

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL (NO. 2) 2006

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural - Leader of the House) [5.09 pm]: Before my speech was interrupted by question time, I had been making the point that even though China is a very large country, it has only one time zone. That time zone is the same time zone as Perth. China's big neighbour, Russia, has, by comparison, seven different time zones, which must make it an extremely difficult place to do business.

I do not intend to speak a great deal further about this issue. I have lived with the previous trials of daylight saving and I hated every minute of them. I could not find a single thing to recommend daylight saving. People talk about how much extra time they will have with their families. I had a young family during the last trial. I did not see my kids at all. I was up, in any case, before they were.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon KIM CHANCE: It is one thing to be regarded by one's children as a novelty, but quite another thing to be regarded as a stranger. Generally, I was not back until about 10 o'clock at night, by which time they were in bed.

Hon Louise Pratt: Daylight saving will not change that.

Hon KIM CHANCE: If I had got back at nine o'clock, they would still have been up. I would have at least seen them on that occasion. The solar time was nine o'clock, but the clock time was 10 o'clock. I just did not see them. I am only telling the member what happened. I could not find anything to recommend it. It is true that kids travel on dirt roads in school buses without airconditioning for hours and hours. A couple of degrees does make a difference to those kids. My kids did not have as far to travel as some, but I know that a lot of children travel much further. The significance of a dirt road and a non-airconditioned bus is that the windows must be closed. The windows cannot be opened on a dirt road because the dust blows straight in. A non-airconditioned bus, closed up, is very sensitive to the outside ambient temperature. The wheatbelt, where most of the school buses are, is in a temperature zone that is hotter than Carnarvon. Hot weather does not occur only in the north. The same isotherm that curls around north of Carnarvon also goes right through Moora. There is an issue about temperature. When we say we are concerned about our children, and other people say that one or two degrees will not make a lot of difference, we know that it will. Children will be a lot more uncomfortable as a result of it. We are told that everyone has airconditioning these days and that kids will be able to sleep anyway if the blinds are drawn, but not everyone has airconditioning. Many people living in the country cannot afford airconditioning. An hour later makes the world of difference. We should not make assumptions that everyone is as well off and lives as comfortably as those of us who live in the city. Some people do it hard out there. It is a hard environment. They must try to make do with the conditions they have, and an extra hour makes it just that little bit harder, in shifting the time.

We have heard a lot about business being aided by this change. I will make one small point about how daylight saving impedes businesses. The example I will give is that of wheat growers, but many other businesses work on a solar day. They work their machinery while the machinery can work. Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd was great during the last trial of daylight saving because it set its times back by an hour and was able to accommodate our needs. That worked really well, and no doubt CBH will do the same thing again. The problem comes when a machine breaks down about mid-afternoon in solar time and the farmer calls the dealer. Unless the dealer has extended his times by an hour, he is reading the time as 5.30 pm and not 4.30 pm, and is not there. The machine has to wait all that afternoon because of a one-hour time difference. I have to say again that the machinery dealers were generally really good and adjusted their hours to give us the additional hour. However, try that on a government department -

Hon Simon O'Brien: Wouldn't that mean that the machinery dealers were working an hour longer?

Hon KIM CHANCE: That is what those who cooperated with us did. We remember who did and who did not!

Let us take a government department. If I call Main Roads at 4.30 pm to renew my overwidth vehicle permit or my extra mass permit because I want to make arrangements to make my shift the next day or the next week, it is 4.30 pm by me but 5.30 pm by Main Roads. At that time government departments are closed, and I would have to wait until the next day. It is just one extra hour. It will not stop the world spinning; however, it is incorrect to say that it is always, or uniformly, an advantage for business. It is not always an advantage for business; sometimes it can be a significant impediment for business if all government agencies do not adjust their times to

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

start an hour later and finish an hour later. If everyone did that, there would not be a problem, but one would have to ask the question: why do it anyway?

I refer to schools. My daughter is a teacher in the west Kimberley. Her school already starts early in the day.

Hon Peter Collier: They finish early in the day.

Hon KIM CHANCE: They finish early, and that is interesting because they have only about an hour and a half of school in the afternoon. Under this proposal, it would be only about half an hour, so why would one bother with the afternoon? I think that is a fair question. Not too many people turn up in the afternoon anyway, so that is probably a good thing.

Hon Norman Moore: We found in the Pilbara that most of them went home to their airconditioned houses.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes, but in the town where my daughter teaches, people do not have airconditioned houses. It is an Aboriginal community.

Hon Norman Moore: People say you should not do that because kids go home in the middle of the afternoon. They all go home to airconditioned houses from non-airconditioned schools.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes, true. Daylight saving is not all good and it is not all bad. It does affect me personally and I would rather not have it. I have lived with it, I have tried it, and I hated it. I think the Western Australian community seems to be enthusiastic about daylight saving at the moment and about the trial, and no doubt that will be the outcome. The community will try it, it will hate it and it will vote it out next time just as it has done the last three times.

HON SALLY TALBOT (South West) [5.17 pm]: I will not take up much time of the house this afternoon, but as we have a free vote on this matter, I think it is important for everyone to indicate briefly how they intend to vote and why. It is my intention to support the bill. Like Hon Graham Giffard, I have also come to the conclusion that the model proposed in the bill is exactly the one that we should proceed with.

I suspect this is one of those occasions when other members have had the same experience that I have had in moving through the community of being accused of two things that are diametrically opposed: one is that we are poll driven and we listen too much; the other is that we do not listen enough and that we are driven by our self-interest. Like most contradictions, both accusations cannot be true. I suppose that with most issues we employ a little of each of those aspects. I have done a lot of listening to people in the Peel region in the past few weeks since this issue arose. I noticed that many of the people who support the no case have questioned the speed at which this bill has come into the chamber and is being progressed. I must say it was something of a surprise to me. If someone had asked me three months ago what I thought we would be debating in the chamber in November, I probably would not have thought of daylight saving. There have been times in the past couple of weeks when I have opened my e-mail inbox and wished that issues such as climate change, refugees or the war in Iraq could have elicited the same degree of community passion which has been evident in this matter and which has clogged up the servers. However, that is not to be.

I have been persuaded that this is an issue of considerable significance to a number of different sectors of the Western Australian community and I have listened to those views very carefully. One of the most articulate arguments against daylight saving has been put to me by the president of my local ALP branch, whose opinions I value very highly. Nevertheless, I will vote in favour of the bill. During the debate this afternoon a couple of members have indicated that there are sound arguments on both sides. The no case has already been put articulately by some members of this house. Three reasons have persuaded me to vote in favour of proceeding with this trial. The first is that keeping the two-hour time difference for 12 months of the year will generally be an advantage to businesspeople in Western Australia who do business with the eastern states. I am unconvinced by the arguments we have heard advanced by Hon Kim Chance. Many people who advocate the no case would agree with his argument about the desirability of remaining on the same time zone as China and Singapore. However, I draw the attention of members who support that argument to the many European countries that have a one-hour time difference. The United Kingdom and France, and France and eastern European countries operate on a one-hour time difference. That has not caused much difficulty during the many decades it has been operating. I believe that Western Australia will cope with the time difference between Western Australia and Singapore and China quite easily. The second reason I will vote in favour of the bill is that generally people make better use of daylight at the end of the day than at the beginning of the day. Like many other members who have spoken in this debate, I rise at 5.00 am. It always irks me to have to wear my sunglasses to drive to the pool or the gym at 5.30 am. I would rather use the afternoon for other types of activities. Those of us who are early risers get used to rising when it is twilight, and it is not something that many of us object to. The third reason I have chosen to vote for the bill is the proposed three-year trial will give everyone an opportunity to test

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

these arguments. We will then be able to weigh up the matters that we have not been able to truly test previously because in the past the trial of daylight saving has been for only a short time. As Hon Graham Giffard pointed out, a very large section of the community was too young to have voted on the matter in the last referendum. It will be very interesting to listen to their voices.

I began by saying that I had listened to the views of the people from the Peel region. I have listened also to my lower house colleagues, as all conscientious Legislative Council members should do - at least on occasions! This bill has been moved by a couple of members who are especially sensitive to the views of their constituents. I find it particularly compelling that they are reporting a strong level of support for daylight saving from their electors.

When I was a child, one of my favourite books to read from my parents' bookshelf was *Roads to Ruin*, which traced the history of radical reforms throughout the ages. It showed that each time a radical reform was proposed, a section of the community argued that it would be the end of civilisation as they knew it. Some members might know the book, which was famous in its day. The reforms included the exclusion of children from working as chimneysweeps, the eight-hour working day and the entire industrial revolution. Certain members of this chamber are sympathetic with the road to ruin theory. This will not be a road to ruin. After three years, people will realise that the sky will not fall in. The community will continue in much the same way as it did before and some people will benefit to a degree, which will be appreciated. Therefore, I support the bill in its current form.

HON MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM (South West) [5.25 pm]: Like my colleague from the South West Region, I think it is important that if members are supporting or not supporting this bill, they should articulate their point of view when given a free vote. I do not want to take up a lot of the time of the house. I certainly acknowledge all the statements made, especially those made by the Leader of the House earlier. The bill is certainly not necessarily all good or all bad. My electorate, as members would realise, is large and complex. It contains farmers, miners, fishermen, and professional people such as lawyers, doctors, teachers and nurses. That plethora of occupations will have different points of view. People are entitled to have their point of view. Certainly, from the plethora of e-mails to which members have been subject over the past two or three weeks, we have a pretty good idea that it is a passionate argument. I have certainly received many and varied e-mails.

Hon Bruce Donaldson: Spam generated.

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: There were a number of those, and I take on board the member's point.

Hon Bruce Donaldson: There were 7 000 or 8 000.

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: There were many.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: The Leader of the Opposition mentioned letters. I have received a number of letters, and I even received some yesterday, asking me to reconsider my point of view, but I do not intend doing that. Like my colleague Hon Sally Talbot, I need to put on record that I will be supporting a three-year trial. I take on board everything that has been said in the extensive lobbying of people visiting offices and sending e-mails and letters. I find the whole debate divisive. I have two farmers on my electorate office staff. One of them supports the stance I am taking and the other opposes it. If the vote happens to be a no vote, I put it to members that it will probably end up being something like the vote for a republican Australia - it will come back. This is one of the reasons I think we should give serious consideration to supporting the bill. There have been demographic changes to the Australian population - certainly in the south west - where something like 30 per cent of people who will vote in a few years, if this bill is passed, did not have the opportunity to articulate a point of view prior to 1992. It is important that, from time to time, society enables those sorts of people to make a decision.

Hon Bruce Donaldson: Did you vote in 1992?

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: Does it look like it! I certainly did. As far as I can remember, I probably did vote yes. However, at this point in time all I am supporting is a trial. Even though I am probably more pro than anti, I am asking that we vote for a trial and then let the community decide in three years whether it likes daylight saving or not.

As a former educator, one of the other issues that really intrigue me is the point made about kids on buses and at school. My question would be: where is it best for kids to be at two or three o'clock in the afternoon? Should

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

they be in a stinking-hot classroom or on the way home? The best time to learn is the earliest part of the morning, so the sooner we can get kids to school the better. I would defend that forever.

Hon Robyn McSweeney: Try getting them to bed at midnight!

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: There may be plenty of arguments to the contrary, but the earliest part of the morning is the best time to learn. I would not deviate from that opinion one iota.

As Hon Sally Talbot said, a three-year trial will surely be a true test. At the end of three years, a vote will be taken. If the vote is in the negative, we might be able to look at daylight saving another 10, 15 or 20 years down the track. In the meantime, given a 30 per cent change in demographics, my contention is that we deserve to give the people of Western Australia an opportunity to vote.

HON HELEN MORTON (East Metropolitan) [5.30 pm]: We canvassed the views of around 600 people throughout the East Metropolitan Region on the issue of daylight saving. Interestingly, the outcome was a meagre difference of 20 one way or the other. It is a really difficult position because we have one of those situations in which we are damned if we do and damned if we do not. People think differently based on the kind of business they are in and the lifestyle they lead. I do not believe that daylight saving is desirable and I do not believe that it will be supported in the long run. Unfortunately, we need a trial to find that out. I do not believe that we need a three-year trial. I think it would be better if the trial were out of the way before the next election.

The biggest issue that has arisen for me during this debate is the incredible ability for something that is not urgent and not necessarily important to divert the entire Parliament away from urgent and other business. When I was in Sydney last week, I looked out the window at 7.30 in the evening and it was nearly dark. At 7.30 in Perth there is the same amount of light. I can understand why people in the eastern states think they need daylight saving.

I wish to highlight some areas that people have felt are quite important. Firstly, people who are against daylight saving talk extensively about the process. They say that there have already been a number of trials and that people have already voted against it three times and politicians do not have the right to overrule that. They feel that a three-year trial is much too long. I agree. They feel that a three-year trial is an underhanded way of putting daylight saving in place and that people would be seen as apathetic if they were not in favour of it. People have talked a lot about what I refer to as the myth busters. They say that people will not exercise for longer; regular joggers, walkers and cyclists will wait until the cool of the evening to exercise; sensible beachgoers will wait until they can walk on the sand without burning their feet; and gardeners will wait until the evening to garden. People in the eastern states and Europe say that they love daylight saving but we do not really know that.

One of the things that I want to emphasise - it arose a number of times - is the perception that people have about the extra electricity, water and other resources that will be used. This trial will be an absolute farce if some objective measures are not put in place to gather some honest, baseline measurements about things that people believe. It would be desirable if some objective measures were put in place, and some rational baseline data gathered. We could measure power and water usage per household over selected hours of the day or carry out a survey that outlines the amount of time families spend outdoors or have some other objective business indicators. Unless objective measures are put in place, in three years we will not know whether any of these things that people are talking about are real.

A lot of people have spoken about lifestyle. Members have already said that people will travel home from school during the hottest part of the day; that there will be an increased risk of skin cancer; that if people want to exercise, they can do it in the morning; and that small children will have disrupted sleep. All those things have already been raised by people.

Arguments against daylight saving were that over the years businesses have adjusted to the time difference between Western Australia and the eastern states, and it does not create a problem; employees can use their flexi hours as they see fit, and if they want extra hours they can organise it with their employer under the new workplace arrangements; and there is no evidence to indicate that there is an economic slowdown during the summer months when this state does not have daylight saving. An issue was raised about the time linkage with businesses in Asia. A number of constituents in the East Metropolitan Region are semi-rural people and they more consistently indicated how daylight saving would affect them. A number of people who have already experienced daylight saving said that they did not like it.

On the other side of the ledger are the people who argued in favour of daylight saving. They talked about quality of life issues; for example, having more time with the family and more leisure time. I do not believe that will come to pass. People who currently work a lot will work an extra hour, and if they want to exercise or spend

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

time with their family they will be able to do that in the morning. It was said that small children wake up with the sun at 4.30; however, my experience was that my children slept through the coolness of the day and were not woken by the sun.

The hospitality industry was well represented among those who put forward their views on daylight saving. Many people in that industry talked about the benefit of daylight saving for alfresco dining.

Representatives from the building industry contacted us and said that they cannot start work prior to 7.00 am because of the problem of noise disturbing people. With daylight saving they will be able to start earlier when it is cooler. A lot of workers said that they would be happier because they would have better quality of family life and daylight saving is a simple initiative that will put the focus on a more family-friendly workplace.

One of the issues that were consistently raised by the business sector was that the time difference between the eastern states and Western Australia means that that sector cannot compete with the businesses that are on the same time line as the customer.

The tourism industry advised us of the benefits it will gain from daylight saving.

A number of people referred to the demographics of the issue. The last referendum on this issue was in 1994. A large number of people who were then too young to vote would like the chance to have a trial and then, based on their experience, the opportunity to vote on daylight saving. Another group of people said that over the past 14 years daylight saving has not been trialled and they want the chance of a three-year daylight saving trial and then the opportunity to make a decision.

A large number of people made the point that our supporting the bill does not mean we are supporting daylight saving; rather, we are giving them the opportunity to have their say in three years - although it should be two years. That is the argument that has moved me in that direction. A number of people who have experienced daylight saving said how they enjoyed it. Of course, there are the myth busters who say that children will adjust and sleep when they are tired and that farmers work with the sun and the weather, not the clock.

Given the number of people we surveyed within the electorate and the close call in the numbers, the argument that it is worthwhile having a daylight saving trial and then a referendum has persuaded me to support having a trial, but for only two years. That will allow the referendum to be out of way before the next election.

HON RAY HALLIGAN (North Metropolitan) [5.39 pm]: I will be supporting the bill, albeit - I was going to say reluctantly - I am a little ambivalent. This legislation is not earth shattering. It will not change the world. It will not cause people to do things that they would not normally do during a normal day for them. I am one of seven representatives for the North Metropolitan Region of this Legislative Council. I have received e-mails - I gave up counting them at 6 000 - and phone calls about this bill, and I have spoken to people about it at a number of functions. Because of my shadow portfolio, I got around to quite a number of functions and spoke to people. I did not even have to put the question on daylight saving to those people; they came to me and asked me which way I would vote on it. When I told them that I would probably vote for it, they thanked me, as that is what they said they wanted and what they expected me to do. I am fully aware that there have been three referenda on daylight saving and that the people of Western Australia have spoken on each of those occasions. However, times have changed. People must be provided with an opportunity to tell this Parliament their beliefs. Certainly a trial is a good thing to undertake. I liken it to my four children and sport. Often, when I tried to encourage them to partake in some sport, they would hold up their hands and say that it was not for them. I would tell them that they had not tried it, that they should give it a go first and that if they did not like it, they could come back and say that it was not for them. This bill represents something similar, although it is not something that I believe people will remember, particularly in three years.

All we are doing with this bill is changing something that is artificial - clocks and watches. Many members of this chamber have travelled overseas. How often have members been told by a pilot or someone on the plane to change their watches as the time is now different in the place in which they are landing? People do it readily. It is not a problem. It is another time, and they accept that. They do not get out their sextants, check the sun and say it is wrong and that back in Western Australia, with the sun in such a position on such a day and such a month of the year, the time is such and such. We do not bother going down that path; we just accept that somewhere else it is another time and we get on with life; even if it is summer in the United Kingdom and tennis is still being played at Wimbledon at 10 o'clock at night without lights.

We have an opportunity to do something similar in Western Australia. We should not become paranoid about daylight saving. As has been mentioned by many other speakers, there are people in non-metropolitan areas who rise by the sun and often go to bed by the sun. If we look back a few years - I can probably look back a little further than some members - we can recall times when there was no electricity. We had Tilley lamps and

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

kerosene lanterns. We knew they had to be switched on when the sun went down, and that was when we as kids had to come inside. We played outside until the sun went down. We did not have watches. The time did not matter to us; we just came inside when it started to get dark. We survived and enjoyed ourselves because we were able to go out and play to our heart's content, until we knew it was time to go home. How often have members said to other people - they might have to go back in their memories now - "I will meet you at sunset"? It might well have been at the beach. They would not have mentioned a particular time; they would have said, "I'll meet you at sunset."

Hon Helen Morton interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Hon Helen Morton continually shows me that she has not lived.

Hon Kate Doust: You should be nice to her.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I am always nice to her. I did not get upset when she criticised me for saying "motherhood statements".

Several members interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: We call them parenthood statements. Things have evolved over time and we have learnt to live with the changes that have taken place. People tend to think they are special because they have evolved to such a great extent and high technology is available to us and we are continually improving it. However, in many countries around the world, communities exist that do not have watches or clocks, and they survive. Their children survive and it matters not to them what our artificial time is. Once the sun goes down, they go inside. Often, many of these people have no electricity.

Change is taken seriously if we believe that it will be of some benefit to us. The view about what will be the benefit of the proposal in this bill is somewhat subjective. Many people will say that it will benefit them for certain reasons. Others will say that it will not benefit them for certain reasons. This is the case with the majority of legislation that is passed in this place. Unfortunately, legislation that is passed - this is but one piece of legislation - will affect everyone in Western Australia. I have spoken about the North Metropolitan Region and mentioned that the majority of constituents who have contacted my office and, obviously many other members' offices, including Hon Graham Giffard's office, have said that they support this proposal. I am trying to shy away from the term "daylight saving". The proposal will not save any daylight.

Hon Ken Travers: It will result in daylight shifting.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: It will be more a shifting of the hours in which we work. It will not affect us but it will affect many people who start work at a certain time and knock off at certain times according to their timepieces. That is what it will shift. I suggest to those who think that it will make an enormous difference that they are not necessarily correct because, at two different times in the year, there will be at least an hour's difference between the time suggested by the sun's position in the sky and the time shown by the watch on our wrist or the clock on the wall. People do not complain about that; they accept that. It is not an issue to them other than perhaps they might wish it was light when it is dark. However, as I mentioned earlier, when we were on the plane and landed at our destination in another country, we felt quite comfortable resetting our watches. We just accepted the time change as the norm. I suggest to members that, after a very short period, this proposal could become the norm. I fully understand what some members have been saying about problems that could arise, and I will talk about that a little later. These are issues associated with people who, as has been said, are on the land. However, I do not believe that these so-called problems are necessarily insurmountable.

Those who are against this proposal speak about the time zones in which people are able to engage in business. Currently, there is a three-hour difference between Western Australia and the eastern states, and there is no difference between Western Australia and Asia. Some people suggest that all we are trying to do is reduce the time difference between Western Australia and the eastern states from three hours to two hours, and create a one-hour difference between Western Australia and Asia, and there will be far more of a balance. I do not think for one moment that a one-hour time difference between Western Australia and Asia will cause those businesses with which we deal in that area to say that they will not do business with us any more. I do not think that will be the case at all.

Of course, an argument has been put by those against the proposal about the problems of getting children to sleep. Throughout the world when the sun is high in the sky at a time when we believe our children should be asleep, there is an issue for parents. However, what do they do? They normally pull down the blinds or close the curtains to create darkness. At the moment, what happens to shiftworkers when they work throughout the night and must sleep during the day? They find ways and means, as we all do, of overcoming these so-called problems. They are inconveniences without a doubt, but they are not insurmountable.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

I understand what some people have been saying about schoolchildren having to travel on school buses in the heat of the day. However, I do not believe that this one hour - it is only one hour, 60 minutes - will create the problems that have been suggested. Within those 60 minutes, I do not think that the temperature change -

Hon Ken Travers: If it is only 60 minutes, will it create the benefits that have been suggested?

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I will get to that in a moment. I am just going through one side of the story. The point is that the change in temperature during those 60 minutes will not be of such magnitude that it will warrant not going down this path. We have heard about how difficult it is of an evening when the temperature is still high. I have noticed that that high temperature normally remains for five or six hours. It does not drop dramatically after 60 minutes. We have heard that this legislation will cause it to remain high. Often when we have had very high temperatures throughout the day, the temperature is still quite high at midnight. Whether or not this legislation goes through will not change that situation; it will remain the same.

Daylight saving will be of benefit for not just one reason but a variety of reasons. One reason is that it will give people the opportunity to do other things with their time. A number of members, including Hon Sally Talbot, have mentioned that they are early risers. I rise at five o'clock in the morning. It is wonderful to rise at five o'clock in the morning when the sun is up. In a previous life, I used to start work early in the morning. When I walked up the Hay Street mall at half past eight in the morning - three and a half hours after the sun had come up - not one shop was open! The shops opened at nine o'clock in the morning - four hours after the sun had come up! It has been suggested that people will use that time to ride a bike. I suggest people will not do that.

Hon Ken Travers: There are people who do that. I did that this morning!

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Would the member kindly wait, or is that too much to ask?

Hon Ken Travers: If you say rubbish things like that, I cannot wait!

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I do not follow the member and what he does. I am thankful for that.

Some people get up at five o'clock in the morning and go out. However, more people go out when the sun has risen than go out in the dark; so people follow the sun themselves, and to some extent - only to some extent - ignore their clocks. Most people prefer to go out when the sun is up. The majority of the people who go out at that time - I must admit I have not checked this out fully - go walking or jogging, either with or without a dog, or cycling. I have yet to see anyone play tennis or a game of golf at five o'clock in the morning. Some people swim early in the morning, on a regular basis. Therefore, I repeat that it suits some people to do things at that time of the day. However, many people prefer to do things at the end of the day so that they can relax afterwards. Daylight saving will not prevent the early morning people from jogging and bike riding. They are committed people. I am sure they would do that even if it was dark. However, many of the people who prefer to play tennis or golf at the end of the day do not have that opportunity, because there are fewer daylight hours at the end of the day. Therefore, daylight saving would be of benefit to them. Some people have suggested that daylight saving will give children the opportunity to engage in sports and recreation with their parents. There is no guarantee that the incidence of childhood obesity will be reduced just because children will have an additional hour of daylight in which to exercise. However, at least they will have the opportunity to do these things if they wish. Some people have suggested that children can exercise early in the morning. I do not believe it is conducive for children to exercise early in the morning. Other people have suggested that children should be allowed to sleep early in the morning, during the cool of the day. People cannot have it both ways. I believe it is important that the morning be used to prepare children for school. That means allowing children to wake up in a congenial atmosphere, and to have a shower and get dressed, and have a meal, before they go to school. I am not talking about a particular time of the morning. I am talking about the time between when children get out of bed and when they walk into school. I believe the end of the day is more conducive for children to play sport, either with or without their parents, and undertake other forms of exercise. This legislation will give people the opportunity to do these things. At the end of the trial, people will be able to make an informed decision about what they want in the future for themselves and their children.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Before the dinner break I was explaining how this bill will not cause the world to stop, nor will it cause people to consider their reasons for being here. It is purely a measure that will change that artificial timepiece, the watch or the clock, by one hour, or 60 minutes. We are hearing a lot of people warn that daylight saving will shatter lives and ruin the economy, while others have suggested that it may create consternation within our bovine community. However, daylight saving will not really change much at all. One or two years after this measure has been in place, people will not be able to explain exactly what has changed in their lives.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

The question is, and probably always will be in the minds of some: why change at all? It is a matter not of changing for the sake of change, but of making a change that we believe will benefit the majority of people in Western Australia. Even the answer to the question of who will benefit is somewhat subjective. I understand that many people have been suggesting that we need a referendum - referendum number four - to provide the answer. Under normal circumstances, the people of Western Australia have given us, their elected representatives, the authority to make decisions on their behalf. In this instance, however, their thoughts on this matter are pretty obvious, considering the number of e-mails the majority of members have received. The general public believes that it has the right to have a say in this matter; and it does have that right, if it so wishes. Some members of the community have tried to provide individual members with their thoughts via e-mails, letters and phone calls, and, in some instances, face to face. Those that have not afforded themselves that opportunity are now saying that we should have a referendum. Far be it from me to disagree with the people of this state. All we are asking is that we provide people with the opportunity to understand what they are going through, and what this one-hour time shift might look like and how it might affect their day-to-day lives over not just one year but a number of years. At the end of that time they can have their say on the matter. Many members have indicated that the trial is not for the better and will not assist a great number of people. Again, I can put to them only that there is need for a trial. It is all very well and good to hypothesise on these matters and try to put forward an argument. However, that argument is often flawed unless one has actually tried what is being proposed. One can then stand up and say, "I did this, and for these reasons - these facts - and it failed." That is the type of thing we need here. People will say that we have had three referendums. However, their view of daylight saving is only their opinion of what it is like. They are not saying that they have tried daylight saving and they do not like it for certain reasons. The fact is that in a lot of instances they have not tried it; they are expressing purely an opinion, a hypothetical. Just as I said before the dinner suspension that I try to encourage my children to at least try a sport before arguing their case as to why it is not their cup of tea, I believe it is not unreasonable to ask people to go down the path proposed in this bill as well.

There is no doubt that there could be other ways of overcoming some of the problems that we face and that moving the clock forward one hour will not necessarily overcome them. If it were possible, I would encourage all employers and employees to arrange flexitime to try to change the numbers of people on our transport system - our roads, trains and buses - to make it easier for people to move between point A and point B. Unfortunately, going down the path proposed by this legislation will not overcome that problem. That is something that needs to be discussed and considered in future.

As I said before, legislation of this nature and the results thereof will suit some but not all. That could be said of every piece of legislation that goes through this chamber. We could not for one moment suggest that everyone will be happy with all the legislation that we agree to in this chamber. This is but another piece of legislation that will have similar results, some happy and some unhappy. It will inconvenience some people, and we have heard about that. I know of one instance where that is the case; I refer to my youngest daughter, who is into wedding photography. One might expect that moving the clock forward one hour would not affect wedding photography or any other vocation or business all that much. The difficulty in this instance, and I am not suggesting for one moment that it is insurmountable, is that bookings are made sometimes two or three years in advance. I am sure the young ladies in this chamber will correct me if I am wrong, but a great deal of time and effort goes into arranging a wedding. There are many parts to that arrangement. The chapel must be booked not just for the day, but for a time of the day, and the location of the wedding reception must be booked for a particular time of the day. I understand that many of the soon-to-be brides would like to have some - not all - of their wedding photographs taken at sunset. Having already arranged to do that, because the experts can tell us when the sun will set on a particular day, people must work backwards from that time to arrange the time of the reception and the booking of the chapel. If we are to change those artificial times, the only constant thing will be the setting of the sun, irrespective of what time is shown on our watches or clocks. There is some work to be done. Admittedly, daylight saving will apply only over the few months of summer. Weddings are held during that period, not just in June. If this legislation is passed and we have daylight saving, it will mean either that some alterations will have to be made or that people will have to accept that their wedding photographs may not be taken at sunset. It could mean also that people will have to wait around for an hour. All these matters must be taken into consideration. I am suggesting that it is not a simple matter of moving the clocks forward one hour and then continuing on with our lives. It will not affect a great number of people, and they will not have to worry about these types of things. It has already been explained that some people, particularly in the non-metropolitan area, will have to consider these matters. I am sure that Hon Kim Chance will correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that cows tend to come in to be milked at a certain time of the day, irrespective of the time on our watches and clocks.

Hon Kim Chance: So they tell me, but remember that I was a beef cattleman!

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I will forgive the member for that. No doubt the time when the milk is picked up will have to be rearranged, which is understandable. That could have a domino effect on the other aspects of milk production. These matters must be taken into consideration.

This bill is not about a simple matter of people just changing the clocks and nothing else changing. Although things will not change for a great number of us, some people have concerns about this change, and although I do not believe that their concerns are insurmountable, they must be taken into consideration. People must be given time to rearrange their affairs. For that reason I believe that the trial should be conducted for more than 12 months. It is no good putting people through the bother of having to rearrange their appointments and then to change the times back 12 months later. I can assure members that my youngest daughter would not be happy with that, and I am sure that many other people would not be either. It is important that people be given an opportunity to understand how the changes will affect them, and the time to come to terms with them. There may well be other people who have similar problems.

Earlier, other speakers and I spoke about whether people would utilise the additional daylight time to undertake some sporting activities and whether young people would use the time for the betterment of their health. It has been rightly suggested that even though the time would be available, it does require a change of attitude. Members have suggested that many people would continue to work anyway, and this extra daylight hour would not necessarily cause them to do anything other than that which they would usually do. I believe that what we are providing is opportunity. I think that is all we can provide; the rest is up to them. We can encourage. The government spends an enormous amount of money on encouraging people to get out and exercise. The government is trying to change people's attitudes. By providing people with an extra hour of daylight after they have knocked off work, one would hope that they would see the benefit of undertaking exercise. Again, it is the proverbial case that one can take a horse to water but one cannot make it drink. Here we have a situation in which those who may well have complained about the fact that they have not had the time to do these things are now provided with the opportunity to do them.

For a variety of reasons, there are benefits to be gained by going down this path and having a trial for three years. I, like other speakers, have some concerns about when the referendum might be held. I think it would be most unfortunate if the referendum were held at the time of a state election when the people of Western Australia would be asked to consider not only daylight saving, as we call it, but also the more important issue of who should govern the state for the next four years. Although I initially saw no problem with a three-year trial, on further consideration I think that a two-year trial would be far more satisfactory from a number of points of view. I think that the general public believe we are proposing not a three-year trial, but only a two-year period. I think that two years is the absolute minimum period for a trial. I have already mentioned that one year would not be sufficient, but two years would be. I mentioned earlier that I am a supporter of daylight saving, having moved throughout the South Pacific and experienced not so much daylight saving by our definition but a difference in when the sun rises compared with the time shown on a wristwatch. I have no problems with it. Having come originally from New South Wales, where daylight saving was a natural occurrence every summer, I see no real problems for metropolitan people, although I do recognise that non-metropolitan people may have some difficulties and that we need to support them and help them through those difficulties.

I would be quite happy for what we term daylight saving to be in place permanently, but if we are to have a referendum, it must be at a certain point. I think a three-year trial would create difficulties for the voting public because they would then be asked to concentrate on two matters. It would not be just a simple matter of worrying about the referendum. It would also be a matter of worrying about all the issues associated with the state election. I believe it is particularly important that people be given the opportunity of not having to consider other, extraneous matters that might cloud the more important issues that we believe they should be concentrating on. Other members will speak in this place. Some will be in favour of daylight saving and some will be against it. Each will express a point of view, and each will speak about constituents who have let them know their thinking on this legislation. However, at the end of this debate, we in this chamber will need to decide whether to proceed with a trial of daylight saving.

While there appear to be some downsides to the legislation - other members have mentioned that - I do not believe those downsides are insurmountable. I believe people can overcome them relatively easily. I believe there are benefits to be gained from daylight saving, even by those in the non-metropolitan region, once they change their attitude. A change of attitude is important, otherwise we would go back to the days when we insisted that someone walk ahead of motor vehicles on the roads and hold up a lantern. Things change, attitudes change, and that is exactly what is happening in this instance. In some instances people are harking back to 50 years ago, before the first referendum on daylight saving. They are saying that because of what happened all those years ago, nothing should change. If we took that attitude to everything we did, there would be no improvements and no-one would try anything. Mistakes have been made over the years, but that has not stopped

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

people from trying to find better ways of doing things and trying to change things to improve the lot of the majority of Western Australians, not just a few. We are talking about a democracy. While some members have mentioned that it is somewhat unusual for the government to be bringing on this bill when there are more urgent bills to discuss -

Hon Ken Travers: Do you know what else is unusual - for people who support the bill to filibuster it!

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I do not think that is an area that the member best go down. I could talk about last Thursday and the Sunset Hospital Site Bill.

There is a need for this trial. We need to provide people with an opportunity to experience an extra hour of daylight. As others have said, younger people have not had an opportunity to experience daylight saving and vote on the issue by way of a referendum. I support the bill.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan) [7.54 pm]: I support the Daylight Saving Bill (No. 2) 2006. I regret considerably that there was no referendum to proceed with the bill to enable the people of Western Australia to be heard. I recognise that in the past 20 years there have been three separate referenda on daylight saving, as it is termed in Western Australia. I have spoken to a number of people in the community who have said that if it is good enough for them to be heard on those three occasions, why is it not good enough for them to be heard on this occasion? I understand exactly where they are coming from. I say again that I believe the community should have been part of the decision making on this bill. I say that because in my view daylight saving is all about personal lifestyle issues - nothing more and nothing less. I doubt whether any speaker in this place will convince another member to change his or her position, because daylight saving is a personal lifestyle matter.

Some people have argued that daylight saving is good for business. It is an interesting argument. There are those who say it will not be good for business. There are arguments both ways, and that is why for most people to whom I have spoken in the community it has very much come down to a personal lifestyle issue.

I represent the North Metropolitan Region, which is a large metropolitan region stretching from the Fremantle traffic bridge, in the south, through to Yanchep-Two Rocks, in the north. That region has the highest number of electors in any region in Western Australia. From the demographics of the people who have contacted me, there is no question that the majority of those in the over-60s age group appear to be less in favour of any change than those in the 15 to 60s age group. In the latter age group a clear majority have indicated to me that they are in favour of change. Boiling down the results of the discussions I have had in the community and the letters I have received, and the strength of those representations, it seems to me that the ratio of those in favour of daylight saving is four to one; I qualify that by saying that the ratio applies in the region that I represent, North Metropolitan Region.

I disregard completely the electronic campaign in which my office has received in excess of 6 000 e-mails. If I were to take into account that electronic campaign, the ratio in favour of so-called daylight saving would be about 75 to one. If I rely on the personal representations and the people who have written letters in their own hand or typed them, the ratio is about four to one in favour.

Like most members I have been contacted by various business groups within the community. Most of the groups that have contacted me are in favour of so-called daylight saving. The finance industry strongly supports the proposed change. It is interesting that not all big business groups support the daylight saving legislation. In some cases, particularly those industries that are in the main outdoor industries, the response is that, irrespective of this bill, they will continue to do their own thing by starting work early in summer. They do not need this bill to tell them that it is very hot in the Perth metropolitan area. Outdoor workers will set their own working hours to suit the conditions.

I do not buy the argument put by some members of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia that business will be in jeopardy if we do not support the bill. It is my experience that business has a remarkable capacity to be flexible in its pursuit of the almighty dollar, and it will not be daylight saving that makes or breaks industry.

The referendum that is proposed in the bill is critical. It will give the community the opportunity to become involved. Regrettably, it will not be held for three years. I will support an amendment that brings that referendum forward to two years hence, and not three years.

I am interested in some of the claims that I have read in the newspaper that the number of motor crashes will reduce because of daylight saving, and it will somehow facilitate a healthier community. I am sceptical of some of these claims, but I will certainly watch the statistics with great interest. I hope that is the case, but I am not

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

sure that in other areas it is a proven fact. Some of the claims that I have heard remind me of the claims that have been made about the amendments to the liquor laws. Some people have said that a liquor-led recovery will result in both a significant increase in tourism and an economic benefit to Western Australia. I say again that I do not buy that argument either. In recognising the proposed changes, I do not believe there will be a liquor-led recovery at all.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Some people are hopeful, I'm sure.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Some people may be hopeful, but they are probably not the ones who will be able to help us in that regard.

I am not trying to convince anyone of the benefits of daylight saving; I think the counting has already been done. I have read the newspapers and I understand the position of most members of this Legislative Council. Some others have been coy and not stated their position, which is obviously their right. However, I am hopeful that a decision on this bill will be taken reasonably quickly because there are two ladies in particular who are very close to me. One rings me almost on a daily basis to remind me to vote for the bill and the other rings me on a pretty regular basis to tell me that the bill will not suit her lifestyle. I therefore need the matter sorted out so that those phone calls stop and we can get on with our lives. However, I believe this bill is all about personal lifestyle issues; it will not suit everyone. The bottom line is that the bill will most likely be agreed to. The bad news is that the community was not given an opportunity to comment on daylight saving before the bill was introduced and they will now have to wait until after the bill is passed to voice their views on the issues at hand. I support the bill.

HON ED DERMER (North Metropolitan) [8.01 pm]: I rise to support the Daylight Saving Bill (No. 2) 2006. I have reached the conclusion to support the bill after quite an extended period of time. It is a subject on which I had no fixed view. The last time I would have exercised my vote in a referendum on daylight saving was some time ago, and much life experience has since followed. Not having a fixed view left me very open to listening to the people who expressed their views to me, which included colleagues around the Parliament, but most importantly my constituents and others. My office was open to receive representations from anyone who chose to send them. I received letters, phone calls and e-mails. Like Hon George Cash, my office could tell when e-mails came through that had been copied from a standard form, and I put the least weight on those e-mails. On one day the computer in my office got into serious trouble because of the enormous number of replica e-mails that came through. However, it was worth going to the trouble to discern the serious representations. In addition to telephone calls, letters and e-mails to the office, whenever I was out and about at primary schools or other activities, I made a point of asking people their opinion and I continued going through the process of endeavouring to reach a conclusion. The complication, of course, was that I heard very good arguments both for and against daylight saving. Hearing very good arguments both for and against did not necessarily make the decision-making process any easier. I suppose the best example of this would be the fellow I met at a primary school who put what I thought was one of the strongest arguments against daylight saving, and then declared that he would be voting yes when the referendum came forward. Obviously, that gentleman was able to contemplate two very cogent arguments in opposite directions. He articulated a very clear argument against and concluded that he was going to vote yes in the referendum. It is therefore not a simple process to actually come to the conclusion to support the bill. The argument put by that gentleman against daylight saving was similar to one raised by the Leader of the House earlier today when he talked about the difficulty facing children in country areas in having a long drive home from school in the heat. I thought that was a very sensible argument against. It was very interesting to hear my colleague Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm say today that, notwithstanding the issue of children being uncomfortable and hot on the way home from school, it was more important to have them comfortable and cool while they were at school. To the extent to which daylight saving achieves a cooler school starting time - with respect to the earlier solar time - those children will be more advantaged by the cooler time at school than disadvantaged by the hotter time when they are travelling home. It is a sound argument and reflects the depth of Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm's experience in the teaching profession. The fact that I was hearing good arguments both for and against did not make my decision making any simpler. However, I am hopeful that the process was sound, given my decision was based on very serious consideration of the arguments for and against from so many people. I am very grateful to each of the people who took the trouble to put an argument to me on daylight saving regardless of whether it was for or against it.

I am reminded again of how I came to the conclusion that I arrived at. Early in the discussion on daylight saving, the Heart Foundation's views were reported in *The West Australian*. The Heart Foundation was quite enthusiastic in its support for daylight saving on the basis that it would encourage people to exercise more. I know that I am far from the finest example of physique and exercise, but given that, I probably appreciate more than some the importance of people being encouraged to undertake more active lifestyles. People would be

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

wrong to anticipate that daylight saving will be the total answer to our tendency to spend too much time watching television and following other passive pursuits rather than engaging in physical activities. It will assist on the margins, but often that assistance can be very important, and is the reason I have come around to supporting daylight saving and the bill.

I received an interesting phone call from a gentleman who said that, too often on the weekends when his children suggest they undertake a pleasant physical activity, he is busy mowing the lawn or doing some other chore around the garden. Consequently, he has decided that, if the house passes the bill, he will work through his gardening chores in the evenings from Monday to Friday, and that will allow him to respond more positively to his children's desires to engage in physical activity on weekends. It is not accurate to imagine that everyone will rush off to join a tennis club, for example, after work. However, on the margins, in that way, I anticipate that daylight saving will allow for a more active and healthier population. I suppose one can visualise a family on a summer's night wondering what to do after the evening meal. The homework and the dishes will still need to be done, but once they are done, the family might wonder whether to take the dog for a walk or turn on the television. I reckon that if it is still daylight, based on that significant margin, they are more likely to reach the healthier conclusion of taking the dog for a walk or doing some other activity outside.

I thank Hon Ray Halligan for reminding me of some very joyous times in my childhood when he spoke about children playing. I remember a special treat in summer, particularly during school holidays when we were not thinking about homework and mum and dad were not so worried about me going to bed early. I was allowed after dinner to play cricket with my friend next door in his backyard. That was a special summer treat; it was a marvellous thing. It is one of those marginal, but important decisions which, because of daylight saving, might influence children and others to lead a more active lifestyle.

My decision-making process was interesting. The argument from the Heart Foundation that initially caught my eye did not bring me to a conclusion at that time. However, it resonated with other representations that were made to me subsequently and I think, on balance, daylight saving will be a helpful and positive contribution to our society. For that reason, I support the bill.

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan) [8.09 pm]: The issue of daylight saving is very much about personal preferences. We have all been exposed recently to some very strong views in favour of a daylight saving experiment in Western Australia, and we have all been exposed to some very strong views against that proposal. There are also some people in the community, as one would expect, who really do not care either way about whether we proceed with this proposal. I think there is also a group of people in the community who do not really know whether they would like daylight saving, but, to find out, they would not mind having a trial of it. This is one of those issues that really get people talking. Every conversation becomes dominated by it. We have all heard and discussed the same things over and again. On some days - I am sure it is the same for all of us - I have had the identical conversation with umpteen different people. A person cannot go to a function after -

Hon Vincent Catania: It is happening now.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Indeed, it is. At every meeting and every function that a person attends the question is asked, "What are you doing? Are you for it or agin it?" I do not want to canvass all those arguments, but, similar to other members who are debating a bill on which party positions are not clearly defined, people need to explain where they are coming from.

My initial preference - it has always been my preference since 1975 - is that I do not like daylight saving. My experience of the trial that we had in that year was coloured very much by the difficulties that I recall my younger sister having in those days. She would have been about eight or nine at that time, I think. We lived in a block of apartments, in an elevated position, at 1 Forrest Street, Fremantle. Most of our three-bedroom apartment overlooked John Curtin Senior High School, so we had a good view out to the harbour. The apartment faced west; I remember that my bedroom faced north. My young sister Annette would, as children of that age do, retire early when it was still light and still very hot. I remember that it was a very difficult summer for her in that period. They are the sorts of experiences which a person is exposed to and which colour a person's judgment when considering the benefits or otherwise of a daylight saving proposal. Therefore, similar to other members, I have some considerable sympathy for people who have expressed the concern that they will have difficulties getting their young children off to sleep on some nights, particularly when it is hot and still light. Therefore, I acknowledge that argument because it is one that I relate to. Furthermore, my time for recreation is in the early morning. If I do not get out and manage to go for a bike ride or go to the gym first thing in the morning - about six o'clock - it will not happen. Therefore, again, I do not really like the idea of advancing the clocks.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

However, this is not about my personal preference; it is about representing the community. In the course of the public debate, we have all had many representations. I thank those people who have been in touch with me. However, I make the point to whoever started those e-mails with the colossal mailing lists, which were taken up by thousands of people in support of daylight saving and which were hijacked by a lot of people who received them and then forwarded them, having inserted the word "not" to customise it to their own needs, that that was not a good idea. I think a lot of members of this place put all those e-mails to one side with a view to acknowledging them as a courtesy. However, it appeared that many of them were actually spammed.

Those members who had not deleted their e-mails received a notification from IT support that the number of e-mails going through the system had caused the system to jam. The fact that many of the e-mails were spammed created the additional problem that when members tried to reply to them, they ended up sending a reply to people who had not even sent them an e-mail. That is the reason that many people did not receive a reply from the 91 members, and others, to whom they had sent an e-mail.

Like other members, I also received a number of letters. I thank all the people who took the trouble to put pen to paper or hit the keyboard and send me a letter. The letters that I received were about 50 per cent against daylight saving and 50 per cent in support of daylight saving. My office also kept a telephone log. The phone messages that I received were about two-thirds against daylight saving and one-third in support of daylight saving. Perhaps that is a reflection of the demographics of the area in which my office is located. We have had all sorts of other polls. In the last referendum, my electorate of South Metropolitan Region recorded a slight level of support for daylight saving; that is, a touch over 50 per cent in favour. My perception is that the level of support for daylight saving is now slightly stronger, but that is only my perception. The only way we can find out for sure is by holding a plebiscite. For the benefit of people who may read this debate, each of the regions that members in this house represent has a large number of voters. There are 270 000-plus voters in the South Metropolitan Region. The number of people who actually live in the South Metropolitan Region is probably double that. It is impossible, with our level of resources, to knock on doors and speak to every individual so that we can conduct a full plebiscite or survey of our electorate. My perception is that although the community of the South Metropolitan Region is divided on the issue of daylight saving, with varying degrees of vehemence, it is probably in favour of proceeding with a trial. That is my perception. We will find out in due course.

A variety of personal arguments have been put in this debate, all of which are valid. However, what I have found unsavoury about this debate is that when people have stated their point of view, they have been held in contempt, or ridiculed, by those who hold a contrary view. That is not the way we should debate things in our community. A councillor from the City of Cockburn, Kevin Allen, said to me, "I commute frequently to the eastern states. It is a pain in the neck when there is a two-hour time difference. However, when there is a three-hour time difference, it is really difficult with jet lag and with coordinating the travel, so I would really like daylight saving to be introduced." That is okay. That is a perfectly valid argument for that person to put. Ian Day from Qantas has also told me about some of the difficulties of travelling to the eastern states. Fine. I accept his argument also. I have already mentioned that some people have concerns about getting young children to sleep in the heat of a longer evening, whereas other people look forward to using the extra daylight hour as an opportunity to recreate with their children in the outdoors. Every single one of those arguments is strongly held by the people who propose them, and every one of them is valid. They should not be scorned. The problem for us is how to have regard for all of those elements put together.

I said that I would acknowledge some correspondence I received. It is not possible to acknowledge it all, but there is some that I particularly want to refer to. A kindly couple from Finlayson Street in Subiaco took the trouble to write to me, and probably to others as well, and said, in part -

We hope that you will vote against the introduction of so-called daylight saving, as we think our climate unsuitable.

This we believe after each of us spending over 65 summers here, and some in Europe.

We also believe that our two opinions should count as four as we have probably spent twice as many summers here as most.

I think that was a tongue-in-cheek remark; I have certainly taken it as such. A chap came into my office with his cap pulled down over his face. According to my staff, he slunk into the office very quickly, and the staff member wondered whether he was up to no good, but he just slapped a flyer down on the desk and took off. It is an anonymous sheet, of the kind that people sometimes put out. It states that the local member - namely, me - does not care about WA businesses being competitive and successful. It states that I want to tear down the opportunity for people to enjoy daylight, and that sort of thing. If the fellow had come in and asked to see me, he might have found out that that is not necessarily the case. In fact, it is an absurdity. I am sure that the people

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

in the immediate vicinity who received this sheet of paper know me better than that, and did not take any notice of it. If the author of this anonymous, ill-conceived letter wants to get in contact with me I would be more than happy to have a talk with him.

Hon Ken Travers: It might not have been written by the guy who came to see you.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: He might have been only the deliverer; that is a possibility, but I am more than happy to talk to the author or the man who came into my office. I have a letter from Ms Watson, of Manning, who went to a great deal of trouble to give her view. She made the good point that, for her and others of like mind, the factor is not sunlight but heat. For people who are not in a position to get out and enjoy an outdoors life, the additional daylight hours are not a factor; it is a concern about greater heat. That is acknowledged by members. I received an e-mail from a man named Peter, who was cross because he had read the debate in the other place, in which someone stated that because this bill may not pass the upper house - a premature pronouncement to make - perhaps we should get rid of the upper house. The chap who wrote to me was outraged that people should make such threats.

Hon Kim Chance: Was it signed C. Barnett, by any chance?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: No, it was not. I think the remarks he was referring to were made by the member for Perth, Mr John Hyde. I wrote to Peter to thank him and noted what he had to say. I reassured him not to worry about campaigns to get rid of the upper house, because a lot of us had a campaign to get rid of the member for Perth, which is a far more attractive proposition. Some other people wrote to me. I do not have the opportunity to acknowledge them all, but I refer to one letter. I am not sure who it is from, but I am sure they are nice people who feel very strongly about the issue. This is one of those letters that I think was written to "Dear member", saying "If you vote in support of daylight saving, we shall NEVER again vote for you or your party". It appears it has been sent to all members of all parties, saying the senders will not vote for any of us or for any parties that we represent.

Hon Ken Travers: Frank Hough will be getting excited.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Indeed he might. The funny thing is I then opened another letter - this would have happened to other members - which said, "If you don't support daylight saving, I will never vote for you or your party again." It is one of those difficult situations in which people are pretty evenly divided in their points of view, and that is reflected in the correspondence one receives. It is pretty hard to please everyone when one is caught in that difficult situation.

I will refer to one more letter from someone who tried to look at the problem in a very lateral way of thinking. It is from Mr Wilcox, of Rockingham, who very kindly offered this advice -

The Eastern Time Zone (ETZ) encompasses the whole of NSW, and what most people ignore, is that it is the centre of the Zone which the whole state's time is based on, not where the capital city (Sydney) is. The ETZ is centered west of Bathurst, and, as the sun rises in the east, Sydney gets the sun around 30min before the centre of time zone. Consequentially, Sydney also loses the sun 30min before the centre of her time zone, and with the Blue Mountains raising the horizon, the time penalty is actually a little bit more.

Being east of the centre of their time zone is a penalty, and as such, the sun artificially sets earlier, and gives some justification in the argument for having DLS. Sunlight is not gained or lost, the period of sunlight during the day is just shifted to a time earlier than the time zone centre.

The Western Time Zone (WTZ) encompasses the whole of WA, and once again, what most people ignore, is that it is the centre of the Zone which the whole state's time is based on, not where the capital city (Perth) is. The WTZ is centered east of Perth, and runs roughly through Southern Cross.

I am taking this chap at his word. I have not verified this independently but it sounds about right. To continue -

This time however, as the sun still rises in the east, it is Southern Cross, the centre of time zone, that gets the sun around 30min before Perth. Consequentially, when the sun has set at the center of our time zone, it has yet to set in Perth. Additionally, our horizon is the ocean, and so we get the full span of our sun hours.

Being west of the center of our time zone is a bonus, and it gives us an artificial Daylight Savings already, compared to the center of our time zone. Perth's hours of sunlight are skewed to later in the day than the center of our time zone.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

That point has been made, although probably not as well, by a number of people who I am sure have contacted all members. The situation with daylight hours in Sydney is a bit different from that in Perth. Mr Wilcox concludes as follows -

One additional fact to consider, again missed, ignored or otherwise, by most people, is that Perth is actually further north than Sydney. Sydney is at a Latitude of 33.51deg South, Perth is 31.57deg South. This means that Perth is near 2deg closer to the equator than Sydney. While this does not sound much, it means Perth is actually 207km further north than Sydney.

Again, I have not actually gone out and measured it, but I will take him at his word. To continue -

The closer you are to the tropic of Capricorn, the more hours of sun you receive each day. For Perth, it is about a 15 min extra total hours of sun each day over Sydney.

He goes on to talk about other matters. Members might be interested to hear those figures, and recording them does justice to the people who wanted those considerations recorded in the debate.

Where does that lead us? As I outlined in my opening remarks, I have a personal preference. However, I recognise that I also have a responsibility to faithfully represent the views of the region that I represent. Admittedly, we have multimember electorates. Nonetheless, we have a responsibility to reflect community opinion. In some of the country regions there is a very clear aversion to daylight saving. Perhaps it is three or four to one against in some places. That has been faithfully reflected by the remarks we have heard from some of our country colleagues. Those members who oppose daylight saving would look to the strong opposition to the introduction of daylight saving in the country and cling to that as a further argument to add to their own personal preference that daylight saving not be introduced. However, I must look to the South Metropolitan Region. I have already indicated what people have said to me. Although it seems to be fairly marginal, I perceive that there is a preference for the yes vote, and I must weigh that on balance. I must have regard also to the other four members from my region. I do not know how we can reflect that because there is no mechanism to do so. Each member is an individual and must vote according to his or her own conscience and reason.

I conclude by pointing out where my position is and how it has changed slightly over the course of the debate. I started off with a view that was against daylight saving and that I had better divine what the people wanted. I had the strong view also that if we were to go down this path again, after three referendums had been defeated, a referendum should be held before imposing on people the extra daylight saving trial. It was my view that if that was not done, what was the point of a referendum? However, throughout the course of the debate I have gained an understanding of why a trial was held in 1975 followed by a referendum. It was done because of the nature of the division in the community and because of the difficulty of establishing what the overall view of the community was because this is a matter on which most people have a view. I now understand why that was done. That has led me to an understanding of why it is desirable to hold a referendum after the trial. If the referendum succeeds, presumably that will be the end of the matter forevermore. The terms of this bill contemplate a referendum which, if carried, will change the way clocks are adjusted in the future.

I mentioned another aspect earlier that I was not aware of at the start of the debate. A clear theme is that a generation has not voted for or experienced daylight saving.

Hon Vincent Catania: There are two or three members in this chamber who have not experienced it.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Has the member not experienced it?

Hon Vincent Catania: No.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I do not mean children; I am talking about adults, including adults who are in their early 30s. A very large block of the community holds the view that they would like to at least trial daylight saving with a view to working out how they will vote on the issue in a referendum to decide whether to make it permanent. In trying to balance those competing demands and having regard to the fact that we have a whole lot of people who have not voted in any of those previous referenda and who want to experience daylight saving so as to have an informed basis for voting in a referendum, we probably need to accommodate that.

The process that we go through in this place - forget the other place - means that this bill must be agreed to on four different occasions, not one. People say that members are either voting for it or against it, as if that is all there is to it. There must be four votes. One is on the first reading, and unusually we had a division on the first reading of this bill. The second vote will be at the end of this debate, which is the second reading vote. If at the first or second reading the vote is in the negative, the bill is disposed of completely at that stage. If the bill passes the second reading, it will go into the committee stage, when we will first consider clause 1, which will then be put. If clause 1 is defeated, the bill is discarded. In the balance of the committee stage we have the

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

opportunity to entertain amendments. We then have a bill that may have been changed before emerging from the committee stage. There is then a final, third reading. At the third reading stage the bill again has to be carried. If it is not passed at that stage, it is defeated. I do not know whether a similar procedure exists in another place, but it probably does. Therefore, the bill has to be successfully voted for at least eight times. If there are any amendments, another place still has to agree to those amendments or, if not, send them back to us. Quite a few votes take place; it is not a simple yes or no.

I remind the house of those matters because I know that people outside this house will read the record of this debate and they need an explanation of what I am about to propose. A significant number of people out there at least want a trial of daylight saving, plus, of course, those people who want it anyway. I think they are entitled to a trial. If we do not go down that path now, this issue will be back to visit us again next year or the year after. If people are saying to us that they want a trial, perhaps we need to facilitate that. I am concerned though, particularly for those who think they know based on past experience or personal preference that they do not want daylight saving, that the trial should not be particularly onerous.

Hon Ken Travers: That it be non-mandatory!

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Hon Ken Travers raises a point of levity, but the point is that the trial is mandatory. How we keep our clocks impacts on everyone, and that is why everyone has a point of view. This is what I intend to do: in order to reflect as best I can all the representations that have been put to me, I will support the upcoming second reading. I will vote yes in support of the bill passing the second reading and then going to the committee stage. I will then support the amendments proposed by Hon Norman Moore, that there be a shorter trial period rather than subject people to three years of trial of daylight saving whether they like it or not. I think it should be a shorter time but still long enough for people to decide whether they like it or not. For now I will reserve my position on how I will vote in the final, third reading stage, pending my examination and consideration of how the bill comes out of the committee stage. I thank the house for allowing me to place those items on the record. I hope that makes my position clear.

HON PAUL LLEWELLYN (South West) [8.39 pm]: I have heard it said that daylight saving is an entirely personal matter and it clearly means different things to different people. My first take on the matter was highly personalised. I said, "Let's give it a go." That was my view. It was arguably a flippant view. I remember saying, "Let's give it a whirl and then have a referendum." Then democracy kicked in, hundreds of e-mails came, people's views became more divided and loaded and I realised that it is not just a personal thing. This decision has consequences. Then I had to think of what those consequences were. I will go through those consequences. We have discussed this at length and I do not want to reiterate all the views. There is tension over the matter of democracy; that is, we have had these referenda and people who can remember them well enough believe that the decision has already been made and that we are re-visiting it. We have the issue of democracy versus the matter before us, which is a time trial, for want of another phrase, so we can see what it will be like to change the clock. We will have a trial and then conduct a referendum. After that trial period we will go back to the people, perhaps a slightly different generation, and ask what they think. We will get an answer. We may get 50 per cent thinking one way and 50 per cent the other. There will be differences between metropolitan and country people. It will be expensive; an independent referendum will cost approximately \$5 million. We do not want it to be run in conjunction with a state election because that will politicise the issue. There are a few streams running through this matter, not least democracy and then the issue that we have to decide on.

The key issue that I will challenge is that this is a personalised matter. I do not think it is. I am beginning to think that on the question of democracy, there is the question of the run-out costs of having this poll, the notion that there is a new generation of voters, the fact that the last poll was held 15 or 16 years ago and so on. I have noticed that there is polarisation on the matter of democracy. Some people think that daylight saving is a good idea and they do not have a strong view on it. The people who oppose it, the minority, seem to have a very strongly held view.

Hon Murray Criddle: What makes you say it's a small number?

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: The member is quite right. I am suggesting that the people who are opposed to daylight saving have a stronger view.

We should not collapse the democratic process and the matter before us; that is, changing the clocks, looking at the social, economic and environmental impacts of doing that, putting forward a trial and then asking whether we should introduce daylight saving permanently. I will continue to talk about what a trial means. It means that we have to make a judgment, an assessment. We are asking people to try it out, to suck it and see. There are the social impacts of school buses, the lack of airconditioning for some people, farmers' lives, people who believe

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

that their scheduling and lifestyles will be disrupted, work practices, children spending more time in the sun and so on. We have heard of the commercial and economic impacts and the commercial operation of businesses, the convenience of operating in certain time zones and so on.

Very few people have actually asked: what are the impacts of daylight saving? I know that Hon Murray Criddle asked what would be the cost of the water that would be used by people having an extra shower in the heat of the afternoon and what would be the cost of people flicking on another airconditioning unit. It is not just a personalised issue. Consequences will arise from any decision to make society shift the clock forward by one hour. We know that is done all over the world, but what would it mean to the western fringe of this large continent of Australia? I have done a back-of-the-envelope calculation on the impact of daylight saving on energy, and I will come back to that.

I refer now to democracy in the context of 5 000 e-mails - there needs to be an inquiry by the minister who has responsibility for this area to ascertain who generated the 5 000 e-mails that clogged up politicians' e-mail systems. What was the cost of that? The answer to the question of who sent spam to this state's politicians that clogged up the e-mail system and what it cost would be very interesting. It is not important enough to do that, but it is a question that could be asked.

If we have a trial, we should have a decent trial, and I am inclined to the view that it should be for three years, not two, because that will give it a fair go.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Does not one summer give it a fair go?

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: The question of what is a fair go falls within the domain of what is a personalised view.

How much will a referendum on daylight saving cost? Democracy is expensive, but is it a fair thing to impose another \$5 million on the taxpayers of this state versus \$800 000 to run the poll simultaneously with the state election? These were the figures that were given to me following my inquiry to the Western Australian Electoral Commission. Is it worth it to supposedly depoliticise the issue of daylight saving?

I come back to the trial. If we run a trial, what will we measure apart from public opinion? Will we have another divided debate and more clogged up e-mail systems or will we have an informed process? In other words, is there a way to make a decision about daylight saving that goes beyond the personalised and opinionated view?

Hon Robyn McSweeney: You either like it or you do not.

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: That could very well be the case, but there could be significant consequences from daylight saving on the water supply. Who will make that assessment and who will bring into the public domain the issue that, for example, an additional 35 gegalitres of water has been used because of daylight saving?

Again, I have done a back-of-the-envelope calculation to determine how many additional gigawatt hours of electricity will be used. Let us assume that Western Australia has 750 000 airconditioning units. That is a real number. I do not know how big they are or whether they are mobile or stationary and are connected into homes or other buildings. If 500 000 of these airconditioning units are flicked on for an extra hour when people arrive home, each unit will consume two kilowatt hours of energy. What will be the result if, over the 90-day trial period, on approximately 60 of those days - two-thirds of the trial period - people flick on their airconditioners for an extra hour? I do not know whether it is true, but my calculation is that it will result in consumers using an additional 60 million kilowatt hours of power. That is 60 gigawatt hours of electrical energy just to run that little scenario. To give the house a sense of what that means, it is approximately the entire annual output of the Albany wind farm, or about 70 per cent of the annual energy consumption of the City of Albany. It is approximately 60 000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions on top of what we normally emit. That is therefore an additional impact.

Although daylight saving could be construed to be a highly personalised, casual, flippant decision, it could also have tangible, measurable impacts. We do not know what they are. We have put daylight saving into the domain of a casual decision that we are making. I will give the house a sense of what I am referring to. The Water Corporation will run our dams down by 40 gegalitres this year. I do not think there will be much more rain this summer. Our dams are actually storing 200 gegalitres of water. Therefore, if we run the dams down by 40 gegalitres, we will be running pretty close - I suggest in four years - to having no proper inflow into the dams. We will have done our dinner; we will have done our storage capacity. That is something worth considering. What happens if daylight saving actually costs another 10 gegalitres because people are flicking on their showers or turning on the hoses in their gardens? I do not know what the reality is. Who knows?

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

I return to the notion that daylight saving could cost 60 gigawatt hours of energy; that is, the entire output of the Albany wind farm. I do not know whether that is true. I do not know whether people will save that amount of energy in the morning by not flicking on their airconditioning. However, I do know that they will not save that amount of energy if they flick it on at peak time; in other words, in the afternoon. Peak power is the most expensive power. We have discussed this on a number of occasions. I will give the house a sense of what I am saying. I believe that something like \$2 billion worth of power generation and control assets run for just 35 hours a year to service the peak load. That is a very expensive source of power. We should consider the impacts: it is not just an increase in peak load or an increase of 60 gigawatt hours; it is an increase of 60 gigawatt hours at the most inconvenient time. That is a consideration. Our houses are so poorly designed that we live in poorly insulated boxes with very poor standards of thermal comfort. We bolt on airconditioners and we use energy to substitute for poor design when we should be living in comfort. If we were living in comfortable, well-designed houses, we would not be having this peak-load argument. All of these matters weave in and out of a decision about daylight saving in a way that I did not predict when *The West Australian* journalist came by in a frenzy and said, "What do you reckon about daylight saving?" I said, "Give it a whirl, mate; it's a good idea."

Hon George Cash interjected.

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: It was not a she, actually; I think it was a bloke. That is why I did not say, "She asked, 'What do you think about daylight saving?'"

When I first said that daylight saving was a beautiful thing and that we should give it a whirl, I was being fairly loose about it. I quite clearly had not considered all the ins and outs. I am therefore in agreement with Hon Simon O'Brien, who said that there are a lot of ways to make this decision. I would like a mechanism, for example through an amendment to the bill, for measuring the impact of daylight saving on energy. If we are to conduct a trial, why not? I will start using some synonyms. Let us consider what a trial means. A trial is a test; it requires judgment; it is an assessment; it requires consideration; and it is an evaluation. It requires informed judgment and informed assessment against what criteria? It is not as simple as even I thought. Why not undertake a family impact statement?

Hon Barbara Scott: Or a child impact statement.

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: Yes, a child impact statement should be undertaken on daylight saving. Is this trial that our entire community has almost become besotted with important enough to warrant a family impact assessment? That could be done. I am suggesting that we have an empirical, tangible, measure; namely, energy. Energy could be a surrogate measure for the impact of this whole exercise. What is the notional total volume of energy? What is the actual economic value, given peak times will be affected by daylight saving? Let us undertake an assessment of this trial.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: It is almost certain to skew the people we do not know. That is why we need to embed in this legislation some directional, informative aspects to undertake an informed referendum knowing that, when the process is operating, we will consider the energy impact as a guiding measure. Is the community prepared to accept daylight saving on the basis that 60 000 tonnes of greenhouse gases will enter the atmosphere as a result? I do not know, but I am suggesting a proposition that this is not a trial if all we do is give it a whirl, come back in three years and go through the same charade. That would be expensive democracy. Let us just hold a separate poll; it will cost only another \$5 million. I do not know, but I am trying to make amends for my initial light-heartedness about the issue and say that this is not simply a personal issue; it has consequences. As a subject on which the entire community seems to have become engaged, here is an opportunity to drive a referendum based on a number of impact surveys, one of which might be an energy impact audit. Having said that, I am ready to listen to the debate and discover where this whole process is taking us.

HON DONNA FARAGHER (East Metropolitan) [8.58 pm]: I will make only a very brief contribution to this debate because much has already been said both against and in favour of daylight saving in this place and in the public arena. From the outset, I believe very strongly that there are many more important issues affecting our state outside this issue. I find it a joke that the Daylight Saving Bill (No. 2) 2006 has been brought on for debate today ahead of all the supposed urgent legislation that we need to deal with. That, quite frankly, is a sorry state of affairs. To illustrate my point I will digress for a moment to read a short letter to the editor of *The West Australian* of 30 October from L. Gysen of Mandurah. The letter caught my eye and sums up the entire debate. It reads -

How is it that politicians can select a random idea (daylight saving) one day and apparently be able to vote and decide the next day, yet they are unable to vote and make a decision to give our police a pay

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

increase, fix our public health system, sort out our failing education system or dismiss ministers who are obviously not performing their duties. Something just doesn't add up.

How true. It is this government and its poor management of our state that should be the focus. This debate is quite clearly a diversion from the real issues of the day. I must say that on that score it has been very successful.

I am on record as saying that I am not supportive of daylight saving, and that remains my personal view. Some say that that view is strange for a younger person, but it is a view that is held by many Western Australians, even young ones. However, I appreciate that many people within the community support the concept of daylight saving, and it is not for me or others to denigrate the arguments both for and against. I say, however - I take up the point that Hon Simon O'Brien made in his contribution - that it is perhaps disappointing when some people choose to ridicule others because of their beliefs, whether right, wrong or somewhere in between. If, for example, a parent believes that daylight saving will negatively impact on his or her children travelling to and from school, that parent has a right to express that opinion, and, to my mind, that right should be respected by all. It is unfortunate that at times this has not occurred throughout this campaign. However, as I said at the beginning, I acknowledge that many people in the community are for daylight saving, and I certainly take to heart the issues that they raise.

I acknowledge that three previous referenda have been voted down. I also acknowledge that many people say that those referenda are in the past and that a whole generation of Western Australians have not had the opportunity to vote. That is true, because, being 31 years old, I am part of that generation. I say, though, that I and many members within the community are somewhat dismayed at the way in which this issue has been handled. I believe that on a matter as sensitive as this, which creates unnecessary division and which inevitably affects each and every Western Australian, the people should have a say, sooner rather than later.

When the original bill was proposed, a referendum after the trial period was not mentioned. Indeed, one of the proponents of this bill, the member for Ballajura, remains unsupportive of a referendum. That, to my mind, shows arrogance. I certainly indicated to some people within my electorate that, as someone who does not support daylight saving, I would not support that bill. Why? It is because as someone who does not support daylight saving, I would like an opportunity to say no, much like anyone else in the community who wants to say no. To not be given that right on such an issue is very wrong indeed.

However, as we know, the bill that is now before us provides for a three-year trial, followed by a referendum. That is certainly a much better position. It remains my contention, though, and it has been borne out by conversations that I have had with many people in the past couple of weeks, both for and against daylight saving, that the trial period is too long. As Hon George Cash mentioned, if the proposal is hugely popular, as some say it already clearly is, people should be given an opportunity to vote now or after a shorter trial period. Conversely, those who are against the proposal should not have to wait more than three years to have their say. The primary argument that has been put to me is that a short trial period will give a no vote, but after three years people will just give in. Is that democracy? I think not. That argument, to my mind, is a terrible one. My main concern remains with the timing of the referendum. If the bill before us enabled a referendum after a shorter trial period, rather than in a few years, that would be a compromise. It would give everyone the opportunity early on to have their say.

In conclusion, I say that I, like every other member of Parliament, have received thousands of e-mails, letters and calls on this matter. From those that I have been able to identify as being from constituents, along with the many comments that I have received directly from people at functions, agricultural shows and meetings in and around the east metropolitan electorate, I must say that those for and against are still about 50-50, with those for the proposal just in front. Although the East Metropolitan Region is deemed metropolitan, given that the region borders both the Agricultural and South West Regions, many parts of the region are semi-rural and heading towards rural. Chidlow, Serpentine and Gidgegannup are just a few examples. That obviously has a bearing on the differing views in the region. As Hon Helen Morton has said, we are damned if we do and damned if we do not. As I said at the beginning of my speech, many more far important issues are affecting this state and the day-to-day lives of people in this state. Unfortunately, daylight saving has become a political issue. Therefore, I and many other members will, very reluctantly, need to make a decision on this matter. This matter has played heavily on my mind over the past few weeks. It remains my strong view that daylight saving is an issue for the people, not the politicians, to decide. This bill is clearly structured in the hope that people will just give in. That is most unfortunate. However, as Hon George Cash mentioned in his contribution, this bill is likely to proceed. Although I do not support the bill in its current form, I believe there is merit in allowing further debate past the second reading. I strongly endorse the amendments that have been circulated in the name of Hon Norman Moore. I hope these amendments will be supported by the house. These amendments will enable the positions of both sides of the debate to be accommodated. This is a sentiment that has been expressed to me by many

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

people, both for and against daylight saving. I believe that under the present circumstances, that is a fair way to go. I will support the second reading of the bill, and I look forward to the debate during the committee stage.

HON BARBARA SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [9.06 pm]: I want to make some comments on the Daylight Saving Bill (No. 2) 2006. As many speakers in the chamber have said, daylight saving is primarily a personal preference or lifestyle issue. That is the way many people have approached this issue from the beginning. The previous daylight saving trials lasted for only one summer. I believe that trial period was not sufficient. Approximately 420 000 people between the ages of 18 and 32 have not had the opportunity to vote in a referendum on daylight saving. That is a significant number of people by any measure.

This bill demonstrates the challenge that this Parliament confronts in trying to legislate for a state as vast as Western Australia, with its many divergent interests and issues. Before I assess the arguments for and against daylight saving, I want to make some comments about the government of the day and the processes it has adopted during the debate on this bill. Like my colleague Hon Donna Faragher, I believe that it is a disgraceful use of the time of this Parliament to debate a bill that has come from a disgraced member of Parliament. That member is not even a member of cabinet.

Hon Kim Chance: Hon Peter Collier? You are being a bit rough on your colleague!

Hon BARBARA SCOTT: We are debating a bill that was introduced into the Assembly by Mr D'Orazio. That is where the bill originated. It did not originate in this house.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon BARBARA SCOTT: This bill originated in the Assembly. The government of the day - not the opposition - controls what is debated in the chambers of this Parliament. I find it unacceptable and disgraceful that during Children's Week the government of the day gave daylight saving preference over important matters like mandatory reporting of child abuse. I totally disagree with the process. Many members, tonight and at other times, have talked about the importance of this decision for many people in Western Australia. On the surface, it is just a personal preference. I have personally voted for daylight saving at every referendum. However, having had a look at this bill and listened to people in my electorate and in the country, where I had my origins, I am in two minds about which way to go on this issue. As Hon Paul Llewellyn has pointed out, this is a trial. We will be faced with a referendum with no data collected. I will spend some time on that later. It is an insult to voters to have a three-year trial with no effort being put into collecting data about its effects. Nothing in this bill tells me that there will be any way to measure the effect on the community of daylight saving. Many things are touted, such as that it will give us more time in the outdoors for exercise. Will there be a child impact statement about whether our children's fitness will be improved? Will the community's fitness be measured to determine whether it has improved? Will the very reasons for supporting or opposing daylight saving be tested? Will there be economic indicators showing whether it is economically sound for businesses to be two or three hours out of kilter with the eastern states, and the cost impact of that? Will we face the question of whether we need to save daylight in Western Australia? If we do, what are the major reasons for it, other than a personal preference for lovely long evenings?

I will go through some of the things that have been raised with me in the time since this idea was floated. I was not in any way reflecting on Hon Peter Collier in my remarks about the government debating this bill. The origin of this bill is the other place, and it offends my sense of propriety to have parliamentary time taken up with this bill when there are more important things to do.

It is argued that daylight saving saves lives and reduces travel injuries because when people drive home in daylight it changes the dynamic of driving. That is a good argument. In addition, people tend to use public transport more during daylight hours. When it gets dark, fewer people use public transport. The types of offences that would ordinarily occur on public transport tend to not happen during daylight saving hours because more people use public transport.

The issue of children sleeping has been raised. My children were small during the 1970s trial. It was difficult to get them to sleep, but initially it is hard to get children to sleep at night, particularly small children who need 12 hours of sleep, and they often sleep better in the mornings when it is cooler. That is the argument being put by country people. Under daylight saving, children will probably still get up when they have had enough sleep or when daylight wakens them.

The issue of children travelling to school has been highlighted. Some data input is needed: are the school buses going to be airconditioned, and will that cost money? Will children be leaving airconditioned schools to go home to airconditioned houses in daylight hours at the hottest time of the day? Like Hon Paul Llewellyn, I have always voted for daylight saving, but I think if we are going to spend parliamentary time looking at the issue, we

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

should also put in place, or the bill should contain, mechanisms that enable us to measure the outcome of this trial so that we get some proper data and assessment. Although this proposal may benefit children travelling to school on very hot days, it will often mean that they will be travelling home between 2.00 pm and 3.30 pm instead of between 3.00 pm and 4.30 pm. We should be looking at whether it is better for children to arrive earlier at school. Their higher potential for learning is in the cool of the morning when they are rested, and the same applies to fitness. How do we measure and maximise that?

As members will know, in regional areas children have to get on a bus as early as seven o'clock; some of them are lucky and get on at 7.30 am or 7.45 am, but then they often have to travel for at least an hour to school. When daylight saving was introduced last time, children were getting on buses at the equivalent of 6.30 am, which is quite light at the height of summer. I guess the changeover time will be the difficult time and it would be better if it could be done during school holidays. The proposed starting date is 3 December, which is almost the last week of school. That will enable families to adjust over the holiday period.

We also need to consider the time of the year when it is better for children to be in school. As Hon Peter Collier said in his second reading speech, school commences in Perth in February, which is a very hot period of the year. The Perth metropolitan area records the hottest average temperature of 30 degrees in February, and the hottest part of the day in Perth in February on average is at about three o'clock when the mercury hits 28 degrees. Teaching under these conditions is extremely uncomfortable.

Hon Murray Criddle: It is about 40 degrees out our way.

Hon BARBARA SCOTT: Absolutely. As I said, teaching under such conditions is unproductive and very difficult. My issue with this trial is that there is no serious proposal for measuring the trial. It is a nonsense. We will go through another trial and another referendum, which will cost us money, and nobody will know -

Hon Graham Giffard: That is basically it - a trial and a referendum.

Hon BARBARA SCOTT: We have done that before. A proper trial would put in place mechanisms that produced some data so that we would know whether there was an economic or physical benefit and whether people got more or less sleep and were more or less productive at work and school. Will it increase the level of fitness? I am very concerned about the rise in obesity in this state, but will we achieve a reduction in obesity and an increase in physical exercise by bringing children home in the heat of the afternoon? I am not so sure. I think the morning is a better time for exercise. People living around me certainly exercise in the morning. The beaches are better in the morning before the breeze comes in. There are a lot of factors in this state, where we have a lot of daylight, that cause us to question whether this is the right way to go. That is why there is a 50-50 division in the community on the matter. That indicates how evenly divided the cases for and against daylight saving are. There is no strong argument for an economic, fiscal or health benefit. We will not know that unless it is measured.

It was argued that people will work longer hours if the clocks are moved forward because people will have an extra hour at the end of the day, although it is not really an extra hour; it is an extra hour of daylight. Many working parents today are lucky to get home by 6.30 pm. It is difficult for those parents who both work to spend time in the outdoors with their children. Maybe daylight saving will benefit some parents by allowing them to spend time with their children after school. We do not know whether that will be the case, which is why it must be measured. My experience of busy families and young families is that as soon as the parents get home from work, their focus is not only to play with the children, but also to organise a meal. Children get hungry three hours after school has finished. Their tummies will determine when they will be fed, not the clock.

It has been said that daylight saving will be very good for families because it will provide opportunities for exercise. Daylight saving has the potential to impact positively on the dynamic of the family structure. It has the capacity also to reduce an unhealthy reliance on television and computers. However, on very hot days, it is possible that children and adults who come home from school and from work to an airconditioned house will sit down to watch television or use the computer because it will be much less comfortable to exercise outdoors than it will be to stay indoors. Will the extra hour of daylight encourage families out of their lounge rooms to engage in a more active and healthy lifestyle? How will that be measured other than by 50 per cent of people saying yes and 50 per cent of people saying no? Daylight saving may be good for families, and particularly for young families if one parent stays at home with the children, because when the father comes home from work, there will be time for the family to go to a pool or to the beach. Many young city professionals will appreciate it if, when they leave work at 5.00 pm or 5.30 pm, they can enjoy an additional hour of daylight. How will we know that? We have not asked young parents what their preference is, what their lifestyles are, whether they will spend more time with their children or whether they will do more exercise. The people I know, including people in the rowing fraternity, are morning people. The rowers have been putting pressure on me because during

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

summer in Western Australia we do not usually get strong winds in the morning. Therefore, the morning is the best time to row and to go to the beach. There is no point in an eight, a pair or a single skull rowing on the river after three o'clock in the afternoon because on most days the conditions are far too rough then.

Hon Giz Watson: The sailing is good. The rowing is worse but the sailing is better.

Hon BARBARA SCOTT: The sailing conditions might be fine. It depends on people's interests and on what type of boats they like. The prawn fishermen tell me that daylight saving will be terrible for them because they will not return home until nine o'clock at night. That is another lot of people who use the water and who are complaining about daylight saving. Other people choose to exercise in the morning and in the afternoon, whether they run for fun or whether they row or whatever. Some morning people like to take their dogs for a walk, go to the beach, cycle, play golf or recreate on boats of various sizes.

The question needs to be asked: are people in the states that have daylight saving any fitter than people in Western Australia? Western Australia has a huge problem of unfitness and a rising incidence of childhood obesity, and they need to be seriously confronted. We need to be looking at ways in which we can perhaps address these problems. Hon Paul Llewellyn said that we should have a family impact statement or a child impact statement. I have always been a promoter and supporter of child impact statements for legislation that will affect families and children, yet my amendment to the Commissioner for Children and Young People Bill to enable the commissioner to look at policies the government was about to adopt was voted down. This government does not agree with impact statements being made for legislation that may affect people, yet it supports a bill that will have a major impact on children and families.

A number of speakers have quoted the example of tourism. Although daylight saving alone will not be the silver bullet for Western Australia, it is a necessary part of an overall strategy to paint Western Australia as the lifestyle state; a state in which living is an experience and not just a state of existence. Daylight saving is perfect for tourists. It gives them more time to maximise the benefits of daylight. There is no question that daylight saving is an advantage for the tourism industry. Once again, do we know how many tourists are coming into the state in the winter or in the summer, or how many are making ecotourism visits in the cooler weather? Where are the statistics, the data and the information on which we can base such a decision? This bill must hold a whole lot more for me as a pro daylight saving person before it gets my vote of approval for the final reading. On the flip side of the coin of tourism, Queensland has been the place that people consider energetic and engaging and a successful tourist destination. The phrase coined in the business world is that the Queensland Premier is a go to, get done Premier. Queensland does not have daylight saving.

A number of members have talked about energy saving. I want to spend a few moments on that subject. Daylight saving was, of course, originally introduced to conserve energy during the two World Wars. The theory was that if two million people turned on their lights one hour later, there might be a significant energy saving. This would obviously have flow-on effects for the environment, which is a very pertinent argument in contemporary society. Studies of energy saving during daylight saving hours have been conducted in the United States, and in California in particular, which has a similar climate to that of Western Australia. Studies were done into the amount of oil consumed when daylight saving was first introduced in California in the 1970s. These studies have been updated. The most recent study was conducted in 2006. The US Department of Transportation reported that it saved the equivalent in energy of 10 000 barrels of oil a day during the observance of daylight saving, particularly during March and April. A total of 600 000 barrels was estimated to have been saved in each of the two years when daylight saving was first introduced. Studies by the California Energy Commission confirmed that about one per cent of energy usage per day is saved when daylight saving is in place.

Hon Murray Criddle: That is in direct contradiction to all those people who say that they will go to the beach and everywhere else. They will burn up energy when they get into their cars.

Hon BARBARA SCOTT: That is one of the questions that I am posing. There is no intent in the bill to collect any data or determine any scientific basis on which to make a decision. On 2 November, Hon Paul Llewellyn asked the Leader of the House, representing the Minister for Energy -

- (1) Has the government obtained advice on the impact of daylight saving on peak electricity demand?
- (2) If yes, what was that advice?

Hon Kim Chance, who is out of the chamber on important parliamentary business, replied -

Yes.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

... The government has been advised that small anticipated energy savings have been a consideration in the introduction of daylight saving in other jurisdictions, but it is difficult to ascertain whether such savings have been realised. It is difficult to predict how experience elsewhere might translate to local circumstances. Overall, any change in electricity demand from the introduction of daylight saving is expected to be small and will depend on how people respond to the new arrangements.

How can a minister of this house say that any change in electricity demand is expected to be small when there is nothing to measure or compare it against across both daylight hours and those particular peak times?

The next argument that has been raised is that daylight saving is good for most businesses. I agree that the majority of small and medium-sized business owners need to communicate with people in the eastern states of Australia with whom they conduct a good deal of business, but many businesses operate very effectively by communicating with the eastern states by e-mail. I am sure that a three-hour time difference in summer is highly disruptive for the management of many of these businesses. The flip side of that argument comes from people who have suggested that maybe the eastern states could also change their hours so that there is a one-hour difference instead of a three-hour difference. There would be a bit of give and take. This is one of the reasons that we should stay as close to the eastern states' time zones as possible. It is argued that it is just as important to stay in the same time zone as our Asian neighbours, as other members have mentioned. Although daylight saving may put us one hour ahead of Beijing and Singapore, it will place us in the same time zone as Japan.

We have heard about the many problems raised by the farmers. Farmers have approached me and raised the issue of opening times for grain bins. Members have talked about crime figures. There is anecdotal evidence that the crime rate was reduced during previous daylight saving trials. That is one thing that we could compare with certain months of the year. Perhaps there is an opportunity to compare crime rates over a number of summers. There are not many other things in place that we can measure against when we have a referendum, whether it is held one year, two years or three years after the trial.

In conclusion, the point of listing most of the arguments in this issue is to illustrate that there are a lot of assertions, often contradictory. As I said, very little data is available. There have been three trials but no proper studies. This trial is similarly disorganised and, quite frankly, useless. I would like the government to establish a proper, multidisciplinary study group that will examine the contentions objectively. Only then will we as parliamentarians and the people of Western Australia be able to come to a reasoned decision on this matter. As I said at the beginning of my speech, the bill illustrates one of the challenges of a Parliament such as ours; that is, to legislate and respond adequately to the needs of a state as vast as ours with divergent interests and circumstances. It is something that is done with great difficulty. To do it without sufficient information is sheer stupidity. I have said a number of times in this chamber that good policy is based on sound research. We should not pursue a policy for a state as diverse as Western Australia unless we have some sound research upon which to base it.

If this bill proceeds to the point at which measures on which people can base their referendum decision are put in place, I could then be convinced one way or the other. Unfortunately, in this house it is difficult for a member to move amendments that will cost money. It is a shame that the amendment to which I refer was not moved in the other house. Therefore, it is difficult for me to propose an amendment that will be effective and will provide an appropriate method by which the government can measure data and give the people of Western Australia information on which they can make decisions at a later date for the whole of Western Australia. If that were done, we would not need a costly referendum. If the data was gathered and was easily accessible, the government of the day could make the decision. I cannot move an amendment that would require a study group to be established, but it would possibly result in my support for the legislation.

I object to the process by which this bill has been given an airing by the government of the day, which should be addressing far more important issues involving children, education and business. This issue should have been decided by a government, not by way of a private member's bill that is dominating the airways, newspapers, media and the time of members and officers. It was brought on for debate in Children's Week. At that time the opposition introduced into the other place a private member's bill that I devised on the mandatory reporting of child abuse. What has the government decided to do about that? Nothing, even though instances of sexual and physical abuse against children in this state are not being reported. Western Australia is the only state in this country that does not have mandatory reporting of child abuse. In a week in which we should have been focusing on children, this government brought on this bill for debate. It has done that simply to get away from the embarrassment it has suffered as a result of the performance of some of its ministers. We have been forced to debate a bill that has not been considered properly.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan) [9.38 pm]: I will give my views on the Daylight Saving Bill (No. 2) 2006. It is a bill to which I have given a significant amount of time. I continue to wax and wane on the issue. I do not know whether any members were up at 5.15 this morning to see the sunrise.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Given the time of the evening, it is unlikely any members will get up at 5.15 tomorrow morning.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Mr President, I can assure you that I will be. The sun was already up when I headed off at 5.15 am to join my friends who ride regularly at that time of the day. As I headed off, I thought that I would be as popular as the Premier is at Port Beach these mornings. I have thought long and hard about this issue. The name of this bill - the Daylight Saving Bill - is a common-use term, but it is a misnomer. This bill is not about daylight saving; it is about daylight shifting. It is about whether we shift an hour from the morning to the evening. One of the people with whom I ride referred to it as daylight robbery. The best terminology I have come up with is daylight shifting because it is moving the time forward.

It has been fascinating to hear the arguments that have been put forward to us as members. Hon George Cash made a comment earlier, although I am unsure whether I can remember the exact term he used; however, in many cases people put forward arguments to me about how daylight saving would be a personal benefit to them. That was their whole focus on the issue. I found in some respects that the issue of daylight saving has brought out the worst in people on both sides of the argument. One comment that I found particularly disrespectful was, "The only people who are opposed to daylight saving are the elderly. They are all retired and can get up and do whatever they like whenever they like. So don't worry about them. Just get on and give it to me, a younger person." I was raised to respect my elders and I found that comment quite distasteful in the extreme. Therefore, after reading that e-mail, I was ready to vote no on this bill.

Another aspect that has come out of this debate that has been quite concerning and that all members should be concerned about is the way the media has operated in this debate. Some media outlets have clearly been campaigners for this issue. My view is that the media should report the issues, not drive them. In fact, it was interesting to note that attached to one e-mail I received that was sent out to people promoting daylight saving was the original e-mail, which was signed, "Howard Sattler, Producer".

Hon Barbara Scott: Like the one I got from the Premier's office?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Was that signed, "Howard Sattler, Producer"? I do not know what the member is talking about.

Hon Simon O'Brien: What was the tone of that particular one?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It was encouraging people to write to members of Parliament.

Hon Simon O'Brien: To say what?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: To support daylight saving.

Hon Simon O'Brien: That is interesting because Howard, of course, is always very strident about taking notice of people and having a citizens' referendum. We have had three of them, so it's interesting that he wants to revisit it.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Although I have spoken to the *Sunday Times* a couple of times about this issue, it is quite concerning to see the limited number of newspapers that Western Australia has actively campaigning in favour of issues. It is something that the community should be very concerned about.

I will refer to the issue of community engagement and the number of e-mails and contact that my office has had with the community. I note that a number of members have been fairly dismissive of the e-mails they have received. I welcomed all the e-mails I received. I think it is fantastic to see the community engaging -

Hon Paul Llewellyn: Spam!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I have not seen any evidence that they were spam. People were sent e-mails and forwarded them to me. I did not regard them as computer generated. I regarded them as e-mails from real people. They might have been very short, standard-form e-mails. However, we as members of Parliament should be encouraging that community engagement with us. What it has done is cause us to think about how we can manage e-mails in future when such issues occur.

Hon Paul Llewellyn interjected.

Hon Kim Chance; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm; Hon Helen Morton; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon George Cash; Hon Ed Dermer; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Barbara Scott; Hon Ken Travers; President

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No, it is an issue for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to increase the capacity of our computer systems, including the systems in our offices, so that we can receive large volumes of e-mails and respond to them. We need to set up a system that encourages people to include their names and addresses in e-mails. Electronic petitions have been talked about in this place, and the sooner we can bring in those sorts of mechanisms for allowing the community to comment to us, the better. I saw the volume of e-mails my office received. Even though they were one-liners, they were similar to petitions I have received from people. They take about the same amount of effort; nonetheless, the fact that people made that effort to inform us of their views is a positive thing. I personally responded in a more positive way to the people who took the time to write a bit more about their views and why they held them. I have not had the time to personally respond to all of them individually, but I have welcomed that engagement with them and I believe that is a positive thing. I must say that the e-mail I appreciated the most was from a bloke who wrote to me and said that he just wanted to let me know he was completely apathetic about daylight saving and that his vote at the next election would not matter regardless of how I decided to vote. That was a good response, considering the number of other e-mails I received. Some people had clearly researched the issue and friends whom I had not spoken to for many years telephoned me. Those sorts of things amounted to an interesting exercise and clearly highlighted the views within the broader community.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to sessional orders.

House adjourned at 9.45 pm
