anticipate the amount of payment to shareholders.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.**CLOSE OF SESSION.**

Anticipated Date.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH asked the Minister for Railways:

Can he indicate to the House the date on which it is anticipated the Government wishes to end this session of Parliament?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

I am not in a position to give a definite date, but judging by the volume of business still to be considered by Parliament, it is anticipated the session should be completed by the 27th of this month.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION BILL.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways), read a first time.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Totalisator Duty Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

2, Traffic Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Assembly.

CANCER COUNCIL OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [4.43]: I do not intend to endeavour to tell the House all that has taken place

in the formation of the Bill, the formation of the proposed council, or the institute, because if I did we would be here for a very long time. From memory, the members of the present cancer council—which will be dissolved on the passing of this measure—has already held 17 meetings, many of which have gone on into the long hours of the night.

One of the great problems that confronted the committee in its early stages was the type of apparatus that it should purchase for the treatment of cancer; and those who remember the initial publicity that was given to this matter will recall that, at that time, we suggested the purchase of a cobalt bomb. We then began to realise that a more effective instrument in the shape of the linear accelerator was available to us at a somewhat greater cost than the cobalt bomb which, of course, could be purchased in varying sizes. The council eventually agreed to purchase the linear accelerator and it was ordered—I think, before the public had subscribed any money towards its purchase—on the realisation that the generosity of the people of this State would again be manifest as it had been in the past when appeals were made to them for anything that would improve the health of the community.

Having overcome that major problem, there were still a great many major factors in regard to the use of the linear accelerator, its siting, its housing, and the improvement of facilities in relation to its upkeep and maintenance. These questions all required expert knowledge at the meetings, and a great deal of information had to be obtained on matters that were beyond the capacity of many of us to understand in the early stages. The difficulties that arose in this regard were numerous and, in some cases, profound, but with the aid of the experts in all branches associated with the linear accelerator, the matter became clear as time went on.

One question that did not become clear, however, was the siting of the instrument. The problem was whether it should be sited at the Royal Perth Hospital or in association with the proposed medical centre at Hollywood. On this question there have been many goings and comings and great difference of opinion, but in the end it was decided that it should be placed just south of, and across the road from, the Chest Hospital; and probably in line with the dining equipment of that hospital.

There are those who still believe, however, that it would have been wiser to place this instrument in association with the Royal Perth Hospital. One of the great difficulties surrounding that site, however, was that it would be placed in a position from which expansion has always proved difficult. If a new medical centre is to be formed, it will be on what might

be termed the Hollywood site. There were many advantages pointed out by the honorary staff of the Royal Perth Hospital in having the linear accelerator based at the Royal Perth Hospital in that all those who would be associated with the work would be already working at that hospital and it was felt that, on those grounds, and because the rest of the instrument would already be housed there, the new linear accelerator should be placed in Wellington-st., or in close proximity to the Royal Perth Hospital.

On the other hand, one had to realise that the time was coming when the new medical centre would be completed and, by that time, the institute would, of necessity, have to be removed from the Royal Perth Hospital site to the new centre. However, at first it was considered that an interval of 10 years might elapse before the new centre was built, and it was for this reason that so much effort was made by some of us—including myself—to have the instrument placed in proximity to the Royal Perth Hospital. The other site, of course, has advantages, many of which probably outweigh those of having the instrument sited in the city. One advantage is that it is very close to the State X-ray Laboratory technicians, whose building is already established on the Hollywood site.

Then came the question of where exactly it would be housed on the Hollywood site. I think at least three hospital sites were investigated, but one has not finally been chosen. It can be said that all the difficulties which occurred resulted from the fact that the Medical School was brought into being without any general plan being adopted for the establishment of a planned central medical centre. Even when we started to look for a site on which to erect the building to house the linear accelerator we found it was almost impossible to plan a big organisation around a small building. It was quite obvious, of course, that the plan should have been prepared for a large medical centre with a clinic hospital attached. Then it would have been easy to site a small portion of that organisation, as is required to be done, for the linear accelerator.

After a great deal of consideration, and with the assistance of the Principal Architect (Mr. Clare), this latter site was decided upon. One of the great influencing factors was the observation by Mr. Clare that a great deal of expansion was required by the Royal Perth Hospital; that with the site in Wellington-st. opposite the hospital being reduced from approximately 11 acres to approximately $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres, the expansion could be met only by the construction of at least four multi-storey buildings. To erect a one-storey building, which is the usual practice when housing an instrument of the type of a linear accelerator, would be a rather wasteful use

of land. Eventually, after a great deal of discussion, the decision to which I referred was reached.

Each hon. member of this House must be conscious of the tremendous generosity of the people of this State whenever they are called upon to subscribe to funds for the provision of measures of this sort. I can recall that within the last few years, including the Coronation Gift Fund, the Medical School appeal and the cancer appeal, the public of this State contributed nearly £600,000.

There are one or two points in relation to cancer on which I wish to touch. I would like to reply to some remarks made in another place, because they give a somewhat false impression of the present situation in regard to the control and treatment of cancer. All of us are aware of the desire of a small number of people to bring about a complete investigation into the use of a plant known as *scaevola spinescens*—a plant native to Western Australia—and its effect upon cancer. Certain statements were made about the lack of investigation and about the lack of appreciation by the medical profession of the medicinal properties of this plant.

I wish to deal right from the start with one impression which has arisen, namely, that the proposed cancer council will carry out a lot of research. I am afraid that with the small amount of funds at its disposal, the amount of research into the causation and treatment of cancer will be very minor indeed. Research is a costly business. Once an institute begins to spread into the field of research, money is required in great quantities. Up to date, prior to the establishment of the Medical School, any sort of research in this field was not possible except under one or two methods.

The complaint was also made in another place that the uses of this plant, and its qualities, have not been investigated on a pharmacology basis. The establishment of the Medical School, and the formation in the near future of a school of pharmacology in association with the Medical School will permit investigations into native plants, such as the one I am referring to, to be carried out.

In order that the people who read these Hansard reports will not be misled, I have obtained a few facts concerning the effect of *scaevola spinescens*. From what I have learned I wish to make the following statement briefly to this House. In some 22 to 25 cases in which the drug has been tried, and which have been kept under observation, the drug has had no effect whatever on the progress of the disease. However, one or two cases were the subject of changes in the symptoms, which could not be solely attributed to psychological causes. It does appear that this drug has some effect either upon the relief of pain, or the

condition of the patient by bringing about a state of euphoria or well-being. Both of these results are desirable results.

In future, any research into this drug should be confined to its quality in those directions, rather than research along the lines of the arresting of cancer. It was suggested that the ideas of the medical profession in general in regard to cancer research were along fixed lines; that there was only one line of treatment; and so on. That idea is completely false.

In the last few years a large number of remedies for cancer have been suggested. All of them have been tried, and all of them have failed completely to alter the progress of the disease. Some of them have given relief from pain, and others have given relief in some form to the patient, but in no way did they arrest the progress of the disease; and in no way was the progress of the disease altered by the various methods that were tried. Some of them did slow down the rate of progress of the disease, but the end was always inevitable. I would suggest to those who are keen on further investigation of this plant and its properties, that only its properties in regard to the relief of pain and the bringing about of a feeling of well-being, be investigated.

Cases in which this drug was used have been recorded, and one or two of them were mentioned in another place. In one instance there was undoubtedly a mistaken diagnosis; and it is not on the result achieved in such a case that research should be based. Research assumes many forms; some times large areas are required and sometimes only small areas. One of the most effective forms of research has developed through the use of statistics, and a most interesting example of how statistics can be used in medical research appears in the latest issue of the "Reader's Digest"; but I do not intend to go into the method which can be used in that regard.

This Bill presents to the House the opportunity of forming a council which will have a certain amount of control and which will be able to receive advice from any part of the world with regard to cancer; distribute it where necessary throughout the State; organise institutes for the treatment of cancer; and generally be a body to which the public can look, in connection with the treatment and management of this disease. The Bill gives the council the long title for the purposes of which all hon. members can read, and for that reason the measure should prove a great success and fill a need in this community.

There are, however, one or two matters in the Bill which I think might be discussed, and some about which I would ask the Minister to obtain further advice, because, whilst the council itself was mainly responsible for the drawing up of

this measure, certain words have been added which make a considerable difference.

If hon. members will turn to page 3 of the Bill they will find that 16 members, appointed by the Governor, will comprise the council. An hon. member in another place made the statement that having 13 medical men out of 16 on this council is all wrong. He said that they would not be able to contribute very much to the operation of the council, and suggested that busy medical men would not waste their time on committees. In fact, he did not think it was necessary for them to do so. He said that what these men really required was for someone to direct them what to do.

I can see the point of argument. It is to be realised that our methods of handling these matters may be entirely different from those used in the other States; and particularly do we differ from New South Wales in these organisations because of the differences in our population and the number of hospitals. This Bill really constitutes a technical body, whereas this technical body has already appointed a group of lay people who will be the means of raising funds and interesting the public generally in the need for research and other factors concerned in cancer treatment.

I repeat, this is practically a technical body, and, therefore, there must be technicians represented in numbers, on it. The Bill does, however, allow for the Minister to appoint persons and also for two other members to be appointed because it is desired that the persons who will be taking charge of the institute or institutes, will be members of the council, so that a direct link will be maintained between the council and the institute, where the actual treatment will take place. A member also said that if specialists are to be appointed to this council, he would like appointed certain specialists who were named—

The Hon. H. K. Watson: When you say "member" you mean a member of—

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I mean an hon. member of another place. As I remarked, he said we should have certain specialists whom he instanced as regards qualifications but not by name. It is interesting to realise that every one of those representatives suggested by the hon. member is included in this Bill except a pharmacologist who will not be required until such time as research in pharmacology is undertaken.

But what I would like the Minister, to do is to ask the Minister in charge of the Bill to explain the statement on page 9, that the council shall administer this Act subject to the Minister. Further on we find that the board is to be responsible to the Minister.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Can that board be "King Edwarded"?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I will deal with that later. It is in the Bill. This institute is responsible to the Minister! I do not quite see how the council administers the institute that it appoints, if both are responsible to the Minister. The institute must surely be responsible to the Minister through the council, and it seems to me that the working of such administration would be impossible if the institute had to side track the council to the Minister; and yet the council is to be responsible for the administration. It does not seem workable. I should say that the institute should be responsible to the Minister through the council, because the institute is the body that is to spend a considerable amount of money. But the following clause to which the hon. Mr. Watson has called my attention, makes it extremely difficult to administer this measure:—

15. (1) The Minister may—

- (a) dismiss any member of the board of an institute;
- (b) where all members of the board, or so many members of the board that a quorum cannot be formed, are dismissed pursuant to paragraph (a) of this subsection, appoint seven new members to the office of member of the board in the manner provided by section fourteen of this Act; and
- (c) where a member is dismissed by him, appoint a new member in the manner provided by section fourteen of this Act.

This means that the Minister can summarily dismiss the board of the institute without reference to the council which administers the Act. I cannot see how that can possibly function. The council is going to have the right to appoint two people apart from the 13 already mentioned. Clause 6 (6) provides as follows:—

(6) The Minister shall recommend to the Governor for appointment to the remaining six offices of the council the following persons who are willing to accept office as members of the council:—

- (a) Two officers of the Department of Public Health, one of whom is for the time being appointed to the office of Commissioner of Public Health or to the office of Deputy Commissioner of Public Health;
- (b) two persons who are selected by the Minister; and
- (c) two persons who are nominated by the council in accordance with the provisions of subsection (8) of this section.

And the Governor shall appoint the persons so recommended as members of the council.

Those are the people who are going to be asked to take charge of the institute or institutes; and the Minister may summarily dismiss this whole board, including the men whom the council has appointed. This surely must be a vote of no confidence in the council. The administration of this Act as provided for in the Bill will be very hazardous, and I think it would be much better if the Minister would take this Bill back and ask that the following suggestions be included in it: The first is that the board of the institute be responsible to the Minister through the council; and the second that the Minister may dismiss the board with the consent or at the request of the council. Then I think we would have some workable administration. I do not see any council being able to administer this Act if the board of the institute that it appoints can be summarily dismissed, one of the board being a member of the council.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You would not want the Minister mentioned at all under that proposition.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I cannot see that that is wanted.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: He would be responsible for the money.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think the responsibility must rest upon the council, because the council is to be the responsible body appointed by the Minister. If anything goes wrong, the council will be blamed, because it is the responsible body. I think that this Bill, good as it is, could really be made workable by altering the clause in regard to the institute—and that would have to be done in a number of places—or by simply stating that the board of the institute shall be subject to the Minister through the council. The Minister then would be able to discharge such board, but only with the consent or at the request of the council.

When the Bill was first drawn up, and this clause appeared in it, members of the council objected thoroughly to it. Certain members of the council said that they would not remain as members if a repetition of the King Edward Memorial Hospital incident could take place. They would not at all agree to Clause 15 as it was then worded; but they would agree to the Minister's having the right to dismiss the board so long as it was at the council's request and with the council's approval. That would obviously be given by any thinking council if there were some valid reason for the Minister's taking that action.

However, this Bill has been presented to us and the words, which the council inserted, have been left out. The Bill in its present form would not make for harmonious working; and I think there are certain

members of the council who feel very badly about this type of administration. I support the second reading of the measure, but I ask the Minister to have a look at the position so that he may realise how impossible it would be to administer if both the council, and the institute which it appoints, were responsible to him and not the one through the other.

On motion by the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways), debate adjourned.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [5.13]: The object of this Bill, as was explained upon its introduction last week, is to amend the parent Act in order to make some inspectors specialists in their particular activities. Section 6 (3), of the parent Act sets out the qualifications for an inspector of machinery, and at present those qualifications read as follows:—

... has served an engineering apprenticeship of at least five years during which time he has been engaged in the actual manufacture and repair of engines, boilers and machinery, and that he has had engineering experience of a satisfactory character subsequent to his apprenticeship.

As has explained, inspections with regard to lifts have become increasingly numerous. There are many more lifts in operation these days, and some of them are very old and require frequent inspection, while others, of course, are very modern. The modern ones are becoming most complicated and, as we all know, they stop automatically to pick up and let down passengers at different floors. Because of the technical nature of these lifts, it is obvious that specialists with electrical training are needed to cope with the inspection work; they are also needed to make the work of installation easier. To overcome the problem, it is proposed that the parent Act be amended by adding the following:—

or that he has had practical and technical training in electrical, structural and mechanical engineering and subsequent practical experience of a satisfactory character in the erection and maintenance of lifts and is capable of making technical calculations and drawings and comprehensive technical reports on lift practices.

So far as it goes, that is a good move. The only difficulty is that having appointed an electrical expert to deal with matters that require the services of an electrical expert, it is still possible, despite the amendment contained in the Bill, for a boiler expert to be sent to do the work; and it is equally possible for an electrical expert to be sent to inspect boilers. The Bill

does not make it obligatory for an electrical man to do electrical work, a mechanical man to do mechanical work or a boiler man to do boiler work. As a matter of fact, Subsection (5) of Section 6 of the parent Act states—

Any duly appointed inspector of machinery may exercise any or all of the powers of an inspector of mines under the Mines Regulation Act of 1906 . . .

Therefore, this man appointed specifically to assist in the work of examining lifts, has power under the Act to operate as an inspector of mines. That seems a little foolish; so foolish does it seem that I suppose we could take it for granted that such a state of affairs would never exist. However, I hope that in the operation of this Act due care will be taken to see that when specialists are appointed they do work only within the field in which they specialise—in this case that the specialist will work only on the inspection of lifts, and that he will not have to carry out work which could more adequately be done by an inspector with other qualifications. But, as I believe the measure to be a step in the right direction, I support the second reading.

Hon. G. Bennetts: I think you could safely leave it to the engineer.

THE HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [5.18]: I rise to support the Bill, but like the hon. Mr. MacKinnon, I was a bit concerned with regard to Subsection (5) of Section 6 of the principal Act, which provides that an inspector of machinery may, under some circumstances, take the place of an inspector of mines. Bearing in mind that an inspector of lifts would be well trained in this work, he may not be so well trained in the inspection of machinery, and presumably would not have much knowledge of mining operations.

Because of this I took the trouble to inquire from the Under Secretary for Mines as to the reason for having the Bill passed. He explained that with the growth of modern buildings in Perth, and the installation of modern lifts, some of which are electronically controlled, it was becoming increasingly necessary to have an inspector, with a special knowledge of that work, appointed so that the convenience and safety of the public could be taken properly into account. It was proposed to employ that man's services exclusively in the metropolitan area, because in no other area of the State would there be buildings requiring lifts of the nature proposed. Knowing, now, the exact reason for the appointment of the inspector, and the duties that will fall to his lot, I think the measure is a good one, and I am pleased to support the second reading.

On motion by the Hon. E. M. Heenan, debate adjourned.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [5.21] in moving the second reading said: There are three main proposals in this Bill. The first is to extend the interim development powers in the metropolitan region, and thereby prolong the interim development order for a further 12 months until December, 1959. The second proposal is to amend Part II of the parent Act, relating to town planning schemes made by the Town Planning Board in respect of Crown land, to make such schemes easier to administer when the Crown land is alienated; and the third proposal is to amend Part III of the parent Act, relating to subdivisional control, particularly as far as leased land is concerned. This part was amended at the last parliamentary session, but unfortunately alterations during its passage through Parliament have resulted in the intended effect being negatived, and, as it stands at present, the position is rather worse than before.

As hon. members are aware the purpose of the metropolitan region interim development order is as a "holding" provision for the proposals in the metropolitan region plan, until such time as a statutory regional authority is appointed which can finalise the plan. A number of difficulties which have occurred in this connection are being dealt with, and, as a result, it has not been possible, this session, to resubmit legislation for a metropolitan region planning authority.

Even if it had been possible to reintroduce these proposals this year, it would still have been necessary to extend the date of the interim development order to cover the period until the new authority was able to take over control from the Town Planning Board. The interim development order has been administered satisfactorily by the Town Planning Board, and there are no grounds for believing it has caused any major difficulties or hardship which it has not been possible to overcome. It is most essential that the order be continued, as otherwise much of the considerable work so far carried out would be lost.

The second main proposal in the Bill deals with the subdivision of Crown land. The parent Act provides that before any Crown land is sold, leased or disposed of as town, suburban or village land, the Town Planning Board shall prepare a town planning scheme. The relevant section goes on to say that the Town Planning Board shall be the responsible authority for enforcing the town planning scheme. This may be necessary while the land is

still held by the Crown, but, as it gradually becomes alienated, it is obviously desirable that the appropriate local authority should take over control of the scheme. The Bill, therefore, proposes that, after a town planning scheme has been prepared by the Town Planning Board and approved by the Minister, the scheme may be amended at the appropriate time with the agreement of the local authority, so that the local authority may take over the responsibility of the scheme, either in whole or in part.

The third main amendment seeks to rectify a situation caused through amendments made last session to the parent Act. Last year the Act was amended with the object of preventing persons avoiding the normal subdivisional control by granting leases of small parcels of land for periods of under 10 years, thereby virtually creating a subdivision without having to comply with normal subdivisional requirements. During its passage through Parliament, this proposal was amended and a proviso added to Section 20 (1) which has virtually negated the intention of the amendment. As it now reads, leases for 99 or 999 years could be granted without approval if the requirements of the proviso were included in the lease.

The proposal in the Bill will place the matter on a proper basis, and will provide that all leases of, or licences to occupy, land will require the approval of the Town Planning Board, unless the land concerned consists of the whole of one or more existing lots, or is part only of any house, building or structure, and the lease is for not more than 10 years. This means that the most common types of leases will not require approval. These include the leases of offices or flats as part of a building, the leases of houses on, and forming the whole of, a lot or lots, and the leases of shops forming part of a larger building or parade of shops.

My remarks cover the main provisions of the Bill. The other amendments are of a machinery nature and have little effect on the provisions controlling the Act. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. L. C. Diver, debate adjourned.

CITY OF PERTH PARKING FACILITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways), read a first time.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [5.38] in moving the second reading said: This is an important Bill which proposes to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. In the past some hon. members have criticised the Government for bringing forward, each year, a Bill to amend this Act. But it must be realised that our compensation Act is by no means a perfect measure. It rapidly gets out of date, as does any other piece of legislation; new ideas of workers' compensation are evolved in the light of experience, and, accordingly, it is necessary that, from time to time, this important piece of legislation—which vitally affects the lives and well-being of a great number of people—be reviewed, corrected and brought up to date.

That is largely what this measure proposes to do. I trust, therefore, that this time some of the proposals in the measure, which are already familiar to hon. members, will receive more consideration from the majority of the House than they have on former occasions. I do not propose, at this stage, to deal with each amendment in the Bill, but will confine myself to those of the most importance. Hon. members will have the opportunity, in Committee, to deal with each proposal individually.

Two of the main provisions are to provide retrospectivity in the Second Schedule payments and to re-introduce the provision that has been disagreed to by this Chamber on a number of occasions, namely cover against injuries sustained while travelling to and from work. Such a provision is in operation in all the other States of the Commonwealth with the exception of South Australia, and its insertion into our legislation is well overdue. The absence of such a provision is beyond doubt the most serious defect in the Act. The whole object of workers' compensation is to replace loss of wages through injury caused through or by anything incidental to a worker's employment. The whole object and reason of his absence from home on these occasions is to work; and his economic circumstances, and those of his family, are affected in exactly the same way whether an accident occurs inside or outside the gate of the workshop. Amendments to remedy the omission have been submitted by both this and the former Government, so that opposition is difficult to understand.

I repeat, once again, that the Acts of our State and the State of South Australia are the only ones in Australia which now do not contain the cover to workers going to and from their employment. Reference to what this may cost employers has been made in the past, but a careful

check of the official figures in New South Wales reveals that the cost has been only 3.6 per cent. of the total cost of compensation in that State.

That is an important fact which I hope all hon. members will recall on this occasion. The experience of New South Wales shows that this coverage has only meant an increase in cost of 3.6 per cent. of the total cost of compensation paid in that State.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: In what period would that be? Would it be for 12 months?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think it would be over a longer period. I forget off-hand, but I will either inform the hon. member in Committee or will ascertain when the amendment was brought in in New South Wales.

Section 4 (5) (a) of the parent Act provides for varying the amounts of certain benefits and allowances following sufficiently large basic wage variations. The definition of "basic wage" provides separately for male and female basic wages. Not unnaturally it appears to have been overlooked that the Arbitration Court fixes both male and female basic wages to the nearest penny, and it happens that while one goes upward, the other goes down. Under the present wording of the section it is necessary, on a strict application, on such occasions, to draw up both a male and female scale of benefits, causing unnecessary work and confusion for employers, workers and insurers alike; while the difference between the same items in the two scales is usually 1d. only with a maximum of 3d.

This position is proposed to be rectified by inserting the word "male" before the words "basic wage" wherever that term appears in the section. I am sure this is a proposal to which the House will have very little difficulty in agreeing.

The Bill seeks to extend the definition of "worker" so as to keep up with recent developments. There is an increasing tendency in some industries, particularly those connected with building, to have their work done under subcontract. Much of this is of course done by genuine subcontractors who regularly carry on that type of work as both a trade and a business, and who are truly independent contractors. The proposal in the Bill does not seek to affect genuine independent contractors. In many other cases a worker, before commencing certain works, is persuaded to sign a form of contract purporting to make him a subcontractor, while the relationship of master and servant really subsists between him and his employer, in the contract styled as principal. These workers do not and never have carried on any business on their own account, have no financial reserves and are essentially the type of persons the Act was designed to assist. It

is understood that the chief reason for these contracts is the avoidance of pay roll tax.

In many cases it is possible that the men would in law be compensable, but are misled by the contract they sign. To meet this situation it is proposed to insert a similar provision to that in the Victorian Act. The Workers' Compensation Board has been asked by insurers to press for this amendment. Not only does the board find it difficult to advise employers as to whom to insure, owing to uncertainty, but it states that while some employers pay premiums on these men others do not. It is considered that the amendment would not cost any more in premiums but would merely spread the payment fairly. At present while those employers who pay bear the whole burden, they pay too much, and the rest escape payment altogether. The amendment would, accordingly, secure fairness as between employers themselves.

Hon. members are aware over recent years that large companies, operating many cars, have to an extent replaced the old taxi-cab owner-driver. Various arrangements exist between these companies and the drivers, and the only one which concerns the Workers' Compensation Board is where the driver is a driver only and does not own the car; so he is in truth a worker of the type intended to be covered by the Act. It is possible they are usually within the Act, but certainty is required. Amending legislation has been passed in other States, and the proposal in the Bill has been culled from the New South Wales and Victorian Acts.

An amendment of importance is the deletion of two words; namely, "by accident", in Section 7 (1) of the Act. This section provides that a worker is entitled to compensation where, in the course of his employment, he incurs injury by accident. It is proposed to delete the words "by accident." That will entitle any worker, handicapped by a gradual process through the nature of his employment, to receive compensation. Of course, medical evidence would have to be produced that his handicap arose through the nature of his occupation, and that it was of gradual onset over a period of years, and did not happen suddenly. That provision obtains in another State, and it is considered that it should be introduced here.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: That is fair enough.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Section 7 (2) (b) of the Act provides that where an employee is injured as a result of the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer, or of some person for whom the employer is responsible, the employee may either claim compensation or proceed for damages. It is proposed to follow the position in New South Wales by repealing

this provision thereby allowing the employee to proceed for both damages and compensation. He would not, of course, be entitled to recover both.

Section 7 goes on to say that an employee cannot obtain compensation if his injury is attributable to his own serious and wilful misconduct. The Bill proposes that if the injury results in death or in serious and permanent disablement, compensation shall be payable. This is an important amendment. This will ensure that the worker's dependants are not penalised by their breadwinner's death or disablement.

Another important proposal in the Bill concerns industrial diseases, and I think it will be of particular interest and gratification to hon. members from the Goldfields. Under the Act at present any claim for compensation made by a worker who has contracted an industrial disease must be made within three years of his leaving employment. If he does not apply within three years, or if the disease does not assert itself within that period, he is, at the present time, outside the Act and does not get compensation.

The amendment proposes to remove that limitation, because in the past it has been found that many workers, after leaving the industry, have contracted silicosis and pneumoconiosis long after the three-year period has elapsed. Cases have been known of men who have worked in the mining industry for many years, and then have been deprived of their compensation because they have contracted silicosis long after the three-year limitation period.

I feel confident that the hon. Dr. Hislop, who has given this matter careful consideration in the past, will be able to give the House considerable enlightenment on that very worthy provision in the Bill.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: There are several of those cases about now.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think every hon. member from the Goldfields has had personal experience of some case where a man has left the mining industry, and silicosis has not revealed itself at the medical examination; but years afterwards it has asserted itself to a serious degree; but, because of the fact that the three-year limit applies, no compensation is recoverable.

The Bill seeks to delete Section 11 of the Act which provides that when permanent partial incapacity is caused to a worker, the rate of compensation shall be proportionate to the degree of incapacity. I am advised that this provision was based on a misunderstanding of the nature of compensation, and of the meaning of incapacity; and that since it came into the Act it has created difficulties, anomalies, and injustices. It has no counterpart in any other Act in Australia, or, to the best of our knowledge, in the world.

The basic principle of compensation is to replace to as near a degree as thought proper, the wages of an injured worker, for such time as the injury prevents him from earning them. There can be no logical limit to his right to receive such payments during his incapacity, whatever the nature of his injury or the extent of his physical disability, except the limit that must be placed on the employers liability in consideration of the ability of industry to pay. This is amply catered for without Section 11.

The worst result of the section has been to encourage a tendency in insurers to treat a medical certificate in regard to the extent of physical disability, stated as a percentage, as indicating a similar degree of incapacity to earn. This is obviously wrong reasoning, as a similar injury can have vastly different effects on the earning capacity of different workers, depending upon the nature of their work, their various skills, temperaments, ages, etc. Such certificates are often used as a basis for redemption, which can work against either party. At times, an unfortunate worker is given a lump sum for partial incapacity while totally unable to earn. At other times, workers who could really return to work are loth to do so without first getting a lump sum.

Another result of the section is that while one worker, who has a chance of recovery or partial recovery, can continue receiving weekly payments up to the maximum, his more unfortunate brother, whose injury is certainly permanent but not quite total, gets proportionately less.

Section 13 requires tying up in several respects and this is done in the Bill. Subsection (3) refers to an agreement in the policy of insurance whereby the employer is to furnish a wages statement, but it fails to make it legally obligatory upon him to do so to the extent that failure is an offence. The further provision that the insurer can require the statement to be in the form of a declaration is, for that reason, empty.

Subsection (4) lacks clarity, and gives rise to some legal doubts which could be resolved by the amendments in the Bill which have been agreed to by the Underwriters' Association. It then becomes necessary to expand Section 29 (7) (a) (xiii) in order to resolve the doubt as to whether refusal to insure includes refusal to continue to insure and to cancel an existing policy. This has been discussed with the underwriters, and it is obvious that under certain circumstances, such as refusal to pay premiums, they should be permitted to cancel. Upon granting permission to cancel, the board would immediately have the recalcitrant employer inspected to see that he had either taken out fresh insurance or ceased to employ workers. Control would be possible in all directions. This matter is covered by the proposals in the Bill.

Another matter which requires some policing is the voiding of policies for non-compliance with conditions; and an amendment is designed for this purpose. It is probable that the Workers' Compensation Board already has this power under Section 29 (i), but certainty is necessary. It involves interpretation of the policy which is a question of law, and is, accordingly, open to appeal to the Full Court, should an insurer desire, so that insurers could have no valid objection. On the contrary, if these matters are not to be decided by the board, an employer—possibly a small man—would have to undergo the expenses of a Supreme Court action in order to test the position—and usually he will not do so—to the detriment of himself and indirectly his workers.

Opportunity is taken to rectify an error in Section 4 (5) (c) of the Act. Apparently the words "Paragraph (d)" were inserted erroneously in lieu of "proviso (d) to paragraph (c)." The former refers to medical advice or treatment, whereas it appears it was the daily rate of hospital expenses that it was sought to exclude, these being otherwise fixed. This is a small matter, but its correction will save some confusion, and rectify an apparent anomaly.

The 1954 amendment to the Act made some changes to proviso (c) to paragraph 1 (c) of the First Schedule, in order, it is thought, to give effect to a recommendation of the Select Committee that the cost of artificial limbs be in addition to and not included in the limit of medical expenses. Unfortunately the result now is that provision is made for the supply of artificial limbs only in the cases of injured workers who have lost both legs, or are paralysed in both legs, and not for the much more usual case of the single leg. This is startlingly unfair, and, of course, was not intended. This is met by inserting the words "artificial limbs". Provision also is made so that the cost of all artificial limbs shall be additional to medical and hospital expenses.

It is proposed to increase the maximum payments provided under the Second Schedule to the Act. Following serious injury, many workers have to remain in hospital for long periods. As a result, their hospital and medical expenses often exceed considerably the maximum amounts now allowed under the act; that is, £100 for medical and £150 for hospital expenses. The worker is legally bound to pay the balance between the amounts of £100 and £150 respectively and the total amounts of his expenses.

It cannot be argued that any employee who meets with an accident in the course of his employment, and who is thereby incapacitated for a long period, should be bound to pay part of his hospital or medical expenses. I think all hon. members will

agree that this is a fair and proper contention. If a man is injured, and is forced to incur medical and hospital attention, surely it is not right that a set limit be placed on these amounts.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: I know of one man who has been in hospital for four months.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The amount now provided under the Act would not cover him; he would have to pay the excess above the amount of £100 or £150 of compensation. Victoria is a case in point where a provision similar to this amendment applies. The proposal in the Bill is that the worker shall be entitled to all reasonable medical expenses incurred as a result of hospital and medical attention. If considerable sums are to be paid out in any particular case, then the worker will in no way be liable. If there is a difference of opinion as to whether the amount is reasonable or not, it will be a matter between the hospital or doctor, and the employer. The insurer will, of course, act for the employer. If agreement cannot be reached, the Workers' Compensation Board will have the authority to make a full inquiry and determine the amount of the expenses.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: That is fair.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes; and I think it is what is required. Another amendment which has been asked for on several occasions by the Boilermakers' Union, and, I think, other unions, seeks to include a provision for compensation for occupational deafness—commonly referred to in certain quarters as boiler-maker's deafness. Goldfields members will readily call to mind those workers who are employed at batteries where there is a constant, terrific noise and din. Undoubtedly it causes deafness.

An amendment which is considered to be overdue deals with workers who are incapacitated through injury received in the course of their employment; and who, after a period of incapacity, receive a certificate from their medical adviser saying they are fit for light work. Very often, arguments immediately arise between the insurer—acting on behalf of the employer—and the worker, as to whether any further compensation is payable. In some cases, workers have been deprived of a continuation of weekly payments, even though they have a certificate indicating they are fit only for light work; and even though the certificate is produced to the insurer.

This is undoubtedly true; and here again I hope that Dr. Hislop will give us some enlightenment. The doctors are careful and wise, and they are doing their best when they tell a man that he should get back to some light work; but we all know how difficult it is to define or procure

light work. The present position, in respect to interpretation, causes considerable difficulty, and even hardship to the worker. It all depends on the nature of the man's occupation. In the case of a tally clerk—or a bookmaker's clerk—carrying out duties of a light nature, if a doctor certifies that he is fit for light duties, presumably he will say that he is fit for his ordinary work.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: The same applies to a member of Parliament.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: But a man who is a tradesman, or a tradesman's labourer, or one performing laborious work and manual labour, is in another category altogether. If he is certified fit for light work, it is obvious the doctor does not think he is fit to carry out his ordinary work. Why should such a man be penalised in the payments of his weekly compensation? There is no justification for it at all. Where a worker is certified as fit for light work, and the employer does not provide or obtain light work for him, he should be entitled to receive weekly payments until such time as he is certified fit for his ordinary duties; or until suitable light work is found for him.

I am sure that is another proposition with which hardly any hon. member will argue. It is an illustration of the necessity for constant revision and improvement in an important Act such as this.

The Hon. J. Murray: Has any employer refused to provide light work?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I could not answer that offhand. I have tried to point out that what constitutes light work differs in practically every instance. As the hon. Mr. Bennetts said, if a member of Parliament damaged his leg it would not prevent him attending the sittings of Parliament; but if it was a railway man—

The Hon. J. Murray: But you were talking about manual workers.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Bill seeks to increase the total compensation payable for total permanent incapacity from £2,750 to £3,000, and the amounts payable for various items proportionately from the present figures to a maximum of £3,000. Surely there can be no objection to these increases. A payment of £3,000 is not very great for a man who is permanently and totally incapacitated, and who has a wife and family to look after. The basic wage is £700 a year, and this represents barely four years' wages at the rate of the basic wage.

Some people may feel that £3,000 is a lot of money, but is it a large amount if a man is unable to work? What about a tradesman who receives a margin of £200 over the basic wage? The amount will represent only three years' salary, and he will then have to apply for social service

benefits. We feel that £3,000 is not a large amount. As a matter of fact it is in the Act now; and it is provided for the widow and dependants where a worker's death ensues as a result of injury. But if a worker lives, and is permanently and totally incapacitated, and is still responsible for looking after his wife and children, he receives a maximum amount of £2,750.

This is so in spite of the fact that there is one more person to maintain and a further mouth to feed. The inconsistency of it can be readily seen. I think that fairly comprehensively covers the more important provisions of the measure, and I am sure that most of them will seem equitable and reasonable to a majority of the hon. members of this Chamber. I am confident that they will receive the sympathetic and careful consideration of all hon. members. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. R. C. Mat-tiske, debate adjourned.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [6.5]: I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. Mr. Griffith when introducing the Bill. As hon. members will recall, a parliamentary committee was appointed last year to carry out an investigation into the Licensing Act, its operation and the various implications arising thereunder. That committee sat over a lengthy period, and early this year completed and submitted its report to the Premier. I am not at liberty to disclose what was in the report, but I can tell the House that it covered the Act in a comprehensive way. I can appreciate that the Government has not yet had sufficient time in which to draft a Bill that would incorporate all or most of the fairly far-reaching amendments suggested by the committee.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Really!

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The report was a comprehensive one, which took some months to compile, although the committee devoted many hours to it. I can therefore appreciate the delay in tabling the report or giving consideration to it. I have been advised by the hon. Mr. Jeffery that the report was tabled in the

Legislative Assembly this afternoon, and I hope that all members who have shown such anxiety concerning it will now read it carefully. The report will take a lot of reading but I can assure hon. members that it will be interesting—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you continue speaking till 6.15 p.m. you will be able to quote from it, after tea.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: —because the committee was assisted by a great number of worth-while witnesses, and it paid careful attention to the report of His Honour, Mr. Justice Maxwell, of Sydney, who was appointed by the Government of New South Wales to report on the licensing law of that State. His Honour went overseas and saw in operation the licensing laws in England and on the Continent. I had the pleasure of meeting him in Sydney and of spending a whole morning with him. He was most helpful and informative, and I felt it was a privilege to meet him.

I will say no more about the report at this stage, because it is presumably available to everyone now, but will get back to the Bill. My main objection to the hon. Mr. Griffith's measure is that, as chairman of the committee to which I have referred, it became obvious to me—and to the other members of the committee also—that our Licensing Act badly needed bringing up to date, because it had got into a very unsatisfactory state in some respects, due to the fact that it had never been comprehensively overhauled; and also because over the years haphazard amendments had been made to it. I think that is one of the weaknesses of the Act; that haphazard amendments have from time to time been introduced to deal with isolated circumstances, with the result that the Act is now an unsatisfactory patchwork.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you object to the Bill on that count?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I and the other members of the committee—I am sure—are most anxious that an overall Bill be introduced to bring the present Act up to date and into conformity with the requirements of present day standards. I am certain that will be done next year, and that is why I am sorry that the hon. Mr. Griffith bothered to introduce his measure at this time.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is dreadfully weak.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I might say that the hon. member's reasons for introducing his Bill were dreadfully weak. The licence referred to has been operating for about 12 months, and now an amendment is proposed when it is obvious to everyone that a complete overhaul of the Act is imminent. Why not be a bit patient? Last year the hon. Mr. Baxter—and others from time to time—desired to have passed

amendments to the Licensing Act, but a gentleman's agreement was arrived at, that no amendments would be made to the legislation until this committee had brought down its report and an overall review was made. I think that was wise. No harm would be done at the airport if this measure were left until next year, and by then we would have more experience of the position. I understand that the licence is operating satisfactorily at present, and the turnover in the bar is relatively small.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How do you know that?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I know it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But how?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: How does one get to know anything?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: As the hon. Mr. Griffith pointed out, permission to allow a licence at the airport was granted only 12 months ago, and my view is that no harm would be done by allowing further time to elapse, because I do not think the matter can be regarded as being urgent.

As a result of the study made by the hon. Mr. Roche and myself, together with other hon. members of this Chamber, we became imbued with the idea that a comprehensive measure dealing with licensing should be introduced on a Government level. That was one of the recommendations contained in our report, and also that Parliament should have time to consider the matter thoroughly. I agree with the hon. Mr. Griffith when he says that this is a minor amendment, but that probably some inconvenience would be felt by the Department of Civil Aviation. I am of the opinion that we should wait until next year to have a proper and thorough Licensing Act Amendment Bill brought down.

Other members of the committee which investigated licensing matters were of the opinion that there were certain aspects which demanded immediate attention, but I was under the impression that we had reached some sort of agreement that nothing would be done until our report was published and the whole matter could come under review.

The Hon. J. Murray: And do you think we would get an amendment to the Act next year?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I can see no reason why it should not be brought down next year; and if the Bill has intrinsic merit I would undoubtedly support it. The railway dining-rooms and the bar at Kalgoorlie station and at Perth station and other places operate as one. I think it is an advantage having the bar and dining-room brought under the responsibility of the one licensee. We have to devote some

care to the question of principle before rushing headlong into doing something that seems so simple and which will help the Department of Civil Aviation in its difficulty. However, that has been the practice which has been followed in the past. We have dealt with individual districts, and, as a result of various amendments passed over the years, we now have a patchwork Act on the statute book, which is most unsatisfactory.

If we continue to put this principle into practice, it may have far-reaching effects. This Bill may be perfectly innocuous, but my view is that it is not a matter of such urgency that Parliament should be asked to adopt it after only 12 months' experimentation. That is a very short period in which to review the results of any amendment to an Act. I am not saying that this measure does not possess some advantages, but there are many sections in the Licensing Act which are crying out for correction, and I think that this amendment, along with many others, could well wait until we have the opportunity to have a real go at the Licensing Act next session.

I am pleased to hear that the report of the committee which inquired into licensing matters has been tabled in another place tonight. It may cause a great deal of misgiving on the part of some people, and it may fall a good deal short of what is expected. However, in fairness to the other members of the committee, I can say that careful attention was given to the whole matter and, although we disagreed on some points, we were all of the opinion that a comprehensive review of the Act is badly needed and the haphazard amendments that have been made to the Act in the past should not be continued. It is for those reasons that I think this measure could well wait for consideration in another session.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan)[7.38]: I am not going to oppose this measure because I do not think it is of vital importance. Nevertheless, I am not very happy about it. For a start, I think that, because of the way it is drafted, the Bill will be unworkable. Section 3 of the Act reads—

An airport licence may be granted in respect of . . .

Then, firstly, it mentions the overseas terminal building; and, secondly, those premises at any other airport that the Governor may proclaim from time to time.

That means that an airport licence may be granted to more than one place, and yet Clause 2 of the Bill seeks to amend Section 44C by inserting the words, "overseas terminal building". That will make the overseas terminal building the only place where liquor can be consumed with a meal. I do not think the words "overseas terminal building" are necessary in

the Bill. All that is required is to delete the words, "on licensed premises", or to alter paragraph (b) in some way to make "licensed premises" a place approved by the court.

The second objection I have to the Bill—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We seek to delete the words, "on the licensed premises" and insert the words "at the airport."

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: But then it is proposed to add the words, "overseas terminal building." After the word "purpose" in line 3. of paragraph (b) of Subsection (1) of Section 44C, it is proposed to add the words, "in the overseas terminal building or in such other premises so situate at the Perth Airport," etc. That will make the Perth Airport—as a licensed house—practically the only place where drink can be consumed with a meal.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can we sort the difficulties out in Committee?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not think we can make the Bill work as we want it to work. Also, I am not certain that adequate provision is being made in the Bill to enable a person consuming a meal to be served with liquor, especially if the licensed premises are divorced from the main building by some distance. I think we should make it clear and definite that a person shall be so served. Apart from that, I have no objection to the Bill, but in Committee I will endeavour to discuss the clause I have mentioned.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—in reply) [7.42]: In replying to the points raised by the hon. Dr. Hislop—

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Questions raised!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:—I am of the opinion that they could be sorted out better in Committee. I will be glad then of the hon. member's help. In reply to the hon. Mr. Heenan, I point out that neither he nor I had any knowledge that the report made by the committee appointed to inquire into licensing matters was going to be laid on the Table of another House just prior to the hon. member commencing his speech. Therefore, it is quite unreasonable to suggest that because of the existence of the report—which, incidentally, has been in the hands of the Government for some twelve months without us hearing anything about it until this afternoon—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Not twelve months!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Well, even six months. We have been in session for quite a while, and perhaps it could have been tabled before this. The fact remains that I had no knowledge it would be tabled today, and the hon. Mr. Heenan could give us no information concerning the report until it was tabled. In any

event, what the report has to do with this Bill I fail to see. The only valid objection to the Bill put forward by the hon. Mr. Heenan is that it should be held over because of the comprehensive report submitted by the members of his committee. There is one tangible and important reason why it cannot be left, and that is that the agreement between Qantas Airways and the existing concessionaire expires in February, 1959.

If the position is left as it is, the agreement between the concessionaire and Qantas Airways will expire in February next. Parliament will not meet until much later in the year, and in the meantime the whole matter will be in a state of flux.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Could not the licence be renewed for a period?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In addition to the reason I have just given, I told this House when introducing the measure that Qantas Airways are passing over to the Department of Civil Aviation the control of this concession at the airport, and that is why it is necessary to get this Bill passed in the present session of Parliament so that the current negotiations can proceed.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Has the Bill been introduced as a result of a request by the Department of Civil Aviation?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. There is nothing further for me to say in reply except to answer an interjection by the hon. Mr. Heenan. He asked me if I had any idea of the takings in the dining-room and bar at the airport. I asked the department to submit figures to me, and I have obtained them. They indicate that the takings of the dining-room and restaurant amount to £1,600 to £1,800 per month, while the bar takings amount to approximately £450 a month.

At present, the number of aircraft services which use this terminal is limited, but when the tarmac is extended, the international terminal building will also serve Ansett-A.N.A.; and it is likely that it will also serve T.A.A. The present number of services of six a week will be increased to some 34 a week.

It can be seen that a huge increase in turnover is expected in respect of the licence at the international airport. As I said during the second reading, it is much more desirable, for the easier running of the concessions, to have the licence decided. I want to reply to some comments made by the hon. Mr. Strickland who said he was disappointed that the Bill restricts the supply of liquor to people travelling intrastate.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I said interstate.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The hon. member accused me of opposing strenuously the amendment which had been

brought forward by Dr. Hislop. He suggested I was of the opinion that travellers coming from the North-West were not justified in being able to obtain a drink. He added further that I did not seem to have much interest in those people. I have gone through the Hansard reports for 1955 but I have not been able to find any mention of the extravagant words which I am alleged to have used.

It is true I opposed the amendment introduced by the hon. Dr. Hislop, but it was for an entirely different reason from the one suggested by the Minister. My reason for opposing the amendment is recorded in Hansard. To indicate the extent of the extravagant words I am accused of having used, I shall read what I said—

I think it would have an undesirable effect. Members will appreciate that a licence can be granted only if the Licensing Court thinks fit to grant it. If the amendment remains in the Bill, the measure will become applicable to any aircraft of any size arriving from or going to any place at any time on any day. Therefore, if the court granted a licence in those circumstances—and I doubt whether it would—the premises would be open for 24 hours of the day.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That was on recomittal. Do you call that strenuous opposition?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I can promise the Minister that on some other measure I will give him more strenuous opposition than in this case.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should not threaten the Minister.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is not a threatening remark. Hon. members will recall the reason why the amendment introduced by the hon. Dr. Hislop was opposed. I am grateful to the hon. Mr. Heenan for the help he gave in opposing that amendment. He said it was trial legislation; that the Licensing Court would be asked to grant a licence for an international airport; and that it was more likely the court would view the application for a licence favourably than if it realised the airport had a bar which would be open for 24 hours of the day.

On the notice paper there is an amendment in the name of the Minister, which if agreed to will have that very effect. If it is agreed to the section will read thus—

The liquor licence in respect of the overseas terminal at the Guildford Airport will be applicable to the landing or taking off of aircraft.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Of passenger aircraft.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Is there anything wrong with that?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not oppose that provision now any more than I did in 1955; but I am prepared to consider suggestions put forward to assist us if the Bill goes to the Committee stage.

Hon. members will realise that aircraft arrive at Gullford at all hours of the day and night. The first plane takes off at 5 a.m. and the last one comes in at 11 p.m. The Act permits the bar to remain open for half an hour before an aircraft arrives and for six hours after an aircraft lands. The reason for this half hour before an aircraft arrives is to enable people meeting the aircraft to congregate for a drink. The reason for the six hours after an aircraft has landed is to meet circumstances when, on account of bad weather, breakdown or similar causes, an aircraft would be kept on the ground. Parliament decided that when passengers are grounded they should be given the opportunity to partake of alcoholic refreshments up to a maximum of six hours after the aircraft has landed.

I have no basic objection to the amendments on the notice paper in the name of the Minister. It is not correct for him to suggest that I am not interested in the people from the North-West being able to obtain a drink. I have as much sympathy for them as I have for people in any other part of the world.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You did not three years ago.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There was a good reason for my opposing the proposal then.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What has the Minister himself done in the last three years?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: He would have been a very thirsty Minister.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If he has gone without a drink when travelling over the last three years it is his own fault. Instead of castigating me for doing nothing I would point out that he himself has done nothing about this matter. The Minister has far greater access to legislation than I, as a private member. Why does he wait until the opportunity presents itself on this occasion to say that I was not interested in the people from the North-West?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will resume his seat. The hon. member should reply to the second reading debate. He should not refer to what happened at previous sessions of Parliament.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: With respect, I am replying to the second reading debate.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is raising issues discussed at a session of Parliament in previous years.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If I am raising issues which were introduced in debates of past years, then I submit it is

within my prerogative to point out what has taken place in respect of this legislation.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should reply to what has been submitted during this debate. What he is discussing were issues raised at another session of Parliament.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I most respectfully disagree. The Minister said that I was not interested in what happened to people in the North-West when this legislation was under consideration previously. I am saying that I was interested.

The Minister has had plenty of opportunity to introduce a Bill similar to this, but he did not do so. He chose to take a few strips off me because I did so; he is doing that by his amendments on the notice paper. I ask the House to give consideration to those amendments.

The PRESIDENT: In Committee.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course; it must be during the Committee stage. If we agree to his amendments, there is a distinct likelihood that the airport bar will be open for 24 hours of the day. If that is the wish of hon. members, and if another place agrees to the amendment, then I will have no valid objection. I thank hon. members for their comments, and trust that when we get to the Committee stage we will overcome the difficulties.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BANK HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [7.59]: I rise to oppose this measure. I do so with a great deal of sorrow, because the people wanting a five-day banking week are those who have enjoyed education above the average. They are a set of individuals on whom the future will depend to no small degree. Consequently, when we find such a group of persons, so competent and so rational, coming to Parliament and asking for an essential service to be restricted to a five-day week, it is indeed serious.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Where else can they go?

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: This measure is undoubtedly a political stinging nettle as has been amply illustrated in the address that was given on the presentation of the Bill by the hon. Mr. Jeffery. He stated that bank officers had, in 1956, approached Mr. Nicklin, the present Premier of Queensland, with the object of establishing a five-day working week. Mr. Nicklin

said, so we are told—and I believe it—“We will not only have a look into the idea of a five-day banking week, but of the whole of industry being limited to a five-day week.” But that has to run the gauntlet of this inquiry. The salient point is this: How is it that over the years bankers have wanted a five-day week in Queensland, but the Labour Administration there, although it had every power and facility to do so, did not see fit to introduce a five-day week?

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Two wrongs don't make a right.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: That is a poor sort of an answer if it is the only answer. Let us sincerely hope that our banking friends will put it to a better test than that. I have stated that banking is an essential social service and I would like to read a portion of a reply that was furnished by the banks to the Employers' Federation and published in the “Sunday Times” on the 2nd November. It is as follows:—

The question of whether the banks are for or against Saturday morning closing or are neutral on the question, cannot be answered in a categorical manner. Banking is an industry, amongst others, which provides certain essential services to the community. In the expression “community” banks include not only those engaged in commercial activities of all kinds but also all private members of the community.

The banks' experience of Saturday morning trading indicates that banking services are required on this day to a very considerable extent by people who are precluded by their employment from attending to their banking needs other than on Saturday morning.

Our investigations confirm that on Saturday mornings the banks are used extensively by various types of customers, including five-day week workers, for withdrawal and deposit of funds or the remitting of money abroad, and also for consultation with managers and accountants by borrowers, prospective borrowers and others. It must be obvious that many of the Saturday morning customers could not make use of banking facilities at any other time unless they were permitted to be absent from their employment.

Let me first of all ask: Why don't the banks come straight out into the open and say it is essential that the banks be open on Saturday mornings? In the first paragraph of the article just quoted it says that it cannot be categorically stated that it is necessary to keep the banks open on Saturday mornings; and subsequently in the following paragraph it indicates

that it is essential to provide this service. Therefore I think it behoves the bankers to come out into the open with this fact and inform the employees that they desire that this service be made available to the public on Saturday mornings.

In supporting that, I do not say that every bank employee should work on a Saturday morning. There is no reason why they could not have a roster system for the essential services on a Saturday morning and so enable quite a percentage of their employees to have the morning off. I understand that system is adopted quite a lot at present.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Half a dollar each way for them.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I wonder how we would manage in the farming industry, in which I am engaged, if we endeavoured to institute a five-day week.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: How often do you do your banking from the farm on a Saturday morning?

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: How would all the chores that require to be done on a farm be carried out; and how would the cost of production be affected if we tried to enforce a five-day working week in farming activities—knocking off on Friday and starting again on Monday? Think of the cost to the community! I know our friends do not want to face up to realities but they just have to be faced. Consider how the young farmers today would feel if other members of the community were knocking off on Friday night, as some do at present. They would soon be asking for the same privilege.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You don't think the farmers are the slaves of the nation, do you?

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: The hon. member would not know! Would the advocates of a five-day banking week be agreeable to the essential transport of our community ceasing on Friday night?

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Why not?

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: There we have it! Would they be agreeable to the hotels closing on Friday night until Monday morning? Or would they be agreeable to betting shops closing on Friday night until Monday morning?

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I never use them, either.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: And would they agree to the restaurants closing on Friday night?

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan interjected.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: We will consider the hon. member's own district. Would he like it if the mines were closed down on Friday night—

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: They do. They close down for Saturdays and Sundays. There is a five-day working week in the mines, my boy!

The PRESIDENT: Order, please! Will the hon. Mr. Diver please resume his seat? Will the hon. Mr. Garrigan please refrain from interjecting? He will have an opportunity to make a speech later if he desires. The hon. Mr. Diver may proceed.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I will now deal with the attitude that the bank employees have adopted in inundating hon. members of the Legislative Council with a stereotyped form of request that they support this five-day banking week legislation that is before us.

The Hon. L. A. Logan interjected.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: It has had one good effect anyway, and that is it has at least helped the Post Master General's Department. But—and I say this in sorrow, not in anger—it is hardly fitting that individuals of such a high educational standard should be parties to an action of that kind.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You are spinning words, you know.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: These people claimed that they were our representatives—at least that we were theirs. I have checked the position in regard to a few of these letters—those whose signature I could understand or who had typed or printed their names underneath. I found from my investigations that in quite a few instances the husband and wife had obviously signed one of these letters and in many cases neither name appeared on the Legislative Council roll.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Did you check them all?

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I would like hon. members to give me an opportunity to make my points one by one. I was about to say that in a limited number of instances the husband had evidently been transferred and had not had an opportunity to have his name placed on the roll. I also found that the same material had been used in a lot of cases; the same wording and the same typewriter had definitely been used for people outside the employees because in one instance I found a second-hand car dealer was a signatory; also, a waterside worker had signed one. I am sorry these people have had to go to such lengths to prove their case.

I would also like to point out that I encountered the invidious position of the motor garage owners, who were desirous of having some reasonable working hours instead of the 100 hours they had to work a few months ago. I, with some other hon. members of this Chamber, investigated their hours of labour, and as a consequence the Government brought down a measure to give reasonable trading hours for the garages and to make provision for rostered stations for emergency trade; even on Saturday afternoons and Sundays.

But what do we find? We find many of those people who were working for a five-day week signed a petition for petrol stations to be kept open seven days a week, 24 hours a day. I have always tried to be fair, and I ask these people to search their consciences and think of the other chap when they ask for a five-day week.

Before getting too far away from the circular letter style of correspondence which we received, I would like to point out to the bank employees that in the Central Province there are at least five country centres which have trading all day on Saturdays at present. While I frankly admit that, as an individual, I do not believe in Saturday afternoon trading, nevertheless it has been decided in those towns by the local option poll. The five centres I have in mind are Beverley, Cunderdin, Dowerin, Kellerberrin and Tammin. If those communities have decided by a local option poll that they wish to continue trading on Saturday afternoons, of what avail are the pressure tactics of the bank employees, and why should I sink to the same level by counting the heads of my supporters as against those in favour of the Saturday closing of banks?

Since I have been a member of this Chamber I have not made my decisions like that. I have tried to make my decisions in a fair and just way. I have already said that I do not believe in Saturday afternoon trading, but it is a far cry to closing the shops on Friday nights. Those communities which trade on Saturday afternoons have made their own determinations in the matter, and in such cases their member of Parliament becomes their servant as distinct from their adviser. It is only when a community is endeavouring to have the shops closed on Saturdays that we can use our influence; and if we have not sufficient influence to get the people to close at mid-day on Saturday we have to abide by their decision. That is how things work out in a democracy.

In regard to the principle of a five-day week, the bank employees tell us that their services are not required on the other days. But I have been talking to a few business people on this matter, and it may be enlightening for some of my banker friends to know that comparatively small businesses in the outer areas—particularly those which trade with farmers who are going to Perth for a long week-end—have to carry up to £400 and £500 in cash in order to provide a facility for the bank's customers, and so that they can retain and perhaps attract business. If a farmer knows that he is able to get that facility from a certain business it attracts his trade.

Is it the desire of bank employees that the stock agents who operate in the country should become banks? We will

have the spectacle of Elder Smith, Dalgety and Goldsbrough Mort, who have agencies throughout the country, performing the same duties as banks; they will be engaging in banking in all its forms.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: That is camouflage.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: The ignorance of some hon. members is remarkable! The institutions I mentioned provide an essential service for their farmer-clients; so much so that some banking people have been known to say to the management of these firms "We would rather lend you a million pounds so that you can lend it to the farmers—and for you to do all the bookkeeping, and we can have our eggs in two baskets, instead of one—than carry all the work ourselves." That shows the hon. member who has been interjecting that there is more in this than meets the eye. It would not be far-fetched to say that I would willingly sponsor legislation to put these firms on the same footing as the banks, if bank employees try to avoid their obligations to the community.

It is a remarkable state of affairs that the Labour Party, through a private member, should introduce this Bill. One would have thought that if it is as good as some of the interjectors would have us believe, it would have been made a Government measure, and would have been introduced by one of the Ministers—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It was introduced five years ago.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: —and that it would have Government backing.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It was introduced by the same hon. member.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I think I have made it perfectly clear—

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Which side you are on.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: And why I am on that side. In conclusion, I would like to recount a little experience I had over the question of the closing of businesses. On one side of me stood a businessman—a friend of mine—and he said to me, "I see you have before you a Bill to amend the Factories and Shops Act which will have the effect of bringing about Saturday closing." I said, "Yes, that is so." He said, "If you don't support that I will never vote for you again." On the other side of me was one of my farmer friends and he said, "If you do I will never vote for you."

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: You were on the horns of a dilemma.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: What did you do?

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I make up my own mind on these matters, and I think I have made my contribution in opposition to this Bill.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [8.25]: When this Bill has been before the House on previous occasions I have supported it, and I intend to do the same thing tonight for the same reasons as I have given before. One of the reasons is that I firmly believe it is time we started to fit our ideas in regard to business into the age in which we are living. To try to hang on to the ideas of past ages, as seems to be the general idea here, is doing the wrong thing to the future generations of our society. We are in the age of automation—the atomic age—and I have never heard a worse example of hypocrisy than I heard from the hon. Mr. Diver when he appealed to bank officers to remember their superior education.

Our aim is to give all children an equal opportunity in regard to education. We know that all do not have equal opportunity, but that must come. I once read a book written by a great social writer, Beatrice Webb, and she was expounding her views on the social conditions of the day. At that time we had not heard of a five-day week for bank officers—we had not reached that happy stage—but in talking about a move by the opposition she said that their ideas were always to make the worker succumb to the aristocratic embrace. The hon. Mr. Diver, by his speech this evening, has been trying to do that "par excellence." He was pointing out to the bank officers that they were so superior, through their education, that they should not tolerate the idea of coming down to the standards of the ordinary worker by asking for a shorter working week. The shorter working week is becoming absolutely necessary.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Other people think differently.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Sometimes I am amazed when I listen to the debates in this House. Only last week I visited certain factories around the city, and I stood by some machines without anyone knowing my thoughts. I saw the machines working the operator and not the operator working the machines. This must have a deadening effect on a worker, day in and day out. There is more mental stress today than ever before—I say that quite honestly and fairly—and no-one would be more subject to mental stress than banking people. Will anyone dispute that?

The Hon. L. C. Diver: What about members of Parliament?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I think their mental strain is much worse than members of Parliament.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: They are only worrying about the other fellow's overdraft.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Machines used in banks impose great mental strain on the operators. I know that the hon. Mr. Jones would not know much about

this; but this mental stress and strain has to be taken into consideration. I take a great interest in children and some of them have a mental capacity for certain things in life. The time will soon arrive when people in industry will be working one hour on and one hour off; unless that state of affairs is brought about our asylums will be filled with people suffering nervous breakdowns caused by mental stress.

I am not just saying that without having a knowledge of what I am saying. Doctors are realising more and more that most illnesses are being caused through severe mental stress. I do not think the hon. Dr. Hislop would deny that. All doctors are taking more notice than they did, of nervous symptoms and nervous disorders which are causing more and more mental and bodily illnesses. If bank officers feel that they need a five-day week, I do not see why the banks should not be brought into line with other businesses. I want to see them granted a five-day week because I think it will help overcome much of the stress and strain of the week-end.

Even in our family circles we have crotchety men going home after working hard all the week, and women, who have worked just as hard, not being able to give their families the full benefit of their company during the week-end. The hon. Mr. Willmott need not look so astounded, because I mean what I say. We are working in a machine age, and we must move with the times. If we do not, we will pay the penalty. As I have already said, we are suffering the aftermath of two world wars. We cannot expect to emerge from two such total wars without paying some penalty. If the bank officers feel that they are justly entitled to a five-day working week why should they not take the initiative? Why should they sit back and do nothing about it?

It is nonsense to say that we could not manage if the banks closed on Saturday mornings. We have heard that cry down the ages. During the late 18th and early 19th centuries little children were tied to machines. Then came the industrial revolution. One statesman is quoted as having said he was proud to state that every child in England of over five years of age was worth his keep. Imagine a statesman being able to get away with such an expression of opinion! It was also said that it was better for the poor to have fires than for the coal-miners to work shorter hours. When women and children were brought out of the mines, and the hours of work shortened, the poor still got their fires, and the mines did not go broke.

If the banks were to close on Saturday mornings there would not be a ripple on the social surface. The hon. Mr. Diver has spoken in a derogatory manner about circulars having been sent to members

of Parliament. But what is wrong with that? I have 150 such letters here with me, and I would say that these people have a perfect right to send out the circulars to members of Parliament. If they feel that something should be theirs by right, should they not take steps to secure it? And this is their avenue of approach. I take these letters as evidence that people do want this reform, and that they are not exactly in a minority. If they are, then they are a very vocal minority, and good luck to them.

In the days gone by, when I was a child, the tempo of life was much easier and slower than it is now. I know that my mother's life was more simple. I had one frock for best, and two school frocks and pinafores. Although the ironing and washing was done by hand, the amount was not as great as it is today. Hon. members seem to think that the housewife has only to press a button and then sit back. But that is quite incorrect. Today the housewife works harder than she ever did, because she takes an interest in society as a whole. It is most necessary that we should secure shorter working hours in industry. I am afraid, however, that hon. members opposite are very pigheaded in this regard. The hon. Mr. Diver quoted the country areas of Beverley and York as an example. But what would one expect from retired farmers and such people? They should come here to the areas which I represent; then they would see how much time was wanted off.

I think the Bill contains a reasonable demand, and that it is a trend in the right direction. It is certainly one that I like very much, and I hope the bank officers are successful. I come now to the reasons why they have approached Parliament in this matter. Here we have a body of workers who have no authority but Parliament whom they can approach to right what they consider an injustice. They are perfectly justified in taking that step. We know that the Legislative Council in Western Australia is the most powerful House of Legislature in the British Commonwealth of Nations. We have a Labour Party in Government but not in power; I have said this on several occasions.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member kindly get back to the Bill?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The bank officers are depending on the opposition majority of two, to secure the passage of this measure. It may not be good hearing for hon. members opposite but it is true nevertheless. I do not think there is any doubt as to which party stands for advancement, and which does not. When a matter is considered to be right and just and seeks to provide an advance in society, we should all get up and express our opinions on it. I have here one of the letters that were sent to me. I will not.

mention who it is from, without asking the person concerned, but I would like to quote what it says—

The banks in other countries have caused no inconvenience to their customers by closing on Saturdays, nor has it caused economic upset. It can be done here, you know.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Ask the hon. Mr. Tonkin what happened in New Zealand.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: To continue—

Farmers I know classify all days alike and certainly do not have to make Saturday their town day. When we started working in banks most people including Government departments worked Saturday mornings. The "West" is definitely off the beam in their editorial of the 29th October, 1958, and their voting threat should be ignored.

We do our private business and shopping in our lunch hours and we accept it.

I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed. I do not know who this was from but it looks as though it might be a lady's hand-writing. I have already touched on the scientific age in which we live. There is a medical man in this House, and I am sure he will not dispute the fact that the time is fast approaching when we will have to do something if we are to prevent numbers of nervous breakdowns occurring. If we do not, there will be so many nervous breakdowns that the hospitals will not be large enough to hold them. Prevention is better than cure, and this measure is a step towards any such eventuality.

What is the good of science? What is the use of people studying so hard that they will eventually suffer from a nervous breakdown, if society is not going to benefit? There is no good in our labours at all, if our children are not going to benefit. We might just as well shut up shop and let the world go by.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: That is what you are trying to do.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The reasoning of hon. members opposite is as outmoded as the system of Government in this State. Why cannot we alter the day on which the housewife receives her pay roll? Why cannot she be paid on Monday or Tuesday morning? I am sure she would be much happier. We seem to follow a system of life that has been arranged for us, and stress the psychological effect of Friday and Saturday. Those days are no different from Monday or Tuesday. Monday can no longer be regarded as washing day, because in our present age, with washing machines, this can be done on Tuesday just as well. Why should we

not shape society for society's benefit? If the housewife got paid on Monday or Tuesday it would relieve some of her burden and permit her to take Friday and Saturday off.

I remember, when I was a child, Saturday always seemed to be the day chosen for a bath; and it was a long tiring day for mother. We had to get our clean clothes ready for Sunday morning. Today, however, children have a daily bath. Men should alter their way of thinking. I say men, because if there were more women in this House we would not have to contend with these difficulties, because more commonsense would be brought to bear on our problems. What I say is true and logical, and it is a step that we will have to take before very long, particularly if we are to advance with science. We will have to follow the example set by Tasmania and the other States. This would also promote family life, because most families these days have cars in which they get away for a picnic. It would keep them happy and contented, healthy and sane. It is a good and progressive move, and I support the bank officers wholeheartedly. I have not spoken to any of the bank officers on this matter, and I am expressing my own thoughts and views. It always seems to be the Labour Party that moves towards emancipation. If we did not do something, it would never be done.

Hon. members opposite should surely appreciate that the repeated clatter of machines in factories has a most deleterious effect on people's health. I took the trouble to work on one of these machines that seem to do almost everything required of it. Within two hours I had a splitting headache, and I was glad when I stopped working on that machine. It was not that the physical work was hard, but the continual click, click, click of the machine was so monotonous, as to be oppressive. We build great hospitals, and talk about progress that has been made in relation to our mental asylums. But here we are trying to harness old-fashioned methods to a machine age. Every other worker in Australia has the Arbitration Court which he can approach. The bank officers, however have no such authority to air their grievances.

We hear hon. members rise in their places and preach about the Arbitration Court. However, I understand that if this Bill is passed the bank officers will have to refer their case to the Arbitration Court. Surely there is nothing wrong with that! I think it is a perfectly reasonable and honest request.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That would not be the effect of this Bill.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I hope the hon. Mr. MacKinnon will tell us what he thinks will be the effect of the Bill. I think it is very democratic and reasonable.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This Bill would not do that.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I have a daughter working in this line and I know that she comes home from work very tired; much more so than her neighbour who does domestic work in a house. I have watched my daughter over the months; and when this measure was brought forward I made up my mind that I would support it, because I think it is right to protect people's health and allow them to enjoy their lives. People have a right to enjoy their lives. If they live an honest and decent life they have a perfect right to enjoy themselves and have happiness. Happiness to me is a great thing.

I have had a hard life through circumstances I could not help. However, there is enough misery in the world without my adding to it. People have a perfect right to expect that society will give them a certain amount of leisure and happiness in their lives.

I will end on this note by saying it is wrong to harness the laws of 100 years ago to the scientific age which we have today and which was brought about by war and the advance of science that war brings. We all know that there is plenty of misery left by war and there is no need for me to dwell on it. However, it is wrong for a group of people to sit down and deny a body of other people a reform like this. If the bank officers think a 5-day week is necessary they must need it; otherwise they are dishonest.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Are you in favour of a 35-hour week?

The Hon. E. M. Davies: Are you in favour of this Bill?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I am in favour of the Bill and support it. I have put forward my ideas as a woman without trying to be pedantic on the issues of the Bill. It is necessary in the cause of humanity and the march of progress; and I hope that hon. members will support it. I hope they will not allow this Chamber to always be a place where might is greater than right. I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [8.49]: This Bill, called the Bank Holidays Act Amendment Bill, is a very small one which seeks to change a few words in the Act, but it would have a great effect upon the public life of Western Australia.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is what I have been telling you.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! The hon. member has had her say.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: An approach has been made by a small number of people. I say small, because I realise that bank employees possibly number something like 2,000 or more, but when that figure is compared with the general population of

Western Australia, it is quite small. It represents only one in 3,000. Are we to pass legislation in this State which will give something to a small minority and which is going to affect most of the population of Western Australia? I agree it will not affect all, because some people are not concerned if banks open on only one day a week, because they have access to them. However, many people are dependent upon the banks being open on Saturday morning in order to transact their banking business.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Change the day!

The Hon. A. R. JONES: This applies not only in the country areas, but in the city as well. I think it is very noticeable when one goes, as I did last week-end and the week-end before, to some of our banks, particularly now that they have a savings bank section, similar to the Commonwealth Bank, to see how busy they are on Saturday morning. I have no doubt that the average businessman has a strong-room on his premises which would accommodate any cash taken on a Saturday morning, or has a safe-deposit facility available at a bank which he could use. I also have no doubt that the average farmer does his banking on other than a Saturday, because I feel a bank manager in the town concerned would not make an appointment for a business transaction to take place on a Saturday.

However, small business houses and the public are certainly entitled to go to a bank on Saturday morning and transact whatever business they want. They work from Monday morning until Friday evening, and the earliest they would cease work, as a general rule, would be 4.30 p.m. on a Friday evening. Therefore, there is no possible chance for them to transact business in a bank unless it is done on a Saturday morning. A letter the hon. Mrs. Hutchison quoted said that they did their banking in the lunch hour. Not all people are fortunate enough to work in the city or close to a bank where they can conduct banking business in their lunch hour; and some people would take more than an hour in which to conduct their business.

I agree entirely with people wanting a five-day week, and I agree that wherever it is possible to work a five-day week people should not be brought back on a Saturday morning, because undoubtedly it is an inconvenience and is not always economically sound. I remember when miners were brought back to do a half shift on Saturday morning. It was uneconomic both to the men and the mine management. The men had to pay their fares both ways to work half a day, and they were no sooner down the mine than it was time for them to come up again.

In heavy industry, whether it be for the manufacture of heavy goods, clothing or the manufacture of some edibles, providing they are not perishable and can be kept in cool storage, there is no need to work on

a Saturday morning. When people are working in factories which manufacture motor cars, tractors, ploughs or processing cereal foods for breakfast, their hours can be regulated. They can end their working week on Friday night and be as free as the world on Saturday.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: These people want to go to arbitration.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Are we going to forget all those people who look to the banking facilities on Saturday morning in order to satisfy their needs, or are we going to consider some 2,000 people? Is it our job to consider just a few people or is our job to consider the general public and the economy of Western Australia? If we are going to be guided by a small minority in each case when legislation is brought before this House, as the hon. Mrs. Hutchison said, we might as well close up.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: We have no right to be considering this.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: So far as I am concerned nothing new has been submitted in this debate following on what we have heard over the last three or four years. Some hon. members seem to feel it is a great vote catching Bill. They seem to think that if we do not pass it we may incur the bad thoughts, or otherwise, of the community at large. However, I cannot feel it matters two hoots at all whether we do incur bad thoughts. Our job is to do our best in a conscientious endeavour in the interests of the whole of Western Australia and the community generally.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I say: Refer it to arbitration.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Mention has been made that this is an atomic age. The hon. Mrs. Griffith made mention of the fact that many people in banks were using machines. How many people in the banks work at machines?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Mr. President, I object to the remark made by the hon. Mr. Jones and would like to tell him that my wife is at home.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may proceed.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Only a very limited number of people work machines in banks. However, one would be led to believe by listening to Mrs. Hutchison that 99 per cent. of the people working in banks use machines. They do not. Of course, there are a few typistes. That sort of work has been going on for years and years, and I have never seen a typiste break down in health. Then there are ledger keepers who push buttons and pull a lever or press another button, and figures are added up. However, that cannot be a highly complicated job which calls for very much rest. I admit that this sort of work can become monotonous.

We talk of the atomic age and if we took any notice of the hon. member who has just resumed her seat—

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Mrs. Griffith!

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Cut it out!

The Hon. A. R. JONES:—we would be led to believe that machines are used throughout the length and breadth of our commercial world. Unfortunately we have not automatic buses; they do not drive themselves. We do not have automatic trains; they have to be managed.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Have you ridden in some of the buses?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. R. JONES: We have not an automatic cow which will hang on to the milk supply from Monday morning to Friday evening. It is impossible for us to say that we can all finish our work on Friday night. As stated by the hon. Mr. Diver, what would the bank people feel about us if we turned round and closed everything down on Friday night?

They chose this profession, and it is unfortunate for them that they have to work on Saturday morning. If they do not want to work on Saturday morning and give service to the public in compliance with the banking institutions as we have known them for many years—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is a weak argument.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: The hon. member who introduced this Bill read, I think, four or five reports from America. In one of them I noticed that banking—I think it was in the Chase-Manhattan Bank—was changed to a five-day week in 1939; and during the war years banking was resumed on a Saturday. However, in 1947 that bank reverted to Saturday closing which was started originally in 1939. I immediately asked myself the question: Why, during the war years, did that bank go back to banking on Saturdays? I wonder whether other hon. members had the same thought; because what struck me was that the bank realised it was in the best interests of the nation to open the banks on Saturday mornings. That is the only conclusion to which I could come.

Not one of the reports read by the hon. member showed that everyone was thoroughly satisfied with the closing of the banks. In many of the States the banks did not close at all on Saturday mornings, and in others they closed in parts of the States. Again, some banks closed, and others did not. For the information of the hon. member, who is so knowledgeable that she talks on every subject and knows nothing about anything, she says that Tasmania—

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I object to that. To say that I do not know anything, is a bit rough.

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member may resume her seat. She says some very offensive things, too, sometimes.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Just to point out that the hon. member does not know everything, she spoke of Tasmania. Have the banks been closed in the whole of Tasmania on Saturdays?

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Yes.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: They have not. See whether the banks are open at Launceston! Apparently the general public, in many places, do not agree that the closing of the banks is a good thing. Particularly now, when each and every one of the banks—I think without exception—has provided savings bank facilities, as well as making provision for the ordinary commercial cheque accounts, the banks leave themselves open to a demand from the public to open their premises on Saturday mornings, because many people avail themselves of the savings bank department.

I have no quarrel with a person wishing to work five days a week—I only wish I could join them. People say, of course, that we do not do anything, but not long ago I was quietly reminded at home that it was 13 weeks since I had been home for a week-end. I think that the position is common with many members of Parliament. We are called upon from time to time to perform special work which takes us many miles from our homes. So, the bank officials are not the only ones who have to do a little bit of work on the week-ends—Saturday mornings, and Sundays, too.

As I said previously, the people who work in heavy industry, have no need to work on Saturdays, because it is uneconomical for the management for them to do so, and it is also uneconomical to the worker. But when we come to the public services—telephone, water supplies, and electricity supplies are amongst them—the position is somewhat different. Whilst the Government offices are closed on Saturday mornings, I think it is wrong that they should be closed, because many people wish to go to the Government offices on Saturday mornings, but they cannot do so. They have to arrange to get time off from their work when they have to go to a Government office. Someone has to suffer as a result.

I cannot recall now what Bill we were discussing when the hon. Mr. Heenan said it was of paramount importance that offices of some sort should remain open at Kalgoorlie because prospectors from outback, and people working on small mines, came in on the week-ends. As a result, it is essential that certain services should be available on Saturday mornings. This applies also to the banks; particularly in those areas.

Even the telephone department gives a service on the week-end; breakdown gangs are available if anything goes wrong. Similarly, the Water Supply Department has an emergency gang which can be called upon when necessary, and so has the State Electricity Commission. So we are not left without some semblance of service; although I will say that the breakdown has to be serious before the telephone department will deal with it on the week-end. If a subscriber happens to have the phone off for a week, the department does not reduce the rental payable. All in all, I have not had many requests from banking people. I received something like 60 or 70 letters.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I will give you some of mine if you like.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I have no objection to receiving the letters. Provided they are worded as these are—respectfully requesting my attention and support for this legislation—I feel there is nothing wrong with them. Last year I received one letter which I thought was a little offensive. It was signed by three bank clerks. I took exception to it, but I cannot take exception to the letters I have received on this occasion.

Whilst I have some very good friends among the bank clerks, and I would like to say to them, "I will vote for the banking holiday legislation so that you can have your Saturday mornings off," I am afraid I am going to meet them and be told once again that I did not do the right thing by them. But I am going to take that risk.

I had a request from the farmers' organisation to oppose this legislation. When I speak of the farmers' organisation, I refer to the Farmers' Union. This is a strong organisation embracing a membership of many thousands of people. Here again, quite a big majority of the farming community are asking us not to support this legislation because they need the banking facilities on Saturdays. Also, from many other organisations, not only in the city but in the country, I have received requests not to support the legislation. I have also received the same request from private people.

Like the hon. Mr. Diver, who took the trouble to check up on a few names, I did the same because I was suspicious of one or two which I saw on letters I received. I know positively that in one instance a bank manager, and in another, a teller, got their best friends to sign these letters. The people who signed them had no interest in banking at all, but just to please their bank friends, they signed the letters. I have the copies of the letters here; and I suppose there are others, but I do not know. It is reasonable to assume that of the 60 or 70, quite a number are not signed by banking people. Like the hon. Mr. Diver,

I could not understand many of the signatures, so that had I wanted to reply to the letters, I could not have done so.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is to prevent forgery.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I feel, with others who have spoken, that I cannot in all conscientiousness agree that the time is anywhere near ripe to consider this legislation. When the banks come forward with a policy, and declare themselves, we will have some guidance. But the banks have remained silent on this issue. We have heard nothing from their executives.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: That goes to show they are satisfied.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: No, I would not say that. I would say it goes to show that they feel they have sufficient faith in the commonsense of this Chamber to give the question a serious review and do what is right in the best interests of the public of Western Australia. At the same time, I do not agree that the attitude they adopt is correct. I feel they should, with their employees, be taking some part in this question.

Realising that a bank has to be open on Saturday morning, they should, if they want their employees to have a five-day week, make some arrangements whereby certain of the employees work back at overtime rates; or do something of that nature. The hon. Mrs. Hutchison would have us believe that people do not want to work on Saturdays or Sundays at all. But I tell her it is my experience—having been on several boards—that if an essential service has to be carried out on Saturdays and Sundays, and certain employees are not rostered to do their share of work at the overtime rates of time and a half or double time, they are immediately up in arms and say, "When is my turn coming around?"

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is because they are pushed for money.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: The hon. member says they do not want to work; they want to work only five days. She has nothing to back her argument.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You have a pretty weak argument there.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member should discuss the Bill before the House.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I am discussing it, Sir, inasmuch as I am replying to the claim that these people want to work only five days a week. This does not necessarily apply only to bank employees. The hon. Mrs. Hutchison would have us believe that most people do not want to work more than five days. I am pointing out that some workers are on a five-day week, and, if it is essential that their work continue over Saturdays and Sundays, they are aggrieved if they are not rostered to work

on those days at double time. The hon. Mr. Lavery would know very well how this applies on the Fremantle wharves. That one does not cut any ice at all.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I will answer that point later.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I think I have said sufficient—not only just now but in the last three or four years—to show that I am not going to support the Bill.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [9.12]: I intend to support the measure, and I will try to make a few brief remarks to convey my arguments. I cannot agree with much of what the last speaker said, but I was pleased to hear him defend the right of any section of the community to write to members of Parliament and submit their arguments. Surely in a democracy that is one of the fundamental rights of the people; and I hope that nothing will ever be done to suggest that it should be taken away, or even criticised. I was pleased to hear the hon. Mr. Jones defend this right, because the hon. Mr. Diver who is eminently fair in the majority of his submissions seemed rather critical of it.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: I did not challenge the right.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If I misconstrued the hon. member's remarks, I am sorry. I understood them as a criticism of the written submissions that have been made to us. I think written submissions are good, because we in Parliament deal with many diverse topics. This evening we have dealt with the licensing law and with the Workers' Compensation Act.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: And we have dealt with legislation dealing with native welfare.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Recently we dealt with health matters; and in this connection the hon. Dr. Hislop gave us an able explanation. We have also had to deal with the fruitfly menace. The average hon. member does not know much about these things, and if the people who do know about them, or are interested in them, will write to us, and submit their arguments, we can sum up those arguments and put them forward. That is why we are in this House. We are here to submit the views of the section of the community that we represent.

My fan mail does not assume such proportions as that of the hon. Mrs. Hutchison or even that of the hon. Mr. Jones, but I have had considerable correspondence from Kalgoorlie—almost all of it from people I know well, the majority of them being bank officers. I had one communication from the Kalgoorlie Chamber of Commerce and I will submit their views before I conclude. In a democracy the main consideration is not whether something

favours a majority or a minority, but whether it is right or wrong; and we have a duty to protect the rights of minorities and see that they receive proper treatment.

As the hon. Mr. Jones said, this is one of the briefest measures that has been before us for a considerable time, but it nevertheless introduces an important extension of a principle that has been adopted in Australia for many years. I remember when the 40-hour week first came into operation—

The Hon. J. Murray: Do these people work a 40-hour week?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I could not answer that offhand. When the 40-hour week was introduced many people were genuinely afraid of what might happen and some even suggested that the country would be ruined, that business would stagnate and that the community would suffer greatly. They said that production would go down and that there would be all sorts of dire consequences, but I do not think anyone would now say there was much justification for those fears. Whenever there is an alteration to the existing state of affairs there is always a breaking-in period, after which things settle down. I believe the 40-hour week is working out very well—

Mr. J. Murray: It is not, of course!

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is my view and I will be interested to hear argument to prove it wrong. The hon. Mr. Jones pointed out that the telephone section of the P.M.G.'s Department, sections of the Water Supply Department and of the State Electricity Commission, and a number of other Government departments provide a service right over the weekend when required, but I do not think he was justified in mentioning those services in the same breath as the people working in banks.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The banks do not run to help broken down punters.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The hon. Mr. Diver mentioned the hours that farmers work, but there is a tremendous disparity between their position and that of bank officers. He also made reference to hotels, betting shops, restaurants and so on, but they are in an entirely different category—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is still service to the public.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes, but employees of the courts have Saturday morning off, as do also a majority of professional people. Insurance offices are largely closed on Saturday mornings, and from conversations I have had with a couple of insurance office managers, I know they would welcome complete Saturday morning closing.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Even undertakers have skeleton staffs.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: This measure seeks an extension of a principle that has been fairly generally adopted and I do not think that the business community would suffer if it were agreed to, because it is remarkable how easily adjustments can be made. I lived for many years in Esperance, before the better times that have now come to that area, and in those days a bank officer used to visit Esperance, from Norseman, once a week, and people did their business without difficulty. I am grateful to whoever sent me a copy of the pamphlet containing the bank officers' case for the five-day week. It states that in Tasmania, New Zealand, New York and many other parts of the U.S.A., as well as in Canada, the banks close on Saturday morning.

Surely the statement contained in that pamphlet is not untrue, and what applies in Tasmania, New Zealand, New York and many other parts of the U.S.A.—and now in South Australia also, I believe—should cause no hardship in Western Australia. The pamphlet also states that it is significant that the banks do not oppose the claim for a five-day week. The bank officers apparently want this measure almost unanimously, and the banks do not oppose it. I realise that they are not the only ones to be considered. The public must be considered, but I have not been inundated with protests from any section of the community. In deference to the wishes of the Kalgoorlie Chamber of Commerce I must point out that they oppose the measure, their argument being that it is out of step with progress and an imposition on the community. They say Saturday closing would confer an advantage upon a few people at the cost of the majority. They say, "A great and growing number of people in this mining town do their banking on Saturday morning. It is the only day when most working families can attend to their financial business as families." They say that if Saturday closing becomes law, traders, retailers and industry alike will have to make arrangements for the custody of cash, and that shopping days will have to be rearranged, with consequent loss of some trade to most branches of commerce.

That is the view of the Kalgoorlie Chamber of Commerce, but it is the only organisation that has made any protest to me in this regard. All the rest of the correspondence I have had from the Goldfields supports the measure, and the great majority of the people on the Goldfields with whom I have discussed it, approve of the Bill. They feel that instead of being out of keeping with progress it will, to the contrary, make for progress and extend to a minority fair play and justice. For those reasons I support the Bill and hope that on this occasion it will be agreed to.

THE HON. J. MURRAY (South-West) [9.27]: I rise to oppose the Bill. I might say that it was hearing the hon. Mr. Heenan speak that stirred me into activity in this regard. He said, in effect, that he had not very much fan mail from a certain section of the community, but that he had some from another section. I have had very little fan mail from a certain section of the community in this regard, but those people, probably, balancing reason with economy, think that 30 members of the Legislative Council, viewing this matter in an impartial way, will defeat the measure because it is not in the best interests of the State.

We have had a lot of correspondence from another section of the community but unfortunately it was, in the main, all printed on the one press and it said, in effect, "As my member of the Legislative Council of Western Australia, I trust you will support this legislation." I wish to make it clear to those people in the gallery and in Western Australia generally, that I do not represent any individual or any section of the people.

In these matters I represent Western Australia as a whole. This representation which is made on a stereotyped printed form and sent by certain individuals does not mean two hoots to me. It does not matter to me if they say they will vote against me, because I have to decide these questions on the principle of whether they are in the best interests of the people as a whole.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: But you are elected by the people.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I discount the interjections made by the hon. member, because they are most aggravating at times. I consider that this legislation is the thin edge of the wedge. If Parliament agrees to pass this Bill, business in Western Australia will cease on Friday nights. The extension of shopping hours until late Friday night will not matter. This is just another step towards a certain objective. It is definitely a sorry state of affairs when a large section of our community objects to this legislation. The most vocal supporters of this measure only a few years ago, presented to every customer who entered a bank, either to withdraw or to deposit money, a petition objecting to the socialisation of banking. When I say "socialisation of banking" I am referring to the nationalisation of banking.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: Tell us something of the socialisation that your party has done.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I am talking about the bank clerks, some of whom are now in the gallery and who, when people came to trade at the banks were dogmatic in their request for those people to sign a petition objecting to the socialisation of

banking. The benefit which can be conferred upon them if this legislation is passed could be granted to them through their own administration if they have a case. There is no reason why this question could not be dealt with in the ordinary course of business so that they may work a 40-hour week spread over five days, but which would ensure that some of the staff would work on Saturday morning. That could be done for their convenience without us debating a measure which, if passed, would mean that all business on Saturday morning in Western Australia would cease.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Do you believe—

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I take no notice of the hon. member's interjections.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: She has not a strong enough voice. That is why you take no notice of her.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: No matter how strong the voice is, if the interjection is not worth while I will still take no notice of it. If the hon. member who has just interjected knows nothing of the subject I would continue to pay no attention to her.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member now get back to the Bill!

The Hon. J. MURRAY: The hon. Mr. Heenan suggested that when the 40-hour week was introduced to this State no ill-effects were felt, despite the outcry that was made beforehand. I wonder if the hon. Mr. Heenan and other hon. members of this Chamber fully realise the critical position in which we are placed in this State today. Despite the rosy picture painted by some people, I maintain that we are still in a bad financial position. There is no doubt that the 40-hour week, so far as our markets are concerned, has placed us in a parlous state.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You are like Simon Legree.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I still take no notice of the hon. member.

The PRESIDENT: I hope the hon. member will take no notice of interjections.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: Despite what other people may say, I know quite a good deal about the timber industry, but as a result of the 40-hour week, better conditions, and all the rest of it that have been granted for the benefit of certain representatives of the Seamen's Union, we cannot market this product in the Eastern States. Strangely enough, we can market it overseas to better advantage than we can in other States of Australia. It might be of interest to hon. members to know that it costs more to carry timber by ship

from Bunbury or Albany to Adelaide, Melbourne, or Sydney, than it costs to produce.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What is the reason?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The 40-hour week!

The Hon. J. MURRAY: It is not only the 40-hour week but also the high emolument paid to seamen. The remuneration that is earned by seamen is probably greater than that received by a member of Parliament. To me, the repercussions from the granting of a 40-hour week do not mean a thing unless we get down to fundamentals and realise what this benefit has on the welfare of Western Australia and Australia generally. Hon. members should consider the fundamental question of whether we are building up an economic structure that is worth while or whether we are tearing it down as a result of following the principle of trying to build up something that is tottering, because the foundation has no substance. I wholeheartedly oppose the measure.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [9.40]: Prior to the Legislative Council elections, which were held in May this year, the Bank Officials' Association wrote to me requesting my support of this Bill. I informed the association that while my party had treated this legislation on a non-party basis, it was becoming obvious to me—because of the political pressure that was being exerted—that it would be necessary for my party to define its policy on this question. As a result, the letter I wrote was published in one of the issues of a journal called "The Banker."

At a public meeting which I held in connection with the last Legislative Council elections, a gentleman, who was presumably a bank official, questioned my support for this measure and I answered him in much the same terms as those contained in the letter I sent to the Bank Officials' Association. Over the last few days I have also received a large collection of documents from various people concerning this measure. I have not the slightest objection to people writing to me about legislation which is to be brought before the House, particularly when they couch their requests in respectful and courteous terms. I certainly took exception to a document that was sent to me last year wherein the writer threatened to put me out of Parliament if I did not oppose the measure in question.

I find myself in this situation: Am I to measure my support or objections to any measure by the size, or the weight—or any other method by which we can measure—of the demands received by me from those who want it or from those who do

not want it? If that is what I am required to do, I suggest that I, or any other person in this Chamber, would be a poor old member of Parliament. The communications I receive from various sections of the community I look upon as a guide for me to take certain action.

Of course, on this question, if I have to decide on the volume of correspondence I have received; on the amount of publicity it has been given by the Press; and other mediums through the employers expressing their views, and the expression of views by those people who send these notices to me, it will be difficult. At this stage, I would like to say that I am not opposed to the principle of a 5-day week for bank officers. I made the same statement in this House last year, and I repeat it now. However, when I made that statement last year, I indicated that the trend in Australia was not to restrict trading hours, but, on the contrary, the trend showed that people would work a 40-hour week, but not necessarily over a period from Monday to Friday. They might work it over a period of seven days a week, but in all there would be more people working a 40-hour week. The idea is to give greater freedom and greater purchasing power to the people and to meet the demands of those who require services made available to them over a greater length of time.

That was about a year to 15 months ago. To some extent the matters I thought of 15 months ago have taken effect in the State. Instead of seeing a restriction of hours we are seeing a definite tendency towards extending the hours. I noticed an advertisement in "The West Australian" by a wholesale grocery firm offering service to its customers between 6.30 p.m. and 9.30 p.m. on special nights of the week.

In the Eastern States there is a similar tendency. I noticed an advertisement in "The Sunday Telegraph," subscribed to by the Bank of New South Wales which showed that the hours of trading in the Pitt-st. branch were from 8.15 a.m. to 6 p.m. from Monday to Fridays, and 8.15 a.m. to 12 noon on Saturdays.

I asked the hon. Mr. Jeffery by way of interjection to give us some idea of what was happening in Victoria and New South Wales. He parried the question by saying that some people cloud their views with politics. That was his expression. Before sitting down I want to convey some information of the way in which politics have been played in respect of this measure, and how the people seeking support for the Bill—I do not blame them for wanting a five-day week and doing all they can to secure that end—are being used by an hon. member in another place who introduced this Bill for political purposes. I regret to say that the Government which he supports sits by and is prepared to take advantage of the politics he is playing.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: You were the one who played politics in the previous years.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I can make my speech without the assistance of the hon. member. In Victoria I see by the Press that the Premier, rather than restrict the trading hours of the banks, has said that he will not grant a five-day week and that the banks will have to make application to the court.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: What about the position in South Australia?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I understand that the Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Cahill) is reported to have said that he will not have a bar of Saturday closing of banks. We find as late as the day before yesterday an advertisement appearing in "The West Australian" concerning the Commonwealth Trading Bank and the Commonwealth Savings Bank, indicating that the Commonwealth Bank was opening a service, which it described as a service for migrants. The hours during which this service will be available are 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on week days; 6.30 p.m. to 8.30 p.m. Friday evenings; 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. Saturdays; and 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays.

The hon. Mr. Jeffery also stated—the statement was supported to some extent by the hon. Mr. Heenan—that the banks have no views on this question, and that they do not in any way oppose a five-day week. That is not correct. Whilst the heading in "The West Australian" of the 28th October dealing with this matter did state, "Banks no view on five-day plan," an entirely different story is told in the letterpress. That stated that the Associated Banks were of opinion that while service was required, the banks should be open. They said that was in conformity with the evidence they placed before the Select Committee.

I repeat that I am very much in sympathy with bank officers who desire to improve their situation by not having to work on Saturday mornings. It is suggested that we in this House could accept some compromise and keep the banks open on Friday evenings. If we did that we must accept the principle that banks are to be closed on Saturdays.

I have said that this matter was being made a political football, not by the bank officers but by the person who was responsible for introducing this legislation to Parliament. I have here a letter signed by S. E. I. Johnson, M.L.A. which I do not propose to read because it did not concern my particular election but the election of the hon. Dr. Hislop. But I propose to read the one concerning my election, and when I have done so hon. members will be able to see that the hon. member for Leederville was able to tell me and his fellow bankers before the

last election exactly what I was going to do in connection with the Bill. The letter states—

Parliament House,
Perth,
7th May, 1958.

Dear Fellow Banker,

Five-Day Week for Banks.

Last time the Bank Holidays Act was before Parliament it was defeated by one vote in the Legislative Council.

On the previous presentation of the Bill it had been supported by two non-Labor members, namely, Messrs. Cunningham and Griffith. There was a Legislative Council election between the two presentations and, following his re-election for six years, Cunningham voted against the measure; so despite an increase in Labor representation, the Bill was defeated by one vote.

Hon. A. Griffith, who is now a candidate for Suburban Province, was the only non-Labor member to support this Bill last time. According to his letter published in the April "Banker," he will, if re-elected, follow the Liberal line. Just what that line is is defined by Liberal leader Brand, who is contemptuous of the "comparatively small section (bankers) and cannot . . . support the reform."

Compare this with the attitude of Premier Hawke who offers "continued, consistent support," and the Labor candidate for your Province, H. R. Fletcher, who is "completely in favour."

It seems improbable that Griffith can be relied on to support the five-day week if he is re-elected.

If you are concerned to obtain Saturday off, it is certainly far preferable to support Fletcher, and I urge you to do this with your vote on Saturday May 10th.

Yours sincerely,

Ted Johnson,

S. E. JOHNSON, M.L.A.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Is he the same Mr. Johnson who, in the Legislative Assembly, referred to the bankers as despicable worms?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The expression was not "despicable worms." He referred to those gentlemen as "spineless worms industrially."

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Who is now playing politics of the lowest order? It ill becomes you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I suggest the hon. member make his speech after I have finished.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: After you counted the heads on the last occasion you came over to this side to vote.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I demand a withdrawal of that interjection. It is quite incorrect, even though the hon. member is prone to lose his temper, to suggest a statement of that nature.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I saw you doing that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I demand a withdrawal.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should withdraw the statement.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I do not propose to withdraw because the hon. Mr. Griffith did that on the last occasion by counting the heads and coming over here.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will withdraw the statement.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I withdraw the statement, but it is already in Hansard so it does not matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is no question about the Standing Orders of this House requiring amendment, because it is quite farcical for an hon. member to make an assertion which is diabolically untrue—

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should not proceed with that line but should get on with the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —then to be able to say it is recorded in Hansard after he has been told to withdraw it in accordance with the Standing Orders. My attitude on the last occasion when this Bill was before us is printed in Hansard, and there was no necessity for me to do what the hon. member suggested. On the last occasion I supported the Bill with the reservations which are recorded in Hansard. The decision which I have to make on this occasion is whether I shall continue to support the measure.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Camouflaging!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have to say this to myself: Whilst it is true these requests have come from the bank officers who desire my support, it is equally true to say that many people are opposed to the measure. I have here correspondence which has been sent to me in connection with the matter as follows:—

Telegram from Waroona Chamber of Commerce asking me to strongly oppose closing of banks on Saturday.

Telegram from Associated Chamber of Commerce asking me to oppose this measure.

Communications and Press reports from the following parties:—

Farmer's Union opposed to it.

Retailers opposed to it.

Employers' Federation opposed to it.

Chamber of Manufactures opposed to it.

Chamber of Commerce opposed to it.

Furniture Trades Association opposed to it.

On the evidence which the Associated Banks gave at the Select Committee, they also are opposed to it.

At this stage I must say that I think the Associated Banks could have been more forthright in their attitude towards this measure. I do not mean that they should come out with a categorical Press statement saying they are opposed to the legislation outright, but we should have some greater guidance from them. I think it is not too late for the Bank Officials Association and the Associated Banks, and other banks affected by this legislation, to come together to see whether something could be done. If we accept the statement given by some people—I see no reason for not accepting it—that banks do not have much trade on Saturday mornings, then the problem of meeting on the basis of giving at least some relief to bank officials on a rostered system could be more easily resolved.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchinson: Do you believe they should go before the Arbitration Court?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I believe the hon. member should make her own speech and leave me to make mine. Heaven knows we had to listen to her long enough! In view of the trend that is taking place in Western Australia; in view of the evidence that banks throughout this State and in some others are extending their hours rather than restricting them; at the present time, at least, it would be wrong for us to legislate to close the banks on Saturday mornings. For that reason I am obliged to oppose the Bill. In doing so it seems quite obvious from the advertisement which the banks themselves subscribed to, there is a demand for extended service; I refer to the advertisement which relates to Sunday service—whatever type of service it might be—to migrants. That is significant of the fact that there is a demand there and I understand the Premier of Western Australia (Mr. Hawke), was at the function held when the Sunday service was inaugurated, and he made a passing reference to the fact that this legislation was before the House.

I would say to the bank officers that so far as I am concerned, I have endeavoured to be of what assistance I could in this matter. I am extremely pleased to think that the political attack made upon me by

the hon. member for Leederville, who introduced this Bill, was of no avail and I was returned to this Chamber. For the information of that hon. member, I would like to read a short passage which is on the back of one of these documents. It is as follows:—

This is interesting—sent me by Johnson. Although I am a bank officer, he's stretching it a bit to call me "fellow banker" as he couldn't get back into a bank if he lost his seat in Parliament.

THE HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [10.2]: I did not intend to speak on this measure as I thought there would be one or two speakers after which the vote would be taken, but I have decided to do so after hearing the touching address delivered by the hon. Mrs. Hutchison. I think it was a very touching address—

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: It was. Touching on every subject under the sun!

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: —and was good motherly advice. The hon. Mr. Heenan also contributed very good information. I shall now go back a few years and refer to the days when I was a member of the mining industry. These were the times when it was a seven-day week of eight hours a day. The butchers then—I am talking of the period about 1900 or 1906—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You were only six then!

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: —worked from four in the morning to midnight. And what happened when shorter hours were suggested? It was said that people could not live because they would not get their meat. But what is the position today? The butcher opens his shop at 8 a.m. and closes it at 4 or 5 p.m.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Ever heard of refrigerators?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: That is the explanation, of course. We only had coolers in those days. But now, even miners have a five-day working week. So do municipal workers, public servants and so on.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: How many hours do you work?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: If the hon. member would really like to know, I will give him a resume of my work, but I would say this: I travel over 750 miles every week to and from my job here to participate in the debates on matters concerning the people whom I represent, and the State as a whole. In addition to that on some weekends I travel to Norseman—140 miles—and on others I go to Merredin, Bruce Rock and those places, to keep in touch with my constituency and to render the service for which I am paid. I would

say that many of the hon. members in the metropolitan area would not travel 100 yards.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You would say that, would you?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I would suggest that there would be 90 per cent. or 95 per cent. of the 2,000 bank officers—I think it was the hon. Mr. Jones who said there were about 2,000 bank officers—who would be solidly behind this legislation as they want a five-day working week. I have been contacted by many people from my own constituency and although it is going to be a bit hard on some of them, they are all in favour of it. But the miners in Kalgoorlie, have been fortunate enough to be granted a five-day working week and I am sure they will not begrudge the bankers the same privilege. A lot of the miners are paid on a Friday—every second Friday—and do most of their banking on a Saturday morning, but, as I say, it was good enough for them to obtain a five-day working week and they will not begrudge the bank officers the same hours. I would like to go one step further. The shops could then come into line and have a five-day week. That is all that is worrying the State, or certain parties, because the shop assistants might claim a five-day week. There would be no harm in that either!

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What about the doctors?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: No, the doctors are unfortunate. I think the hon. Dr. Hislop will support me when I say that there are more people living longer than ever before, and that is because they are working fewer hours a week and are able to participate in the home duties and be among their families.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Do you think the Kalgoorlie hotels should close on a Saturday?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: We must fall in line and introduce better working standards and reduce the hours of work to keep our people living longer.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Your wife should not have to cook your meals on Saturdays and Sundays.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I might help with that, too. If other hon. members would give a help in the home and take the opportunity of spending some time in their homes instead of in the betting shops and hotels, they would be far better off. But I think the majority of people are good living and spend most of their time in the garden and with their families. Therefore, if we are going to legislate we must cater for all the people and not for just a few.

I have received a few letters but I am in no way perturbed about them. I think it is only right that we should know whether all the people want a five-day

working week. I received one letter from the Kalgoorlie Chamber of Commerce which is not in favour of this legislation; but that is the only one I have received opposing it. I am supporting the Bill in all good faith. Like every new system which is inaugurated, it will be awkward for the first few weeks but the people will fall in line with it, and I think after it has been given a trial for a few months, other organisations will want to do likewise.

We have received word today that the South Australian Government has fallen in line with this idea and has granted a five-day week, but we do not want to worry about what the other States do. Let us look after ourselves and cater for the people we represent. After all, if we are in difficulties the other States will not help us. Therefore, as I say, let us help ourselves and satisfy our own people. If we do that, we are doing a good job.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [10.10]: I rise to oppose this measure on several grounds. Banking is irrevocably tied up with general business, and if banking hours are reduced without supplying an alternative, then the jobs of those people who work for the banks must be placed in some sort of jeopardy. We have heard all sorts of examples given of countries and States throughout the world which have cut out Saturday morning banking. The point—that member after member has failed to bring out—is that invariably when Saturday morning banking has been stopped, some provision has been made to cater for those desiring to avail themselves of this service.

An hon. member: Such as agencies.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will deal with that matter later. Generally though, the banking hours have been extended on a Friday to 5 or 6 o'clock—usually to 6 o'clock. That fact has been conveniently omitted from the remarks of hon. members, although the hon. Mr. Jeffery mentioned it briefly in passing. The hours in America are generally from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. on Mondays to Thursdays, and from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Fridays, which, of course, is a vastly different proposition from that which has been suggested year after year in this House. Under present legislation, banks would be open from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. for five days a week. I must say that, originating where it does, I am amazed at the support this suggestion has received, particularly in view of the widespread activities of all the banks to encourage deposits in savings banks and the encouragement given by all Governments to people to take advantage of the savings banks.

It is all very well to speak of 30 or 40 years ago when economic conditions were vastly different from those which exist today. The general level of savings

bank deposits are higher now than ever. People have been encouraged—and probably rightly so—to utilise savings banks, and deposit their money therein. The moment the whole scheme becomes effective, it is suggested that a reduction be made in the major effective hours when the ordinary factory workers can do their business. That is on Saturday mornings.

The person who amazed me the most when she supported this Bill, was the hon. Mrs. Hutchison. She has, to the best of her ability, expressed the woman's point of view in this House, and I give her credit for that, but the moment a real issue for the women is presented, she turns her back on them and just wipes them off.

This is the position; Saturday mornings are the only times when the bulk of the factory working men can arrange to see the bank managers, but under this proposal, any business which is necessary in the future will have to be done by the women. Consider the position in many country towns where we have large groups of migrants. There are several towns in the South-West where considerable numbers of Italians live. In that respect alone there is sufficient reason for me to vote against this measure.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Pay them earlier.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It does not matter when they are paid.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Of course it does!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: If they were paid on Monday it would not make any difference.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Nonsense!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The only time they have off is Saturday morning. There is another alternative and that is to give Monday off to the potato diggers, the mill workers and the workers in factories so that they work on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. But the position at present is that they work from Monday to Friday from eight o'clock in the morning to about half past four or a quarter to five in the afternoon. Probably it would be 5 o'clock by the time they got to town. The only time they have off, and when they can visit the bank, is on Saturday morning.

Members of the Labour Party want to close the banks on Saturday morning which means the only persons left to do the banking business are the wives and, in a great number of cases, the wives of these migrants cannot speak English well enough, and do not understand figures sufficiently well, to do the banking. Somebody might say, "They ought to learn it." That would be heartless; a great number of migrants have come to this country because of the disruption caused throughout Europe by the war. They did not have an opportunity to obtain an adequate

education even in their own language; many of them cannot read their own language very well, and so what chance have they to follow the intricacies of our language sufficiently to enable them to conduct general banking business?

It would be extremely difficult. The women would have to go to the banks between the hours of 10 o'clock in the morning and 3 o'clock in the afternoon, which are the hours when the banks are open—that is if the proposal to close the banks on Saturdays is agreed to. The hon. Mr. Jeffery said that he found plenty of time to do all his banking business during his lunch hour, or after work.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There is plenty of time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The hon. Mr. Jeffery worked in the city. I would like to see a mill worker from the Shannon River mill trying to conduct his banking business in Manjimup during his lunch hour.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: I worked at Bayswater, which is a long way from the city.

[The Deputy President took the Chair.]

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is still not as difficult to get from Bayswater to the city as it would be for some potato digger working in the swamps at Benger to get into Harvey to conduct his necessary banking business. The man just could not do it. But some hon. members seem to be quite happy to load the extra work on to the wives. I was most amazed at the speech made by the hon. Mr. Bennetts. His attitude on this measure is quite the opposite to speeches he made on at least two other occasions. I can remember him talking on a Bill to amend the Licensing Act. On that occasion he had no hesitation in supporting a Bill which would make hotel employees in Kalgoorlie work extra time in the week-ends. He said on that occasion—

I am not going to bar the wives of other people if they wish to have a drink on Sunday. The woman is a slave worker, with her back bowed down, looking after the male of the house, and the family.

Yet the hon. Mr. Bennetts—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Stick to the Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yet the hon. Mr. Bennetts now is quite prepared to close the banks on Saturday mornings, which means that if a man is working for five days a week, and he has banking business to do, he must of necessity ask his wife to do it. That is an extra load to place upon her. The hon. Mr. Garrigan

said that the banks have agencies. I do not think it is reasonable that the banking fraternity should ask the agencies to do work which they are not prepared to do themselves.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Why do they take it on? They don't do the work at a loss.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Why should a chemist, who has a bank agency business, be expected to conduct banking business on Saturday mornings if the banks are not prepared to do it? However, that side of banking is not the most important. If a man—an ordinary working man—wants to build a house and wants to talk over his business arrangements with his bank manager on a Saturday morning, why should he not be able to do so? In those cases the wife wants to participate in the discussions, and the only time the husband and wife can see the bank manager together is on a Saturday morning.

Whenever this matter is brought up no notice seems to be taken of the fact that in other parts of the world banking hours have been increased on some other day in order to allow the working man more opportunity to see the bank managers. Hon. members who support this Bill take no notice of that. They say, "No. We will close the banks on Saturday morning." But there is no provision to extend the hours on Fridays.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: They have made provision for Fridays.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: They have made no such thing.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: That is what you think.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In many other countries a great deal of the work of the banks, as we understand it, has been taken over by other agencies—by the personal loan corporations of America. If the bank officers are prepared to allow these other organisations to extend their activities, and to take over some of their functions, well and good, but that is what will happen.

Early this year I discussed this particular problem with an ex-chairman of one of the banks in Victoria, where the banking hours have been extended. One of the matters which he mentioned was the tendency for outside organisations to enter the banking field by way of personal loans, and that type of thing. That, of course, cuts down the bank's activities and automatically affects the employment potential and the possibility of improvement in bank officers' jobs. That was one of the particular points which they bore in mind when they introduced the increased spread of hours in Victoria.

I think that most of the other points I have noted have been adequately dealt with by various speakers, but the one I

particularly wanted to mention was the heartless manner in which the hon. Mrs. Hutchison was prepared to load another job on the wives who would, of necessity, have to go along and conduct the family's financial affairs unless, of course, the husbands could arrange time off between the hours of 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. I still say that if this Government had been prepared to approach the Bill in a genuine manner some condition would have been imposed so that the hours of the banks would be extended on some other days in order that the people whom the Government claims to represent—that is the workers—who are invariably working during normal banking hours would be given some opportunity of being able to conduct their normal banking business without seeking time off. If that were done they would be able to see their bank manager without having to arrange special interviews in the evening or outside of normal working hours.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What factory worker would want to see his bank manager? How would they have enough money to warrant seeing him?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: A great many of them would want to see the bank manager, the same as many waterside workers would want to see their bank manager. The sort of talk indulged in by the hon. Mr. Lavery is so much malarkey. There are many factory and waterside workers today who have—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Who work odd shifts.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: —a considerable number of dealings with the banks. There are many working men in the cities who do not work shifts. Probably there are quite a few workers in the city who work shifts in the bigger factories; but in the country towns very few businesses work shift work. Those employees work from 8 in the morning—

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: I beg your pardon.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I know that the hon. member comes from Kalgoorlie and can think of nothing else but the Goldfields.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Yes, I stick up for them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There are towns other than Kalgoorlie in this State. It is not the only town in Western Australia; and for the various reasons that I have enumerated I oppose the measure.

THE HON. J. D. TEAHAN (North-East) [10.25]: Although much has been said about the Bill, and many arguments have been retraced, I have no desire to cast a silent vote. Therefore I should advance a few of the reasons I have for supporting the measure. Firstly I should say that one of the most valued reforms

over the last few years has been the five-day week. I know that as a civil servant I placed a great deal of value on the five-day week, and looked forward to the day when it would be granted. All other civil servants had the same outlook. Of all reforms that have been granted this was the one they enjoyed the most. So, how can we find fault with bank officers when they say, "Why should we be one of those left out if it is possible for us to get a five-day week?" Of course, it has been said that it is not possible for bank officers to get a five-day week. But what is the necessity for keeping the banks open on Saturdays mornings?

We have only to look back a few years and remember that at one time the savings banks were open on Saturday nights because it was said that they were essential to the public. I know that the savings banks in Kalgoorlie and Boulder were open on Saturday nights—although I am not sure of the position in other places—between half past seven and half past eight. During that period a person could pay money into the savings bank. But over the years it was found that this was not essential, and so those extra hours were eliminated. We have now almost forgotten that those days existed.

Now we arrive at the next step, which is the desire to eliminate the Saturday morning opening of the banks. When that does come about—and it certainly will—people after a few years will have forgotten that the banks were ever open on Saturday mornings.

How necessary is it for the banks to open on Saturday morning? They open for business at half past nine. Some business people say that it is necessary for them to be able to get change on Saturday morning. But half past nine is too late for them to think about getting change, because by that time half their Saturday morning trading hours have gone. Some business people also say that it is necessary to have Saturday morning trading so that they can deposit their Saturday takings with the banks. But the banks close at 11 a.m., and in order to prepare bank slips and so on it would be necessary to start adjusting affairs by half past ten. By that time business in some shops is only just starting, and there would be hardly any takings by the time the banks had closed. So I do not think there is much in favour of that argument for keeping the banks open.

People can make a greater use of the safety deposit system. By that means they can deposit their money when the banks are closed. People can also have safe deposits installed in their own homes, and at no great cost. Some hon. members have said it is essential that the ordinary working man should be able to visit the banks on Saturday mornings. Why must he be able to visit the banks? We know

he does, but why must he? I know, speaking for the railway employees, that many of them, even those on the basic wage, have their wages paid direct to their banks; and there is no need for them to deposit any money—it is paid direct by the paymaster to the bank concerned. Most of those employees use the cheque system and they have no need to visit the banks to withdraw any money. They write cheques and work on their bank statements.

There is no necessity at all for the businessman to use the bank on Saturday mornings, and there is no reason for the ordinary wages man to use it. I think the hon. Mrs. Hutchison made quite a good point when she said that men and women are slaves to custom, and because it has been the rule to do a certain thing on Friday and something else on Saturday, they have to keep on doing it. Thus, because it is the rule to have a pay day on Friday, that system seems to be continued. Why is there this clamour for things to be done on Friday and Saturday?

I have often said to my wife, "Why this rush to do the shopping on Friday? Why cannot it be done on Monday or Tuesday, or one of the other days?" The only reason why it is done on Friday, of course, is that we are slaves to custom. The pay day could be altered to Monday or Tuesday, quite easily. As a matter of fact at one time on the Goldfields the banks paid on the 3rd and the 18th of the month, and those dates, of course, fell on any days. It was found to be quite suitable. I am certain the business men were favourably inclined towards men being paid at the beginning of the week, and I am also certain that the housewives looked at the idea with satisfaction.

So we follow a great number of customs because of convention, and the fact that the majority of people do certain things on Friday and Saturday. I remember the time when the five-day week was introduced into the Government services and, later, into local government administration. At the time it was said the municipal labourer could work five days a week without upsetting the community, but it was claimed that the municipal offices could not close on Saturday because people would be unable to pay their electricity bills and their rates; and they would be unable to make any inquiries. Accordingly, the offices were kept open for a year or two, but for the last eight or 10 years they have been closed, and this service has not been missed. I will admit that the particular municipal offices of which I have knowledge used to close at 3 p.m., but they now keep open till 4.30 p.m. They find it suits them, and it also provides a service to the public.

Necessity is the mother of invention, and there are always ways of getting around difficulties. Those of us who enjoy the five-day working week should not deny

that privilege to others. Hon. members would immediately say that trains run on a Saturday. Very well, let us give it to those who can enjoy this privilege; and among those are the bank officers, because we would not miss this service if it were closed on a Saturday. With those few words to prove that we could still live with the banks closed on Saturday morning, I support the measure.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [10.34]: A great deal has been said tonight on this subject, and most of it is reiteration of what has been said over the past few years. What I propose to say will be brief. I don't suppose there is a bank officer alive in Western Australia who would expect me to vote for this Bill. I would be most surprised if there were. During the last elections most of their guns were turned on me. Even my opponent saw fit to use the bank officers' request for Saturday morning closing as a means of asking—by pamphlets—people to vote against me. The leader of the bank officers in a political newsletter, as it were, reminded the bank officers that it was essential that I should not be returned to office. It all proved of no avail, and it produced not the slightest spark of public interest. I was returned with a majority that even interested my opponent. All this, however, makes me feel that this request of the bank officers has not got public appeal.

I have no objection to hundreds of people writing to me on any subject, providing of course they follow the ordinary customs of courtesy in letters. If I am written to personally, I will attempt to reply courteously. I would like to stress, however, that it would not matter to me whether I received four or five hundred letters—and I am sure I received nearly that number. I feel flattered, however, from the discussion tonight that I probably received more letters than anybody else. But the fact that I received that number of letters would not influence me if I felt that the request that had been made by a minority was not in the public interest.

I have made that statement here before. I would, however, like to draw the attention of the House to one of the letters that I received, and I suggest to the person who wrote it that it is not the way I would go about asking somebody on whom I had turned all my guns to do something for me. I certainly would not include the paragraph I propose to read—

This is, I consider, a long overdue reform and one in which we bank officers have done everything in our power to meet the objections of antagonists with civility and restraint. However, during my attendance at parliamentary sittings dealing with

this measure it has become increasingly apparent that many members of the House have not bothered to do us the courtesy of acquainting themselves with the facts of the case and appear inclined to just brush it off out of hand.

It is with this last mentioned point in mind that I write you

I would not at any time feel inclined to do what that gentleman desired of me. Fortunately he was one out of a very large number. I do not believe that what is contained in the letter is the general attitude of the bank officials. But my statement still holds, that no matter how many letters I receive, I must look at the matter from the point of view of the interests of the State. I do not propose to make a long speech, because I gave my considered opinion on this subject last year when I returned from a journey abroad. If the bank officers wish to know my opinion they should turn up the Hansard in which that speech still stands as an expression of my beliefs. I do not think it would be wise to close the banks.

I said last year, and I said all through my recent political campaign, that this was the start of a major move of a purely political character, and that the bank officers were being used by a political character for his own ends. They do not seem to appreciate that fact. The end which that man and his followers were hoping to achieve was the closure of all work in this State on Saturday morning.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: At least you have been consistent.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That will continue to be my view as long as I am here, and if this Bill comes back to us at any future date, I will repeat that opinion. I do not propose to support a measure of this nature until such time as the economy of the country justifies it. The views I have expressed were borne out by my opponent in his pamphlet when he rather unwisely accused me of preventing Saturday being secured by all persons in the State as a day of rest. I think my opponent made a false move to admit that the step to close the banks on Saturday mornings was the first of a preliminary start to close all activities on that day.

We were also told by the hon. Mr. Bennetts tonight that there were other facilities that could be closed. He did not know why we should not close the shops. Accordingly it becomes apparent that the bank officers, whilst accepting for themselves—if they can get it—something which many of us would desire, are unable to see that they are being used as political tools in a campaign that would not be in the best interests of the State. Accordingly, I maintain the position I have always adopted here. I will not vote for any legislation that restricts our trade.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.40]: Like the hon. Dr. Hislop I can also say that anybody who wishes to know my views on this matter should read page 1409 of last year's Hansard. That would be the case upon which I rest in regard to this measure, because I have not altered my opinion since the intervening 12 months. On that occasion I spoke for 36 minutes, and I covered most of what had to be said on the subject. I would have refrained from speaking at all, but I believe I ought to do so in deference to those people who have seen fit to write me letters, whether stereotyped or otherwise. Accordingly I wish to make some further observations on this measure. The first point to decide is whether the service provided by the bank is an essential service. We must decide whether this service in conjunction with other essential services should be open on Saturday morning. Let us have a look at the case put up by the Bank Officers Five Day Week Committee. This is what they had to say in the pamphlet that was sent to me—

Banks provide an essential service to the community . . .

That provides the answer; it is an essential service. If it is an essential service required by the community, it is my duty to see the community gets that service. It would seem, however, that the officials who presented this case for a five-day week did not do the bank officers justice, because they later say, "The banks do not contribute directly to the nation's productivity." I will come to that in a minute. They then go on to point out—

Savings bank depositors need not bank on Saturdays. They are amply catered for by agencies throughout the suburbs and country towns, by postal banking facilities, and by special purpose banking facilities in shops, factories and offices.

In other words, they do not contribute anything towards the productivity of the country, and they are not essential for the needs of the people on Saturday morning. If that is so, then what is the good of the banks at all? It seems to me that the bank officers do not want to work on Saturday morning; they want the agencies and other people to do the work for them. That is the position we could reach. To my mind it is stupid for them to say that they are not contributing towards the nation's productivity. Surely if I enter a bank and borrow £5,000 to help me produce 10,000 bags of wheat, that would be a contribution to the nation's productivity. Of course it would! It cannot be otherwise. Accordingly, I feel that the bank officers have not done themselves much good in the pamphlet they have had circulated. Tonight we had the hon. Mrs. Hutchison weeping on our shoulders—

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Never!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN:—and telling us about the mental strain these people are experiencing, and the fact that they would fill up the mental homes because of that strain. Let us have a look at what the bank officers said about their own conditions. I will quote some opinions from "The Westralian Banker" of December, 1957. The following question was asked:—

What aspect of your conditions of service do you appreciate the most?

I will now quote some of the replies—

A firm first favourite is created perhaps more by the staffs themselves than by the banks, although the general climate necessary for its development must exist in the first place and be fostered. It is best defined by the one word, "congeniality" and is a dominantly recurrent theme throughout the response, with comments such as "congenial workmates," "good companionship" and "congenial atmosphere."

Does that sound as though bank officers suffer from mental strain or are likely to be sent to a mental home, because of the existence of a 5½-day week? Then, "The Westralian Banker" goes on to say—

High on the list of aspects most appreciated is a related factor best summarised by two actual comments—"friendly and considerate staff administration" and "consideration when in difficulties."

The article goes on to say—

Another aspect receiving strong priority is "security of employment."

Further on it says—

"Medical benefits" is by far the most appreciated factor involving direct monetary outlay. These schemes, initiated by the banks and never the subject of negotiation or awards, have created a large measure of staff contentment. It is indeed pleasing and reassuring to know that, while employed in a bank, no officer can be financially crippled through a run of ill health. Sick leave consideration also receives an honourable mention.

Those are the conditions under which the bank officers are working today. Where is the mental strain about which the hon. Mrs. Hutchison wept on our shoulders?

Let us look at the position in which the Premier placed himself when he complimented and congratulated Mr. Simpson of the Commonwealth Bank on expanding facilities for migrants. Only the day before yesterday the photo of the Premier was in the paper. This photo was taken at the opening of these facilities for migrants. I believe the Premier made reference to the Bill which is now before this House, and his words were to

the effect, "I do not know how you reconcile this service to the Bill before the House at the present time." Of course he cannot reconcile that service to a measure such as this which takes facilities away from Australians.

I think I might as well go further afield, as we have heard quite a lot about what happens in Tasmania, New Zealand and other parts of the world. I can assure hon. members that Saturday morning closing in Tasmania has not brought any advantage to Tasmania from a tourist point of view. In my opinion, Saturday morning closing in Tasmania is objectionable. I found it very difficult during my trip around Tasmania.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: You wouldn't open the shops there on Saturday morning.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I found that conditions in Tasmania were not as good as those in Western Australia—not nearly as good.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: It all depends on what you mean by good.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The people had a reform in some of the other States, but it is not a reform that is worthwhile. Firms like McRobertsons and Repco have to close their doors at 2 p.m. on Friday to enable the staff to do business transactions in the afternoon. They have got down to a 35-hour week. They have to close their factories at 2 p.m. on Friday to enable their staff to attend to banking matters. Hon. members can check that if they wish.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: We will take your word for it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In Melbourne and Sydney, which are the two leading cities in the Commonwealth we find the Commonwealth Bank giving extra service. At Wynyard station the bank is open from 8.15 a.m. to 6 p.m. The other banks, because they provide a savings bank service, give a service from 8.15 a.m. till 12 noon on Saturday. The same was done in Melbourne by the Bank of New South Wales, which went into the savings bank field. That bank opens from 8.15 a.m. to 6 p.m.

I think we can take another aspect. We very often get it thrown up at us by the Minister about what the Grants Commission is doing to Western Australia. Surely when the Government is putting up a case for Western Australia, the Grants Commission will consider conditions in the other States, which it does. The Grants Commission, when comparing these conditions, will say to Western Australia, "If you can afford to close your banks and reduce essential services, then you are better

off than the bigger States, so we will reduce your grant." The Minister throws that up quite a lot. I now throw it back to him.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: South Australia would be in a bad way.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is for the Minister to refute it.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: What have the banks got to do with it?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Quite a lot, because the conditions are laid down in the States, and service to the community is quite a part of them. Do not forget that although the Bill in South Australia has passed the House, it will not be proclaimed for some considerable time. The Governor will not proclaim it until he is satisfied that all of the other conditions appertaining to 5 o'clock opening are accomplished.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That is correct. Who is arguing about it?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am telling the Minister so he will know.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Your argument is all words.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is just as well for the Minister to know what is going on. We also have the Premier of this State advocating greater production of Western Australian goods because our deficit with the Eastern States is something like £60,000,000 per year. Yet we are going to reduce our essential services on Saturday morning, and this would have an effect on production. One might ask the question: Why do the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufacturers oppose Saturday morning closing?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They oppose anything for the worker.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of the manufacturers' production, 40 to 50 per cent. is sold on a Saturday morning, and because of this they are able to keep people employed for the rest of the five-day week.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: People would not buy the goods if they were unable to on a Saturday.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If goods cannot be purchased on Saturday morning unemployment will result. That is not a theory; it is a reality. On this occasion, I think members of Parliament should have sat back and let the bank officers be on one side of this issue and the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufacturers, the Retail Traders' Association and the Farmers' Union on the other. It would stop all the arguing of the point through the Press. Apparently there must have been some genuine claim put up by these people when they asked for the banks to remain open on Saturday mornings.

The bank officers say they want a five day week and, in regard to their reason, I will read another extract from "The Westralian Banker" of December, 1957; and this was the question asked—

Do you think the bank should prohibit officers undertaking paid outside employment in their own time?

These are the bank officers who are asking for Saturday mornings off. Seventy-nine per cent. of them replied to that question, "No." This, in effect, means that 79 per cent. of them want the opportunity to knock off on Saturday mornings and then take employment outside; and yet, as the hon. Mrs. Hutchison stated, they say they want to get away from the mental strain. I thought the Labour Party policy was—one man, one job; but here the bank officers say they want to take outside work.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: You say that they said it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I said that 79 per cent. of the bankers wanted it. I suggest that they are being given the opportunity—or an attempt is being made to give them the opportunity—to take outside work and so reduce the possible jobs that can be taken by other people. That is what the Labour Party is advocating.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Even if they wanted to do that, they would still have to find the jobs.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They will. They are doing it now; and that, despite the fact that the bank service agreement bars outside employment. I know many who do outside work and receive payment for it, too. Apparently they are breaking the law, whether they know it or not. At any rate, they are breaking their own banking service agreement.

Is it fair that these people should want to work their five days in the bank and then take outside employment over the week-end, and then ask the people in agencies to do their work for them on Saturday morning? I do not think it is a fair proposition at all.

Perhaps the main disturbing feature about this matter is the political aspect. This question was asked—

If there was a Federal election tomorrow, would you support—

- (a) the present Government?
- (b) the Opposition?
- (c) I am undecided.

The answer was—

- (a) 81 per cent.
- (b) 8 per cent.
- (c) 11 per cent. were undecided.

The same question was then asked in regard to State elections to which the answer was—

- (a) 41 per cent. would support the present Government.

(b) 44 per cent. selected the Opposition parties.

(c) 15 per cent. were undecided.

There is indicated the political influence of this particular measure. What is the mentality of the bank officers if 40 per cent. would change their minds from one Government to another?

The Hon. E. M. Davies: This is a democracy. They can change their minds if they want to.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The explanation is obvious, and was confirmed by remarks made in regard to other sections of the poll. Because the Labour Party in this State had supported the closing of the banks on Saturday mornings, the bank officers' political thinking was influenced.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Why shouldn't it be?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: What I am trying to say is this: What will be the outcome if the public is going to take one small issue and elect their Government on that. These bank officers should be sensible enough to know that they cannot by one piece of legislation, make up their minds as to the Government's policy on all matters.

The same situation has arisen in other spheres. I have here one example from the Parents and Citizens' Federation, and it has said some pretty nasty things in a way. Portion of an article from "The West Australian Parent and Citizen" reads as follows:—

Federal elections will be held on November 22nd. Well before that date the many candidates for political places will be active in their efforts to solicit your support. See that you quiz them about their views on education, on whether or not they realise the importance of education and the serious handicaps it is facing. Ascertain their intentions in regard to doing something to remedy the present position. Above all let them see that you are determined, come hell or high water, that education must be given national standing and if necessary direct national finance.

Some of them will try to fob you off with soft promises or evasive legalities. Don't be fobbed off—make them enunciate their beliefs and promises in plain language. If we try hard enough we'll make them realise how determined we are that matters shall be set right. And don't think that your efforts will accomplish nothing and that you can leave this matter to more influential people. At election time you are the most influential of people. Use your influence to ensure that education's handicaps are overcome!

It is very disturbing that people in this State should take one little issue out of the whole of the ramifications of a party's policy and believe that the Government is going to rise or fall on it.

Several hon. members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I will ask hon. members to allow the hon. Mr. Logan to continue his speech without interjections.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It conveys to my mind that people without education are going to make this issue their yardstick on which to select a Government.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: It is not a parochial but a national issue.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is parochial, coming from one section of the community; and it is disturbing if people in our midst, who should have a better knowledge and be able to grasp the subject, are going to stick to the one issue.

An hon. member: This subject should be debated at—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not care whether it is debated here or not. It might save this House quite a lot of time if it were debated elsewhere; but I have been told this is the only place it can be debated.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Unfortunately!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think I have said all I want to say on this Bill at the moment; but I stress again that the working conditions of bank officers are particularly good. They themselves admit it. Seventy-nine per cent. want Saturday morning off, and the right to work outside. If they are genuine in their demand for a five-day week, surely they should not ask for the right to obtain employment! They cannot have it both ways.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [11.5]: I support the measure. I am by no means amazed at the hon. Mr. Logan being perturbed at a section of wage and salary earners deciding to support a political party which seeks to improve their working conditions. I am proud to belong to a party which, since it came into existence, has done everything possible to better the lot of the working people, whether they be salaried or wages people. It has always been the policy of the Labour Party and of Labour Governments to endeavour to better the lot of those underprivileged and unfortunate enough to have to chase the clock and work daily for their living.

Should any example be necessary as to what can happen to the underprivileged worker or person, I would refer hon. members to what is called our native race. Had

not organisations of workers got together and put into Parliament people who would attempt to do something for them—and who have succeeded in doing it over the years—many of them would still be in the same condition in which our existing legislation holds many natives today.

I will now return to the Bill, having answered the hon. Mr. Logan's query in that regard. I will not endeavour to chase him on all the subjects which he invented, imagined or twisted around from the words before him, in an endeavour to justify his opposition to an improvement sought for the working class. Over the several years during which this legislation has been before us on behalf of bank employees, I have listened to lots of excuses and reasons from those who oppose the measure. We have heard that if it were agreed to the economy of the country could not stand it, yet the economy of this State has never been better or sounder than it is now. Admittedly the price of wool is not what it used to be, but it would not need to recover very much in order to be still a very good price—and there is no doubt that it will recover to some extent.

Our other main rural products, wheat and meat, have never been in a sounder position than they are now; and I say that the closing of the banks on Saturday morning would have no effect on the economy of the State. To argue that the taking away of 1½ hours of public service by the banks on Saturday morning would have anything to do with the production of the country is, in my opinion, to talk nonsense. The hon. Mr. Logan has in his electorate towns similar to that which, the hon. Mr. Diver says, trade on Saturday morning and Saturday night—

The Hon. L. C. Diver: No.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Or until 9 p.m. on Saturday.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: No.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I know that Dowerin trades until 9 p.m. on Saturdays because I have been there, and that knocks the hon. member's argument over. He says that without banking facilities there can be no business done. Does he mean to say that every person who goes into Dowerin on Saturday arrives there before the banks close and then stays there, spending money, until 9 p.m.? The service given by the bank at Dowerin—if there is one—ends at the same hour as does the service in Perth, yet business thrives there. I slept in Dowerin on the night before I went to Cadoux—or I attempted to sleep there, but because of the crowd in the town that night and my thoughts of the next day I did not get very much sleep. At all events, there was certainly no business lost there because the banks had closed at 11.30 a.m. That did not

affect the business, and I doubt whether half the farmers who came to town got there before the bank closed—

The Hon. L. C. Diver: You would not know.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I said I did not know. But, if they did, why did they stay there till midnight? I do not think there is any substance in the hon. Mr. Diver's objection. There are many towns, villages, or trading centres in his province which have no bank at all—and many in mine, also—but business people in those places survive. When the hon. Mr. MacKinnon all of a sudden gets soft-hearted towards the working people and says they will not be able to see their bank managers, we know that does not hold water.

We have been told, by the Leader of the Opposition here, of the various organisations that have written to his organisation, protesting against the Bill, but we have not heard mention of any workers' organisation protesting against it. I, as a member of a workers' organisation, have not had any verbal or written protest placed before me. The only organisations that protest against the Bill are employer-organisations—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: None of the organisations that you mention has asked for it.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: They support the five-day week and there is no need for them to ask for something which is part of their platform—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But you said they were not opposed to it—

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: What I say now is that we support it. There have been other objections raised to the closing of the banks on Saturday morning. It is said that the measure would do away with services that other States are making available, and that the Commonwealth Bank will make available to migrants here, but this legislation would not curtail those services.

The banks can make them available, and will do so. The hon. member has told us that there will be a service on Sundays. The banks do not open on Sundays now, but it is a service for migrants. Therefore the hon. member's objection in that regard does not hold water.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: But you have to have staff.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes, the staff is provided. After analysing most of the objections—the hon. member in charge of the Bill will probably answer them more effectively than I—I can find no reason at all for the opposition to the measure except that a section of workers might be gaining something that some

hon. members think they should not have. That is the only reason that I can find to justify their opposition to the Bill.

We have heard of the position in most of the other States. This evening I was advised that the Bank Holidays Act had passed all stages in the Upper House in Adelaide today; and the Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide not only supported it and voted for it, but also spoke in favour of it. We have been told by some hon. members that they are amazed that the banks have not taken any action in the matter. Surely this is good solid action which has been taken in the Upper House in Adelaide today! The manager of one of the biggest trading banks in Australia spoke and voted in favour of the closing of banks on Saturdays. I think that is a complete answer to what some hon. members have suggested.

I was interested in the remarks of some hon. members, which remarks we have heard before, that they object to a private member introducing a Bill such as this. They criticise his actions and say that the Government sits by and does nothing, and that the Government should have introduced it. The private member responsible for the Bill has received a lot of criticism, and almost abuse, for attempting to do something for his fellow workers. But he first introduced the Bill into Parliament only a few weeks after he became an hon. member in 1952, when there was a Liberal-Country Party Government in power. Mr. Johnson introduced the Bill on the 11th September, 1952, and the Liberal-Country Party Government defeated it at the second reading stage in the Legislative Assembly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What was the vote on it?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not know, but the debate is reported in Vol. 132 of the Parliamentary Debates, 1952. It is also listed in the Bills introduced but not passed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You will find that the hon. member concerned did not even call for a division. It went out on the voices.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not know what the voting was.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is in that volume.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If we read it we might find some of these political propensities and footballs that we hear such a lot about. There is nothing political about a man who, as a private member, and an ex-bank officer himself, after being elected to Parliament, is prevailed upon by his fellow-workers to introduce a Bill and then, from year to year, keeps on introducing it. It is no different from the farmers prevailing upon their representatives to introduce Bills to amend certain Acts; there is no difference to the

manufacturers, or whoever it is that the Liberal Party represents, prevailing upon members of that party to introduce Bills in their interests.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We represent all sections of the community.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: As a private member, the hon. Mr. Griffith introduced a Bill this session generally to improve the Electoral Act. That is the right of any private member and surely he should not be criticised for doing what is his right! To say that it is a political football is absolutely incorrect.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not object to the hon. member introducing the Bill; but I do not like the politics he tried to use on me.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not like the politics that the hon. member's party uses on me, either; but that is all in the game of politics and, if we are so thin-skinned that we object to that sort of thing, we should not be in politics.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Be careful!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: My party has been branded with communism, and goodness knows what; but we have to take it and prove that we are not communists. That is all in the political game. If the hon. member is objecting to the plain truth we cannot help that. I again support this Bill because I know that if the banks were to close on Saturdays there would not be the inconvenience to industry which has been suggested; and there could not be much inconvenience to the wage-earner—the factory worker—for whom the hon. Mr. MacKinnon pleaded, because he already has facilities, through bank agencies and post offices, and other sources, to use if he so desires. He would not miss out on his banking business any more than he does at Easter-time when the banks close for five days on end, or at Christmas time when they close for four or five days. I think Easter is the longest closing time because the banks shut down on Thursday and reopen on the following Wednesday.

But nobody runs around in despair, or starves, because they have no banking facilities over those days. My impression of banking on Saturday mornings is that the volume of business is so small that it could be well left to the agencies, which are open, anyway. It has been said that if that were done the agencies would be doing the work of the banks. That is not so.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Of course it is.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: They would be getting paid for doing the work; they would be getting commission on the work they did. Apparently the hon. member objects to anybody getting a little bit more.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: What will happen when the agencies close?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: But the agencies do not close.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: But why shouldn't they?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I suppose the same could be said if the surgeries closed. I have been to New Zealand since this legislation was introduced last year, and there they have a five-day week.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: And they are nearly bankrupt.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I could not see anything amiss about the five-day week. I thought things seemed to be a little bit different from what we have here on Saturday mornings, and the cities did not seem to have the same number of people in them, but on inquiry from different people with whom I travelled on buses and trains nobody seemed concerned about the position.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Perhaps they are not concerned about anything.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: They were not concerned about that, anyhow. In that Dominion a National Government—which is the equivalent of the Liberal-Country Party Government—had been in office for five years at this time last year. It had made no effort—and it had no desire to do so—to alter the position.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: And you would desire that Western Australia be placed in the same position.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am sure that the economy of this State would not collapse if banks were closed on a Saturday morning. I am certain that no district would die simply because the banks were closed on Saturday morning. The hon. Mr. Jones raised the argument that if there was some fault in the water supply system, a breakdown gang would immediately be sent out to repair it. Surely, however, he does not imply that if someone is in financial straits a bank officer should be sent out to him to ensure that he is able to get out of his difficulty. There is no comparison whatsoever.

In my opinion, Western Australia would, with this legislation, be just as well off—and certainly no worse off—than South Australia where a Liberal Party Government has agreed to the closing of banks on Saturday mornings.

THE HON. J. J. GARRIGAN (South-East) [11.26]: In support of this Bill, I merely wish to reiterate the words which I expressed last year. Sometimes I think that in this House there is a great deal said which means so little. Tonight I heard a very good speech by the hon. Mr. Diver. He covered most of the points, but I must disagree with him on the views he expressed. Throughout the great South-East Province, which stretches from

the South Australian border in the east to Hines Hill in the west, I represent many farmers and pastoralists.

Recently I have interviewed many of them, and I am of the opinion that they would suffer no disadvantage if the banks were closed on Saturday morning. However, if this Bill were passed it would mean a great deal to those bank officers who have to work on that morning. For the sake of 1½ hours' trading on that day they are prevented from travelling to Esperance or some other holiday resort for the week-end. In Burracoppin and other centres there are no banks whatsoever, but only agencies. However, with the fast transport that we have today people are able to do most of their banking on week days.

For example, at Boulder many of the miners receive their wages at 3.30 p.m. and they are able to do their banking up till 5 p.m. They suffer no inconvenience whatsoever. Therefore, I cannot see any reason why the bank officers should not be granted a five-day week. They have performed excellent service to the community over the years and, in my opinion, they are entitled to this privilege. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [11.29]: I have listened to a great deal of debate this evening, but as yet I have not heard anything that would lead me to change my mind.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Nor have we.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I do not wish to hear the interjection by the hon. member, although it is possible that it may be of advantage. I have my opinion, just as the hon. member has his, and I repeat that I have heard nothing tonight that would cause me to change it. The arguments that have been put forward in opposition to the Bill are the same as those that have been heard right through the years whenever some move has been made to introduce a reform for the benefit of those people who barter their labour in return for their living needs.

I would remind hon. members that the same argument was advanced when the move was made to close shops on Saturday night. It was said then that business and commerce would go on the rocks and that people would be unable to do their shopping. However, when shops were closed on Saturday night, it was found that people had no difficulty in doing their shopping during the week. Similar arguments were advanced against the closing of the offices of municipalities and road boards on Saturday morning. Against this move it was said that the local authorities would not be able to collect their rates. However, it has been found that they still collect their rates from the rate-payers during the week.

Comments have also been made about how the financial position of the country would be changed, but I am at a loss to understand that. We have heard tonight that South Australia has already put a Bill through Parliament to close the banks on Saturday morning and I suppose the authorities in South Australia are just as well versed in the banking needs of any State as some of the people who have raised objections to this measure in the House this evening. Also, when I visited Tasmania I could not see that the closing of banks on Saturday morning had had any detrimental effect on the economy of the State. It has certainly had no adverse effect on the economy of New Zealand, and I am sure that the passing of this Bill will not adversely affect the economy of Western Australia.

The hon. Mr. Logan said tonight that some bank officers had made the statement—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: In their own bank.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I am not concerned where they made it or whether they made it. It has nothing to do with anybody else what a person does with his week-ends.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It has a lot to do with the rest of the community when the bank officers are asking for this privilege.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: We have already been told that the banks are open for only 90 minutes on Saturday mornings. I am sure that that is not sufficient time for all the people to conduct their banking on that morning. A great deal of the business conducted by the banks is for those people who are seeking loans or overdrafts and they would not be doing that business with the bank on Saturday morning. In any event, the people who are seeking this reform have stated that if the Bill is passed they will consider the question of arranging for the banks to be open for a longer period on Fridays. They have expressed the opinion that if they are granted a five-day week they would have no objection to working for an hour or 1½ hours extra on Friday if such a move will prove to be of benefit to the people.

We have heard a great deal of talk in the past that, if people do not come to the city to do their shopping, business would deteriorate. However, a great many of the people do not shop in the city now; they buy most of their needs in the suburbs. This is emphasised by the fact that many large emporiums have established branches in the suburbs, because they have found that people will not travel to the city when they are able to do their shopping in their own suburb.

A number of the large emporiums have realised this fact and they have established themselves in the suburbs. All this

talk about people finding it necessary to do their banking on Saturday morning carries no weight with me at all, because I know very well that any banking I have to do can easily be done by myself, or my wife, on any day of the week. The truth is that hon. members opposite are opposed to this measure, and they feel that any old stick is good enough with which to beat the dog. That is their attitude. I support the measure.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

THE HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [11.36]: During the past few years I have usually taken the lead in this debate in opposition to this measure, but on this occasion I come in as a sort of tailpiece. That, however, does not affect the views I have held throughout; views which I still hold. Like other hon. members I have received a sheaf of communications from various officers of banks in the country accompanied, in some instances, by forms signed by those who are not bank officers. There is no objection to that.

In the early part of the year, and prior to my re-election, I received a letter from the Secretary of the Bank Officials' Association asking me in most forthright terms my attitude on this question. I was too busy to reply to this letter. It was not due to any discourtesy on my part—for I have no wish to be discourteous—it was due to the fact that I was more than busy at the time. In any case, I think the bank officers knew my attitude, because I personally discussed the matter with them prior to the election, and they were aware that I had no reason to change my views.

In that letter I was told I would forfeit the support of the bank officers in my electorate if I did not advise them of a change of mind in regard to my previous attitude. When the letters to which I have referred started coming in, I took two batches of them arriving from the only two centres in my electorate where there was an adverse majority against me. I thought it would be a good idea to check the signatures to see if the people concerned were on the rolls; because some bank officers could quite easily qualify to be placed on the Legislative Council rolls; others, of course, would not be old enough—they would be juniors.

When I checked the list to see if these people were on the rolls, unfortunately I could not decipher the signatures, and accordingly it was impossible for me to conduct the check I had intended. I appreciate that this question can be a matter of great concern to some of the officers in the bank, particularly the younger folk who see young fellows in occupations alongside theirs having the advantage of free Saturday mornings, and naturally feeling under some sense of grievance, because

they themselves do not enjoy the same amenity. I appreciate that point of view. But, as I said last year, I do not think this is the place where such a question should be decided.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: No, it is not.

The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: If it is to be brought here, then I think it should be sponsored by the Government, as a Government measure. It should not be the subject of a private member's Bill.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: What difference does that make?

The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I have no objection to a private member introducing a Bill, but when a measure is obviously one of great public interest, and when it can have serious repercussions on the economy of the State, then I think it is the responsibility of the Government to definitely align itself with the Bill and put it through as something for which the Government holds itself responsible. That was the universal practice when I first entered this Chamber. In those days a private member might introduce a Bill, but if the Government considered it to be of value, it would place the Bill at the bottom of the notice paper and introduce its own measure, sometimes improving or at least adding to the private member's Bill. The measure would then be brought forward in the usual way and generally it would be carried.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Would you support the measure if it were brought down by the Government?

The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I do not think that is the same as the Government accepting responsibility for it, because if it did the Government would then, in the eyes of the people, bring the matter forward as one of Government policy and identify itself with that declaration of policy, whether it succeeds or not.

I have said on previous occasions that I thought a matter like this should be approached on an Australia-wide basis. As far as I can see there is no indication that that has been done. I know that a question was asked of the Premier in another place as to whether he would bring this matter before a Premiers' conference. He replied that he thought it could be done by means of this Bill. I do not agree with that view. What surprises me, however, is the negative attitude—if I may put it that way—on the part of the controllers of the banks. It has been suggested that unless legislation is passed, the banks must be open on Saturday mornings. I feel, without legislation being passed, a skeleton staff could be provided to give the necessary service to the public on Saturday morning. That could be done under a system of rostering.

I have been told it would be difficult, but I well remember my early days working in the mines, where we worked for 24 hours a day on continuous process plants which had to carry on for seven days a week. A law was introduced that we should not work more than 13 consecutive days; that we must have one day off in a fortnight. Although the mine owners demurred, they found ways and means of meeting the requirements of the law by employing extra staff as relief hands to supply the service during the period when the regular men were compelled to take time off. I see no reason why that cannot be done by an amicable arrangement between the employees and the employers; I see no reason why the service cannot still be maintained for the public.

After all, any service one enters contains its own particular occupational hazards. If, for instance, one is a restaurant proprietor, one must work around the calendar to provide a service while other people are enjoying themselves. If one is an entertainer, then the hours one works are, of necessity, those during which one's customers are free from work. Such hours of service are common to purveyors of perishables and commodities of a similar nature. They have to work around the clock when other people may be on holidays or enjoying time off. This happens to be the hazard of their particular occupation.

In any case I come back to the point that if there was a concerted effort made by the employers and employees, I am quite sure that service on Saturday mornings could be rendered and that public convenience could be met to the satisfaction of the vast majority of the employees, who could be free on Saturday morning.

I was on holiday in Tasmania some time ago. I was warned not to leave my shopping until Saturday because I would find the town dead and I would not be able to buy petrol and the other things I needed. I was told the banks were closed on Saturdays and the other businesses followed suit. I was told that the girls employed in one factory took Friday afternoon off in order to do their shopping and get their hair dressed, because they could not do that on Saturdays.

In the days when shirt-sleeve workers worked on Saturdays, they approached the Arbitration Court to ask for their 48 hours to be worked in five days, on the score that they required Saturday morning off—during which time the white-collar workers were employed—to do banking and shopping. If banking services were to be curtailed on Saturdays, very probably shops and other types of services would also be suspended. Then we would have the same position as is found in Tasmania where everything closes on Saturdays and Sundays. I do not wish to prolong my speech, I think I have said enough to indicate that I cannot support the Bill.

THE HON. G. E. JEFFERY (Surburban—in reply) [11.48]: Much has been said in this debate relating to the five-day week for bank officers, and much of it was irrelevant. At the commencement of the debate the hon. Mr. Diver spoke; I have never heard him in worse form. I have heard of the expression "Dragging a dead horse up Greenmount," but I have not known what it meant until I heard him speaking tonight. He said he was concerned that bank officers, with their great intelligence, should ask for a five-day week. The only thing that amazes me is that bank officers did not apply for a five day week years ago.

This is the third occasion on which I have been privileged to put up a case for the bank officers. Many hon. members went to great lengths when they spoke about politics being brought into this debate. I challenge any hon. member to say that on the three occasions I introduced the Bill I have played politics. On each occasion I told the true and full story as well as I could.

The hon. Mr. Diver went to great pains to mention the position in Queensland. He said that in introducing this Bill I mentioned a great deal about the correspondence between the secretary of the Queensland Bank Officers' Association and the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Nicklin. I did so. If hon. members would read my speech, or were present in the Chamber when I made it, they would remember that I said early this month, the Minister for Labour and Industry in Queensland, had requested the Industrial Court to examine and to advise on not only the question of the abolition of Saturday bank trading, but also the merits and demerits of general trading on Saturdays, and the substitution therefor of late banking and shopping on Friday evenings.

In all fairness, I did read the correspondence which passed between the then Leader of the Opposition, and now the Premier of Queensland, and the Bank Officers' Association in that State. In fairness I showed that the then Leader of the Opposition was keeping faith with the promise he made in the correspondence, of which I have the photostats, to the bank officers in Queensland. He was asking the Industrial Court of that State to investigate the position. Any political gain I might have made is beside the point. I told the true and full story.

Reference was also made during the debate to the position in New South Wales and Victoria. I said in the first place that this was not a political football and there was not great glory to be gained. In introducing this measure I thought that bank officers should enjoy the privilege of a five-day working week, which I myself enjoyed when I was working in

industry. The five-day week was the greatest boon to industry. The difference between 1½ days and two days away from the job is much greater than the actual hours involved.

Much play was also made of the banking service available to the public on Saturday mornings between 10 and 11.30 a.m., a period of 90 minutes. Much has been said by speakers in support of the measure that shops remain open much longer than those hours, both in the suburbs and in the city. Most of the shopkeepers would carry reasonably large sums of money long after the banks were closed. They have various methods of protecting the money such as safes, armoured escorts, and other methods. There is no need to worry on that score.

One other fact mentioned by the hon. Mr. Diver and other speakers was that the Associated Banks have not come out into the open in respect of this matter. I know it must have been a great disappointment to those opposing this measure that those banks did not come out into the open. In South Australia and Queensland the banks are strictly neutral. It was said that I derived my information in regard to this State from a newspaper headline. I am at a disadvantage because the rules of debate preclude me from reading the Press cutting. Hon. members will agree with me that the headline was, "Banks no view on five-day plan" as stated by the hon. Mr. Griffith. The next five or six lines of the article give the list of the attitude of the banks. It is stated that representatives of the Associated Banks in Western Australia declined to give the official attitude of the banks at a meeting of the employees in this State last Monday.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That was not all of it.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I am referring to five lines. I leave the rest to the imagination of hon. members. It stated that representatives of the Associated Banks in this State declined to give the banks' attitude to Saturday morning closing at a conference with employer interests. I am prepared to read the rest, because I have mentioned the attitude of Sir Thomas Playford. I agree with his attitude when he said that the person who was suffering a hardship on Saturday morning was the one with a savings bank account, not the one with a cheque account. He said at the time that he was prepared to insert an amendment in the Bill before the House, if the bank officers were prepared to accept it, to the effect that the banks were to work a five-day week.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That has nothing to do with the cutting.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: When introducing the Bill, I said the position in South Australia was very similar to that

applying in this State. I agreed with the Premier of South Australia when he said that by opening the banks until 5 p.m. on Fridays, which meant two hours more trading, the public would have equal opportunity to do their banking. I agreed with him then and I still do.

I realise that some people consider him to be an astute gentleman, but I have every confidence in him. When I read his announcement from the South Australian Hansard I also read out the interjection by an hon. member, Mr. Jennings, who said, "Yes, and have it knocked out up top." I said that some members of the Legislative Assembly in that State were suspicious of their members in the Legislative Council; the same as some Legislative Assembly members in this State are suspicious of us. Sir Thomas Playford said he would not do that, and would support the measure. He has done that because I have received the following telegram from Adelaide which reads—

Holidays Act Bill passed all readings Upper House. Significant Rymill Chairman Bank of Adelaide spoke and voted in favour.

There is one employer who has supported the bank officers. Everyone knows and believes this. When introducing the measure, I read four opinions which showed that this matter could only be dealt with and decided by Parliament because of the Bills of Exchange Act, which make every bank remain open on Saturday morning for meeting the payment of bills. But I have said on previous occasions and say now that it is most unfortunate for bank officers to be working under conditions in 1956 which are governed by legislation that became law in the first instance in 1884. I said when I introduced this Bill, and say it again this evening, that the position of the banks is such that they can close on Saturday morning without any great discomfort to the public of this State. I say that the Associated Banks by their silence gave assent to their staff to obtain a five-day week. I have said it before and I say it again.

This measure was before another place a long while before it came here and the only people to oppose it were the Employers' Federation, the Retail Traders' Association, the Chamber of Manufacturers and people of that nature. I cannot recall one letter in the Press from any individual who would be upset by the closure of banks on a Saturday morning.

The true reason behind the attitude of the Employers' Federation is that if the banks operated on a five day week, the retail trade would demand it. I told this House when I introduced the measure that if the Arbitration Court decided that the workers in the retail trade were entitled to a five day week, nothing should prevent their getting it, even if the banks remained open on Saturday morning.

Much has been said about the stereotyped letters which were sent to hon. members. Some hon. members expressed concern that in one instance a letter was signed by a car salesman and in another by a waterside worker. That is one of the freedoms of democracy. I do not think there is anything wrong in that, because the wording of the letter did not say that they were bank officers; and no doubt if my son worked in a bank and I was a waterside worker, a car salesman or an insurance executive I would be behind him in his efforts to obtain a five day working week. I can see nothing wrong with that. I prefer people to write giving a name and address, even if they are stereotyped letters. Admittedly, I could not read all the signatures, but I could read the addresses. I prefer that approach to an anonymous letter. In a democracy we must expect that sort of thing.

In Tasmania the banks are closed on Saturday morning, not only in Hobart, but throughout the State. Much has been said about the introduction of this measure by a private member. Hon. members cannot have it both ways. The hon. Mr. Simpson said, "if the Government had introduced it" but he did not say that in such an event he would support it. When questioned by way of interjection, he did not answer. Therefore, I assume that no matter who introduced the Bill, he would oppose it. If hon. members do not want it on a political basis surely it is better to come from a private member. That is my opinion.

When I introduced the measure I informed the House of the amendments inserted in the South Australian legislation by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and said that they were acceptable in this State. I said that they would not automatically give bank officers a five day week. I will read the provisions again so that hon. members will recall what Sir Thomas Playford's amendments mean. The South Australian Act will do exactly the same as the measure which is before this Chamber, but his three provisions are a safeguard. They are as follows:—

- (1) This Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by the Governor by proclamation.
- (2) A proclamation bringing this Act into operation shall not be made until the Governor is satisfied that arrangements which will operate generally throughout the State have been made and will be carried out for keeping trading banks open until 5 o'clock p.m. on every Friday which is not a bank holiday.
- (3) If, after this Act has been brought into operation, arrangements as mentioned in subsection (2) of this section cease to operate the

Governor may, by a proclamation, declare that the principal Act shall thereafter have effect as if this Act had not been passed.

I think that is perfectly clear. The Premier of South Australia inserted those amendments, and the passage of the measure will allow bank officers to negotiate with their employers to agree to work until 5 p.m. on Friday afternoon, and the Bill will become law. On a future occasion if one or other of the parties withdrew from the agreement, the measure would be null and void. When introducing the measure I suggested this would be a good feature here.

Some mention was made of the Chase-Manhattan Bank in America and the numerous complaints it had. I will correct that and read the exact words which I read previously—

There were minor complaints but none in sufficient volume to warrant reversing our decision.

I suggested on that occasion that banks, like retail concerns, are sensitive to customer reaction in all their business dealings; and I do not think there is any need for further comment.

The hon. Mr. Murray was resentful because of the letters he had received. He said they were the "thin end of the wedge." He mentioned the timber industry, but I do not think the closing of banks has any bearing on that industry. Bank officers could easily have a five-day week just the same as the building tradesmen obtained it 10 or 11 years ago. In the 1920's bank officers worked 84 hours per fortnight and in 1947 they, along with other workers were given a 40-hour week. That clears up that point. The hon. Mr. Murray was talking about the export of timber, but what that has to do with a five-day banking week I do not know. The price and difficulties of markets in the Eastern States and the closure of banks in the South-West are not related.

The hon. Mr. Griffith said he reserved the right to change his mind. I am not actually quoting him, but he said there is a tendency to extend hours. The service provided by the Commonwealth Bank on Saturday afternoons is not of a monetary nature; it is an advisory service where people can state their problems. There is nothing done in the line of banking as we know it.

Other speakers said that perhaps some form of a roster system could operate. I am not a banker, but the Associated Banks and others have said that it is not possible to work a bank with a piecemeal staff.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Some banks do.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I do not know where.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They do in New South Wales.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I understand that they cannot give a full banking service without a full staff. I prefaced my remarks by saying that I was not a banker. The hon. Mr. MacKinnon's remarks can be summed up by saying that he forgot the proposed amendment when he talked about the potato digger and other individuals who would want to go to the bank on Saturday to obtain a supply of cash. I suggest that the amendment to open the banks on Friday night would meet the situation. Banks are closed during the Easter period for five days, and they are also closed at Christmas, but there is no diminution of trade. As well as the big stores in the city and the suburban stores, everyone seems to get along all right. The proof is that industry and business can set their sales in such a way that the closure of the banks over a period of five consecutive days does not affect their trade.

The hon. Dr. Hislop, who opposed this measure is consistent in his viewpoint, and has been on every occasion on which he has spoken. Although he is diametrically opposed to the measure, I pay him the compliment that he is consistent in his attitude. The hon. Mr. Logan covered a lot of ground and fittted from tree to tree. He quoted from "The Westralian Banker" of December, 1957, and so that hon. members will get the full story. I will read the four lines which he omitted. On page 5, it states—

Do you think the banks should prohibit officers undertaking paid outside employment in their own time?

79 per cent. said No.

21 per cent said Yes.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I read that.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I know. I am going to carry on and quote the four lines that the hon. member did not read—

In 1949, the percentages were 75 and 25.

There were a number of comments made by those answering "No," which ran on these lines—

If we do our work properly, surely our own time is ours to do as we like.

The four lines I am concerned about are—

Apparently many members were not aware that the banks' service agreements all place a bar on outside paid employment.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I read that.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I think that applies to a lot of places. Civil servants are not allowed to work in other places, and it is the duty of the master to attend to that. In many cases he does—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I read that part, too.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: You may have. But you read it so quickly, I could not keep up with you. I am trying to say that the relationship between the master and servant is very well governed, and the masters have a habit of catching up with those individuals whose efficiency suffers as the result of outside activities. A five-day week is operating in Tasmania, and despite what has been said here, that State is equally as prosperous as ours. A five-day week has not made any difference.

The hon. Mr. Logan also made comment on "direct" contribution to productivity of the State. I suggest that that is only a play on words. Banks do not make a direct contribution to the productivity of the State.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Of course they do!

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: They do not. As I said, it was merely a play on words. I feel I have covered most of the essential points in the debate. The tragedy of this measure is that hon. members have allowed party politics to creep in; and I said in the first place, I did not want it to become a matter of that sort. If hon. members will recall, I made mention that a Labour Government in N.S.W. and a Liberal Government in Victoria have not granted banks a five-day week. A Labour Government in Tasmania and a Liberal Government in South Australia have done so. Therefore there is not much advantage, politically, to be gained in this regard. I went to great pains to avoid party politics when introducing the measure.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Nobody has accused you of doing so.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: Bank officers have been very loyal to their employers. I do not know of any bank strike or anything of that sort, and I think the employers are appreciative of it. The tragedy is that the bank officers' hours are being governed by the Bills of Sale Act which stipulates that banks must be open six days a week.

I think everyone has made a contribution to this debate, and, in conclusion, I would state that I have always been, and always will be of the opinion that bank officers are entitled to a five-day week, and whatever the outcome of this Bill may be, I am sure that eventually a five-day week

will be instituted because it will not make any difference to the prosperity of the State.

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

Ayes—12

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. G. E. Jeffery
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery

(Teller.)

Noes—14

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott

(Teller.)

Majority against—2.

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT.

Amendment of Barristers' Board Rule 30.

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting concurrence in the following resolution:—

That new Rule 30 of the Barristers' Board, made under the Legal Practitioners Act, 1893-1950, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 28th May, 1954, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 22nd June, 1954, be amended as follows:—

Add to paragraph (i) the passage—

provided however, that an articulated clerk whose principal does not practice within fifty miles of the General Post Office of Perth shall not be required to attend any lectures.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [12.14]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. today.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Thursday).