

Ayes.	Pairs.	Noes.
Mr. Graham	Mr. W. Manning	
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Mann	
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Wild	
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Thorn	

*Majority for—11.*

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Sewell in the Chair; the Hon. W. Hegney (Minister for Labour) in charge of the Bill.

*Clause 1—Short title and citation:*

Mr. COURT: As indicated during the second reading, it is not the desire of the Opposition to debate each and every one of the clauses. Our attitude has already been made clear. That was one of the reasons why I spoke at considerable length during the second reading. At this stage I want to endeavour to facilitate the proceedings by stating that although we are not opposing or dividing on each of the clauses it is hoped that this will not be interpreted as being a change in our attitude.

Mr. May: In other words, you are relying on another place.

Mr. COURT: If the hon. member wants us to debate each clause we are quite willing to do so. I merely want to make it abundantly clear that although we are anxious to facilitate the Committee stages of the Bill, that does not mean we have changed our view and attitude as shown during the second reading debate.

Mr. BOVELL: I do not want to delay the passage of the Bill, but I was impressed with the proposal expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, namely, that this type of legislation should be dealt with outside Parliament. It should be emphasised that party political issues can cloud the outlook on such an important matter and therefore an outside tribunal should be appointed to investigate this question and then Parliament could consider the matter.

*Clause put and passed.*

*Clauses 2 to 4—put and passed.*

*Clause 5—Section 7 amended:*

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

Page 10, line 4—Delete the words, "judgment is obtained" and substitute in lieu thereof the words, "a person obtains judgment."

The hon. member for Stirling would undoubtedly know of the Lord Campbell Act, and it is proposed that this amendment will have the same effect in those cases where negligence has been shown on the part of an employer. Where the death of a worker has resulted from an injury and

his widow and one of his children sue for damages in the Supreme Court and obtain judgment, it has been suggested that no other dependant is entitled to receive compensation under the workers' compensation law. However, in a case such as that which I have cited, if another dependant child of the deceased worker sues for compensation, such child shall be entitled to receive it. As it stands now, the clause is restrictive. Therefore, this amendment, in conjunction with the amendments I have to follow, will clarify the position.

*Amendment put and passed.*

On motions by Mr. W. Hegney, the following amendments were put and passed:—

Page 10, line 6—Delete the word "the" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "an."

Page 10, line 7—Add after the word "compensation" the words, "to or on behalf of that person."

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

*Clauses 6 to 29, Title—put and passed.*

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 29th October, 1958.

### CONTENTS.

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>	
Licensed golf and bowling clubs, eligibility for membership .....	1839
Bus services, reduction in suburbs served by railways .....	1839
High school hostels, purchase of suitable place at Geraldton .....	1839
<b>BILLS :</b>	
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 3), 2r. ....	1839
Traffic Act Amendment, recom. ....	1840
Electoral Act Amendment (No. 4), report .....	1840
Totalisator Duty Act Amendment, Com. ....	1840
Cancer Council of Western Australia, 1r. ....	1841
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 1r. ....	1841
Licensing Act Amendment, 2r. ....	1841
Bank Holidays Act Amendment, 2r. ....	1845
<b>ADJOURNMENT, SPECIAL</b> .....	1851

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

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

### LICENSED GOLF AND BOWLING CLUBS.

#### *Eligibility for Membership.*

1. The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many

(a) licensed golf clubs;

(b) licensed bowling clubs;

(c) licensed bowling and recreation clubs

are in the State?

(2) Would a licence for a bowling and recreation club mean that members must play the game of bowls to be eligible for membership?

(3) To have the required number of 50 to obtain a licence in the country, would 30 male and 20 female members be a sufficient number?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) (a) 36

(b) 40

(c) 8

(2) No.

(3) Yes, providing all are full or ordinary members of the club.

### BUS SERVICES.

#### *Reduction in Suburbs Served by Railways.*

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

(1) Has any action been taken, or is action being contemplated, to reduce, alter or cancel bus services between suburbs and the city in districts served by alternative suburban rail services with the substitution of feeder bus services to nearby metropolitan railway stations which will have the effect of compelling the travelling public to complete the greater part of the journey to the city by rail?

(2) If so, what districts will be affected and what is the exact nature of the Government's proposals?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Arrangements have been made for the Bassendean bus service to the city to be discontinued and a feeder bus service instituted to serve the railway stations at Ashfield and Bassendean.

### HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS.

#### *Purchase of Suitable Place at Geraldton.*

3. The Hon. L. C. DIVER (for the Hon. L. A. Logan) asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of the policy of the Education Department on high school hostels (see page 19, paragraph 3 of the report of the Education Department for the year 1957),

will the Government purchase a suitable place in Geraldton—if one is offered to it—and entrust the running of such hostel to the Country Women's Association?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

The Government is prepared to consider any offer.

### CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3).

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [4.34]: I only want to say a few words in support of this measure. As the hon. Mr. Simpson has pointed out, its purpose is to prevent the continuance of the state of affairs that is in operation today. At the moment it is possible for large companies who own land and sites in many towns of the provinces, and who have a manager controlling that part of their undertakings, to have such manager registered to enable him to vote in the Legislative Council elections.

Some may say he cannot hold two votes in each instance. But there is no necessity for that. I cannot say definitely that at the present time the wife is exercising a vote with regard to the residence in which she lives, but it is possible that such a state of affairs could exist, and the husband, who might be the manager for the company, could exercise a vote for the property held by that company. I am merely trying to make the position perfectly clear, because it would seem that this aspect has not, perhaps, come forcibly enough before some hon. members, and they have not been obliged to combat such a position. It may be claimed that if such a position did exist, no company could exercise such control over an employee, so that the employee would vote at the Legislative Council election in conformity with his employer's point of view. I think it will be generally agreed that in many instances an employee is willing, even anxious, to meet the requirements of his employer.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It is still a secret ballot.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: That is so, but by and large the controlling influence, shall I say, could have a significant effect, especially in elections where the issues may be extremely close. For that reason, I think the hon. Mr. Simpson's Bill is highly desirable. It will ensure that the non-resident proprietor operating such a concern, or his representative, will not be able to make use of the loophole that exists today in our Legislative Council franchise. For the reasons I have outlined, I support the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. A. R. Jones, debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 4th November.

**TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.***Recommittal.*

On motion by the Hon. L. C. Diver, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 2.

*In Committee.*

The Hon. E. M. Davies in the Chair; the Hon. L. C. Diver in charge of the Bill.

*Clause 2—Section 57A added:*

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

To the proposed new section 57B add a new subsection as follows:—

(2) The provisions of this section and of Section 57A apply only in the metropolitan area and in such other places as are prescribed.

The whole object of this amendment is to confine the operation of the Bill to the metropolitan area or to such other places as may be prescribed.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have no objection to the measure applying to the metropolitan area, but "in such other places as are prescribed" could be anywhere from Wyndham to Eucla; and it could be that regulations will have to be made to prescribe areas that come within the ambit of this Bill. I wonder whether the hon. Mr. Watson could give an idea how far-flung these prescribed areas or places are to be.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: When it comes to the prescribing of areas, the hon. Mr. Wise will have the ear of the Government to a greater extent than myself.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It is not a Government Bill.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: So far as I am concerned, I have moved this amendment as I sensed it to be the Committee's desire. For myself, I have no feeling as to whether the provision applies only to the metropolitan area, to such places as are prescribed, or even to the South-West Land Division. The hon. Mr. Diver mentioned yesterday that the Government may find it desirable to apply the measure to other than the metropolitan area.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting all words in the amendment after the word "area."

It seems clear, from what has been said, that there is no intention of bringing in outlying towns. I would not have minded if the amendment included the words "in such other places as are prescribed," so

long as it had a further proviso that its application would be only to towns which have a police station.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: There is no doubt that the hon. Mr. Watson was entitled to gain the impression that other areas should be included when we turn our minds back to the notes which were prepared for the Minister when replying to the introduction of the measure. Just what limits did the Government have in mind when the Minister's notes were prepared? I think that, before many days go by, we will be told the matter has become a problem in some country towns where certain areas are not being used for the purpose for which they were established. Hotels provide parking areas for customers, and people who do not drink may use those facilities.

I do not wish to confuse the issue and I am quite agreeable to let it rest with the metropolitan area. However, I will not be at all surprised if objections are raised later on.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Bill is a totally different proposition now from when it was introduced. At that stage, no employee could take charge of another person's motorcar; or remove a motorcar; or order that it be removed. That provision has since been added, and I have not been advised of the Government's views on the Bill as it is now. A Bill cannot be presented for the reconsideration of the Government, until it is completed here.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That is fair enough.

*Amendment on amendment put and passed.*

*Amendment, as amended, put and passed; the clause, as further amended, agreed to.*

Bill reported with a further amendment.

**ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4).**

Report of Committee adopted.

**TOTALISATOR DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.***In Committee.*

The Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways), in charge of the Bill.

*Clause 1—put and passed.*

*Clause 2—Section 3 amended:*

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I have on the notice paper, some amendments that are designed to provide for doubles betting. The principal object of the Bill is to give to the racing clubs a bigger share of the tax; and doubles betting was

omitted. At the request of the racing clubs, these amendments will be moved. I move an amendment—

Page 2—Add after the passage, "or as 'quinellas'" in line twenty-three, the passage, "or as 'doubles'".

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I support the amendment, and on behalf of the racing clubs, I thank the Government for listening to their plea, and helping in this small measure. I hope that when a further plea is made in regard to the turnover tax, the Government will be just as co-operative.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not know anything about races, and could not even say what a quinella is. Surely some definition could be found of these fancy types of betting, rather than that we should put in particular words such as "doubles" and "quinellas." I understand an attempt was made to put in something covering the third race in the programme, and that, if it is necessary to have an alteration, an amendment to the Act will have to be agreed to by both Houses. Is not there a definition which would cover the lot?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not know of any definition that would cover the various forms of betting. A number of novel forms are introduced from time to time. I have heard that another new betting system may be introduced.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: "Concessions," is it not?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: No; a newer system. It is to cover the picking of the placing of the first three horses. The experience is that punters fail to pick even the first one, so I do not know how they are going to get on placing the first three! If such a system is introduced, I suggest that the only way to cover it, would be by including a specific name to designate it.

For the benefit of the hon. Dr. Hislop, quinella betting means that a person attempts to select the first two horses. It does not matter in which order they finish; so long as they are the first two, he wins. With doubles betting, the punter endeavours to pick the winners of two separate races. If another type of betting is introduced, it must have a specific title. I do not know of a definition which could be put into the Bill to cover what is operating now and what might operate in the future.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Would it not be possible to add words to this effect: "Or any novel form of betting as sanctioned by the Minister"?

The Hon. J. MURRAY: The only reason why different forms of betting are stipulated in the Bill is to make it perfectly clear to the general public and to the racing clubs, that ordinary totalisator

betting, as we have known it for a number of years, is not included in this 10 per cent. which the clubs are to get. This is a specific method of betting which has been introduced by the clubs in an attempt to attract people to the racecourses to invest their money on the courses rather than with the s.p. bookmakers in the city. The Government in its wisdom has decided that, because it is a special attraction to the racecourses, the clubs should benefit to a degree from it.

*Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.*

*Clause 3—Section 4 amended:*

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 35—Add after the words, "or as 'quinellas'" the words, "or as 'doubles'".

*Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.*

*Clause 4—Section 7 amended:*

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

Page 3, lines 12 and 13—Add after the words, "or as 'quinellas'" the words, "or as 'doubles'".

*Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.*

*Title—put and passed.*

Bill reported with amendments.

## BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Cancer Council of Western Australia.
- 2, Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly; the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways) in charge.

## LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

*Second Reading.*

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [5.5] in moving the second reading said: Hon. members will recall that a couple of years ago I introduced an amendment to the Licensing Act, and the Bill subsequently became an Act. Its purpose was to grant to the Perth Airport a licence to sell spirituous liquors under the Licensing Act, and the measure was introduced because of the growth of the Perth Airport and its new status as an international airport. In recent years the growth of the Perth Airport has been most marked, and it is developing in step with the progress of the State of Western Australia.

I am sure that all of us can remember, because it is not so long ago, when the Perth Airport, or Guildford Airport as it used to be known, did not exist; the only landing ground in the metropolitan area being at Maylands. But owing to the growth of aviation the Perth Airport has been developed at Guildford, and now it has international recognition and does a great job so far as aviation in this State is concerned.

Although the Bill was introduced a couple of years back, it was not proclaimed until just over 12 months ago, and naturally did not become operative until about that time, because, in the meantime, the bar and catering facilities were being arranged. After just over 12 months of operation, the officers of the Department of Civil Aviation have had a chance to see how things have worked out and they have discovered certain weaknesses in the system. It is with the idea of clearing up a couple of those weaknesses that this Bill has been introduced.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do they think it has been given sufficient trial?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. As I said, it has been in operation for just over 12 months and the officers think it has had a fair trial. As I go on to explain the remainder of the reasons why the Bill has been introduced, perhaps the hon. member will become more informed as to the need for it. The Bill that was passed a couple of years ago provided that a licence could be granted to the Perth Airport; the actual words used were, "on the licensed premises." A concessionaire has the licence for the bar and for the dining-room at the Perth Airport, which means, of course, that only one person can hold the combined licence.

The principal part of this Bill seeks to enable the bar and the catering concessions to be let separately. That is the main reason for the introduction of the Bill. There is a minor and less important reason, and that is to tidy up Section 44C, of the principal Act. This will make the hours in which liquor can be served at the airport conform more closely with the hours specified in the Act.

I am informed that the Bill has the support of the Government. Bearing in mind that it is a private member's Bill emanating from another place, the Minister for Justice has been very helpful to the hon. member for Cottesloe who introduced it. He has been helpful to the extent of submitting certain amendments which are considered to be an improvement of the Bill. As it is now framed, the measure appears to be acceptable to most of the persons concerned.

There are five reasons why the Bill has been brought before the House. I would like to enumerate them. Firstly, it

is the experience of officers of the Department of Civil Aviation that, under the heading of management and control, better control will be achieved if Parliament consents to this amendment of the Licensing Act, so that the two concessions—the dining-room and the bar—can be let to separate persons. Secondly it is felt that the licensee will be able to give better personal supervision to bar facilities than the present licensee has been able to give, because at the moment he looks after both the bar and the dining-room.

Thirdly, it is considered that the one licensee may not necessarily be suitable for the two concessions. He may be suited to take charge of only one of the concessions. I understand there is some history in regard to the concessions which goes to prove that point.

Fourthly, the Department of Civil Aviation requires the change to be made in order that a more satisfactory financial arrangement can be arrived at between the concessionaires and the department so as to bring about a greater profit to the department. We should bear in mind that this feature will not interfere with private enterprise in any way, because private enterprise will still handle the concessions. I am told that tenders will be called for the concessions of the two sections.

Fifthly, and finally, at the present time Qantas Airways is the company which has charge of the dining-room concession. It has let the concession to a concessionaire. This arrangement will cease very shortly, because the Department of Civil Aviation is taking over this concession from Qantas Airways, and it will have charge of all the buildings, including the bar and the dining-room. It will take over the assets of the dining-room.

The current agreement which exists between the present operator and Qantas Airways will lapse shortly. As I remarked, tenders will be called in respect of each section.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: By the Department of Civil Aviation?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Will the present concessionaire have to go out?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot answer that question directly, because I am not the one to determine the acceptance or rejection of tenders, but tenders will be called. I suppose the present concessionaire and anybody else will be free to tender in accordance with the terms of the advertisement. I am not able to answer the question just asked; I do not think the hon. member himself can answer it either.

By the same token, it is felt by the officers of the Department of Civil Aviation that if the concession remains as it is, that is, to have the dining-room and

the bar facilities run under the one heading, there is a distinct likelihood that some large interstate interest may be able to tender such a low rate that it will become the successful tenderer. It is the desire of the Department of Civil Aviation to keep the control of this business, if at all possible, in the hands of Western Australians, and to have the concessions let to individuals rather than to concerns.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: It does not have to accept any tender.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is true. I repeat, the Department of Civil Aviation is anxious that individuals should obtain these concessions in order that Western Australians might be able to tender successfully and make a living from them.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Can you give us some figures of takings to indicate whether there is any justification for this Bill?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not in a position to give any figures relating to takings at the moment. I am told by the department that in some respects the figures have been difficult to obtain. I am informed that there is a very good living to be obtained from either of these concessions separately. It might interest hon. members to know this: I am informed that Qantas Airways pays, out of the price charged for an air ticket, to the concessionaire an amount of 17s. 6d. for a meal. The meal is not an extravagant one but that is the contract price being paid. In addition, the concessionaire serves meals to aircraft travellers on board the planes themselves. I am assured there is a good living to be obtained from both concessions.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Will that also apply to the South African Airways?

The Hon. G. Bennetts: I think the Unfair Trading Commissioner should have a look at that price.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not in a position to answer both interjections.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should take no notice of interjections.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot give a reply in respect of the South African Airways, but the Perth Airport is an international terminal. No doubt aircraft travellers from other places will be able to use the facilities at this airport, the same as anybody else.

To comment further on the point of dividing the concessions, the Department of Civil Aviation is anxious for the tenders to go to individuals, otherwise the purpose of the Bill will be defeated. With the concessions split into two parts, it is felt that a greater chance will be given to Western Australians to tender successfully on a competitive basis. It is desirable that,

wherever possible, we should encourage people of this State to take over such jobs. It is a local product, after all.

Turning to the wording of the Bill itself, at the present moment the words used are "on the licensed premises." There is a very grave doubt as to whether these words contained in the Act at the moment are sufficient, in the event of the concessions being separated, and it is desired to place the words "at the airport" in the legislation, rather than have the words "on the licensed premises" because—I am sure that hon. members will appreciate this—with the growth of the Perth Airport in recent years, the number of buildings, facilities, etc., that will be required, in the very near future will be much greater than at the present time.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: Did the department bring these matters before the recent inquiry?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know, but the hon. Mr. Heenan could probably answer that one because he was one of the members on the committee. It was indeed interesting to pick up this morning's paper and read an article which states that somewhere in the world every five seconds an aircraft takes off or lands. It gives some indication of the terrific growth of aviation throughout the world. In recent years Perth Airport has gained recognition as an international airport on account of its geographical situation, and it must be obvious that the growth of aviation will continue to be rapid.

The only other amendment is the minor one which I referred to during my speech. This is to bring trading hours into closer conformity with the principal Act. The Licensing Court has had a deal of difficulty with this matter because, whilst an aircraft is deemed to arrive at a certain time, I am sure that hon. members will appreciate that many factors prevail which sometimes make it impossible to adhere to scheduled arrival times, thus rendering normal trading hours inadequate.

In conclusion, I ask hon. members to recall and appreciate the fact that we saw fit to grant this licence because of the lack of facilities for travellers from overseas. At the time, I pointed out the difficulty that passengers, and those going to meet them, encountered at the airport. Prior to the introduction of the Bill a couple of years ago, there was no common ground on which they could meet. With those remarks, I commend the Bill to the House and trust it will reach the statute book. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [5.24]: While it is still fresh in my memory, I would like to express my disappointment that the

hon. Mr. Griffith has not mentioned anything—or attempted to amend the Bill or bring in another Bill—which might have complied with the wishes of a number of hon. members in this House. It will be recalled that the hon. Dr. Hislop—if my memory serves me correctly—pointed out that the Bill restricted the supply of liquor to persons travelling interstate and anyone travelling intrastate was precluded from taking refreshment.

The hon. Dr. Hislop moved an amendment, that was carried in this House, to ensure that any person travelling from Wyndham or Meekatharra, or any other part of the State—and Wyndham is nearly 2,000 miles away—would be provided for. Upon recommitment, the hon. member in charge of the Bill objected strongly to those persons being supplied with liquor, and on a division, there were only five members here who supported the amendment. There were others, however, who intimated that they thought the system should be given a trial after which an amendment could be introduced—it could apply to all air travellers—which would cut out the anomalies and give a person who may come from overseas to Perth—after having changed planes at Darwin—the same privileges as those enjoyed by a person flying from Sydney or Singapore to Perth.

That is all we asked, but the hon. member would not accept that three years ago, and I am surprised he has not given it some consideration on this occasion. It is my intention to endeavour to have that anomaly removed. I would like hon. members to appreciate the fact that while liquor is supplied on all interstate and overseas planes, by merely pressing a button and ordering it from the steward or hostess, there is no such provision on any of the internal air services in this State. No liquor is available on any North-West route. I am not advocating that it should be, but it is available to those for whom this special legislation is desired. They have it, as I said, by merely pressing a button and asking for it. The people who will be served are those who go to meet the travellers.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: And tourist passengers.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Those going to meet them. Anyone travelling—

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: No, the tourists.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is one of the reasons for introducing the Bill.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I have never travelled on one of those planes and am not too sure about the position. I have, however, travelled to Darwin by our own service and by the interstate service and had I desired, I could have obtained a cold drink on the interstate plane but not on

our own. I am not actually advocating that it should be possible to do so. All I want to do is to point out the anomaly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Before the legislation was passed, a second-class passenger could not be provided with liquor.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Bill covers anyone employed at the airport; or rather, that is what the Act provides.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not this Bill.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: That is what the Act does. And I want to try to achieve that which the hon. Dr. Hislop and others, including myself, failed to achieve three years ago; that is to make the service available to those who may desire it. The argument put up then by the hon. member was that they were not in need of it, because it was a terminal airport—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not right.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Let the hon. member read Hansard and see for himself. The other argument put forward, as far as I can recollect, was that it was a private concern and an overseas terminal and was to be run by Qantas; but that will be changed in the near future. The hon. member tells us that Qantas is handing over to the Department of Civil Aviation, and therefore it will be a Government concern; and I maintain that it should give the same service as a railway refreshment room, which is there to provide for passengers and travellers.

Here we have the anomaly of a person coming from overseas and, perhaps, a dozen friends going to see him, and they can all be served with liquor. The employees of the Department of Civil Aviation, who work at the airport, can also be served with liquor, but a person who flies 2,000 miles from Darwin to Perth, through the heat of summer, is precluded from obtaining refreshment if he desires it.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: He would have to carry a waterbag in the hot weather.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The same applies to anyone coming from Kalgoorlie, Norseman or Esperance.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister is laying it on too heavily.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am not doing that. The hon. member opposed it two years ago and the debate is all recorded in Hansard. I ask this Chamber to agree to an amendment—after I have examined the Bill and the Act—which will turn the facility into one for air travellers; either those within the State or those from outside the State.

On motion by the Hon. E. M. Heenan, debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 4th November.

## BANK HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

### *Second Reading.*

**THE HON G. E. JEFFERY** (Suburban) [5.32] in moving the second reading said: This is the third occasion upon which I have sponsored, in this House, a measure seeking to give bank officers employed in this State the benefit of a five-day working week. If one were superstitious one might say, "Third time lucky," and I hope that is how it will be. I think we should content ourselves with the fact that this Chamber is the only place where the bank officers can obtain relief or industrial reform such as is sought in this measure.

Much has been said about shop assistants, and the retail trade, and efforts have been made to link up the bank officers with them; but the destiny of the retail trade at present does not lie within the hands of this Chamber, but in those of the Arbitration Court. The position of bank officers is totally different and is due to the provisions of the Federal Bills of Exchange Act, which was passed in 1909 and which supplanted the State legislation of 1884, in which year the legislation of this State provided both a Bank Holidays Act and the Bills of Exchange Act.

After Federation in 1909, the Federal Government passed a Bills of Exchange Act which supplanted that of the State and took precedence over it in everything except bank holidays. My submissions are backed up by the opinions of four eminent people and I will read those opinions to the House. The banks are in the position of being compelled by law to open on Saturday mornings—under Section 98 of the Federal Bills of Exchange Act—as they must open to meet the payment on bills. The four authorities that I will quote are the opinion of Mr. T. S. Louch, Q.C., an eminent and well-known legal gentleman of this city, the comments of Mr. Portus, the Commonwealth Conciliation Commissioner when dealing with a case to grant bank employees a five-day week; comments made in the State Arbitration Court in 1955, during a similar case; and the comments of Sir Arthur Fadden, who was Federal Treasurer. Mr. Louch said—

Prior to Federation there were two statutes in Western Australia which dealt with this matter; the Bank Holidays Act of 1884 and the Bills of Exchange Act of 1884. These statutes had their counterparts throughout the British Empire. In 1909 the Federal Parliament passed a Bills of Exchange Act. The first schedule to this Act shows that it overrides the whole of the Western Australian Bills of Exchange Act of 1884, but still leaves it open for the State to appoint bank holidays under the Bank Holidays Act of 1884; see also Section 55A (3) of

the Banking Act of 1945-53 which preserves the State laws relating to bank holidays.

It is my contention that the banks are forced to remain open on Saturdays, and industrial tribunals are not prepared to grant a five-day week to bank officers because, in effect, a bank would be forced to remain open for 5½ days and pay penalty rates to its staff; and the bank officers would be paid overtime and we would not achieve the five-day week.

**The Hon. F. D. Willmott:** Do you object to the overtime?

**The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY:** No, but it is farcical that, when a man wants a five-day week, he should get it in principle, but his master should be forced to employ him on Saturday morning at penalty rates, because, under the law of the land, he has to open on Saturday morning.

**The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon:** I thought your party objected to that—

**The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY:** the bank officers want a five-day week and not the overtime, and the proof of the pudding is in the presence here of this Bill. The laws of debate in this Chamber allow each hon. member to express himself in due course and I hope I shall be allowed to complete my remarks. In the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, Mr. Portus, when giving judgment on the case before him, said—

Early in the hearing it became clear that under the Bills of Exchange Act banks were required to open on Saturday morning to discharge their obligations with regard to bills of exchange. It also became clear that to discharge this obligation at least the great majority of the staffs of the banks would have to be in attendance. Consequently one is faced with the fact that if a five-day week is prescribed the banks would not have the two alternatives of closing on Saturday morning or remaining open and paying overtime on Saturdays. While the banks are in this position I do not consider it fair to impose on them a five-day week with costly overtime. It is sufficient to state that if an industry is such that it must by law carry on during 5½ days of the week it is not appropriate that an industrial authority should limit the ordinary working hours to five days a week. It appears to me that if a five-day week is to be prescribed for the banking industry it should be prescribed by Parliament, as Tasmania has done by closing banks on Saturday.

I think that is clear, and it bears out the submissions I have made on that point. My next reference is to what was said on the five-day week for bankers in the State Arbitration Court in 1955. Mr. Adams,



who appeared for the Associated Banks, in opposing the bank officers' claim at that time, said—

I submit that this court has no jurisdiction or, if it considers it has, it would be improper for it to accept and exercise jurisdiction on the point. My submission is based on Section 98 of the Bills of Exchange Act, Federal, and Section 1 of the Bank Holidays Act of 1884, State,

He stated further—

I submit, therefore, that you have no jurisdiction. If you have jurisdiction you should not exercise it and it would be improper for this court to make an order which, in effect, would close banks on Saturdays unless and until the Bank Holidays Act is amended.

In reply to that contention the President of the court said—

Well, we are all of a clear opinion on this point. I do not think there is any doubt that this court has the jurisdiction to fix the hours of employees in banks, even although under the Commonwealth it is if not legally, practically necessary for banks to keep open on Saturday mornings—

The PRESIDENT: Is the hon. member quoting from this session's Hansard?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: No, from that of 1957. To continue—

—and it might be, as Mr. Adams suggests, legally necessary for them to do so. But whereas here it seems certain that any award made by this court of a five-day week would only result in extra overtime being paid, in that the employers would be forced to keep their businesses open despite the court award, we are all agreed that the court, even although technically it may have jurisdiction, would not, except in very exceptional circumstances, make any such order. I think that is as far as I need go.

Further to that I will read the letter from Sir Arthur Fadden, Federal Treasurer, to Mr. C. L. Mobbs, General Secretary of the Commonwealth Bank Officers' Association, Sydney, N.S.W. It reads—

Dear Mr. Mobbs,

I refer to your letter of 1st October, 1957, conveying the text of a resolution dealing with banking hours, which was carried unanimously at the recent General Conference of your Association.

There is no Commonwealth legislation under which it would be appropriate for the Commonwealth Government to take action on the lines advocated by your Association; the fixing of trading hours in industry is a

matter which comes within the States', not the Commonwealth's, sphere of responsibility.

It is true that the Commonwealth Banking Act 1944-1953 gives the Commonwealth Treasurer the power to declare a bank holiday by public notification in the Gazette, but the purpose of this provision is solely to enable a bank holiday to be declared at short notice throughout Australia in the event of a national emergency which warranted closure of the banks on a particular day—for example, an emergency such as could arise from a major exchange rate change. Certainly it was not the intention to override the States' general powers in regard to the declaration of bank holidays, and in fact the Commonwealth's Banking Act provides specifically that the provision in the Act for declaration of a bank holiday by the Treasurer does not affect the operation of any State law relating to bank holidays or public holidays.

However, it does appear that the provision has raised some doubts as to the Commonwealth's intentions in this regard. Consideration is therefore being given to amending the wording of this section in the forthcoming banking legislation, to make it quite clear that the Commonwealth has no intention of usurping the States' powers relating to bank holidays or bank trading hours generally.

I can only suggest that your Association address its representations to the various State Governments.

That is dated the 23rd October, 1957. I think hon. members will agree that members of the Bank Officers' Association have applied themselves with some zeal to doing just that, and what they have done has always been done on a constitutional basis. I think what I have read out to the House places the matter in the hands of the State Parliament. Reference to the South Australian Hansard shows that the Premier of that State (Sir Thomas Playford) agrees that it is a question upon which Parliament must make a determination.

Hon. members have expressed their opinion on the sacred rights of the States and expressed resentment at the Commonwealth interfering with the economy of this State, and I think this is one occasion when we have to make our own decision. I have always been of that opinion, and that has been supported by the views expressed by the Commonwealth commissioner and those of the other gentlemen that I have read.

The Commonwealth Bills of Exchange Act is the governing factor concerning the number of hours bank officers shall work. At the time that legislation was promulgated it was probably up to date and

conformed with the existing conditions, but with the changing trend in industrial affairs it has become obsolete, and banks are forced to remain open on Saturday mornings no matter what the personal feelings of their officers may be. It is a pertinent factor that, in 1955, the representatives of the Associated Banks were opposing the claims of bank officers for a five-day week and yet, as late as Monday of this week when representatives of the Associated Banks met representatives of the employees in this State, they did not express any opinion on the merits or demerits of a five-day week for bank clerks.

I am rather amazed at the attitude shown by the Press. I do not know whether the names "Jonah" and "Jeffery" are synonymous to "The West Australian," but whenever I introduce a measure in this Chamber, that newspaper in its issue on the following morning, publishes an editorial expressing its opposition to what I have said. All I can say is that some of the opinions expressed by "The West Australian" show confused thinking. It sometimes does not even know how to spell the names of the various parties. The attitude adopted by it is similar to that shown by the faithful dog licking his master's hand.

In publishing the article concerning the admission of the Associated Banks that they have no opinion to express on this subject, it had recourse, in its editorial, to express the official viewpoint of the Employers' Federation, the Retail Traders' Association, the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures. Their argument shows that they are not concerned whether the bank officers should have a five-day week, but they are concerned about the fact that if those officers are granted a five-day working week, shop assistants may demand it also.

However, there is nothing to prevent the Arbitration Court from granting those employed in the retail trade a five-day week should the court think it warranted. The case presented by the bank officers should not be tied to any case that may be presented by those employed in the retail trade. A great deal has been said about the loss of banking facilities to the public should banks be closed on Saturday morning. Up to 1937, almost everyone worked a 5½-day week and the small amount of banking I was able to perform on those days was usually done during my lunch hour or by racing from my work to the bank after I had completed my duties for the day.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Are you speaking from that knowledge?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I am speaking from my personal experience as a worker up to the time the five-day working week was introduced. Claims have been made that the bank officers are revolutionary in their attitude, but of all the

workers I have ever met, they would be the last ones I would regard as being revolutionary when considering the industrial relationship between master and servant. I cannot recall bank officers committing any rash acts.

In my opinion, the bank officers are entitled to a five-day week. Some hon. members have also referred to the fact that when a bank officer entered the banking profession he was fully aware of the working conditions. That is quite right, but I would suggest to those hon. members that the majority of bank clerks today entered the service of the bank at the same time as many civil servants and most professional officers who, for many years, have enjoyed the privilege of working only a five-day week. Therefore, I do not see why the bank officers should not enjoy this privilege, too.

Most hon. members have heard of Sir Thomas Playford, the Premier of South Australia; and it has been pointed out that the banking conditions in South Australia are similar to those in the field of commerce and among the professions. In Hobart, Tasmania, both the shops and banks are closed on Saturday morning, and my advice is that neither the banks nor the proprietors of the shops wish to return to a 5½-day working week.

A great deal has also been said about that wonderful country, the United States of America; but before referring to the banking conditions there I wish to make a few remarks concerning the present situation in Queensland. I have here some photostats of correspondence which took place in 1956 between the Secretary of the Bank Officers' Association in Queensland and the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Frank Nicklin. I propose to read the contents of those letters to the House and I will then inform hon. members of the position which exists in Queensland today. The first letter is dated the 13th March, 1956, and is addressed to F. Nicklin, Esq., the Leader of the Opposition, Brisbane; and it is from the General Secretary of the United Bank Officers' Association of Queensland (Mr. K. H. Laidlaw). It reads as follows:—

Dear Sir,

Abolition of Saturday Banking.

Bank officers are still very desirous of working a five day week and I have been directed to again approach you to ascertain the views of your Party.

There are three major points to be made clear:

- (1) My association is not advocating a reduction of working hours from the 40 hour week.
- (2) Bank officers are willing to meet the convenience of the public and retailers and are

prepared to work late on Friday afternoons, should the banks and retailers so desire, to open for business from 3 p.m. to any such time as can be mutually agreed upon to enable customers an opportunity to deposit Friday's takings and to cash cheques and provide other banking facilities for any customers requiring same.

- (3) Government accession to our request is necessary for the reason that the validation of Saturday closing of banks calls for legislation and is beyond the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court.

Should your Party be returned with a majority in the coming elections could you advise me for the information of my members what the Government's attitude would be in this direction.

The reply by Mr. Nicklin, dated the 28th March, 1956, to Mr. K. H. Laidlaw, the General Secretary of the United Bank Officers' Association of Queensland, is as follows:—

Dear Mr. Laidlaw,

Further to my letter of the 19th instant, I have to advise that the question of the Saturday closing of banks has now been discussed.

As a result of the discussion, I now advise that our Parties favour the suggestion of closing the banks on Saturdays.

However, there is one point on which we would like your advice. What effect would Saturday closing have on savings bank activities? We think this is important, particularly as there has been an extension of savings bank activities of late.

A reply was sent to Mr. Nicklin by Mr. Laidlaw on the 16th April, 1956, reading as follows:—

Dear Mr. Nicklin,

I have your letter of 28th ultimo. and thank you very much for your advices.

As regards the activities of the Savings Banks, I have made enquiries and find that after a trial in Hobart for some years when the Trading and Savings Banks, including the Commonwealth Savings Bank, closed on Saturday mornings, the experiment—if we can call it so—was such a success that the Government extended the Act under which the banks closed on Saturdays to cover the whole of Tasmania. This is still in operation and neither the banks, the traders nor the public, have requested a return to the Saturday trading.

In New Zealand the banks have closed on Saturdays for many years. This also includes the savings banks and has been accepted generally by all concerned with no wish to return to the Saturday trading.

Again thanking you for your interest in this matter.

Finally, the answer to Mr. Laidlaw from Mr. Nicklin was dated the 17th April, 1956, and it reads—

Dear Mr. Laidlaw,

Many thanks for your letter of the 6th instant and for your explanation re savings bank activities. This will clear up the doubts that we had on this question.

Today, the position is that the Leader of the Opposition then is now the Premier of Queensland. The following information is contained in an extract from a fairly recent letter dated the 20th September, 1958:—

For your information I have been served with a notice of motion from the Industrial Court of Queensland to the effect that the Minister for Labour and Industry has requested the court to examine and advise on, not only the question of abolition of Saturday bank trading, but also as to the merits and demerits of a general abolition of trading on Saturdays and the substitution therefor of late shopping and banking hours on Friday evenings.

That is the position in Queensland at the moment. I believe that in New Zealand, the banks have been closed since 1946, and, for the information of hon. members I will read a letter dated the 16th September, 1956, from the General Secretary (D. R. Lennon), of the New Zealand Bank Officers' Guild (Incorporated), to the General Secretary of the United Bank Officers' Association of Queensland—

Dear Mr. Laidlaw,

#### Saturday Closing of Banks:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of 5th September together with copy of your case for the statutory closing of banks on Saturdays. We are very pleased to give what assistance we can.

We advise that we can truthfully say that there is no agitation here for the re-opening of banks on Saturday morning in New Zealand. No inconvenience whatever appears to result for the business community. Saturday closing of the banks here seems to be thoroughly accepted and has been in force for about 12 years. Although there may have been some propaganda for re-opening the banks on Saturdays for the first few months

or so, there is certainly none now and has not been any for some considerable time.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Did Mr. Tonkin tell you about his observations there recently?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: The hon. member will have an opportunity to have his say at a later stage. I would remind him of the old Persian proverb, "The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on." I will now refer to the position regarding a five-day week for bank officers in America. We often talk about the almighty dollar and how, in some instances, the people in America work 24 hours a day. No doubt they do. The information which I am now about to quote for the enlightenment of hon. members reads as follows:—

The four American banks I refer to are The Chase Manhattan Bank of New York, The First National City Bank of New York, the Bank of America, and the The First National Bank of Boston, Massachusetts.

The Hon G. C. MacKinnon: Is he any relation to Allen Chase?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I would not know, and I am not particularly concerned. To continue with this quotation—

The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York said: "Saturday closings are not a recent innovation nor is the practice uniform in each of our states. The practice began in the middle thirties when several states enacted the legislation. These amendments proved successful. The Chase National first closed on Saturdays during 1939. During the war it reverted to six days, and on April, 1947 and thereafter remained closed on Saturday." They were asked, "Was there any adverse customer reaction after closing?" The answer was, "There were minor complaints but none in sufficient volume to warrant reversing our decision."

The First National City Bank of New York said: "Our bank closed opening for business on Saturdays on a year-round basis beginning on 5th April, 1947. We were also closed on Saturdays during July and August of 1939. Our desire for a Saturday closing was based mainly on reasons of personnel relations influenced by the fact that a five-day week was the common practice in other industries. In order to attract and keep good personnel in the banking field it was our institutional attitude shared by many other banks to take the initiative in seeking legislation which would permit banks to close on Saturdays. There was no adverse customers' reaction to any consequence after announcing our decision to close. The closing was accepted in a matter of fact manner

and it might even be said the number of complimentary public comments made in connection with this action far exceeded those of a questioning nature. All States except Iowa and Wyoming, plus Alaska and the District of Columbia now have some form of legislation permitting banks to operate on a five-day week. Of these 49 jurisdictions, 42 permit banks anywhere in the state to close, while the following seven states permit closing only in certain areas."

The third example is the Bank of America, first started in July, 1953, and other banks in California in 1951. They said: "Prior to any banks closing there were surveys and studies made by most banks to try and determine what the customer reaction might be if any. The final decision to try Saturday closing indicates the surveys were favourable and except for a little adverse customer reaction at the beginning there has been very little comment. Week day banking hours are from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.—with very few exceptions they have been extended to 6 p.m. Fridays. These hours have been generally accepted and appear to meet the needs of the public. We found an increased usage of our night depositories especially over the weekends.

I would now like to quote the opinion of the First National Bank of Boston, Massachusetts, where Saturday closing was initiated 12 years ago. It is as follows:—

Of more than 100,000 customers advised of proposed Saturday closing only eight protested. Two of these were anonymous and two were from school teachers who contended that Saturday was the only day they had to visit their safe deposit boxes. The amusing part of these latter complaints was that when we reviewed the access slips for these two boxes we found that one teacher had never come to her box on a Saturday, while the other had come on only two Saturdays as against 15 accesses on other days. I think it can be said that our individual customers, the retail stores and industry have adjusted themselves to it satisfactorily so that they were not incurring any difficulties at the present time as a result of Saturday closing.

This information has been obtained from America, the home of free enterprise and that mighty dollar. I will now give the views of the American Bankers' Association, 12 East, 36 East Street, New York. In dealing with customer reaction they say—

Generally favourable in every State and especially favourable when banks remain open extra hours on other

days. No record of an organised protest in any area. Apparently most bank customers quickly adjusted to Saturday closing and have accepted it without complaint.

On the question of bank experience they said—

Generally favourable in every State. No serious complications in bank organisation or services have resulted. The five-day week attracts more desirable personnel.

The same applies in Canada, which is over the border. The Vice-President of the Canadian Bank of Commerce said—

At the outset we might say that following preliminary investigations and the necessary changes in the Bank Act, which of course require parliamentary approval, Saturday closing was initially introduced in February, 1952, at a number of key points in various provinces.

There were 14 of them. To continue—

These are extended on Friday afternoons. We conclude with observation that Saturday closing in Canada has been very well secured by the public who appear quite satisfied with the extended service provided at most points on Fridays. In spite of some reservations in the early stages that it might impose some hardship on communities in certain specialised areas of activity, this has not proved to be the case and general acceptance of a five-day week is practically universal.

So, without going any further, the opinion of these people in America—who are just as keen to make money in their various walks of life as anyone in our community—is that the five-day week has not imposed any great hardship on the people.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is the position in New South Wales and Victoria?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I think the bank officers there should have a five-day week. The trouble is that some people cloud their views with party politics. I could not care less. I think the bank officers should have a five-day week no matter where they come from. Since I am a Western Australian I will do my best to secure that right for the bank officers of this State.

Last year the bank officers approached the Premier of South Australia, Sir Thomas Playford. I will quote an extract from "The Bankers Journal" of July-August, 1957, page 2. The bank officers asked the Premier of South Australia to introduce legislation to provide for a five-day week, and an extract from his letter reads as follows:—

As there is still a large public demand for banking facilities on Saturday

mornings, Cabinet regrets that it cannot see its way at the present time to grant your request.

I think every hon. member knows that quite recently the subject of a five-day week for the bank staff was before the South Australian Parliament, and I would like to quote the present attitude of the Premier of that State. Hon. members will then be able to compare it with his attitude quoted earlier. It is an attitude with which I concur. I propose to quote from the South Australian Hansard of the 7th, 8th and 9th October, 1958. At page 1107 we find the following:—

It has been brought before Parliament and I think Parliament should express its views. In considering this legislation members should keep two or three facts well in mind. In the first place, I do not think this Bill would impose much hardship, if any, upon the normal type of customer of a trading bank, for if he wanted to make a purchase he could pay by cheque. However, persons who could be greatly inconvenienced are those with savings bank accounts only.

I agree with the Premier of South Australia in those remarks. He continues—

Later today I propose to table an amendment to this Bill and if it is acceptable and the bank officers advise me in writing to that effect I will support the second reading and assist the passage of the Bill.

At this stage somebody by the name of Jennings said, "And get it knocked out up top." Apparently, some of their Assembly members are equally suspicious of their Upper House as are members of our Assembly. To continue—

We do not indulge in those devious practices. I will support the Bill to the limit of my ability and I may have some influence even in another place. I regret that I have not the actual amendment before me but it will take the form of a proviso attached to the Bill stating, in effect,—

This Bill will not come into operation until steps have been taken to open banks and to keep them open to the public until 5 o'clock on Friday afternoons.

In other words, while the public will lose some banking time on Saturday mornings they will gain additional time on Fridays to enable them to carry out their weekend transactions.

I have a copy of the amendment which Sir Thomas Playford subsequently placed in the Bill; and I might say that on the 20th October, 1958—last Monday week—the bank officers of Western Australia met and carried the following resolution:—

(1) That this meeting strongly reaffirm the policy of the Bank Officials' Association of W.A., and the Commonwealth Bank Officers' Association,

which is to seek a five day banking week by all constitutional means, and this meeting further asserts that a banking five day week is a long overdue and justifiable industrial reform.

(2) That this meeting, representative of all bank officers in this State, pledges its full co-operation with a plan to extend public banking hours on Friday afternoons, if necessary, providing a Bill now before the West Australian Parliament, to provide that each and every Saturday shall be a Bank Holiday, is passed.

I will now read the amendments added by Sir Thomas Playford to the South Australian legislation. They are as follows:—

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

I think this House should follow the lead given by the South Australian Parliament. I have read the resolutions carried at a meeting of the Bank Officials' Association of Western Australia showing they are prepared to negotiate with their masters on the question of staying open until 5 p.m. on Friday evening. As I have already said, I concur with Sir Thomas Playford that closing the banks on Saturdays causes some hardship to men with savings bank accounts, but the opening of the banks until 5 p.m. on Friday evenings would overcome that objection; it would permit people to do their trading during that period.

Most people engaged under these awards cease duty at 4.15 or 4.30 on Friday evening. The bank officers have said that they are prepared to accept the conditions to accommodate those people who wish to bank late on Friday evening, and I think it is an excellent compromise. It is a provision to which this State should agree, and the bank officers should be entitled to their leisure hours. Most hon. members have occupied positions in which it has been necessary for them to work 5½ days a week, and I am sure they will agree that by the time one gets home after a half day's work on Saturday, most of the day is gone and it is not always

convenient for one to attend sporting fixtures and social functions. In sponsoring this Bill my main concern is for the bank officers of Western Australia. I sincerely believe that we can give these bank officers a five-day working week without causing undue inconvenience to the general public. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. H. L. Roche, debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 4th November.

#### *Tabling of Papers.*

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I ask—that the papers from which the hon. Mr. Jeffery quoted be laid on the Table of the House.

The PRESIDENT: Is the hon. member prepared to lay the papers on the Table of the House?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: Yes, Mr. President.

Papers tabled.

#### **ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.**

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

That the House at its rising adjourn till 3.30 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.*

---

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 29th October, 1958.

### CONTENTS.

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>	
Fruit-fly, tests with ethylene-di-bromide ....	1852
Fruit for export, cartage of soft fruit in refrigerated railway vans ....	1852
Railway road transport service, concessions over private hauliers ....	1852
Busselton jetty, cost of improvements, maintenance, and repairs ....	1853
Wines, local production, and imports ....	1853
Parliament House, completion of additions	1853
Daglish-Whitfords Beach railway, application of town planning orders, etc. ....	1853
Wokalup crossing, accidents and fatalities since the 1st January, 1958 ....	1854
Rural and Industries Bank, sources of finance to agency section ... ..	1854