

Mr. O'CONNOR: He is a member of Parliament and he has the endorsement of the A.L.P. He is a member of this House from which he obtains his salary, and therefore he has a pecuniary interest.

Also, as a member of the Executive of the A.L.P. he is one of the decision makers in connection with the proposed building, the profits from which could go to support him in any future campaign, and no doubt that will be the case.

Therefore, I believe he has a pecuniary interest and I believe he should be ineligible to vote.

Mr. DAVIES: I feel I should say I have been misrepresented. It is required by the Australian Labor Party that every member pay his own expenses, and I do that at every election.

Mr. Hutchinson: All of your paper expenses?

The **SPEAKER:** Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: This argument is so puerile that one should not waste any time dealing with it.

The **SPEAKER:** Order! I have not yet given my decision on the point of order raised.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am sorry because I wished to comment.

Speaker's Ruling

The **SPEAKER:** Before taking into consideration Standing Order 195 we must refer to the definition contained in Standing Order 2, which is as follows:—

"Pecuniary Interest" means an immediate direct personal pecuniary interest and does not include such an interest which is general.

I would point out to the member for Mt. Lawley, and to members generally, that if the Minister for Health is to be challenged on this particular Standing Order then the member for Avon should have been challenged several times in this House with respect to motions under the Bulk Handling Act, because he is the Chairman of Directors of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.

Mr. May: We would not do that.

The **SPEAKER:** I feel there is no point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. GAYFER: On a point of order am I to understand I am being challenged by the Speaker.

Several Government members: No.

Mr. GAYFER: I do not know why I have invoked this from you, Mr. Speaker, when this matter was cleared up in this House some five years ago.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Perhaps the member for Avon had better ask the member for Mt. Lawley.

The **SPEAKER:** I ruled on this occasion there is no point of order under Standing Orders. In reply to the member for Avon I simply pointed out that if this point of order was upheld then he, in the past, would have been out of order in voting. I do not say that he is out of order now. I said he was in order, and his case is a precedent in that respect.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS SYMBOL BILL

Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it did not insist on its amendments to which the Assembly had disagreed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier)
[1.25 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2.15 p.m. today (Thursday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 1.26 a.m. (Thursday)

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 14th September, 1972

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Police) [2.38 p.m.]: I seek leave of the House to postpone the consideration of questions until a later stage of the sitting.

The **PRESIDENT:** Leave granted.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Police) [2.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

My colleague, the Chief Secretary, during debate on the second reading of the Greyhound Racing Control Bill, gave an undertaking that the necessary complementary legislation to provide betting facilities would be introduced.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the handling of greyhound racing investments by the Totalisator Agency

Board, and as such, members will appreciate that it is complementary to the Greyhound Racing Control Bill, which is also before the House for consideration.

Bookmakers will not be permitted to operate at greyhound racing meetings.

Two other complementary Acts, the Totalisator Duty Act, 1905-70, and the Totalisator Regulation Act, 1911, will also need amendment and these will be introduced by the Treasurer in another place as the Bill to amend the Totalisator Duty Act imposes taxation.

This Bill will provide for greyhound racing interests in a manner similar to that already provided for racing and trotting interests. However, it is not intended that greyhound racing interests should be represented on the Totalisator Agency Board.

Under section 26 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act an amount equal to 1.25 per cent. on turnover is set aside for capital purposes. It is not proposed to change this allocation; consequently the percentage will be applied to the total turnover from all sources.

The board receives an amount equal to 1½ per cent. on the gross takings of the on-course totalisators. This amount forms part of the distribution to the club and the association. It is proposed that the greyhound racing control board benefit in a similar fashion by receiving an amount equal to 1½ per cent. of the gross takings of the on-course totalisators operating on greyhound races.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would like the two tax Bills before us before we debate this Bill. Would that be all right? In other words, I would like the three Bills together.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I have no objection whatever if the House feels that is desirable. It is fitting that members should know what is proposed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will ask for an ordinary adjournment and perhaps you could arrange with the Leader of the House to keep this item down on the notice paper.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Yes. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th September.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [2.43 p.m.]: It comes as no surprise to me that we have been presented with a Bill on this subject, but what does surprise me is the form in which

the measure has been presented. I say this because members will recall that about this time last year we were presented with a Bill on the same subject. This House took certain action in regard to its passage through the Chamber. Bearing that in mind, the surprising fact is that the Bill before us now is in exactly the same form as the Bill introduced last year. Indeed, the Minister's second reading speech is identical, practically word for word, with the speech with which he introduced the Bill on Tuesday, the 14th September, 1971, which is exactly 12 months ago today.

The Bill on that occasion was discussed at great length and decisions were made in regard to it. Then, of course, as is the case with all Bills introduced in this House, it was presented to another place which, for some reason unknown to members of this Chamber—certainly unknown to Opposition members—did not deal with it. Now we are presented with an identical Bill and with an introductory speech which is virtually identical with the introductory speech made on the previous occasion.

Members of this House could quite justifiably ask: If our opinions have not changed, will this Bill, after its passage through this House, receive the same fate received by the Bill introduced last year?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Without any explanation for its fate last year.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Yes. Members justifiably could ask this question because we do not deal with Bills without putting a great deal of time and effort into research and preparation. We debated the subject at length in 1971 only to find that, without any explanation whatever, the Bill was discharged from the notice paper in another place.

It is for this reason I find it somewhat surprising that the Bill has been presented in this form.

I am disturbed about several aspects covered by the Bill. Earlier this session I asked the Chief Secretary a question the answer to which, I believe, was unsatisfactory. I begin to wonder what the Ministers have in mind when they are presented with questions which members propose to ask in this House; because it is becoming blatantly apparent to me that the Ministers consider such questions as of no consequence; they seem to think they can deal with them as they think fit, having no regard whatever for the information members might be seeking. This has been proved time and time again, particularly during this session. On this occasion I asked the Chief Secretary a question which, as far as I can see, was simple and straightforward, and he gave me an answer which—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The Minister cannot be responsible for any fault in your perception.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That was a startling contribution by the honourable member. I will completely ignore such unwarranted and rude interjections—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Unruly.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —and proceed to inform members of my views on the Bill before the House.

I come back to the point I was making; which is, that the question I asked was simple and straightforward, seeking information in regard to a certain state of affairs which existed at that time. I received what I believe was an unsatisfactory answer. Indeed, the Chief Secretary did not answer the question at all. For the purpose of the record I will read the question which is as follows:—

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the statements attributed to the Minister for Mines and to the Chief Secretary in an article commenting upon police action in closing down bingo games which appeared on pages 1 and 9 of the South Suburban supplement of *The West Australian* on Wednesday, the 5th July, 1972?

That was the first part of the question. What I wanted to know was whether the Minister was aware of the statements that were attributed to the Minister for Mines and to himself in regard to police action in closing down bingo; and his answer was—

- (1) I did not comment on the police action as suggested by the Honourable Member.

I did not suggest this at all. I did not ask him anything except whether he was aware of the article which attributed these statements to him. Therefore I fail to understand how he arrived at that answer. The second part of the question was—

- (2) If so—

In other words, if he was aware of it—

—does he agree that the contents of the newspaper item are factual?

He replied—

- (2) Answered by (1).

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would the answer be that he was reading out somebody else's views on the matter?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This could well be so.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: The interjections are wasted on me unless members talk a little louder.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Read it in *Hansard*.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The third part of my question read—

- (3) If the reply to (2) is "No" what action is contemplated to rectify the situation for the benefit of the public?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not think the Minister can hear you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He obviously did not hear me when I asked the question originally.

The Hon. J. Dolan: The Minister can read.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This is all the more reason for my being amazed; as the Minister for Police has said, the question was presented to the Chief Secretary in writing. Therefore, his affliction of bad hearing could have had nothing to do with the unsatisfactory answer I received.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He could have bad glasses.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: To carry the situation a little further, two days later I asked—

With reference to the inadequate reply to my question on Tuesday, the 1st August, 1972, relating to the closing down of bingo games by police action, will he further investigate the two newspaper articles and reply to the specific items to which I referred in my previous question?

Mr. President, I am sure you will recall quite clearly that the answer I received was simply—

The question was answered adequately.

I was the person asking the question and I believe I ought to be the person to judge whether or not it was answered adequately. I had already indicated verbally and in writing to the Minister that the question was not answered satisfactorily, but he simply contented himself by saying that it had been. In these circumstances I think members are justified in being concerned over the way in which their questions are being answered.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You have to ask the question properly in the first place.

The Hon. F. R. White: Read the question again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am being interjected upon!

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Which is most unruly!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This hurts me deeply and is obviously designed to detract from my contribution to the debate. However, my time is unlimited and the interjections certainly will not deter me from completing the remarks I wish to make this afternoon.

I have already read out the questions and if the honourable member who interjected is unable to comprehend them, I am sure all other members will agree that he is alone in this. I am sure this affliction would not extend to yourself, Mr. President, and I know that you would well and truly understand the questions which I have read out.

However, be that as it may, I would like to refer to a newspaper article which, in fact, gave rise to the questions I asked. For the benefit of the House and with your indulgence, Mr. President, I would like to read out the article.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am sorry but the honourable member has asked me to grant indulgence for something which contravenes Standing Order 81. I cannot allow it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am sorry, Mr. President. Actually I had not got round to stating the subject matter for which I had asked indulgence.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Extra-sensory perception!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If the particular thought I had in my mind contravened Standing Order 81, I apologise; but I do not believe it did. However, had I felt I was doing this I would have refrained from pursuing the matter.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Say that again.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I will recommend the honourable member for a Logie award.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr. President, you will recall a similar Bill was introduced into this House during the last session of Parliament. In consequence of the ultimate fate of that measure, an item appeared in the newspaper. It referred specifically to the Bill which we discussed in the last session of Parliament. I would like merely to read to members what the newspaper article said about the measure which was introduced at that time. Amongst other things, the article states—

Last year the Legislative Council passed gaming amendments to allow bingo to be conducted by charitable and religious organisations.

But it deleted the clause which would have allowed bingo by non-profit bodies authorised by the Charities Commission. This deletion barred kindergarten committees, parents and citizens' associations and social clubs from benefiting.

Because this Council amendment was unacceptable, the Government did not proceed with the Bill in the Legislative Assembly.

The same article refers to comments made by Mr. Lee which are as follows:—

"All were organisations conducting it for worthy causes but once you condone law-breaking, for whatever cause, it leads to some strange rebounds on the community," he said.

The organisations which have lost their bingo revenue place their hopes in what Mr. Stubbs said in Parliament.

He said the Government was re-examining the bingo legislation because of many requests from community bodies for legalisation.

That was the reference in the questions I asked the Chief Secretary. I asked whether he had seen this article and whether the comments were correct as far as he was concerned. I refer to page 9 of the same paper. In my question I mentioned that certain comments had been attributed to his colleague, the Minister for Mines, in the person of Mr. May. The article states on page 9—

Bingo could become legal within the next three months, according to the Minister for Mines and Electricity, Mr. D. May (Lab., Clontarf).

He said Cabinet had asked the Chief Secretary, Mr. Stubbs, to re-submit the amendments which had been rejected in the Legislative Council last year.

The proposed legislation would come before Parliament in the August session, and its passing would depend on a change of heart by Opposition members.

Mr. May said the move to re-submit the bingo proposals had come after strong representations by kindergarten and school organisations which had their principal revenue source cut off when the police closed the bingo games.

The part about which I am concerned, which misled the public, and which is absolutely incorrect, is that Mr. May said the proposed legislation would be before the Parliament in the August session and its passing would depend upon a change of heart on the part of Opposition members.

We must bear in mind that the previous part of the article had said that this Bill, as it had passed through the Legislative Council, had created a situation which prevented the Kindergarten Association, the parents and citizens' associations, and other welfare organisations from playing bingo. That was not the situation at all.

I wanted to know from the Minister whether or not he had read the article and the matters attributed to him and Mr. May and whether, for the benefit of the members of this House, he could give us an answer as to what the position really

was. I asked him this because we were not in a position to ask the question of Mr. May as he is not in this Chamber.

I used every avenue open to me and asked the Minister to obtain the necessary information. The Minister refused point blank to do so, and suggested that his answer was completely satisfactory.

The information printed in this newspaper was absolutely incorrect; it gave a completely distorted and untrue explanation of the position. I was so concerned about the matter that I rang the reporter under whose name the article had appeared.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Who was it written by?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Since the Minister asks me I will tell him. The reporter was Ted Williams. After speaking to this gentleman it became blatantly obvious to me that he had no knowledge of what had occurred in Parliament; he had written the story after looking at extracts made by other reporters or by those who had apparently listened to the debate at the time.

He said it was as a result of reading through these extracts that he had come to the conclusion he did. I said it was quite wrong, and I went to great lengths to explain why it was wrong and the manner in which it was wrong. He did not appear to be very interested in the fact that it was wrong.

I then said to the reporter in question, "In all honesty you should endeavour to print a story that will tell the people the correct situation; that in fact the amendments made by the Legislative Council at that time had done nothing more nor less than take the precaution to ensure that the game of bingo would not be played on licensed premises."

We certainly took no action that would have prevented the game of bingo being played by parents and citizens' associations, by Kindergarten Associations, by Boy Scout Associations, or by any of the hundred-and-one other associations which come within the classification of charitable organisations in the eyes of the Lotteries Commission. Yet we find the newspaper decided there was no point in doing anything about it.

To give the Minister an opportunity to say that the statements were incorrect, or that he had been incorrectly reported, or that Mr. May had been incorrectly reported, I asked him a question to which I expected the reply "Yes, we were incorrectly reported and we have taken certain action to rectify the position".

In the absence, however, of a satisfactory reply to any of my questions I can only come to the conclusion that the statements are correct and that Mr. May did inform

the newspaper that, to permit bingo to be played by the parents and citizens' associations, and other similar associations, a change of heart would be necessary on the part of the members of the Opposition in the Legislative Council.

I take strong exception to that, because it is a complete misrepresentation of the situation that existed; it was clearly designed to mislead the people who were being prevented from playing bingo because of action taken by the Police Department. I have nothing to say about the police preventing people playing this game under the present law, because it is against the law to do so and the police would be only doing their duty; but I do take strong exception, however, to the implication that the action we took on that occasion would still make it illegal for the people concerned to play bingo.

To make it perfectly clear that what we did on that occasion would not have resulted in what the newspaper article suggested it would, I intend to direct the attention of the House to certain other aspects.

Before I proceed along that line, however, members will no doubt recall that the Leader of the House, as a result of the amendments he moved on that occasion, received from the Chief Secretary an unequivocal acceptance of the amendments as presented by him.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You mean the Leader of the Opposition, not the Leader of the House.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Yes, the Leader of the Opposition presented the amendments which were accepted at the time without argument on the part of the Chief Secretary; and when the vote was taken it was the unanimous decision of this House that the amendments framed and put forward by the Opposition be accepted and included in the Bill.

So, in the first instance at least, we have agreement from every member of this House that the purpose of the amendments certainly did not extend to excluding organisations such as the P. & C. Associations the Kindergarten Association, and other social welfare associations from playing this game. That was certainly the first step towards our agreeing that the action we took at the time did not—as the newspaper item and Mr. May suggested it did—prevent the people concerned from playing bingo.

I would ask members to cast their minds back to 1962 when the Liberal Government of the day made certain amendments to the Lotteries (Control) Act. The amendments were made by the Liberal Party to ensure that these types of organisations would qualify under section 18 of the Act and thus be able to participate in the various forms of lotteries, etc., that were in vogue at the time.

So here we have a situation where members of the Liberal Party—the party to which we belonged in 1962—introduced a Bill to ensure that every opportunity would be afforded these organisations to enable them to participate, at that particular time, in activities which came within the control of the Lotteries Commission.

If the House wishes me to do so I can read numerous extracts from the *Hansards* of the day to indicate that in fact this was the position at the time. I do not propose to follow this course, however, because I am sure members will take my word for it, and many of them, no doubt, will personally be able to recall the situation which existed at the time. These facts are, however, recorded in *Hansard* of 1962 and they indicate the purpose for which the amendments were made and they clearly show that it was the desire of the Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government to permit these charitable organisations to participate in the particular lotteries, and what-have-you, that were conducted in 1962.

The Hon. R. Thompson: There was no reference to bingo, of course.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No; certainly no amendment was put forward by the Opposition of the day to include bingo.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was not even popular then.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If Mr. Ron Thompson was listening carefully to what I have been saying—

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —he would have heard me make specific reference to the activities which were in vogue in 1962. Bingo was not one of them, and hence it was not included in the Bill.

However, because members of the Opposition, who were in Government in 1967, were so conscious of the necessity for these organisations to be permitted to use all means within their power to raise funds to carry out their various activities, a Bill was again introduced to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act. The purpose of that amendment was to include, amongst those various activities in which parents and citizens' associations and other organisations participate, the operation of chocolate wheels. Members will recall at that time these organisations were operating chocolate wheels at their fetes, etc., and there was serious doubt about the legality of the practice. Because we were conscious of the fact that the running of chocolate wheels was desirable and certainly desired by the general public, we introduced a Bill to include that facility.

I am making these points so that members may be conscious of the fact that the parties to which members of the current Opposition belong are sympathetic and

were sympathetic to the need and the desire of parents and citizens' associations and others to participate in such activities in order to boost their funds. So it is most disturbing indeed for us to be accused of taking action to prevent those organisations from holding bingo games. I emphasise that we certainly had no intention of doing that.

If members look at the notice paper they will find that my leader has given notice of certain amendments he intends to move to the Bill if and when it reaches the Committee stage. If you look at those amendments, Mr. President, you will see that they are identical with those moved in September, 1971, when the other Bill was before the Chamber. The sole intention of the Opposition is to ensure that the playing of bingo is confined to those charitable organisations which we all agree are worthy of the right to play it; namely, parents and citizens' associations, kindergarten associations, junior football clubs, amateur sporting bodies of all descriptions, etc.

In order to ensure that the right to organise bingo games is extended to those organisations and not to large, powerful organisations which have licensed premises, we have done no more than suggest that an amendment be made so that licensed premises are precluded from having this right.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Didn't the Government support the amendment last time, and was it not supported by the whole Chamber?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I think I made great play of that fact about five minutes ago.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Then you are merely wasting words on nothing.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, I am not.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was supported in this House, but the Minister was let down by his colleagues in another place. He was dropped from a great height.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I will not say that Mr. Ron Thompson is not listening; I will merely say it appears he is not listening.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would say this is one occasion when the Government has not consulted Mr. Ron Thompson.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As I know that you do not like interjections going from side to side, Mr. President, I will endeavour to continue with my speech unhampered by these rude interjections.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Adjust your halo!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: In order completely to satisfy myself that none of the organisations which we all agree

should be eligible to have the right to organise bingo games in order to boost their funds would be excluded, I wrote to the Lotteries Commission on the 11th July, 1972. Amongst other things, I asked whether the commission would provide me with answers to the following:—

(a) For the purpose of authorising sporting clubs, such as Junior Football, Cricket, Basket Ball, Hockey, Athletics etc., P. & C. Associations, Kindergarten Committees, to conduct raffles and run chocolate wheels, which section of the Lotteries Control Act is applied?

(b) Would you supply a list of the types of organisations, i.e. the main activity of the various bodies which are being granted approval to conduct either of the two items mentioned in (a) above.

The Lotteries Commission replied to my letter on the 20th July, 1972, and said—

Authorisation for raffles to be conducted by organisations other than the Lotteries Commission is covered in Part N of the Lotteries Control Act and embraces Sections 12-19 inclusive.

To determine which organisations shall receive authorisation to conduct a raffle, the Commission applies Section 18 (3).

I already knew that, but I wished to verify that my interpretation was correct. However, the commission did not provide me with a list of the types of organisations and the activities in which they were participating. That was the main information I wanted.

Instead of writing another letter I phoned the secretary of the commission and told him that he had not indicated the types of organisations and activities which qualify under section 18 (3). He said, "Goodness gracious, there are so many of them. However, if it is important I will do so." He again wrote to me on the 24th July and enclosed with his letter a list of the organisations which qualify to organise activities within the scope of the Act. I will not read out the list to the House.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Why not, we are all waiting?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There is a page concerning public recreation, and I will read out just a few—

Agricultural College & Society
Art Workshop for Children
Aust.-American Association
Accordian Society
Aquarium Society
Activities Club
Arts and Drama Groups

Aero Clubs
Bands
Business & Professional Womens & Mens Clubs
Bird Societies
Civil Aviation Institute
Colonial Bottle Clubs
Camera Clubs
Coin Clubs
Good Companions Club
Cheerio Clubs
Cats—
Fanciers
Society
Clubs
Dancing and Ballet Clubs
Dog Clubs
Fire Brigade Clubs
Housewives Association

Several others are mentioned. Then under the category of sporting clubs the following appear:—

Athletic Clubs
Axemens League
Archery Clubs
Angling Association
Badminton Clubs
Baseball Clubs
Netball Clubs
Boating Clubs
Car Clubs—
Hot Rod
T.Q.
Sporting
Speedway
Cycle Clubs
Croquet Clubs
Cricket Clubs
Canoe Clubs
Darts Clubs
Football—
W.A.N.F.L. Clubs
Junior Councils
Amateurs
Ladies Auxiliaries
Businessmen's Clubs
Go-Kart Clubs
Golf Clubs
Pistol & Rifle Clubs
Gymnastic Clubs
Hockey Clubs
Pony & Horsemens Clubs
Judo Clubs
Karate Clubs
Lacrosse Clubs
Polocrosse Clubs
Rowing Clubs
Rugby Clubs
Miscellaneous Sporting Clubs
Softball Clubs
Soccer Clubs
Ski Clubs
Sailing Clubs
Squash Clubs
Tennis Clubs
Trotting Clubs (Not W.A.T.A.)
Turf & Jockey Clubs (Not W.A.T.C.)
Volleyball Clubs
Yacht Clubs

Under the category of charitable and religious organisations the following appear:—

Air Force Association
Asthma Foundation
Churches—
 Anglican
 Catholic
Catholic Schools Parents & Friends Associations
Cancer Crusade
Civilian Physically Handicapped
Diabetic Association
Senior Citizens—
 Aged Homes
 Meals on Wheels
 Welfare
 Autumn Clubs
Epilepsy Association
First Aid Clubs
Flying Angel Clubs
Royal Flying Doctor Service
Hospitals
Kidney Foundation
Legacy
Maimed & Limbless Association
Mentally Incurable Children
Muscular Dystrophy
Ngal-a Mothercraft & Training Centre
Nurses—
 Association
 Clubs
 Aged Society
Pensioners League
Paraplegic-Quadriplegic Association
Returned Services League
Red Cross
Slow Learning Children's Groups

Several other organisations are mentioned in that category. Under the category of social welfare organisations the following appear:—

Apex Clubs
American Field Service
Aust Care Campaign
Aboriginal Fellowship, Homes and Clubs
Boy Scout Groups
Blind—
 Society
 Business & Professional Centres
 Guide Dogs
Civilian Widows Association
Christmas Tree Clubs
Country Womens Association
Cooina Clubs
Fairs, Fetes, Gymkhana & Festival Committees
Girl Guides and Brownies
Infant Health Centres
Interact
Italo-Aust. Welfare
Jaycees and Jaycee ettes
Kindergartens, Play Centres & Day Centres
Lions Clubs
Lodges

Mothers Clubs—
 Kindergartens
 Schools
Naval Association—
 League
 Girls Nautical Training
Progress Associations
Police & Citizens Youth Clubs
Parents & Citizens Associations
Rotary Clubs
Womens Radio Clubs (for Nulsen Haven)
Swimming and Surf Life Saving
Ex Servicemen and Women
Sea Scouts

I will not read them all.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Among them are there political parties or unions?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I cannot find any.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: How many are there altogether?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There is a great number. If any member can think of any club or organisation that is not included I will be interested to know.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Mr. MacKinnon has just mentioned one particular category.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I cannot find any reference to unions or political parties, but that is beside the point. My point is that the current definition appearing in section 18 (3) of the Act is interpreted by the Lotteries Commission to include all the organisations I have mentioned.

With the adoption of the amendments put forward by the Opposition in respect of this Bill, the particular provision in the clause will be the same, word for word, as the section that now appears in the Act. There will be no deviation, no added fullstops, and no extra words. At the bottom of the particular provision in the Bill it is proposed to add certain words to the effect that the provision does not extend to organisations playing bingo on licensed premises. This has had the unanimous support of members of this House, including that of the Chief Secretary who administers the Act. Notwithstanding that Mr. May, a Minister in another place, made a statement to the Press, and apparently this was agreed to by the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Break it down. I did not know anything about that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Chief Secretary had every opportunity to read the newspaper report. I asked him two questions concerning this matter, but despite that the Chief Secretary did nothing to refute what I have said and he did not answer my questions.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: You ask Mr. May about that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Chief Secretary is suggesting that I approach Mr. May. Action has to be taken

in this House and you, Mr. President, know that I have no other avenue to question Mr. May than through the Ministers here. I did just that. If there is another avenue I am sure that you, Mr. President, will tell me about it later on.

Notwithstanding all this evidence to the contrary the newspaper suggested that the action taken in this House ensured that organisations like the P. & C. associations and others will not be allowed to conduct bingo games. I say that is untruthful and misleading to the public. That report was condoned by the Chief Secretary, because he took no action to ensure that it was corrected. Apparently this was sanctioned by the Minister for Mines, in view of his statement, which I have mentioned, that a change of heart by the Opposition would be needed before these organisations would be permitted to conduct games of bingo. I can assure members that it needs a change of heart on the part of the Government which is viciously excluding these charitable organisations from raising the necessary funds to enable them to carry out their very important and worthwhile work in the community. The Government has viciously refused them the opportunity to raise money by these means, and I condemn it for that action.

I will support the second reading of the Bill, because I am quite confident that the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, which appear on the notice paper, will once again receive the unanimous support of members of this House. I am absolutely sure of that, because the arguments in support of them are sound, and the facts upon which they are based are correct. Nobody can suggest that there is any truth in the statements of the Ministers which appeared in the newspaper report I mentioned.

I repeat that if it was thought at the time the Bill was amended it would exclude some organisations, then the Chief Secretary who has at his disposal the services of the Crown Law Department to advise him on the matter failed to suggest that any would be excluded. If he thought that some organisations would be excluded he ought to have informed the House. Obviously the Act did not and does not make such provision. I wonder what was the motive of the Government in not even giving the Legislative Assembly an opportunity to debate the measure. It simply allowed the measure to slide down to the bottom of the notice paper where it remained.

This move by the Government was a callous and brutal blow to those organisations which are dependent on the funds they raise by conducting innocent games of bingo. So, without prolonging the debate or repeating myself I conclude by saying that I intend to support the second reading and, indeed, the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [3.30 p.m.]: I rise to support my colleague the Hon. C. E. Griffiths in his remarks. I think the situation requires that I draw to the attention of members what I said when the Bill was first introduced.

I believe without any shadow of a doubt the Chief Secretary is a man of integrity. If I remember correctly this House debated the previous Bill and the Committee did not even go to a division on the amendments which were agreed to. However, somewhere between our corridor, and the corridor in another place, something went drastically wrong. Apparently the provisions of the Bill did not suit somebody in another place and I can only conclude—

THE PRESIDENT: Order. The honourable member cannot reflect on members of another place.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. President. I am in no doubt that something went wrong somewhere, and I am reminded of a quotation which, perhaps, should be noted by the Government. It is as follows:—

O what a tangled web we weave
When first we practise to deceive.

I think the reappearance of the bingo Bill is indicative of the actions of the present Government, which, I think, can be described in two words; "organised"—to some extent—"chaos".

We have a Bill before us which was previously debated freely in this House, and a lot of sound logic went into the discussion. The Bill was agreed to by this House, but it then disappeared into obscurity. I wonder who in the community—be he in this House or outside—did not approve of the actions of this Council. The Chief Secretary had no doubt at all regarding the intention of this House; none whatsoever. Yet, we find that this Bill has been re-presented—as my colleague Mr. Clive Griffiths has said—in its original form.

If I interpreted the feelings of members correctly, this House expressed the opinion that it did not mind bingo being played by anyone associated with religious, social, or cultural bodies as defined by the Lotteries Commission. Yet, to my amazement, such was the misrepresentation of the Press reports on the bingo Bill that I have been told time and time again that we, as Liberals, are against bingo.

I want to say here and now that I would like somebody, please, to draw a distinction on my behalf because I find the situation embarrassing. I am not against the game of bingo as such. However, I am against organised commercial bingo, because commercial bingo would develop to a scale which would make our T.A.B. turnover look stupid.

I have previously quoted the social inroads which commercial bingo has made upon the community in the United Kingdom. I do not wish to see the same systems operating in this State. That is my firm belief and nothing will swerve me from that course.

I think the Chief Secretary shared my view when the previous Bill was passed and I also think that all members in this House felt the same way. However, somewhere along the line the Bill did not suit someone. Whether it was because of commercial profit, or because of some political disagreement, I would not know.

I find it astonishing, with a socialistic Labor Government such as we now have, that we are having introduced so much legislation which eats at the very roots of the society the Government claims and purports to support.

The Leader of the Opposition has called the present Government a gambling Government. If that is the case the extension of gambling through bingo on a commercial basis would be a very real danger to this community. To my knowledge operators with thousands of dollars worth of equipment are waiting for this Bill to go through. Those operators will show members what bingo can mean, and they will show members how to twist and cheat the law in such a way that before long we will see bingo schools electronically linked. It is as simple as that. Members might scoff and say that is not true. If they do then they have never seen bingo parlours operating on a large and organised scale. I repeat: I believe the Chief Secretary does not want to see that situation develop in this State and nor do any of his ministerial colleagues in this House. I know that I am convinced on this matter.

I am a gambler and I venture to say that you, Mr. President, are also a gambler. I would venture to suggest that every member in this House is a gambler.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It all depends on how you spell it.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I realised the Minister for Police would be on to that point straight away! If members read a book entitled *Etiological Dynamics Within The Gambler Syndrome*, written by Maurice J. Keyser, they will see a definition of a gambler, which is as follows:—

The average person in any social system may be considered a gambler to a degree in that there are variables in our world no man can always predict, let alone control. The farmer who plants seeds is gambling on the weather as much as a business man who opens a motel. Driving a car, crossing a street, or going to a movie, involves some dangerous risks.

I hope that the Chief Secretary will include in the definition of bingo, "housey-housey", "tombola", and the apparently little known game of "lotto" which is the name given to bingo in America. I am worried as to whether yet another gambling syndrome will become apparent in our society, and whether more and more housewives will become compulsive gamblers. Compulsive gambling is a psychotic illness which has not been recognised in this State because, thank God, we do not yet have the greatest instrument available to the gambler for him to become compulsive. I refer to the iniquitous one-armed bandit.

In Sydney there are 3,000 compulsive gamblers. If an examination is made of the people who are serving sentences in gaols in New South Wales it will be found that the psychotic compulsive gambling syndrome is the cause of their troubles. That is not to say that we do not have compulsive gamblers in this State: We have. This information can be obtained from the prisoners serving sentences at Wooroloo. We tend to think of a compulsive gambler as a man who must have a bet and win. However, nothing is further from the truth; nothing at all.

A compulsive gambler is a hyper-maniac who cannot help himself. He does not desire to win; he gambles for the sheer thrill of gambling. If he loses, so much the better for his psychotic illness. It is a form of masochism. I would like to quote, from the same publication, the definition of a compulsive gambler. It is—

The compulsive gambler is an outgoing, action seeking, crowd finding person who really has a neurotic need for people. His basic nature may not make this role sincere or desirable but he has to go on and play the role.

The compulsive gambler is emotionally immature. He will not accept this most vehemently to the point of a brawl.

The compulsive gambler has a strong need for authority, knowledge and direction. He will resent, resist, and defy a professor, or judge on any topic.

The compulsive gambler is intellectually superior in special interest areas, but his mistakes involve simple stupid judgement errors.

In other words, such people are now with us in the community. To know this is so one need only consider some of the frauds that have taken place against employers by well placed accountants who take money from their employers' tills, put it on horses, and take a little more because they have lost what they had; those who go down the drain to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

This is the problem. It is not a new one. I am sure most members of this House will have read Dostoevski's *The*

Gambler, which was published in 1867 and cannot be described as a modern work. In that book Dostoevski said—

After having been in the grip of a gambling mania for ten years I cannot explain my own motives. However, the main point is the game itself. On my oath, it is not greed for money, despite the fact that I need money badly.

Dr. Freud interpreted Dostoevski's attitude towards gambling and said—

Dostoevski's gambling mania is a form of self-castigation, an irrational instinct-like force in which the need to lose is pre-eminent as a self inflicted punishment.

I will never vote in this House for commercialised bingo on a large scale on licensed premises in any way, shape, or form.

If, as might be suggested, people get around the law and erect a four-sided screen on a football oval to allow 20,000 to 30,000 people to sit up there and be electronically connected up to other football ovals in this city of Perth, they will incur my opposition. I do not believe that is the intention of the Chief Secretary. If some other people regard that as being the intention of the Bill, this House should be made aware of it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We ought to be told.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: This House should become so much aware of it that it will not allow the Bill to go any further.

I will support the second reading of this Bill with the amendments suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, and I shall follow—as I am sure every member of this House will follow—the progress of this Bill through these Houses of Parliament. If it is amended in any way to include commercialism, one might say the Bill will be in for a rough passage, as far as I am concerned, when it is returned to this House.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.05 p.m.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.05 p.m.]: I feel compelled to make a few remarks about this Bill. I quite agree with the comments on the sincerity of the Chief Secretary. I would like to know that he can hear what I am going to say. If he cannot hear my remarks, I will speak up until he can hear.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I can hear quite plainly now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not doubt the Minister's sincerity for one moment, but I think at times he is a

Minister without portfolio. He is without portfolio because someone takes it from him every now and again. The method which is employed is quite unfair to the Chief Secretary and his ministerial colleagues in this Chamber.

The actions of the Government in another place with regard to this Bill were quite unfair. I think we are entitled to know why the Bill, as amended in Committee, did not go through the Legislative Assembly. I have read the debates in *Hansard*—in fact, I have them in front of me—and yet I am no closer to an explanation as to what happened to the amended Bill in another place.

I would ask the Chief Secretary: Surely we are entitled to an explanation? Does he not think we are entitled to an explanation?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I would hate to interrupt until you have finished your speech.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not mind if the Chief Secretary interrupts—it would probably help me. In fairness to the Chief Secretary, we are entitled to know why the Government intercepted this little Bill. As a matter of fact, we are spending far too much time on this type of thing.

I would like to see a Bill introduced here to embrace all forms of gambling. Parliament could then decide definitely whether or not we should be a gambling community. We are nibbling away at the problem—a little bit here, and a little bit there. I thought the next question would have been a casino in Kalgoorlie to fulfil the wishes of the Chief Secretary. However, I observe someone else has made a decision on this point. A group of people on the other side of the railway line said, "No casino," and we have heard no more since then. Quite frankly, I do not think I am disappointed about this.

As Mr. Clive Griffiths said, exactly a year ago today we had an identical Bill before the House. The Government has tried to blame the members of the Legislative Council for the defeat of this legislation. However, the people to whom the Chief Secretary is seeking to give an advantage could have received that advantage nearly a year ago had it not been for the actions of the Government in another place. The Government decided that the Bill in the form in which it reached the other House was not acceptable.

Naturally enough I have put some amendments on the notice paper in the same words to which I asked the Committee to agree when the previous Bill was before the House. When I read Mr. Stubbs'

speech in *Hansard* about my amendments at that time, I felt I would have to move them again. Mr. Wordsworth said—

Will bingo be allowed to be conducted on licensed premises?

Mr. Stubbs said—

Certainly not. Section 126 (1) (f) of the Liquor Act provides that a licensee who bets with any person, or suffers betting, gaming or the playing of unlawful games, or the conduct of lotteries on licensed premises, commits an offence. The provision is specific.

The Leader of the Opposition has foreshadowed certain amendments. I have examined them, and I agree with them. I think they will ensure that gambling will not be allowed.

What will the Chief Secretary do when I move the amendments on the notice paper? Will he have something different to say? Of course, I will be interested in his remarks. If he does not intend to say something different, why is the Bill introduced in its original form? Why not introduce it with some modifications? Why not produce a Bill with the modifications which were completely satisfactory to everybody in this Chamber, including the Ministers? At least, I thought this was the case at the time.

I am not even slightly enthusiastic about bingo. In fact, after listening to Mr. Williams' speech, if I thought there were any risk whatever of somebody using the amendment to this Act to turn the game of bingo into a commercial enterprise, the Bill would not get my vote on the second reading. I would take that action feeling very sorry for the charitable organisations which the Minister hopes, and which all of us in this House hope, will receive some benefit as a result of the passage of the legislation; but the Bill will not receive my support if I feel there is any risk of commercialisation. I want the Chief Secretary to assure me that this is not the Government's intention. In fact, I would even go further—I would like the Minister to assure the House that he has talked to his colleagues in another place and he is certain he will not have the rug pulled from under his feet as happened a year ago. On that occasion I am sure he proceeded with the best intentions.

I am becoming very unhappy about the state of affairs in regard to the conduct of the legislation between the two Houses. It cannot be a happy situation for the Ministers to know that one day they can introduce a Bill, the next day they can agree to amend the Bill, but on the third day somebody else can say, "We will not agree to that." If that is to be the case we will be in exactly the same position as we were a year ago.

Surely the time has come when we should be able to accept the word of the Ministers in this Chamber without any chance of interference from someone else.

That is all I wish to say about the Bill. Mr. Clive Griffiths has examined it minutely. He has pointed out the unfair criticism which was levelled at the members of this House. I do not know how this situation arose and I say that it certainly should not have arisen. A member of the Government should have got up and said, "That is not right."

The legal situation is that the Minister for Police has to stop people playing bingo. He has to carry out the law because the law says we must not play bingo. On the other hand, the Chief Secretary says, "We must be fairly naive if we do not think it is being played." How do we reach the stage of being fairly naive?

Can we reach a stage of being unfairly naive? It is probably an unnecessary adjective that has been used in the speech but the Chief Secretary considers we are naive if we do not know this game is being played illegally. If it is being played illegally, the Minister for Police took the correct action when he stopped it, because an illegal practice should not be allowed to continue.

So we have now reached the stage when we have two Bills before us which are identical. One cannot find any word that is different in the two Bills, and I cannot find any difference between the speech made a year ago and the one delivered yesterday or the day before. However, what is missing is an explanation as to what happened between this House and the other place. I want to be told. I do not know that I can insist on being told, but I would like to know what did happen, because in my opinion the members of this House are entitled to know the truth of the matter from the Chief Secretary, because he is the meat in the sandwich. What Mr. Williams has said is probably correct. Somebody has said, "This is no good. You go back and present the Bill exactly the same as it was presented previously." That is not good enough.

If the Chief Secretary in all good faith accepted the amendment put forward by me, and if it were not acceptable to the majority of Cabinet members, then the Chief Secretary should say so and give the reasons why it was not acceptable. If the reasons are that there is an intention to allow this gambling game to move further across the board, we should be acquainted of that intention so that we can consider it and decide what our action will be.

At the moment we have a plea from the Chief Secretary because, in effect, he is saying, "We want to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act so that worthy and charitable organisations can be granted a permit to play this game for small stakes. We

do not want anybody to play the game on licensed premises. I am against that, and the Liquor Act precludes the game from being played on licensed premises. We are quite satisfied that everything is all right." Then, a year later, after the Bill has been thrown out, we have before us another measure which is exactly the same. I intend to let the matter rest there until the Bill goes into Committee when I will have a further opportunity to speak on the clauses of the Bill.

I will not say any more except to mention—as I have done half a dozen times—that, as Leader of the Opposition in this House, I want to be able to accept the word of the Ministers in this House, but until there is a change of attitude I am unable to do this. The same applies to the answering of questions, but I will not go into the reasons at this stage. Therefore, I support the second reading of the Bill somewhat reluctantly. I intend to support it so that I can hear from the Minister the reasons for the introduction of the Bill and until I do so I reserve the right to decide what I shall do when the Bill reaches other stages.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [4.20 p.m.]: We have just had another dissertation from the Leader of the Opposition on his view as to how the Ministers should conduct their affairs, and he is entitled to express his view, but it does not necessarily mean that the Ministers have to follow what he lays down. I think they will conduct their affairs in the best interests of the State and of this House.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you think the Ministers can speak for themselves?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, that is quite true.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Then why don't you sit down?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Leader of the Opposition is entitled to express his opinion on how Ministers shall conduct their affairs, and I am sure they will conduct their affairs in the way they see fit. Recently we had a very good example of amendments to a Bill being accepted in this House without going to the vote. There is little point in having a division on every amendment that is moved, particularly when one realises that we are not going to win, and that is the reason the Chief Secretary followed such an example. The other evening we had the example of amendments to a Bill agreed to in this House being disagreed with by another place and then this Chamber having to agree not to insist on its amendments. I think the Minister has indicated, by reintroducing this Bill in its original form that he prefers the Bill to be accepted in that form.

The opinion put forward by Mr. Clive Griffiths was a very irrational one. In fact, I felt he did not even do us the courtesy of outlining the reasons for the amendments that are proposed to be made.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you know that that is usually done in Committee, and don't you know that they are not the amendments of Mr. Clive Griffiths?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I was just about to tell him that there are two members in this House with names that are fairly similar.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Three Opposition members have spoken to the Bill, but none of them has outlined his reasons for the amendments.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Those reasons are usually outlined in Committee.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I agree that they are usually outlined in Committee, but it is not unusual for the reasons to be given in a second reading speech. Mr. Clive Griffiths spent a great deal of time in castigating the Government over an article that appeared in the Press and the answer he received to a question. Again, it is not unusual for Opposition members to be dissatisfied with the answers that are given to their questions. I have had that experience on quite a few occasions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Tell us some of them. Give us an example.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Very well, Mr. President. It is not unusual for members to be dissatisfied with the replies that are given to their questions, and Mr. Clive Griffiths accused the Minister of being misleading. Yet he did exactly the same thing when he spoke. He quoted from the article that appeared in the Press which, in effect, stated that the action of the Opposition in this Chamber had caused delay, or prevented organisations from gaining benefit from this game of bingo. Then, later in his speech, he said that the Opposition was being accused of depriving these organisations of the opportunity to conduct this game, because of the provisions it sought to have inserted in the legislation. These two matters are quite different; that is, the amendments that are proposed and the action taken by the Opposition.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: This is a big waffle. I hope you will make the position clear later on.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I think that is a good word to apply to the speeches that have been made to the Bill already.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You said that my speech was irrational, but I think your remarks are irresponsible.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will cease replying to the interjections that are being made and address his remarks to the Chair.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. Standing Order 86 reads as follows:—

No Member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any Member of either House. . . .

Mr. Claughton has just said that my colleague is irrational which, by dictionary definition, means that he is insane. I therefore ask the honourable member to withdraw his remark.

The PRESIDENT: I think the point of order should be taken by the honourable member against whom the reflection has been made.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr. President. I withdraw my remark to the extent that it may cause any reflection on the intelligence or stability of the personality of Mr. Clive Griffiths. My remark was directed only to the content of his speech and not against his personality. I had indicated that the honourable member had misled the House by referring to an article in the Press, and later by referring to the amendment that was made.

The remarks attributed to Mr. May in the newspaper could be viewed as being quite correct, because it is obvious that the Bill, in the form it was originally introduced to this House, clearly indicated what was desired by the Government, and if it had been accepted in that form there is no doubt that all the organisations mentioned would now be enjoying the benefit of being able to partake in that form of social activity known as bingo.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is not true, because Mr. Stubbs said the amendment made the Bill as the Government wanted it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I reiterate that what I have said is correct. If the Bill had been accepted in its original form it would have proceeded through the other Chamber and would have been in operation at this time. Regarded in that way, the remarks made by Mr. May are correct and are not intentionally misleading. In the Committee stage of the Bill I hope we will have elucidated the reasons for the Opposition insisting on the amendments it proposes. A P. & C. association in a large school situated in my area normally uses one of the nearby motels to conduct a games night. In this area and in other parts of my province there is a shortage of hall space where such activities can take place.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you say a hotel?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No, a motel.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Licensed?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, it is licensed, but I do not know whether the part of the motel used by the P. & C. association is licensed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Liquor Act would prevent the game from being played there.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am sorry, Mr. President, I cannot hear the interjections coming from both sides of me so I am unable to answer them. I do not know what the Minister will do in regard to this—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I know what he would like to do with you.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: —because there are other laws that prevent a P. & C. association from conducting the game of bingo if it is granted a license. I am not sure where they would go.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The licensing Act would prohibit them from doing it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Of course.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: They conduct games and quizzes.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: What sort of games?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You say you want it on licensed premises.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: As I have said, the P. & C. association conducts social evenings in the form of quiz evenings. If they desire to conduct a bingo evening, I cannot see the dangers.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You are thick if you cannot see the dangers, mate.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps I am naive, or less suspicious of the normal activities of our citizens than is the honourable member who interjected. In the main the parents of the children who attend the school would be rational and responsible. I cannot conceive that the Minister would grant a permit to the association to conduct a game of bingo if it were felt it would not be conducted in a responsible manner.

I would conclude at that point, and hope the Bill not only passes the second reading stage, but also is accepted in its present form.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. T. Leeson.

QUESTIONS (4): ON NOTICE**1. PUBLIC SERVICE***Professional Division Salaries*

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

- (1) Is the Government aware of marked discontent in the Professional Division of the Public Service with regard to salaries?
- (2) Is it intended to restore parity by moving to adjust the Professional Division salaries in line with recent increases given to other divisions?
- (3) If so, when?
- (4) If not, why?

The Hon. J. Dolan for The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) to (4) Public Service salaries are fixed by negotiation between the Civil Service Association and the Public Service Board with the right of approach to the Public Service Arbitrator if agreement cannot be reached.

I am informed by the Public Service Board that recent increases were made to keep Western Australian Public Service salaries in line with the General Australian Public Service standard. They were based on a decision by the Commonwealth Public Service Arbitrator to award a 7½% increase in clerical salaries which did not apply to professional salaries.

Salaries of the various occupational groups in the professional division are compared with similar groups in the Commonwealth and other States, and our rates, particularly in the lower areas, compare more than favourably with the Australian standard. They will be increased as, and when, there is need to do so to maintain parity with this standard.

2. TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD*Agencies: Sites*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to The Minister for Police:

- (1) Is it the policy of the Totalisator Agency Board to establish their shops in the near vicinity of hotels?
- (2) What are the determining factors in the location of any new shops?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) The siting of T.A.B. Agencies is governed by zoning laws, which cause them to be established in commercial areas.

They are therefore in close proximity to other commercial enterprises.

- (2) Agencies are located so that they will provide an adequate service to the public. Population statistics, parking and traffic flow, type and size of commercial areas, suitability of site as regards zoning and other Local Government requirements and any aspects which relate specifically to a particular area are determining factors.

3. ROYAL COMMISSION*Wool Exporters Pty. Ltd.*

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Government given consideration to the introduction of legislation based on the recommendations of the Royal Commission into the affairs of Wool Exporters Pty. Ltd., and associated companies, as detailed on pages 82, 83, 84 and 85 of the Royal Commission's Report of April 1969?
- (2) If not, would not the evidence therein indicate the necessity of protection to wool growers against the practices revealed?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", could it be expected to be brought down and dealt with in this present session of Parliament?

The Hon. J. Dolan for The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Yes but final consideration was deferred in view of Commonwealth proposals for the marketing of wool. The matter will be re-examined.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Answered by (1).

4. DROUGHT*Report of Committee of Inquiry*

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

- (1) Has the report of the Committee appointed to inquire into drought affected areas of the Lower North Province been received by the Government?
- (2) If not, when is it anticipated it will be?
- (3) If it has been received, when will it and any Government measures be made known?

The Hon. J. Dolan for The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) and (2) The report of the Committee inquiring into drought affected areas in the Goldfields is being currently considered by the Drought Finance Committee.

- (3) The report involves major policy considerations and is being dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th September.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Railways) [4.35 p.m.]: I would like first to thank Mr. McNeill for his contribution to the debate and the point he raised concerning the words "at any time" in the proposed new subsection (3) in clause 3. He asked me if I would study the point. I did examine the matter very closely and my line of thinking was in accord with that of Mr. McNeill so I consulted one of my railway officers and he also agreed with us. I then referred the matter back to the Parliamentary Counsel for investigation to ascertain whether he agreed and if so how the matter could be rectified. The Parliamentary Counsel suggested the amendment which I have on the notice paper.

I also asked him whether he would ensure that everything else was in order because I did not want to find later that something else was remiss. As a result I was told that section 52 contained a proviso which it had been intended to delete. He recommended, therefore, that I move an amendment to achieve this objective.

The two amendments are on the notice paper and they will, I believe, rectify the points raised by Mr. McNeill who I thank for his close examination of the Bill resulting in those amendments. I think any Minister presenting a Bill would like it to be passed as it is in the knowledge that everything is all right. However, when a point is raised which is followed up and is responsible for amendments being made to tidy up the Bill so that no possibility exists of a mistake being made in the future, then the honourable member who draws the point to the attention of the House deserves commendation; and I therefore commend Mr. McNeill on this occasion.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. R. F. Claughton) in the Chair; The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Railways) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Amendment to section 52—

The Hon. J. DOLAN: As I have already explained, my first amendment is designed to repeal the unnecessary proviso in section 52. The other two amendments are

to ensure that, by the insertion of certain words, Mr. McNeill's point regarding the words "at any time" is clarified. I move an amendment—

Page 2, after line 9—Insert after paragraph (b) the following new paragraph to stand as paragraph (c):—

(c) by repealing the proviso to the section; and .

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I would just like to convey my thanks to the Minister for his rather generous comments. I have no objection to the amendment as it is obvious that the proviso must be deleted because otherwise it would be quite superfluous and would only cause confusion.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Thank you.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 25 and 26—Delete the passage ", at any time after receiving that notice," .

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 32—Add after the word "Act" the passage ", and for the purposes of section eighty of this Act the date on which the person received that notice shall be deemed to be the date of the decision appealed against" .

The Hon. N. McNEILL: During my second reading speech I said that I thought some reference to section 80 was necessary. I said I believed this was probably the wish of the Minister and the Government. In my opinion the amendment is satisfactory and I therefore support it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th September.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East—Chief Secretary) [4.45 p.m.]: Mr. Berry researched this measure fairly thoroughly and I wish to thank him for this. He raised several queries which I referred to the Minister who initiated the Bill in another place. The Minister has supplied me with a reply and has also indicated that he is not averse to the amendment which I have placed on the notice paper. The effect of the amend-

ment would be to restore the voting powers in the Act. The information is that—

As provision is to be made for a Chairman and Deputy Chairman (without a pecuniary interest in hair-dressing) it will be only on a rare occasion, if ever, a member is appointed as Chairman for a particular meeting. Outside the Chairman or Deputy Chairman, the members of the Board in accordance with section 5 of the Act shall consist of—

“four other persons, all appointed by the Governor, of whom each shall be a person who has had at least three years experience, either as principal or employee in any business in the practice of hairdressing.”

One of the members is nominated by the Master Ladies Hairdressers Association, one by the Master Gentlemen's Hairdressers Association and two by the union of workers. It is usual for those bodies to nominate persons active in the trade and there is nothing in the Act to preclude their appointment as members whilst having a pecuniary interest in hairdressing. In fact their knowledge gained from current experience can be helpful to the Board. It does not seem necessary to go beyond them to provide for a person to act as Chairman, in an emergency only, when the Chairman or his Deputy are not able to attend. In fact when a meeting date is arranged and it is found beforehand that the Chairman or his Deputy could not attend, an alternative date would normally be fixed to hold the meeting.

With reference to clause 2 (d) which repeals and re-enacts section 5 (8), dealing with voting procedure, the Minister advises—

Some words in the current subsection have been omitted in the re-enactment i.e. “in case of an equality of votes to declare the vote in the negative.”

The Parliamentary Counsel, when preparing the amendment, verbally indicated that those words do not relate to the appointment of a Chairman, with which the current subsection is mainly concerned, but actually refer to the voting on business before the Board. They are out of context in the subsection and should be removed therefrom. They were written into the Act in that form in 1946 when the Act was originally introduced and passed.

Their exclusion altogether does not seem to have any material effect as the Chairman will have one vote in the ordinary manner at a meeting but not a second or casting vote.

The amendment, if accepted, will mean that there can be no misunderstanding in connection with voting powers.

I again thank Mr. Berry for the research he has undertaken and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. R. F. Cloughton) in the Chair; The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Amendment to section 5—

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I move an amendment—

Page 3—Delete paragraph (f) and substitute the following:—

(f) by adding after the word “members” in subsection (13) the words “and a question arising at any meeting of the Board shall be determined by a majority of the valid votes of members present at that meeting.”; and.

I think I gave sufficient information when replying to the second reading.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I thank the Minister for moving the amendment which will restore the original provision dealing with voting procedure at meetings.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

RACING RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 7th September.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [4.53 p.m.]: I do not know whether members are aware that the Statutes of Western Australia contain two pieces of legislation under the name, “Racing Restriction Act.” This came as something of a surprise to me last week when I discovered that the two Acts deal with two separate aspects of racing. The first deals with the limitation on the number of race and trotting meetings to be held in the metropolitan area and the Fremantle district. This Act was first put on the Statute Book in 1917 and was amended in 1925. The Bill before us will effect amendment to this Act and not the other Racing Restriction Act, which was placed on the Statute Book in 1927.

It is many years since the legislation which is now under discussion was amended and it is rather surprising that such

a lapse of time has occurred during which no amendments have been made to the legislation, particularly when we consider the increased interest there is in trotting in this State.

As I have said, the other Racing Restriction Act was placed on the Statute book in 1927. That particular Act deals with the prohibition of racing by and between animals other than horses. I think I should quote a little of that Act to the House. It is headed, "An Act to prohibit Racing by and Between Animals other than Horses." Section 2 says—

The use of any mechanical device or contrivance for the promotion of or in connection with racing by or between animals other than horses, at or in any place to which the public is admitted on payment or otherwise, is unlawful.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: To what are you referring?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: To the 1927 Act. I do not know why, in those days, the two Acts were not consolidated into one. I cannot see any reason against doing this today, except perhaps for certain circumstances which I cannot mention at the moment because they are connected with other legislation.

In the 1917 legislation the number of trotting meetings in the metropolitan area was limited to 35 in any one year. At that time the metropolitan area was defined as an area within 30 miles of the radius of the Perth Town Hall. The amending Bill of 1925 provided that 35 meetings could be held in the metropolitan area. At that time it was also decided to hold meetings in the Fremantle district and the amending Bill of that year provided for 10 meetings to be held in that district. Section 5 of the principal Act was amended in 1925 to include definitions of the particular areas. The metropolitan area was defined as a land area within 30 miles radius of the Perth Town Hall and the Fremantle district was defined as an area within five miles radially from the Town Hall of Fremantle.

The Bill under discussion will provide for 49 meetings in the Fremantle district.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: How many?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I have made a mistake; it provides for 14 in the Fremantle district and 49 in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We should get 49.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The members who represent the Fremantle area appear to be hungry; I doubt whether 49 trotting meetings could be held in Fremantle in one year.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Try us.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: People would become tired of travelling to and from Fremantle for meetings of this nature. However this is by the way.

As I have said, the Bill plans to increase the number of meetings in the Fremantle area from 10 to 14. I do not see anything wrong with that provision and I agree with it.

I was rather surprised to find that only 600 trotting horses are registered in Western Australia—the figure given by the Minister in his notes—in view of the increase in trotting in Western Australia. I imagined that many more than 600 trotting horses would be registered, particularly when we consider the number of trotting meetings in the city and country areas. The figure does not seem correct to me, although it is stated that the figure was obtained from the Trotting Association. I am particularly surprised in view of the fact that 6,744 thoroughbred horses raced in the city area last year. This is the number that has raced at meetings in the metropolitan area, but of course it would include a number of horses which raced on more than one occasion. I imagine that the number of registered thoroughbred horses in Western Australia would probably exceed a few thousand.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I think the figure is probably more than 600.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, and this is why I am surprised at the figure of 600 given by the Minister as the number of trotting horses registered in Western Australia. As I have said, it seems wrong to me and it may be worth while to check the figure to see if it is incorrect. In this way, any error could be corrected.

This Bill takes my memory back many years; when I was only a boy, and when trotting meetings were held on the old W.A.C.A. ground. I daresay many of the younger members do not recall those days, but I do because I attended these trotting meetings. I followed this sport right through, almost from its inception, because my father owned horses and he won several races with them on the W.A.C.A. ground.

As I say, when dealing with this matter of trotting my mind goes back to the events that occurred in those days. The ground on which trotting is at present held—namely, Gloucester Park—was originally called Brennan Park.

The late Sir James Brennan might almost be considered to be the father of trotting in Western Australia. He was Chairman of the W.A. Trotting Association when Gloucester Park was first developed. It was not till later that the name was changed from Brennan Park to Gloucester Park.

I cannot understand why this was done—I believe it was done after the Duke of Gloucester visited Western Australia—because I should imagine that people

associated with trotting would have preferred to retain the name of the gentleman who was more or less responsible for making what is now Gloucester Park possibly the best trotting ground in the southern hemisphere.

I am sure that many of those who have followed trotting over the years would hold similar views and feel that the name Brennan Park should have been retained. I understand, however, when the Duke of Gloucester visited Western Australia, somebody had the idea that it was desirable to change the name to Gloucester Park. This of course is now history, but I do feel that the name Brennan Park should have been retained.

I certainly believe the Bill is necessary. Quite apart from my interest in thoroughbred horses I had, as I have already indicated, been interested in trotting horses. I have more or less followed horses all my life, except, possibly, during the depression years when I was not able to devote as much time as I would have liked to the sport.

One of my horses won the South-West Derby, so this will give members some indication that I have some knowledge of both trotting horses and thoroughbreds. I do not by any means seek to imply that I am an expert in the field, but I do have considerable knowledge of the matter and I can speak on it with some authority.

I support the Bill. I think we should do all we can to place it on the Statute book of Western Australia.

THE HON. T. O. PERRY (Lower Central) [5.04 p.m.]: I believe the popularity achieved by trotting in Western Australia has prompted the W.A.T.A. to seek an increase in the number of meetings which are held in the metropolitan area.

The purpose of the Bill is to provide that a certain number of meetings be held in any one year; it seeks to increase the number that are already held. I do not know, however, whether the reference to "any one year" means a calendar year or a trotting year.

I think most of us are aware that the trotting year commences on the 1st August, and, accordingly, I would like the Minister to inform me whether the reference to any one year means, in fact, any one trotting year.

At the moment it is most unusual to hold a T.A.B. meeting in the near country areas at the same time as a trotting meeting is held in the metropolitan area. When I refer to the near country areas I mean places like Bunbury, Northam, Cunderdin and Merredin.

During the Kalgoorlie round meetings are held sometimes at Kalgoorlie on the same nights as those held in the metropolitan area. With that exception, however, I cannot recall a T.A.B. meeting

being held in a country area on the same night as one is held in the metropolitan area.

The purpose of this practice is not to restrict the country people from visiting the metropolitan area when meetings are held in that area. Accordingly if the number of meetings are increased in the metropolitan area I feel this could inhibit the trotting clubs with T.A.B. facilities at Bunbury, Harvey, Pinjarra, Northam, York and elsewhere, because these clubs would be prevented from holding meetings on the same nights on which they are held in the metropolitan area.

I would like the Minister to clarify this before I give the Bill my support.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. C. R. Abbey.

House adjourned at 5.06 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 14th September, 1972

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMENTARIES

Background Film

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton): I wish to advise members that I have granted TVW 7 permission to make a very short silent film of Parliament in session for use in parliamentary commentaries. This will take place at 3.30 p.m. this afternoon.

KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Tenders for Construction: Urgency Motion

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton): I wish to advise the House that under Standing Order 48 I have received the following request:—

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I desire to seek your approval to move when the Legislative Assembly meets at 2.15 p.m. today for the adjournment of the House as a matter of urgency for the purpose of discussing the following:—

- (1) The seriously unsatisfactory position that has developed in local industry due to the Government's decision to enter into a contract with E.P.T. worth approximately \$7.7 million for 330 kV transmission lines, Kwinana - Southern Terminal, Southern Terminal - Northern Terminal, Kwinana - Northern Terminal when pre-tender information under date