

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 17th October, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (2): ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Land Agents Act Amendment Bill.
2. Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Bill.

QUESTIONS (2): ON NOTICE

1. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Woolgrowers

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

Since the implementation of the Rural Reconstruction Scheme as applied to the wool section of the pastoral industry—

- (a) what total amount of assistance has been applied for;
- (b) how much has been approved;
- (c) what was the maximum amount granted;
- (d) what was the minimum amount granted?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) \$1,714,158;
- (b) \$250,800;
- (c) \$40,000;
- (d) \$6,300.

2. TRAFFIC INSPECTORS

Police Schools: Attendance

The Hon. J. HEITMAN, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Are country shire traffic inspectors allowed to attend police traffic schools?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) when was the last school held;
 - (b) how many country traffic inspectors attended?
- (3) When will the next school be held?
- (4) Have invitations been sent to country shire councils advising them of the date and time of such school?
- (5) If country shire council traffic inspectors are no longer welcome at police traffic schools, will the Minister advise of the circumstances preventing them from attending?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) September, 1970.
(b) Nine.
- (3) At the earliest suitable time after a request is received from the Country Shire Councils' Association.
- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) Traffic inspectors are always welcome to attend the police traffic school on application through the Country Shire Councils' Association, as has been the practice in the past. The Police department through its officers does everything possible to ensure that traffic inspectors are made welcome and that the training they receive increases their efficiency comparable to police standards.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL

Second Reading: Defeated

Debate resumed from the 12th October.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [4.42 p.m.]: It is my intention to comment on one or two aspects of daylight saving. Some of the points I wish to raise have already been mentioned during the course of this debate, but others have not.

Before discussing the measure, I feel it is in order for me to suggest that this Government, because of its persistence in reintroducing measures which have been rejected, will go down in history as the "Robert Bruce" Government—it keeps trying and trying again.

The Hon. R. Thompson: One day we will have the majority here and we won't have to try so hard.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: However, unlike Robert Bruce, on this occasion the Government will not succeed.

As a result of a motion moved by Mr. Medcalf, a committee was set up to investigate and report to the Government on daylight saving. I intended to say I was somewhat surprised to find the committee's report so inconclusive, but on reflection that is not the correct term. The report was conclusive inasmuch as it was apparent that the majority of evidence obtained by the committee clearly indicated that daylight saving was not acceptable to the people of Western Australia or, I should say, to the people who saw fit to make a submission to the committee.

The committee did not make any clear recommendations, except to say amongst other things—and I am repeating comments which have already been made—that a case had been established on balance

that daylight saving should benefit the health of Western Australia. The committee made this comment as a result of its investigations.

I have made an investigation myself, and I have come across a letter which was forwarded to the committee inquiring into daylight saving. Incidentally, it was the only letter which suggested that any sort of a case for daylight saving could be put up. The letter was from the Commissioner of Public Health, and it is contained in the file which I believe was tabled in another place and which the Minister has made available to us. The concluding sentence of the commissioner's letter to the committee reads as follows:—

On balance daylight saving should benefit the health of Western Australia.

I find it rather strange that the committee extracted a sentence from the commissioner's letter to use as a recommendation in its report.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: A case of great minds thinking alike.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The committee used this sentence, and this sentence alone, to justify its recommendation that daylight saving ought to be introduced. In fact, the committee stole the sentence from the letter written by the Commissioner of Public Health.

It seems to me that the committee was on very shaky ground when it made its recommendation, because it was unable to put forward a recommendation of its own. In fact, one sentence is the extent of its recommendation for the introduction of daylight saving.

After checking through the file and the evidence made available to the committee, and indeed, after listening to the cases put up by individuals throughout Western Australia, it seems to me that the main argument proffered in support of the introduction of daylight saving is that it will provide more leisure time for the people of our State to participate in sporting or leisure-time activities in daylight hours. Indeed, looking through the evidence and the letters received by the committee from all the other States of Australia, this seems to be the major point in favour of daylight saving—that people would have more leisure time in daylight hours.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is in the city areas, of course.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am saying that this was the point made in submission by people living in the Eastern States. It is also the main reason given by people in the metropolitan area who favour daylight saving. I have visited the areas represented by Mr. Withers and I have first-hand experience of the situation prevailing in that part of the State. It is quite obvious that if this measure is passed, the principle of daylight saving will

be put into effect throughout the State and, accordingly, I have looked at daylight saving from this aspect. For the reasons I have stated, I feel I am quite justified in my opposition to this measure.

I have already said that the main point in favour of daylight saving is the increase in leisure time available during daylight hours. However, another reason put forward is the likelihood of an adverse effect on the short-term money market in Western Australia. I have made various attempts to discover the extent to which this short-term money market was adversely affected last year, but I have been unable to discover any figures whatever to support this contention.

So I find it difficult to understand those who support the measure on these grounds. Question after question has been asked to ascertain the amount of money that was lost as a result of Western Australia not introducing daylight saving last year but, to date, that information has not been forthcoming. However, that is not significant. Even if it were, I feel the solution to the problem is that the people who are affected by Western Australia not coming into line with the policy adopted in the Eastern States and so adopting daylight saving, should start work one hour earlier. I suggest that, because from my investigations of the people engaged in this type of business I find little evidence of any of them commencing work before 8.30 a.m.; indeed, the majority of them start work at 9.00 a.m.

Therefore, in my opinion, it would not be a great imposition if these people were obliged to commence work an hour earlier. Conversely, those who will be adversely affected by the time change are unable to do anything to rectify the situation. If I said no more, I believe that this alone should end the argument. The people who believe that the introduction of daylight saving will adversely affect them can do absolutely nothing about it. Their business will be affected to such an extent that it could have a widespread effect on employment throughout the State. Heaven knows! Western Australia still holds the record for the greatest unemployment in the nation.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Here we go again!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Miss Elliott may interject along those lines, but these are the facts of life. Every month and every quarter figures are published in the Press indicating that this is the situation, and it is one about which we are greatly concerned.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Did I say I was concerned about it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member seems to be concerned every time someone mentions the unemployment situation, as if she fears it

being mentioned; as if it were something that ought to be hushed up, so that people will not be aware that there are a great many unemployed.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Can you prove it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I have bundles of information to prove that. However, I do not want to start an argument along these lines. I was about to say that the introduction of daylight saving would aggravate the already high rate of unemployment in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How can you say that?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Because it will have an effect on many industries, including the motion picture industry which employs a large number of people.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Other than by interjection, we have heard very little on the matter from the Labor members of the House.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: We are becoming quite used to that, Mr. President, and you will know that whilst I object to interjections I am quite capable of carrying on my speech in spite of them. I will not allow interjections to interrupt me, and I will continue to point out to you, Mr. President, that, in particular, the representatives of the motion picture industry have gone to great lengths to explain to many people, including members of Parliament, precisely how the introduction of daylight saving will affect their industry, and they have given their reasons. They are to be commended for this. I do not think members want me to read out the multitude of reasons that have been given. However, I have the information before me and if Mr. Dans is not in possession of it—

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: How do you know that one was sent to him?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The representatives of the motion picture industry sent copies to all members of Parliament, but if a copy was not sent to Mr. Dans I will make my copy available to him later so that he may read it. Not only is it reasonable to believe that the fears of these people are justified, but also it is only common sense that an industry which relies on darkness for the showing of pictures cannot start the programme until darkness falls. People can do what they like with the clock and change the time around as much as they desire, but pictures cannot be shown outdoors until it becomes dark. Therefore, the representatives of the motion picture industry cannot do anything about the situation to overcome their problems.

Some of the reasons given to show the effect daylight saving would have on the motion picture industry could be outlined in a few minutes. For example, people

will not stay at home until 9.00 p.m. prior to attending a drive-in theatre, and other people will consider it is far too late to stay up.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: And they have to get up one hour earlier in the morning.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: People can go to bed an hour later, but they still have to get up at the same time in the morning. The sleep requirements of people do not change with the clock. However, it is necessary for children to go to bed at a reasonable hour so that they may enjoy a certain number of hours of rest, and it is equally important that adults should have their hours of rest. What they will do whilst they wait for 9.00 p.m. to arrive, should they desire to go to the pictures, I do not know, but it is not unreasonable to suggest that some other form of entertainment may attract their attention and lead them away from the attractions offered by the motion picture industry. If this does occur it will, of course, have a dramatic effect on that industry.

The motion picture industry is not standing still. New cinemas are being constructed progressively in various parts of the metropolitan area. From the figures made available to me I understand that each cinema costs about \$250,000, which is not an insignificant sum. It is certainly an industry that provides a great deal of employment. We cannot just brush these people aside and prevent all future building. If daylight saving is introduced not only will we stop future building, but we will send bankrupt those operators who are conducting drive-in theatres at present.

Numerous people are indirectly employed because of the operation of the motion picture industry. There are those who make bread rolls and confectionery, and there are others who are engaged in the dairy industry. All these people have something to do with the motion picture industry, apart from those who are directly employed by the motion picture companies. On the list which I have before me of people who will be affected by the introduction of daylight saving I notice that electricians are included. I could not possibly stand by and see that eventuate, having earned my living in the electrical trade for many years before I became a member of Parliament. I may have to earn my living as an electrician again one day.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not unless you choose to.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It will be of my own choosing, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition of that. A letter was sent by Mr. Cyril Cornish to members of Parliament—at least I received a copy and Mr. Griffith read from a copy. Mr. Cornish indicated that his company was affected to the tune of \$25,000 last year.

Someone asked how this information could be substantiated or how we could know that the loss of \$25,000 could be directly attributed to the pending introduction of daylight saving.

I simply wish to point out that the majority of people who advertise on theatre screens do not do so on a weekly basis. They enter into a contract for 12 months or some other lengthy period. When a client's contract is due for renewal, and it is not renewed it is not unreasonable to believe that the client would be asked for his reason. The reason given has been the pending introduction of legislation to implement daylight saving and that the money spent on theatre advertising could have been better spent in some other direction.

Cyril Cornish Theatre Ads Pty. Ltd. has indicated that it lost \$25,000 last year. This information can be substantiated because it was contained in a letter under the letterhead of the company, and the letter was signed by the general manager. The information I have given is not hearsay—something I have heard in the street or the corridors. It is contained in a letter duly signed by the general manager of the organisation. If that is not sufficient proof that the company lost \$25,000 then I want to know what proof members require. People do not indiscriminately write and sign letters if these include falsehoods. The people involved are reputable and they have conducted their business in this State for a long time. They do not deserve to be treated as they have been.

In turn the unemployment situation will obviously be adversely affected. The letter to which I have referred indicates that the only way the company can effect any sort of economy is to retrench some of its employees. If \$25,000 is involved here, \$25,000 is involved there, and some other amount of money involved somewhere else, before long the amount will be considerable and quite a number of jobs will be affected. If it does nothing but preserve the employment *status quo* this House will be justified in defeating the Bill. So much for that aspect.

My colleague, Mr. Williams, made some remarkable statements.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Fantastic.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not think they were fantastic. I think they were diabolical.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I can see the headlines, "Fight within the Liberal Party."

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It will not be a fight; it will be a walkover.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Why? Are you going to throw the towel in?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr. Williams said that the average man in the street could not care less about daylight saving; at least his comments were to that effect.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Yes, that is true.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member said that the general run-of-the-mill man in the street could not care less because he is not affected. He further went on to say that the people in his electorate made a definite request to him to support this Bill. So, firstly, he told us that the ordinary man in the street, not affected in the film industry or in any other way, could not care less; but the people in his electorate were so vocal that he has found himself with no alternative but to support the measure.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Against his own personal thoughts, too.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are not disbelieving one of your colleagues, are you?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you believe him if he wrote it in a letter with a letter-head?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I believe him now, but I do not believe that his understanding of the situation is correct. I believe the average person in the street does not care one way or the other. Some would like daylight saving only because they may want to go for a swim at 8.00 p.m. or 9.00 p.m.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Or at midnight after a barbecue.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Some want to practise sports, and I have nothing against such people. Indeed, I do not think many people in this Chamber or in any other place would have had more to do with sporting organisations than I have had. I am very sympathetic towards these people; but we live in a country where we have indulged in certain sports and leisure-time activities since the nation was first founded, and we have done so with the clocks the way they are at the moment. We have been very successful, too, because we are near the top in just about every sport.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We are still called a nation of spectators.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Such a reference is intended to apply to people like Mr. Cloughton.

I am saying that whilst I sympathise with sporting folk, they are aware that daylight saving will not adversely affect them at all. In fact, they will gain a sort of bonus. However, if we are to issue a bonus to one section of the community to the detriment of another, we ought to stop and reconsider the matter. If we

could issue a bonus to the whole community, it would be a different story altogether, but a bonus is to be issued to those seeking extra leisure time to the detriment of a great number of people who can do absolutely nothing to rectify their situation.

Back to Mr. Williams and his comments. He said we ought to give daylight saving a trial so that those whom he classed as the men in the street who do not care one way or the other, would, at the end of 12 months, have gained a fuller understanding of the situation and thus be able to form a definite view on the subject. How the dickens does the honourable member think these people, who, at the moment, are not concerned one way or the other—and the only reason they are not is that they are not directly involved in those industries which will be adversely affected or they will not be the receivers of the bonus to which I have referred—will then be in a position to tell the Parliament of Western Australia what it ought to do with regard to daylight saving?

The honourable member's deduction leaves a lot to be desired and I consider he should have another think about the matter, because he has some time left this afternoon in which to do so. Those members who have listened to him will certainly not look at him with any displeasure if he decides to change his mind and vote against the Bill as I suggest he should.

I wish to deal with a couple of other aspects although I consider I have already justified my decision to vote against the Bill. Numerous people in the community, because of their age or infirmity, are committed for the rest of their lives to a "C"-class hospital or some similar institution. During last week I made some inquiries and I ascertained that the inmates in these hospitals have a pattern to which they are subjected—a pattern which is dictated by the hours worked by the employees.

I am told that the evening meal, following which the inmates are put back into bed for the last time for the day, is delivered between 4.30 and 5.00 p.m. It cannot be delivered any later. So what will be the situation of these people if daylight saving is implemented? For the whole of the summer they will be put back into their beds at the hottest time of the day. They will be committed to what almost amounts to purgatory merely because it is considered some people should have an extended leisure time or because those engaged in the short-term money market cannot start work at 8.00 a.m.

Thousands of elderly citizens will be involved. All the time we are making more money available for the construction of further "C"-class hospitals because it has at last been realised that we have many

people in the community who require such hospitalisation. Yet we are now considering putting them to bed at what would be virtually 3.30 p.m. where they must stay until the next morning.

It might be said that some of the institutions are air-conditioned, but many of them are not. Even if they were all air-conditioned, would that be any justification for putting people to bed at virtually 3.30 p.m.? The evening staff finishes work at 7.30 p.m. and that is why the meals must be delivered early and everything else organised so that the staff can finish at the correct time.

The night staff has a certain number of chores to perform, and one of them is to give the inmates sleeping pills and all the rest of the jazz that occurs when one is in hospital. This duty is performed between 8.00 and 9.00 p.m. So these elderly people would be put to bed at virtually 3.30 p.m. and then at what would be 7.00 p.m. they would be given sleeping pills; and this despite the fact that two more hours of broad daylight would remain. This will be the situation if the Bill is passed and that alone is sufficient reason for our rejecting it.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Do you think matrons of "C"-class hospitals would let that happen?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They would have no option. The awards dictate when the employees will work; and it is stipulated that they must finish at 7.30 p.m. Before that hour they must complete all their duties one of which is to put the inmates to bed. That argument alone should convince those who intended to support the Bill that they should not do so.

Finally, I think I have the most important reason why we should reject the Bill before us. On the 12th October *The West Australian* newspaper carried an article under headlines which said, "Water Cut Expected in Perth." The article then went on to say—

Water restrictions appear certain to be introduced in the metropolitan area this summer. The general manager of the Metropolitan Water Board, Mr. H. E. Hewitt, said yesterday there were no immediate plans for restrictions but they could be introduced in the next few months.

He then goes on to say that the restrictions would be probably limited to hours during which sprinklers could be used. There is an article in this morning's *The West Australian* which contains the heading, "Water fails after heat". The article adds that because of the hot spell that came over the State yesterday some of the northern suburbs had experienced

water shortages. In the *Daily News* of today we find the following under the heading, "Don't Waste Water" Plea":—

The Metropolitan Water Board today appealed to Perth people not to waste water on lawns.

The board and the Agriculture Department said lawns will survive on two good waterings a week.

They said a lot of water was wasted on lawns.

The board's general manager, Mr. H. E. J. Hewitt, today appealed to the public to co-operate with the board in its efforts to conserve water.

Mr. Hewitt said the Perth water storage had possibly reached its peak—and was almost 10,000 million gallons down on last year.

He said that storage last year continued to rise until November 1, when it reached almost 58,000 million gallons.

The hot weather of the past few days meant the 1972 peak had possibly been reached, at only 47,000 million gallons.

Yesterday's water consumption in Perth leapt to 135 million gallons. It was about 100 million gallons on the three previous days.

You may wonder, Mr. President, what all this has to do with daylight saving. I think all of us must be very concerned about the possible water restrictions and the proposed action on the part of the water board. I have no doubt that during the course of the restrictions the people of Western Australia will be most agreeable to give all the support they can in this direction, because we all realise it is necessary to conserve our water; we realise how limited our water supplies are in this State. We are making every attempt possible to preserve our water supplies by means of catchment areas, underground supplies and the like; apart from which we take all kinds of legislative action to ensure that this vital commodity is preserved to the greatest extent possible.

When we introduce daylight saving, however, and when it does not get dark until 9.00 p.m., the people will not be permitted to turn on their sprinklers and, accordingly, they will be standing out in their gardens during the extra hours of daylight using up millions of gallons of water which we certainly cannot afford at the moment.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You mean they will be doing this instead of going to the drive-in theatres.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They might quite easily be doing this.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: They certainly could not go to the drive-in theatres while the sun is shining.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Those who attend the drive-in theatres at nine o'clock will take the opportunity while waiting for darkness to remain out in their gardens and use millions of gallons of water which is so vitally needed at the moment; they will use this water while watering their lawns and gardens by hand.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Good, clean outside recreation.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of course it is, and I am all for it, but only if we have sufficient water to make it unnecessary for us to conserve this commodity.

The General Manager of the Metropolitan Water Board and the Government are both appealing to us to conserve our water supplies, and yet the Government has introduced a measure which will be diametrically opposed to this concept, because it will induce people to stay out and water their gardens by hand instead of remaining inside their homes as they normally would.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: This will all be fixed when dehydrated water comes on the market next week!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I think I have made it perfectly clear that I do not believe that daylight saving will be of advantage to anybody. I am sure I have successfully convinced you, Sir, that its introduction will adversely affect everybody.

I have deliberately not mentioned the farmers and how daylight saving will affect them, because their case will be adequately covered by the members who represent the farming areas. I hasten to add, however, that I do not discount the claims of the farmers in this matter but, as I have said, the members who represent them are far more competent than I in this field and they will, no doubt, press any claims the farmers may have.

One other point which I did perhaps forget to mention is the extra leisure time that will be made available to the people. The State is already crying out for sporting facilities because not sufficient money is being allocated to sport at the moment. I will admit that the amount allocated at present is more than it has been in the past, but it is still far short of the needs of the community.

Accordingly, if we provide this extra leisure time and we are unable to provide the facilities to assist the people to expend their energies in a profitable manner, it could possibly mean that with time on their hands the people concerned could get into more trouble, as many of our youth unfortunately do at the moment.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The extra time will enable them to spend more time with their families.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: With the provisions of the new Licensing Act which provide for extended hours of trading, together with the entertainment that is provided at hotels, it could well be that many young people, while waiting for the pictures to commence, will spend their leisure hours at the hotels and, finally, they will not go to the pictures at all. The longer they stay at the hotels the longer they will want to stay.

Surely it is not our purpose to encourage young people to spend their leisure time in a manner such as this. I am quite sure the House will do with this Bill what it did with the previous legislation that was introduced; that it will indicate to the Government that, unlike Robert Bruce, it will not succeed in its attempt to have this legislation passed.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What percentage of people attend drive-ins to watch the pictures?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is not at all relevant. The point is that the drive-ins survive on the amount of money they receive from the people who attend. It does not matter in the least if while attending the people stand on their heads or decide to go to sleep—I cannot imagine what else they are likely to do. This is not likely to have any effect on the industry at all. I oppose the Bill.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [5.25 p.m.]: I have no doubt it will be recalled that the last occasion on which a similar proposal was before the House I supported the measure. One of the reasons I gave for doing so at the time was the fact that as a result of the circumstances that existed then the period of daylight saving was to be confined to 12 weeks, if my memory serves me right; and I said that during the greater part of that time the school children would be on holidays. I also said that my greatest sympathies were for the children and the mothers, particularly those in the country areas, where it is necessary for them to travel long distances by bus.

I think I would be right in saying that on the previous occasion, a year or so ago, a great deal of what was said was the result of pure guesswork. I say it was guesswork for the reason that at that time there was no other way to assess the situation. We did not have much real evidence either way.

Today, however, things have changed quite considerably and there has been a great deal of evidence put forward in connection with this matter.

I am aware of the fact that there are a great many people in my electorate, and perhaps there are also quite a number elsewhere, who are waiting with bated breath to see what I propose to do on this occasion. Accordingly I had better not

leave them long in doubt. As I have said, previously it was not possible for the public to give mature consideration to the likely effects of daylight saving, and I would have expected on this occasion that convincing reasons would have been put forward in support of the Bill, by the Minister who introduced the measure.

I have conned the speech made by the Minister and I find that he said—

Western Australia did not have daylight saving and contrary to the arguments of some members of this House and in another place this caused many hardships to quite a large number of people.

This is all that we were told; we were given no indication of the hardships that were caused. We were given no information whatever. No figures were produced to prove the point made by the Minister—at least none that I have been able to find. By way of argument the Minister further said—

As the result of the evidence submitted I think that the committee did the only thing possible when it agreed by a majority decision to the submission of Dr. Davidson which claimed—

- (1) that daylight saving in Western Australia would have no adverse effect on the skin;

That is really a mighty deduction. To continue—

- (2) that daylight saving will not affect the eyes and in so far as people are likely to have an extra hour of natural light instead of an hour of artificial light it could be considered an advantage;
- (3) to the extent that people use the extra hour of daylight in outdoor activities, it could be beneficial to their health because exercise as a prevention of coronary heart disease is well known.

These may be considered to be profound statements, but as reasons for the introduction of daylight saving they leave me cold; indeed they leave me as cold as the argument put forward by Mr. Logan when he referred to elderly people having to play bowls in the heat. This means nothing at all, because such people could start their game an hour later if they desired.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Do you not play bowls?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I have played bowls in the past and, possibly, when I am old enough I will do so again. Another statement made by the Minister would be most impressive, only if it were backed up by fact.

The Minister said—

I would not be telling the truth if I said that business dealings with the Eastern States were not possible during the times when the Eastern States were on daylight saving and we were not, but it would be equally false for opponents of daylight saving to say that the increase in the time differential did not cause considerable inconvenience, that efficiency was not impaired, and there were no financial losses.

Those are merely opinions or statements. I have searched the Minister's speech and I have found not one tittle of factual evidence to back up the statements; not one jot. Having had 12 months to consider this matter, one could surely be excused for expecting the Government to put forward a factual case; but nothing of the sort has even been attempted.

Let me say that the Minister who introduced this Bill stated last week, by interjection, that he has the facts that will convince us. He said that; but what is the good of that to me now?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He is going to give them to us when he replies.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: That is no good. For what reason are adjournments of debates requested and granted in this House or any other House of Parliament? The reason is that members may have the opportunity to check for themselves the case that has been put forward. I have been here far too long to accept, as factual, information given at the last minute before I cast a vote, without my being given the chance to check it. No, I will not be caught that way.

I am not doubting the word of the Minister but I am doubting the wisdom of the Minister in coming up with evidence when he is replying, thus closing the second reading debate. That is too late for his evidence, as far as I am concerned.

Because I cannot find any factual case put forward by the Government, I feel I cannot support the Bill on this occasion. I still believe that on the last occasion when a similar Bill was before us it would have been better had it been agreed to, for the reasons I have already given and for an additional reason. Although members say we have had a trial period, it has been a negative trial. Had we agreed to the previous Bill we would have had a positive trial and I think that would have meant a great deal more.

I recall my final words when I spoke to the Daylight Saving Bill last year. They were—

I believe that having experienced daylight saving for that period the people of this State will not continue with it.

The period referred to was 12 weeks. I believe that because I am old enough to have had two experiences of daylight saving on previous occasions; they are well within my memory. At that time, one year was enough in anybody's language. For that reason I think it would have been better had daylight saving been introduced last year and had the trial been a positive one. However, that was not the case.

For 12 months, or thereabouts, the Government has had the chance to prepare a factual case. Unless I have some facts before me, I am not prepared to go against the people of my own province. As a result of a statement in the Press last week that I had yet to speak, my telephone has been running hot with calls from people trying to tell me what they think about the situation, but I have always been, and I still am, prepared at any time to buck my electorate if it can be shown to me that a course of action will be to the benefit of the State of Western Australia as a whole. I think most other members would do likewise if they were presented with factual proof that a course of action would be beneficial to the State as a whole. No such proof has been given to me, so I cannot be expected to support the legislation on this occasion.

To take the matter a little further, I will quote another statement made by the Minister which indicates the sort of case that has been presented. The Minister said—

The committee of inquiry sought evidence on this question and probably the most illuminating statistics that were forthcoming were those submitted by the Chamber of Manufactures which sought an opinion from its members.

What is the good of an opinion from the members of the Chamber of Manufactures? This is the very thing to which I am objecting. What is the good of seeking an opinion? We want some factual evidence. This is the only sort of case I can find the Minister has put forward in regard to this legislation.

I think I have not left anyone in any doubt as to where I stand on this occasion. Much has been said in this Chamber and I will not repeat it. I will leave my remarks at that. Unfortunately for the Government, if it wants my support for legislation in the future it will need to put up a better case than this.

In fact, the way this Bill has been introduced and handled by the Government, I am left in serious doubt whether the Government really wants daylight saving. I am of the opinion that this is another kite being flown by the Premier for another measure to be thrown out by the Legislative Council. We all know a campaign is being conducted against this

Chamber. I have serious doubts whether the Government really wants this legislation; otherwise it would surely have put up a better case for it.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan) [5.37 p.m.]: I intend to support the Bill.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: I thought you would.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I think the honourable member might have gathered that, Mr. President. I have listened very intently to the debate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You would get whacko if you did not.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: By way of interjection, the Leader of the Opposition said he had not heard much from the Labor Party. If I were to get up and simply say, "I support the Bill," and sit down, I would have made as much contribution to this debate as has any other speaker who has already spoken.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You made a greater contribution by interjecting.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes. At least I got into *Hansard*.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are you referring to those who spoke against the Bill?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am referring only to those who spoke against the Bill. I do not cast Mr. Withers in the other camp.

I think we should look at the history of daylight saving in order to arrive at a reasonable conclusion. When I was talking to a member the other night, I was amazed to learn he did not know the history of daylight saving in Tasmania. Daylight saving was introduced into Tasmania simply because that State was short of power. The Tasmanian system of power generation is a hydroelectric system. Tasmania experienced a shortage of water and daylight saving was introduced simply to extend the hours of daylight and thus conserve electricity. It conserved electricity and the people became hooked on daylight saving. Once it was introduced they wanted to keep it.

At a later stage, other States of the Commonwealth saw some benefit resulting from daylight saving in Tasmania, and five of the other States decided to introduce it for a trial period. I agree with Mr. Willmott that we missed our opportunity last year. Western Australia was the only State in the Commonwealth that was not big enough to give the population at large a chance to decide whether or not it wanted daylight saving.

I have a fairly open mind. Perhaps after one trial period our decision would have been the same as that of Queensland. I think this State averages eight hours of sunshine a day and Queensland has a little less than that.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: It is 10.5 hours here.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: If the honourable member refers to the *Year Book* he will find it is about eight hours.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: It is 10.5 hours.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: We have gone up by 2.5 hours. That amounts to a great many hours of daylight in a year.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: I did not organise it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It is better than ever. I will now enumerate the facts that are before us. In four of the States which gave the people at large the democratic opportunity to decide whether or not they wanted to retain daylight saving, daylight saving is to be instituted as a permanent measure. This State is still dragging the chain.

Along with Mr. Clive Griffiths, I ask: For how much longer are we going to debate daylight saving here? Is it going to be a hardy annual? Regardless of the fact that a Labor Government is in office, the people in the community keep pushing us to put this proposition forward.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Why do they not do it sensibly, with facts?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: There was only one way in which we could ascertain the facts. Every member who has spoken to this Bill today—perhaps with the exception of Mr. Willmott—has argued from supposition. It has been supposed that this or that would happen. The only way in which we could have ascertained the facts—and this also applies to the committee—would have been to have a 12 weeks trial period.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The Government could have obtained facts such as those obtained from the Forests Department for Mr. Ferry.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: They are only some of the facts. If we had had daylight saving for a trial period, we would not now have this hiatus.

As unsubstantiated statements are the order of the day, I refer members to the *Daily News* of the 14th September, 1972, in which the following appeared:—

Six out of 10 West Australians want daylight saving for at least four months a year, according to a Gallup poll.

Eight out of 10 people in NSW, Victoria, SA and Tasmania want daylight saving from November to February.

Extensions to the six months October-March might be approved in NSW, Victoria and Tasmania.

I will not read the whole article because all members have read it. We know Queensland has rejected daylight saving. We also know that a group of people on the south coast of Queensland intends to adopt daylight saving. The brokers in that State intend to adopt daylight saving; so in Queensland there will be a mix-up.

Let me go over some of the statements that have been made. They are worth looking at. I could not understand why Mr. Logan spoke about bowlers. I fail to see their relevance to daylight saving.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Mention was made of coronary diseases.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I see many women bowlers going out at 9.00 and 10.00 o'clock in the morning to start bowling at the present time.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Try to stop them bowling!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It is a matter of their personal decision whether or not they bowl in the heat of the day.

We have all our facts tangled. On the one hand we have the situation with the time lapse between Western Australia and the Eastern States.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you put the clock back you relieve them of their personal decision.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have not said that. I have said before that we should not jump to conclusions. This matter does not involve only the time lapse. It involves stock brokers and the people in the short-term money market.

I think it was unfair of Mr. Heitman to say, "Don't worry about the young people or the few who have to get up earlier." I can assure this House that daylight saving affects quite a few people in the transport industry—shipping, rail transport, and air transport—and no doubt the extra costs that will accrue in that industry, particularly in the container trade as it pertains to shipping, will in due course be passed on to the general public.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What has that to do with daylight saving?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: About as much as the few clerks starting earlier in the morning, about whom the honourable member said we should not worry.

On going through all the speeches that have been made in this debate, it seems to me we have all been groping in the dark simply because we did not give the people of Western Australia the democratic right to decide this issue for themselves. We are now deciding the matter in this Chamber simply on the basis of the areas we represent.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you force daylight saving onto the people, how on earth are you giving them a democratic right to choose it?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The people will tell us quick and lively what they think about it after a trial period.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They have already done that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have no doubt they have. I know the Leader of the Opposition received correspondence from the drive-in theatre operators, and I have no doubt those people have a problem; but from the beginning of time one man's laughter has been another man's tears and that will continue to the end of time. I have received correspondence from the drive-in theatre operators and also from the Potato Growers Association; however, those are the only two organisations which have written to me.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What about the members of the Trades and Labor Council and its difficulties?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It has not done me the honour of writing me a letter.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They didn't write to me, either.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The only reason I know it is opposed to daylight saving is that I had an opportunity to read the report.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is where I got it from.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Well, at least we are at one on that matter. Whilst I do not challenge the report, I would say that I have also had the opportunity to speak to others and they—a good cross-section of people in the community—were not prepared to commit themselves until they had experienced daylight saving.

I think we have all become very emotional about the matter. I do not know where we will end up. We have heard remarks about school children. If my reckoning is right, during the period in which daylight saving is suggested school children would attend school for between 38 to 45 days only—depending on whether they attend State schools or private schools—after making allowance for school holidays and public holidays.

Much play has been made of the fact that people will be required to rise an hour earlier and knock off an hour earlier; but no matter in which direction we move the clock we will still have a 24-hour day. The subject at issue is how much daylight saving we will have in that 24 hours.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As a matter of fact, I do not think that is the subject at issue. We have the same amount of daylight, no matter how we move the clock.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That depends upon when one rises in the morning. One of the factors which has been overlooked in the question of daylight saving is the changes which have occurred in the living habits of the Australian people. This is not to be passed over lightly. I have listened to members speak of people in farming communities, and I have sympathy for them and for those in the drive-in theatre industry. I suppose had we had a Gallup poll on daylight saving some years ago we would have received the thumbs down signal; but today large numbers of our population are living in apartment-like dwellings, and this has affected the issue. Some people will never be able to escape from that situation. The extra hour of leisure which daylight saving would afford those people would be of great benefit to them. I would not be surprised if that is what Dr. Davidson was referring to.

Those of us who live in homes with lawns and gardens close to the sea or the river do not experience the problems experienced by those who live in apartment-like dwellings. Many thousands of our people live in these hell-holes—not by choice—which normally record higher sun temperatures than those recorded in more settled and older areas. It would be reasonable to expect that we would be able to do something about the rising delinquency rate in the areas to which I have referred.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are upsetting me a little because when I am in Perth I live in one of those hell holes.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr. MacKinnon lives there by choice and not because he must.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That does not make it a hell hole.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: All right, but he still lives there by choice. All people have their dreams, and many dream of homes they have seen in women's magazines, on television, and so on. Anything at all which will enable them to escape from their environment would be of benefit to them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are wriggling around now because you know you should not have called them hell holes.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is the statement I made. I have had the opportunity—and sometimes a very sad opportunity—to go into some of these areas and I could not better describe them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They are not all hell holes.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would not say that of all of them, but I would say a number are.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That statement is different from the one you made moment ago.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The people who live in such places do not do so of their own volition.

I do not intend to weary the House on this subject. I think we have already gone over almost every aspect of it, including school children, bowlers, drive-in theatre operators—who perhaps have a real problem—and how long children will attend school. We have also considered people in "C"-class hospitals and how we are to disregard those who may work some extra hours. We have also had talk of industries which may have to pass on extra charges because of changes in navigational times, and of other industries and people in the short-term money market who may be disadvantaged—and I have no evidence to the contrary.

We have heard of people earnestly looking forward to a little more leisure time in which to be relieved from their daily drudgery. We are now arriving at the stage of our development where people in many jobs receive no job satisfaction and live humdrum lives. In fact, from the moment they start work they are only waiting for the knock-off whistle to blow.

I reject the proposition that people will go to the nearest hotel or club because they will knock off an hour earlier. I do not think the number of people who will do that will be any greater than those who do so now.

I wind up on this note: I am distressed and sorry that this Chamber—a Chamber of review—has not heeded the warning of the whole world. Many publications now are saying that throughout the world more and more decisions are being made outside Parliament, with one exception—and that exception is the United States. I fully endorse the propositions I have read in that regard. We have a terrific opportunity to allow the population of Western Australia—and also of every other State of Australia—to decide the issue. We should have done that last year, but we denied the public the opportunity. I support the Bill.

THE HON. T. O. PERRY (Lower Central) [5.53 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the Bill because I represent a rural province and the matter before us is of importance to the rural community. I do not know whether many members realise that in my province children board the bus for school shortly after 7.00 a.m. at the moment, and if the clock is advanced one hour those children will be required to board the school bus shortly after 8.00 a.m. That may not matter much in the case of nine and 10-year-old children, but it matters in the case of the children who start school in the year they turn six years of age. At the beginning of the 1973

school year children of approximately 5½ years of age will be boarding school buses at just after 6.00 a.m. if daylight saving is adopted.

In his introductory remarks the Chief Secretary claimed that daylight saving could be of benefit to the health of the community as a whole; but think of the effect it will have on the health of very young children. We should also think about the health of the parents who will worry about their children travelling 30 or 40 miles to school after boarding the school bus just after 6.00 a.m. and returning in the heat of the afternoon. Those children travel over hot and dusty gravel roads and will be worn out by the time they reach home.

The Chief Secretary then went on to say that both opponents and supporters of daylight saving have been guilty of making extravagant claims in support of their cases. I do not think he meant that to apply to members of this House, because we do not make extravagant claims. However, I have a recipe for good health, and as the Chief Secretary is concerned about the health of the nation I thought he would like to hear it.

If the Chief Secretary rises tomorrow morning at the time I rise and comes with me for a jog around King's Park—which I do every morning—and when he returns has a couple of grapefruit for breakfast, as I do, his health will be much better. I have a couple of grapefruit which I will give to the attendant to pass to the Chief Secretary, and I hope he partakes of them for breakfast tomorrow.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about the rest of us?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: If the Chief Secretary follows my recipe then, without advancing the clock one hour, he will be fit enough to jump over the karri log in King's Park without any trouble.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Can we watch you jump over it one morning?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Like Mr. Clive Griffiths I am concerned about those people who cannot adjust themselves to daylight saving. I refer to school children, housewives, and shift workers who leave for work early in the morning. Such people rise early and if the clock is advanced an hour they will be required to rise an hour earlier and they will not be able to adjust themselves to do so.

If daylight saving is adopted I suppose all the people in the world of business and commerce will be required to commence work at half past seven. The farmer does that at all times. In my province one would not find a farmer in bed at 7.30 a.m. They must work by the sun and not by the clock when they are harvesting.

These are the people about whom I am concerned. They just cannot adjust themselves to daylight saving. The rest of the people who have expressed concern are in a position to adjust themselves to daylight saving. For those reasons I am opposed to the Bill.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [5.57 p.m.]: I do not intend to speak at length on the Bill. I feel we have already been through most of the arguments. However, I think it will not hurt to recall some of the views put forward 12 months ago when we discussed a similar measure.

I seem to remember hearing that the short-term money market would deteriorate if we did not adopt daylight saving; that it would be impossible to carry on business with the Eastern States; that telephone lines would be crowded; and that Albany would be finished as a wool selling centre. Of course, very little of that came to pass.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: None of it.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I think Mr. Clive Griffiths is probably right. Last year we in this State found that we can survive on our own without adjusting our times to those of the other States. In that respect I think probably we have given Queensland some heart because it has decided not to adopt daylight saving this year; it has decided to stand on its own. Perhaps Queensland decided on that course after seeing that Western Australia was not greatly affected by remaining out of line with the rest of Australia.

As you are well aware, Mr. President, my party proposed that an inquiry be conducted into daylight saving. In spite of the overwhelming evidence presented to the committee of inquiry against daylight saving, it still favoured the adoption of daylight saving. Perhaps I could comment on the selection of the members of the committee. To my mind it seemed to be overloaded with Government servants who, unfortunately, were already aware of the view of the Government. I was struck most of all by the fact that not a single woman was included on the committee, in spite of the fact that women would be most affected by daylight saving.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That goes to prove that women's lib is not having much success in this case.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: What worries me is the fact that the Labor Party is so proud that it has the only lady member in this Chamber, and that she is the only person who is capable of speaking for half the population.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member who interjected resume his correct seat.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It is fitting that the interjection came from that lady's seat.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I was going to take the lady's part.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Very little new evidence was presented in the report of the committee. I found—and I think other members also found—that the general public, apart from those who will be adversely affected, are not very interested at all in the matter of daylight saving. We find the President's Gallery full of those people.

Obviously the statement of the Chief Secretary that the drive-in theatre industry will not be greatly affected is incorrect. That industry has put up a very good case, and I do not think anyone will doubt that it would be greatly affected. As a resident of the country I appreciate very much what the drive-in theatres have done to provide entertainment for the people in the country. They have provided good family entertainment, whereas previously, to use an expression of that industry, we were not able to have "hard tops." I do not have to remind members that I represent a province, a large part of which is not served by television.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are lucky.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Our need for drive-in theatres is greater than that of most provinces.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you not getting television in all areas of your province?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: No, and the country people are not very satisfied with the arguments that have been put up for the introduction of daylight saving.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You can only speak for the country people living in the southern part of the State.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Perhaps the people in the north are not as isolated. Country people do not accept the argument that children can be sent to school an hour earlier each day, and that on only 36 days of the year will the children have to be sent to school that much earlier. This is only one argument, and there are many relevant to the conditions under which people in the country work. Their conditions are tied very greatly to the hours of daylight rather than to time on a clock face.

I wonder to what extent the Government really wants daylight saving. Here we are nearing the time when it is proposed to introduce this innovation, and we have people in the corridors approaching us and trying to carry out polls on the views of members, to forecast what

the vote will be on this measure. They are doing this to enable them to prepare their timetables; yet the Government contends that it is looking after the interests of business. We find the Daylight Saving Bill was placed on the bottom of the notice paper for a long time. I do not think the Government is very much concerned about this measure.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I should explain to you that items remain on the bottom of the notice paper until such time as I can arrange with the Leader of the Opposition to bring them forward. This is done to enable the members of the Opposition to have a reasonable chance to look at legislation, particularly reasonable legislation.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am not aware of that. I wonder how much of this legislation is new, compared with the measure introduced last year.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is the position.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: No doubt that is the position in respect of new legislation, but the Bill before us can hardly be placed in that category. I would like to take up the comment of Mr. Dans who referred to the overwhelming world evidence which favoured daylight saving.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I must protest. I did not say that at all.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Perhaps then it was the honourable member who was overwhelmed by it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not make such a statement. I said there were more decisions made outside of Parliament.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I hope the honourable member will enjoy reading in *Hansard* what he did say. The Government has had 12 months to collect evidence in respect of daylight saving. If such evidence is available then the Government has not taken very much trouble to educate the general public.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The public is educated. It is the Opposition in this House which is not educated!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member disregard the interjections and continue with his contribution?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am quite satisfied that insufficient evidence has been adduced to make us change our minds on this matter. I am sure we are all aware that Western Australia already has half an hour of daylight saving without this measure. I intend to oppose the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [7.31 p.m.]: In rising to speak to this Bill I am afraid I must say after listening to the debates which have taken place, that I am not enamoured of the measure at all. Not many people, individually, have consulted me about daylight saving. However, when I have been in Perth I have taken advantage of every opportunity, when speaking to people, to find out their reactions. Invariably, I received the same answer. If I happened to be speaking to a young unmarried girl or a single chap the answer was, invariably, that daylight saving would be advantageous, because more time would be available to do the things which they normally do during daylight hours. Among the people to whom I have spoken I have not found one who has been vitally concerned with the prospect of an extra hour of daylight.

During the war years I was stationed in Perth and I can remember the effect of daylight saving. I know that daylight saving affected people with young families. It might be said that the war years comprised a different set of circumstances from those which apply now. However, during the war years I can remember that people wished that daylight saving had never been introduced. Their main concern seemed to be that they could not get the children to go to bed early.

Another argument raised in those years was that people rose an hour earlier in the morning and, accordingly, they were not actually saving any daylight. They could not see why the hours should be changed at all.

Daylight saving was introduced during the war years in an effort to save electricity. As Mr. Dans has said, daylight saving was introduced in Tasmania for the same reason—because of the electric power situation. I was not able to find anyone in this State who was enamoured of daylight saving, and this applied particularly to those with young families.

A great number of people who live in the Lower North Province, as is the case with many of those who live in the agricultural areas, do not work by the clock. Many of them work by the sun, and in some places they do not work during the heat of the day. They knock off and return to work during the late afternoon.

When the subject of daylight saving is introduced people immediately think of what they would be able to do during the extra hour. I remember the effects of daylight saving when it was introduced into Western Australia during the war years. As Mr. Clive Griffiths has pointed out, hospital employees are bound to union rules. This could mean the evening meal would be served between 3.30 p.m. and 4.30 p.m. during the day. The same thing would occur in a normal home where a family usually sits down to the evening

meal at 6.00 o'clock. With the introduction of daylight saving they would have their evening meal at 5.00 o'clock. The same situation would apply in hotels where meals are served at set hours. I do not think that eating at 5.00 o'clock in the evening would be conducive to the good health of anybody. People usually like to eat a little later.

With the introduction of daylight saving, people will equate the time to the actual time, as it existed before daylight saving. In the past I can remember people saying that although it was 6.00 o'clock, it was really 5.00 o'clock. From my experience people did not get their proper amount of rest. They got out of bed earlier in the mornings but they did not go to bed earlier at night time.

The children were the ones who were most affected. They usually became very niggly during the period of daylight saving, particularly during the hot summer months. Mothers with young children usually like to get the children to bed at a reasonable hour so that they can enjoy the evening period with their husbands.

Daylight saving will have a disastrous effect on drive-in theatres; it will have much the same effect as has the introduction of television. It is well known that when television was introduced many suburban theatres went out of business. The drive-in theatres and the city theatres were able to survive. However, daylight saving will affect city theatres because it will still be daylight when they open for business.

Part of Mr. Claughton's speech, which appears on page 3988 of *Hansard*, reads as follows:—

On the other hand, this week I spoke with two ladies with young families—a number of children in each family—who were most anxious that the legislation should pass this Chamber. They are looking forward to enjoying the benefits of daylight saving. Those ladies see daylight saving as an advantage to their families because the fathers will be home earlier and will be able to share in the family circle.

There are already plenty of daylight hours during which the children can spend time in the family circle. I do not think an extra hour of daylight will make very much difference; nor do I think we can use the argument that the father will get home an hour earlier.

I would also like to correct a statement made by Mr. Clive Griffiths. He mentioned that the Metropolitan Water Supply Department was down by 10,000,000 gallons last year. However, the figure is 10,000,000,000 gallons.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Did I not say that?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: The honourable member said 10,000,000 gallons. The figure is 10,000,000,000 gallons. No wonder the department is beginning to show a little concern, and I think that concern is valid.

When the Daylight Saving Bill was defeated last year I was prepared to take notice of any evidence brought forward by the committee of inquiry. I wanted to know whether people had been inconvenienced, or had suffered, because daylight saving was not introduced. However, many people told me that they had not suffered; but a number of them did say they would have liked to try it. I think that is a fair enough argument. Many of the people said we should not fiddle with the clock because Western Australia appears to have been served very well and there is thus no reason to change our time. If, and when, someone produces a case to sustain the argument in favour of daylight saving I will support it. However, in the present circumstances I cannot support the Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West) [7.42 p.m.]: I think, perhaps, the strangest feature of this debate is that a matter such as this which has no political association at all has become a political discussion. We have seen some divergence of opinion within the Liberal Party, but none whatsoever within the Labor Party. Yet, this is not a political question; it is a matter of geography and economics, and that is all.

If daylight saving were looked at from a political point of view—and I think the bulk of shift workers are supposed to be Labor voters—one would expect the A.L.P. to oppose daylight saving. It was my experience, when a similar Bill was last discussed—and according to the newspapers it was my vote which stopped the Bill; this was not the case at all—I received more phone calls from shift workers thanking me than I received from anybody else. So, if the measure were looked at purely as a political one, one would expect the Labour Party to be opposing it.

I think if one were to look at the matter from the point of view of good Government one would also expect the Labor Party to oppose it. As Mr. Berry said, apparently the Metropolitan Water Supply Department will be hard pressed this year to supply the required quantity of water. Without the slightest shadow of a doubt a longer period of leisure in the afternoons will mean a greater use of water.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How can the honourable member make a statement such as that without some proof?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Because, when the children arrive home earlier on a hot afternoon Mum will put the sprinklers on and more water will be used.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They can be put in a paddling pool an hour earlier.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Only Liberals can afford things like paddling pools! That is what members opposite have been telling me for years. The poor down-trodden slave workers cannot afford them.

THE PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr. George Bennetts, as you will remember, Mr. President, used to stand in this Chamber and tell us that he represented the slave workers.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: In the iron mines in Thrace!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is what Mr. Bennetts used to say, and he was a member of the A.L.P. He was an honest and worthy gentleman, whom I believed. We cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Let us return to the argument.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I did not start it. Members who are interjecting in a disorderly manner started it.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Before we use all the water we should wash our hair.

THE PRESIDENT: I suggest the honourable member does not appeal to me to rule in favour of disorderly interjections.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Thank you, Mr. President. A little while ago I said that this is a matter of geography. To prove this to Mr. Dans, we have only to point out that we never hear of requests for daylight saving in, say, Singapore. Such a request would be absurd, because of Singapore's geography.

We hear examples of the efficacy of daylight saving in Canada, but the geography of that country almost demands it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Does Hong Kong have summer time?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: My guess is that it does, but Mr. Dans could tell us about this. He was a member of the Seamen's Union and is widely travelled. He could have given us this information when he spoke. He knows that I am not as widely travelled as he.

Daylight saving suits Tasmania. It happens to suit the Kimberleys for a totally different reason and, consequently, Mr. Withers will vote for the measure. The reason is the Kimberleys are to the east and have a marked connection with Adelaide which has a time ahead of ours. Again it is a question of geography.

In a different way, Tasmania's desire for daylight saving is a matter of geography, and this criterion applies in most

countries. If Australia happened to be a long narrow country running north and south, the southern areas would have daylight saving but the northern areas near the tropics would not be interested. Again, if Australia happened to be a long narrow country running east to west we could possibly find ourselves with a four-hour time difference between the eastern and western seaboard. We would simply have to put up with it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: As in the United States.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes. It is a matter of geography and not a matter of political philosophy. If Canada were run by a Communist regime or by a right-wing Conservative regime—whichever one it might be—that country would desire and institute daylight saving, because it is a matter of economics and geography. A long hard winter, such as Canada experiences, imposes the necessity to devise a system which will give all the working time that is possible. The farmer in Canada needs all that working time and commerce comes into line with him.

It is also argued that the measure is being thrown out—if it is to be thrown out—on sectional interests. It has been claimed we are talking for the areas we represent. How else should we talk on a question such as this? The electorate which Mr. McNeill and I represent is predominantly rural.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Perhaps we have "no moral fortitude."

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Perhaps that will be said. In any event, I will not support daylight saving. If I were to represent a small urban area in which most of the people worked in shops or others wanted to go fishing in the afternoon, probably I would support the measure. Members may ask: How could any member have two different views on a matter such as this? I see nothing incongruous about this. It is not a question of morals or of political philosophy; it is a matter of economics and geography.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The honourable member and I must have attended different schools, because I think that economics and geography literally are people when one is talking in this sense. If there are no people, geography does not come into it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Let us not forget the people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The measure is only relevant to people. Cows do not know the meaning of "geography." Cows simply go munch-munch, in case the honourable member is not aware of this. In an area such as this, we are talking about people, because we are talking about the way geography and economics

affect the people and how people affect them. An interjection like that is nonsense and should not be uttered in a place such as this.

I am quite certain that if we were to transfer a member, who represents an urban area and who has indicated he will vote for daylight saving because it will suit the interests of the people in his area, into an electorate where every member of that electorate was milking cows and was adamantly opposed to daylight saving, the member in question would be a stark-raving fool—and, indeed a bad member of Parliament—if he neglected his constituents and voted against their wishes and needs on a matter such as this. It is not a matter of political philosophy.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I only spoke to one dairy farmer and he could not see the argument.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Perhaps he has a manager running his farm for him. I know of one man who has a nice home at Mandurah and a manager who is running his farm. That particular dairy farmer likes to go fishing. Daylight saving would suit him because his mate in the grocer's shop could knock off earlier and they could go off fishing together. We always go on a consensus of opinion and not on an individual's opinion. Mr. Claughton knows this very well. He also knows it is ludicrous to bring one dairy farmer into the argument. The fact is that cows, and other animals, work by solar time. Of course it can be adjusted and adapted to some extent. For example, in the case of poultry, many turn on lights and try to kid the poultry that it is daylight so that the fowls will lay eggs earlier. However, cows work by the sun.

We must have milk every day and the whole process of handling milk has to be geared to a commercial operation. It must be geared, also, to the time men start work, and be finished by the time they start demanding penalty rates and overtime.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What is the effect in Victoria which is a dairying State?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There is a totally different system in Victoria. With due respect, Mr. President, I do not know whether the honourable member wants me to start on a dissertation on dairying and the handling of dairy products in Victoria. Victoria is a smaller State; it is very wealthy; it has many processing plants which, individually, would handle more than the total production in Western Australia; the whole of the production of a particular area is much greater, as is the flow of milk.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The milk is processed practically in the area.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, the processing is handled in the area and the distribution points are close to such area.

As I have said, it is a totally different set-up. This emphasises my point that it is useless to say that Hong Kong and Canada have summer time, because we must look at the State itself—its geography, its economics, and its distances.

This is why we have the peculiarity of my colleague, Mr. Withers—

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Is the honourable member calling another honourable member peculiar?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am not saying Mr. Withers is peculiar; the peculiarity is that Mr. Withers is absolutely right in voting for daylight saving, because the Kimberleys are as far east as one can go in Western Australia. He is perfectly right, although the area he represents is nearer to the tropics and one would think that it would not want daylight saving. However, because of the distances to the east, it does want it. On the other hand, members like Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. McNeill, and I will vote against the Bill for perfectly correct reasons.

Most of the individual cases that have been brought forward here and there do not really hold water. It comes down, as I said, to a matter of geography. Consequently, I have every intention of voting against the Bill.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East—Chief Secretary) [7.55 p.m.]: I do not intend to be long in replying, because I think the sooner we take this measure to the vote the better. In any case, most members have indicated how they will vote.

I do appeal to members in the House to give daylight saving a trial period. Last year we had the experiment in reverse, because Western Australia did not adopt daylight saving.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You will have to speak louder.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The other States introduced daylight saving. It would be a good idea for Western Australia to adopt daylight saving this year and, by giving it a try, we can reach our own conclusions. Queensland adopted daylight saving last year but does not intend to do so this year for the simple reason that that State, also, wants to find out what the difference will be.

I promised to bring some evidence along of the financial effects in Western Australia as a result of our not adopting daylight saving last year. I have a letter from the Capel Court Corporation Limited.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Which company?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The Capel Court Corporation Limited. It reads—

Regarding the Daylight Saving Bill under debate in Parliament at present,

I would like to point out a few of the inconveniences experienced by the Official Short Term Money Market.

The Market is controlled by the Reserve Bank in Melbourne and all transactions have to be completed by 2.30 p.m. Eastern States Time, because of this the latest that money can be withdrawn is 11 a.m. W.A. Time.

When Daylight Saving was introduced last year, because of the time difference this had to be brought forward to 10 a.m. Since all Market transactions have to be done with Bank cheques, clients usually have to know their exact bank balances. Unfortunately, last year the banks opened and closed at their usual times, which meant that their customers received their balances at about 10.30 a.m., which meant that if they were short of funds, they were too late to call it from the Market.

This meant that clients, including the State Treasury had to carry extra funds in their accounts, to cover cheques which may or may not have been presented that day, and therefore did not earn any interest on these funds.

The Building Societies in particular were affected by this, as their funds are quite liquid and in fact most of them had to leave funds in the bank as by the time they received their balances the market was closed. The Rural and Industries Bank, was on one occasion left with over one million dollars un-invested over the weekend because the Market was closed before we opened here in Western Australia due to an excess of funds in the East.

The other effect was on interest rates, because of the one hour difference, our offices in the Eastern States balanced their books without worrying about how much money was available in Western Australia. This meant that rates offered here, were generally $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}\%$ lower than those offered in the Eastern States.

The Market in Perth is estimated to be around 100 million dollars on any one day, and $\frac{1}{4}\%$ on this amount of money represents a large loss to our clients.

The inconvenience to the Dealers themselves was minimal, as we simply came into work earlier, but after about three weeks we came in at our usual time as we found that our clients did not know their positions any earlier than before, because of the banks starting at their usual time.

Mention was made last year, by the Motion Picture Industry of having our own Money Market here in Western Australia, unfortunately for

the gentleman concerned, all the companies mentioned by him i.e. Alcoa Limited, Western Mining Corporation and B.H.P. all have their Head Offices in Melbourne, and all their finances are controlled from there.

I trust that this will help you in your efforts to Legislate for Daylight Saving as it will be of great benefit to the Business Houses, Mining and Manufacturing Companies who use the Short Term Money Market as a means of utilising their excess funds to the best advantage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What was the date of the letter?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The 6th October, 1972. My calculations are that for 125 days last year this firm lost \$170,000. I have a letter, which is dated the 17th October, from The Stock Exchange of Perth Limited. It is headed, "Daylight Saving" and reads as follows:—

I understand that the Hon. J. Heitman, M.L.C., recently indicated to the Council that The Stock Exchange of Perth Ltd. was opposed to the Government's intention to maintain a two hour time differential between Western Australia and New South Wales. Inasmuch that Mr. Heitman stated:—

"I have consulted the Stock Exchange on this matter and I have been told that, if daylight saving were not introduced, it would not affect them at all. Their employees would merely have to get up an hour earlier and those in the Eastern States would get up two hours earlier."

I wish to advise that neither the Committee nor the executives of the Stock Exchange have ever expressed these views to Mr. Heitman. The non-introduction of daylight saving certainly creates staff problems for the Stock Exchange but that is not the basis of the Exchange's objections to its non-introduction.

The Exchange's main objection is based on the fact that investors in Western Australia are disadvantaged compared with their opposite numbers in the Eastern States, because the market is most active at the commencement of trading each day and most information is released prior to the first trading session. Thus, investors in the Eastern States have time to consider and absorb information released whereas investors in Western Australia will not have this opportunity.

The Stock Exchange of Perth Limited strongly supports the proposition that Western Australian time should

not be more than two hours behind that of the time ruling in Melbourne and Sydney.

I endeavoured also to obtain some information from the Rural and Industries Bank.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think the Stock Exchange said it wanted daylight saving, but admitted it could overcome the situation by commencing its duties an hour earlier.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes, but the Stock Exchange found this did not work in practice.

The Hon. J. Heitman: The Stock Exchange should have put that in writing.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The next comments are from the Rural and Industries Bank.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is that a letter?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: No, this is information the bank has given to me. It reads—

During the 1971/72 Daylight Saving period in the Eastern States the additional time differential of one hour caused problems for the Rural & Industries Bank of W.A. The actual dollar loss cannot be calculated because of the imponderables involved in attempting to estimate how well the Bank could have invested its funds had the time lag remained at two hours. There are at least two significant indications that a loss was involved.

During the period of three hours time differential the Bank held funds which it was unable to invest on the Short Term Money Market because the Authorised Dealers had filled their books in the Eastern States. During the period of three hours time differential and since the return to the normal time differential the liquidity within the Australian economy has been rising yet since daylight saving in the Eastern States ended the Bank has not had one occasion on which it remained uninvested.

The Bank believes that over the period of daylight saving in the Eastern States they suffered a reduced return on their short term funds. This is supported by the statistics available over the previous twelve months when the Bank's rate of return was on average consistent with short term interest rates published by the Reserve Bank of Australia. However over the period of daylight saving the Bank's rate was consistently well below the published figure for the average Australian rate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Doesn't it strike you as a little strange that some firm—not the R. & I. Bank—is able to write you a

letter telling you of the bank's experience but the bank is unable to write to you confirming that point.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: No.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not strange?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: No.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is strange to me.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I feel that everything which can be said has been said. I therefore commend the Bill to the House.

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

Ayes—12

Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. J. L. Hunt	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. R. T. Leeson	Hon. R. Thompson

(Teller)

Noes—15

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. O. MacKinnon	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. L. D. Elliott	Hon. C. R. Abbey

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

BILLS (3): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Companies Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. I. G. Medcalf, read a first time.

2. Acts Amendment (Abolition of the Punishment of Death and Whipping) Bill.

3. Industrial Lands Development Authority Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the House), read a first time.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st September.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [8.11 p.m.]: When it comes to amendments to the Liquor Act, I realise that many varied views are held in our community as to how the sale of liquor

should be controlled. In fact, as many views are held in this Chamber as there are kinds of liquor with which one can amuse oneself, confuse oneself, or abuse oneself depending on the amount of liquor one is prepared to consume at any one time.

I realise that all members will not agree with my comments. Some will agree, some will disagree, and others will agree in part. However, I will comment on this measure as it appears to me and I will leave other members to state their own views.

I wish firstly to refer to the provisions contained in clause 3 which proposes to amend section 6 of the parent Act. Paragraph (a) of clause 3 provides that a licensed auctioneer may sell liquor at a bazaar or sale of gifts, etc., for charitable, educational, or religious purposes. I feel this provision is quite reasonable. Paragraph (b) defines the hours during which the occupier of a vineyard may sell liquor when it is not to be consumed on the premises, and in this context the occupier of the vineyard does not need a license.

The existing Act provides that liquor may be sold in these circumstances as long as it is sold within ordinary trading hours. This terminology was a little ambiguous, as it was not certain what constituted ordinary trading hours. Did it mean the ordinary trading hours of a hotel or those of a liquor store? The proposed amendment will clear this up. Liquor may be sold under these conditions from 8.30 a.m. until 8.30 p.m.—the same hours that are applicable to a person with a store license. This again is a reasonable provision, and clears up an ambiguity.

The measure also provides for the consumption and supply of free samples of liquor at a vineyard. This is fair enough if the samples are given away. I can see nothing wrong with this provision.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Neither can any of us.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: It may even persuade us to visit the vineyards. I now wish to deal with the amendment proposed to section 7 of the principal Act. In the first place, this amendment defines a dining room where liquor is served ancillary to a meal. I think the amendment will eliminate the absurd position that now exists—I am sure all members are well aware of it—where police officers sit around those places where liquor is supplied ancillary to a meal, with a view to catching someone who has broken the law. I have heard the police criticised for such action. In my opinion it is not right that the police should be left open to such criticism under the existing system, because we are responsible for framing the laws, and it is our duty to amend them if they are in any way deficient.

Therefore, as I have said, the amendment in clause 4 seeks to amend section 7 of the principal Act to allow the consumption of liquor, ancillary to a meal, one hour before the partaking of the meal, and, also, it shall be permissible for patrons to be served with liquor for the balance of the authorised trading hours set down in the license. I agree with this amendment.

In the same clause an amendment is sought to section 7 to fix the time of trading on Anzac Day when that day falls on a week day. Here I find that a peculiar situation exists, because in those cases where a hotel now closes at 10.00 p.m., the amendment seeks to alter the hours of trading so that the hotel will commence to serve liquor on Anzac Day at 12.30 p.m., but in the case of a hotel that closes at 11.00 p.m., the amendment seeks to provide that it shall start to trade at noon. I have placed an amendment in my name on the notice paper to provide that the hotel which now closes at 11.00 p.m. shall also, on Anzac Day, commence trading at 12.30 p.m. in the same way as the hotel which closes at 10.00 p.m.

I have been in touch with representatives of the Returned Services League concerning this amendment and they assure me that what I am seeking with my amendment is what they desire. Why the amendment in the Bill should seek to allow the hotel which closes at 11.00 p.m. to commence trading at noon, I cannot understand. However, I will say no more about this, because I am sure that further discussion will ensue on my amendment in Committee.

Clause 4 also seeks to fix the hours during which trading can be carried out when Anzac Day falls on a Sunday. This amendment seeks to provide that the normal trading hours after 12.30 on Sunday shall be the hours of trading during which liquor can be served on Anzac Day when that day falls on a Sunday. The same amendment also provides that the licensee is not authorised to sell liquor during those trading hours on any Christmas Day which falls on a Sunday except where he is expressly authorised to do so under this Act. I find no fault with those provisions.

I now wish to deal with the amendment that seeks to amend section 11 of the principal Act. This provides that a court shall impose further conditions or revoke existing conditions during the currency of a license. I think this is a reasonable amendment, because conditions could change quite considerably in a particular area during the term of a license, and therefore I think the court should have this power. If the amendment is agreed to the court can use this power to suppress such things as undue noise or other nuisances which are detrimental to the general public, and which did not exist at the time the license was originally granted. This is a reasonable provision.

The amendments set down in clause 7 rather interest me. These provide for a new vigneron's license. I ask myself how many vignerons will apply for such a license. I doubt whether they will number three or four. Possibly five may apply. I should imagine that the smaller vignerons will not be prepared to meet the liability of the facilities they would be required to provide if they applied for such a license. Such facilities would include the provision of toilets, and so on.

I think most vignerons would prefer to continue operating as they do now; that is, under a function permit. I will not oppose that amendment, because there is no reason why four or five people should not apply for such a license. I may be wrong in regard to the number and if I am, I stand to be corrected.

I now want to speak on the amendment which seeks to alter that section of the Act that provides for one-third of a gallon of beer to be purchased on a Sunday. The Bill proposes to alter the existing section to make it read, in effect, "one-third of a gallon of any liquor other than spirits shall be purchased on a Sunday." I cannot help asking myself: Why exclude spirits? I know that a case can be put forward perhaps in areas where there is a fairly large population of primitive Aborigines who may over-indulge if they can buy one-third of a gallon of whisky or some other spirit. However, this Parliament has considered the situation of Aborigines being permitted to consume liquor and it has decided there shall be no discrimination, so why should we discriminate with this provision?

I have not placed an amendment on the notice paper in my name with a view to altering the existing provision in the Bill, but some other members may consider this desirable. I cannot understand why spirits cannot be sold on a Sunday, even if it is only one-sixth of a gallon of spirits. Why should not a farmer, or some other person in a rural area situated a fair distance from a hotel, be able to purchase one-third of a gallon of any type of liquor during the session on a Sunday if he so desires? Why should he not be permitted to purchase one-third of a gallon of spirits to take home? I cannot see any sound reason for such a provision. However, I will not make any further comment at this stage. I will wait to see whether any other member comments on it.

I now wish to deal with the proposed amendment to section 28 of the Act which refers to canteen licenses. The amendment seeks to widen the scope of this license so that wives of men working in the locality are permitted to use the canteen facilities. I cannot see any objection to that amendment, because these canteen licenses are granted principally in remote areas, and the canteen is the only place where people can purchase liquor within

a reasonable distance. I cannot see why wives of men working in such places should not be granted the benefit of using such facilities. Therefore I do not raise any objection to the provision.

A further provision in the Bill seeks to provide for the supply of liquor, with or ancillary to entertainment provided by artists in those places conducted by holders of winehouse licenses. Once again I do not object to this amendment. Some members may, but I do not raise any objection to it.

The next provisions to which I wish to allude are to be found in clause 11 which deals with cabaret licenses. These amendments seek to alter the hours during which liquor can be sold under a cabaret license; that is from 9.00 p.m. to 3.30 a.m.; the hours set down in the Act at the moment. The amendment seeks to alter those hours to 10.00 p.m. to 3.30 a.m. I think there has been some misunderstanding among various people over this provision. As I understood the position earlier, many of these cabaret and night club licensees were prepared to forgo the hour of trading from 9.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. on condition that the hours of trading were extended from 3.30 a.m. to 4.30 a.m. As I understood the submission they made at the time, some, at any rate, claimed that their clients do not usually attend cabarets or night clubs until after the hotels close, and so the hour of trading from 9.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. was of little value to them. This is how I understood the case they presented at that time, and this was done so they could gain another hour at the conclusion of their existing trading hours. However, they were not successful in that move.

I have a letter before me which is addressed to The Hon. A. F. Griffith, and from its contents it would appear that the cabaret and night club licensees had a change of heart concerning the position. I will not read the letter to the House, but it would seem that some of them wish to start trading at 8.00 p.m. They want the trading hours to be amended so that they will be able to operate from 8.00 p.m. to 3.30 a.m. Others say they do not want to start until 9.00 p.m., and yet again there are others who do not want to start until 10.00 p.m.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The time was 8.00 p.m. originally when a Bill was introduced in May.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I am not interested in what was provided in May; I am only concerned with the Bill before the House and the amendments which are proposed to the Act at the moment. There does seem to be confusion among these people in regard to the hours of trading they desire. In this letter they say that they have lost a large volume of their trade to hotels. I suppose the

hoteliers could quite readily claim that they, in turn, have lost a great deal of their trade to cabaret and night club licensees.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: They have.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: For my part I feel a certain amount of sympathy for hoteliers, because they are obliged to provide facilities in excess of those provided by holders of other licenses under the Liquor Act. I do not think any real argument could be advanced against that fact. Again I will not make an issue of this amendment, but other members may think differently. As far as I am concerned I am prepared to leave the clause as it is in the Bill, or, alternatively, I would not object to the existing trading hours in the Act; that is, from 9.00 p.m. to 3.30 a.m. being left unaltered.

I would certainly raise quite a deal of objection to any extension after 3.30 a.m. because I think that is late enough. If we extended the hours to 4.30 a.m., it would not be long after that daylight would appear. That is too late for a person to be going home from these places. Anyone who has not had enough liquor by 3.30 a.m. should have had. That is my personal opinion.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It is mine, too. It is too early in the morning.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Sometimes when I have gone to bed even earlier than that I have, the following day, wished I had gone to bed earlier still.

I have serious doubts about other provisions in this clause. I have doubts about the occasional permits. An amendment on the notice paper deals with this. I am not sure whether it would be better to delete the provision altogether or try to limit the number of occasional permits which may be obtained. Here again I am sure that the granting of occasional permits *ad lib* must cut into hotel trading; and I repeat that hotels are obliged to provide to the public services in excess of those which must be provided by the holders of occasional permits. Consequently the hoteliers have a certain amount of my sympathy. As I have said, an amendment appears on the notice paper and I will therefore leave any further discussion on that point until the Committee stage.

Clause 12 contains for holders of a theatre license provisions similar to those for cabaret license holders. For the life of me I cannot see why theatre licensees should be allowed to obtain an occasional permit at all. After all, the theatre license was designed to enable those people attending a theatre to obtain a drink for one hour before the commencement of the entertainment, one hour at the conclusion of the entertainment, and at the

intermissions, and I cannot understand why it should be necessary for an occasional permit to be granted in respect of a theatre. Again an amendment has been placed on the notice paper to delete this provision, and I am prepared to support it without any reservations.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Have you asked the theatre people why it is desired?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: No. I expected someone here to tell me if he thinks he knows. I am always prepared to listen, but at this stage I intend to support the amendment. Actually I was instrumental in its drafting.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If the provision is in the Bill you would expect an explanation.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: That is so, and that is why I will leave any further remarks until the Committee stage.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Some of your party seem to have a close association—

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I am sorry but I cannot hear the honourable member. I have no doubt it was quite an intelligent interjection, but if I cannot hear it I cannot answer it. I repeat that I will leave further comment on that aspect until the Committee stage.

Clause 13 repeals and re-enacts section 33 of the principal Act. That section deals with packet licenses. I am quite in agreement with the provisions involving those licenses; one of which covers the supply of liquor on cruises when a vessel is engaged solely in carrying passengers having a common interest of a political, social, literary, sporting, or like nature. That, of course, does not allow the master of the vessel to advertise a cruise and take on board all and sundry and then supply them with liquor. The vessel must be chartered by a body with a common interest, and this is a reasonable provision. I would certainly not agree if the master of a vessel could advertise a cruise and then supply all and sundry with liquor. The provision in the Bill has my support.

The clause also provides that when overnight accommodation is provided on the vessel, the master may sell and supply liquor at any time to any passenger on board for consumption on board and I raise no objection to this provision either. I think the provisions concerning packet licenses are reasonable and I am prepared to support them.

The next provision I wish to mention deals with the Australian wine house licenses. Members will recall that under previous amendments these licenses were to cease to operate after the 31st December next. The Bill provides that this proposal shall be altered and the existing licenses will continue to operate. No further licenses of this type will be issued, but I understand some difficulty has been experienced in converting these businesses to

some other type of business. These places do not appeal to me and I feel rather reluctant to agree to the amendment, but I am even more reluctant to deprive a person of his means of livelihood and for this reason I am prepared to go along with the provision to allow the existing places to continue to operate at least for the time being. It would be hardly fair for this Parliament to deprive someone of his livelihood. If the businesses were easily convertible to some other type of business I would not agree to the amendment, but I understand some difficulty has been experienced in this regard.

I now wish to deal with the amendments proposed to section 43. They provide certain exemptions concerning the place from which the holders of function permits can purchase their liquor. One exception has been omitted. I notice that the Leader of the House has on the notice paper an amendment to rectify the situation and to include a person conducting a canteen at a livestock saleyard. When I realised that this provision had been omitted, I also realised how it came to be omitted. Although the Liquor Act was passed in 1970, amendments were made in that year and it is in those amendments that the provision concerning the operator of a canteen license at a livestock saleyard was included. I did not realise until I studied those amendments that such a canteen had been omitted on this occasion. However, as I have said, the Leader of the House intends to move an amendment to rectify the position and I am glad of that.

While on this clause I desire to mention some further amendments which were suggested to me by the Australian Hotels Association. I drafted certain amendments to cover the submission of the A.H.A., but I then realised that our Standing Order 257 would rule them out of order, because the Bill deals only with the place from which holders of a function permit can purchase their liquor. However, with your concurrence, Mr. Deputy President, I will mention them so that the Minister can study them and perhaps have them covered in some later Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Could you not include them in a new clause?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: No. I considered the possibility but then discarded it, because of our Standing Orders. I intend merely to mention them at this stage so that the Leader of the House can perhaps take some action later. I think that maybe the amendments as submitted by the A.H.A. are not correctly drafted, but my main object in mentioning them is to enable the Minister to consider the situation.

Section 43 (1) provides that the court may, on the application of an unlicensed person, body, or association of persons, issue to the applicant a function permit,

and so on. I do not believe that Parliament ever intended that that provision should allow any person to apply for a function permit, obtain it, and then sell liquor.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And make a profit.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes. I do not think this was ever intended. The amendment submitted in this instance does provide what is required. Perhaps later amendments do not. The suggestion is simply that after the word "person" we insert the words "on behalf of". The section would then provide that the court may, on the application of an unlicensed person, on behalf of a body, or association of persons, and so on. That would exclude an individual from applying.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sure that this provision was introduced at the time to be of benefit to organisations, sporting and otherwise, and not for the benefit of individuals.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I will agree with that, except for one thing. I do not consider that an individual should be able to purchase liquor and then sell it at a profit. However, I understand that some vigneron, as a means of advertising their products, operate under a function permit. Consequently I think an amendment drafted differently from the one I have submitted is required to prevent a person, but not a vigneron, from purchasing liquor and selling it at a profit.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you think a court would give a license to a single person?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: The court will operate as the Act dictates.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You want to look at the number of permits it has granted.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes; I was coming to that. In the last licensing year 6,751 function permits were issued, and that is an awful lot of permits. If we are to go along these lines without restrictions, we may as well cut out restrictions altogether and get to the stage where liquor can be sold off the shelf as is the case with tomato sauce at the moment. I think some restrictions should be retained.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I do not agree with your views on this.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I do not propose to be misled by interjections. I feel the honourable member is trying to confuse me. I am merely trying to explain the position to the Minister.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think you are talking to the person who knows least about the matter.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Certainly not through a lack of experience!

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I am talking about the retail side of it.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I give the Minister credit for being able to follow what I am trying to say. I am merely putting forward the point made by a few people who approached me, but perhaps I am not achieving what I would like to achieve. I do not think the next amendment proposed is necessary. I read the provision several times as it exists at the moment. I think the provisions being sought are already in the Act because section 43 (1) reads—

The Court may, on the application of an unlicensed person, body or association of persons, issue to the applicant a function permit authorising the applicant to sell and supply liquor, as provided by subsection (2) of this section, during such period or periods between the hours of nine in the morning, or any day other than Good Friday, and two in the morning of the following day, notwithstanding that the following day is Good Friday, and on such premises, as may be specified in the permit.

The A.H.A. asks that the words "during such period or periods" be deleted and substituted by the words "a reasonable period."

The association claims that this will allow the court to use its judgment as to whether the period is reasonable. I think the association has been misled because if we leave out the guff which appears concerning Good Friday we will find the provision already gives the court jurisdiction, because the court can— issue to the applicant a function permit authorising the applicant to sell and supply liquor as provided by subsection (2) of this section, during such period or periods, etc.

This can already be done as specified in the permit or permits. I think the words "specified in the permit" refer back to the words "period or periods". If we read that in conjunction with the provisions contained in section 11 of the Act we will see that this is so. Section 11(a)(iii) says the court has exclusive jurisdiction throughout the State to hear and determine all applications under this Act for—

the issue, renewal or revocation of permits;

Paragraph (b) of that section gives the court jurisdiction to—

impose and vary or revoke conditions under which licences are granted or renewed and permits are issued or renewed;

That read in conjunction with what I have endeavoured to explain gives the court discretion to define "reasonable period or periods". This is already contained in the Act. Accordingly, I think

the association's request for this amendment is really not necessary. I do ask the Minister, however, to have a look at what I have said so that he may be able to explain the position.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: This matter has not been raised before. It has just come to you, has it not?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: It has come to me since the introduction of the Bill.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I will certainly have it looked at.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I do not know whether this has been considered in another place.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I do not think it has, but I thought it was a point I should clear up.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: The next matter I wish to mention refers to a function permit and the proposal to place a limit on it. The Hotels Association asks that after the word "permit", which is the last word in subsection (1) of section 43, be added the words "except to the organising body of race meetings no more than six function permits may be issued to the same body or club in any one licensing year."

The aim is to place a limit on this. When I came to have a look at it I found that it would have to read differently because of the provision in regard to the operator of a canteen at a livestock saleyard. Accordingly, I ask the Minister to let us know what is intended and what would be the best way to overcome the difficulty. I am convinced that the proposals put forward by the Hotels Association are different from what the association intended should be the case. But I have put the matter forward so that the Government may have an opportunity to consider the position and see whether it is necessary for something to be done.

I considered placing certain amendments on the notice paper but I realise that our Standing Orders rule them out, anyway, so I do not propose to proceed with them.

The next provision to which I wish to allude is contained in clause 23 of the Bill. This provides a right of objection to the granting of a cabaret or a restaurant license to holders of similar licenses in the affected area. It also provides that residents in the affected area may also raise objection provided they are not holders of some other type of license in that area.

Provision is also made to extend this right of objection to the holders of provisional licenses for a cabaret or a restaurant. I am quite in agreement with this. I think it is reasonable that a right of objection should be provided and I find no fault with the provision.

I would now like to refer to a provision contained in clause 26 of the Bill which seeks to add a new section 123A as follows:—

123A. The holder of a restaurant license shall cause to be exhibited at each table provided for the use of customers in the licensed premises a printed list showing the charges made for meals and for the various types of liquor supplied therein.

I am in complete and thorough agreement with this provision. I feel sure that if such a provision were not included in the Bill there would be any number of operators who would be ready to pick the pocket of the public while they are dining at a restaurant. The customers would not know what they were up for and I am sure that advantage would be taken of this fact.

I have been caught like this myself while visiting other countries where no price lists were provided. When I came to pay the bill I realised that my stomach could not possibly have coped with the amount of food for which I was being charged.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Your stomach or your pocket?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I felt my stomach could not possibly cope with that amount of food for which I was being charged; because it was just not large enough. I think the public should know what it is up for when paying for food and drinks. If the list were to merely state the cost of the meal it would not mean a thing; it should also include the price of drinks.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: You are talking about a restaurant?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: About a restaurant only?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes, I said that.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: I did not hear you.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I am referring only to the holder of a restaurant license. The entire section deals with a restaurant license.

The next provision to which I wish to refer is contained in clause 26 of the Bill. At this point I would like to read the Minister's remarks while introducing the Bill. In his opening remarks the Minister said—

Clause 27 sets out grounds of defence to a complaint of selling or supplying liquor contrary to the conditions of a license which allows the supply and consumption of liquor with meals. These amendments, we trust, will clarify the position of licensees and patrons.

The Minister, however, made no mention at all to proposed new subsection (2b) contained in clause 27 which reads—

(2b) It is a defence to a complaint of an offence against paragraph (f) of subsection (1) of this section relating to the conduct of a lottery on premises licensed under section 35, to show that the lottery was one for which a permit had been granted by the Lotteries Commission pursuant to the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1954.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Are you on clause 27 of the Bill?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I was referring to proposed new subsection (2b) which is contained on page 16 of the Bill. The Minister made mention of this in his speech, but he only referred to the former part which deals with the supply of liquor ancillary to a meal.

Why should this provision apply only to a club license? Section 35 of the principal Act deals only with club licenses. It seems to me to be peculiar that this provision should apply only to a club. If it is good enough for this defence to apply to a club, why should it not apply to hotels in many cases? Many country hotels perform almost the same function in the community as do clubs. In fact, I will quote one country hotel. I am sure Mr. Ferry will agree with me that the Denmark Hotel is literally a community centre. Anyone who has stayed at that hotel overnight would have realised it is the community centre of Denmark.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It is very centrally located.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: If it is fair enough for this to be a defence to a complaint in the case of a club, I do not see why it should not also apply to country hotels, which sell tickets in lotteries for charitable organisations, sporting bodies, and so on.

When I read this provision originally, I thought perhaps it had something to do with the playing of bingo on club premises.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It could well be.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: No. I checked this with the liquor and gaming branch of the Police Department and I found that is not the case. This provision would not permit the playing of bingo at licensed clubs because bingo is classed as gaming, not as a lottery, and as such amendments to the Gaming Act, the Criminal Code, and so on would be necessary to enable bingo to be played at licensed clubs. Therefore, if it were intended that this provision should apply to the playing of bingo on licensed premises, it will not work. I went to considerable trouble to check on that.

On the notice paper there is an amendment for the deletion of the proposed new subsection (2b). At this stage I am prepared to listen to what is said about that amendment but I cannot see why the provision should apply only to a club. There may be reasons for it of which I am not aware. I will leave further comments until the Committee stage. No doubt the provisions will come in for some criticism then.

There also appears on the notice paper an amendment to clause 28 of the Bill. Clause 28 provides that any holder of an unlicensed club permit or the servant or agent of the holder shall not supply liquor or cause liquor to be supplied to a person who is intoxicated or likely to become so. The proposed amendment seeks to add after the word "permit" in line 2 the words "or a function permit" because it is felt that the holder of a function permit should be just as responsible as anybody else to the general public in regard to supplying liquor to a person who is intoxicated. If the holder of an unlicensed club permit should not do that, neither should the holder of a function permit. Why should the holder of a function permit be able to supply liquor to a fellow who is already well and truly intoxicated?

The adding of those words makes the holder of a function permit responsible in the same way as anybody else is responsible. In my opinion, he should not be allowed to supply unlimited quantities of liquor to a person who is already intoxicated. Again, that matter can be discussed further in the Committee stage when the amendment is dealt with.

Clause 29 deals with the provisions in regard to juveniles. I think the provisions proposed in the Bill are reasonable. We all agreed it was desirable to do away with the old objectionable system of leaving children running about on the streets or locked in motorcars. For that reason, we made it permissible for juveniles to enter hotels provided they were accompanied by somebody who was responsible for them.

Experience has shown that provision did not work well. It has proved to be quite wrong to allow juveniles into public bars. It is now proposed that juveniles should be restricted to those parts or that part of licensed premises where the juvenile may remain while reasonable refreshment is consumed, provided the juvenile is accompanied by a person in authority over him.

The Bill proposes that hotel licensees shall apply to the court for approval to set aside areas which juveniles may enter provided they are under the control of someone who has authority over them. I am rather puzzled as to how this provision will be applied in law.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I, also.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I think the Minister said in his speech that this will enable various parts of the Bill to be proclaimed at different times. I cannot see how this provision can be applied. Hotels cannot make application to the court until this part of the Bill has been proclaimed. The court will have to consider the applications and approve or reject them. What will be the situation when hotel A's application has been dealt with and approved while hotel B has made application but the court has not had time to deal with it? How will the law be applied in this situation?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The existing conditions will be approved until such time as they are reviewed.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: It is not at all clear to me. Mr. Claughton seems to know more about it than the Minister does. I would like some clarification on this point. The Bill must be proclaimed before applications can be made and dealt with. A considerable time will elapse before all the applications are approved. Some hotels will receive approval before others. Will those that have not received approval be restricted?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: There is also the question of areas. Will it be a common area or a variety of areas from hotel to hotel?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: It will be in the hands of the court. Application will be made to the court and the court will consider the application. Applications cannot be submitted before the Bill is proclaimed. It will be a long time before the law with regard to the entry of juveniles can be enforced.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: If there is not a common area it will be hard on John Citizen. If there is a variety of areas in different hotels, one could unwittingly do the wrong thing.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Applications must be made to the court, following which they must be processed and approved or otherwise. Hotel A will have approval, while hotel B's application has not been dealt with. Hotel A will be operating within the law. Will hotel B be operating outside the law if juveniles are admitted to all parts of the premises before approval is received? Does the Leader of the House see the point?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I see that point, but I am concerned about consistency in the areas.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Under these provisions, that matter rests entirely with the court. I think the court can be relied on to do the right thing. It has seen the disaster that has occurred under the law as it stands at the moment, when juveniles may go to any part of an hotel.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think you have said enough to enable me to get a reply.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Those are the only provisions with which I want to deal at this stage. The Bill also proposes to repeal section 130 of the Act, which is now redundant. That section deals with the supply of liquor to Aborigines. Parliament has decided there shall not be any restriction on the supply of liquor to Aborigines. It is therefore reasonable that section 130 should be repealed, because it no longer applies.

I will leave further remarks until the Committee stage. I have outlined my views on this Bill.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [9.13 p.m.]: This measure is what I would call a Committee Bill because I believe most of the debate will centre around each clause as it is dealt with in the Committee stage.

Firstly, I would like to congratulate Mr. Willmott on his coverage of the Bill and the review he made of the Liquor Act as he saw it. He made a worth-while contribution and I think we can all gain something from what he said. Members will realise he spent a great deal of time in research prior to speaking to the Bill.

In giving my formal support to the second reading of the Bill, I will content myself by commenting on two clauses of it. I would like to draw attention to clause 11. Mr. Willmott also drew attention to this point. I refer to page 7, the first word on which is "ten." In my view, that word should be "nine." I have not placed an amendment on the notice paper but I wish to make known to the Government that there is the possibility of my doing so.

I believe the existing hours in respect of cabaret licenses—from 9.00 in the evening until 3.30 in the morning of the following day—are quite reasonable. I really cannot see any merit in altering the hour of opening to 10.00 in the evening; nor can I see merit in extending the terminating hour beyond the present limit of 3.30 a.m. However, I raise that point in passing so that perhaps we may receive an expression of opinion from the Leader of the House when he replies to the debate. Possibly further comment may be made in the Committee stage.

I now wish to refer to section 111 of the Act, which deals with the rationalisation of licenses. I realise that this is an age-old problem in respect of licenses, whether in the country or in the metropolitan area. I believe the problem will continue for a long time.

Here again, I would request an expression from the Government in regard to the point I raise. I am aware—as I am sure are other members—that in a

number of country localities the situation may well be better served by reducing the number of licenses which operate in those areas. In some towns I can readily recall there are three and possibly four hotels operating in localities where the population for various reasons is declining. The hotels are endeavouring to carry on in a viable manner, but their overall takings appear to be decreasing.

Quite obviously the licensee of any hotel which should be closed has difficulty in closing his hotel and moving elsewhere, even though he may wish to do so, because he stands to lose a considerable sum of money. I believe the time has come for a further serious look to be taken at this problem to try to remedy it. I say "a further serious look" because I believe I am correct in saying that the matter has been looked at for many years. I believe many years ago the Act included a provision to assist hoteliers to vacate their premises and move to another area in view of changed circumstances. I think the point is equally pertinent today as it was then, and will continue to be so until it is tackled in a forthright and sensible manner. I propose that we should provide a compensation fund to allow such licensees to go off to pastures fresh.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Where is that contained in the Bill?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is not mentioned in the Bill, but in the Act. I raise the matter because we are dealing with the Act and I believe it is pertinent that we consider it. Possibly in another session the matter could be further examined if the Government feels so inclined. I merely raise the matter to show that it requires further examination.

Those are the only two points I care to raise during the second reading debate. As I mentioned earlier, in my view the Bill is one which lends itself to debate in the Committee stage, and I will make further comments on some clauses at that stage.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: If you have any comments or queries regarding clauses which have not been touched on by Mr. Willmott, it would be helpful to me if you would mention them now so that I may consider them and explain them more quickly.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I appreciate the request of the Leader of the House. However, I do not believe I have anything further to add to the clauses already mentioned by Mr. Willmott and the amendments standing in my name on the notice paper. I support the second reading.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West) [9.20 p.m.]: I would like to obtain clarification from the Leader of the House in respect of only two aspects. However, before mentioning these, I would say that

upon looking through the Act and the amending Bill I have arrived at the conclusion that we could almost do without the Liquor Act. One might say that would be throwing the door wide open, but I believe that as a result of the reduced working hours arising from the efforts of unions, and as a result of our economics, we do not really need the restrictions which are contained in the Act. It seems to me that Australians as a whole drink far more than they should, despite the various Liquor Acts throughout the Commonwealth. I do not think they would drink any more if the restrictions were lifted altogether; possibly they would drink less.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I have heard that said before.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am merely expressing my thoughts on this matter. I am certain that shortly the position will be such that one could not continue to drink all night because the human capacity to drink is limited.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think Italy is a glaring example.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am not sure that we have not reached that stage now. My only comment in respect of the Bill is that I am not sure we should allow people to auction liquor at functions. Provision is made for that in clause 6.

I do not like the distinction between a beer drinker and those who drink spirits in section 24 (2), which allows a club or hotel to sell certain quantities of liquor, providing spirits are not sold. Many people do not drink beer and prefer to drink wine, whisky, gin, or brandy. So why should we distinguish between one drinker and another when it comes to buying bottled drinks on Sundays?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: A bottle of beer in the hands of a person might be something he can handle; but a bottle of whisky in the same hands might have a disastrous effect.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: He could get a bottle of whisky any day of the week, though.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There are more people to watch him on a week day.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not think there should be any distinction whatsoever. I am not sure what amount of liquor may be purchased on a Sunday.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is one-third of a gallon, or two bottles.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Well, some people can do as much damage with two bottles of beer as they can with a small flask of brandy.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What gives you the idea they would buy only a small flask of whisky?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I merely make the point that I do not think there should be a distinction between one who drinks beer and one who drinks spirits.

A further matter I would ask the Leader of the House to consider is the extraordinary situation of the Geraldton Yacht Club. The club has been in existence for a considerable time and has performed a terrific job for the people in the district. It started off with a hall and dance floor, and it has now established a two-storey building alongside the first. The boats are kept in the undercroft, and above that the club has installed licensed premises, including a bar, a lounge, and everything to go with them.

However, and members may believe it or not, if the club holds a function in the dance hall it must obtain a provisional license in order to sell liquor. Recently the club held a commodore's ball, which was open only to club members. Under the provisions of the Act it must buy liquor for such a function from a hotel, despite the fact that it has its own licensed premises. On the last occasion the club took a risk. It bought beer from a hotel up the road, and supplied whisky and spirits from its licensed premises upstairs. The club was taken to court and the person who ran the function and the commodore were fined. That is a ridiculous situation.

I do not know how the problem may be overcome, but I would like the Leader of the House to consider it because I do not know of any other place in the State where similar circumstances apply.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: They would apply in certain other places.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think the situation is ridiculous. The club has its own licensed premises and a dance floor, but because the dance floor is not part of the licensed premises it must obtain an occasional permit to run a function and it cannot bring down liquor from upstairs to sell to its members. I hope the Leader of the House will consider the points I have raised to see whether anything can be done to overcome the problem.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [9.27 p.m.]: I would like to touch on a few matters, largely because they have been raised in the debate.

Mr. Willmott and Mr. Logan both mentioned the matter of the purchase of spirits. When the Bill was introduced in the other Chamber the clause in question referred only to beer; the word "beer" was deleted and the word "liquor" inserted. The clause was further amended by adding the words "other than spirits" because somebody in that place feared that a purchaser might get more than his share of liquor by buying spirits instead of beer.

I cannot see the sense of prohibiting a person who does not drink beer or wine from purchasing the type of refreshment he prefers on Sundays. I have proposed an amendment to allow such a person to buy one-sixth of a gallon of spirits. I hope Mr. Willmott and Mr. Logan will support my amendment.

In the process of attempting to alter the hours during which a cabaret may open for business from 9.00 p.m. to 3.30 a.m. to 10.00 p.m. to 4.30 a.m., cabaret owners have in fact lost one hour of business. I think that is one of the accidents which can occur in the course of attempting to amend legislation. I think cabaret owners should be permitted to retain their existing hours of opening.

I intend to move an amendment to enable the cabarets to commence trading at 9.00 p.m. The only other matter I wish to raise relates to the amendments proposed by Mr. Ferry. I did hope to hear him giving reasons for deleting certain provisions from the Bill, but he has not done so. Perhaps he will give his reasons during the Committee stage.

In his second reading speech which is recorded on page 3519 of the current *Hansard* the Minister said that one amendment in the Bill was designed to enable wedding breakfasts and family parties to be held on cabaret premises. He said the same reasons applied to the extension of theatre licenses. This appears to be a reasonable basis on which changes to the Act should be made. I do not think the hotels would be placed at any great disadvantage, or that they would lose business if a lodge, which is particularly oriented to catering say for wedding breakfasts, were granted such a license. Here we have a case of establishments which are used three or four nights a week. This particular amendment will provide them with another avenue through which their facilities can be utilised.

The Bill deserves our support.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth.

LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 18 amended—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 5 to 8—Delete all words after the word "organisation" down to and including the passage "members,".

This amendment was fully debated by members when the Bill was last before us.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I ask members not to agree to the amendment, because it seeks to prevent the playing of bingo in hotels and on licensed premises. I am aware the Australian Hotels Association is not in favour of this proposal, but many organisations hold their meetings in the back rooms of hotels or licensed premises, but not in the front bars. In the country centres the usual place of meetings is in the back room of some licensed premises. I can see nothing wrong in permitting such organisations to conduct a game of bingo in the back room of a hotel or a club.

So that there is no misunderstanding of my position, I would point out that last year I agreed to a similar amendment in good faith. However, the Government saw fit not to proceed with it in another place. I have since discussed this matter with my colleagues in Government, and I can say that the Government is not prepared to accept this amendment. If it is carried here, I can assure members it will not be accepted by the Government in another place.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I suppose we can call this sort of action a revelation. When the second reading of the 1971 Bill took place on the 5th October of that year, Mr. Wordsworth interjected when the Minister was making his speech. His interjection was—

Will bingo be allowed to be conducted on licensed premises?

The reply of the Minister to that interjection was—

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 has taken place subsequently to cause the Government to change its mind? I want to know why the Government is so anxious to permit bingo or any other type of gambling game to be conducted on licensed premises. Is the Minister aware that in the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, which we have just debated, one clause allows this to be done?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I heard it to-night.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Chief Secretary should have heard it some days ago when the Government changed its mind on the question of gambling on licensed premises.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: What the Leader of the Opposition says is quite correct. I accepted the amendment in good faith, but when the Bill was dealt with in another place the Government decided not to proceed with that amendment. Since then we have had a great deal of discussion on this matter, and the Government has decided that members of licensed clubs should be permitted to play the game of bingo on their premises but not in the front bar. A fact of life is that gambling now takes place in the front bars of these premises, and I am referring to the playing of darts for money.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Gambling is illegal.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I know that, but we have to live with the facts of life. The Government has considered this matter, and it wants charitable organisations to be given the right to conduct games of bingo to raise funds. The Government also wants to permit club members, both in the country and in the city, to play the game of bingo in the back rooms of their premises or at their meeting places. If members agree to this amendment all I can say is that the Government is not prepared to accept it in another place.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am amazed the Leader of the Opposition is opposed to the granting of the right to ordinary people to play the game of bingo on licensed premises. He must be fully aware that members of organisations, like bowling clubs, gather together for social occasions, other than for the playing of bowls. The Leader of the Opposition wants to deprive them of the right to play bingo, as though this is something sinister. I cannot comprehend that sort of thinking. The Minister will have full control over these activities, and if anyone tries to monopolise or gain control by using Mafia tactics the Minister has the power to refuse a permit for the conduct of the game.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If Mr. Cloughton is still here after the next election I am sure that time will teach him a few parliamentary lessons. He makes a habit of getting on his feet to defend the Minister, when the Minister can do without his help.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I must protest at the remark of the Leader of the Opposition. I have every right to get onto my feet and speak when I wish to do so. I ask the Minister to withdraw his final remark.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Leader of the Opposition prepared to withdraw that remark?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What words am I to withdraw? Can the honourable member tell me the words I am to withdraw?

The CHAIRMAN: Will Mr. Claughton state the words which he desires the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The remark that I find offensive is that I have no right to get on my feet to speak on anything I like according to the Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member claim these words are offensive?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If Mr. Claughton can find in the *Hansard* report that I said he had no right to get on his feet then I will withdraw the remark; but I challenge him to find that in the *Hansard* record. I simply said that the honourable member made a habit of popping up and defending the Minister when the Minister could do without his assistance.

I will make the honourable member an offer. I will pay \$10 into any charity which he nominates if he can find in the *Hansard* record that I accused him of what he said I did; and if he cannot do that will he be prepared to pay \$10 into a charity I nominate? Will the honourable member take up that offer?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are making the speech. You can carry on.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is not prepared to take that on?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I am not a gambling man.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I still do not know what words I am to withdraw.

Chairman's Ruling

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that the words used by Mr. Griffith were not offensive, and I cannot see there is a need for him to withdraw any words.

Committee Resumed

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What I was saying was that at the point I spoke I had not registered any objection to gambling on licensed premises. I merely asked the Minister to tell me why his Government had changed its mind. The Minister replied and told me why his Government had changed its mind, and his second statement was the one which attracted my attention more particularly.

On the first occasion the Minister said the Government could see no harm in bingo being played in a back room of licensed hotels.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Or clubs.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The next statement by the Minister was that the Government desired that the game of bingo be played on club premises. That runs completely contrary to the statements made by the Minister last year.

It appears to me that the Minister introduced to Cabinet a proposition for a Bill to amend the lotteries Act. He said in the speech he made at the second reading, and later in reply, that the desire of the Government was to allow charitable organisations to play this game in order to raise some money, and to offer to people who belonged to charitable organisations some form of entertainment. The Minister said he imagined that the game would be played for as little as 1c and 2c a time. I think the Minister was very genuine indeed, as were the members generally in their approach and desire to help the Minister in this regard.

I said at the time, and my view was shared by a number of members of this House, that I thought it would be a retrograde step for gambling to be permitted on licensed premises. The Minister joined in and said, "You cannot do it anyway."

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The licensing Act prevents it. When the Bill got to the Legislative Assembly it was given short shrift. What annoys me most is that a Minister of the Government went to a meeting in the electorate of Mr. Clive Griffiths and said that if it were not for the Legislative Council the game of bingo could have been played. Members know that is not right.

The Minister in question should have said, "If it were not for the Government of the day giving orders to the Chief Secretary to change his mind!" because that was the reason the game has not been played during the past 12 months. I think the Minister would admit that I am pretty right. Perhaps Mr. Claughton will jump up and admit it for the Minister! That is the situation, and I think it is a poor show.

I certainly do not intend to give my vote in favour of the playing of bingo, or in favour of any gambling game, on licensed premises. Let us examine what gambling on licensed premises would mean in relation to bingo. Some very big clubs exist in the metropolitan area, and probably in some of the larger country towns. I can well imagine games, if organised properly, reaching the proportions mentioned by Mr. John Williams. Is that what the Government desires? Can the Minister imagine people playing bingo on a football oval or a community oval, where there could be 1,000 or 2,000 people involved, and playing for 1c or 2c a time? That would be just utter nonsense.

Is it intended that clubs, hotels, or anybody who holds a license under the licensing Act, is to be given permission for bingo to be played on those licensed premises? Can I get an answer to that question?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: When you sit down.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If that is the intention of the legislation it will not receive my vote, and I will persist with the amendment which was moved last year. The Minister told us that the small charitable organisations approached him. If the big clubs and the hotels, which hold licenses, approached the Minister he should let us know now. He should not discover the fact some days later. He should not tell us, at some later date, that he has just come into possession of the facts.

It is necessary for the Committee to be told what the Government intends to do in respect of the playing of bingo. I want to know where it will be played, whether permits will be granted, and what conditions will apply.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: All I can say is that the Government wants bingo to be played on licensed premises. That means in hotels or clubs, but it does not necessarily mean in the front bars of those establishments. I know that the Australian Hotels Association is not interested in bingo because whilst a person is playing bingo he is not drinking beer.

It does not matter what happened last year; there is no change of mind. The Government has decided that it wants bingo for the people who want to play it in clubs or hotels. The game will not be played in the front bars, but in adjacent rooms.

We do not envisage that the game will be played on football ovals. The purpose of the Bill is to simply legalise bingo so that it can be played on licensed premises under certain conditions.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where in the Bill does it say anything about that?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The Bill simply states that bingo will be legalised.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is right. Where does the Bill say anything about what the Minister has just told us?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: With the passing of the Bill a permit will be issued. That is the position and I ask the Committee not to vote for the proposed amendment.

I will go so far as to say that if the amendment is accepted the Bill will not be introduced in another place, and we will not have bingo.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: We have reached a most extraordinary stage. We have reached a situation where the Minister has reintroduced a measure which was passed in this House after being amended.

The Legislative Assembly, or the Government, refused to accept the previous amended Bill during the last session of Parliament. The second reading speech made by the Minister was almost word for word with the speech he made on the previous Bill.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If the Minister had changed his speech he would have been criticised because the Bill is word for word with the previous Bill.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not think it would have been unreasonable to expect the Minister, in his second reading speech, to mention the fact that the Government was hell bent on bingo being played on licensed premises. That is a state of affairs which the Minister vehemently declared was not the situation when he introduced the previous Bill. Would it not have been reasonable for the identical speech to be followed at least to the extent of explaining to this Chamber that the Government did not care about the parents and citizens' associations, the kindergarten associations, and the junior football associations about which the Minister spoke previously?

The Minister has stated tonight that unless we are prepared to accept the Government's desire to permit the playing of bingo on licensed premises then there will be no bingo Bill because the Government will not accept it. The Minister has issued us with a most extraordinary ultimatum which clearly indicates that the report in the newspaper, to which I referred earlier, and which was attributed to the Minister himself and to the Minister for Mines in another place, was a pack of lies. The newspaper article suggested that the reason that bingo was not being played by charitable organisations at the moment was because of the action of the Liberal Party, or Opposition members in the Legislative Council. The Minister has clearly suggested tonight that that is not the situation at all. He has indicated that my objection to that newspaper article was well founded.

I am absolutely horrified to hear the Minister say that the sole purpose of the Bill is to ensure the playing of bingo on licensed premises, and under no circumstances do I intend to support that provision.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will be eternally grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for extracting from the Minister the harrowing admission—it must have been terribly harrowing—concerning the actual situation with regard to this Bill. I want to ask a question of the Minister: Can he guarantee that for every union or Labor affiliated political organisation which receives a permit to run a bingo night, the Lotteries Commission will grant the Liberal Party a night and the Country

Party a night? The reason for my question is that the provisions of this Bill will allow the Lotteries Commission to issue permits to any political organisation to raise funds.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Young Liberals are having a bingo night tonight.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: If the honourable member is aware of that he can report the matter to the police and have it stopped. This Bill is entirely and completely different from the one which the Minister proposed to us. The Chief Secretary took a proposal to Cabinet and received permission to introduce a Bill. The Chief Secretary introduced a similar Bill last year. He obtained permission from Cabinet to introduce—

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: We are now talking about this year.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Chief Secretary mentioned the debate of last year and he also spoke about changing his mind. The Chief Secretary did not change his mind—it was changed for him by another Minister. This legislation looks the same, and it is the same according to the information given to The Hon. A. F. Griffith. However, it is a totally different concept because, as Mr. Clive Griffiths mentioned, we now go past the kindergartens and the parents & citizens' associations to the junior football clubs and then to virtually any organisation. Presumably the bigger the organisation, the more successful the bingo nights will be. A club with a big hall can run a big bingo game. On the Chief Secretary's admission this is the result desired by the Labor Party. Will a bingo hall be included in the new Trades Hall building?

The Hon. R. Thompson: It would not be licensed premises.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No, but with the Government's guarantee of funds and the Government's plan to house the Medical Department there, all the building needs is a bingo hall.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It would pay it off very quickly.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It would not only pay it off quickly; we could have the biggest American-style election of all times. For three years the Labor Party could make hay.

Last year and until this evening, the legislation had the support of all the members of this Chamber. The Chief Secretary agreed to The Hon. A. F. Griffith's suggestion. Indeed, he almost said, "I am sorry this has been overlooked. Thank you very much for drawing it to our attention." However, if the Chief Secretary sought to frighten members with his comments about the nonacceptance of the amendment by the Government, he was a long way out. I would hazard a guess that in

one sentence he lost all the goodwill he had gained. I would not be surprised to find he had even lost votes on his side of the House if we conducted a secret vote.

In this Chamber we know each other fairly well, and by the Chief Secretary's answer to The Hon. A. F. Griffith's suggestion last year when he moved the amendment, I feel we know how the Chief Secretary feels.

The Chief Secretary told Mr. Arthur Griffith that any organisation not established for the purpose of trading or for securing pecuniary profit to its individual members—and that means the A.L.P., the Country Party, the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the Waterside Workers' Federation, the Seamen's Union, the Chamber of Manufacturers, and the Employers' Federation—may make application for a bingo license.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Not the Seamen's Union. They play it on ships now.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: For these reasons the Bill has lost my support.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Tonight in this Chamber we have heard words used which I would prefer not to have heard. Mr. Clive Griffiths used the word "ultimatum." It would appear that an ultimatum has been issued to this Committee. Mr. Cloughton used the word "sinister." And to help him along, I feel a sinister motive underlies this legislation. If it is not sinister it stinks.

It is well known throughout the State of Western Australia that forces outside this Chamber are trying to force a dissolution of the Legislative Council. These people do not want us here. We hinder their plans because we think and we then pass clean legislation.

The Chief Secretary is not the architect of this measure before us, and nothing on this earth would persuade me that he would ever willingly bring such a Bill to the Chamber. This is the result of a majority decision of another body in another place. The gauntlet has been thrown down to this Chamber tonight. We are told: Let us encourage gambling; let us encourage it even onto licensed premises. This is the gospel according to socialism.

The goodwill engendered by the legislation of bingo could end in heartbreak for many people. Mr. Dellar would not know much about heartbreak but I feel he would not like to see the Department of Community Welfare overworked because of broken homes caused by big-scale bingo. I am not speaking of the smoke-screen which the Labor Party is putting up by stating outside Parliament that the wicked Upper House is preventing these games being played. Government members must drop the scales from their eyes.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: You ran away and left it. Go back to it.

Withdrawal of Remark

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I feel that the honourable member's remark is most offensive and I ask him to withdraw it.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: I would like to know which part of the remark the honourable member asks me to withdraw. I do not consider the remark offensive.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you please state the words you require to be withdrawn.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I would like the remark withdrawn that I ran away from it and I should go back to it.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: I withdraw the remark.

Committee Resumed

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Large-scale bingo operators may move in with grave consequences to the community social welfare services. People can become hooked on gambling as well as on alcohol and drugs. I have seen this happen, and the social problems that have resulted, particularly in the places mentioned by Mr. Dans. I cannot support the Government on this occasion, and I ask the Committee to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not sure whether I should ask permission to stand. The Leader of the Opposition may object to my speaking. Perhaps it embarrasses him, but I am sure it does not embarrass the Ministers.

I cannot help feeling amused at some of the statements made during this debate. Some members have been able to introduce petty politics—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Petty politics my eye! You contradict it and say it is not possible.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Does it really make a difference to the Bill that the social club of the A.H.A. may be issued with a license to play bingo? That does not derogate from the workings of the legislation at all. Mr. Clive Griffiths has stated that we should only allow permits to kindergartens, parents and citizens' associations, and junior football clubs. Apparently it is too bad about any other organisation which has licensed premises.

Mr. Clive Griffiths is not concerned about a bowling club which may wish to conduct bingo as a social activity. Such a club would have to find other premises. This is a situation we are now faced with, and it is no wonder that the Government had second thoughts on this matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: On page 1282 of *Hansard* of the first session of 1971, members will find the second reading speech made by the Chief Secretary on the introduction of similar legislation. It was a friendly little speech, comprising just over one column of *Hansard*. The Chief Secretary explained that this was a Bill to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act so that the game of bingo—sometimes called housie-housie or tombola—may be played by a *bona fide* organisation. The Minister concluded with these words—

The Bill has been drafted to exclude any individual or organisation established for the purpose of trading or giving its members pecuniary profit from obtaining permits and, as a result, there is no chance of such people turning the game to their own individual ends.

The Bill now before us is identical with the Bill which was introduced in 1971. During the second reading speech this year the Minister had this to say—

As I said in my opening remarks last year when introducing a similar short Bill, its sole purpose is to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1954-1970 in order that the game of bingo—sometimes called housie-housie or tombola—may be played legally by a *bona fide* organisation.

I have been approached by many organisations such as senior citizens' clubs, migration social groups, and parents and citizens' groups, requesting the legalisation for the playing of bingo.

I am sure that members are well aware of the problems besetting people who have the task of sustaining the interest of members and at the same time raising money for amenities in organisations such as I have mentioned. It is a thankless task, but many people are facing it today. The consensus of opinion amongst many of the charitable organisations is that a game such as bingo is just the thing to solve this problem. Not only does it provide an evening's harmless enjoyment in which the participants win or lose a small amount of money, but also the organisation running the game obtains a modest sum of money for some worth-while purpose.

Until the Chief Secretary made his second reading speech we had been deceived into believing that Parliament would authorise this game to be played by charitable organisations. When I rose to my feet in the first place I said it was a revelation to hear the Minister say that what the Government really wants is for the game to be played by people who hold licenses under the Liquor Act. Why do we have to drag that information out of the Government? Why do we have to defend ourselves in this Chamber against the statements that are made in the electorate about the members of this Chamber?

To the best of my knowledge we did not have a division on this Bill. I moved the amendments, the Minister agreed with them, and they were passed on the voices. I cannot recall Mr. Cloughton objecting to the amendments and calling for a division on them, because nobody raised any objection to them. We all thought we were to help charitable organisations. I hope that members of the Press who are listening to this debate tonight will go to the trouble of publishing the full story on the deceit that has been practised in relation to this Bill, because it is outright plain deceit! The Bill was taken right through the second reading stage and it was not until we reached the Committee stage that I was able to draw out of the Minister, after close examination, that the Government's real desire—and this is recorded in *Hansard*—is that this gambling game will be played on licensed premises, and we all know what that means.

I feel sorry for the Chief Secretary in view of the situation in which he is now placed, and I would like him to know that, personally, I am sure that what he expects he will be obliged to do is to have these facts brought to light and the members of the Committee acquainted with them, so that eventually the people will know what is really taking place in this Chamber. No doubt he will have to say to himself, "I knew I would get it," and then he will have to say to the members of his Ministry, "I was in a bit of a spot, because I made five speeches, but under Arthur Griffith's cross-examination I had to admit that this game was to be played on licensed premises. I could not get out of it." Then I suppose the Chief Secretary will get into more trouble with his colleagues when he makes that report.

Where does the Bill, in its present form, indicate in its two clauses what has been said to us tonight by the Chief Secretary? It simply states—

The Commission may grant to a religious body or charitable organization or to any other body or organization not established for the purpose of trading or for securing pecuniary profit to its individual members, a permit to hold . . .

How can the Government say that a club which holds a license under the Liquor Act does not operate for the purpose of trading or for the purpose of obtaining pecuniary benefit for its members? How can the Government possibly deny that anybody who holds a license under the Liquor Act buys liquor wholesale for the purpose of retailing it at a profit?

If I give the Chief Secretary a few more minutes in order to explain that point he will probably say, "We will not grant those people a permit," and if he does, to whom are we to grant the permit? As far as I am concerned the legislation is completely unsatisfactory, and I hope, for the benefit

of the disappointed people who have complained about the action of the Legislative Council, that they will learn the real truth by being given a chance to read a report of this debate in the Press in the morning, or at some other appropriate time.

I certainly press for this amendment, and if the Government wishes to act in good faith and does not agree to it, I hope it will withdraw the Bill and not proceed further with it. However, it should do this with good grace and not try to turn the blame onto the members of the Legislative Council by saying, "They did it," and think it will rest there, because I will tramp the country and tell the people about the deceit that has been practised in regard to this Bill. It is not right that one Minister of the Government should be put on a spot like this and have to say almost apologetically, "Do not take any notice of what I said last year, and what I said the first time I introduced the Bill and also the second time I introduced a Bill, because what we really want is that the game shall be played on licensed premises." That is what has been admitted by the Chief Secretary tonight and I think it is a pretty poor show.

I feel strongly about the position; I do not feel strongly about the Bill. I can recall, when replying to the second reading debate in somewhat jocular terms that I accepted the Bill in good faith and indicated that it should be passed in good faith, because I have had a little experience of the game, but I am afraid I am very bitterly disappointed. I intend to press my amendment, but if the Government does not approve of it, it should not attempt to place the blame where it does not belong. It should withdraw the Bill and not proceed further with it.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Firstly, I will answer Mr. Clive Griffiths who has been trying to get me to admit that I had something to do with the article that appeared in the Press. I knew nothing whatsoever about it and had no part in it and therefore I do not intend to pursue that matter any further. The honourable member can think what he likes, but I could not care less, because I had no part in it.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You did not make any comment?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I did not make any comment whatsoever.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why did you not say so before?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I made no comment whatsoever. I did not know the article existed until the honourable member drew my attention to it.

In replying to what Mr. MacKinnon had to say about clubs and charitable organisations conducting the game, I feel he is drawing a red herring across the trail. The Lotteries Commission will have complete say in granting the permits, and it is a responsible body. In regard to what will be said in another place, I do not have a monopoly on that. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place spoke on another piece of legislation and stated that when it left this Chamber all that would be left would be the full stop.

I ask the Committee not to agree to the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. I think it is my duty to say that if they are agreed to by the Committee and the Bill goes to another place, members there are not obliged to accept them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Chief Secretary has said that the Lotteries Commission will have all the say in regard to granting permits, but what do those words really mean? We have seen what happened to the personnel of the Licensing Court when Mr. Robertson was removed from it. Three weeks before the Chairman of the Bunbury Harbour Board was advised that Tom O'Brien had been dropped from the board, the news was bruited all around the town that he had been dropped and that Mr. Colin Ganfield had been appointed in his place; Mr Ganfield being the Secretary of the Waterside Workers' Union.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: If I take your mind back a few years I can give you chapter and verse of what happened when the previous Government came to power.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The honourable member can rise in his place and make his speech later if he so desires. That is what happened in regard to the Bunbury Harbour Board, and the same can be said of the Metropolitan Markets Board, and of other boards. I do not care what party is in office when this occurs. The fact is that I know all the members of the present Lotteries Commission. I know the way they feel and the way they think. I was Acting Chief Secretary for a while and I got to know them.

That does not alter the fact that it is possible, before the term of the present Chief Secretary concludes, that the members of the Lotteries Commission could be changed. That does not mean a thing. A Government does not leave laws in a state such as that. When one reads the Bill it looks innocuous enough, but when it is re-read in the light of the information extracted by the Leader of the Opposition, it is not so innocuous, and yet all the objections that have been raised here tonight can be overcome by the acceptance of the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, which amendments the Chief Secretary accepted with alacrity, sympathy, and understanding last year, because he believed in them. His statement

about the personnel of the present Lotteries Commission does not amount to a row of buttons, because it can be changed as quickly as the members of many other boards can be changed.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I think it is time the general public began to realise the type of Bills presented by this Government and which are being thrown out. This measure is probably a typical example. It has only two clauses; one sets out the title and the other states—

2. Section 18 of the principal Act is amended by adding after subsection (1) the following subsection—

(1a.) The Commission may grant to a religious body or charitable organization or to any other body or organization not established for the purpose of trading or for securing pecuniary profit to its individual members, a permit to hold or conduct the game commonly known as bingo, housie-housie or tombola, on such terms and conditions as the Commission may think fit to impose.

I read that clause out purposely, because I think the public should realise, when it reads *Hansard*, what is presented to this Chamber and that the provisions contained in this measure are very flimsy indeed.

This points to the fact that it is not in the hands of Parliament to pass a Bill such as this, because there is nothing in it to indicate where the game is to be played. The Chief Secretary has now admitted it will be played on licensed premises. There is nothing in the Bill to indicate that any limit will be placed on the size of the game. We are simply told that the game will be conducted by small charitable organisations. Further, there is nothing in the Bill to limit the stakes. We are told that the game will represent only a couple of sets with small amounts that housewives can afford.

I think the Government should realise that there is nothing in this Bill we can change. No regulations will be promulgated under the legislation to vary the stake and other conditions. We are simply asked to give complete authority to the Lotteries Commission to issue the licenses. The public should know the sort of legislation we are presented with in this Chamber, and this measure is one of those pieces of legislation.

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

Ayes—16

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. J. M. Thomson

(Teller)

Noes—9

Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. L. Hunt	(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. Lyla Elliott

Amendment thus passed.

The clause was further amended, on motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith, as follows:—

Page 2, line 10—Insert after the passage “tombola,” the words “on specified premises for such length of time and”.

Page 2, line 13—Add the following proviso to proposed new subsection (1a):—

“Provided that a permit shall not be granted to hold or conduct the game at any time on premises licensed under the Liquor Act, 1970, or during the time in which liquor may be sold or supplied in the case of unlicensed premises.”

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 17th October, 1972

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

BILLS (2): ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Land Agents Act Amendment Bill.
2. Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Bill.

RESERVES (UNIVERSITY LANDS) BILL

Tabling of Plan

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [4.36 p.m.]: When speaking to this Bill, I gave an undertaking to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that I would lay on the Table of the House a map detailing the extent and location of the land concerned, which would remain on the Table of the House until a final determination is made by this House in relation to the Bill. I now present it for tabling.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 425).

QUESTIONS (14): ON NOTICE

1. ABORIGINES' WELFARE NEEDS

Royal Commission: Terms of Reference

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

Further to his reply to my motion for a Select Committee to inquire into Aboriginal affairs—

- (1) Will he now set out more clearly the proposed terms of reference?
- (2) Is it intended to appoint more than one commissioner?
- (3) If not, will he consider the advisability of appointing a commission of three to ensure that any recommendations are firmly based, practical and capable of implementation?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) These have not yet been finalised but it is intended that they will be widely based.
- (2) No.
- (3) No. It is proposed to obtain the services of a Judge.

2. YUNDURUP CANALS DEVELOPMENT

Height of Blocks

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that the height of required filling of the proposed blocks at the Yundurup canal development has been reduced by approximately two feet?
- (2) If so, what are the reasons for lessening the previous requirements which were set for health reasons in connection with sanitary and stormwater drainage?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Since the original filling height was approved, the developer has negotiated to provide an outlet drain for the area upstream of the subdivision. The effect of this drain will be to lessen the flood heights in the canal system, and it has been possible, therefore, to reduce the required levels of the blocks.

3. PADBURY BUILDINGS

Request for Land

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Premier:

- (1) When did the State request the Commonwealth Government for the land presently occupied by the Padbury Buildings in Forrest Place?
- (2) Has there been any response by the Commonwealth Government?