

occasions, but the Leader of the Opposition can be assured that we will look at this question to see if some discussion can take place on a Commonwealth-State level to achieve uniformity. If my recollection is correct, comment on radio and TV several days before the election was cut out because of the complaint by the political parties that it was more difficult to deal with the malicious spoken word than it was to deal with it in print.

For this reason it was decided at the time—perhaps in a different atmosphere from that in which we are discussing the question today—that the broadcasting and televising of electoral material would cease about four days before an election. However, the main point is to get some uniformity and a more practical approach to bring the time closer to the actual election day.

The matter of canvassing the rolls, raised by the member for Belmont, is also pertinent. I can assure him there is very close co-operation between the Commonwealth and the State in respect of canvasses that are made by the Commonwealth. I agree it makes a more thorough canvass of the rolls than does the State, but there is close co-operation between both authorities which does achieve substantial benefit to the State in regard to the care of the rolls.

The question of one enrolment card has also been brought before this Chamber on a number of occasions. The Government is working towards achieving this objective, but as yet it does not consider the time opportune.

The member for Belmont raised the point of a public demonstration having reference to an election. It is on the last page of the Bill and is a point to which I cannot, this evening, supply an answer for the benefit of the honourable member. However, I will have some research made on it before we get into the Committee stage. There could be a great deal of argument on the definition of a public demonstration; whether it constitutes a brass band, or whether it means a person travelling down a street shouting at the top of his voice. However, I will have the point clarified before we meet again.

The Government does not support the idea of a circular ballot paper. The suggestion has been closely examined. The Royal Agricultural Society was quoted as one body which had tried this system of voting. I have had a look at that society's circular ballot paper. It tried this system for two consecutive years, but it proved so cumbersome that it was abandoned in favour of a system of voting straight down the ballot paper. Incidentally, in using its new ballot paper, the positions on it will be decided by ballot, as was the case with the circular ballot paper. The society had a system whereby one, first

of all, had to be in a ballot to determine the order of the names on the ballot paper, following which one's name went on to the circular card. However, having tried to vote in one of the Royal Agricultural Society's elections, I would hate to see the day arrive when we had one of these circular ballot papers, especially for a Senate election. I found that if one wanted to be selective in one's vote, the circular ballot paper was most cumbersome and almost impossible.

Mr. Burke: How many names were on the circular ballot paper issued by the Royal Agricultural Society?

Mr. COURT: I think there were 12.

Mr. Burke: There would not be that many in a State election.

Mr. COURT: No, but even with only half a dozen names the same principle would still apply. I can understand people jockeying for position in the hope of securing some advantage as against the disadvantages, perhaps, from the donkey vote. However, no matter what one does there will still be disadvantages. I can assure the member for Belmont and the Leader of the Opposition that there will still be a donkey vote, whether it is the straight up and down form or the circular form. We seem to be in agreement on the need for a ballot for position. I give notice that the Government does not give support to the circular form, because it would not achieve that which it sets out to achieve. If the intention is to defeat the donkey vote, we think the reverse will be achieved with the circular ballot paper.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 29th April, 1970

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

LIQUOR BILL

Late Trading Permits: Petition

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont) [4.32 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed as follows:—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia, in Parliament assembled—

We, the undersigned petitioners, express our complete approval and support for licensed stores being able to apply for a "late trading permit" to allow trading to 8.30 p.m.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your House will take into consideration this petition during the course of the Bill through Parliament.

I have certified that the petition conforms with the rules of the House, and it contains 743 signatures.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

QUESTIONS (35): ON NOTICE

1. EDUCATION

Mt. Newman School

Mr. BICKERTON, to the Minister for Education:

Reference Mt. Newman Government School, will he supply the following information—

- (a) number of children enrolled;
- (b) number of classes;
- (c) number of children in each class;
- (d) number of teachers;
- (e) future plans concerning teaching staff and school buildings;
- (f) anticipated additional enrolments for the next 12 months?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (a) 113.
- (b) 4.
- (c) 16.
42.
26.
29.
- (d) 4.
- (e) As enrolments increase additional staff will be provided. There is sufficient accommodation to cater for any immediate foreseeable increases.
- (f) Anticipated additional enrolments are at present uncertain, but a close watch is kept on developments in the area.

2. EDUCATION

Swanbourne High School

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Would he advise when works for the enclosure of walk-ways in front of classrooms at the Swanbourne High School will commence in order to give sheltered places to students—who in winter are exposed to rain and strong winds—for recreation and the eating of their lunches?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Finance for this work has not yet been allocated. However, the Public Works Department has been requested to prepare plans and an estimated cost for departmental consideration.

3. STATE FORESTS

Dieback Disease

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) How many acres of the State forests have been affected by the dieback disease?
- (2) What progress is being made towards arresting this disease?
- (3) Is he satisfied that everything possible is being done to check the disease?
- (4) What are the districts in which this disease is most prevalent?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) In the northern forest areas 1,850,000 acres of forest have been mapped and this revealed—

	Acres	approx.
Severe dieback	34,040	2
Less severe dieback	58,590	3
Total	92,630	5

In the southern forest areas small pockets of less severe dieback have been located.

- (2) Steps taken towards arresting the disease have included—

(a) Hygiene:

A publicity campaign has been carried out among forest officers, the sawmilling industry, mineral operators, S.E.C., Public Works, Main Roads, and all likely forest users to impress upon them the need for hygiene to prevent the spread of the disease which can be carried in the soil adhering to vehicles. Vehicles leaving affected areas are being carefully washed down to remove the soil.

(b) Control:

Badly infected areas are being rehabilitated with species resistant to the disease. These include pines and eucalypts.

(c) Physical Control:

In cases where small pockets of dieback are found in areas of high quality forest, steps to contain the disease have included—

Trenching.

Poisoned band killing.

Replanting with disease resistant species.

- (d) Research is continuing into this disease and the following personnel are now engaged on the problem:—

Forests Department, W.A.:

4 Professional officers.

7 Technical assistants.

Commonwealth Forest Research Institute, Canberra:

1 Professional officer.

2 Technical assistants.

Forest Research Institute, Kelmscott (Commonwealth):

2 Professional officers.

5 Technical assistants.

Australian National University:

1 Plant pathologist (full time).

1 Plant pathologist (half time).

3 students doing honours degree.

University of W.A.:

1 Plant pathologist.

- (3) Yes.

- (4) The higher rainfall areas on the western section of the jarrah forest from Harvey north to Mundaring.

4.

EDUCATION

Pinjarra High School Library

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) When is it expected that a start will be made under the Commonwealth scheme on the building of a library at the Pinjarra Senior High School?

- (2) What will be the estimated cost of the project?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) A private architect will be commissioned at an early date. A date of commencement will be dependent upon preparation of plans and documents.

- (2) This information is unavailable at present.

5.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Caustic Soda and Chlorine

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) To what extent is caustic soda and chlorine imported into Western Australia?

- (2) From what sources is it imported?

- (3) What are its main uses?

- (4) Is it correct that Western Aluminium N.L. is considering the establishment of a chemical plant for the production of chlorine and caustic soda in Western Australia?

- (5) If so, is he in a position to give any details of the project?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) (a) Imports from overseas of chlorine into Western Australia were valued at \$16,000. The quantity imported is not available.

- (b) Imports of chlorine from interstate are not available.

- (c) Imports of caustic soda into Australia from overseas in 1968-69 were 2,027,791 cwt., valued at \$3,138,000, but there is no breakdown available into importing States. In 1967-68 imports into Western Australia from overseas were 890,813 cwt., valued at \$2,042,000, out of a total Australian import of 1,990,810 cwt., valued at \$3,370,000.

- (d) Interstate imports of caustic soda are not available.

- (e) The Fremantle Port Authority annual report for 1968-69 shows that imports into the outer harbour of liquid caustic soda were 26,207 tons from interstate, and 79,509 tons from overseas.

- (2) See (1) above.

- (3) Chlorine is currently used in Western Australia mainly for water and sewerage treatment, and in the manufacture of weedicides. The main use for caustic soda is in the manufacture of alumina from bauxite. Small quantities are used in the manufacture of soap and in the tanning industry.

- (4) As caustic soda is a raw material used in the manufacture of alumina, Western Aluminium N.L. has been encouraged by the Government—and is co-operating in an excellent way—to examine prospects of local manufacture of chlorine and caustic soda, using Western Australian salt. Such an industry would be a valuable one as it would also require establishment of chlorine-using industries, for example the manufacture of certain types of petrochemicals. Western Aluminium N.L. and the Government are continuing the studies. They are very complex because the marketing of chlorine in one form or another is not easily resolved either within Australia or for export.

- (5) See (4) above.

6. FAUNA RESERVE

Tuttaning

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Is he satisfied with the progress and development of the Tuttaning Fauna Reserve?
- (2) Was not this reserve, if successful, to be a pattern for similar type projects?
- (3) If so, what plans has he for further fauna reserves of a similar type?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Research and management work is still proceeding on Tuttaning and is by no means complete. Research will continue to be concentrated there until it is felt that there is enough knowledge and manpower available to apply the principles worked out there to the management of other reserves.

7. CAUSEWAY

Traffic Congestion

Mr. DUNN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What proposals are being considered by the Government to relieve the periodic traffic congestions which occur at peak hours at both ends of the Causeway?
- (2) Can he give details of these, both as to short term and long term planning?
- (3) Has any consideration been given to the construction of a temporary bridge similar to those currently in use in the construction of the Mitchell Freeway?
- (4) Is there any practical situation where such a bridge could be used?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), is it considered that the saving in man hours and inconvenience to the general public would warrant any expenditure which may be involved?

Mr. COURT (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson), replied:

- (1) The problems at the Causeway have been under consideration for a considerable time, and it is considered that of the many proposals a new river bridge at Burswood Island will give the greatest return for the financial outlay.
- (2) Design of the bridge is in progress with the intention of commencing construction in 1972.
- (3) Yes. Some consideration has been given to the use of temporary bridging at both the eastern and western rotaries.

(4) No single bridge will provide much relief in traffic congestion and hence not improve the overall position to any great extent. Temporary bridging would be very expensive and will not be required in the long term.

(5) It is considered that available funds should be conserved for construction of the Burswood Island bridge.

8.

EDUCATION

Darlington Primary School

Mr. DUNN, to the Minister for Education:

Further to the deputation he received from the Darlington Primary School Parents & Citizens' Association regarding the development of a playing field, can he advise—

- (1) What action has been taken to resolve this problem to date?
- (2) Can the Parents & Citizens' Association expect any assistance within the near future?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) and (2) This matter is receiving my close attention at the present time.

9.

HEALTH

Talking Books

Mr. DUNN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Did he see the article published on page 5 of *The Independent* dated the 5th April, 1970, headed "A Small Lonely Campaigner for talking books" and dealing with a service to the blind?
- (2) If not, could he make himself acquainted with the details of such article with a view to giving some assistance to those unfortunate people to whom these talking books are of such comfort?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A service is provided by the Braille Society for the blind. The system is available to organisations caring for the handicapped person.

10.

RAILWAYS

Coolgardie Goods

Mr. T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Railways:

With the cessation of narrow gauge rail traffic between Perth and Kalgoorlie where will the unloading of goods consigned to Coolgardie be effected?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

When narrow gauge services between Perth and Coolgardie are terminated, goods intended for Coolgardie should be consigned to, and will be delivered to, Bonnie Vale.

11. GASCOYNE RIVER *Salinity*

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Works:

Referring to question No. 12 on Wednesday last and his answer to part 5 of that question, wherein it is stated in respect of the feasibility study of the Kennedy Range dam site "there would be difficulties of salinity and supply"—

- (1) What is the anticipated maximum salinity that would accrue should the Gascoyne River not flow for a period of 18 months?
- (2) What is the evaporation rate in that area?
- (3) What is meant by the words "difficulty of supply"?
- (4) What is the average salinity of the water in the Gascoyne River during a normal flow after heavy rains?
- (5) What is the maximum salinity that can be reached before the water is considered unsuitable for irrigation at Carnarvon?

Mr. COURT (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson), replied:

- (1) The salinity that accrues after 18 months to a large degree depends on the salinity of the previous inflow. In general terms, after a failure of the river to run in an 18-month period, the salinity in the dam would rise to approximately 800 p.p.m. total salts. For this large reservoir the worst conditions would be produced at times when a series of small river flows occur, such as in 1910-1914, 1935-1941, and 1952-1959. During such periods the salinity in the dam would rise about 1,000 p.p.m. total salts. It would continue at this level for several years reaching as high as 2,500 p.p.m. total salts on occasions.
- (2) 100 inches per year.
- (3) Difficulty of supply means that during major drought periods such as are mentioned in (1), the reservoir would actually be empty for an extended period.

(4) For a river with flows as erratic as the Gascoyne it is difficult to generalise, but the median flow has a salinity of the order of 450 p.p.m. total salts.

(5) For the purpose of this study a salinity of above 1,000 p.p.m. total salts was considered as unsuitable. A salinity of this magnitude could only be tolerated for a short period and only if preceded and followed by periods of low salinity supply.

12. *This question was postponed.*

13. GASCOYNE RIVER *Allocation of Water*

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the present allocation of water to planters and vegetable growers at Carnarvon?
- (2) Should the Gascoyne River not flow within the next three months, what will be the allocation then?
- (3) Is there likely to be any rationing of water in Carnarvon in respect of other users, such as domestic, industrial, and parks and gardens?
- (4) If so, when?

Mr. COURT (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson), replied:

- (1) The present allocation of water to planters and vegetable growers is the basic winter allocation plus 40 per cent. This means that a normal one-family-unit property is permitted to draw 504,000 gallons per month from the aquifers during the period the 1st May, 1970, to the 30th September, 1970.
- (2) Should the river not flow within the next three months, the allocation will remain unchanged until the 30th September. From the 1st October the basic summer allocation of 720,000 gallons per month will apply if no river run occurs.
- (3) The necessity for rationing of water in Carnarvon will depend on future river behaviour, but restrictions are not warranted at present.
- (4) Answered by (3).

14. LIQUOR

Debilitated Persons: Cost to State

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

What is the estimated annual cost to the State—

- (a) to hospitalise, treat, and maintain persons injured or

debilitated in consequence of excessive consumption of liquor;

- (b) to hospitalise, treat, and maintain persons injured or debilitated in consequence of other persons having consumed excessive quantities of liquor, and then behaving harmfully towards them?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (a) and (b) Information not available.

15. LIQUOR

Crimes: Cost to State

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police:

What is the estimated annual cost to the State—

- (a) to maintain persons convicted of crimes committed by them whilst influenced by liquor;
- (b) to investigate and prosecute criminal offences perpetrated by persons whilst influenced by liquor?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (a) and (b) Not known.

Point of Order

Mr. CASH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I ask for your guidance and ruling in regard to questions 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21. All of these questions refer to the Liquor Bill which is currently being debated in this House, and therefore I suggest it could be interpreted that they anticipate discussion on Order of the Day No. 2 on today's notice paper, which is the Liquor Bill.

May's *Parliamentary Practice* at page 353 seems to indicate that such questions are out of order in the House of Commons, and therefore I ask you to consider the point of order I have raised and give a ruling on it to this House.

The SPEAKER: There are a number of instances cited on that page. To which are you referring on page 353? Perhaps it is No. 9 to which you are referring, which reads as follows:—

Anticipating discussion upon an Order of the Day, or asking a Minister about a motion upon the paper, when under Standing Orders that motion must be decided without debate.

Mr. CASH: The one which I have in mind refers to anticipated discussion on an Order of the Day, and on our notice paper today Order of the Day No. 2 is the Liquor Bill.

The SPEAKER: These questions were referred to me yesterday evening by one of the Ministers, but I did not see the lengthy question—No. 24—which is addressed to

the Minister representing the Minister for Justice. However, I did see the others, and I instructed the Clerks that, in my opinion, they were admissible. Previously it has been suggested that such matters cannot anticipate any debate, but I cannot agree with that contention, either.

The honourable member does seek some information from which he desires to obtain data which he can use to formulate his own speech. The Minister has already spoken. He can only speak again as the last speaker in the debate, so it is quite impossible for the honourable member, during the course of the debate and before he speaks, to elicit information from the Minister. So I think, purely on that ground, the matter cannot be questioned.

I did not take into account May's *Parliamentary Practice* on the House of Commons practice, but I did take into account the instructions I have issued in this House and which have been accepted by the House. To my mind they fit the present situation.

I must draw the attention of members to the fact that May's *Parliamentary Practice* is now a very doubtful authority in this Parliament. I must also draw the attention of members—as I have done previously—to Standing Order No. 1 of our own Standing Orders. Previously it read that when a matter was not covered by our Standing Orders reference should be made to the practices of the House of Commons. When this House amended the Standing Orders in 1967 the Standing Order was altered to read as follows:—

In all cases not specially provided for hereinafter, or not covered by our practices or usages, or by other orders, resort may be had to the rules, forms and usages of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which may be followed so far as the same can be applied to the proceedings of this House: Provided that nothing hereinafter contained shall be deemed to render applicable any new Standing Order of the Commons House made since the 1st January, 1890, save so far as the same shall have been or shall be expressly adopted by this House.

So I warn members that they must be very careful in referring to May's *Parliamentary Practice*.

In other words, over a period of 70 years, we now consider that we have built up usages in this House which are paramount to the usages in the House of Commons. I have not had time to consider the particular point outlined on the page referred to in May's *Parliamentary Practice*, and I do not propose to do so at this stage, having already allowed questions on the notice paper to be answered. However, I will give the matter further consideration and will make an announcement on a future occasion.

16. LIQUOR BILL

Police Department: Efficacy

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Have his departmental advisers been consulted as to the efficacy of the Liquor Bill insofar as it affects crime, traffic offences and safety?
- (2) If "No" why?
- (3) If "Yes" will he state each of the objections which his departmental advisers have to the Bill insofar as it affects crime, traffic offences and safety?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) By reason of such aspects not being included in the terms of reference of the committee of inquiry.
- (3) Answered by (1).

17. LIQUOR BILL

Traffic Department: Efficacy

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Have his departmental advisers been consulted as to the efficacy of the Liquor Bill insofar as it affects crime, traffic offences and safety?
- (2) If "No" why?
- (3) If "Yes" will he state each of the objections which his departmental advisers have to the Bill insofar as it affects crime, traffic offences and safety?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) By reason of such aspects not being included in the terms of reference of the committee of inquiry.
- (3) Answered by (1).

18. LIQUOR

*Absenteeism and Impaired Efficiency:
Loss of Production*

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Labour:

- What is the estimated annual loss of production by reason of—
- (a) absenteeism from employment,
 - (b) impairment of efficiency, in consequence of proprietors, management and staff being adversely affected in consequence of their excessive consumption of liquor?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

This information is not available.

19. LIQUOR BILL

*Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust:
Efficacy*

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Have his departmental advisers been consulted as to the efficacy of the Liquor Bill insofar as it affects increased Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust claims and increased premiums to be paid by the public under the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust Act, and insofar as it affects the operation of the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust?
- (2) If "No" why?
- (3) If "Yes" what are the estimated increases in claims and the estimated increases in premiums which will be paid by the public under the provisions of the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) There are no means by which this may be assessed.
- (3) Answered by (1).

20. LIQUOR BILL

*Department of Native Welfare:
Efficacy*

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Have his departmental advisers been consulted as to the efficacy of the Liquor Bill insofar as it affects native welfare?
- (2) If "No" why?
- (3) If "Yes" will he state each of the objections which his departmental advisers have to the Bill insofar as it affects native welfare?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) to (3) Heads of departments are usually consulted on matters concerning their departments.
- These discussions are on a confidential basis.

21. LIQUOR BILL

Child Welfare Department: Efficacy

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

- (1) Have his departmental advisers been consulted as to the efficacy of the Liquor Bill insofar as it affects child welfare?
- (2) If "No" why?
- (3) If "Yes" will he state each of the objections which his departmental advisers have to the Bill insofar as it affects child welfare?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) to (3) No. This was not necessary as the general public were invited to give evidence to the committee. All the committee recommendations have been included in the Bill before Parliament. It is now up to members of Parliament to decide whether they agree with the recommendations or not.

22. LIQUOR

Property Damage and Personal Injury: Annual Waste

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police:

What is the estimated annual waste—

- (a) by way of damage to property; and
- (b) by way of injury to persons; in consequence of things done, or not done, by persons when influenced by liquor?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (a) and (b) Not known.

23. LIQUOR

Traffic Accidents and Offences

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) In the last five statistical years—
 - (a) how many fatal traffic accidents have involved drivers who were at the time of the accident influenced by alcohol;
 - (b) how many non-fatal traffic accidents have involved drivers under the influence of alcohol?
- (2) In each of the last five statistical years, how many people have been committed under the Traffic Act and Regulations for offences, an element of which was that the defendant at the material time had consumed alcohol above a certain limit?
- (3) Will he classify the convictions to each of the sections offended against, and supply the total fines imposed in each category under (2)?
- (4) In each of the last five statistical years, how many of those convicted of—
 - (a) drunken driving;
 - (b) the offence of having a blood alcohol content of, or above .08 per cent;
 were aged between 18 and 21 years?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) to (4) Information not readily available.

In fairness I might add that some of the information could be obtained but it would take several weeks to secure it.

24. LIQUOR

Committee's Decisions and Comments

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Does he agree with the Liquor Committee's decisions and comments as follows—

- (1) (a) that it had no power to take evidence on oath nor to enforce attendance by subpoena;
- (b) that for the most part witnesses before the committee merely gave opinions and little facts;
- (c) that the problem of the drunken driver and the answers thereto were outside the committee's terms of reference;
- (d) that alcoholism was outside the committee's terms of reference;
- (e) that a sorry state of affairs exists as regards Aborigines and liquor, but that the committee could do nothing about it?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1)(a), (b) and (c), why was this vital matter of life and death and waste, and which directly relates to liquor, omitted?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1)(d), why was this fundamental question, which is directly related to liquor, omitted?
- (4) Is it anticipated that the amendments proposed will mean a variation in the price of liquor to the drinking public?
- (5) If "Yes" when, in what way and to what extent?
- (6) If "No" why?
- (7) What is the estimated average number of people currently participating in the Sunday hours drinking?
- (8) Will the Government receive greater revenue as a result of the proposed amendments?
- (9) If "Yes" what is the estimated annual amount?
- (10) What was the State population of persons, male and female, respectively, between the age of 18 and 21 years, at the end of each of the last five statistical years?

- (11) What recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry have not been included in the Liquor Bill, and why?
- (12) Will he detail the provisions of the Liquor Bill which were not recommended by the said committee?
- (13) Since farmers' profits are partially controlled by Statute, and the cost of employees' services are fixed by statutory bodies, is it intended to fix the price for the supply and service of liquor by persons, firms and companies which will operate by virtue of the Liquor Bill, should it become law?
- (14) If "No" why?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
(b) Yes, but many gave facts in support of their opinions.
(c) Yes.
(d) Yes.
(e) The committee expressed an opinion.
- (2) This is a separate issue that is dealt with by separate legislation.
- (3) Alcoholism was not a matter for this particular committee: the question should be considered separately.
- (4) No.
- (5) Answered by (4).
- (6) The recommendations do not call for any conditions that should affect the price of liquor.
- (7) The Minister for Justice does not know.
- (8) This is not expected.
- (9) Answered by (8).
- (10) These figures are available in published reports.
- (11) None.
- (12) The provisions of the Bill that were not the subject of the committee's recommendation are those in the present Licensing Act, which it is necessary to continue.
- (13) No.
- (14) This is a matter of Government policy.

25. ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD

Annual Reports

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) As the annual reports of the managing secretary of Rottnest Island Board are not available at

Parliament House after the 30th June, 1965, to present date, does this mean that the reports have not been tabled?

- (2) If not tabled, why not?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Tabling of Rottnest Island Board reports is not a statutory requirement. However, during a period of extensive development of the island, reports were made available for public information.

26. GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY

Biggs Story: Advertising

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) In view of the increased crime rate in Western Australia, does he agree with the sensational advertising in the Press and on television covering the Biggs story in connection with the "great train robbery"?
- (2) If "Yes" will he give his reasons?
- (3) If "No" is he able to take action?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) No.

27.

EDUCATION

Sweeney Report: Salaries

Mr. H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of the fact that the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science has made public his decision to implement the major recommendations of the Sweeney Report at the Canberra College of Advanced Education, that is, to pay and maintain salaries at that Institution equal to those operating at Australian Universities (retrospective to the 1st January, 1970) as is already the practice of the Queensland Institute of Technology?
- (2) Is it a fact that he received, in February, 1970, recommendations from the Council of the Western Australian Institute of Technology to similarly implement the Sweeney Report recommendations and pay and maintain salaries at this institution equal to those operating at Australian Universities?
- (3) In view of the above circumstances will he say when he intends to give his approval to the Council's recommendations and bring the salaries of the academic staff at the Western Australian

Institute of Technology into line with those not only at the Canberra College but also at the Queensland Institute of Technology?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes, but in March—not February.
- (3) This is still under consideration.

28. HOSPITAL *Busselton*

Mr. H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it the intention of his department to build a sub-regional hospital at Busselton?
- (2) If so, when is it intended a start on such a project would be made?
- (3) Upon what site would such a hospital be built?
- (4) If (1) is "No" has his department an alternative proposal to extend hospital facilities in Busselton?
- (5) If so, what is the intention in this regard?
- (6) Has land been acquired to permit the implementation of any such proposals?
- (7) If so, what amount and in what location?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Date is indefinite as the feasibility study so far undertaken is not yet complete.
- (3) Existing site.
- (4) to (7) Answered as above and not applicable.

29. SWAN LOCATION 1560 *Vesting in Kalamunda Shire*

Mr. DUNN, to the Minister for Lands:
In view of the large scale development which could take place as the result of the Kalamunda Shire's rezoning proposals currently in the objection period—

- (1) What is the current situation regarding the use of Crown land consisting of approximately 128 acres and being Swan location 1560?
- (2) As this land is considered suitable for the establishment of a sewerage treatment plant and effluent disposal site, can favourable consideration be given to vesting such land in the Kalamunda Shire for those purposes?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Swan Location 1560 forms portion of Reserve No. 29880, which is set apart for the purpose of Government requirements (automotive industry).
- (2) Not under existing reservation.

30. EDUCATION

Driver Training; Boyup Brook

Mr. KITNEY, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has his department recently received a request from the Boyup Brook Parents & Citizens' Association to have driver training in schools extended to third year students at that school?
- (2) If "Yes" what is the department's attitude to this request?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) As only students above the age of sixteen years are eligible for a learner's permit, driver training cannot be undertaken with third year pupils.

31. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 5th May.*

32. ROAD CONSTRUCTION GANGS

Instruction on Conservation

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Works:

In the interests of conservation are Main Roads Department road construction gangs being instructed to adopt a more careful approach to the destruction of natural bush on roadsides?

Mr. COURT (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson), replied:

Yes. The department is well aware of the need for adopting proper conservation methods including limiting the width of clearing. However, it must be realised that it is difficult to construct highways to adequate standards within a 66 ft. road reserve without destroying some natural vegetation.

33. EDUCATION

Safety Bay School

Mr. JAMIESON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the number of children attending the Safety Bay school?
- (2) How many teachers are at present employed at this school?
- (3) What difficulties have been experienced at this school this year in—
 - (a) maintaining staff;
 - (b) providing sufficient accommodation?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) 673.
- (2) 18.
- (3) (a) and (b) No difficulties have been experienced. Additional staff has been provided in accord with enrolment increases, and as classrooms in the new building became available demountable rooms were removed from the site.

34. *This question was postponed.*

35. TAXATION DEPARTMENT

Supply of Information to Land Agents

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is it the policy of the valuation section of the State Commissioner of Taxation's office to supply information over the counter to those licensed land agents only who are members of one or another institute such as the R.E.I.W.A. or C.I.V.?
- (2) If "Yes" can he explain why?
- (3) If (1) is "No" would he direct the section to supply the required information to all licensed land agents?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) Information gathered by the valuation section of the taxation office in performing its valuation functions is made available to inquirers who require such information for the purpose of making a valuation of a property. Usually it is found that inquirers are in fact a member of one of the bodies mentioned in the question.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) There is nothing to prevent a licensed land agent or any other person obtaining information providing that it can be demonstrated that they are qualified to make a valuation and that the information is required for the purpose of making a valuation. It is not practicable for the taxation office to make information available for other purposes.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. RECEIPT DUTY

Outstanding Statements: Notices

Mr. TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is the Commissioner of Stamps continuing to issue notices concerning bulk payment of receipt duty, drawing attention to outstanding statements and requiring the payment of duty within 14 days of an expiry period under threat of imposition of a penalty of \$200 plus double the duty not paid?

- (2) Does he not think he has a responsibility to request the Commissioner of Stamps to ensure that any communication he sends out concerning the payment of receipt duty clearly states that there is no liability for the payment of such duty in respect of a sale of Australian manufactured goods?
- (3) As small business proprietors are likely to be intimidated where larger firms with ready access to legal advice are less likely to be so, will he take immediate steps to have the position regarding liability to pay receipt duty clearly stated?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

The Leader of the Opposition gave me some notice of his intention to ask these questions, the answers to which are as follows:—

- (1) Notices were being sent out to persons whose returns were overdue, but these were discontinued some time ago.
- (2) and (3) I believe that sufficient publicity has already been given to the position of taxpayers in relation to duty on goods produced or manufactured in Australia.

2.

RECEIPT DUTY

Outstanding Statements: Notices

Mr. TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

I appreciate that it will not be possible for the Treasurer to answer off the cuff the question I am about to put to him, but as I have a notice that was issued quite recently will he ascertain the date upon when the Commissioner of Stamps discontinued sending these notices out?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

Yes. I did make some inquiries as to when it was decided not to send out any more of the notices and I was told the date was approximately three weeks ago. I will, however, check back on this matter. I got this information from the Under-Treasurer and I presume he believed this to be the position.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. Norton, leave of absence for three weeks granted to Mr. Davies (Victoria Park) on the ground of urgent private business.

TAXI-CARS (CO-ORDINATION AND CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. O'Connor (Minister for Transport), and transmitted to the Council.

LIQUOR BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 22nd April.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5 p.m.]: I want to emphasise immediately that any remarks I might make in addressing myself to this Bill are personal views—they are my own opinions. The Opposition—and the conscience of each individual with the Government members—has decided that this is a non-party matter, and is one to be decided according to the light and the conscience of each individual member. As a consequence of this the Parliamentary Labor Party has made no decision whatsoever with regard to any principle or any aspect of the Bill which we are considering.

Let me say here and now that the committee upon whose findings this Bill is substantially based is, in my view, to be commended for its practical approach to this problem. I express the hope that members of Parliament will be prompted by similar motives in their consideration of the measure, although perhaps it will be difficult to do so in many cases on account of the pressure groups of various sorts which seek to impose their line of thinking upon members—a line of thinking which naturally enough those groups are entitled to take. It could be that on occasions the better judgment of a member could be influenced by these approaches; and he would take their line rather than make a full assessment of the situation and decide on the steps to be taken in order to meet the situation.

I think it is indicative of the activities of the committee I have referred to—and this is involved in the title of the Bill—that in future this legislation is to be known as the Liquor Act rather than the Licensing Act; because the term "licensing" could apply to anything ranging from the trades and professions to other pursuits, and so on. If the Bill is accepted in the broad outline of its present form it will be a substantial advance on the current situation. Here and now I state that in certain particulars some changes are necessary, and no doubt these will be reflected by the amendments that will be placed on the notice paper.

Even if the Bill is passed in its present form or with minor amendments it will not have the effect of opening the floodgates

to an era of irresponsibility, or of drunken orgies to be indulged in by various groups of our people—young, old, or otherwise. I feel it is a pity that on nearly every occasion, and certainly during the time I have been a member of this Parliament, when proposals for the extension or modification of the law were put forward some sections of the community saw in those moves something in the nature of a crisis, and believed that following the acceptance of the proposals there would be virtually death and destruction in this fair land. Of course, history has proved such prognostications to be completely unfounded.

With regard to the Bill, and speaking in broad principles, I am definitely of the opinion that it will be an improvement on the present situation. As the Minister stated when he introduced the second reading, it is largely a Committee measure. For this reason the views which I am expressing at this stage are more of a general nature, but they pay particular attention to the two points which are regarded as controversial; namely, the Sunday trading facilities, and the age at which persons are permitted to be supplied with, and to consume, liquor on licensed premises.

Of course, it goes without saying that drinking is an accepted social custom; and only in the minds of an insignificant fraction of the community is drinking regarded as an evil and something that is sinful. It is true, as with anything and everything, that a fraction of the people is irresponsible, but surely we do not base our judgments upon this minute fraction, because if we did there would be an endless stream of restrictive legislation impinging upon every aspect of what we regard as normal life and normal living.

Drinking is an accepted social custom not only in Australia, but in practically every civilised country of the world. I am of the opinion that some of the worst features in connection with the question of drinking in Australia, and in the State of Western Australia in particular, stem from the very restrictions which we have imposed. Of course, members will agree that it becomes somewhat tedious to have to listen to members of Parliament who have had the good fortune to visit other parts of the world, giving their experiences. Several years ago I visited quite a number of countries, and in some of them I found there was virtually no age limit in respect of drinking and no restrictions in regard to the hours or days during which liquor can be served. I saw not one person in those countries under the influence of liquor, and I visited 10 or 15 countries.

I think it stands to reason that if we legislate in order to create limited drinking sessions and cramped periods then we can expect nothing other than the inevitable. That, of course, is what we find in this State—unreal and unnecessary restrictions. I hazard a guess that before

many years pass there will be a further easing of the restrictions. Perhaps as we are somewhat nervous, to take one step at a time may not be a bad idea, unless we can thoroughly convince ourselves in respect of the various matters.

To me it seems remarkable that this new legislation, which many of us hope will become law very largely in its present form, takes up 131 pages and contains 177 clauses for the purpose of regulating the sale of what is virtually a single commodity. To me this is extraordinary. Because we have given to liquor an aura of mystery and have surrounded it with a sense of being something that is a little wicked or perhaps not quite respectable, I think to a great extent we have brought upon ourselves some of the ills of which those who are encompassed in the bracket of the temperance people so bitterly complain. If we adopt a common-sense attitude then, as I have already said, we might expect a lessening of the evils that arise from the excessive intake of alcoholic beverages.

I have mentioned that we have restrictions not only in the matter of hours, but also in the matter of hotels. I represent a constituency with about 15,000 voters and a populace in excess of 30,000 people, and there are only two hotels in that district. There is only one registered club; there is no wine saloon; there is one gallon license; and there is one wine restaurant. There are comparative villages in Western Australia where the populace would number hundreds only which have more than one hotel. Yet, I repeat, in my district 15,000 people are catered for by two hotels.

This inevitably results from the present basis under which we operate, that very largely the liquor outlets—at least the major ones—shall provide accommodation by way of beds and meals. The establishments become rather expensive structures and, of course, they have to be manned and staffed generally. Because we have required the proprietors of those establishments to do those things, involving a substantial capital outlay, understandably those people have a claim for some protection, and we have provided that protection. Rather, we have appointed a Licensing Court which, amongst other things, performs that operation. However, in my view, it has gone too far.

I repeat: A tremendous population of 15,000 adults has only two hotels. This inevitably means that the great majority of those seeking a beverage of their own choice must travel to the local hotel in their motor vehicles. Instead of there being a local tavern or place where they can have refreshments quite handy, they have, of necessity, to make a journey. Of course, having travelled a couple of miles to have refreshment, the natural conclusion is that those who have made the

journey tend to remain for a period instead of just for a couple of drinks. There is a tendency for the drinking to develop into a session of one hour, two hours, or longer.

The return journey, in many cases, is not as straight and direct as it might be, and there is a tendency to wander from side to side which attracts the attention of the traffic police and, of course, endangers members of the public generally. This, in my opinion, stems from the fact that we have insisted upon the erection of giant establishments instead of having a smaller homely type of place where people can drink and talk and engage in recreation and pastimes; where, generally speaking, there is some sort of family feeling instead of the bulk handling impersonal operation which is characteristic of our drinking in Western Australia.

To me it is pleasing to see that the committee which was appointed to investigate our liquor laws has given attention to this fact and, accordingly, there will be—if the legislation is passed—taverns and other places established where people will be able to obtain the drink of their choosing with a minimum of exertion and discomfort.

In another respect, we restrict trading and this has an impact upon which I had something to say a few moments ago. Our law takes no account whatever of climatic conditions. We could have a hot night without a sea breeze and the temperatures could be in the 90s up to midnight. Of course, I am speaking of the metropolitan area. Yet, at ten o'clock the public drinking places are required to close their doors. These periods are, as a rule, the bonanza periods for those who sell aerated waters and drinks of that nature allowing people in their thousands to drink the beverage of their choice. When the temperature exceeds a century on a Sunday, whether one is driving in the hills or visiting a beach or a suburb, surely there is no crime in being able to go to a hotel in the vicinity to have a drink or two with one's friends.

Some people feel that those places are dens of iniquity and anybody who enters them goes there for the purpose of getting himself sozzled. In other words, coming out drunk. It would be true to say there are a number of alcoholics in the community but the great majority of people who drink are decent, respectable, and responsible citizens. They know how to comport themselves with decency, and they are indistinguishable in behaviour and attainment and general respectability from those who have not sampled alcoholic refreshment in any form.

So, by and large, except during restricted hours, we show no consideration for the requirements of the people. Big Brother, in the form of members of Parliament, tells the populace at large it is wrong to

drink beyond certain hours, and that it is wrong to drink on certain days. There might be some call for that line of thinking in respect of what I might term "non essentials" but surely the question of providing food and refreshments ought to be left to the caterers—those who provide for the public need.

We do not regulate the hours or days, or periods, when soft drinks, food, tea, coffee, and the rest of it can be served to the people. Certain individuals carry on that type of business to cater for the public need and the public patronises or does not patronise those businesses according to individual wishes and whims. The public should not be restricted by what members of Parliament decided in 1870, 1970, or on some particular date.

I therefore hope this Bill is an awakening of a conscience in connection with this matter. By the very fact of limiting and restricting we encourage, to a great extent, over-indulgence. Persons become intoxicated because of this attitude. You, Mr. Speaker, and I have recollections, no doubt, of the war years in Western Australia when we had six o'clock and seven o'clock closing and there was a shortage of the bottled beverage of the type I customarily enjoy. At that time people queued up to order their drinks. If three people were in a party, as six o'clock drew near they would order nine or 12 glasses in order that they might have their fill.

All of those who saw the drinking habits in the Eastern States during the time when they had six o'clock closing appreciate the situation, which was of international repute. I refer to the six o'clock swill. That was a disgrace to a civilised community, but something brought about because of limitations and restrictions imposed by a group of people known as members of Parliament.

Since the hours have been extended to 10 p.m. the swilling aspect has virtually disappeared. The same thing occurred in Western Australia. However, on special occasions, such as Friday nights and Saturday nights, and on holidays, I suggest that 10 o'clock is an unreal hour for closing, and does not cater for the wants and requirements of the people. However, we will leave the matter there for the moment and, as I said, be thankful for the fact that at least some progress is being made.

I wish to deal with the question of the reduction of the drinking age, which is the term in which the proposition is generally stated. I think it should be said here and now that it is not an offence in Western Australia for people under 21 years of age to drink alcohol. They are, of course, doing it in their countless thousands at the present moment. Unfortunately, a great deal of it is done surreptitiously and

perhaps this is at the rock bottom of a great deal of the trouble. People under the age of 21 years are able to drink in exactly the same way as their elders, except on licensed premises; that is, except in the places which have been especially designed and constructed for the purpose of enabling people to drink. I refer to places where there is some supervision and control; where there are standards to be observed; and where those standards are enforced.

There is nothing unlawful in people under the age of 21 years coming to my home and partaking of alcoholic liquor. At every barbecue, at every ball, at every wedding, and at every party, liquor is consumed by people over the age of 21 as well as by people under the age of 21. When I use the word "every," I realise I am indulging in a little poetic license. Such drinking is not contrary to the law. To my mind it is most extraordinary that the one place especially provided for the consumption of alcohol is the only place where drinking is not permitted so far as a person under the age of 21 is concerned compared with a person who has reached the age of adulthood, as we know it in Western Australia at the present moment. Strangely enough, the age of 21 as the age of majority has been in existence in this State only since the year 1922.

I have quoted previously from a volume which I would commend for the study of every member of this Parliament. It is the *Report of the Committee on the Age of Majority* in the United Kingdom. The committee delivered its report in July, 1967. The committee was charged with the responsibility of investigating the question as to whether the age of majority should remain at 21 or be 20, 19, 18, or some other age.

It would be beyond the compass of the Bill we are considering for me to outline the very many aspects but, on all counts—on all the issues the committee investigated—it recommended that the age should be not 21, 20, or 19, but 18 years. The consumption of alcohol scarcely received a mention because, in the United Kingdom, 18 years is the lawful drinking age, or the age when persons can purchase, and be permitted to consume, liquor on licensed premises. This fact is accepted in the United Kingdom and has been for many years.

As I have stated on other occasions, it is necessary to give our fullest attention to this whole matter. It should not be handled on a piecemeal basis. In the last couple of years I think at least three Bills have been brought forward which have made moves in the direction of allowing people to be permitted to do certain things at the age of 18—things from which they were previously debarred until they reached the age

of 21 years. I should like to quote two paragraphs from the book to which I have made reference. I refer to page 41, which says—

Young people today, as the old never tire of remarking, are not what they were. They are largely literate and educated; they are far better off financially and far more independent of their parents; they are taught to think and enquire for themselves and mostly do so; and their experience of life is wider. The question is not whether this is a good thing or a bad thing but what are we to do about it. This Committee is convinced that we must ensure that the young go out into the world as fully prepared for their adult responsibilities as possible, and that in giving them adult status at 18 we are doing no more than recognising the simple facts.

I might here interpolate to say that, since the beginning of this year, the age of majority in the United Kingdom has been 18 for all purposes. I shall quote half a dozen lines from the general conclusions of the committee which appear on page 42 of the publication. It says—

We therefore consider:

That the historical causes for 21 are not relevant to contemporary society;

That most young people today mature earlier than in the past;

That by 18 most young people are ready for these responsibilities and rights and would greatly profit by them as would the teaching authorities, the business community, the administration of justice, and the community as a whole.

I repeat that these recommendations came from conservative old Great Britain; yet, we are tying ourselves into knots wondering whether it is safe to follow the same course.

In many other countries 18 is the legal drinking age and, as I mentioned earlier, in some countries there is no age limit at all. Indeed, that was the case in Western Australia from its commencement until, I think, the year 1908. In that year somebody was really bold and made the drinking age 16 years. I do not know what happened in the year 1922, but it was then that the age was raised to 21.

Anyhow, I am pleased to say that there is recognition, in this year of grace, of the fact that the young in our community are, by comparison with bygone days, mature individuals. That statement can be gone into in so many different respects. I know that the older we become the more sceptical we become of the younger generation and the more critical we are of youth. Of course, it is true to say that our parents had this same sort of attitude towards us.

Mr. Lewis: That is a fairly wide generalisation.

Mr. GRAHAM: I can well recall—but I shall not pronounce—some of the declamations of my parents concerning me and those about my age some 40 or 50 years ago.

Mr. Lewis: That is a sweeping generalisation, of course.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the position in Australia? Western Australia and Queensland still observe the age of 21 years. In South Australia and Tasmania, 20 is the recognised age. In New South Wales and Victoria, 18 is the legal age for drinking—if I might use that short and expressive term.

I shall base my comparison on the 1968 figures, and it is interesting to observe that there were 7,787,000 people—in other words, in excess of seven and three-quarter million—in those States where, now, 18-year-olds are permitted to drink. In the balance of Australia where the permissible drinking age is in excess of 18 years there was not much more than half that number; namely, 4,386,000.

Mr. Lewis: What does that prove?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am simply proving that there is nothing new or novel about this concept; it is no pioneering move. I put the question to the Minister for Education—and, indeed, to all members—when I ask: Can anybody in this Chamber honestly say that the youth of the United Kingdom or of the States of New South Wales and Victoria are at a lower level mentally, morally, or physically than they are in Western Australia?

Mr. Lewis: Or *vice versa*.

Mr. GRAHAM: What has been the downward effect upon young people in other States?

Mr. Lewis: Or *vice versa*.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. Surely there should be some evidence to support the view, if any members fear that there is something wrong and harmful in the proposition to reduce the legal drinking age from 21 to 18 years. When I see Victorian footballers against Western Australian footballers, I have to confess immediately that, physically, they are not suffering as a consequence of an earlier legal introduction to the intake of alcoholic liquor.

Mr. Lewis: Don't forget they pick their 18 from many more people than we have here.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so, but the numbers do not count, of course, because we are able to defeat Great Britain in cricket test matches, and Great Britain has far more people than we have.

It would indeed be a brave member or person in the community who could point out or demonstrate that the young people in the two major States of the Commonwealth of Australia are at a lower level, on whatever grounds one cared to submit,

because of the fact that there is a drinking age of 18 in those States as against 21 in this State.

Here and now let me acknowledge the introduction of the system of certificates which will enable licensees and their employees to exonerate themselves, and which will place the onus fairly and squarely on the person suspected of being an underage drinker. Such a person will be required to sign a declaration that he has attained his eighteenth birthday. Hitherto some concern has been expressed by licensees, barmaids, and barmen that there is a responsibility upon them to an extent that should not exist. I know they will welcome this innovation in Western Australia, which should overcome some of the objections from people who feel and fear that children of 14, 15, and 16, and the rest of it, will virtually be given the open Sesame to licensed premises.

I now turn to the question of Sunday trading, about which quite a number of people are becoming concerned and upset. It is interesting to note what goes on in other parts of the world. I am not one of those who say that because something is done in another country it is necessarily right or that we ought automatically to follow it; but I think if we display any nervousness in respect of the matter it does not do any harm to have a look about us.

We find that Sunday trading is permitted in Belgium, Panama, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Britain, Bulgaria, Chile, Holland, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Mexico, the Philippines, Singapore, Columbia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Denmark, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia—

Mr. Gayfer: Is there any Saturday trading in Israel?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is an interesting question, but I am afraid I have not the answer. If it will make the member for Avon happy, perhaps we could delete Israel because it may not have trading on Saturday—who knows?—but it does not affect the argument or the point I am endeavouring to make, which is that there is nothing new or novel in this regard. It has been the practice and experience in many of the leading countries of the world. I suggest there is a responsibility on those who oppose the proposed reform to bring concrete evidence that people in those countries, measured against our own, are suffering because of the hours and the days of trading that they have.

What is the position in the other States of Australia? Again, it does not make it right or wrong, but I think we ought to know what is going on about us.

In New South Wales at the present moment there are 1,400 hotels and in excess of 1,400 clubs—1,436, to be precise

—that are legally trading on Sundays. If one travels more than 30 miles from Sydney one becomes a *bona fide* traveller and can attend a bar. Outside and away from the metropolis if one travels in excess of 10 miles one becomes a *bona fide* traveller and is able to have a drink of one's choice. Drinks may be bought during meal times. The meal periods are from 12 noon to 3 p.m. and from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. So it is possible for many, many thousands to have liquor with their meals and there is no limit on the amount of liquor.

Again, we are talking about decent, sensible, responsible citizens, and not about the ratbags, the alcoholics, and the no-hopers. There is no possibility of legislating to cater for the latter, and the decent section of the community, which is the overwhelming majority, should not have restrictions imposed upon them and have their lives interfered with because of a comparatively insignificant minority.

In Victoria it is possible to have drinks with meals from 12 noon to 2.30 p.m. and from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. In Queensland every hotel is able to sell liquor, in every department except the bottle department, between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m., and 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. In South Australia, if one has a bonny appetite, one can have liquor between 12 noon and 10.45 p.m., non-stop, with meals. In Tasmania, with permits, drinks can be obtained with meals at mid-day and in the evening.

Here in Western Australia we have 741 hotels, limited hotels, canteens, wayside houses, and clubs in which Sunday drinking is permitted—741; and there are only 149 hotels and limited hotels in which Sunday drinking is not permitted in the general sense. I use the term "in the general sense" advisedly because, from my reading of the Licensing Act that we have here, we witness the most peculiar admixture of nonsense that I think it is possible for any Parliament to place in any Statute. What I am about to say will be somewhat long and involved, but it will give an idea of where we have got to by endeavouring to prescribe for every type of condition as the situation has arisen.

In the goldfields, hotels—that is to say, publicans' general licenses, as they are called at the moment—limited hotels, canteens, and wayside houses can serve liquor variously between 10 a.m. and 1 p.m. and between 3.30 p.m. and 7 p.m., and two bottles of beer may be purchased before 1 p.m. Those hours may be extended, reduced, or varied by a decision of a court. In addition, on the goldfields any person may have liquor between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. and between 6 p.m. and 7.30 p.m. provided he has a meal at the hotel. In these hotels and limited hotels, etc., drink may be had at any time on Sunday by the licensee, or by a member of his family,

or by an employee of the licensee if he resides on the premises, or by a lodger.

As far as clubs on the goldfields are concerned, liquor may be served at various hours ranging between 10.30 a.m. and 1 p.m., and again in the afternoon between 3.30 p.m. and 6.30 p.m., and a maximum of two bottles may be obtained during the morning session. A *bona fide* lodger or employee of a club living on the club premises may have liquor at any time.

Any person, if served with a meal on club premises between 1.30 p.m. and 2.30 p.m., or 6.30 p.m. and 7.30 p.m., in a room set aside for the purpose, can have as much liquor as he wants provided it is consumed with his meal; that is, before, during, and after, no doubt. I have been referring to the goldfields, but I mean the goldfields and the north-west area. I think, for the purposes of the Licensing Act, that area is referred to generally as the goldfields.

We find that north of the 26th parallel anyone who has a packet license can sell liquor during any hours at all on a Sunday, provided the ship is not tied up by, or adjacent to, a wharf or a jetty. Any passengers who have travelled, or are about to travel, at least 20 miles by train or bus can regale themselves on the Sabbath in railway refreshment rooms. In licensed restaurants drinks can be obtained up to 12.30 a.m. on Sunday morning with a further half-hour's grace in which to consume them. So one orders a couple of extra bottles to keep oneself occupied until 1 a.m. on the Sabbath. That is the position on the goldfields, and I will guarantee that no member of this House is able to remember all the niceties of the situation there.

So we come to the country which, for the purposes of this exercise, is somewhere more than 20 miles from the Perth Town Hall. Hotels, limited hotels, canteens, and wayside houses in the country districts can serve liquor on Sundays to the general public between 12 noon and 1 p.m. and, again, between 5 p.m. and 6 p.m. Those places can serve any person with liquor, provided he is having a meal, for an hour between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. and for an hour and a half between 6 p.m. and 7.30 p.m. Once again, liquor can be consumed at any time by the licensee, his family, his employee, or anybody living on the premises.

Clubs in the country districts can serve liquor from 10.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m., generally speaking, and again in the afternoon between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. Again, any *bona fide* lodger or employee who is living on club premises—if there is any residential accommodation in country clubs—can obtain liquor at any time on the Sabbath. A person being served with a meal in a club in the country between 1.30 p.m. and 2.30 p.m. or 6.30 p.m. and 7.30 p.m. in a room set aside for the purpose can

obtain liquor provided it is consumed in association with the meal. I suppose the remarks I made regarding packet licences for ships would not have application, because north of the 26th parallel would be regarded as the goldfields. There are other types of licenses, the provisions of which are identical to those in the metropolitan area.

So we come to the interesting point: What is the practice on Sundays in the metropolitan area at the present time? In hotels and limited hotels any person having a meal between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. is entitled to be served with all the liquor he desires and this applies also between 6 p.m. and 7.30 p.m. Once again, the licensee, a member of his family, or an employee living on the premises has access to whatever quantity of liquor he might desire.

Generally speaking, clubs can serve liquor for two hours in the morning between 10.30 a.m. and 12.30 p.m. and in the afternoon between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. Again, any *bona fide* lodger or employee or a person being served with a meal between 1.30 p.m. and 2.30 p.m. or 6.30 p.m. and 7.30 p.m., may be served with liquor.

In railway refreshment rooms, one may be served with liquor provided one is about to travel at least 20 miles. At the Perth Airport where, for all practical purposes liquor may be served around the clock, we find that people who are not seeing anybody off and who have no intention of boarding a plane, are out there in droves on Sundays and other days and during all hours of the night.

As in the case of the country and goldfields districts, when served with a meal in a licensed restaurant one can buy liquor from midnight until 12.30 a.m. and drink it on the premises until 1 a.m. on Sundays. Of course, in respect of canteen licenses—wherever they might operate, in the country or otherwise—liquor may be served at any time at all on Sundays or any other days if approved by the Licensing Court. So we reach the situation where we ask ourselves the question: Who cannot obtain a drink on a Sunday?

If a person in the metropolitan area does not qualify under these heads, there is the necessity to take a journey to licensed premises beyond 20 miles from the Perth Town Hall. Accordingly, we, the members of this Parliament, create the absurd and disgraceful scenes and situations which occur in the hotels just outside that 20-mile radius. We have created the situation in which a person who wants a drink for any one of a number of reasons is required to travel that distance if he does not belong to a club, or if he happens to be visiting another point of the compass.

So there will be nothing new or novel in introducing Sunday trading into the metropolitan area or elsewhere; it is here

at the moment, but on a ridiculous and absurd basis. Why this peculiar way of going about the matter? Why the difference between the metropolitan area and elsewhere in the State? Why, in the metropolitan area, in clubs but not in hotels? What is the particular virtue—or is it a sin—in my being able to drink to my heart's content for four hours in a club and yet, because I am not a member, I would be breaking some commandment if the hotels were open and I was able to obtain a drink of my choice in a hotel?

Why not allow people to make their own decisions; or, if some restrictions are necessary in the matter of trading—whether it be this trading or any other—why not a minimum of interference to the wishes of the people who desire to go about what I call lawful pursuits, but made illegal because of the narrow-minded attitude of members of Parliament of this and previous generations? In my view it is no more wrong to drink liquor on a Saturday than it is to drink liquor on any other day of the week. I leave the choice to the person concerned.

If you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, prefer lemonade, that is your business, and I do not seek to interfere with your right to do that; and I do not think you have any moral right to interfere with my wishes in respect of drinking. I think I have already said that the overwhelming majority of people are decent, sensible, and responsible in respect of their behaviour, their finances, and their family obligations.

I think if we remove some of this air of mystery, the suggestion of naughtiness, and the challenge to young people either to obtain liquor because, on account of age, they are forbidden to do so, or to acquire liquor during hours when we are told it is naughty to do so, there would be an openness, a freedom, and a naturalness about the whole procedure which is missing at the present moment. It is true to say that over the last 50 years or so Parliament has moved in the direction of relaxing the previous restrictions and gradually liberalising the liquor laws of the State. But it has been very gradual and we are, I am afraid, falling behind the rest of the world and the other States of the Commonwealth in this matter.

We are treating our citizens as babies or irresponsibles. In the process of effecting amendments such as those contained in the Bill, usually in the direction of a relaxation of our laws, there have been cries that some harm would befall the community, but experience has proved otherwise. In other words, the ill-effects of the predictions were, in fact, not borne out. Surely those who are so sceptical and critical are being insulting. I want to know why, if I happened to be living in the State of New South Wales, I would be a decent and respectable citizen, but whilst living in this State and having ready access to liquor on the Sabbath, I

would be regarded as being an undesirable type of person; I would lose any fine feelings I might possess; I would be recreant to my responsibilities, and so on.

It is a fact, of course, that others whom I encompass within the term of advocates of temperance, have a point of view and although, I suppose, they do not intend to be rude, they are organised; but we, as ordinary members of the public, who have a drink within the limits of the law when we feel so disposed to do, are disorganised. We do not write letters and sign petitions on the top of which is written some high-sounding name. On the contrary, we suffer in silence. The views and outlook of this noisy minority do not conform with the views of responsible people.

Mr. Craig: You do not mean to suggest that those people who have made representations are irresponsible?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, but I believe they go to tremendous excesses. They see evil in something which, in itself, is not evil. We are being pressed by them, but of course nobody seeks to deny their right of approach to members of Parliament. However, I do not think they have the right to suggest that any of us would be less worthy citizens if we had liquor trading hours more in conformity with those that apply in other parts of the world.

Mr. Court: I do not think you do your case much good in being so vitriolic in respect of these people, because whether one agrees with them or not, they have rights.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am endeavouring to speak not only as a member of Parliament but also as a citizen in the community who has a close association with numerous clubs. I also have many friends who are associated with the hotel industry, if I may use that term. However, I am more concerned with people in the community, and the great bulk of those with whom I have association, and there are some thousands of them. They are people who more or less enjoy their regular after-work or evening drinks. They are people who attend their clubs and various functions, very often in company with their wives and, of course, also in exclusively male company. On these occasions such people enjoy themselves over a drink or two, or more, but to my knowledge scarcely any of them have come to any harm.

It therefore rankles with me that those people and myself are regarded as likely to descend to the depths because of our drinking habits, despite the fact that, in accordance with what I must regard as being world-wide experience, it is shown that there is nothing wrong in acting the way we do. I do not like the attitude of those who criticise people who have a drink, and I do not think they have the right to interfere with me. We have no

right to instruct them to do anything in regard to the provisions of the law and, in fact, we do not instruct them to do anything. They merely go about their normal way of life.

Mr. Court: If we followed your argument to its conclusion we would not have any restrictions at all and would allow people to sort it out for themselves.

Mr. Brady: That would be in keeping with a permissive society, so it would be all right. Anything goes with the new order!

Mr. GRAHAM: Again thinking of the experiences I had overseas I can recall being in the Italian Alps. It was very cold and there was snow on the mountains. I can recall, about 6 a.m. or 7 a.m., entering a small tearoom establishment and having a Scotch whisky. Nobody took any notice of that. There was nothing untoward about it. At that time there was no congregation of people, nor was there at any other hour of the day. Such an incident makes me wonder again whether, in placing these restrictions on the people of this State, we are not, in fact, creating the very problem about which some people complain.

Mr. Gayfer: There are places in Western Australia where one can obtain a drink at 7 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose it is possible to do many things contrary to the law.

Mr. Gayfer: This is done within the law.

Mr. GRAHAM: That could be so. Why then should we be so cagey and tend to to clamp down on people with our licensing laws and become more rigid in our outlook?

There is one other comment I would like to make. I do so because emphasis has been given to an aspect of drinking; an emphasis which is not warranted. In this regard I want to make myself perfectly clear. Nobody will deny that over-indulgence in liquor will impair one's judgment. That applies in many spheres, including those occasions when a person is at the wheel and in control of a motor vehicle.

Mr. Bertram: You are preaching temperance, are you not?

Mr. Brady: He is coming onto our side.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the members who have interjected feel that they gain some comfort from what I am saying they are entitled to it. I maintain that round about 5 p.m. tens of thousands of people travel to their clubs, hotels, and other places to have alcoholic refreshment. Others have their drinks a little later in the evening. So I suppose it would be true to say that about 10 p.m., particularly on a Friday or a Saturday, 60 or 70 per cent., or even more, of those who are driving motor vehicles would have consumed alcohol in varying quantities.

Let us assume that 50 per cent. of the drivers have consumed alcohol. Is it not logical to assume therefore, that if on any evening there are 20 accidents, approximately 50 per cent. of them would involve persons who had consumed a certain quantity of alcohol? I am not speaking of the drunken driver or the person who has become almost insensible with drink. I am speaking of the great majority of decent, responsible citizens. If one of those persons happened to be the victim of an accident after consuming a certain quantity of liquor, some people, for their own purposes, would say, "There you are; another instance of a person, under the influence of alcohol being responsible for the accident," which would be absolutely nonsensical. It would be equally nonsensical for me to say that the other 50 per cent. of the accidents that had occurred were due to the fact that the drivers of those vehicles did not have any alcohol in their systems. One contention is as ridiculous as the other.

I now wish to point out something which I have pointed out on previous occasions. That is, I have never been able to understand why the statistics retained by the Traffic Branch of the Police Department are not in a form which is readily accessible.

I was rather surprised when the member for Mt. Hawthorn asked a question this afternoon relating to the number or percentage of accidents attributable to alcohol that the Minister should have indicated this information was not readily available and that it might take weeks in which to produce the figures. Having regard to the fact that he has introduced quite a number of measures into this House dealing with breathalyser tests and the rest, one would have thought he would have almost a daily tally to indicate precisely what was going on.

I repeat that for some unaccountable reason the statistics are now kept in a different form and all I can do is to quote from the figures supplied by the Bureau of Census and Statistics and contained in a publication called *Symposium on Traffic Hazards and the Community*. This publication is the result of a symposium held at the University of Western Australia in October, 1967. In this publication there are some figures supplied by the lecturer when dealing with the year ended the 31st December, 1966, which show that during that year in the State of Western Australia there were no fewer than 18,202 accidents.

It is quite interesting to see the various causes of these accidents. Some are attributed to drivers or riders of vehicles, under about 20 different headings; some are attributed to pedestrians, while others are attributed to vehicle defects, animals, road conditions, weather conditions, parties not involved, and to other agencies.

Of the 18,202 accidents, the number attributed to drivers or riders of vehicles who were intoxicated is given as 164. This is less than 1 per cent. of the total figure.

These figures have not been cooked up by me; these are figures supplied by the Police Traffic Branch to the Government Statistician. It could, of course, be said that half, or thereabouts, of the 18,202 accidents involved people who had consumed a certain amount of liquor.

Without divulging too much of my personal life I think I can say that practically every night of the year when I go home there is a certain amount of alcohol in my system. I consider that on these occasions I am quite capable of handling my car successfully and that my judgment and driving ability have not been impaired. A number of other considerations are mentioned in this publication, but 164 accidents are shown as having been attributable to intoxication.

Mr. Gayfer: Were all these fatalities examined by medical officers?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know. I think I have used this illustration before. Let us say that on a wet, wintry day, the bridge on the other side of Brookton was washed away and a person who had not consumed alcohol at the wheel plunged into the river and was drowned. This would be considered an unfortunate accident due to the circumstances outlined in the report and statistics. But if it were found upon analysis that that person had a certain percentage of alcohol in his system then, in the order of things today, his death would be considered a black mark against drinking and the associated trade and his accident would be attributed to an excess of alcohol.

When the campaign to which I have referred was not on, the police, who are not beholden to one side or the other, ascribed 164 accidents out of the 18,202 as being due to the consumption of alcohol.

Mr. Gayfer: Because they were amongst the only ones checked. Your member on the National Safety Council would have a different view on this.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the driver were hopelessly blithered—if I might use that expression—it would be obvious to the traffic inspector or the policeman, and it would be equally obvious as to what was responsible for the accident taking place.

After all is said and done these people are not fools; they are responsible policemen who are accustomed to preparing statistics without fear or favour. If there were some substance in what the honourable member has suggested, and even if we doubled the figure, or multiplied it by 10, it would still become only 10 per cent.; whereas 90 per cent of the accidents are caused by people with whom alcohol has played no part.

I repeat that I am not pretending for one moment that when a person has over-indulged in alcohol he is a better driver. I do know, however, that there are some people who when they have never had a supply of any liquor are the most remarkable careerists that I have seen behind the wheel of a car—and I now include those who play a prominent part in association with bodies such as the National Safety Council; they include some members of Parliament and other worth-while citizens. To be near them—either as a passenger or in another vehicle—while they are driving, is to take one's life in one's hands, if I might use that term.

Mr. Gayfer: Some ex-Ministers, too.

Mr. GRAHAM: That might be true. Whereas previously provision was made for a referendum to be taken and the talk was prohibition, the process proved so unavailing that now advantage is being taken of something which causes us all concern—I refer, of course, to the many smashes that take place on the roads. Because of this fact quite a number of people are jumping on the bandwagon and trying to use this somewhat natural disquiet in the community for the purpose of either containing the existing licensing laws or restricting them still further. They do not consider the possibility of any advance being made.

I have addressed the House longer than I intended. As I stated at the outset while we, on both sides of the House, no doubt hold different viewpoints in regard to the general principles, my view is that the main debate will take place in the Committee stage when amendments—one or two of which are rather drastic, and many others are minor—dealing with various aspects of the liquor law of this State will be considered.

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [6.8 p.m.]: Following the speech by the most able member who has just resumed his seat I feel somewhat diffident about making my contribution. He is a very forceful speaker, and he spoke in terms which make me think that he is in favour of this exercise completely. I trust he will not be disappointed with some of the things which might happen to this Bill on its way through the Committee stage.

At the outset of my remarks I must concur with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in congratulating the committee which was appointed to inquire into the operation of the liquor laws of this State. Regardless of whether or not one agrees with the findings of this committee one must admit that it has carried out an excellent exercise, and it has endeavoured to put forward its views, arrived at as the result of the evidence placed before it, in a concise manner. Indeed, the whole report is very concise.

I honestly believe that if other people, with different make-ups and different temperaments, had been appointed as members of this committee of inquiry they might possibly have arrived at different conclusions; just as we in accepting the report as a guide might use our own judgment in not agreeing fully with the recommendations which have been made by the committee.

Arising from the recommendations of this committee the Minister for Justice prepared the Bill which is now before us. I agree fully with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that our speeches will be confined mainly to the Committee stage of the Bill. I have placed a few amendments on the notice paper, and so have other members. I intend to concur with some of the amendments, but others I do not intend to support. Nevertheless, this is a Bill on which every member whether or not he is fully in accord with it, is entitled to express his own views.

There is one observation I would like to make, and this is perhaps a little beyond the confines of the Bill, but nevertheless it has a bearing. Over the years I have heard many reasons why the alcoholic content of beer cannot be reduced. We all know that the alcoholic content of spirituous liquor varies between the States, and, indeed between countries throughout the world. My firm belief is that the alcoholic content of all types of liquor should be reduced.

If social drinking is to be encouraged—as is the purport of the recent liquor inquiry and the Bill—under convivial and family surrounds, and the consumption of liquor is to be enjoyed as a social custom—as is intended by the action we now hope to take—then by reducing the alcoholic content of liquor a more healthy atmosphere will be developed. Whenever this matter has arisen in various countries, a mercenary consideration has had its effect on the legislation of those countries. I feel sure that those responsible for the legislation had the excise duty more in mind than the welfare of the people.

I admit that the reduction in the alcoholic content of beverages would not restrict the amount that would be consumed by an individual. I suppose the end result is that the quantity of liquor consumed reflects the alcoholic content of one's bloodstream. However, some notice should be taken of the proposal to reduce the alcoholic content of liquor, and an inquiry should be undertaken.

Like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition I have travelled to many parts of the world, and it was very noticeable that the alcoholic content of liquor varied between the countries. If what we are striving for is to encourage social drinking, then let the people drink socially without getting intoxicated.

This is a lengthy Bill, which I feel sure will be dealt with clause by clause at the Committee stage. If I remember rightly it contains 177 clauses. For that reason I think many speeches will be made at the Committee stage. One should not go into the ramifications of the measure during the second reading debate—as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did—in trying to justify the introduction of certain of the provisions. We can do that in Committee, clause by clause. I therefore intend to reserve the other remarks which I wish to make until the Bill is dealt with in Committee, and to that end I support the second reading.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [7.30 p.m.]: I wish to make a few comments on this Bill. It may be quite surprising to some members in this House to know that, in the main, I feel the committee has done an excellent job in reporting on the matters which were referred to it.

Whilst those matters covered a fairly comprehensive field, they did not cover all aspects of the liquor situation. As was stated earlier, the proposed legislation which is before us is to be referred to not as licensing legislation but as the Liquor Bill and, ultimately, the Liquor Act. So it would seem that by design, rather than by accident, the State is being asked to set up the rod of liquor in our community.

I feel I should criticise, first of all, some of the matters which were not referred to by the committee and, in some cases, other matters which the committee felt were within its jurisdiction. I want to point out to all members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that whilst there has been a certain amount of levity in connection with this measure, I feel that members of Parliament have a very grave responsibility and they would not be doing the right thing by the community if they treated the subject with levity and did not take seriously the contents of the Bill at present before us, and also the many amendments, notice of which has been given.

In my opinion the committee has done an excellent job in a minimum time. Full marks are due to the members of the committee, and all others concerned, for their effort in making the Bill available to us in such a short time, and for the thorough presentation of the facts.

This brings me to another aspect. It would seem that the liquor trade in Western Australia is the most highly organised and perfected organisation in our community. The Licensing Act was introduced in 1911 and since that time, almost like clockwork, amendments have been brought to this House. Sometimes there have been two or three amendments in the one year. This organisation could be an indication to other business people—and to trade unions, I

might say—that if they took the same interest in their business affairs as the liquor trade has done, we would have a very active community and a very active Parliament.

The matters dealt with by the committee are set out in the Bill, and were comprehensively explained in the memorandum which the Minister gave to members and recommended as very good light reading. I have read through the memorandum on two occasions, and also I took advantage of the opportunity to peruse the four volumes, comprising approximately 2,000 pages, of the evidence taken by the committee, which is in the Parliamentary Library. However, I was not able to read all the details regarding this matter. So even at this time, while I had a desire to follow the matter through in detail, I can do so in general terms only.

The Bill before us will repeal 42 sections of the Licensing Act, and several other supplementary Acts. Virtually, we will have a new Act so if there is anything wrong with the licensing laws of Western Australia in the future it will be on the heads of the present members of both Houses of Parliament. The committee of inquiry has done its job as thoroughly as was possible in the limited time available, and this Parliament has now to review the recommendations.

I feel that the subject has not been dealt with comprehensively enough to gauge the effects of alcohol on the community as a whole. As the present Bill is dealing with liquor, generally, and not only licensing, I feel it should have gone a lot further. The committee could have comprised a greater number of members, and it could also have been representative of the temperance section of the community. After all, those in the temperance section of the community are taxpayers, and despite what some people might say or think, they are a very responsible section of the community.

I think the temperance section of the community was entitled to be represented on the committee of inquiry, and I also think that the restaurateurs and the caterers should have had representation so that we could have obtained a balanced view, and not an opinion from one side.

As far as I can see the committee did not deal with the alcoholic content of beer, wine, and spirits. This is a burning question in the community, not only with those who drink but also with those who do not drink. It is felt that the alcoholic content of liquor is too high, particularly in the case of beer. It has been advocated that if we had lighter lagers and less alcohol in our beer then drinking would be more acceptable in our society as a whole.

I go along with those thoughts because I am told that in Europe the alcoholic content of the beers is much less. Why

cannot we give some consideration to this suggestion. As a matter of fact I think a representative of the licensed clubs suggested it would be better if we had a standard alcoholic content for liquor in Australia. This matter was referred to by a representative of licensed clubs.

As I have said, the temperance section of the community has not had the right to question various witnesses or to influence the committee, as a committee, on the decisions that have resulted from the representations made.

I shall mention a few of the matters that could have been considered by the committee but which were not. First of all it could have inquired into the effects of drinking liquor without eating. For years the position has been that food is not necessarily available in hotels and wine saloons. I have sat on the bench as a justice of the peace with other J.P.'s who were drinking men. They deplored the fact that people were before them who would be charged and fined because they were drinking in hotels and were not able to obtain food to go with the drinks. I have heard other people say that if their husbands or sons had been able to buy food at the time they were drinking they would not have reached the irresponsible state brought about by excessive drinking.

Personally I consider the committee could have given some consideration to the handling of liquor at social gatherings. Nearly every Christmas we read complaints in the paper from mothers and fathers of young men and women who attend Christmas parties and are loaded up with drink. The families are not drinkers and, consequently, they deplore the situation in which their youngsters become involved. These are factors which should have been considered by the committee.

Mr. Lapham: It is hard to get a soft drink and easy to get a hard one.

Mr. BRADY: The member for Karrinyup has said that it is easier to get a hard drink than a soft one. Members in this House must have observed what happens at nearly every social function: tray after tray of hard drinks come around and if one asks for a soft drink one is thought to be a square or a queer. This sort of attitude is encouraged on licensed premises and even in places like Parliament House. I have stood in Parliament Houses in other States and asked for a soft drink, but I have had to ask half a dozen times before I received one. A person feels that he is out on a limb, although he is asking for something to which he is entitled.

The effects of alcohol on untrained drinkers—particularly, Aborigines, who have recently been given the right to drink—should have been examined by the committee.

Mr. Bateman: How does one become trained?

Mr. BRADY: The honourable member has asked how one becomes trained. How do white people become trained? Some are trained by experience; others are trained in their homes; and still others are trained by organisations to which they belong in that they are told to try to do things in moderation and to have something to eat with the drink.

In recent times I have noticed that acquaintances of mine who are men in high positions and who like a drink, start off the evening on soft drinks and work to the harder drinks later on in the evening in the hope that they will not be over the .08 content when it is time to drive their cars home.

Now is a time in the history of our State when the Minister for Police has introduced the use of breathalysers and tests are conducted all over the State in connection with drinking. Because of this, one would think that the Minister who appointed the committee would have asked it to give special consideration to this aspect of the consumption of liquor. I repeat that the committee should have considered the untrained and ill-informed drinkers, particularly Aborigines.

I believe there should be a greater emphasis on education in connection with drink and its effects on the individual and the community. Greater emphasis should be given to its effect on health, on the driving capabilities of people, on the police and the economy of the Police Department, on hospitals and hospital administration, and on gaols and the economies of gaols.

Let me say, in passing that a new institution for women alcoholics in the nature of a semi-gaol has just been opened in my electorate. There is already one in existence at Karnet. This is another matter which the committee should have been asked to investigate thoroughly and to make recommendations on it to the Parliament.

Mr. Craig: Where is the gaol for women alcoholics in your area?

Mr. BRADY: I believe there is one just across the road from the Swan Electorate, if the Minister wants to split hairs. The Minister knows where it is, because he went to the opening.

Mr. Craig: That is not an institution for alcoholics.

Mr. BRADY: Is the Minister saying that there are no women alcoholics there?

Mr. Craig: Yes, but it is not specifically for women alcoholics; it is a women's prison.

Mr. BRADY: I ask the Minister not to split hairs. We know what is going on and the type of prisoner in the institution.

Mr. Bovell: All women prisoners are not alcoholics.

Mr. BRADY: Not all of the inmates of Karnet are alcoholics.

Mr. Craig: But there are two sections at Karnet.

Mr. BRADY: Exactly.

Mr. Craig: There are not two sections at Caversham.

Mr. BRADY: There may well be two sections if the position continues the way it is going. To my mind there is a necessity for a committee of this nature to bring in recommendations which would encourage young people to abstain from drinking in the interests of discipline, in the interests of their families, and in the interests of the economics of the State.

Those are just a few of the matters that have been overlooked by the committee and might well have been considered in the presentation of a balanced report and a balanced view on what action should be taken in regard to legislation on liquor.

To refer specifically to the Bill before the House, I have already presented petitions to the Chamber on behalf of a number of churches. The Seventh Day Adventist Church brought the first petition to me and then several other petitions were brought forward by other denominations. Approximately 600 or 700 signatures appear on the petitions and the main burden of the petitions is that the signatories do not want to see Sunday trading or the drinking age reduced from 21 to 18 years. As far as I am concerned, I go all the way with both the petitions which have been made to the members of the Chamber.

I do not think that all adherents of churches are 100 per cent. in agreement on this, but I want to say that not only do the majority of church adherents feel this way—they have expressed their views in the petitions which are on the Table of the House—but the Barmaids and Barmen's Union, which will be vitally affected by the measure, does not want to see Sunday trading. Members of this union feel that their calling is such that they should have at least one day's rest to be with their families and to take care of domestic chores. Doubtless, married barmaids with children wish to have the time on Sundays to do some justice to their families.

There are many hotel managers—not owners, but managers—in the country districts today who resent the fact that they have to work on Sunday mornings and Sunday afternoons when everybody else is free to enjoy recreation. They deplore the existing provision which applies to country areas.

In concluding my remarks on Sunday trading, let me say that I venture to suggest that many thousands of families would not want to see the husband and father of the family stuck in clubs or hotels on a Sunday morning for the sole purpose of drinking when he could be at home with the family. These people advocate that there should be a referendum. Nothing could be more

democratic than a referendum, and if one were held, members of the public could all vote and the majority decision would decide the issue.

As well as advocating a referendum to find out whether Sunday trading was required, a referendum was requested in regard to under-age drinking.

It is a strange thing—and almost unbelievable—that in 1911, as mentioned by a previous speaker tonight, the drinking age was 16. It was then increased to 18. Subsequently, in 1922, just after the first World War, it was increased to 21. This is significant, in my opinion, inasmuch as people, particularly those who had gone overseas to do their bit, began to realise the effect of alcohol on the young people in the community, and they wanted some reform. Apparently this was agreed to by the Parliament.

I do not think it is good enough for any member of this House or anyone else to say that because men can now make wills at 18, or serve in the Army, and because England has done it, we should do it.

I was talking to a churchman at a function as late as last night. He was not of the same faith as I am but I have a lot of respect for him. He said, "They are getting the drink now; they get it at 17 and 18." Too often that is happening with our laws. People break the law for a number of years and the argument is that because they are breaking it we should go along with that and let them get away with it. I do not approach laws or drinking on that basis. It has been done in regard to other matters but I do not want to intrude other matters into this discussion.

There are many pitfalls in giving drink to young men of 17 and 18 years of age. I can go into some detail on this because when I was Minister for Police I sometimes got telephone calls from people informing me that drinking was taking place and asking me the reason for it. I will not go into details, but these are a few of the things we can bring on our heads. Young people can go out driving in cars and cause themselves a great deal of trouble because, even without drink, there is a tendency for young people to be irresponsible, and the driving of cars would be no exception. If they have drink, where do they go in regard to this matter?

There are other responsibilities they are expected to measure up to, and there is a tendency today to bring about a permissive society—it is coming in many respects. I do not mind the permissive society myself if it only means wearing stovepipe trousers, or sideburns, or flashy clothes, or going down to the beach in bikinis; but when it comes to the more serious matters of life I think we as a Parliament have a responsibility to protect the young people against the pitfalls brought about by sex crimes, rape, and things of that description.

One member who spoke tonight said he knew that a lot of his friends drank on Fridays and Saturdays, and I know a lot of my friends do too. They go into the hotels and clubs with their mates. It is more or less a custom in our Australian way of life. When I was a young man of 21 I used to go with my friends and have soft drinks, and they would grog on when I went home.

It was only a couple of years ago that I referred in this House to the nightmare experienced by the staff of Royal Perth Hospital on Saturdays as a result of accidents caused through drinking. When I asked a series of questions, as did another member here tonight, as to what statistics were available in regard to these matters, I was amazed to find out that there were very few statistics recorded at the time.

The point is that we who take the temperance line are not advocating that people should not drink or that they should not drink when they are driving. We think people should drink with a certain amount of discipline and responsibility, but they are things that seem to be going out the front door. We do not want people to be drinking and causing innocent people to be slain as a result of their drinking.

Mention was made earlier of the way one could drink in six or seven hotels in New South Wales, but we were not told in the same breath that a referendum on Sunday trading was taken in New South Wales last December, only four or five months ago, and Sunday trading was turned down overwhelmingly. When we are told one side of the story we should be told the other side of the story.

A member interjected.

Mr. BRADY: I do not mind if the honourable member who has just interjected makes a speech but at the moment I am making this speech and there are certain things I want to deal with before I sit down.

As I said, I went through the volumes of transcript that are in the House, and I must say that most things pertaining to the running of hotels, licensed premises, winehouses, wine saloons, gallon licenses, and clubs, were canvassed very thoroughly by the committee and the legal representatives at the hearing.

Accommodation seems to be one of the items that were played down. It seems that the view today is that hoteliers should not be obliged to provide a lot of accommodation, that the accommodation available in some cases is not used, and that difficulties can be caused if that situation continues. I want to ask the question: Why is that so? The answer I give myself is: It is because many hotel licensees have discouraged the taking up of accommodation on their premises; it is too much trouble; it is not a payable proposition.

I know of one hotel that was obliged to have a front light at night; the publican installed a one candle-power light and one had to be standing under it to know it was a light. That same hotel for about 10 or 15 years had one boarder but it had accommodation for 20 or 30 boarders. That seems to be the way the licensing people have fronted up to the responsibility for accommodation over the years.

The question is: Is this accommodation wanted? I say: Yes, it is, at a reasonable tariff. I came over from Sydney on the *Orcades* in December, 1969, and I met three families who were concerned about finding accommodation when they got to Perth. They asked me where I could recommend them to go for accommodation. They were coming over here to work. This accommodation is wanted not only in the city but also in the country.

As a Minister of the Crown I had the experience of travelling for 16 hours, calling into a hotel at 11 o'clock at night, and being told, "There is a minimum of accommodation but you can get a maximum of drink." The hotel was not encouraging or wanting to give accommodation but wanted one to drink. One could not even get a cup of tea. This is the approach of some country hotel people today. I have called into as many as two and three hotels at seven o'clock at night and could not get a meal. One asks oneself: Is the Licensing Court, the Police Department, or the Minister aware of these things, and why has the committee not been asked to report on this aspect?

What could be more devastating than to be in the country with one's wife and children when one's car breaks down and find that there is no hotel accommodation available. I think there could be nothing more demoralising. I had such an experience when travelling with four or five men; we called into a hotel and were not able to get proper accommodation.

As I see it, the hotels as such have a privileged position in the community. In the past the licensees were given an exclusive license to provide liquor and the only condition was that they had to provide suitable accommodation as well. However, by and large we have lost sight of that, and I do not think it does any harm to remind members that it was once the position and that it should continue. I noticed during my review of the transcript of the evidence placed before the committee that the chairman contacted the Licensing Court and expected to receive the views of that body concerning the proposals before the committee.

I was pleased to notice that Dr. Mossenson of the Education Department gave comprehensive evidence and pointed out that at present a three-year course is taken by students in schools. The students take three topics a year—nine in all over

the three years—which deal with health; the effect of alcohol on the body, especially the brain; how to treat food; the digestion of food; and the effects on the system of having too great an intake of alcohol. I am very pleased to see that the Minister for Education is encouraging this sort of thing in his department and I thought it only fair to the department, the committee, and all concerned to mention that students now receive a certain amount of tuition in regard to this subject.

One witness mentioned local options and deplored the fact that they were not now operating. He felt that the State should be divided into districts, as was the case many years ago, and the electors in the various districts should have the right of local option. As a member of the Labor Party I know that for many years the right of local option was a part of the Labor platform, although it is not at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you a story about local options. In 1948, as a member of Parliament, I travelled to New Zealand and on the way I met a Maori who was a shearer. He was returning to his home town and was very pleased to be going back. However, a week later I met him at a railway station in Auckland. I said, "Hello, what are you doing here; I thought you were going home." He replied, "To tell you the truth I did go home and when I got there I found there was a local option. It was a dry State, and so I left it." That was his experience of local option; but nevertheless I feel that if the State were divided into districts, as advocated by the witness I mentioned, the individual districts could vote for local option as they felt disposed from time to time.

In regard to the proposal for Sunday trading I believe that it will upset not only the general church-going community and the Barmalds and Barmen's Union, but also family life. I think it will also upset the 100-odd clubs which are now finding it hard to carry on their activities as recreational and social clubs. Those clubs have to compete with several hundred hotels in the metropolitan area and some may run into such financial difficulties that they will have to close down.

I think in many instances clubs are more suited to our community life on Sundays than are hotels. Clubs are a more co-operative type of concern and are generally run by members of the community. I do not think anything which will lessen the possibility of clubs carrying on normally, as they are today, should be encouraged either under this Bill or under any Act of Parliament.

In connection with the proposal to introduce a new form of license—namely, taverns—under which liquor may be provided with light meals but the provision

of accommodation is unnecessary, I feel some sympathy for the hotel owners, proprietors, managers, and licensees. I think in many cases this provision will sound the death knell of many licensed hotels if a great number of those licenses are issued. A tavern will be able to sell liquor—beer, wines, and spirits—whilst providing a light meal, but it will not be necessary to provide accommodation. On the other hand, a hotelkeeper has to provide accommodation, full meals, and proper bars. So I do not think tavern licenses should be encouraged.

It would seem it is the view of the committee that wine saloons are on the way out. I think most people would agree that that proposition was coming fast. A new form of license, to be known as a wine-house license, will be introduced. The winehouses will provide all types of wines and—I want members to remember this—will be required to provide meals as defined in the interpretation clause of this Bill. That means the proprietors must provide the necessary dining and cooking facilities.

However, here is the irony of the situation, Mr. Speaker: Whilst wine saloons have been carrying on their activities for 60 or 100 years in Western Australia, they will not, under this Bill, be allowed to sell a bottle of wine for consumption off the premises. To me that is an injustice; it is not equity; and it is not fair. I would say that anything between 50 per cent. and 60 per cent. of the normal activities of the wine saloon concerns bottle trading over the counter and I do not think it is fair and equitable to take away that right. As far as I am concerned, I would like to see the Bill amended so that proprietors of wine saloons will not lose the right to sell a bottle of wine over the counter.

Mr. Craig: There is an amendment on the notice paper.

Mr. BRADY: I am glad to hear the Minister say that. There is a further aspect in relation to these winehouses and that is the fact that they will be obliged to provide meals. Under the Bill a meal means a comprehensive meal and I feel the position would be met adequately if a light meal could be supplied and the term defined in the legislation.

From time to time I have observed many people going into wine saloons, particularly during the lunch hour. Such people want to have a quick drink and a quick meal. They do not want to sit down and eat a three-course or a two-course meal; they want a meal along the lines of a buffet, a few sandwiches, or some cheese. I think this should be encouraged because, as I said before, if people eat while they drink there may be fewer difficulties in our community.

I think I have dealt with the contents of the Bill in the main. I do not wish to deal with the more positive recommendations of the committee on gallon licenses, store licenses, and caterers' licenses.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. BRADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, I believe some consideration should be given to ensuring that taverns are not granted licenses lightly and that the hotel interests which are in the same area as a tavern are carefully considered. I think the right to sell wines over the counter should be restored to wine houses.

I also think that light meals should be included in the interpretations because I think this would overcome some difficulty. Finally, a referendum should be held on the question of Sunday trading and a reduction of the drinking age from 21 to 18. The annual report submitted by the Commissioner of Police, was tabled in this House on the 17th March. In appendix 4(b) is recorded a statement of motor drivers' licenses suspended by the court or subject to cancellation in accordance with section 25B of the Traffic Act. In that statement it is shown that under the heading of, "Driving under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs," 1,375 offences were committed, and under the heading of, "Driving with .08 per cent. or more Alcohol in the Blood," 265 offences were committed.

Many statistics are set out in that report, but time will not permit me to enumerate them. As a temperance man I do not want anyone to lose his right to drink on a Saturday or a Sunday. As far as I am concerned he can take liquor home in bottles, in cans, or in a keg, but I do not think he should reserve to himself the right to ask other people to work on Sundays so that he may enjoy that special privilege. Other commodities, such as milk and bread are provided by some establishments on Saturdays and Sundays, and petrol, on Saturday afternoons and Sunday afternoons, can also be obtained at roster stations, but I do not think we should have to provide for the sale of liquor on a Sunday.

The wants of a drinking man are reasonably provided for under our licensing laws at present and the provisions contained in this Bill will be even more in his favour. Therefore I support the recommendation of the committee for the acceptance of the Bill and, to the best of my ability, I will also support the amendments, proposed by various members, which appear on the notice paper.

MR. BURT (Murchison-Eyre) [8.13 p.m.]: I support the Bill almost in its entirety, and I commend the Government for appointing a committee to investigate the whole question of the consumption of liquor in this State. I believe that liquor reform has been badly needed in this State and that the overhaul of the Licensing Act was long overdue.

Without referring to any specific clauses in the Bill I would like to make a general review of liquor consumption in Western Australia. I believe that as we are allowed to give our private views—something which members do not always enjoy—

Mr. Jamieson: On that side, of course.

Mr. BURT: I could not even think of a suitable rejoinder for that one.

Mr. Jamieson: There is not one.

Mr. BURT: It is nice to see members of the Opposition not teaming up for once. In my opinion, drinking is just as much a part of everyday life as anything else is. It should be consumed according to the desire of every member of the community in exactly the same way as he chooses the clothes he wears, the food he eats, the football team he supports, or the political party he joins. It is something which is purely his own choice; something on which he can make any decision he thinks fit. Yet, as has been pointed out this evening, we, as members of a modern community with high standards of living, are restricted, far and wide, when we wish to take a drink of intoxicating liquor.

Sometimes I think we should throw all this legislation out the window. The wishes of those who desire to consume alcohol would be adequately catered for under the provisions of the Health Act, the Factories and Shops Act, and a few other Statutes, but, as yet, that cannot be. Nevertheless, we could follow the example of some other countries overseas which have no laws whatsoever governing the consumption or the sale of spirituous liquor. On the other hand, there are other countries, besides ours, which have laws just as stupid as our own.

Whilst overseas I visited several States of the United States of America, which is regarded as being the country with the highest living standards in the world. Some of the liquor laws in the States there were completely puerile. On one occasion I entered the bar of a hotel in which I was staying in Tennessee. On the shelves was every conceivable bottle of liquor one could imagine. I ordered a whisky and I was told that only beer could be sold. When I drew attention to all the various bottles of liquor which stood on the shelves I was informed that the reason they were there was that those who patronised the hotel had bought the bottles of liquor at drug stores in the vicinity, placed their own names on the bottles, and these were handed to them

whenever they wanted a drink. I merely instance this experience to point out the extreme lengths to which some people will go to govern their consumption of liquor.

In Canada I saw establishments where a meal could be bought for a few cents, because under the law it was necessary to have a meal together with the liquor that one was consuming. That is the sort of thing that goes on mostly in the new world, in countries such as the United States, Canada, and Australia. I am pleased to say that in the old world—in European countries, and even in Nigeria, which I visited as a representative of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association a few years ago—liquor is regarded purely as something which can be bought without any restriction whatsoever.

Although we often hear the story that black people cannot hold their liquor, I did not see any instances of drunkenness in Nigeria, despite the fact that anyone could buy any type of liquor at any establishment.

I believe the two most important parts of the legislation that is before us today are those dealing with the permission or otherwise to drink on Sundays in the metropolitan area, and under age drinking. Having spent most of my life on the goldfields, I can readily state that Sunday drinking in those parts has always been an accepted fact.

Even before Sunday trading was legalised in the 1940s, I think everyone realised that liquor was consumed behind closed doors of the hotels in most country towns on Sundays, and the patrons depended on the whim of the local constable as to whether they could stay there for long. It was a ridiculous situation, and the loosening up of these provisions in the Act, on the goldfields particularly, simply followed the wishes of the people.

Referring to the metropolitan area, my only experience of Sunday drinking, now that I live in the city, is what I see happening in the outer suburbs such as Naval Base, Rockingham, and at the various hotels in the hills which are outside the limits imposed. If anyone can regard the pig swill that goes on in those hotels during the midday and late afternoon drinking sessions, together with the attendant danger to all and sundry when the heavy traffic of motor vehicles moves away from the hotels at 6 p.m. as being a satisfactory situation, he cannot have a true conception of sane and sensible living.

I sincerely trust the House will give consideration to the provisions concerning Sunday drinking. After all is said and done, they are purely voluntary as affecting those who sell liquor, and they will, I think, cause a great lessening in the amount of liquor consumed on the Sabbath.

Some reference was made to referendums. To my mind referendums are not a true indication of the thinking of the people who vote at them. I refer to the New South Wales referendum, which the member for Swan mentioned a moment ago. The proposal was roundly defeated, particularly as it related to the Sunday drinking clauses.

It is well known that it was not only the people who objected to Sunday drinking, as such, who were responsible for its defeat. The clubs that were in danger of losing a tremendous amount of revenue were a very active force against it. Many unions also voted against it.

In my opinion the only referendum which is of any use at all is the general election which takes place every three years and if members of Parliament are elected with that responsibility, they themselves must make the decisions on these matters. Referendums are not only untrue in their results but they are also a great waste of time.

Underage drinking, of course, is something that concerns all parents. In my case I can remember an occasion when my two sons, who were employed in their late teens in Victoria, came home for their Christmas holidays. I suggested they come with me and have a drink but I suddenly realised I was enticing them to break the law. They would not have been breaking the law in their own State had they done this but, of course, when they came to Western Australia these boys, who were then as big as I am, would have been committing an illegal act had they entered a hotel to have a drink with me. I must admit that even though I knew they would be breaking the law I did not think much harm would be done by it.

We all know there are cases of young fellows who visit the drive-in bottle departments in their hundreds, get a swag of grog, and tear off to the beach to drink it. These boys are a danger not only to themselves, but to everybody else. Surely if we lower the drinking age of boys to 18 years, more sanity would prevail in regard to their habits!

The only thing I wish to add to my comments is that I have included on tomorrow's notice paper certain amendments which affect gallon licenses. This has been done as a result of representations made to me by gallon licensees.

The amendments I will move are only minor in nature, but I would like to mention that I consider the abolition of the gallon license—under which the sale of a gallon of liquor is made compulsory—is probably one of the best moves in the Bill.

I do not want to weary members with my personal experiences, but I can well remember going into a grocer's shop as a small child and buying my parents a

bottle of beer and wondering why the grocer put the sale down as a tin of jam. I can quite vividly remember that happening and I can recall asking my parents why it was so.

Mr. O'Connor: What did it cost you?

Mr. BURT: About one shilling.

Mr. O'Connor: The jam or the beer?

Mr. BURT: I will conclude by saying that I think it is most essential that more sophistication in drinking habits is brought into our every-day lives in this State. I am glad the Bill has been introduced and I believe that to be the opinion of most sober-minded and stable people.

MR. BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [8.26 p.m.]: I do not enter this debate with a faint heart. I do not feel in any way oppressed or pressurised by, nor in any way fearful of, the Temperance League or any of its members. I doubt whether there are too many members of this Chamber who have feelings other than those I have expressed in this regard.

I should imagine that the funds which the league has to fight what it regards as the rights or wrongs of the liquor question are a mere bagatelle when compared with the funds available to those who support the other side of the question—and that would not be irrelevant.

It is always important to get to the beginning of a measure in order that we might find out how the measure happens to be before Parliament. This Bill is said to be one where each member has the right to say and vote as he thinks fit. This is right to a point. I believe, however, that the measure with which we are dealing is before the House because it is the Government's desire that it should be; that the contents of the Bill are precisely what the Government, by and large, wants in the Bill.

Mr. Bovell: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. BERTRAM: It is the Government which decided to do something; I was not consulted, nor did I have any say in it.

Mr. O'Connor: You could have had if you wanted to.

Mr. BERTRAM: I wanted to. If the Minister has any further questions to ask he can ask them in the proper sequence. There then came the point where the Government, decided it would have an inquiry. This was another decision by the Government, of which I had no knowledge and in connection with which I was certainly not consulted. The Government decided the committee would consist of three people, and once again I knew nothing about this; it just happened.

Mr. Craig: The Premier might invite you to the next Cabinet meeting.

Mr. BERTRAM: The Government decided upon the composition of the committee. I had no knowledge of this. It was the Government which decided the terms of reference.

Mr. Dunn: In short, it was carrying out the functions of government.

Mr. BERTRAM: That may be so, but the point I am making is that the Bill is before us because of the Government's desire; it is here in the form it is for the same reason. The committee appointed did not function as an expert committee, nor did it function in a judicial manner. It did not have the power to *subpoena* anybody, nor did it have the power to administer an oath. Both these facts were established by questions I asked in the House today.

Of the three people appointed to the committee I consider that only one can be said to be an expert—not necessarily in liquor, in the true sense, but certainly an expert in liquor laws.

I do not think the other two people were experts in matters relating to liquor. Whatever I may say I am certainly not attacking the members of the committee. I have far more to do than that. I think one can fairly say, however, that a committee of equal standing in the community and of equal talent could have been appointed; it could have done the job just as well but could have brought in directly opposite recommendations.

It is very important, of course, to pick the right committee. A former eminent legal man and a Prime Minister was very well aware of that when he expressed the view that it was very important even as to members of the High Court to recognise their inbuilt attitudes, and to know what those inbuilt attitudes were. If one knows another's inbuilt attitudes one gets a better idea of what the results will be. There is nothing wrong in people having inbuilt attitudes, and if one knows what those attitudes are then one operates accordingly.

What I do not understand is why this legislation was referred to a committee; that is to say, a committee outside of Parliament. As I have said, this is not an expert committee, and it has no more expertise than is to be found among the members within the four walls of this Parliament. But members of this Parliament have to account for their actions and for the recommendations they make in this type of thing. The committee, however, does not have to account to anybody.

Sir David Brand: But the members of Parliament who make a decision on the recommendations will have to account for their actions.

Mr. BERTRAM: Indeed they will, but I always prefer to set the foundations, rather than to have other people build them for me.

Sir David Brand: Your foundation is that we must have an impartial view.

Mr. BERTRAM: I think my views are reasonably impartial. Seeing that we have got onto this aspect, I should discharge my obligation by indicating where I stand. I have no objection to people drinking, if they wish to do so; but I might add that I take very strong exception when, as a result of their drinking, they hurt me, or an organisation or society of which I am a member. I do not think I am on my own in this regard.

On the other hand, I do not believe that the Australian way of life should be organised in such a way that we attend functions only when a keg is provided. Can we only discuss matters when we are able to consume liquor? Surely that is not the aim for which our community should strive. Some people may think that is the aim, but I differ. I think this is a completely defeatist attitude. We ought to aim our sights a little higher.

People who choose to be appointed to positions of leadership ought to give leadership in this field, as well as in other fields of endeavour and activity. I do not think one has to be a "square" to give leadership in this field. However, this is a matter of one's viewpoint.

I think this matter should have been dealt with by Parliament in the first instance, or by committees of this Parliament. It should not have been passed on to some other body to carry out the job for us. The committee was fairly well picked in this regard. This confirms my argument: I do not think that in the report of the committee, which extends over 59 pages, there is one dissentient voice. Someone can correct me if I am wrong. Surely that is quite an extraordinary feature. Nevertheless, what I have said is an accurate statement, and is worthy of comment in the context of what I have been saying.

Let us examine the all-important matters the committee had to look into; they are included in what are known as the terms of reference. Perhaps we should examine what the terms of reference do not include. If we did we could form our own opinions on whether the committee was given a fair go, and whether the people of Western Australia and the members of this Parliament were also given a fair go.

The committee had no power to deal with the adverse consequences of liquor so far as they affect traffic, road accidents, and similar matters. It was not given the power, but occasionally it exercised a bit of license. The committee felt it could not get out of dealing with the adverse consequences of liquor, so it made a few comments which I imagine were

really beyond its terms of reference. According to the members of the committee—and this was agreed to by the Minister—they had no power within the terms of reference to delve into the question of alcoholism. All they were charged with doing was to discuss the matter of liquor and to bring forward recommendations to deal with the sale of liquor. The committee had no right at all to consider anything associated with alcoholism or alcoholics of whom a reliable authority recently said there happened to be 300,000 in Australia—not just a few.

Mr. Jamieson: That sounds like a statement from the Temperance League.

Mr. BERTRAM: No, it is not. I guarantee that.

Mr. Jamieson: Who sweeps them all away before I go home at night?

Mr. BERTRAM: The question of health and anything connected with health was not dealt with by the committee, either. It was securely tied and bound; its mouth was not closed, but it was partly closed. It was able to say something, but it was fenced in and placed in a vacuum in the middle of society, yet it was shut away from society. The committee was only able to deal with this matter in a confined way, and it could do only one thing; and that was what it did in bringing forward its recommendations.

Mr. Court: Surely you would not ask the committee to study this part of the total subject which is essentially a very technical health matter!

Mr. BERTRAM: If we are to deal with the question of liquor we should do the job thoroughly and not mess about with it. Apparently we are doing the latter.

Mr. Rushton: The three members of the committee were wrong?

Mr. BERTRAM: The honourable member will have the opportunity to say whether they were wrong. He will be able to speak at length. There is also the impact of the consumption of liquor on the native population. I forget the precise words which the committee used, but it acknowledged that liquor harmed the native population to a great extent. However, the committee concluded that it could not do anything about the matter. That is a natural statement for the committee to make. The harmful effects of liquor on natives is something which is directly associated with this question, but the committee was told it could not touch this aspect.

Mr. O'Connor: You feel that natives should be prohibited from consuming liquor?

Mr. BERTRAM: I certainly do not.

Mr. O'Connor: That was the inference.

Mr. BERTRAM: Where did the inference come from? I follow on to discuss what is the Government's attitude on this question. One member valiantly attempted to shut out certain questions; and if the questions did not have to be answered the disclosure in respect of the Government's attitude on the Bill did not have to be made. A young legal practitioner was advised many years ago by a very senior member of the judiciary to always get discovery; in other words, always find out what the facts are before moving. You, Mr. Speaker, were not unmindful of that admonition when you ruled that the question should be answered.

Let us see what questions were asked and what answers were given. Today I asked the Minister for Police the following question:—

What is the estimated annual cost to the State—

- (a) to maintain persons convicted of crimes committed by them whilst influenced by liquor;
- (b) to investigate and prosecute criminal offences perpetrated by persons whilst influenced by liquor?

The answer of the Minister was—

- (a) and (b) Not known.

Mr. Dunn: That was a good honest answer.

Mr. BERTRAM: That is the only thing that can be said in favour of it. I also asked the following question of the Minister for Police today—

- (1) Have his departmental advisers been consulted as to the efficacy of the Liquor Bill insofar as it affects crime, traffic offences and safety?
- (2) If "No" why?
- (3) If "Yes" will he state each of the objections which his departmental advisers have to the Bill insofar as it affects crime, traffic offences and safety?

In answer the Minister replied as follows:—

- (1) No.
- (2) By reason of such aspects not being included in the terms of reference of the Committee of Inquiry.
- (3) Answered by (1).

There may be some who would consider those answers as being adequate, and that they discharge the responsibility of the Minister. I would think that the majority of people here would consider that the job was not being done at all. The expertise, surely, in respect of these matters, is to be found within governmental departments. Whatever the experts say about this Bill, and whatever they think, this House does not know tonight.

I asked the Minister for Labour the following question:—

What is the estimated annual loss of production by reason of—

- (a) absenteeism from employment,
 - (b) impairment of efficiency,
- in consequence of proprietors, management and staff being adversely affected in consequence of their excessive consumption of liquor?

The answer was that the information was not available. I sought information from the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government with regard to the likely effect of this Bill upon third party insurance premiums, which the public does not like paying. The Minister replied that there were no means by which this may be assessed. Once again, no help in any way.

I asked the Minister for Native Welfare a similar question and his answer was as follows:—

- (1) to (3) Heads of departments are usually consulted on matters concerning their departments.

These discussions are on a confidential basis.

Mr. Lewis: What is wrong with that?

Mr. BERTRAM: I think it is very poor. Government discussions might be on a confidential basis, but we want to know the impact of liquor upon those people in the care of the Department of Native Welfare.

Mr. Lewis: You must be very naive to think you would get a different reply from that.

Mr. BERTRAM: I think one is entitled to know the facts.

Mr. Lewis: To know what the heads of departments think about different matters?

Mr. BERTRAM: I do not think a member is entitled to go any further than that. I asked a similar question of the Minister for Child Welfare and his answer was as follows:—

No. This was not necessary as the general public were invited to give evidence to the committee. All the committee recommendations have been included in the Bill before Parliament. It is now up to members of Parliament to decide whether they agree with the recommendations or not.

And so it goes on. Other vital statistics are not available, and on we go. So what will happen, irrespective of what might be the outcome of this legislation, is that members of this House will not be proceeding with a full case before them. Let somebody deny that, and substantiate the denial.

Question 24 was directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice and I felt the answer was not wholly correct.

I asked the Minister if he would detail the provisions of the Liquor Bill which were not recommended by the committee. The Minister answered—

The provisions of the Bill that were not the subject of the Committee's recommendation are those in the present Licensing Act, which it is necessary to continue.

That is a denial of page 3 of the explanatory memorandum, which states that the repeal of the two Innkeepers Acts does not arise out of any recommendation of the Committee of Inquiry. The Innkeepers Acts, as members will remember, have been up and down in attempts to get them repealed. I do not know what change has occurred during the last year, but in the Bill before us the repeal of both Acts is included but is not recommended by the committee. The provision just finds its way into the Bill. So much by way of introductory comment.

The committee stated that the transcending principle within its recommendations embodied in the Bill is to give service. I am afraid I am unable to accept that point of view, because my opinion is that if one studies the Bill one will more reasonably and appropriately come to the conclusion that the essence of the Bill is to see that more liquor is sold. Those people who want to sell liquor are in business and they should take steps to increase their business. That is a perfect right. All I am saying is that as far as I am concerned I recognise that this is a result, largely, of the endeavour of those people.

I want to say, and have it placed on record, that I do not believe the Bill is here because of a desire to give service. Furthermore, I do not see how service will be given to the public by legislation which indirectly perhaps—if not directly—will squeeze the gallon license holder virtually out of existence. I should have thought that the gallon license ought to be promoted if anything. I do not hold myself up as an expert on the habits of people so far as drinking is concerned, but I have a bit more knowledge than the average person about the adverse consequences of drinking, having been in various courts and hospitals presenting cases and visiting patients who have been smashed up and mutilated. However, I may be excused for expressing an opinion because that is all the committee has done.

My belief is that people should be encouraged to drink in smaller groups and in their homes if they so wish. For that reason I should have thought that the gallon license would tend to encourage that type of activity rather than, perhaps, some of the other outlets for liquor. I therefore propose, as the Bill proceeds, to do what I can to see that the gallon license activities are not curtailed and squeezed out of existence. Furthermore, I always react

against an endeavour to take away a person's livelihood unless an extreme case can be presented to the contrary. In effect, that might well happen with the passage of this Bill; the livelihood might be taken from the holder of a gallon license.

It seems strange that when the question of liquor is discussed or debated people change positions. If I might describe it differently, perhaps I could say, it is a variety of musical chairs. That, at least, depicts the type of situation I am trying to describe. For example, it will be found that those people who will permit and promote monopolies will get very cross with the formation of another monopoly. They permit every other type of monopoly no matter how greedy, obnoxious, or adverse it might be. When it comes to liquor, that monopoly will not be permitted. People do not recognise the thread which is running through the Bill and who is benefiting from it. They change position.

Then there are those members who find themselves on this side of the House because they have a real affection for, and affinity towards, the little people of the community for whom they feel responsible. However, when it comes to a debate on liquor, their concern for the little fellow is abandoned and no longer do they worry about him. Is this not a fact? Is this not what happens? We hear people referring to no-hopers and alcoholics in our society and saying, "Let us brush them aside and do not let us be concerned with them." On so many other questions the same people will fight tooth and nail for the little people who need a hand.

There are people who say that those who are aged between 18 and 21 years should be heard. However, when a liquor problem comes along, they say, "No; let us give them liquor rights before they are heard and before they have the right to say whether they want it."

There are others who take an extremely dim view of buck-passing. Members know the kind of thing—"all the way with L.B.J."—where responsibility, initiative, and obligation to make a decision are thrown onto somebody else's shoulders. These same people do not mind the obligation being pushed onto a committee and taken off their own shoulders. We see a tremendous amount of position changing.

Then, there are the experts who do a quick trip around the globe and pop into various countries for an hour or a day. They come back and tell us, with great conviction and authority, what the drinking habits are in certain countries and the aftermaths. They say quite emphatically that one never sees a drunk in, say, Italy or France. What of it? I have been told—and I believe the information is accurate—that General de Gaulle did something to try to stem the liquor position and its adverse effects on the people

and on the French nation, generally, just before he terminated his office as President of the Republic.

Is it sufficient for someone to go to a country briefly, to see no drunks in the street, and to say that all is well? The same people do not take that view on other matters. So far as traffic accidents and deaths are concerned, nobody says, "Do not let us legislate on traffic. I have seen no accidents." No, they take a completely different view of that situation.

There are others, of course, who put up the proposition that an individual has only a certain amount of money to spend and, if the drinking hours are extended, it will make no difference, because the individual will have only the same quantity of money to spend on drink. I do not know whether too many people really go along with that point of view. I most certainly do not.

I suppose the people who take that view would point out to anyone who wished to apply for a license at some future time that he was wasting his time, because there is only a certain amount of money and he would not get his portion. The same people forget that the population, amongst other things, is growing and they also choose to ignore the effect of advertising on the buying public.

It is encouraging to notice, however, that the committee has at least done some service in pointing out that all that it has sought to do is to revise the law. Members of the committee did not take the view—the popular view of late—that if the law is changed, it constitutes a reform. It constitutes a reform in one sense, of course, but frequently the word "reform" is intended to mean, and is used in the context, that the community is going forward and making progress, not merely that the law is being rewritten in a minor way.

In view of what I have said, I therefore propose to support certain amendments to the Bill, but I shall also support a referendum. Is there not a good case for holding a referendum? We know that referendums are excellent in theory but they have very real limitations in practice. Would very real limitations be manifested on questions of this nature; namely, whether the drinking age should be lowered to 18 and the trading hours extended?

I put it to members that we can win both ways on this question. The people who want a referendum would be satisfied if one were held and would either be disappointed or happy with the result. A referendum would dispose of them. Also, the people who do not want a referendum would be happy in the long run, because the whole theme of the measure under discussion is that the public—you, Sir, and I—are to be given something which is very real. We are

to be given just what we want and, above all, we are to be given service. I am quoting the people who take that line.

In years gone by I have seen a number of people who have benefited under wills. They did not have to take the gifts under the wills if they did not wish to, but I never knew anyone who did not wish to. If we really mean what we say—namely, we are going to give the public something—we can win both ways as I say. The public would readily acknowledge the service that is given and the referendum would be carried by 100 per cent. at least! The public is to be given something and nothing at all will be taken away. They will be given service, more liquor, extended hours—in fact, the works! All they will be asked is a simple question. Is it suggested that they will not recognise this service?

Therefore I will support a referendum on these questions, whereas I certainly would not support one on other matters which are complex and difficult. Also, sometimes fear comes into it. However, the questions under discussion are straightforward. We will say, "We want to give you something. Will you take it? Yes or no?" Inevitably the answer will be yes. Both camps will be perfectly satisfied in that situation.

I oppose the lowering of the drinking age to 18. Somebody has to take a stand on this question and, as I have said before, I believe that members of Parliament have an obligation to lead. Some members have said that the limitations put on the availability of liquor stimulate the desire to obtain liquor. I think there is something in that statement, too.

However, I consider we will stimulate a different desire in young people—and older people, too, for that matter—if the Parliament says that it does not matter about the extremely important things which should be given to 18-year olds, because members say that the important thing is the right to purchase liquor and we intend to give that right. We put things in proper sequence in our private capacities in life and in the business world. If proper priorities are worked out, other people observe and fall into line and also give priorities which are proper in the main.

Under this legislation there is no question of a proper sequence of priorities. We are not going to set the lead but, instead, are going to spend the time of the Parliament in giving 18-year olds the right to drink before they have the right to vote—which, incidentally, debars them from any say at all on this question. We will give them the right to drink before they have the right to contract and, until a recent amendment, before they had the right to make a will. We will give them the right to drink before they have a right to equal

pay with those who are aged 21 and more. One could name many other questions of extreme importance. We should put them in proper sequence or bring them in altogether; we should not headline this one matter.

The gem of the Bill, to my mind, is clause 120 which, if it does not extend the trading hours of a hotel, I do not quite know what it does. I think it is worth reading so that members may know what I am referring to. Clause 120 (2) reads—

(2) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section or any other provision of this Act, during the period of thirty minutes immediately following the latest time (in this subsection called "closing time") at which liquor may be sold or supplied pursuant to a licence, whether of the kind mentioned in subsection (1) of this section or not, or under a permit, and no longer—

(a) a bar (if any) may be kept open for the purpose of clearing it of the persons who were in the bar before closing time;

Presumably that is to allow them to consume the liquor they may have bought. What we are unable to say is that we are now extending trading hours to 10.30 p.m. That would be too simple. The closing time is 10 o'clock but the door closing time is 10.30. I think we ought to be frank and open as to what we are doing here. Why not simply say, without all this humbug, that the closing time is now to be 10.30?

We hear of people who are concerned about the swilling of liquor. Why do people swill? Because of the limited time they are given in which to consume liquor. Nobody likes the concept; everybody wants to do whatever is possible to avoid the swill. Yet are we not virtually putting a limitation on time? A minute or two before 10 o'clock I imagine people will buy a quantity of drink—perhaps their budgeting is a little out by 10 o'clock. Whether that is so or not, they will buy a quantity of drink and consume it in the next half hour against the clock.

I do not like the concept. I do not think it is necessary; nor do I like the extraordinary way in which it is tackled here. I do not think the answer is that it has got to be done this way for convenience of draftsmanship. I think it is a back-handed method of extending trading hours from 10 o'clock until 10.30. It is as simple as that; and in my belief that is precisely what should be said.

I shall therefore oppose certain aspects of the Bill which I have mentioned, and support certain other matters which seem to me to be long overdue for amendment.

MR. MCPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [9.3 p.m.]: In speaking to the Bill I would like to commend the Government first of all for supplying with the Bill an explanatory memorandum. I suggest it might be a good idea if this were extended to certain other Bills that come before us.

Mr. Jamieson: Particularly the Mining Bill.

Mr. MCPHARLIN: Yes. I think it is well worthy of consideration.

As we are all aware, the Bill before us has wide social implications and we, as members of this Parliament, are charged tonight with a very real responsibility. Each of us has been given the opportunity to speak and to vote according to the way he decides; that is, not on party lines.

I would like to refer to some figures which were given by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Unfortunately he is not here to correct me if I make any mistakes in quoting his figures. He mentioned a figure of something like 18,000 accidents, of which only 164 were attributable to the effects of liquor. Information has been given to me that perhaps the figures he gave were correct at that time, but I understand the Police Department has since adopted a much more reliable and accurate method of examining accidents and it can now give a more accurate assessment of the number of accidents that are attributable to liquor.

To follow this up, I refer to a report which was issued by 14 of Perth's leading doctors and was published in *The West Australian* of December, 1968. Those doctors claimed that 50 per cent. of all road accidents and 75 per cent. of all vehicle accidents were attributable to the effects of alcohol. At a meeting of the National Safety Council in Perth yesterday, one of Perth's leading thoracic surgeons confirmed these figures, which would be more accurate than the figures given by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also made mention of the fact that there is no legal drinking age in Western Australia. An examination of the committee's report confirms that there is no legal drinking age and that alcohol can be given to a child of any age in his own home, but not on licensed premises; nor can a person under a certain age—at present 21—purchase liquor on licensed premises. If there is no legal drinking age applicable in Western Australia at the present time, why all this clamour? Why all this panic? Why all this urging to reduce what is called the legal drinking age?

Young people can obtain liquor in their own homes; liquor can be obtained from other people. I do not see that there is any great urgency or need to reduce below the present level the age at which they can purchase liquor.

I would like to refer to this a little further because at the present time a great deal of publicity is being given to the terrible effects that drugs are having on the younger people in our community, particularly in other parts of Australia, and those responsible and in authority are making efforts to do something about the matter. In New South Wales and Victoria—this was also referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—young people are able to obtain liquor at the age of 18. Apparently the effects of alcohol are not sufficient to give them what they are looking for; so, having taken part in the consumption of alcohol—which after all is a drug—they then go on to the stronger types of drugs.

This is indeed a very serious matter and a danger that we are facing in Australia at the present time; so much so that only recently the Health Ministers had a conference and they suggested much stiffer penalties and fines for people who are peddling drugs and so on.

In New South Wales and Victoria the drinking age is 18. Reference has been made to the fact that a person can go from here, where he is not allowed to purchase liquor under the age of 21, across to Victoria or New South Wales, where he can purchase liquor at 18. This causes some concern and confusion, but figures given to me show that in both Victoria and New South Wales there is a far higher proportion of sex offences than in the other States.

A comparison was made over a certain period of time and it was found that in Western Australia there were five offences of rape whereas in the same period 70 such offences occurred in New South Wales. To take the matter a little further: A former New South Wales Government consultant psychologist examined 1,200 cases of rape over a period of years. His statistics showed that 60 per cent. of those 1,200 cases were attributable to the effects of alcohol and, of that 60 per cent., 70 per cent. of the offenders were under the age of 21 years. So members can see from those figures that the effect of providing freer access to alcohol for the younger generation is not conducive to the well-being of society as a whole. I would venture the opinion that statistics would show that the increase in the road accident rate in this State is due greatly to the effects of alcohol.

As I see it—and this has been mentioned by other speakers—this Bill lends itself more to Committee debate than second reading debate and, like other members, I do not propose to speak for a great length of time. However, there are one or two matters to which I would like to refer, and one of those is the suggested change in trading hours for hotels on Sundays.

I spoke to two hotelkeepers in my electorate and they suggested to me that they thought it would be desirable that the 12

noon to 1 p.m. trading—or, as now suggested, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.—be cut out altogether. They said in their own cases they would prefer this to be done to give them a little freedom in the middle of the day so that they could enjoy a decent lunch. After all, if the opening period is altered to 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., we must remember that the hotelkeepers have to prepare for the 11 o'clock opening and then clean up afterwards. The two men I spoke to would prefer that the 12 noon to 1 p.m. period be deleted and the evening session increased accordingly. Of course, that proposition would not suit everybody, but that was the opinion expressed to me by two hotelkeepers in my electorate.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is the question of certificates, and this was mentioned also by the member for Swan. I think this is a desirable feature of the Bill and one which I feel most members would endorse; that is, that where a hotelkeeper or anybody serving liquor is of the opinion that a young person is not of age, that young person will have to sign a certificate. As I said, I think this is a provision which will be endorsed by most members.

Another matter upon which I wish to make brief comment is the one mentioned by the member for Avon concerning an examination of the alcoholic content of liquor. I feel that the member for Avon made a good point. This matter should be examined, and if we are to allow freer access to liquor and a greater number of people to obtain it, then, perhaps, if the alcoholic content was reduced I think it would make for better social drinking and fewer alcoholic effects. So I think it could help in that respect.

Mention has been made of an amendment which appears in my name on the notice paper concerning the matter of a referendum on the issues of the hours of trading and the reduction of the age at which people are able to purchase liquor. My reason for bringing forward this amendment is that I think it is desirable that Parliament should debate whether or not it is necessary to hold a referendum. I felt it my duty to bring this matter before Parliament, to have it debated and to decide whether or not we as a Parliament think a referendum should be conducted.

Like the member for Mt. Hawthorn, I feel this would be a democratic way of obtaining the opinion of the people of Western Australia, because the measure before us affects every home, and every man, woman, and child in the State. So I think the holding of a referendum is the most desirable way to make a decision.

I do not intend to go further into the details of the Bill. There are many amendments on the notice paper some of which I intend to support and others I intend to oppose. With those remarks I

offer my support to the Bill, subject to certain amendments in the Committee stage.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren) [9.16 p.m.]: I would like to join with other speakers in commending the committee for its thoroughness in compiling the report which has been mentioned. There is no doubt that the report is a first-rate example of the research carried out within the ambit of the terms of reference of the committee.

At the same time I cannot agree with all the conclusions drawn by the committee nor can I agree with every recommendation contained in the report. In that regard I have no doubt I am in the same position as every member in this House. Also, I regret that the report has some inadequacies because it does not go far enough to cover the entire situation faced by the community today with regard to the drinking of alcohol.

The member for Mr. Hawthorn made fairly sweeping references to some of these matters and touched on native welfare, alcoholism, and road accidents; and the members for Mt. Marshall and Avon referred at length to the alcoholic content of liquor. These are matters which could have been properly considered by the committee and would no doubt have made a valuable addition to the report we have before us. I can and will support some of the recommendations made by the committee and embodied in this legislation, but I cannot support others.

At this juncture—the middle of the second reading debate—I will contain my remarks to two issues; the two main issues which confront us. Those issues, incidentally, have generated the most concern: I refer to the questions of the hours of Sunday trading and the lowering of the drinking age. I feel that those matters merit my expression of opinion, as they do the expression of opinion of others.

Sunday trading has been an established practice in country areas for many years. As most members know, it was introduced as a solution to the *bona fide* traveller provision of some years ago. That provision became redundant with the advance of transportation methods. It became an anachronism and so it was deleted from the Statute and the present provision was inserted.

As I said, Sunday trading has become an established practice in country areas. There is no doubt that it is a part of the pattern of life in the country. However, I feel there is little justification for extending the hours of trading. I can see some serious implications arising if the hours of trading are extended any further, and I feel obliged to oppose any provision of this kind.

However, I am sufficient of a realist to recognise that whilst the extension of trading hours on Sundays is not desirable, it would not be possible to have them reduced or Sunday trading stopped altogether. It is a situation with which we must deal as best we can. It is true that some of the more travelled members of the House have drawn attention to the almost Utopian conditions that exist in those countries that have no restriction on trading hours or on the drinking age.

However, that is not what we are asked to achieve by the passing of this Bill. We are faced with the proposition of extending drinking hours slightly and, in itself, I do not think this will achieve a great deal of good. On the contrary I can see more undesirable features arising from it.

Turning to the contentious question of lowering the drinking age, I find myself wondering whether we have got this question out of its true perspective. I cannot help but wonder to what extent the drinking age is an integral part of what we might term the age of maturity and the recognition of it that is accorded by the general community at this juncture.

I wonder whether the arguments that apply to the lowering of the drinking age apply, with equal validity, to the lowering of other manifestations of maturity, if one can call them that. It is an embracing term, I suppose, in which we have to include the right to vote; the right to serve on a jury—I do not know whether that can be regarded as a right or a responsibility—the right to sign contracts without a counter signature; the right to borrow money; the right to obtain a taxi license or a license for a semitrailer; the right to marry without parental consent; and the right to gamble on the racecourse or in a T.A.B. agency. All those rights are bestowed on one who is 21 years of age. Eligibility for national service comes at the age of 20. At the age of 19 a soldier in the permanent forces can be sent overseas on active service. The right to enter a hotel; to purchase cigarettes; for a boy to marry with permission of his parents, comes at the age of 18.

The right to obtain a driver's license, and other rights, come at an earlier age. However, I feel we would follow a much more satisfactory course if we could adopt perhaps, say, an age of responsibility, giving due consideration to all the relevant factors; because it seems to me that at the moment our approach to what we consider to be an age of maturity is fragmentary and piecemeal. I cannot help but wonder whether the drinking age is given far too much prominence and so it takes on an inflated sense of importance. I cannot help but wonder whether we are assisting that viewpoint because of the emphasis we place on the drinking age.

I realise that if we recognise a general age of responsibility we may take away some of the psychological and emotive factors associated with the right to drink. I notice that the committee, on page 37 of its report, refers to the age of 18 as the watershed of a young person's life. But again that, too, could be a matter of opinion. I believe we could do much more to establish an age of responsibility and maturity.

Having regard for the occluded and fragmented approach to this question, I consider there is some merit in holding a referendum on it, and I would be disposed to support such a course of action. There are several points to which I would like to draw attention, but I will deal with them in the more appropriate Committee stage. With those remarks I conclude my contribution to the second reading debate.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [9.25 p.m.]: First of all, I congratulate the committee on a job well done, even if I do not agree with many of its recommendations. I believe the committee spent a great deal of time and effort on the task it was given, and we should respect the members of the committee for that. I also congratulate the officers of the Crown Law Department for the expeditious preparation of an entirely new Bill in the time allotted to them.

I notice that the committee was not given a term of reference under which it could report on the results of drinking alcohol. This very point constitutes a challenge to this House, because it places the responsibility for considering this aspect fairly and squarely on the shoulders of all members of this Assembly. I also notice that in a number of questions asked by the member for Mt. Hawthorn the consistent reply has been contained mostly in the words "Not known," or words of a similar nature. I do not blame the Minister for this, of course, because in most instances the figures are not known, but this is an indication that many of the answers to the questions that were asked are not known to anybody as no consideration is given to them.

In my opinion it would have been appropriate and most helpful if the Minister could have added to the words "Not known" the fact that the position was serious, because there is no doubt that the effects of alcohol on the community are serious. There is no obligation on any of us to adopt the recommendations of the committee as set out in its report. Therefore, each member of this House must accept responsibility for any decision that is made.

I think the Government has shown great consideration by having the inquiry held, by preparing the Bill, and leaving the decision to us. However, I hope that members of the Government will not vote *en bloc* for the Bill as printed but that they will vote according to their own personal opinions, as I intend to do.

Several members: We will!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am sorry the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not present in the Chamber at the moment, because he made several extravagant statements. However, I agree with him on point one: that this is a large Bill and that it contains many clauses. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that the measure has been drafted to control only one act: the consumption of alcohol. It should not be necessary for us in this House to spend our time debating and elaborating on this difficult question of having to control the drinking habits of people. It is absurd that we should have to do this.

Surely, as human beings, we should be able to control our own desires in regard to drinking, but the fact is that many people are unable to do so. It is true that people should be able to make their own decisions on the consumption of alcohol, and I have no desire to interfere with their decisions in this regard. Every one of us has to face that situation. Nevertheless it is our responsibility, as members of this Parliament, to legislate to control acts which cause trouble to others, and, indeed, to one's own person.

These are two aspects which are serious, because, first of all, alcohol has an effect on the individual who consumes it in that it reduces his ability to make his own decisions and, in many cases, places him in such a condition that he is unable to make any decision. It is in this regard that the consumption of alcohol differs from any other act performed by an individual. It is open to anyone to take up smoking, but such an act does not interfere with anyone else so far as I know.

However the other effect of the consumption of alcohol is more important; that is, the effect that it has on others, because the actions of an individual who is under the influence of alcohol can cause him to do harm to others. As far as we are concerned this is the aspect that is very serious and if we do not regard it as such we are not doing justice to the community at large, because alcohol has an adverse effect on the home; if taken in excess it has an adverse effect on a man's work, on his driving of a motor vehicle and on everything else he might undertake.

There is, of course, a distinct connection between alcohol and crime. This aspect is very interesting and I have extracted a few words from the court news published in the papers indicating some of the things that are said in court. We often see the

expression, "under the influence." This is used as though it were some sort of an excuse for doing things which ought not to be done.

Very often we also hear it said in evidence that a person is of good character generally but on the particular occasion he was drunk. That appears to be an excuse for not doing what is right. We also hear it said, "He has never done this before, but he was under the influence."

Mr. May: Under the influence of what?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Of alcohol. We must face up to these things. This is not at all funny although perhaps the person who is drunk may appear funny. We must protect people from those who have indulged too freely in alcohol.

If we as members of Parliament are doing our job we will all know that we come up against these matters every day; we see the results of over-indulgence in alcohol, not only in the homes but also in many other places.

I have received—as I suppose has every other member—an avalanche of printed matter in relation to this Bill. A great deal of this matter has come from the liquor trade. If all these submissions are considered in detail it would certainly appear that some sections of the trade are seeking favours over other sections. This is remarkable and it makes one wonder whether the purpose of the Bill is to protect the trade or to protect the individual. The more I look at the position the more I am convinced that the Bill seeks to protect the trade rather than the individual.

The committee was not given the power to investigate the effects of alcohol. It was merely empowered to consider the various aspects of trading and drinking as they might appear under their different headings. I find it difficult to understand why any one category of retailer should be given priority over another. This is one of the aspects which should be considered and adjusted during the Committee stage. I had better say something about these matters now, because I will not get much chance of doing so in Committee.

Mr. Graham: Not if you are doing your job.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If we can set aside consideration of the dollar and of vested interest and look calmly at the situation from the point of view of the people—the little people, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is so fond of calling them; I think he used that expression tonight—I think we would obtain a more balanced result.

As I have said before, it is the responsibility of members of this House to weigh up these matters which the committee was not given the power to do. We must

accept recommendations from the report and try to fit them in with a balanced point of view. This is most serious and it is something which should not be overlooked.

As we all know, the present is the time of opportunity for the future of our young people. It is also a time when they can so easily go wrong. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition—to quote him again—talked about tens of thousands of young fellows between the ages of 18 and 21 years. I think that was the figure he quoted. He could have said a million; it would not have mattered because it was so extravagant.

Mr. Graham: I did not even mention the figure "one."

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The honourable member said tens of thousands. If he looks up his speech he will find I am right.

Mr. Graham: I would be very surprised.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I know the expression is there, because I wrote it down when the honourable member said it. There is no doubt that behind the scenes there are just as many, or perhaps more, young people who are not accustomed to drinking their time away. These young people work hard to improve their future. They may be unknown to us because they are not out on the streets.

I say without any hesitation that I cannot support a measure which provides a recommendation to lower the drinking age. I see that the notice paper contains a suggestion that a referendum be held on these two aspects and I would certainly favour such an approach. I know it is not the desire in many quarters to hold such a referendum because the people concerned are mindful of the fate of the referendum held in New South Wales and, consequently, they are a little afraid to suggest the holding of a referendum.

I feel we should take the matter to the people and see what they have to say in regard to the matter of extended hours of trading. If we were back in the days when we had no refrigeration or other facilities for keeping liquor cold there may be some reason for extending the trading hours. Today, however, we have every facility in our homes to provide for the storage of liquor and there is no reason whatever for the provision to which I have referred.

Only recently this House threw out a provision concerning the extension of hours of trading and yet now we want to do a complete somersault and provide for an extension of trading hours.

We are all most conscious today in matters relating to conservation—matters which affect the conservation of fisheries, of wildflowers, of native animals, of road

verges, of our foreshores, and so on. This being so, why should we not seek to conserve the valuable young life of our community; the lives of those who are to be our future responsible citizens. We should do all we can to preserve these young lives, because they are far more important than the profits which are made from the liquor trade. I hope that is the opinion of other members of this House.

I would now like to say something about unlicensed restaurants. We have heard comments made about the indignity of carrying bottles under one's arm while entering such restaurants with one's friends. We have heard this said over and over again. We endeavoured to overcome this problem by licensing restaurants. The committee has now made a recommendation in relation to unlicensed restaurants, and to me this seems most strange. On the one hand we provide for the licensing of these places and then, on the other, we provide for those which are not licensed. We must not lose sight of the fact that the Licensing Court has no power under the Bill to enforce the provision of conveniences.

In many instances the places to which I refer are not well conducted; they generally have a small back room where all sorts of activities take place. To my mind it is most unsatisfactory that we should provide for these unlicensed premises.

I would now like to say a few words about taverns. I do not think there is any need, as perhaps there was in the early days of our history, to couple alcohol with accommodation. In most cases the further apart we keep the two the better, because entertainment has now become part of the liquor trade in the hotels and I feel that extended trading hours are hardly compatible with the needs of many travellers. I have heard people say quite often that they patronise motels to get away from all the drinking associated with hotels. This is one of the reasons motels are so popular, and it is certainly a good reason why taverns should be dissociated from the provision of accommodation.

We are all aware that we have in our midst what we call alcoholics, and we regret very much that there are so many of them. I would point out, however, that one does not become an alcoholic unless one drinks alcohol and, accordingly, I would say that alcoholics are therefore the responsibility of the liquor trade. The trade should accept that responsibility. There is no reason why we should encourage the extension of trading hours. We should not encourage the opportunity to drink when we know that there are 300,000 alcoholics in Australia—that is the official figure that has already been quoted. We certainly do not know how many others are on the way to becoming alcoholics.

Obviously a large number of people are on the way to alcoholism. We know of instances in this place and in our own towns. I am aware, and I am sure other members are also aware, of many of these cases. It is our responsibility to take these matters into account.

I noticed there was support from the member for Avon, the member for Swan, the member for Mt. Marshall, and the member for Warren for the lowering of the alcoholic content of spirituous beverages, but particularly of beer. This matter should be taken up seriously. Surely this is one way to reduce the effects of drinking, and to get over the problem of alcoholism.

There is nothing wrong with drinking. It is the alcohol which causes the trouble. If we reduced the alcoholic content we would overcome some of the difficulties. I think the committee of inquiry could have made some recommendations in this respect. I suggest the Government or this House take the matter up in an endeavour to effect amendments along these lines. I do not wish to say any more on the Bill at this stage. I support the second reading, but I do so with many qualifications which will be discussed in the Committee stage.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [9.42 p.m.]: Other members in this debate have made reference to the committee of inquiry. I would like to commend the members of the committee for their findings, and for the submissions they have made to this House. It is not incumbent on us to support all the recommendations, but I do believe that the members of the committee have done a public service. I might mention in passing that I know personally two members of the committee. I know the lady member and the legal representative to be persons of ability and integrity, and I have no doubt the third member is of equal ability and integrity.

I support the Bill in order that the provisions can be dealt with in Committee and that amendments may be made. The committee undertook a comprehensive inquiry, and the opportunity was made available for submissions, both for and against the changes, from interested parties. I admit there is widespread support for the lowering of the drinking age, but I deplore the fact that there are too many people who drink too much. However, I accept that.

I am sure that all members have received correspondence in opposition to the lowering of the drinking age and to the sale of liquor on Sundays. I promised to make this opposition known. I will not deal with the large number of letters I have received from individuals, because time will not permit me to do so, but I will mention correspondence I have received from organisations and churches.

In respect of the organisations, I have received correspondence from the John Curtin Parents & Citizens' Association in which it expressed concern that senior students could bring liquor to school, and that this would interfere with their studies and encourage junior students also to indulge in drinking. Whilst I sympathise with the attitude of this association, I would point out that liquor is already available to the youths if they acquire it the night before, or if they ask somebody else to acquire it for them.

I have received correspondence from the Wesley Church expressing its opposition and suggesting that a referendum be held on the question of the lowering of the drinking age and Sunday trading. I also received some correspondence from the Fremantle Central Mission, and from the Western Australian Temperance Alliance giving a summary of organisations which were for and against the proposals. This letter was signed by a reverend gentleman whom I saw in the House this evening, and for whom I have a very high regard. I have received correspondence from the Fremantle Combined Methodist Guild containing some 69 signatures in opposition to the lowering of the drinking age to 18 years and to Sunday trading.

I also received similar correspondence from the Baptist Church and from individual members of it in the Fremantle area. The Church of Christ, Fremantle, sent me correspondence attaching a copy of a submission which it had made to the Premier. I am aware that the Premier also received similar correspondence. I have received correspondence from the Seventh Day Adventist Church in opposition to these proposals. I am now honouring the undertaking that I gave to make all this opposition known to the House, and that is my principal reason for rising to speak in this debate.

In contradistinction to this opposition, I have received correspondence from the Social Questions Committee of the Western Australian Council of Churches. The correspondence is in the form of a statement on the committee of inquiry into the licensing laws. I will not read it in full, but will condense it. This says, in effect, that as a body of Christian men and women the Social Questions Committee is particularly interested in the recommendations. It also says that although it has had the opportunity to make submissions on these matters it felt it could not make any useful contribution to the discussion as the views expressed by its members varied widely. In an organisation such as this there is not even unanimity of viewpoint. This organisation is realistic, and it points out that a division of opinion exists within the rank and file of its membership.

Even if Parliament rejects the proposal to lower the drinking age people under 21 years of age will continue to drink in the

open, and, worse still, in a nefarious way. I believe that a case does exist for the lowering of the drinking age. I cannot help but feel that some of the desire of young people to drink stems from the fact that it is illegal for people under 21 years of age to purchase liquor. I submit that some supervision is better than none. The alternative is for these young people to acquire liquor, to take it to the bush or beach, and to indulge in parties. If this provision in the Bill is rejected they will have no alternative but to do just that. As I have already said, some supervision is better than none.

I believe that drinking on the part of teenagers is done more out of curiosity for the imagined thrills and kicks than anything else. Pleasure is obtained by these people from breaking the law and bucking the establishment. The young people who wish to drink will continue to do so; including those younger than 18 years of age. However, we can take away that thrill of breaking the law.

I have also received correspondence in support of the proposal from the State President (John Guilfoyle) of the Young Liberal Party. So it appears that we on this side have something in common with the Liberals, even if we have not in politics.

Mr. Tonkin: Surely you would not take any notice of that!

Mr. FLETCHER: I do take notice of matters in respect of the issue before us, but at the moment I am not attempting to be controversial. I say we have something in common in that we both support the lowering of the drinking age to 18 years for the reasons I have just given.

Like other members, I have reservations on Sunday trading. At the present time Sunday trading does exist in certain parts of the State. My reservations are related to my belief in an eight-hour day. I know that publicans are forced to work more than 12 hours a day; that is, the publicans who manage the hotels. It is incumbent on them to work those hours. I also believe in a five-day week; but a six-day week exists in regard to hotel trading.

It is with some reluctance that I would support trading on a Sunday. I do not believe most publicans would want their hotels open all day Sunday. I also think it would be difficult to frame questions with respect to a referendum, and a "no" vote would create hostility on the goldfields and in other outer-metropolitan areas where Sunday trading is allowed.

If hotels are to be opened on Sundays then, as far as I can gather, the opening should be optional. In fact, the recommendation is that opening should be optional. If the hotels do open, I believe they should be open during the same hours that clubs operate, not as recommended by the committee of inquiry. If

the hours of trading are extended to the extent recommended, people will go to the hotels on Sundays and the tendency will be for them to stay longer than they ought to, which will be at the expense of the domestic harmony in the home.

The present situation is that an exodus occurs from the metropolitan area to the sessions at hotels outside the metropolitan area. Liquor is consumed in haste, which has a greater effect on the individual than the same quantity consumed at leisure.

Vehicles are queueing on the roads now on Sundays with a consequential increase in the number of traffic accidents. The number of accidents increases with the increase in the consumption of alcohol in country areas. If liquor was available within walking distance in the city and suburbs, there would be less traffic on the roads and less business for the hospitals and mortuaries. More beds would be available in the hospitals for the sick, rather than for the injured.

I am also of the opinion that the members of the community have a limited amount of money to spend, and would only have the same limited amount to spend over a longer period. What was available to spend on Saturday would have to be spread over Sunday.

It has already been pointed out that 18-year-olds are adults in Britain, yet they are minors in Western Australia. They can drink in the United Kingdom, yet it is illegal for them to drink here. Western Australia permits 18-year-olds to drive cars, fly aeroplanes, and even buy guns. However, they cannot drink liquor in this State. I do not think the reason relates to the fact that guns and liquor do not mix. Young people 18 years of age can drink in New South Wales, Victoria, and the A.C.T.; they can join the Army, or be dragged in; and they can exercise a vote if they happen to be in Vietnam.

Young people today are physically, educationally, and socially more mature than they were in the period of my youth, and proportionately more so than the generations before my time. That being so, I think, the 18-year-olds, in view of the maturity I have mentioned, are capable of coping with liquor.

There is one aspect about the availability of liquor to youth which I would like to mention. I have witnessed an incident which I deplore, and which is practised at junior football clubs. People much younger than 18 years of age are handed glasses at functions held by the club. They are handed the glasses irrespective of their age, and subsequently a jug appears. The youths are obviously below the age of 18 and could be as young as 16, but they look at their neighbours and see that some of them are drinking and so they have a glass of beer. Young people much younger than 18 obtain liquor in this way, and such a practice is an encouragement to young

people to drink many years before they reach the age of 18. As I said, I deplore the practice and I would like to see less of it.

I think a big responsibility devolves on the parents of young people. If young people learn to drink in the home, even if they drink only a cheese glass of beer regularly with their parents during their infancy, they develop a proper approach to drinking. A sensible parent can ask his son if he has ever seen his father drunk. I hope, quite frankly, that the son will be able to say he has never seen his father drunk; and that gives the parent an opportunity to point out to the youth that he should not drink to excess and become drunk.

I have related that example because it has been my own personal experience. I have two sons—and they have friends—and they are not opposed to the lowering of the drinking age, because of the type of training I have mentioned. The responsibility is on all parents to adopt a similar attitude. I am not attempting to be a paragon of virtue, but I have found that what I have said works, and I suggest that more people should attempt a similar practice.

I suggest there is a percentage of people in the community who are alcoholics, or potential alcoholics. I suspect the fault is in the genes or the temperament of those persons, or the environment in which they were brought up. I also think that alcoholics will obtain liquor irrespective of the hours of trading. I do not think a reduction in the age limit, or an increase in the hours, will increase the percentage of alcoholics or the quantity of liquor they will imbibe. The number of alcoholics will grow with the increase in population. Their numbers will, in fact, be proportionate to that increase. I am concerned with the percentage of people who are not sensitive to the hardship inflicted on the dependants of alcoholics. I do not want to be accused of defeatism, but drinking has been going on for thousands of years and will continue to go on legally or illegally.

If we continue to legislate to make it illegal for people under 21 years of age to drink, then we will make drinking more attractive to that age group. I would refer members to America, where some 40 years ago prohibition was introduced. Prohibition created greater evils than those which existed when liquor was readily and legally available.

I will leave further comment until the Committee stage of this Bill. I wished to honour an undertaking I gave to express the opposition to this measure on behalf of the churches and other organisations I have mentioned. At this stage I support the Bill.

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [9.59 p.m.]: I wish to comment, shortly, on the Bill at this late stage and after so many speeches have been made. I believe it is the duty of every member to make his position quite clear on this very important question. In my case, I wish to honour an obligation I have to so many of my electors who have asked me to oppose the Bill as far as it refers to the lowering of the drinking age and the extension of Sunday trading hours.

I can truthfully say that I have not received one request to support the Bill in those two regards, presumably because most people thought I would do so as a matter of course. However, I have received hundreds of signatures, letters, and other literature asking me to oppose the measure on these two matters.

Mention has been made of the good work done by the committee and the very comprehensive report it submitted. Everybody would agree with that. I am worried on one question in connection with the committee's report and this was mentioned by the member for Fremantle. Most members received a paper from the West Australian Temperance Alliance which gave the submissions made to the committee. Altogether 24 people or organisations were mentioned but only eight people or organisations were in favour of the suggestion that the drinking age be reduced to 18 years; 11 people or organisations were in favour of leaving it at 21 years. It could be said, of course, that those who favoured the age of 21 years have vested interests, because they are members of the Temperance Alliance or are people associated with it. It could also be said, however, that those who supported lowering the drinking age to 18 years have vested interests, too. Therefore, the committee's recommendation that the drinking age be reduced to 18 years cuts across the evidence submitted to the committee.

We have the same situation with regard to Sunday trading. Only four of the 24 people or organisations wanted an extension of Sunday trading, whereas seven were in favour of no extension of Sunday trading. Therefore, it does seem strange that the committee has recommended that the drinking age be lowered and the trading hours extended.

If I were to vote on the Bill as a whole—with the items I have mentioned included in it—I would have to vote against it in order to meet the wishes of my electors. I realise, of course, that there is much that is useful in the measure and many of the clauses are extremely good.

To some extent, I would support the holding of a referendum. So far as the lowering of the drinking age is concerned, this would be a simple matter; it would be a straightout question. However, I see many difficulties in regard to the extension of trading hours on a Sunday. Most

members will have noticed that I have amendments on the notice paper to cover these two points. My concern is that, by extending Sunday trading hours, we would reach a situation which would be out of balance with the present situation. We have been told it is most unfair for country areas to have Sunday trading when the metropolitan area does not.

If we submit this question to a referendum, what do we ask the people? Do we simply ask whether they are in favour of the extension of trading hours? I have always been of the opinion that one should compromise on many things and, on this question, I think the compromise would be to have some trading on a Sunday and to put trading on an equal basis right throughout the South-West Land Division, at any rate.

An unfair situation has occurred in the past in that clubs in the country are allowed two hours' trading on Sundays whereas hotels are permitted only one. In the metropolitan area clubs are allowed two hours' trading, but hotels are allowed no trading at all. Consequently people in the metropolitan area who are not sufficiently fortunate to be members of clubs have not been able to enjoy a drink on Sundays.

I believe that if we are to have Sunday trading we cannot do away with the practice that has been established already. Indeed, I believe Sunday trading should be on an equal basis and footing for both clubs and hotels in the country and city areas.

I smiled—if one can smile about such a thing—at the comments of the committee in connection with people in the metropolitan area who have to drive 40 miles to enjoy a drink on Sundays. I suggest that anybody who wants to drive 40 miles to enjoy a drink on a Sunday, or any other day, wants to go and see a doctor; he does not want to go to a hotel. The same situation could occur if there is Sunday trading in the metropolitan area. Hotels in the country close at 1 p.m. Consequently, the unfortunate people who have had a taste of alcohol until 1 p.m. will be driving 40 miles into the city to enjoy a drink. That is why I believe trading should be on a uniform basis right throughout the country.

To allow Sunday trading for the whole of the afternoon in the metropolitan area would, I believe, cause a breakdown in many aspects of family life. Other speakers have mentioned this problem. To my mind, it would have a damaging effect on the recreational and sporting activities which so many enjoy. We have all seen it, unfortunately. People cannot even wait to finish a game once the bar opens; they must go off and have a drink, or several drinks. To preserve all these things, and to give everybody an equal chance,

I believe the same hours of trading should apply to the country and the city, as I have mentioned.

Had I been a member when Sunday trading was first suggested in the Western Australian Parliament, I would have opposed it strongly, because I believe that Sunday is meant for something better than standing in a hotel and imbibing liquor. There is no harm in that, of course. I do it myself and most other people do. Nevertheless, I believe Sunday should be sacred; it is meant for something better than that.

I have accepted the fact that Sunday trading exists and, because of this, I want to compromise and try to meet the situation and the wishes of my electors who say that there should be no extension in the trading hours or of the situation which exists today—a situation which we cannot do away with, because it has already been established.

Those are the comments I wanted to make. I find it strange that the committee has made this recommendation against the apparent weight of evidence submitted to it. I want to make it known that I do not wish any extension of liquor trading further than is necessary to meet the present situation.

I will support the second reading of the Bill because, as I said earlier, it contains many important and useful amendments. One fails to understand the implications of some of the amendments, but the committee in its wisdom and the Government have recommended them for inclusion in the Bill. Doubtless they will be dealt with by other members who, perhaps, have more interest in a particular line than I.

I will support the second reading in the hope that some amendments will be passed in Committee which will make the measure more acceptable to a greater majority of electors in my own area and, judging from the number of petitions read out in the House, in other areas of the State.

MR. MAY (Clontarf) [10.9 p.m.]: The report of the committee of inquiry was delivered on the 23rd December, 1969. The committee was appointed to inquire into, and report on, the operation of the laws of the State relating to the sale, supply, and consumption of intoxicating liquors and to report whether any and what amendments should be made to the Licensing Act, 1911.

From that report emanated the Bill that is before the House tonight. The Bill is for "An Act to revise, consolidate, and amend the Law relating to the Sale, Supply, and Consumption of Liquor and the Services to be rendered in conjunction with the Sale and Supply of Liquor and for incidental and other purposes." In the Bill there are 135 pages, 177 clauses, and four schedules.

I would like to commend the committee for the report. It is a basis upon which Parliament can further the inquiries into the liquor situation in Western Australia. While I am not totally in agreement with everything in the report, I feel that in the main it will serve as quite a valuable document in deciding what is to be put on the Statute book.

I will not go along with the honourable member who stated that this committee did not have diversified terms of reference. I think the committee's job was to inquire into the liquor laws and then to present the result of its findings to Parliament so that we could discuss the matter and come up with something which we felt would be acceptable, just, and right for the people in the community.

Sir David Brand: That is right.

Mr. MAY: It must have been a very difficult assignment because of the controversial nature of the inquiry. It is quite obvious that these three people had a very big job to do and they enabled everybody who wished to present matters to the inquiry to come forward. One speaker this evening mentioned the fact the the committee was restricted because certain people were not able to come along and put up their cases, but that is not right. It was quite open to any member of the public to go along and give his views on this piece of legislation.

I think there are quite a number of issues of a contentious nature which will be discussed in Committee. I am not going to deal with those this evening because I consider the Committee stage is the time for those to be debated. I am speaking on the second reading because of the limited time available to us in the Committee stage.

I agree with the member for Balcatta in his view that the limiting and restricting of hours only encourages demand. I have not been able to find from my inquiries that an extension of hours has caused a great increase in the consumption of liquor. Another member mentioned that he had heard views expressed by people who had been overseas.

I had the honour recently to represent this Parliament overseas. I was away for approximately three months and visited 10 or 11 countries. I can quite honestly say that in the main the overseas countries are very well presented as far as their liquor laws are concerned in comparison with the laws applying in Western Australia. There are places overseas where the liquor laws are not to the best advantage but those places are outweighed by the other countries where they are put to the best advantage. In some places one can go down the street and sit down and have a cup of tea, sandwiches, a glass of beer, a Scotch, or anything like that.

There are children around; nobody appears to be intoxicated. I think that is the way the laws should be.

I have had quite a bit of experience in regard to liquor. I was born and bred in Collie, where the consumption of liquor would be quite considerable. At that particular time all the hotels had bat doors: one walked past and wondered what was going on inside, and all of a sudden somebody would come out and finish up in the gutter and have to be taken home.

Since that time we have realised that the liquor laws in this State should be amended in an enlightened manner so that everybody can see what is going on. I think this has eventuated to a great extent since World War II. When I enlisted in the Army I was 18 years of age and one was entitled to drink at 18 years of age if one was in uniform. One could walk into a hotel and have liquor and there was no restriction on anybody in uniform. I can honestly say I did not like beer when I was 18 years of age, and I was 20 before I had beer or liquor to any great extent. I used to go into a hotel with other soldiers and have a port and lemon. That was the extent of my drinking ability at that time.

I do not see any point in holding a referendum. Parliament is the place to decide this issue and I think we should be big enough to decide what is right, rather than go to the people on a referendum when we have all the facts. Every member in this Chamber has probably made inquiries into the Bill. It cannot be said we did not have time to look at it, even though it was only presented a matter of a week or 10 days ago. The report has been in our hands since December of last year, and surely those interested enough would have had time to look at this measure, make their inquiries, and form their views ready for the debate which is taking place in Parliament at the present time.

I do not want to labour the point or reiterate what has been said previously, but in New South Wales and Victoria 18-year-olds have been able to drink since 1905 and 1906; in the Australian Capital Territory they have been able to drink since 1929. Surely if it is bad or adverse for youths to drink at 18 years of age States such as Victoria and New South Wales would have been in a position to assess this since 1905 or 1906 and to amend their laws accordingly.

One member mentioned that because of the drinking age of 18 years in New South Wales and Victoria there had been an increase in sex offences. I feel sure I can say quite confidently that per head of the population Western Australia's sex offences are far in excess of those in the Eastern States, which obviously cannot be due to the drinking age being reduced to 18 years.

Mr. Jamieson: Suicides are higher, too.

Mr. MAY: It was mentioned in one of the newspapers a while ago that the present facilities are abused. That does not mean they should be restricted just because a few drinkers cannot behave themselves. This applies to the people whose ages range between 18 and 21 years. Surely the majority of the community should not be penalised because a few people are not able to conduct themselves in the best possible manner. Once again, I feel that this is occasioned by creating demand all the time. No matter what happens, every time one creates a demand obviously one will create a problem. That has happened in many ways in Western Australia, not only with liquor. Many of the things that are happening in Western Australia have been caused by a demand, and I do not have to tell members what that is all about.

I would like to speak briefly on the gallon licenses or store licenses proposed in this Bill. My own personal opinion is that gallon licenses over the years have provided a very good service to the community. I think the ambit of the gallon license must be increased. It is something we should look at very closely in the Committee stage because I feel that if ever there was a need for service to the public it is from the gallon license people.

If a person wishes to hold a party, he can go along to a gallon licensee and arrange for the beer—which is always very cold—and he can also arrange for cool drinks, sweets, etc. In fact, he can get almost anything at all from the one store, including jugs and good pouring services. In this day and age it is essential that we obtain good service, and we will patronise only those gallon licensees who give us good service.

I am particularly upset about the provision under which it will be necessary for gallon licensees to have a substantial business in groceries or precooked foods. I think this will cause a problem which I hope to ventilate when we reach the Committee stage. I feel we should do something to help the gallon licensees, and I consider it is time we had a good look at the problem.

The proposed trading hours for Sunday are not exactly what I would like to see, and I think it is wrong to allow trading between 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. This is a retrograde step and if the hotels are to open for those hours then they might as well open from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. without any restriction at all. We should give every consideration to our families in regard to this matter, and I think the trading hours should be more flexible as far as the domestic side of it is concerned; but I think it is a retrograde step to open hotels at 11 o'clock on a Sunday morning. I can find no reason put forward by the committee in favour of ex-

tended Sunday trading hours and I hope that in the Committee stage we will hear something about the reasons for it.

Some years ago I witnessed the effect of six o'clock closing in South Australia, and I became quite adamant in my view that six o'clock closing should never again be introduced in any State in Australia. At present no States have it, and I would hate to see it introduced. The situation is that when people finish work at five o'clock, the first place they go to is the local hotel. They do not go to a hotel near their homes; they go immediately to the hotel nearest to the place of their employment. Those men order beer and drink it quickly because of the limited time available and by the time they get home they do not feel like their evening meal. As a result domestic trouble emanates from six o'clock closing.

I feel that our present trading hours have gone a long way towards improving the situation as far as drinking is concerned. People now go home and eat their evening meal and are then able to take their wives and families out during the evening and fraternise with other people whilst drinking in a normal and reasonable manner.

I think the extension of beer gardens in Western Australia is a most sensible thing. I can remember the hue and cry that went up when a particular hotel north of the line started an estaminet shortly after the war. The windows were open and one could see men drinking and people thought this was a horrible thing. However, I notice this practice still goes on and I think it is part of our way of life. Surely to goodness we do not want to go backwards; we have to go forward.

Obviously we have not much faith in our youth because we will not allow the young people to drink at 18 years of age. We are quite prepared to send them to Vietnam, but we are not prepared to give them the opportunity to drink. We do not think they can conduct themselves in a worth-while manner and so we do not give them the opportunity to drink. I think we should have a good look at this matter.

At this stage I do not want to say very much more in regard to the Bill. One member mentioned the amount of money that people have to spend on liquor, and I think that is quite a good point. It is a valid point because, after all, people have only a certain amount of money available, and it is quite obvious that in the main the majority of people who indulge in drinking habits enjoy, and save their money for, their weekends. I do not think an extension of trading hours will cause any worry in this regard because people are well aware that they need their money for other purposes and that they have only so much to put away for drinking.

I think that is all I have to contribute to the second reading debate. When the Bill is in Committee, I shall speak to some of the amendments which have appeared on the notice paper. I think some of them are worth while and I am sure that others will come forward. I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. CASH (Mirrabooka) [10.26 p.m.]: Like some other members, I had intended not to enter this debate until the Committee stage, but I was encouraged to take part in the second reading debate by some statistics quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Firstly, I would like to congratulate the committee, as other members have done, on the particularly good job it did. The committee had a most difficult task set for it by the Government. I think that three people from various sections of the community would be able to bring down recommendations concerning some of the problems in the community far more effectively than would a group of three so-called experts in one field or another. I disagree with some of the recommendations but, in a general sense, I believe I will support most of them.

I have clearly indicated previously that I will oppose the recommendations regarding the reduction of the drinking age to 18, and I will also oppose any extension of Sunday trading hours.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in endeavouring to make his point and to minimise certain aspects of traffic problems, quoted figures from a symposium at the University of Western Australia in 1967. He said that statistics quoted at that symposium indicated that in only 1 per cent. of traffic accidents was alcohol a prime cause.

Mr. Graham: I did not say that. The police said it, and then the Government Statistician said it. All I did was to quote the figures.

Mr. CASH: I will accept that, if the honourable member quoted those figures. However, he quoted the same figures about 12 months ago, and I followed the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in that debate. When I made my speech I pointed out the invalidity of those statistics. Therefore, I thought the honourable member might have taken heed of more reliable statistics to use in this type of argument and not use those minimal percentage statistics in order to make a point in a debate of this nature.

The annual report of the National Safety Council for the same year as that of the report quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentions this point and states that routine statistics show that in only 1.5 per cent. of cases

can it be considered that alcohol is the prime cause. The report then goes on to say that if available supplementary statistical data is used, the figures clearly indicate that alcohol is the prime cause of accidents in excess of 40 per cent. of the cases.

The journal quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, *Symposium on Traffic Hazards and the Community*, contains a table headed "Survey of Blood Alcohol Tests—Road Death Victims—Perth, 1950-1965." Although the years are different, they still cover a 15-year period. The table shows that of a total of 1,266 road deaths in which blood alcohol tests were taken, there was no evidence of the presence of alcohol in the blood samples in 381 cases. However, Dr. Pearson clearly indicated that in 885 cases of those road death victims alcohol was present in the blood samples.

At the same symposium Dr. Golledge in his address pointed out that three groups of people make up the bulk of our seriously injured. I would like to mention one of those groups and to quote the words of Dr. Golledge in his address at the symposium.

He said, in regard to the drunken driver and the drunken pedestrian, that 50 per cent. of the accident victims studied at postmortem had a significant amount of alcohol in their blood. Dr. Golledge went on to say that a Canberra survey made on similar lines indicated that, of 10 out of 16 fatal accidents alcohol was the prime cause. The Australian Medical Association in its policy statement on road safety has constantly stressed, year after year, that alcohol is an important factor in the causation of traffic accidents. Later, in 1969, the Australian Road Safety Council, in its magazine, *Report*, which is distributed to some, if not all, members of this House, pointed out that world statistics on the involvement of alcohol in traffic accidents are indisputable. There is also evidence which clearly indicates that thousands of people will be killed and hundreds of thousands of people will be injured in road accidents in the next 10 years, and it is considered that the prime cause of such accidents will be alcohol.

Each year, in the United States alone, 25,000 deaths and over 800,000 injuries as a result of accidents are directly attributable to the use of alcohol by the victims. These facts are beyond dispute, and so I find it hard to understand the attitude of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in failing to obtain accurate statistics on the involvement of alcohol in traffic accidents. I also wonder why he deplored the efforts of public spirited groups in the community who have made many approaches to members of Parliament to indicate their attitude towards this legislation. He referred to them as a noisy

narrow-minded minority. It is very unfair to adopt such an attitude towards these groups because, although they are in the minority, they are entitled to their views, and I do not think the efforts they have made in regard to this legislation should be decried in this manner.

These groups, and others, made representations and submissions to the committee. Many organisations were involved, and I think their views should be placed on record. Those organisations which were in favour of the retention of the drinking age at 21 years were as follows:—

Seventh Day Adventist Church.
Methodist Church.
Baptist Church.
Western Australian Temperance Alliance.
Western Australian Temperance League.
Associated Youth Committee.
Rev. H. White and Mrs. Martin.
Women's Service Guild.
Dr. Gerald Milner.
Dr. John de Laeter.
Women's Christian Temperance Union.

All of those organisations and individuals mentioned believe that the drinking age should be left at 21 years. This indicates that many organisations want the age to remain at 21. A number of organisations want to reduce the age to 18, and those organisations are as follows:—

Guild of Undergraduates.
Swan Brewery.
Australian Hotels Association.
Seacrest Pty. Ltd.
W.A. Liquor Industry Consultative Council.
W.A. Barmen and Barmaids Union.
Young Liberal Movement.
W. A. Italian Club.

Another organisation, the Young Christian Workers, simply want the age reduced, and the Y.M.C.A. want it reduced to 20 years.

Those in the group opposed to the reduction of the drinking age and the extension of Sunday trading hours are sincere in the approach they have made to this problem and in the representations they have made to members of Parliament. I believe they are concerned about the many problems that are created in the community by an over-indulgence in alcohol, and they rely on this Parliament to make the decisions after having considered all aspects of the problem to ensure that they and their families are protected from the effects of it. This is the only aspect on which I wish to speak on the debate during the second reading and I intend to speak again in the Committee stage.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont) [10.35 p.m.]: I do not excuse anybody at any time for driving a vehicle whilst under the influence of liquor, but I certainly take to task anyone in this House who quotes statistics to indicate the effect an excessive consumption of alcohol by drivers of motor vehicles has on the accident rate. To obtain a true indication from statistics one would have to know how many people driving on the road at any one time had alcohol in their blood. If 90 per cent. of them did have alcohol in their blood at any time, and it was recorded that 90 per cent. of the accidents that occurred on any day had involved drivers who had consumed alcohol, that does not necessarily prove anything. It only reflects a situation that exists.

It is very dangerous for anyone, be he an expert on traffic matters, a representative of the National Safety Council, or a lay person, to quote statistics of accidents without having access to those which would be very difficult to obtain, to say the least. We can only give evidence on facts and figures which are known to us. Therefore, as I have stated, if on any one day persons involved in nine out of 10 accidents were found to have traces of alcohol in their blood, and also on that day 90 per cent. of the drivers of motor vehicles had alcohol in their blood, the percentage arrived at does not mean anything.

As you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, I have often cited instances of people who have been charged with drunken driving even whilst in vehicles that have been stationary. One as you are well aware, Sir, occurred many years ago. The man concerned drove his car from a hotel in Guildford and was waiting for some flashing lights to stop, when two men on a motor-cycle, who had left the same hotel, rode underneath his stationary van. After submitting the driver of the van to a test, the police charged him with drunken driving. He was drunk, according to the test the police made, and he was charged with manslaughter; but subsequently, as a result of your good offices, Mr. Speaker, this charge was lifted.

However, statistically, he was recorded as being a drunken driver. He had nothing to do with the accident, but he was on the road and in charge of a vehicle. All these facts amount to statistics if one wants to refer to them, but they become dangerous if one uses them to support a case that is advanced. Therefore, in such circumstances, one should use sensible statistics and deal with what the community requires; ascertain what group requires certain things, and what group does not require them.

It is stated that certain vocal groups are opposed to any extension of liquor trading. We well know that there are groups that are opposed to all sorts of things, and pressure groups are synonymous with parliamentary publicity. Every

time we move on a social question, whether it be abortion, liquor, or anything else, we have vocal groups and other people who want to poke a pin into members of Parliament and acquaint them of the fact that unless they support their desires they will not get their votes at the next election.

Nevertheless, such groups have their rights, but the community must realise that in the ultimate the representatives of the various electorates have to make a decision on legislation that comes before this Chamber. It comes down to the point of what people are approached in the community when these questions are placed before them. The member for Mirrabooka placed much stress on the fact that certain representations had been made to certain members of Parliament. I think the member for Stirling also pointed out that various petitions have been presented to members. I intend to read one which I have refused to present to the House. I accepted it in view of the good faith in which it was presented to me, but I ask members, in all fairness, whether it is fair and reasonable that people should be asked to sign such a petition. This petition reads as follows:—

PETITION TO PARLIAMENT

The member for Belmont—Mr. C. J. Jamieson.

We, the undersigned, wish to petition the Parliament of Western Australia to grant a referendum on the major issue of the Liquor Inquiry report.

Then follows pages and pages of signatures.

I happened to know the religious affiliation of the person concerned and when he brought this petition to me I said, "This major issue would not be Sunday trading so far as you are concerned." To this he replied, "No." I knew very well that Sunday was not his Sabbath. How could one guess what the objective was? How could one tell the questions that were asked the signatories and how the petition was presented to them?

Nobody would know what the set-up was or what the people concerned were asked unless one approached each person whose name was on the list. If people desire to indulge in an activity such as this, it is in their own interest to seek advice in the matter and find out the right way to go about it.

Ultimately I discovered that the Seventh Day Adventists had sponsored the questions contained in the petition and they were most concerned about the lowering of the age to 18 years. This, however, was certainly not clear from the petition. Accordingly we should not be influenced by such petitions unless the people concerned first find out the purpose of the petition before signing it. This particular one referred to the major issue of liquor reform.

There are dozens of major issues and I would not like to hazard a guess as to the one to which reference was intended.

Some members feel that the committee of inquiry has done a reasonably good job while others feel it did not do quite such a good job. I think the committee of inquiry did a reasonably good job, though in my opinion a number of the recommendations of the committee were taken from the results of recent inquiries in Victoria and Queensland and it incorporated these changes and amendments in its determinations.

We must, however, bear in mind the fact that this is essentially a social reform, and I criticise the Government for appointing a committee without first ascertaining and having regard for the religious persuasions of the members of the committee and the possibility that they could line up in a particular manner. We all know that there are all sorts of prejudices—religious and others—associated with social reform and the Government is therefore deserving of censure for its action in this regard.

I feel that the Government should first have ascertained the religious calling of the three people who were appointed to the committee. I certainly did not know to which faith they belonged until, after the appointment, I saw banner headlines in the Press claiming that they were all good Catholic members and that they were all social drinkers which, no doubt, would be likely to flavour their report.

I might point out that, for my part, I liked the report submitted by the committee because it follows my line of thinking. I do think, however, that when social reform is being considered we should give some thought to the members whom we think should comprise the committee before they are appointed.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn made the point that he looked in vain for one suggestion of criticism by, or for a lack of agreement among, the members of the committee in regard to the recommendations put forward. This means that they were unanimous in their thinking when, as a committee, they considered these matters, and came up with their report. They were no doubt unanimous because they all followed a particular line of thought. In the case of most other committees it does not matter a tinker's curse who the members are—whether they are Calathumpians or anything else—but the matter is quite different when we appoint a committee to deal with a question of social reform such as this. It is possible for the Seventh Day Adventists and others to say that they did not get much of a go from the Parliament of Western Australia when a committee such as this was appointed.

Mr. Court: The Government did not give any thought to the religious callings of the people concerned.

Mr. JAMIESON: I would accept this, because I took the matter up with a member of the particular faith in the Cabinet and he said, "You are probably right in what you say. We did not give it any thought." I feel the committee could have been more critical in certain aspects of its report. On the other hand I must say that the committee has done quite a good job in gathering all the information it has. Its report is a fairly good one.

I would now like to refer to some of the provisions in the Bill with which I am not too happy, particularly now that the legislation has been consolidated. The first provision to which I would like to refer is that dealing with small sporting clubs. We all have these in our electorates; even the member for Stirling who—if I judge his attitude this evening aright—would not give these people a chance to exist in the present circumstances. We all have such clubs, whether they be hockey clubs, golf clubs, or football clubs. Each of us knows what has been going on in these clubs. Since time immemorial socials have been held for some cause or the other for which a keg has possibly been bought. Not being very affluent these clubs generally ask members to subscribe towards the purchase of the keg. By doing this they break the law.

In an effort to overcome this problem the committee makes a report and the Government includes the provision requiring permits for unlicensed premises; particularly a function permit. I have no criticism of a permit for unlicensed premises. These are provided for a body of persons who associate for a political, social, literary, sporting, or other lawful purpose.

To establish such a purpose it would be necessary to have a private building, because of the necessity to have a permit to cover the building. Not too many of these organisations have such a building and, as a result, it is necessary for them to cover themselves in law by taking out a function permit. Strangely enough the proposed fee for a function permit is the same as that for an unlicensed club permit.

If there were two or three players' teas or other functions held during the year—possibly also a barbecue—members will appreciate that at \$5 a time the account would be fairly high. The alternative is to break the law and not register.

Would it not be better to have a nominal charge of, say, 50c for these functions in order that the necessary registration can be carried out? The police know that this sort of thing is going on and it would be far better to charge a nominal fee rather than have these clubs break the law. The whole position is quite ludicrous.

Mr. Lewis: It will be \$5 a year.

Mr. JAMIESON: Not at all; it is \$5 a permit.

Mr. Lewis: See clause 42.

Mr. JAMIESON: Clause 42 would be all right if the club had its own premises and obtained a license covering itself for the full year. But in the case of a football club which might be using the premises belonging to the local authority it is necessary for the club to obtain a fresh permit for each function it holds—whether it be a players' tea, a function associated with the drawing of a raffle, or some other function on a Sunday morning—because the club does not own its own premises, which would enable it to obtain the permit mentioned in that clause.

Each time an association or organisation does that it has to pay a fee of \$5. An R.S.L. club which has its own hall could possibly obtain an annual permit for a fee of \$5; but if it does not own the hall it will not be able to obtain such a permit. It will be required to obtain a function permit. If a function is held and 20 members attend, the cost of hiring the hall as well as the cost of, say, a five-gallon keg will have to be met by the members; over and above that they will have to pay the fee of \$5.

Mr. Lewis: In that event the members are not laying out any money on a clubhouse.

Mr. JAMIESON: They are laying out money in paying this fee to the Government.

Mr. Lewis: As far as the individual member is concerned he is no worse off. If the organisation does not have its own clubhouse the members are not paying for it. It is much cheaper to hire a hall.

Mr. JAMIESON: That has very little to do with the question. An organisation may have to hire the facilities at a cost of \$2 or \$3, but on top of that it has to pay a fee of \$5 for a permit; that is, if the organisation wishes to remain within the law. The same applies to functions such as barbecues. Not long ago the Parliamentary Labor Party held a barbecue at the home of one of its members. Naturally we all contributed towards the expenses. If the people conducting such a function wish to remain within the law they are obliged to pay a fee of \$5. That seems to be ridiculous. I would point out that many of these functions are held in the metropolitan area in the summer months.

Mr. Mitchell: This permit remains in force until May or June.

Mr. JAMIESON: The honourable member is referring to the wrong clause. The function permit is covered by clause 43. Such a permit has to be applied for on each and every occasion. I have no objection to the fee being imposed on the issue of a function permit to cover a ball or some such large function. In these instances all the expenses are covered by the high charges of admission. However, in the case of small organisations this fee imposes a loading which those who are least able to afford it must pay.

The necessity to obtain function permits on each and every occasion is a discouragement to those who are associated with sporting bodies. I have been closely associated with such bodies for many years, and I know that they do not make any profit on the refreshments that are provided, for the simple reason they are required to sell the liquor at approximately the same prices as the licensed clubs charge; but they have to obtain the liquor from the hotels in bulk at retail prices. This is far more expensive than buying the liquor from the breweries, as licensed clubs and hotels are able to do. There is no margin of profit in the sale of liquor at these functions, but it seems to be a necessity in this sophisticated age for liquor to be made available if the functions are to be a success.

This is all part and parcel of the problem which we face. If those responsible for conducting these functions do not obey the law, and a complaint is made, then the hard-working secretary, the president, or some other responsible officer is hit to leg, because he has broken the law. On this occasion, when the legislation is to be changed, we should afford protection in instances such as that. It is more desirable that people should be allowed to drink in an organised way at functions conducted by sporting bodies, than that they should be required to rush around to obtain a few bottles of beer to be drunk in the bush. This is a matter to which the Government must give attention.

While the other features of this legislation might be a matter of individual choice, the imposition of the fee of \$5 for a function permit must be the responsibility of the Government. This aspect must be examined closely. I suggest that a nominal fee be charged for those permits, so that the people taking part in the functions will not be hit to leg. I refer to functions conducted by hockey clubs, football clubs, cricket clubs, and the like. They should not be called upon to pay this fee every time they hold a players' tea.

Mr. Lewis: They could obtain a caterer's permit.

Mr. JAMIESON: They cannot, because only certain people are able to obtain caterers' permits. The provision in clause 43 is the only one which covers these organisations; and it will compel them to conduct the functions without the coverage of permits if something is not done to amend the provision. I do not know why the Government desires to collect this fee from these organisations; because it is already collecting a duty of 5½ per cent. from the outlet sales. Surely a nominal fee should be charged to ensure that these functions are conducted within the law.

Not only do the sporting clubs face this problem, but they also have to obtain permits from the local authorities concerned;

and this provision is to be rewritten into the legislation. Then they have to obtain permits from the licensing authority. If they are forced into the position where it costs them \$5 each time they apply for a function permit they will not take out a permit. If that eventuates some people might suffer as a consequence. It should not be the aim of this Parliament to make the legislation work in that way.

I now refer to the proposed store license, now known as the gallon license. It seems to me that the thinking of the members of the committee of inquiry has gone astray in this respect. In the main the committee has retained the hours of trading from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. for hotels. Whilst I am on this subject let me refer to all the undesirable things that were predicted would emerge when the former member for Stirling introduced a Bill to amend this part of the legislation. In fact, they did not occur, and everything went along fairly smoothly.

One member has said that people have only a limited amount of money to spend, and whether they spend it over 10 hours or 12 hours of the day is a matter of their own choice, and as a consequence we have not had much trouble with gallon licenses. The recommendation of the committee of inquiry, which the Government has embodied in the legislation before us to restrict the store licenses—or the existing gallon licenses—to the hours of trading mentioned is ridiculous.

These hours would suit some big grocery stores which have gallon licenses. I refer to a store such as Tom the Cheap Grocer, which has a number of such licenses. The main trade of those stores is in the sale of groceries and foodstuffs, and they adopt the normal hours of trading. However, these hours will certainly not suit those gallon licensees who in the summer months cater for parties in the metropolitan and country areas. The committee goes further; it says that they can obtain late trading permits if they can deliver liquor that is ordered before 6 p.m. Unless a monitor is affixed to the telephone how will this part of the law be policed? The position is ridiculous. If we pass these laws we should pass them in such a form that they can be policed; and they cannot be policed if there is no cover.

Some of us are aware that certain outlets for the sale of liquor for virtually 24 hours of the day exist. This trade is quite legal and it will grow. I happen to have a telephone number which is a combination of the figures of the telephone number of such an outlet, and I have received telephone calls which were intended for this outlet. On two or three occasions I have jumped out of bed at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. to answer the telephone, and I heard music and voices at the other end. The caller asked whether I could supply a keg, but I told him that I could not and that he had the wrong number.

That organisation has been functioning and it will continue to function, because we do not have State legislation to cover the situation. A similar outlet will be established on the southern side of the metropolitan area very shortly and will come into operation. If the hours of trading are limited the people who have that particular franchise will have a birthday party, because they will get a bigger corner of the trade and will expand while the others suffer. Those people do a good job and provide a service which cannot be supplied by the hotels.

I presented a petition respecting a licensee in the Carlisle area and he tells me that the publican at the Carlisle Hotel repeatedly sends customers to him for supplies of bulk liquor. The hotel does not have the facilities to carry all the extras that go with the supply of bulk liquor, and the publican does not have time to handle those extras while conducting a general publican's business. The gallon licensee provides all sorts of pulling equipment, as the member for Clontarf has already said. He provides glasses, party lights, and a whole lot of extras which are associated with the normal activity of social life in Western Australia as we know it.

I see no reason why this system should be interfered with. If I could see any real reason for extending the hours beyond those operating at present I would have placed amendments on the notice paper. However, suffice it to say that if the publicans who are operating under the general license are to retain their present hours, I think those people who are definitely providing a service to the community should be allowed to trade during the same hours. The other businesses which are trading over the telephone after hours should be frowned upon and the police should not be placed in the position of trying to catch them in the act of breaching the law.

Referring to Sunday trading, a lot has been said about this provision. To those who are objecting, I would say it is too late to protest about Sunday trading. When clubs were allowed to trade on Sundays some years ago, during two two-hourly sessions, that was the beginning of Sunday trading. If anybody is worried about the effect on attendances at churches, surely that effect has already been felt. Most clubs open from 10.30 a.m. until 12.30 p.m. when a lot of churches hold their services.

A large number of people living in the metropolitan area have joined clubs, which is virtually taking out a license to drink on Sundays. Possibly half of the members of the bowling clubs around the metropolitan area are not playing members. They pay their fees and having paid them they seem to think they have reason to spend as much time as possible in the club. It will be noticed that on a rainy day a hotel is not too well patronised, but on the wettest Sunday the bowling clubs are usually packed.

Many people who join bowling clubs do not find it easy to come by the fee, but, having joined, they feel they want to get their money's worth. I think they are encouraged more by that system than if they were allowed facilities for drinking. Most of those members originally had thoughts, by joining a bowling club, only of taking out a permit to drink on a Sunday during the summer months. Of course, the habit continues into the winter months.

If the hotels remained open on Sundays I think the trade would level out. The publicans might sell a little more, and the clubs might sell a little less. I suggest that once the legislation was introduced to permit clubs to open on Sundays then Sunday trading was determined. The opening of hotels is another variation of this aspect.

Referring now to the conditions affecting the employees, anyone who has had experience with rosters will know that a normal 40-hour week covers five days. It is not easy to organise a roster and keep the staff reasonably satisfied, and this applies, particularly, in the transport industry. However, many employees in that industry are satisfied because they work for five days and then get two days off. The two days off vary so that the employees receive the extra margins which apply to weekend work. Anybody who is associated with the M.T.T. drivers will know that the drivers have no objection to working the roster system. If the union has any worry it has only to make sure it gets a reasonable equity for its members when conditions change.

If the hours of trading do change and an employee is able to earn as much for working a few hours on Sunday as he would normally earn for working longer hours on Saturday, it will be found that there will be a rush for the positions. The employees will not be averse to working on Sundays and being able to take time off at a later stage. An objection could be raised on religious grounds. However, I do not know too many people who work in hotels who are very religious; some may be.

Employees in hotels are unable to participate in, or be spectators at, sporting fixtures on Saturdays. They are prevented from doing so by the very nature of their employment. If this proposed legislation is passed they will at least get an occasional chance, because they will probably be rostered for weekend work.

Before somebody reminds me, I would like to state that my attitude on this occasion is somewhat different from my attitude to the amendments to the Factories and Shops Act which we discussed recently. My attitude to the services associated with food, drink, and accommodation is that they should be available, in the main and, if possible, for 24 hours a day. Of course, there is no chance of associating those hours with licensing, so I may as well forget that aspect. However, there is no restriction on anyone who

is running a coffee shop or an eating house which would prevent him from remaining open 24 hours a day. There is no restriction on anybody who has a lodging house which would stop him from remaining open for 24 hours a day. These are fundamental requirements. One eats, drinks, and rests whether it is a Sunday or any other day during the week.

It is not necessary to buy a motorcar on a Sunday or even on a Saturday. Equally, it is not necessary to engage in many other activities on those two days in the week. However, one still continues to eat, drink, and rest. Consequently, if the facilities in question are available they serve a necessary service to the public who should be properly accommodated.

I hope the Premier will not continue with the Committee stage of the Bill immediately after the second reading has been finished. I hope that all those who wish to speak to the second reading will do so this evening and, to that end, I will not say much more. If the Committee stage is delayed, it will give us a chance to reflect on the various opinions that have been expressed. Members have indicated that it looks as though it will be a long day's night in Committee. This type of measure is usually dealt with best as the specific items are called. One can generalise and give one's opinion at the second reading stage, but that is all.

Other than saying I favour some relaxation in the liquor laws which apply at the present time, I would not like to say that I agree to everything that is proposed in the legislation. I certainly agree with the second reading and I think every member who has spoken has agreed on that. Whether our ideas will be in concert in Committee is a different matter. Only time will tell whether a majority will be able to carry various amendments of which notice has been given or whether the Bill will stand as it is printed.

I suggest that we should be very liberal in our thoughts on the Liquor Bill. We should not be unduly influenced on religious grounds or because of other prejudices which have been voiced. Certainly these things are inclined to crowd one's mind and everybody is entitled to his own opinion. Nobody would be forcing anybody else to do something he did not want to do under the provisions of this measure. The main testing feature of social legislation is whether it interferes with anybody else's rights.

The only possible way in which it might be said that the legislation would interfere with somebody's rights is that it would allow some person to become inebriated and cause discomfort to someone else at times when he is not now able to do this. In any event, that kind of thing is quite contrary to the law and other legislative provisions would deal adequately with people in such circumstances. That is a

matter for the Police Force which would be able to cope very well with the situation.

Under the circumstances, I support the second reading of the Bill and I hope that the bulk of it will become the law of the land so far as liquor trading is concerned. In this way we would at least have a reasonably up-to-date Act.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [11.13 p.m.]: I wish to bring forward a point in this debate which has not been deliberately sidestepped but it does not appear to have concerned those who have spoken up to date. We have listened to a number of members who have suggested that the time has arrived for what could be termed a liberal approach to a social problem. They have also suggested that because certain things are happening in other countries they should happen here.

I know the suggestions which I shall make may be challenged by some, but I think it is important for me to make them. Thoughts have been centred around a section of the community which feels that there should be some liberalisation of liquor laws because of the restrictions which exist today. Not very much has been said about the likely effects of such liberalisation. I shall mention them briefly, because I think they are an important part of the discussion on a social problem. Social problems do not immediately affect all sections of the community; almost certainly they will eventually affect all sections of the community.

I remember when a child was drowned last year in a pool in a house in one of the suburbs. There was an immediate outcry in the Press and many letters were written to the editor. All those who expressed a point of view were very critical that there were no laws, under the Local Government Act, to regulate the construction of backyard pools. The outcry was such that pressure was brought to bear on the Minister for Local Government to introduce legislation to ensure that this kind of situation did not occur again. As I have said, this was brought about because one child drowned in a pool.

We have seen the same circumstances time and time again when problems exist concerning the safety of people. I do not oppose this in any shape or form, because I think it is quite right. Building regulations and many other laws are designed to look after the interests of the individual.

Not one speaker tonight has mentioned the likely effects of liberalisation of the drinking laws on the boys and girls—the teenagers—as well as the adults of our community.

A child is knocked down by a car and it is found that the driver had an excess of alcohol in his blood at the time. This

is accepted. I think everybody admits to-day that it is accepted. We hear criticism about the police not doing their job and not finding out who is driving under the influence of alcohol. I should like to refer to a comment which appeared in this evening's *Daily News*. I hope you will permit me to refer to this, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. Toms).

Mr. Jamieson: He is very tolerant.

Mr. NALDER: It says—

The driver of a double-decker bus had a blood alcohol percentage of .18 when it crashed into a train and killed 16 people on April 12, the coroner's court was told today.

Mr. Jamieson: He also did not have a license to have the bus out, amongst other things.

Mr. NALDER: That is all the more reason—

Mr. Jamieson: He should not even have had the bus out.

Mr. NALDER: He was driving a bus with passengers in it. It illustrates the point I am making. I should also like to refer to an article which appeared in *The Advertiser* on the 24th February, 1970. It is headed, "Teenage drinking worse." The article says—

Parents should be more concerned with their teenage children's drinking habits . . . S.M. said yesterday.

It went on to say—

Monday mornings are becoming a drunks' parade in this juvenile court, he said.

He made these remarks when he was hearing the case of two 15-year-olds who had come before him for drunkenness.

Mr. Jamieson: Did the Minister follow up what happened to that magistrate a few days later?

Mr. NALDER: I am quoting only what I read in the newspaper.

Mr. Jamieson: I just wondered. It is worth watching.

Mr. NALDER: I was travelling through Adelaide at the time and I happened to see this.

Mr. Jamieson: He was castigated by the Minister for his comments.

Mr. NALDER: The honourable member quotes items which he reads in the Press.

Mr. Jamieson: Fair enough.

Mr. NALDER: I do not remember seeing anything to the contrary. The point I am making is that, although some people are critical, today we seem to accept the damage which is caused through alcohol. There is no doubt about this.

In *The Sunday Times* a few months ago a retired officer of the Police Force expressed his views on the situation. Some would agree; some would not agree. These

matters are being highlighted time and time again—the effect of home, and family, and so on. Some members have mentioned them.

We are drifting along into a situation, and I, in this place tonight, feel it is my responsibility to say that we cannot allow the drift to continue and do nothing about it. In my view, we have a responsibility to this generation and to the generations of the future, at least to highlight the situation into which we find society drifting today.

I am not opposed to drinking in the sense that if a person wants to have a drink, that is his or her business; but I do feel that if we are going to liberalise the law and make it easier for young people to obtain alcohol, we should be prepared to accept some of the responsibility that goes with it.

I intend to make a contribution to the debate in the Committee stage, but I do want to make this point. Many members have already indicated their views about youth and the extension of Sunday trading. When this matter came up recently I took the opportunity to question some young people about their views. I met them in various places and asked questions to find out what they thought about it. A percentage of these young people were university students. I was surprised that of 30 to 40 young people whom I questioned there was not one—not one—who was prepared to suggest that he wanted the opportunity to drink at 18. This may have been a strange coincidence, but it was surprising to me that I did not find one young person who really wanted it.

Mr. Graham: Nobody is going to compel them to drink.

Mr. NALDER: No; but I am making a point. As a matter of fact, now that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has interjected, I wanted to mention a point that he was making—and appeared to make satisfactorily—when he started the debate this afternoon, in regard to the "noisy minority." I recall the honourable member on a number of occasions over the years getting up in this House and saying it was necessary for somebody to take the side of the minority because he felt it was important that its point of view should be expressed. Yet tonight he is suggesting that a noisy minority has been trying to influence members in their way of thinking. I think the debate tonight indicates that the majority of members—

Mr. Graham: The Minister does not do himself justice. I said they are perfectly entitled to make their representations to us. I made that clear twice.

Mr. NALDER: That is right, but I wanted to make the point that on this matter the honourable member has a different point of view. He has said on a

number of occasions that he felt the minority should have representation and that he was speaking on its behalf.

Mr. Graham: I agree. I still agree.

Mr. NALDER: I suggest that on this occasion it is a different viewpoint, because many people have approached me, and I must say that never in my experience in this House have I had so many letters from people—not from my own electorate; as a matter of fact I was surprised that I did not get more from my own electorate, but I got them from all over the State—and without exception they strongly urged me to vote against the two matters I have mentioned. However, I wanted to make that one point, because I believe Parliament must accept the responsibility for something which will not only influence the position as we see it today will but have a lasting influence on many people in the days to come.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [11.25 p.m.]: The Deputy Leader of the Government spoke about alcohol posing social problems. Surely he must have been referring to the excessive consumption of alcohol and not to the enlightened consumption of that commodity.

Mr. Nalder: I said everyone was allowed to do what he pleased. I said that.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Surely he must have been referring to the excessive consumption of alcohol and not to the enlightened consumption of that commodity. The social legislation in any community has always appeared to be a little less sophisticated than that which the majority of the community has possibly desired. I think this situation exists in the matter of the licensing laws of this State of Western Australia in the year 1970.

The committee formed by the Government, as has been said this evening, made a genuine attempt to bring before this Parliament a document worthy of the consideration that has obviously been given to it. It is an attempt to enable us to bring foresight and our past experience to bear in the hope that what emanates from this Parliament will be an enlightened piece of legislation.

Before I deal with what I consider to be some of the main provisions of the Bill, I would like to make one criticism of the Government in bringing this Bill forward. It has been said that the Government was prepared to set up the committee, to give it wide terms of reference and to allow it unfettered opportunity to gather evidence, and that the Government was prepared to embody the recommendations of the committee in the legislation before us. This may be so, but the legislation also contains provisions to which the committee gave no attention whatsoever. I refer to a provision in the Bill about which I have not heard anything—the provision to

repeal the Innkeepers Act of this State. There is some reference to it in the memorandum.

This matter was before Parliament during the last session. I can recall placing before the Committee proposed amendments to retain the basic provisions of the Innkeepers Act in keeping with the principle of that Act, at the same time affording a reasonable form of protection to innkeepers. The Minister in charge of the Bill to repeal the Innkeepers Act on that occasion assured me that the Government would give some consideration to those amendments, because they were not considered by Parliament.

We find an obscure clause in this Bill attempting to repeal the Innkeepers Act, but apparently no consideration was given to the amendments placed before Parliament last year. I refer to the amendments I drafted, largely based on the Innkeepers Act, 1968, of New South Wales, which the New South Wales Parliament saw fit to enact in 1968. I intend to say something further on that matter when the appropriate occasion arises.

That part of the legislation which is based on the committee's recommendations contains certain new concepts, and it is refreshing to see something new in the licensing laws of Western Australia.

I refer to the concept of tavern licenses, cabaret licenses, and theatre licenses. As a goldfields member I would say that subject to, and with a reservation in respect of those three concepts, there is little new in the legislation that is not already enjoyed, and has been enjoyed for some years, by the citizens of the goldfields. Therefore, when I am called upon to exercise my vote on this occasion I have to consider, without being parochial—and heaven forbid that I am, or will be on this occasion—whether much good can accrue to the people I represent as the result of the passage of this Bill into law.

I hasten to indicate to the Assembly that I intend to support this measure and I intend to support it on the broad in principle. Certain amendments have been forecast, some of which are in conflict with others, and all of which are in conflict with the provisions of the Bill. I refer to those amendments dealing mainly with Sunday trading, and I am somewhat fearful that if, first of all, the provisions in the Bill remain intact the goldfields will lose a half hour of Sunday trading in the afternoon period; and if some of the other amendments that are forecast are carried, we will be deprived of one hour of the time that is now available to the citizens of the goldfields to enjoy a social drink on a Sunday.

However, having said that and having taken the risk of playing with a double-tailed penny—because, with those two

concepts the goldfields cannot win—I am prepared to take the risk and support the legislation. I hasten to add that I do not intend to support any referendum. I feel we are elected to this Parliament to tackle any problem that comes before us. Provision for a referendum in the parliamentary system in Australia is provided under section 128 of the Federal Constitution, and that has no relation at all to State politics.

I feel that if we are to refer matters to a referendum then we are shirking our responsibilities as members of Parliament and I for one do not intend to be indicted on the charge of trying to shirk my responsibility. So I clearly indicate that I do not intend to support any referendum, whether based on the question of lowering the drinking age, or the extension or variation of Sunday trading hours in the country or in the metropolitan area.

Perhaps, having said that, I might explain my reason for presenting petitions earlier in this session from interested persons in my electorate calling upon the Government to introduce a referendum. I hasten to add that I have not been hypocritical in my approach—at least I hope not—but as the member for the district I was asked to express the views of those people. I gave an undertaking to present the petitions to this House, and that is what I did. I also assured those people that in no way would they be licensed to assume from my action in presenting the petitions that I was bound to follow the thoughts expressed by them.

I can well understand the fears of those persons who have not experienced reasonable drinking hours on a Sunday. As I said before, goldfields citizens have enjoyed reasonable hours of Sunday trading for some years now. We have had some years of licensed drinking facilities. It is only natural for one to fear the unfamiliar, and I am afraid that is the position of many of those who now express fear at the introduction of Sunday trading in the metropolitan area. As a member representing the goldfields, I cannot recall any great social harm that has been wrought to family life on the goldfields as a result of the facilities which have been available for some years.

I would like to comment briefly upon the provision to lower the legal age for the purchase and consumption of liquor on licensed premises from 21 to 18 years of age. I indicate that I also agree with this provision, but I would make this comment: I feel that the Government has been a little tardy. It has failed to get its priorities into proper order. For some years the Opposition has been advocating a recognition by the Parliament of Western Australia that young people today are more responsible than we were prepared

to admit some years ago. We have been advocating a general lowering of the legal age from 21 to 18; and yet the Government has been too timid to act and to make a general sweep in this regard in order to let young people know that they are recognised by the community as being more mature.

At least on this occasion we are prepared to admit that they are more mature socially. Only recently this Parliament passed a new Wills Act—the original Act was passed in 1837. In that Act it was originally provided that a will was invalid if it was made by a person under the age of 21. Only this year in Western Australia did we make provision that a person having attained the age of 18 years may make a valid will. We are now further emancipating the young people.

I feel we have our priorities wrong. A young person of 18 years today cannot vote and so it would be reasonable for him to assume that it is still more important for him to make a will than it is for him to exercise a vote, and that it is more important for him to be able to have a drink at 18 years. Let us do this in the proper way.

It is my impression that young people are more legally responsible today. As I said, this legislation contemplates that they are more mature socially. However, as other speakers have said, the emancipation of young people presents a challenge and I myself am prepared to accept that challenge.

I feel the legislation before us is worthy of acceptance in principle and I would hope that the net result is that after this measure passes through the Committee stage it will emerge as more sophisticated legislation and be more in keeping with the year 1970 and more comparable with the legislation of overseas countries—countries which are known to be more enlightened and more experienced than we are. Let us bear in mind that today marks the bi-centenary of Australia. Today Australia is 200 years old; a young country in an old world.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [11.40 p.m.]: The committee of inquiry appointed by the Government undertook a heavy task and, following its deliberations, presented a very comprehensive report. For this I think the members of the committee deserve our gratitude and commendation. Several members who spoke earlier in this debate dealt with the subject of the high alcoholic content of liquor in Western Australia. In my opinion it was a grave oversight that this committee was not charged with the responsibility of inquiring into the alcoholic content of liquor, and particularly the alcoholic content of beer.

Mr. Graham: I do not think the alcoholic content of liquor in this State is higher than that in the Eastern States.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: That is the reputation that we have in this State.

Mr. Graham: That applies to whisky, but I do not think it is so with beer.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Had the committee approached the liquor problem from this angle we may have had an entirely different measure before us now. As I have said, the reputed alcoholic content of the beer sold in this State is very high indeed, and this immediately suggests an opportunity to reduce the dangers that are attendant on the liquor problem. I certainly think that one of the matters that should have been inquired into by the committee is the high alcoholic content of beer in this State. If it were lowered by this means, if by no other, the excessive consumption of alcohol would be reduced.

I have always regretted that Parliament agreed to the extension of liquor trading hours to Sundays. I am surprised that the committee of inquiry, in seeking to prevent the nasty situation that arises as a result of the Sunday swill, recommended that the trading hours on Sundays should be extended instead of solving the problem by recommending that no liquor whatsoever should be sold on Sundays. In my opinion two wrongs do not make a right.

Many of the provisions in this measure provide facilities for people to obtain liquor during the week, and this should suffice. If opportunity is afforded to people to obtain their liquor supplies during the week it should not be necessary to extend trading hours on Sunday.

On the other important question in this Bill—the lowering of the drinking age—I say now that I am emphatically opposed to lowering the drinking age to 18. Today, with the age fixed at 21, there is no doubt that many young people under that age are obtaining liquor. Not a great deal of harm is done by young people aged 19 or 20, who look more mature, obtaining liquor at present, but to lower the drinking age to 18 would certainly present an opportunity to young people of 16 years of age, who could pass for 18, to obtain intoxicating liquor.

If we consider the age at which many pupils attend senior high schools these days, it would be very unwise to lower the drinking age to 18. We could find that many senior high school pupils were ducking down to the local inn in their lunch hour for a few snorts. The Education Department faces enough problems now without being presented with another one which, together with the other problems it already has, would prove too much for it.

Mr. Jamieson: You will have them putting in a wet canteen soon.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Not I, but it could well be, if some of the suggestions put forward here this evening were implemented. The amendments on the notice paper designed to reduce the drinking age to 20 could have some merit based on the argument that a lad of 20 years is eligible for national service. Therefore if the legal drinking age were reduced to 20 years such a provision would cater for that group.

Mr. Graham: If the Commonwealth decided that the eligible age for national service should be 16 or 17 would you consider that the drinking age should be reduced in accordance with those ages? Or, if it raised the age for national service to 35, would you accept that as being the drinking age?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Toms): Order! The honourable member will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I think it would be wise if I observed your ruling, Sir.

Mr. Graham: I just wanted to let you know that somebody was listening to you.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: One of the greatest curses in our community is the consumption of alcohol to excess. Many a good person, whether white or Aboriginal, has been degraded by consuming alcohol to excess. Therefore, it would be a retrograde step if we, on this occasion, agreed to the extension of trading hours on Sundays and the lowering of the drinking age, especially when some people seem to lose all sense of proportion when they drink alcohol to excess. Therefore, when the opportunity presents itself, I shall offer my opposition to lowering the drinking age to 18 years, and to the extension of trading hours on a Sunday. Apart from that, I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. YOUNG (Roe) [11.48 p.m.]: The hour is very late and the measure before us has been debated fairly thoroughly. At this stage I would like to indicate my support for the Bill. I do not agree entirely with all the provisions contained in it, but in the main I think the committee of inquiry has done a good job in sorting out some of the problems that have faced this State in regard to the distribution of liquor.

The two clauses which have brought forth the greatest comment this evening are those which deal with the lowering of the drinking age and the extension of trading hours on Sundays. It can be anticipated that these provisions will be dealt with fully in the Committee stage, and I therefore consider that anything I may say now would only be a reiteration of what has

been said by previous speakers, and would possibly only lead to repetition of what will be said in the Committee stage.

In his comments made earlier in the evening, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition more or less stated that if no restrictions were imposed on the sale of liquor in this State, in time the position may resolve itself. Such a position does pertain in some parts of the world, but I can see no chance of that happening in this State at present. Therefore, if we are to accept that we intend to continue with some restrictive measures, the object of the Bill is to clarify the provisions which relate to the sale of liquor and to make them as acceptable as possible to the public at large.

As the member for Kalgoorlie has said, we have three situations. Firstly, we have the metropolitan situation, then the South-West Land Division situation, and, thirdly, the goldfields situation appertaining to trading on Sundays. If at this time we are to amend the regulations let us strive for some degree of uniformity.

It has been stressed that Sunday trading within a 20-mile limit of the General Post Office has led to a stream of cars leaving the metropolitan area and heading for the nearest establishment outside the 20-mile limit. If we accept the period from 11 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. on Sundays, with the 11 o'clock opening and 1 p.m. closing in the near country areas, we will have the identical situation in reverse. Some of these establishments will be just inside and some just outside the areas in question and we will have a shuttle service between sessions. At this stage we must endeavour to ensure that some uniformity is brought into the matter of Sunday trading legislation so that we will in fact have people knowing that when they go to the local inn for Sunday refreshment it will not be much good their hopping into their cars and visiting the one further down the road, because that establishment will be closing at the same time as the one they have just attended.

I think the committee has done a fairly good job in most respects, though from the number of amendments on the notice paper it is obvious that several of the clauses will be subject to further scrutiny, and possibly amendment at a later stage.

Having indicated my support of the second reading of the Bill, I will leave any further remarks to the Committee stage.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [11.52 p.m.]: I shall endeavour to be brief in my reply, because, as has been emphasised both at the start and during the debate, this Bill mainly comes down to a consideration in detail of the many clauses in it together with some of its basic principles.

I would, however, like to express appreciation to those members who have spoken to the Bill, some in absolute support of it, and some with qualified support of it. This has helped, because as we go into Committee it will give an indication as to those who have rather strong views on various points.

The Committee debate will not be an easy one because of the contentious nature of some of the matters contained in the Bill. That is what we are here for, however, and the sooner we can settle down to a consideration of those matters the better.

I hope we will have all the amendments on the notice paper tomorrow because it will be an intolerable situation for the Committee—not for the Minister, but for the Committee—if we do not have all the amendments now, so that when we settle down to the Committee debate we will have a fairly clear perspective across the board of the thinking of members as reflected in their amendments.

It would be rather confusing to the whole Committee whilst we are on a particular clause relating to a contentious issue if someone comes up with a bright idea for an amendment. Accordingly I make the plea that if anyone has amendments, particularly in the early part of the Bill, he will make a special effort to get those amendments onto the notice paper.

There has, I think, been a fairly general commendation of the work of the committee. Its task was a thankless one but it set about it with expedition and, I think, it endeavoured to produce a simple, clearcut type of report. We do not get enough of this type of report.

It is obvious we do not agree with all of the report—and when I say “we” I mean the House as a whole. It has, however, given us a working base from which we can start. We should get it clear in our minds before we commence the Committee stage of the Bill that the committee of inquiry was never intended to report on the health questions of alcoholism.

This is an entirely different subject and it would have been quite unfair to expect the committee to comment on this aspect. Nor could we expect it to comment on the social problem relating to drinking in connection with natives.

There has also been a tendency in some quarters tonight to intrude into the debate criticism in respect of the committee's work, and to associate the effect of alcohol with traffic accidents. I would ask members to try to accept the fact that the committee was commissioned to bring forward a report to deal with the matters covered by this Bill. It is a Bill for an Act to revise, consolidate, and amend the

law relating to the sale, supply, and consumption of liquor and the service to be rendered, etc.

This is the basic thing the law is seeking to achieve and if we intrude some of these other measures which I believe are the responsibility of Parliament in other legislation, we only confuse the issue.

I am sorry the member for Belmont intruded the question of personalities and background—religious and otherwise—of the members of the committee; because I can assure him that this was never in the mind of the Government at all. In fact, I would hazard a guess that the question of the three members of the committee being of the one faith is quite wrong. If it is not, then all I can say is that one member has changed his mind in recent years.

That, however, is beside the point. The two gentlemen and a lady were accepted by the Government because they had what looked to be the diverse type of experiences required. One was a very eminent member of the legal profession, the other was very highly respected in the commercial fraternity; and the woman, we felt, could bring a fairly broad approach to the woman's angle so far as this very contentious matter was concerned.

When their names went forward I personally felt that it would be a well-balanced committee and quite acceptable. This has certainly been our experience.

The committee set about doing its job thoroughly and I have heard no real criticism of its handling of the proceedings. The only criticism I have heard was that on the TV tonight as it related to the giving of evidence. I did not consider that as real criticism and felt it was probably a misunderstanding when it was suggested that a group of people with common interests would present one case. It was claimed that as a result there were not as many people as there should have been giving the story of the opponents of liberalising the liquor laws.

In my mind that particular point of view, which is against any liberalisation of the liquor laws, has been amply represented and has certainly been very effective in getting in touch with members of Parliament. I can say without any hesitation that contrary to the experience of one of the members on the other side of the House the main approach to me has not been from the liquor trade but from the people opposed to any extension of the legislation.

I respect their views; they are entitled to have them. I do not take quite the attitude adopted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in respect of this matter. They did not irk me as apparently they did him. This does not mean to say that I accept their viewpoint, but at least I

do, together with all members of the House, give consideration to the viewpoint expressed by these people, because I know some of them feel very strongly indeed on the subject. I know that in my own family, my mother and father felt very strongly on these matters; nor is it a question of being one-eyed about these things. It is just that they believed in a certain way of life and they did their best to sell this to other people. Whether they sold their view intemperately is another matter. The fact is they felt strongly this way, and there are plenty of people who feel as they did.

We have to admit that on this question there is the usual division of opinion. After all, we expect that. We are just 51 very ordinary people from all walks of life, and I sincerely hope that we can settle down in the Committee stage to try to hammer out the legislation so that at least it represents progress in this very difficult question. I, for one, do not subscribe to the view that we should go all the way at the one time; and if we go a little slower than some people would like us to go it might not be a bad thing.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 12.1 a.m. (Thursday)

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 30th April, 1970

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

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

1. EDUCATION

Cannington Primary School

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Minister for Mines:

Further to my questions on the 7th and the 13th August, 1969, concerning the re-siting of the Cannington Primary School—

- (1) Does the Minister for Education still consider that the Parents and Citizens' Association is being fairly treated?
- (2) Did the agreement referred to in answer to my question (2) on the 7th August, 1969, fully protect all of the facilities both within the school and in the school grounds, as provided in the old school by the Parents and Citizens' Association?