The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This will be new clause 8 (c).

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 8 has already been agreed to. The Committee has agreed that clause 8 stand as printed. The honourable member is not in order in proposing to add a new provision to clause 8.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Recommit the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can move for a new clause, although it is a bit late. New clauses are acceptable after the clauses in the Bill have been dealt with.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will move it that way.

The CHAIRMAN: This will be proposed clause 9.

Point of Order

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The question was put to the Committee that clause 8 stand as printed, and the Committee divided. The proposed amendment, according to the copy I have, produced by the honourable member seeks to add a new subclause (c) to clause 8. I suggest the honourable member is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already told Mr. Thompson that such an amendment is out of order because we have already dealt with clause 8. But he can move it as clause 9 if he so desires. That is the ruling from the Chair.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: May I ask that proposed clause 9 be circulated to one or more members of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Thompson should give his amendment consideration, and bring it up on recommittal. According to the copy I have, it deals with the increase.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Could I put forward a new clause?

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member ties it up with clause 8, it will have to be included in part I of the third schedule. Therefore the honourable member would have to do it by recommittal.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If you, Sir, rule that way, I shall move that clause 8 be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can do that on the motion for the adoption of the report. The honourable member can do it today if he wishes, because the Bill has not been amended.

Committee Resumed

Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 5th November, 1959

CONTENTS

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT

Financial Details

1. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Treasurer:

   (1) Since the inception of war service land settlement in this State, what amount of money has been received from—

   (a) sale of crops;

   (b) sale of wool;

   (c) sale of other produce,

   grown on properties acquired or developed by the War Service Land Settlement Board before allotment, and on abandoned farms after abandonment?

   (2) As a result of such sales, what profit or loss was made?

   (3) If a profit was made, for what purposes was it used, or how was it disposed of?

(4) Is there any sum of money as at this date standing to the credit of the War Service Land Settlement Board at—
  (a) the Treasury;
  (b) any bank (and, if so, which bank);
  (c) elsewhere, and what are the amounts in each case?

(5) What is the total amount expended in this State since the inception of the scheme on the purchase and development of properties for settlers excluding structural improvements, plant loans, and stock loans?

(6) What are the respective amounts loaned or expended for—
  (a) structural improvements;
  (b) plant loans;
  (c) stock loans?

(7) Referring to—
  (6) (a) what repayments have been made under each heading;
  (6) (b) what interest has been paid by settlers on advances under each heading?

(8) How much interest has been paid to the Commonwealth?

(9) What interest, due to the Commonwealth, is unpaid?

(10) What is the total rent collected from settlers?

(11) Has the State yet paid its two-fifths share of any actual capital losses; and if so, when, and in what sums was it paid?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) (a) Commonwealth cropping £225,646
State cropping advance 298,524
(State) purchase of stock and plant account 8,637
£532,807

(b) (State) purchase of stock and plant account £377,080

(c) (State) purchase of stock and plant account:—

	£
Sales of stock	718,289
Sales of skins and hides	10,330
Sales of milk and cream	106,559
Sales of poultry and eggs	10,192
	845,370

(2) Commonwealth cropping —Loss £48,061
State cropping advance—Profit £64,567
(State) purchase of stock and plant account—Profit *£125,335
* After crediting sales of plant and tools, plant hire, agistment fees, and other sundries.

(3) State cropping advance—£64,567 appropriated to Consolidated Revenue Fund.
(State) purchase of stock and plant account—£120,000 appropriated to Consolidated Revenue Fund.

(4) At the 30th June, 1959, the credit balance of the Commonwealth advance account for war service land settlement at the Treasury was about £360,075. There was also a credit balance of £59,648 in the suspense account at the Treasury, representing settlers' proceeds to be remitted to the Commonwealth. In addition, there was a credit at the Rural and Industries Bank of £40,574.
There is no knowledge of any sum of money standing to the credit of the War Service Land Settlement Board at the Treasury, any other bank, or elsewhere.

(5) Expenditure on development:—

	£	£
Gross total		17,368,318
Less structural improvements :—		
Buildings	2,919,809	
Fencing	1,613,711	
Water supply	1,221,021	
		5,753,541
		11,614,777

Expenditure on acquisition :—		
Gross total		3,413,005
Less structural improvements		799,498
		2,613,507

(6) (a) £2,943,081.
(b) £1,815,114.
(c) £1,867,091.

(7) (a) (a) structural improvements £491,323
(b) plant 644,637
(c) stock 1,107,272
(These figures appear low compared with loans, but working expenses are repaid first.)

(b) Total interest paid £689,970
(Figures not available under each heading. Working expenses interest also included.)

(8) £688,563 (balance would be remitted after the 30th June).

(9) £99,815.

(10) £691,876.

(11) The State has made the following payments on account of two-fifths share of losses:—

	£
1948-49	54,012
1949-50	10,214
1950-51	9,273
1952-53	24,339
1954-55	31,563
1955-56	49,481
1956-57	50,000
1957-58	50,000
1958-59	50,000
	£328,882

2 and 3. *These questions were postponed.*

PARKING NEAR JUNCTIONS

Amendment of Traffic Regulation No. 183

4. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware that traffic regulation No. 183 and the definition of "junction" preclude the standing or parking of vehicles opposite the sub-joining road?

(2) Is he aware that notwithstanding the foregoing, there are marked bus stands, parking stalls, etc.?

(3) In view of this, does he agree that the regulations require amendment?

(4) If so, will he have appropriate steps taken to overcome the present anomaly, and regularise the existing arrangements, including the area marked for ministerial cars immediately in front of Parliament House?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes.

(4) Yes.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Details of Loans

5. Mr. CRAIG asked the Minister for Electricity:

(1) When was the last State Electricity Commission loan raised and for what amount?

(2) Was the loan over-subscribed; and if so, by what amount?

(3) Is any consideration being given towards raising a further loan?

(4) If so, would such a loan expedite electricity extensions to country areas?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(1) March, 1959—£300,000.

(2) The loan was fully subscribed. Over-subscriptions are not permitted by the Australian Loan Council.

(3) Yes.

(4) The funds raised will be applied to the greatest possible advantage.

CROWN LANDS INQUIRY

Personnel of Tribunal and Terms of Reference

6. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) Will he state the exact terms of reference of the tribunal appointed to inquire into alleged sparsely timbered Crown lands, with a view to release for selection?

(2) Is it considered the three persons appointed are better qualified to determine such matters than the Land Utilisation Committee, comprising some of the most senior officers in the Government service, such as Surveyor-General, Conservator of Forests, Water Supply Engineer, Economics Officer of the Treasury, Soil Conservation Officer, and Director of Agriculture?

(3) What forestry experience has the licensed surveyor who has been appointed?

(4) What are the qualifications of the orchardist?

(5) What is—

(a) the age;

(b) the educational attainments;

(c) the forestry qualifications;

of the ex-forestry officer appointed?

(6) What positions did this person hold whilst an employee of the Forests Department?

(7) Did he ever apply for an area of land subject to timber reservation, and have his application rejected?

(8) If so, when?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) Terms of reference are—

To inspect and report fully to the Minister for Lands, Forests and Immigration on all areas of land referred to them by the Minister for consideration; the report to contain—

1. Approximate area of Crown land considered more suited economically to immediate or future agricultural development, measured against its marketable timber content.

In assessing the marketable timber content it will be essential to consider—

(a) Distance from existing sawmills and roadage.

(b) Would area warrant establishment of spot mill for removal?

(c) Whether jarrah content is true to type, or just stunted, or mallee type. (This applies also to the natural timbers in other locations.)

(d) Whether the progress of established town requires the addition of land settlement in its area for its economic stability.

(e) Whether any existing holding requires additional land to ensure its being an economic farming unit or for the purpose of improving and/or straightening boundaries and elimination of fire or vermin hazard.

2. Acreage considered necessary as an economic farming unit in particular area inspected.

3. Type of agricultural development considered suitable for area concerned and its relationship to existing district settlement.

4. Approximate timber content on loads per acre basis, so that an equitable price can be fixed by Department of Land and Surveys—sale of marketable timber from any portion of land to be first approved by the Minister for Lands. (This may entail separate assessment for certain blocks in particular areas after survey.)

5. Suitability of area for economic agricultural development (bearing in mind that in future approximately 5s. per load royalty will be added to upset price in timbered areas to eliminate necessity of reserving timber rights to the Crown).

6. Desirability of setting aside portion or whole of the area recommended for selection, as being reserved for expansion of existing holdings, i.e. holdings which because of area could be classified as too small to ever become an economic farming unit.

7. The need to reserve land for existing and future water catchment areas, soil conservation, and water purity.

(2) Any comparison between the tribunal and the Land Utilisation Committee would be odious.

The tribunal has been appointed in accordance with an undertaking given by the Premier in his policy speech delivered prior to and endorsed at the general election on the 21st March, 1959. Members of the tribunal are considered by the Government as independent and impartial and competent to make recommendations as required under the terms of reference.

(3) The Divisional Land Superintendent of the Surveyor-General's Department has been selected because of his wide experience and practical knowledge of land classification. He has had 32 years with the Lands and Surveys Department, over the whole State of Western Australia.

(4) Wide experience in primary production. Has been engaged in farming pursuits all his life, and owns a property in the Bridgetown district, originally selected by his father.

(5) and (6) 62 years.

Selected because of his long and practical experience in the timber industry.

Twenty-four years' service in Forestry Department duties, including acting forester; tree marking for sawmill intake; timber inspection for export and home market; land inspection for assessment of timber and land classification; inspections before revocation of State Forests.

(7) and (8) Applications were received for portion of State Forests:—

1947—Application approved.

1957—Three separate applicants for same area, of which he was one. All applications declined.

7. *This question was postponed.*

NARROWS BRIDGE OPENING

Details of Invitations

8. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What number of official invitations have been issued for the opening of the new bridge?

(2) How many members of the State Parliament are included in that number?

(3) Who are they?

(4) Regarding the uninvited members of Parliament, does he agree that they should be placed in the position of having to ask to be invited?

(5) Has this procedure been applied to any other sections of the community?

(6) Who was the author of this scheme relating to the elected representatives of the people of Western Australia?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) 524.

(2) 42—being members of Cabinet, together with their wives, and others who have already received invitations as per attached list. In addition, provision had been made for 40 further members of Parliament, together with their wives.

(3) See No. (2).

(4) In view of the very limited accommodation and the wide range of people to whom it was necessary to extend invitations, it became necessary to ascertain the number of members of Parliament who desired to be invited; and, as a result, notices were placed on the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly notice boards with a view to obtaining this information.

(5) See No. (4).

(6) As seating accommodation in the precincts of the northern end of the bridge was limited owing to the ground space available, together with the large demand for seats from people all over the State, it was deemed reasonable to obtain an indication of the demand for seats from members of both Houses by asking for names of those who desired to attend.

List of Official Invitations for Members of Parliament to attend The Narrows Bridge Ceremony.

The Premier — The Hon. D. Brand.
The Minister for Works—The Hon. G. P. Wild.
The Minister for Transport—The Hon. C. C. Perkins.
The Leader of the Opposition—The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke.
The Deputy Leader of the Opposition—The Hon. J. T. Tonkin.
The Minister for Railways—The Hon. C. W. M. Court.
The Minister for Health—The Hon. R. Hutchinson.
The Minister for Agriculture—The Hon. C. D. Nalder.
The Minister for Lands—The Hon. W. S. Bovell.
The Deputy Premier—The Hon. A. F. Watts.
The Minister for Housing—The Hon. A. F. Griffith.
The Minister for Local Government — The Hon. L. A. Logan.
The Speaker of Legislative Assembly—The Hon. J. M. Hearman.
The President of Legislative Council — The Hon. Sir Charles Latham.
The Member for South Perth—Mr. W. L. Grayden.
The Member for Canning—Mr. D. H. O'Neil.
The Member for West Perth—Mr. S. Heal.
A Member of the Federal Parliament—Mr. F. C. Chaney, M.H.R.
A Member of the Federal Parliament—Mr. R. Cleaver, M.H.R.
The Minister for Shipping and Transport — The Hon. Senator S. Paltridge.
The Hon. J. G. Hislop, M.L.C.
The Hon. H. K. Watson, M.L.C.
The Hon. R. F. Hutchison, M.L.C.
The Hon. E. M. Davies, M.L.C.
The Hon. R. Thompson, M.L.C.
The Hon. R. C. Mattiske, M.L.C.
The Hon. G. E. Jeffery, M.L.C.
The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery, M.L.C.

ELECTORS

Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, and Kalgoorlie

9. Mr. TONKIN asked the Attorney-General:

How many electors are resident within the boundaries of each of the following municipalities:—

(a) Albany;
(b) Bunbury;
(c) Geraldton;
(d) Kalgoorlie?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(a) Albany, 5,496.
(b) Bunbury, 6,684.
(c) Geraldton, 4,500.
(d) Kalgoorlie, 5,490.

ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS

Erection and Requested Removal of Iron Shed

10. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Is he aware that—

(a) An unsightly corrugated iron and steel structure has recently been erected in the Zoological Gardens near the Angelo Street boundary, to

the detriment of the residences and college on the opposite side of Angelo Street?

(b) For many years the South Perth district has been a brick and tile area and under no circumstances has the use of corrugated iron been permitted for any type of structure?

(c) The National Parks Board of W.A. has been requested by the South Perth City Council to move the building to another location in the Zoological Gardens where it will not detract from the value of private property in the vicinity?

(2) What decision has been reached in regard to the latter request?

(3) Does the Parks and Gardens Board normally endeavour to work in co-operation with local authorities affected, before buildings of this kind are proceeded with; and if not, why not?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) (a) No. The steel and galvanised iron structure referred to replaces a number of old and very dilapidated galvanised iron buildings.

(b) No.

(c) Yes.

(2) The matter is still receiving consideration.

(3) Yes.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the previous day. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Watts (Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 24—Section 121 amended (partly considered):

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on the clause after Mr. Crommelin had moved an amendment to delete the words, "voting in the districts where those hours are intended to apply" from the amendment moved by Mr. Hawke to insert on page 25 at the end of paragraph (a) the following:—

> This paragraph shall not come into operation until and unless the proposed new trading hours have been approved by a majority of Legislative Assembly electors voting in the districts where those hours are intended to apply.

Mr. EVANS: If the amendment on the amendment is agreed to it will become a State-wide referendum, and people on the Goldfields and in the North-West will be called upon to vote on something in which they have no direct interest. I am sure there would be loud outcries from some of my electors about this—some of them do not like to vote anyway—because they would be called upon to vote on something about which they are not concerned. Therefore I am not happy about the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. HAWKE: I have given further consideration to the amendment on the amendment, and I think it would be unfair to allow people living on the Goldfields, or in the North-West, who already have 11 p.m. closing, and whose position in that regard will not be altered, to decide the closing hour in other parts of the State. Surely the people to decide whether there should be an alteration in the closing hours in other parts of the State should be those living in the districts concerned!

Mr. Perkins: Of course, the Goldfields area does not cover the actual electorates; it cuts through the Roe electorate.

Mr. HAWKE: That may be so. Should my proposal be accepted, and should any Government bring down a Bill in connection with this proposed increase in hours from 9 to 10 other than the North-West and Goldfields licensing districts, it would meet the point raised by the Minister for Transport. The amendment moved by the member for Claremont would not be proper, because it would not be right to allow people who are not to be affected to have a voice and decide what shall operate in districts other than their own.

Mr. SEWELL: I oppose the amendment on the amendment, firstly on the grounds outlined by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kalgoorlie; and, secondly, because at a previous sitting of this Chamber certain hours were agreed upon by a substantial majority of members. If we tinker with this any more, we might lose the hours that some of us are desirous of having apply to our districts. It is essential in a town and district with the potential of Geraldton to have the hours agreed upon, because it would encourage the tourist trade and promote employment.

Mr. BRAND: I listened attentively to the Leader of the Opposition. He mentioned that his motion had in mind voting within the State; presumably he meant State-wide. He now has had second thoughts on this matter. If there is to be a referendum on trading hours, it should be State-wide. There may be many people on the Goldfields who are not happy with 11 o'clock closing. If our decision means that hours are to be extended in certain parts of the State from 9 to 10, the people should be given a chance to vote, particularly if we are not satisfied on the matter.

Mr. Moir: Will you give them the choice of 12 o'clock closing?

Mr. BRAND: Any Bill that is introduced must have State-wide effect; and unless people of the entire State are given the opportunity to decide what the hours of trading shall be, it would not be fair and reasonable.

Mr. Moir: You are playing politics.

Mr. BRAND: One only has to think for one moment to see who is playing politics. I oppose a referendum, and support the amendment moved by the member for Claremont.

Mr. HAWKE: The Premier's comments lack logic.

Mr. Brand: No they don't!

Mr. HAWKE: The Bill was brought down by the Premier and his colleagues. That is the starting point.

Mr. Brand: During the election, we said we would do this.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not concerned about that.

Mr. Brand: You should be.

Mr. HAWKE: The fact is that the Government brought this Bill here after considering all aspects of the situation, and whether it was desirable or worth while to alter the trading hours for hotels in all parts of the State. The Government decided in this Bill that there should be no alteration at all on the Goldfields and in the North-West.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Circumstances have changed.

Mr. HAWKE: Would someone on the ministerial side take the Minister for Health for a walk in the fresh air? The Government said that there was no justification for asking Parliament to alter the trading hours on the Goldfields and in the North-West. One of the other decisions of the Government set out in this Bill is that there was justification for asking Parliament to make an alteration in the trading hours in areas outside the Goldfields and the North-West; and the Government included such a proposal in the Bill. After discussing that proposal, the majority of members in this place decided that trading hours outside the Goldfields and North-West should be altered, mainly on the point that the closing hour in future should be 10 o'clock as against the prevailing 9 o'clock. My amendment lays it down that the Legislative Assembly electors living in the districts which this clause would affect should by referendum decide whether the proposals in the clause should come into operation or not.

Mr. Brand: I say the referendum should be State-wide.

Mr. HAWKE: Those are the facts of the situation. The fair thing to do in this situation which has been created by the Government deliberately is to ask the people living in the districts where the trading hours are proposed to be altered to decide by a referendum whether they agree.

Mr. BICKERTON: The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition seeks to apply to the area covered by this Bill. The amendment on the amendment suggests a State-wide referendum. If my interpretation is correct, it will mean that the area known as the Goldfields district—that is, the Goldfields, Murchison, Gascoyne, Pilbara, and Kimberley—would in any case be exempt from whatever may be provided in this Bill. Under those circumstances, if I were opposed to any amendment at all it would be to that moved by the member for Claremont, because I feel that people not affected in any way by the result of the referendum would be voting to decide whether other people should enjoy certain facilities. There has been much discussion on the attitude of North-West members in connection with this Bill and 10 p.m. closing. As we represent an area where 11 p.m. closing is already enjoyed, I think our attitude to this Bill and to a referendum which would have State-wide effect can be understood.

If a referendum were held in regard to 9 p.m. or 10 p.m. closing, it would be to decide the issue as to whether an extra hour of drinking time should be granted. If that referendum were submitted to people living in the North-West it would have the effect of reducing the hours they already enjoy—whichever way they voted; whereas the people in the rest of the State would have an opportunity of retaining 9 p.m. closing or voting for an extra hour. That is the issue as I see it.

No constituents have either written to me or approached me by deputation to express dissatisfaction with 11 p.m. closing; and I have seen no serious drunkenness in the North-West which could be considered detrimental to the community as a result of closing at that hour. I can only assume, therefore, that the people are perfectly satisfied with the hours which they have. A referendum held in the areas affected by this Bill could prove advantageous, because the people concerned would have an opportunity of saying whether or not they wanted 10 p.m. closing. The North-West people would have no such opportunity. At the best, they could reduce their present hours by one hour; and, at the worst, by two hours. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition because he requests that the people who are affected by this Bill shall have a right to vote at a referendum before any radical change takes place.

It has been said that we cannot have sectional legislation. That is rubbish. Many things are sectional so far as the North-West is concerned. If we must have uniformity in liquor trading in this State,

let us have uniformity in everything. The people in the North-West would not mind paying the same State Housing Commission rents as people in Guildford or Belmont. It costs a person living at Midland Junction 2s. or 2s. 6d. to come to Perth. However, it costs a person living in the North-West £22 10s. If the Government wants uniformity, we do not mind at all.

Each of the towns of Onslow, Roebourne, Pt. Hedland, Wittenoom Gorge, Marble Bar, and Nullagine, with the exception of one, has one hotel; and the reason why the people enjoy 11 p.m. closing is that there is nowhere else in those towns where they can obtain an alcoholic drink. They have no clubs or restaurants where liquor can be obtained, as are to be found in the metropolitan area. The situation is entirely different. Despite that, if the Premier had his way he would hold a State-wide referendum with State-wide effects.

Mr. Brand: I am not advocating a referendum at all. Don't forget that!

Mr. BICKERTON: By way of a counter to the move made by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier says that if we make the referendum State-wide, with State-wide effects, the North-West members must vote against the referendum because they do not want to see drinking conditions worsened in their electorates. That is obviously the theory behind this move. The member for Boulder, I think, interjected that it was political. I agree that that is so.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Would you agree if the hour of 11 p.m. were placed in the referendum?

Mr. BICKERTON: We already have 11 p.m. closing.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I am talking about the referendum.

Mr. BICKERTON: We already have 11 p.m. closing, and I know of nobody in that area who objects to it.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I think it is difficult for any member of this Committee to oppose the principle of deciding this issue by referendum. This is obviously a very contentious subject. Therefore, what better way is there of deciding the issue than by presenting it to the electors to decide for themselves? That is a decision I could fairly accept.

In an Assembly of 50 members, we could debate this matter until Doomsday and still not decide it. If the question were put on a ballot paper, we would know what the people desired. No fair-minded member of this Committee should oppose a referendum; and the matter under discussion seems to be whether that referendum should be State-wide, or whether it should apply to the areas of the State which will be affected if the Bill becomes an Act.

Those who are affected should have the vote. Why should we include people who should not be included? I cannot understand the reason for the amendment moved by the member for Claremont. Why ask people to vote who are not concerned in the matter? We are not justified in saying that every elector in the State, whether concerned in the issue or not, should vote on it.

Some time ago the Licensing Act permitted local option, whereby each district could decide the question for itself. That being so, what is to stop the whole area that is to be affected by this proposal deciding the question for itself? There is nothing whatever. If local option could operate in a district, then the fair way of dealing with this matter is to present the case to the people affected. If we come to a problem like this, which is a big one, the way out of it is to let the electors decide. I am prepared to accept the decision of the electors who are concerned.

Mr. MOIR: The member for Narrogin being opposed to the amendments in their entirety, is trying to project into the debate something which is designed to torpedo the Bill—the question of local option.

Mr. Brady: You are wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOIR: As I understand the position, the member for Narrogin suggested that there should be local option.

Mr. W. A. Manning: No.

Mr. MOIR: I misunderstood what the honourable member said. I have no desire to support the amendment to make the referendum State-wide. The referendum should be confined to the area that the amendments in the Bill are designed to cater for. The Premier, in my opinion, has been trying to intimidate Goldfields and North-West members by his suggestion that if a referendum is held, it should apply to those areas.

Mr. Brand: I do not know whether you would call it intimidation, but that is what I think.

Mr. MOIR: The Premier has been attempting to intimidate members from the Goldfields and the North-West into opposing a referendum, by threatening to extend the referendum on the question of liquor hours to the Goldfields and the North-West. We have been approached around the corridors by members from the other side, and what would happen if we took a certain line of action has been intimated to us. The authority that has been quoted is the Premier. Whether that is correct or not, I do not know; but the Premier has backed up that suggestion by standing in his place and stating that he considers that the question of the hours of trading on the Goldfields should be dealt with by referendum. To show how unfair that would be, I will presume

that the questions to be posed in regard to an extension of trading to 10 o'clock would be—

Are you in favour of 10 o'clock?
Are you in favour of 9 o'clock?
Are you in favour of a reduction of hours?

In order to be fair, the last question must be posed. The question to be posed to the people on the Goldfields would be—

Are you in favour of 11 o'clock closing?
Are you in favour of a reduction of hours?

It would be foolish to ask whether they were in favour of an extension of hours as I have never heard a serious request on the Goldfields for the general hours of trading to be extended to midnight. We know that at two or three hotels situated on the mines, the time allowed is a little longer; but generally the closing time is 11 o'clock. Those questions would mean that the people on the Goldfields would have nothing to gain, but they could lose the benefits of the legislation which they have enjoyed for many years. I hope the Premier understands why we take exception to the proposal he has put forward.

Mr. Brand: Was there a referendum to decide on the 11 o'clock closing time for the Kalgoorlie people?

Mr. MOIR: It was decided long before my time. I cannot remember when the hours were shorter on the Goldfields than they are now. I have not discussed this question with anyone. Perhaps the Deputy Leader of my Party could shed some light on the point, because he spent his boyhood on the Goldfields.

I consider that any referendum should be confined to the people who will be affected by the proposed extension of trading hours. The people in the North-West and the Goldfields are quite satisfied with their hours. No suggestion was made during the election, nor has one been made since, that an expression of the people residing in those areas should be sought. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. NALDER: I suggest that the proposal by the member for Claremont is one to confuse the issue. It is clear from what the Premier said that he is opposed to a referendum altogether. I would say these two points of view are the reason for the amendment.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. NALDER: I am opposed to the amendment; and I am going to support the Leader of the Opposition in his amendment, because I feel it is the only fair and democratic way of dealing with the position. Why should we involve another part of the State that has made no move for an alteration of the present position? This legislation has been introduced for a certain portion of the State; therefore, that portion of the State should have the opportunity to decide whether or not it shall have an extension of the hours. Because of that fact, I feel that the proposal suggested by the Leader of the Opposition is fair and just. The question will be put to the people who will be affected; and they are people outside of the Goldfields and North-West districts. It is clear to me that the decision rests with the people affected in the other areas of the State concerned. I support the amendment.

Mr. TOMS: How refreshing it is to hear a little honesty being demonstrated! I agree with the Minister for Agriculture that the amendment on the amendment seeks to do away with any possibility of a referendum. There are some who would say "No", but only because they know that Goldfields and North-West members would have to vote against the amendment on the amendment. The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is all that should be considered, because the idea of a referendum was mentioned very early in the piece. I support the amendment and oppose the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I support the amendment on the amendment. If a referendum is held it should apply to the whole State, without any line of demarcation.

Mr. Toms: Do you agree with the principle of a referendum?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, on a State-wide basis. The attitude of the Opposition on this question is incongruous. The Leader of the Opposition, during the debate on the second reading, accused the Government of gerrymandering in regard to an electoral measure; but here, having referred to that other piece of legislation as a wicked, gerrymandering Bill, we have a clear-cut example of the Leader of the Opposition himself attempting to gerrymander the boundaries of the area in which the referendum should take place, specifically to exclude the areas represented predominantly by Labor members, where there is 11 p.m. closing. The Leader of the Opposition wants to ensure that the referendum affects only those parts of the State represented mainly by non-Labor members. There are plenty of people on the Goldfields who would prefer 9 p.m. or 6 p.m. closing, and they should be allowed to express their opinions.

Mr. Fletcher: If it was prohibition, yes. That is absolute, but this is only partial.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Many Goldfields people would prefer early closing.

Mr. Bickerton: Do you realise that the amendment on the amendment would not alter the position in the North-West?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The amendment on the amendment would ensure a State-wide referendum; and I think we should widen the scope so as to include club hours as

well as hotel hours; because, in the metropolitan area, clubs remain open until 11 p.m. and have Sunday sessions also.

Mr. CORNELL: This rather ingenious amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is obviously designed to get into the net Goldfields members who can support it with a clear conscience; because their own electors would not be affected by it. The member for Kalgoorlie appeared to adopt an attitude of being all for it up to a point; but then he slipped and slid and fell on his face; and then got up and joined the "Jack" club. In effect, he said, "My fellows are all right, and I couldn't care less what happens elsewhere". To that extent the logic mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, as being adopted by some members opposite, could be summed up as "What makes logic bright and clear? Anything as long as it excludes Goldfields beer".

I think the Government now realises what can happen when certain sections of a non-Party Bill become a Party political issue. On this occasion there is every prospect that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and unquestionably dictated by an outside junta will be carried with the assistance of members on this side of the House; but in my opinion—

Mr. Brady: You are getting nasty.

Mr. CORNELL: I am not getting nasty. I am putting the proposition as I see it. If any degree of fair-mindedness were being exhibited by certain people whom I have in mind, we would not be arguing as we are now. The Minister for Agriculture supported the proposition for a referendum, the cost of which I think would be £100,000 at the minimum. If he is conscientious in the administration of his department, which is lamentably short of funds, how can he justify squandering £100,000 on a referendum—

Mr. Nalder: That suggestion is outside the realm of this Bill.

Mr. CORNELL: The question of finance must be wrapped up with the proposal for a referendum; because if it were agreed to, and the Government decided to implement the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, it would have to bring down legislation to provide the finance for the referendum; and that would make less finance available in other avenues. If we are to have a referendum on this question, we should include certain other proposals which also involve a departure from the accepted principles of the Licensing Act.

As I said during the second reading debate, when we made revolutionary departures and introduced Sunday trading four or five years ago, there was no suggestion that a referendum was necessary; but I believe even the most rabid opponents of extended trading hours would say that that measure has worked satisfactorily. If this measure requires a referendum, it is obvious that there are many equally contentious issues which should be submitted to referendums. The unfair trading legislation was one such measure; and so also was the most revolutionary of all: the legislation four or five years ago to license betting shops. But no referendum was sought there.

Now that we are attempting to introduce some sanity into our licensing laws, the measure is said to be contentious and it is claimed that it should be submitted to a referendum. God forbid that we should decide ever to submit all contentious matters to referendums! Surely in the three short years for which a Parliament is elected we can implement election promises! The tidying up of our Licensing Act in order to bring about better circumstances in regard to drinking conditions was part of the policy of this side of the House at the last election. Because of that, we are here today debating something which was never even mentioned.

That raises another interesting question: Why are the Country Party members so set on the holding of a referendum? Why was that not written into the Party's policy? The subject is tantamount to high policy, but it was never mentioned in any policy speech. In some respects, certain members on this side of the Chamber are being taken for a ride. If we hold a referendum on this subject, we could hold referendums on a multiplicity of subjects which would lead us nowhere. It would involve the State in a great deal of expense, but achieve nothing.

Reference has been made to the liberal trading hours on the Goldfields. It is only logical that if we hold a referendum on extended trading hours, the terms of the referendum should also contain a question in regard to, perhaps, reduced trading hours on the Goldfields. There are certain favoured areas in the electorate of the member for Merredin-Yilgarn which enjoy 11 o'clock closing; and that honourable member would be the last—and so would I—to criticise that hour of closing.

However, the association of residents in those areas with the mining industry has long since passed. They follow purely agricultural pursuits now, but no attempt has ever been made to bring the hotels in those districts into line with the hotels in the rest of the wheatbelt. They enjoy 11 o'clock closing, and they should continue to enjoy that hour of closing. However, if we decide to hold a referendum on the question of extended hours, we should throw the whole subject into the melting pot and hold the referendum on the question of extended hours throughout the State and not in one circumscribed area.

Members of the parliamentary committee obtained evidence, whilst they were visiting the Goldfields, on what they considered was excess drinking there, and it was suggested that perhaps the hour of closing should be brought back to 9 o'clock.

Mr. Evans: I bet they were a minority section!

Mr. CORNELL: It probably was a minority section. There was one citizen who gave some interesting evidence. He told what the late Phillip Collier did for licensing on the Goldfields. But I will not mention that; otherwise it might cause some embarrassment to some people. Nevertheless, there was a request for the hours of trading to be restricted on the Goldfields; and that cannot be denied. One might put the question: What adverse climatic conditions are suffered by Kalgoorlie and Boulder that are not suffered by, say, Merredin, Narembeen, Bencubbin, and even Northam? The question could be fairly asked: Why should the Goldfields be treated differently from other centres in the State?

Mr. Fletcher: The workers there are on shift work.

Mr. CORNELL: The member for Fremantle has mentioned shift workers, and that raises another interesting point.

Mr. Toms: I thought he mentioned the deletion of words.

Mr. CORNELL: As a rule, the honourable member and I do not agree on the deletion of words. Whilst on the Goldfields, we visited the three hotels on the Boulder block which are allowed to remain open after the usual closing hour under a special provision in the Act. Admittedly it was a very hot morning when we visited those hotels; it was well after midnight. The number of patrons that were being catered for by those three hostelries had to be seen to be believed.

Until I walked into those hotels, I never knew that so many females worked in the mining industry, because the preponderance of customers that were in the hotels on the Boulder block that evening were members of the weaker sex. That raises quite an interesting point as to whether the extended hours of trading enjoyed by those hotels are justified and are serving the purpose for which they were granted.

Those are my views. They are like most views expounded in this Chamber; they are merely words and more words. Everyone has his preconceived ideas on this subject, and no amount of debating will change them. However, I have put forward my views, and I will stick to them.

Mr. BRADY: I have not spoken on the Bill this afternoon, and I would not have spoken had it not been for the remarks made by the member for Mt. Marshall in referring to the Leader of the Opposition bringing forward a motion as a result of pressure by juntas. Never since I have been a member of this Chamber have I seen a Bill that has been subject to pressure by so many juntas. The Government has members running around trying to obtain the opinions of others on this Bill. It is trying to get an hour-to-hour description and a person-to-person vote on what is going on. One would think that the life-blood of the nation was at stake instead of merely the interests of the Swan Brewery and the breweries in the Eastern States. I feel sorry for those members on the other side of the Chamber; they are merely stooges for the hotel vested interests.

The CHAIRMAN: I must draw the honourable member's attention to the question before the Chair.

Mr. BRADY: I am glad that you, Mr. Chairman, brought me back to earth, because the member for Mt. Marshall put me right off with his reference to juntas.

Mr. Hawke: The member for Mt. Marshall did plenty of flying around while he was above the earth, despite his weight.

Mr. BRADY: Like others in this Chamber, I believe that this proposed amendment has been introduced only to confuse the issue. Those who are vitally affected—the people—should determine this question, and I hope that that is what the position will be. The member for Mt. Marshall twitted some members on this side of the Chamber because they indicated that they would vote for this referendum. What people do the members of his Party represent? They are supposed to represent all the people, who have varying interests. We have to consider not only those who represent hotel interests in this State, but also the butchers, bakers, salesmen, taxi-drivers, and so on. They are the people I am going to consider when I cast my vote for the holding of a referendum. I consider that vested interests in this trade hold too much power among various members of the community, including politicians.

The member for Mt. Marshall said that the cost of the referendum should be a factor to influence our vote. But what is going to be the cost to the people and to the homes, if extended hours of trading are agreed to? It would be difficult to assess what that cost would be to the State. A low estimate for the referendum would be £100,000. If extended hours are agreed to, what about the homes that are broken up and the jobs that are lost, and also the jobs that are seriously affected as a result of excessive drinking?

I am not opposed to drinking. I have bought hundreds of gallons of beer at various times for small organisations to which I have belonged. However, I do not believe in one section, because it has considerable influence in the community, holding all the power. The licensed hotelkeepers are getting a fair percentage of

profit out of the trade. If the hours are extended it will be to the disadvantage of butchers, bakers, and other tradesmen in the community because there will not be so much money in circulation. Are the members on the other side of the Chamber, including the member for Mt. Marshall, considering those people or the Swan Brewery and the breweries in the Eastern States?

The member for Mt. Marshall asked why a referendum should be held. It has been the established practice in this State to hold referendums on similar important issues. I recall that, in 1929; I voted on a referendum to decide the question of extended or reduced hours. There is so much at stake with this subject that the holding of a referendum is definitely justified. It is our duty to protect against themselves those people who drink to excess. Sixty per cent. of the legislation that is placed on the statute book has been enacted for fools.

This Bill, in particular, is legislation for fools. It is designed to protect those people who do not realise the damage they will do to themselves and to the State if they drink to excess. One has only to read the publications that are issued by Alcoholics Anonymous. The members of that organisation include some with the most brilliant brains in the world. But they find the greatest difficulty in preventing themselves from indulging in excessive drinking.

I was prepared to discuss this Bill according to its merits; but when an honourable member states that there are juntas behind this motion, that is laughable, especially in view of the engineering that has taken place and the juntas that have been behind this legislation for several weeks past. I support the amendment.

Mr. CRAIG: I have become a little confused since this Bill was first introduced. Firstly, by the introductory remarks of the Attorney-General, we were told that it was a non-Party measure. I followed that advice to the extent that I deserted my Government on the first question that was decided by this Chamber. I was impressed then by the fact that members of the Opposition did not let their consciences guide them as mine had guided me. I came to the conclusion that the Bill was developing into a Party-political issue. Therefore, I am going to be careful about the steps I take on future decisions that are made on this Bill.

I am opposed to the holding of a referendum. The member for Mt. Marshall pointed out that a referendum would cost about £100,000. This figure has been queried by other speakers, who considered it would be much more. I think of what could be done with £100,000 in my electorate. Transferring my thoughts from liquor, I think what could be done to the water supply in my electorate with £100,000. Some parts of it are not provided with a domestic service. I would prefer this measure to go through without any referendum. Much has been said about democracy, but those bringing that point forward should study what democracy means.

Mr. Brady: It does not mean two votes in the country to one vote in the metropolitan area.

Mr. CRAIG: Under the principles of democracy I believe that no-one should be disfranchised. It was suggested by several speakers that the people of the Goldfields and the North-West would be disfranchised. They are entitled to express their opinions on this referendum, the same as I. If the people and the Government desire a referendum, I shall support it; but I consider that everybody in the State should be given the opportunity to express his view as to the trading hours. I support the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. COURT: I oppose the amendment which provides for a referendum on this subject. This move reflects a most extraordinary line of thought. The matter before the Chair is whether certain words shall be deleted from the amendment. There seems to be a certain amount of fear on the part of some members of the Opposition of what would be the outcome of a referendum conducted on a State-wide basis. One can only guess the fear, because the reason for it has not been frankly stated. One can only guess that they fear the referendum will affect the trading hours enjoyed by certain parts of the State such as the Goldfields and the North-West.

My understanding of the referendum procedure is this: If a referendum is to be conducted, what goes into this Bill will not determine the actual questions that are to be put to the public; in fact, the terms of a Bill which has to be introduced will fix the terms and the questions which are to go before the public—for instance, whether there should be compulsory voting.

Surely the members in this Chamber are prepared to allow all the people of this State to have a vote on this particular question. There seems to be an extraordinary state of affairs developing on this issue. Members who represent electorates which enjoy longer trading hours than others, are prepared to say that they can assess the opinion of their electors, and that the other members in this Chamber cannot reflect the opinion of their electors.

It was not so long ago when we were prepared to make a firm decision in this House on a matter concerning a very great many people and say that the decision was binding on all the people. The people did not have a chance to express their viewpoint. On that occasion many members here were confident that they could reflect the opinions of their electors. On the

issue now before us they do not feel confident to be able to reflect the views of their electors. Their action is grossly inconsistent.

Very often decisions were made in the past on important matters relating to the licensing law, which were not the subject of a referendum. For instance, the introduction of Sunday trading in country districts, to the best of my knowledge, was not subject to a referendum. That decision was the responsibility of this Parliament. Why members in this Chamber—in particular, those opposite—are fearful of a referendum being conducted among all the people in Western Australia is beyond me.

Mr. Hawke: The answer is that they do not fear.

Mr. COURT: The Leader of the Opposition moved to restrict the number of people who are to vote on this issue. I remind members that in his written words he provided for all the people of the State. He went further than that, because no-one could have expressed in clearer terms than he did, when he spoke earlier in this Committee debate, that the referendum he proposed to move for was to be State-wide.

I can imagine his putting that motion on the notice paper, and on reflection realising that he had included words about which he was not happy. We have all done that on occasions. He went further, after he had had ample time to reflect, and categorically affirmed that the referendum should be for the whole of the people of the State on a compulsory voting basis. So it was no slip of the tongue. He was quite convinced when he gave notice of this motion on the notice paper, and when he spoke during the Committee debate, that it should be on a State-wide basis.

If we are to have a referendum, it should be conducted among all the people of the State, in the terms of a Bill which will have to be presented to this House. We, the Parliament, will then decide the ultimate terms to be submitted to the people; but the referendum should be held among all the people.

There was talk of gaining and losing from the referendum. Some speakers submitted that the people on the Goldfields and in the North-West might lose something. There are probably people in those areas who think that they will gain something if the hours are reduced.

It has been said that when the Government made the decision to introduce the measure, the position on the Goldfields and the North-West was not to be tampered with. I submit there is an entirely different set of circumstances now; because a decision having been made on the change of hours, a new point has been introduced altogether into this debate—that of a referendum. We have to address ourselves to an entirely different set of circumstances; namely, as to who are to vote in the referendum.

It is not only the right, but also the responsibility of all the people of this State to vote, if we decide to hold a referendum. I am opposed to holding a referendum on this particular question; but if it is to be held, let all the people of this State vote. I support the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. HAWKE: We all know that the Minister who has just spoken is the chief representative in this Parliament for the bigger vested interests in Western Australia—

Mr. Court: That is not true. You have repeated that so often that I am thoroughly sick and tired of hearing it.

Mr. HAWKE: —one of which is the brewery.

Mr. Court: That is completely false.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister admitted that previously, but now he is objecting to what I am saying.

Mr. Court: I have not admitted it.

Mr. HAWKE: However, the Minister begged the question. He confused two separate issues. He talked about a motion on the notice paper as a notice of motion, and tried to confuse that with the amendment I have moved to the clause under discussion. The notice of motion in my name is quite clear and distinct.

Mr. Court: That is why you are embarrassed.

Mr. HAWKE: Notice was given some days ago. The purpose was to lay down that no alteration should be made to hotel trading hours, unless there was a referendum. That had in mind the proposition that hotel trading hours for the whole State might at some time be altered. This clause does not do that. It proposes to alter the trading hours only in particular parts of the State.

The Minister is largely responsible for the fact that there is nothing in the Bill—and it is a Government Bill—to propose any alteration of trading hours on the Goldfields and in the North-West. But there is in the Bill, largely because of his activities, a proposal to alter the trading hours in districts outside the Goldfields and the North-West.

The Minister knows, as well as anybody else, that the closing time on the Goldfields and in the North-West is later than the closing time in other parts of the State; yet he wants the people in the North-West and those on the Goldfields, who now enjoy 11 p.m. closing, and who will not be affected in any shape or form by the proposal in this Bill, to have a voice equal to the voice of the people living in districts who will be concerned as to whether the closing hour shall be altered. The Minister is off the track.

Why should a person at Coolgardie or Wyndham, who has the benefit of 11 o'clock closing, have a voice in deciding whether the people in Bruce Rock or Narembeen shall enjoy the extension of the closing time to 10 p.m.? As the people on the Goldfields and in the North-West are not and cannot be affected by this provision, it is fair to lay down the proposition that they would not have to vote on the issue as to whether the closing time in districts outside of their own should be 9 p.m. or 10 p.m. What is wrong with people in the districts affected being able to decide the issue? That is the sensible and fair approach. I hope the Committee will vote against the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. O'NEIL: I am somewhat in the same position as the member for Toodyay, who indicated that at this stage he was becoming slightly confused. I have also been confused. It is time we checked on the proposition before us. In the early hours of this morning, this Committee agreed to the proposition of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. trading for the whole of the State.

Mr. J. Hegney: Not the whole of the State.

Mr. O'NEIL: Those parts of the State not including the Goldfields or the North-West. The Leader of the Opposition opposed that alteration. The reasons he gave were, in his opinion, strong ones, associated with the welfare of children, accident rates, drunkenness, and so on.

After this Committee had made the decision, the Leader of the Opposition acted in very bad taste in attempting to defeat that decision. He did so by trying to amend the clause so that the trading hours of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. would not be put into effect until such time as the people in the areas affected had had the opportunity to vote on the amended trading hours. He fully realised that if his amendment were agreed to, the referendum would not necessarily be held, because the holding of a referendum would require the introduction of additional legislation.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 till 4.5 p.m.

Mr. O'NEIL: Before the suspension I was trying to analyse the reasons behind this amendment, and I indicated that this House had accepted the principle of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. trading. In an endeavour to kill the measure, the Leader of the Opposition has introduced an amendment which we are now discussing. Should this amendment be passed, the effect would be that the present hours of 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. in the metropolitan and country areas—except for the Goldfields and North-West—would be retained.

Those members who represent areas that have the hotels open till 11 p.m. have indicated that their electors enjoy the conditions of that privilege, and I stress the word "enjoy". It would appear, therefore, that as their electors favour the extended hours, those members should be prepared to support the extension of hours in other areas.

On many occasions in this House we have heard reference to sectional legislation. In my opinion, a referendum which does not cover the complete State cannot be defined as anything but sectional. Also, if we accept the fact that people who are now permitted to drink until 11 p.m. enjoy such a privilege, I feel that if their votes were cast in conjunction with all other electors in the State in regard to the extension of hours. I feel the case would be greatly strengthened. It is for that reason I believe the Leader of the Opposition has opposed the amendment on the amendment, moved by the member for Claremont, to extend the terms of the referendum to all electors, including those on the Goldfields and in the North-West. If, in those areas, they do enjoy the privilege of 11 p.m. closing I am sure they would be the first to agree to the extension of hours in other places. I intend to support the amendment moved by the member for Claremont.

Mr. COURT: I want to reply briefly to some of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. It is a well-known fact in this Chamber that when someone says something that displeases him he will immediately launch into an attack on the person making the statement—a personal attack.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is so.

Mr. COURT: And what the Leader of the Opposition said about my so-called representation of vested interests is completely untrue; and being completely untrue, it is completely unethical and improper. It is well understood in this Chamber what tactics the honourable member has adopted in regard to myself ever since I have been in this Chamber. My main point in rising is to correct the statements he made regarding his intention when he placed on the notice paper a certain motion. It is no good the Leader of the Opposition trying to say his motion on the notice paper has nothing to do with the motion he has now moved, because the motion that he placed on the notice paper was not placed there on Tuesday last, but on Wednesday. Therefore, he must have given notice of it on Tuesday which was the day the House was due to debate the Bill.

In other words, because the Leader of the Opposition knew of the Bill a week before, the provisions of which were well known to the members of this Chamber, both from their own personal study and from Press commentary, it is completely wrong for the Leader of the Opposition to say that his motion has no reference to the intention of his amendment. At

least the most charitable view one could take is that it is hard to swallow, because the motion reads—

> That in the opinion of this House no alteration should be made to hotel trading hours unless any proposed alteration—

not concerning the metropolitan area, Goldfields, or North-West, but any proposed alteration—

> —has first been approved by a majority of Legislative Assembly electors within the State, voting at a referendum with compulsory voting applying.

I invite the attention of the Committee to the honourable member's comments earlier in the Committee debate when he again referred to a referendum by the whole of the people of the State. At that stage he was obviously talking about this particular Bill, and not only this particular Bill, but this particular clause. Therefore, in my opinion—and I think in the opinion of any reasonable person—the Leader of the Opposition cannot claim that when he placed this motion on the notice paper it was completely removed from the contents of this Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: While I cannot agree with some of the more recent comments of the Leader of the Opposition, I propose to support the amendment moved by him. I believe that the people who are going to be affected by this Bill are the people who should decide the issue.

If it could be demonstrated to me that under this or any other legislation the whole of the people were going to be affected by the decision, then I would say that the whole of the people should decide the issue. But since the alteration of any existing hours is to apply only to those districts mentioned in the Bill—the whole of the State except the North-West and the Goldfields—then those people should decide the matter. As I said in my second reading speech, it is a matter on which, up to date, we have had no means of obtaining the views of the people. It is true that we have had the views of what might be called vested interests; but outside of those, the people have been strangely inarticulate on this issue. Therefore, in order to give them an opportunity of making their wishes known in regard to hotel hours, I say the democratic course to take is to hold a referendum. I therefore intend to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It should be apparent to all at this stage that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will, in all probability, be carried.

Mr. May: What is wrong with that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If it is carried, it will mean, as all members know, the defeat of the liquor reform which was intended by this legislation: I think that anyone who has any knowledge of politics will realise that the introduction of a Bill to provide for a referendum on this measure is extremely unlikely to be passed either in the near future or in the foreseeable future. The whole basis of the introduction of the legislation was to endeavour to bring about certain reforms in the liquor trade.

Mr. May: In a democratic manner.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: At the same time it was intended to do some tidying up of various provisions in the Licensing Act. It may be that the Bill does not go far enough in certain respects; but the basic idea was to bring about certain reforms, and the Government made it possible for these matters to be considered in this Chamber.

The Committee has decided that the hours of trading shall be 10 to 10 all the year round, but the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition seeks to defeat that. The amendment on the amendment, moved by the member for Claremont, seeks to make the referendum apply to the whole of the State, which will include the Goldfields and North-West areas where the people enjoy trading hours up till 11 o'clock. Any change of hours anywhere in the State affects the people on the Goldfields and the North-West. They do not all stay in those areas for the whole of their lives. Many of them come down to the metropolitan and agricultural areas, and it is only democratic that their views should be obtained at a referendum.

They having enjoyed—and I use the word "enjoyed" because it is the word that has been used by North-West and Goldfields members—the experience of later closing, we should obtain their views at a referendum because we want to find out what the whole of the public wants. I am sure that the majority of members in this Chamber feel in their hearts that there is no need for a referendum; but, because they have been whipped into line on the other side—

Mr. Toms: Boloney!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is no boloney about it. Members opposite have been whipped into line.

Mr. Toms: Did the Minister for Agriculture get whipped into line?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: During the whole of this debate the Leader of the Opposition has not left the Chamber, in order to keep his members in line.

Mr. Hawke: I have left the Chamber for certain purposes.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The whole basis—

Mr. Hawke: You need psychiatric treatment urgently.

Mr. Court: Getting personal again.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to the absolutely unprincipled remark that the Leader of the Opposition has just made, and I ask him for an unqualified withdrawal.

Government members: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Hawke: What I said is my own opinion.

Mr. Bovell: Make him withdraw!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is useless for me to try to insist on a withdrawal from this person, because obviously he is a man without any manners whatever. He is a man who is not prepared to follow parliamentary procedure, except when parliamentary procedure fits his bill.

Mr. Tonkin: What Standing Order are you using?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am following parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Tonkin: But what Standing Order?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I object most strongly to the inference contained in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I think what he has just said indicates the type of person he is. I have asked for a withdrawal, but it is useless to ask a person of the type and nature that he is to do such a thing, or to expect any better treatment from him.

Mr. Hawke: I am glad I am different from you.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: As regards the issue of hours, which is tied up with the referendum, this country is being led by the nose by a union, and that union has whipped members into line and they must follow its policy.

Mr. Hawke: That is not true.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: On this non-Party Bill they are not permitted to vote as they desire.

Mr. J. Hegney: That is not true.

Mr. Hawke: They have done it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Those members who do feel disposed to vote for this liquor reform are unable to do so because they have been told that a referendum of the people is desired. Yet those same members felt that a referendum was the last thing we should have on a pool in the park. A decision can and has been made by this Chamber, and it is a pretty poor state of affairs when the Parliament of Western Australia can be dictated to by a union which is composed of a few people. The people of Western Australia are being told what they can do in the ensuing years.

Mr. Toms: If you say that a few more times you will really believe it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do believe it.

Mr. Toms: I don't think you do.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is perfectly true. It is not difficult to understand the reason why Governments are chary about bringing down any sort of amendments to the Licensing Act. We can see how the whole debate has bogged down into pious humbug. It has resolved itself more or less into a battle of tactics; and because of the whip hand that is held by the Opposition, the humbuggers are going to win. There has been much pious talk by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Hawke: We are in the minority.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No-one can have any regard for anything you say again because they must know the unprincipled type of person you are.

Mr. Hawke: You are suffering from aristocratic embrace. That is your trouble.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This is a reform which the majority of members want; but the battle of tactics will be won because of the strength on the other side. They have made it virtually a Party issue. Already we have seen two members—one from the Country Party and one from the Liberal Party—express their concern that this Bill, which was supposedly a non-Party measure, seems to have become a Party issue; and those two members found themselves voting with the Opposition, who voted *en bloc*.

Mr. Andrew: You must admit that they have not always voted like that.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Only on those occasions when they could please themselves and not have to fit in with what the Leader of the Opposition wanted. This person has dictated the terms of the Bill throughout the whole of the debate.

Mr. Hawke: You flatter me.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Surely members realise that! If a referendum is to be held, it should be held on a State-wide basis.

Mr. Toms: You say there will be no referendum.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If there is to be one, it should be held on a State-wide basis. If social problems are connected with the closing hours of hotels in the metropolitan and agricultural areas, surely the same thing applies in other parts of the State! If members are fair-minded, they will agree with that proposition. Yet the Leader of the Opposition—this person; this unprincipled person—thinks it is all right for the people on the Goldfields and in the North-West. It is just pious humbug on his part.

Mr. May: I don't think you should be allowed to boom him up like that.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It shows the type of thinking on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. His logic is as narrow as the person himself. In the past he has been the only one who has been allowed to slay any member; he has been verbally vicious on many occasions, but he has outdone himself today.

Mr. Hawke: You need psychiatric treatment urgently.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I could go a little further, but I shall not descend to name-calling. What I have had to say has been on a higher plane than what the honourable member has had to say. I hope members opposite will have the guts to make up their own minds on this issue.

Mr. Hawke: Nice boy! Lovely words!

Mr. Bickerton: I think the liquor has affected everyone.

Mr. Hawke: Aristocratic Ross!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I hope the amendment moved by the member for Claremont will be carried in the genuine interests of liquor reform.

Mr. OWEN: It is most unfortunate that personalities have crept into the debate, and it is deplorable that so many red herrings have been drawn across the trail. To me the issue is simple. Either we have a referendum for the whole of the State or for only part of the State.

Mr. O'Neil: It is a question of whether we have liquor reform or not.

Mr. OWEN: The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is a half-baked local option scheme, and I do not support it; in fact, I am against holding a referendum at all, because the decision has been made in this Chamber and it should be accepted. If we applied this question of a referendum to every controversial issue, we would not get very far; and if every referendum had to be put only to those people who were affected by the proposition, in some cases the people in only one or two electorates would vote. I oppose the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, and at this stage support the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I support the amendment moved by the member for Claremont. I entered this Chamber with a completely unbiassed mind on the issue of licensing. This was supposed to be a non-Party measure, and the turn it has taken has surprised me. Obviously, it has become a Party issue as far as the Opposition is concerned; and it is disturbing for me to see that some members on this side of the House have been taken for a ride, though they have their own minds to make up. To support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition would be to support trading from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.; in other words, we would defeat a motion passed last night agreeing to the trading hours being 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. I do not see why we should spend £100,000 of the taxpayers' money on a referendum.

Mr. Jamieson: Why don't you get your figures right?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The member for Beeloo will have his chance to speak.

Mr. Jamieson: Keep your figures within a reasonable limit.

Mr. O'CONNOR: When he speaks, the member for Beeloo will be able to give us any figures he has in mind. When the question of the pool in the park was mooted there was a suggestion of a referendum, and I would no more have supported that than I do this matter of a referendum on licensing. I fail to see how we will be doing our electors justice.

Mr. MAY: I am happy the Minister for Health has sat down, because had he not done so—

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest the member for Collie speak to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. MAY: I rise to comment on what the Minister for Health had to say on this amendment. I would point out that nobody has brought me into line in this matter.

Mr. Court: Not much! The transformation has been amazing.

Mr. MAY: That is the contention of the Government.

Mr. Hawke: The Liberals are discouraged that the brewery has not got more pull.

Mr. MAY: Why is there that solid body of gentlemen sitting in the gallery to hear this legislation discussed?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Because they are interested.

Mr. Court: They came here to listen to you speak.

Mr. MAY: They do not have to listen to the Minister for Railways, because they already know his views.

Mr. Court: I wish more people would come here.

Mr. MAY: So do I, when other legislation is being discussed. A referendum is required to give the people an opportunity to express their views. Are we to dictate to the majority of the people as to what they should do?

Mr. Craig: Why don't you cast a democratic vote?

Mr. MAY: So far as I am concerned this is a non-Party measure. I have heard donkeys make sounds such as are now emanating from the Government benches.

Mr. O'Connor: You have probably made them yourself.

Mr. MAY: If I sit much longer in association with members opposite I daresay I will. Let the people decide what they require. Who are we to say what they should do?

Mr. Bovell: We are their representatives sent here to do a job.

Mr. MAY: I agree, up to a point. We have had absolutely no instructions from our electors on this issue.

Mr. Hawke: The Liberals have.

Mr. MAY: I sent a copy of this Bill to every publican in Collie, and to the club, a fortnight ago, and I have received no intimation of their views.

Mr. Hawke: You would find the brewery share list very interesting.

Mr. MAY: I only wish the Minister for Health looked as happy as does the Premier. I do not agree with what the Minister for Health said; and whatever transpired between him and the Leader of the Opposition is their business. But I guarantee the Leader of the Opposition would win in any argument between the two.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Bovell: The Minister for Health had a good victory.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question before the Chair is whether certain words should be struck out, and I must ask members to keep to the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. MAY: I am glad of your advice, Mr. Chairman, because I now know exactly where I am going; but it has come a little late, because I have said all I want to. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Mann
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Wild
Dr. Henn	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brady	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May
Mr. Kelly	*(Teller.)*

Majority against—1.

Amendment on the amendment thus negatived.

Mr. CROMMELIN: Would I be in order in moving to add certain words to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CROMMELIN: In that case I move—

> That the amendment be amended by adding the following words:—
>
> but notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in section 121 of this Act, these hours shall apply to the whole of the State.

The CHAIRMAN: As the amendment proposed by the member for Claremont has just been submitted to the Chair; and as it applies to section 121 of the Act, it is my intention to have a look at it before giving a ruling as to whether it is in order. I will therefore leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 4.46 to 4.50 p.m.

Chairman's Ruling

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Claremont has moved to add to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition after the word "apply" the following words:—

> but notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in section 121 of this Act, these hours shall apply to the whole of the State.

Firstly, the wording is not quite in order; and, secondly, I must rule the amendment proposed by the member for Claremont as being out of order as it applies to certain provisions in section 121 of the Act which are not contained in the Bill before the Committee at the present moment.

Committee Resumed

Mr. PERKINS: Quite frankly I have been more disgusted with the debate I have heard on this Bill, than with any other debate I have heard since I have been a member of this Chamber—for 17 years. There has been more humbug and hypocrisy talked by members on the other side of the Committee than I have ever heard before.

Mr. Heal: Mr. Chairman, has this anything to do with the matter before the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: I am waiting for the Minister to proceed in order to find out. It will then be for me to decide.

Mr. PERKINS: I am expressing my opinion, as did the Leader of the Opposition. It is just as well to know where we are going as a result of the move for a referendum on the question of hours. It could have far-reaching effects, as the Minister in charge of the Bill will have the ultimate say. We know quite well that

many members on the opposite side desire 10 p.m. closing; but they do not want to face up to the political obligations which will arise because of certain industrial troubles as a result of that decision.

There are more controversial matters in the Bill from a social point of view than the closing of hotels at 10 p.m. Therefore, why submit a referendum in connection with one particular part of the Bill, which seeks to extend the closing time by one hour?

Mr. Lawrence: It does not extend hours; you are misleading the House. Be frank and truthful!

Mr. PERKINS: The closing hour at night will be 10 p.m. We must not run away from the fact that one can drink in clubs until 11 p.m.; and clubs are multiplying throughout the State. It is not good for the State that this should be taking place. If the move for a referendum is carried and it is the means of killing the Bill, I hope members will realise where they are going. There will be more applications for club licenses and it will be difficult for the court to resist many of them.

Members must not forget the provisions in the Bill which relate to the extension of licenses to restaurants; and also the provision in regard to Sunday sessions, which is an extremely controversial issue throughout the whole of the country. If we are going to have a referendum, it is logical that it should be on the whole of the Bill. I would hate to think what sort of a job it would be trying to prepare the questions submitted under those circumstances. We are sent here by the electors to represent them, and we have to face up to these questions even though they be thorny ones. I know that many members opposite are in favour of 10 p.m. closing, and they should think very carefully before they vote in favour of the request for a referendum before this particular portion of the Bill can become effective.

Point of Order

Mr. GUTHRIE: I wish to raise a point of order and submit to you, Sir, that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is out of order. The effect of that amendment will be to render the entire Bill out of order so far as hours under the Licensing Act are concerned. Under the old licensing laws, and until last night, so far as we are concerned, trading hours were 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Last night they were changed to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. The effect of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will be that the hours of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. will not take effect until such time as a referendum is carried. In the meantime, the hours of 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. have been struck out of the principal Act.

I would refer you, Mr. Chairman, to page 401 of May's *Parliamentary Practice*, which reads as follows:—

> Amendments to be intelligible.—Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question or amendment, as amended, would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

If the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is passed and becomes law, it will mean that, until a referendum is carried, there will be no licensing hours whatsoever in Western Australia.

Chairman's Ruling

The CHAIRMAN: We are dealing at the moment with an amendment to section 121 of the Act. Certain alterations have already been made to that section, and the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, in my opinion, is a proviso to the amendment already moved.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: So I must rule it to be in order.

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then I must dissent from your ruling.

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

The CHAIRMAN: Whilst in Committee on the Licensing Bill, Mr. Speaker, the member for Subiaco raised a point of order relative to a section of *May* as indicated on page 401 under the heading "Amendments to be intelligible." I gave my ruling stating that the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition was in order. The member for Subiaco has now disagreed with my ruling, and has submitted that the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition is out of order on the following grounds:—

> The Bill will be unintelligible for the following reasons:—
>
> (1) The existing provisions of section 121, so far as relevant to the metropolitan area, have been changed from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.
>
> (2) If the motion of the Leader of the Opposition is carried, then the 10 to 10 will be inoperative and there will be no licensing hours in force outside the Goldfields area.

The SPEAKER: I think I had better suspend the House and study the position for a few minutes. I will suspend the House until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 5.8 to 5.50 p.m.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: The member for Subiaco raised a point of order regarding the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. This is an amendment to clause 24 of the Bill which seeks to amend section 121 of the principal Act. It means that any of the provisions of this clause must be written into section 121 of the principal Act.

The new paragraph which deletes the word "nine" and inserts the words "ten" in lieu can obviously be fitted into the principal Act. The words proposed to be added by the Leader of the Opposition cannot be fitted into the principal Act under review. By that I refer to the amendment appearing on the notice paper, which reads—

> This paragraph shall not come into operation until and unless the proposed new trading hours have been approved by a majority of Legislative Assembly electors voting in the districts where those hours are intended to apply.

This amendment is repugnant to the construction of the Act, and the mover's intention will have to be achieved by other means. If we read the Act, we find that section 121 states as follows:—

> (1) No licensee shall in any part of the State except the Goldfields district—
>
> (a) have or keep his licensed premises open for the sale of liquor; or
>
> (b) sell any liquor or permit or suffer any liquor to be drunk or consumed in or upon his licensed premises,
>
> at any time before nine o'clock in the morning or after nine o'clock in the evening upon any day in the week, except under the authority of an occasional license.

The amendments contained in the paragraph fit in quite well with section 121 of the Licensing Act; but I cannot see where the proviso moved by the Leader of the Opposition will fit in.

For these reasons I must uphold the point of order made by the member for Subiaco.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

Mr. HAWKE: I move—

> That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

I do so because, in the clause with which we are dealing, provision is made to amend section 121 of the Act. That is the section which prescribes the existing hours of trading in districts outside the Goldfields and North-West areas.

The amendment which I have moved to the appropriate part of this clause lays down that that part of the clause shall not come into operation, take effect, or apply until such time as the people of the State have been consulted by referendum, and until a majority of them, on being so consulted, have decided that the proposed alteration in hours should apply.

The amendment aims to lay it down that these new trading hours, set out in paragraph (a), shall not have legal force until such time as the suggested referendum has taken place. The proposed altered trading hours could not come into effect until such time as that referendum had been held; and until such time as it had been held, the present trading hours would apply.

On many occasions in the past, Bills and portions of Bills have been dealt with by Parliament when there was a delaying qualification inserted in respect of the application and operation of some of them. As the situation appears to me, this is a clear-cut case in which the amendment is in order, because it simply lays it down as a decision of Parliament that the proposed new trading hours shall not apply until such time as a certain step has been taken and a certain decision has been reached. Obviously, if the proposed new trading hours are not to apply, then the existing trading hours would continue to operate. I see nothing difficult or impossible in that situation.

Mr. TONKIN: I support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The question surely is determined on whether the amendment is admissible or inadmissible. If it is an admissible amendment, it is defintely in order. There are certain tests to which amendments have to be subjected to decide whether they are admissible. In this respect I quote from May's *Parliamentary Practice*. On page 530, which deals with admissible amendments, the following is stated—

> The special rules of order respecting amendments to a bill in committee are classified below. These rules relate primarily to amendments to clauses, but will be found applicable for the most part to amendments to schedules. It may be stated here that they also apply generally to amendments proposed on the consideration of a bill, as amended; but at that stage there are special restrictions which are described below on pp. 548-9.
>
> An amendment which is out of order on any of the following grounds cannot be proposed from the chair:
>
> (1) An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter—

An amendment which postpones the operation of a clause has never been held to be irrelevant to the subject matter; because your experience will enable you, Mr. Speaker, to realise that it is quite a common occurrence to insert a provision

into the Bill that certain of the clauses shall not come into operation until a date to be proclaimed.

I remember in my parliamentary experience that procedure being followed on many occasions, when this House agreed to an amendment of a statute but then determined that the effect of the amendment should not operate until a date to be declared or proclaimed. It means that, although Parliament has in effect agreed to an amendment, the old law stands until such time as the condition which was imposed is met.

That is all that the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition seeks to achieve. This House agreed that the statute should be amended. We have now before us for consideration the insertion of a proviso that this particular amendment shall not operate until the question has been referred to certain people by way of a referendum. That only defers the operation of the amendment until a required condition is met.

In raising an objection to the amendment, the member for Subiaco said the amendment was unintelligible, or that it rendered the clause unintelligible. In my view it does nothing of the kind. It may be unintelligible to the member for Subiaco, but anyone with reasonable commonsense can understand what is meant when a proviso is put into a Bill to the effect that the amendment shall not operate until a condition precedent is met. There is nothing unintelligible about that. We have done that frequently when amending statutes. When we have considered it was not desirable for an amendment to operate immediately the Act was proclaimed, we have deferred the operation of certain sections until conditions precedent were met. To continue with the quote from May's *Parliamentary Practice*—

> An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill—

It is not beyond the scope of the Bill to decide the period of time when the amendment shall or shall not operate. Quite often we add to Bills that the statute shall operate until a certain time or longer, but no point of order is ever raised. That is not irrelevant to the Bill. Such an amendment is quite frequently accepted and dealt with. It is not beyond the scope of the Bill to make such a provision. The quotation continues—

> —or if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration. Amendments, which are irrelevant to the clause under consideration, should, as a general rule, if they are within the scope of the bill, be moved as new clauses.

This is certainly not beyond the scope of the Bill. I would draw attention to the fact that it is the practice sometimes —especially abroad, although not so much in our own State—to introduce a Bill for the purpose of causing the cessation of the operation of a number of statutes. When that is done, the statutes affected are mentioned in a schedule.

It is quite competent for any member of Parliament, when such a Bill is introduced, to move an amendment to the effect that a section of an Act with which the Bill deals, shall cease to operate, or shall continue to operate for a certain period. In other words, while it was originally intended that a number of statutes should cease to operate on a certain day, it is competent for Parliament to amend that so that the statutes will continue to operate for a certain time or that a certain portion of a statute shall continue to operate. I think I could quote something from May on that particular principle.

Mr. Perkins: I doubt if you will find a reference in regard to a clause. It is mostly done at the end of a Bill.

Mr. TONKIN: That is not the question which has been raised. It has not been suggested that this amendment is being moved in the wrong place. Nor is that the Speaker's ruling. No question has been raised as to the fact that the amendment should have been moved somewhere else. The first point raised was by the member for Subiaco, who said that the amendment renders the statute unintelligible.

Mr. Perkins: It does where it is now.

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot follow that reasoning.

Mr. Toms: Nor can anyone else.

Mr. TONKIN: If an amendment is made to the effect that a provision shall not operate for a certain time or that it shall not operate until certain conditions have been fulfilled, it is quite intelligible. The existing law stands until the conditions are fulfilled.

Mr. Perkins: If the amendment was that the Bill should not be proclaimed as an Act until then, it might have been different.

Mr. TONKIN: Surely the Minister knows from his own experience that we have in this House over the years enacted legislation which provides that certain things shall not take effect until a date to be declared by proclamation.

Mr. Perkins: Are you going to proclaim this clause separately to all the other clauses?

Mr. TONKIN: I am not dealing with that submission but as to whether this amendment is out of order because it is not within the scope of the Bill or because it is unintelligible. That is the point to which I am addressing myself; and I say quite definitely that it is not unintelligible, because members here are in no doubt as to what was intended by this amendment—no doubt whatever, except, perhaps, so far as the member for Subiaco is concerned.

The strength with which some members fought this amendment illustrated that they were in no doubt as to what it meant, and its effect. It was not unintelligible to them. As a matter of fact they had a very clear appreciation of what was meant by it. Therefore, to argue that it is unintelligible is to be ridiculous. To say that it is inadmissible because it is outside the scope of the Bill is likewise untenable; because if that applies to this amendment. it applies to all amendments to Bills which provide that they shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation.

Mr. Guthrie: That is a totally different thing. You obviously do not appreciate the point.

Mr. TONKIN: The member for Subiaco will have an opportunity of proving that it is a totally different thing. If it is outside the scope of a Bill to say that a certain amendment being made shall not operate until after a certain condition has been met, it is also outside the scope of a Bill to say that the Bill shall not operate until a certain date has been reached.

Mr. Guthrie: The way it has been done is the trouble.

Mr. TONKIN: The argument was that the statute has been amended and the words taken out are no longer included. For that reason it is contended that there is no time mentioned in the statute. That is not so, because the words do not come out until such time as a referendum has been held and the proposal agreed to by the people. If a referendum proves that the proposal has been agreed to, then the amendment takes effect in the Act. On the other hand, if the referendum reveals that the opposite is the case, then the result is that in effect the amendment was not made at all.

All the Committee was attempting to do was to apply a condition to its amendment. In effect, the amendment has been made with the proviso that it shall not operate until certain conditions are met. If the conditions are not met, the amendment shall not operate. That is the same as providing in statutes that they shall operate for a certain time, and no longer; or that they shall not operate at all until a date to be fixed by proclamation; or that any portion of a statute shall not operate until a date to be fixed by proclamation. It would be quite competent for Parliament to do that if it wished.

I therefore support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition because I believe that your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is incorrect and, if allowed to stand, could seriously interfere with the normal practice of Parliament in making conditional alterations to statutes from time to time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The question that was before the House—not the one to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but the original question: that is, the addition of certain words to an amendment which has already been carried—was an amendment to section 121 of the Licensing Act, portion of which reads as follows:—

> (1) No licensee shall in any part of the State except the Goldfields district—
>
> (a) have or keep his licensed premises open for the sale of liquor; or
>
> (b) sell any liquor or permit or suffer any liquor to be drunk or consumed in or upon his licensed premises,
>
> at any time before nine o'clock in the morning or after nine o'clock in the evening . . .

Already an amendment has been carried; and if this further addition were passed there would be two inconsistent paragraphs in the one amendment. Instead of reading "at any time before nine o'clock in the morning or after nine o'clock in the evening", it would read, "at any time before ten o'clock in the morning or after ten o'clock in the evening."

Now we have another paragraph which it was proposed to insert but which you, Mr. Speaker, ruled out of order. The member for Melville has referred to Bills where provisions are inserted so that they shall not take force until a proclamation is made or until certain conditions have been met; but they are of a different nature. It is all a matter of draftsmanship. I am afraid the Leader of the Opposition has made an error in the drafting of this amendment. I could have drafted it for him in such a way as to make it permissible for it to be incorporated in the Bill; but, unfortunately, he has chosen to do it this way.

I see no reason whatever to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The insertion of the proposed amendment would obviously make the Bill unintelligible, which is the very attitude *May* took on the subject.

Mr. GRAHAM: I find myself in a most unenviable position with regard to this matter; because whilst I am supporting the Leader of the Opposition in the objective which he seeks to achieve, in my opinion that objective will not be achieved by the proposition which the Committee has been considering.

There is no question about the amendment being within the scope of the Bill, because obviously it is. The intention of the Leader of the Opposition, in other words, is quite in order and acceptable. But the way in which it has been placed before us, if agreed to, would not make

any sense if incorporated in the Act. I do not desire to weary the House, but I feel that I should read section 121, which is as follows:—

(1) No licensee shall in any part of the State except the Goldfields district—

(a) have or keep his licensed premises open for the sale of liquor; or

(b) sell any liquor or permit or suffer any liquor to be drunk or consumed in or upon his licensed premises,

at any time before nine o'clock in the morning or after nine o'clock in the evening upon any day in the week, except under the authority of an occasional license.

Penalty: For a first offence, Fifty pounds; for any subsequent offence, One hundred pounds.

and then, if the amendment were included it would continue—

This paragraph shall not come into operation until and unless the new trading hours have been approved by a majority of the Legislative Assembly electors voting in the districts where those hours are intended to apply.

That in itself does not make any sense because there are only two paragraphs in the subsection, one being that no licensee shall have or keep his licensed premises open for the sale of liquor; and the other being that he shall not sell any liquor or permit or suffer any liquor to be drunk or consumed in or upon his licensed premises.

As the member for Subiaco has suggested, there is a way in which this could have been done, but I am not in a position to indicate that method. But, as I say, there is obviously a way to make a proviso that the existing hours shall continue, and that the new hours can be brought into operation after a certain process by way of a referendum.

However, I cannot in all conscience justify a vote against your ruling, Mr. Speaker. As I have said, the amendment in question would not make sense if incorporated in a reprint of the Licensing Act; and it is for this reason that, with a great deal of feeling because of the situation in which I find myself, I believe it is my duty to support your ruling.

Motion put.

The SPEAKER: I declare in favour of the Ayes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the effect of that vote, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: My ruling has been disagreed with.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am sure there has been some misunderstanding, because members near me who were in favour of your ruling called "Aye", and no-one called "No."

The SPEAKER: The only course to adopt is to call for a division.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Divide!

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—20.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Mann
Mr. Brand	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	*(Teller.)*

Majority against—5.

Motion (dissent from Speaker's ruling) thus negatived.

Amendment ruled out of order.

Sitting suspended from 6.19 to 7.30 p.m.

Committee Resumed

[*The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair.*]

Mr. HAWKE: I seek your guidance, Mr. Chairman. I propose to move an amendment immediately following paragraph (a) of clause 24; to insert a proviso. If you do not consider it would be in order I will have to give the matter further thought, and endeavour to put into the Bill at some subsequent stage what I want to put into it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would have to rule the amendment out of order if moved as suggested; but it could be moved at the end of paragraph (b), to stand as paragraph (c).

Mr. HAWKE: I move an amendment—

That after paragraph (b) the following new paragraph be added:—

(c) By adding a proviso to subsection (1) as follows:—

Provided the hours which were set out in this section immediately prior to the issue of the proclamation of the Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1959, shall

continue to operate until a majority of the Legislative Assembly electors voting in the districts covered by this section approve of those hours being superseded.

Mr. CROMMELIN: I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting the words "voting in the districts covered by this section."

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Mann
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Wild
Dr. Henn	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Noes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May
Mr. Kelly	*(Teller.)*

Majority for—1.

Amendment on the amendment thus passed.

Mr. JAMIESON: I have kept out of this argument so far; but as it appears that the referendum is to be a State-wide one, I should like to take the member for North Perth to task for the wild statement he made earlier in the debate. If one is going to make a wild statement, one may as well sit down and say nothing, because someone is sure to be able to look at the figures and check the statement. The honourable member said that a referendum would cost in the vicinity of £100,000. I immediately told him how wrong he was, but he did not seem to think that I was on very good ground.

I would point out to the honourable member that the last general election cost the State £23,904. Assuming that the 11 electoral districts not affected by that election were brought in under a general referendum, and as there would be only one lot of ballot papers and single instructions to be issued to returning officers, it would not be unreasonable to expect that the figure would not be in excess of £30,000. It is stupid to say that the cost would be in the vicinity of £100,000; and I hope that, in the future, the honourable member, if he desires to make such statements, will check his facts beforehand, because figures are available to him. I am in favour of a referendum being held and I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment as amended.

Mr. EVANS: I view with much concern the passing of the amendment on the amendment. I do not relish being a party to agreeing to the holding of a referendum in an area where the residents will be compelled to vote on the question at the risk of being fined £2 should they not do so, especially when they are not concerned with the subject. Of course, another argument could be submitted that the Goldfields residents might take umbrage if they are denied an opportunity to vote; but I do not think they will. Some people take an interest in elections because they are vitally concerned with the result, but I cannot see the people on the Goldfields showing interest in this referendum when it is being held on a subject in which they have no interest. I have made my views clear and I must oppose the question before the Chair.

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

Ayes—20.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brady	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Mann
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cornell	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Wild
Dr. Henn	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Hutchinson	*(Teller.)*

Majority against—3.

Amendment, as amended, thus negatived.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 25—Section 122 amended:

Mr. OLDFIELD: My amendments have been on the notice paper for the last two days, so members should be well aware of them. I move an amendment—

Page 25, line 10—Delete the words "subparagraph (ii) of."

The reason for my moving this amendment is to reach the stage where I can move further amendments in an endeavour to retain the existing trading hours in country districts on Sundays. Those hours are from noon till 1 p.m. and from 5 p.m. till 6 p.m. The Bill proposes to do away with the noonday session and increase the evening session by half an hour; that is, making it from 5 p.m. till 6.30 p.m. A good deal was said about this position during the second reading, and I am sure that most members have made up their minds on it.

Point of Order

Mr. WATTS: I take it the intention of this amendment is to enable the remainder of the amendments in the honourable member's name to be moved. Is that your understanding of the position, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I would take that as the position.

Mr. WATTS: Then I must ask for your ruling. If that is the position and this amendment is to be moved and agreed to, it will enable the passage of subsequent amendments of which the member for Mt. Lawley has given notice and which I submit are outside the scope of this Bill, and should not be in order.

The measure makes no provision for any change in Sunday trading hours in the City of Perth; and makes no provision whatever for the return of the system of *bona fide* travellers; and, in those circumstances, I suggest the honourable member's amendments are outside the scope of this Bill, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

Chairman's Ruling

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill deals only with the time that liquor is sold or consumed in relation to this clause. My understanding of the proposed amendments is, firstly, that the amendments refer to extending the area where liquor is to be sold and consumed; and, secondly, to *bona fide* travellers. I rule the amendment out of order. I uphold the point of order raised by the Attorney-General.

Committee Resumed

Mr. OLDFIELD: I agree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman. The only way to retain the existing privileges enjoyed by members of the country on Sunday is to vote against the whole of clause 25. For the reasons I outlined, I oppose the clause, because I feel that Sunday trading hours as at present in the country are most desirable.

Mr. EVANS: I oppose the clause because I am opposed to the deletion of the midday session in the country areas. I also oppose the extension of the evening session by half an hour, although my objection to that is not strong. People should be free to drink when they desire. I would like to see unlimited hours. Drinking is not only a social but an economic problem. Those against Sunday trading have argued that most people have refrigerators and are able to store bottled beer in those refrigerators. The result would be the same, because people would still be drinking on Sunday. I can see no difference in their drinking on a Sunday at home and their going to a hotel to drink. I am against lowering the conditions enjoyed on the Goldfields and other country areas.

Mr. HALL: I am in sympathy with the member for Kalgoorlie. I oppose the clause and support the trading hours as provided in the Act. The area I represent provides considerable entertainment; and both the evening and the midday sessions are enjoyed without any dissension. I would like to quote from *Hansard* of the 29th November, 1951. The then Attorney-General (The Hon. A. V. R. Abbott—Mt. Lawley) of the McLarty-Watts Government, had this to say when introducing the Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—

> The representative of the U.L.V.A. felt that, while the proposals in the Bill contained some amendments with which he agreed, he was unable to give general approval to it. Section 122 of the Licensing Act, provides that no licensee shall keep his premises open for the sale of liquor or sell or permit liquor to be consumed on his premises upon any Sunday, Anzac Day, Good Friday, or Christmas Day. There is an exception to this in respect of a bona fide traveller. Under the Act, a person is not deemed to be a bona fide traveller unless he has travelled 10 miles from the place where he lodged the previous night, and unless the place where he demands to be supplied is elsewhere than within an area bounded by a circle having a radius of 20 miles from the Perth Town Hall.
>
> For many years, the provisions of this section have not been enforced in some parts of the State. I have been informed by the Commissioner of Police that trading is permitted to be, and is, carried out on Sundays in Kalgoorlie and Boulder between the hours of 9 a.m. and 6 p.m.—no bottles being sold after 1 p.m.; and at Collie between the hours of 11.30 a.m. and 12.30 p.m., and 5 p.m. and 6 p.m. The responsibility for the introduction of the situation which now exists at Kalgoorlie and Collie appears to have been lost in the passage of time. For very many years it has been carried on with the authority of the Commissioner of Police for the time being, with the concurrence of the Minister.
>
> In addition, it is well known that in many country centres a practice of having what are known as "Sunday sessions" has arisen. The regulation of this practice apparently depends upon the whims of the local policeman.

If we make this illegal we will drive it underground, and the policemen will have a full-time job trying to control the matter. A Government similar to the present Government also introduced a very severe provision for drinking within the townsite—drinking in the streets outside town halls, dance halls, etc. Though it did something to control the position, it was a bitter pill. The Government gave

with one hand and took away with the other; and people coming into the country for the first time, with no place of abode, found that they were embarrassed on more than one occasion. If they decided to have a glass of beer in their car on a Sunday they were charged and fined. If a snap penalty is imposed, the people will be deprived of this privilege. The Sunday sessions in the country should remain as they are. I oppose the clause.

Mr. WILD: I support the contention of the member for Mt. Lawley, and I oppose the clause. For too long, since clubs have become licensed in this State, have the hotels been denied their normal trade. Had it been decided to restrict the hours of trade of licensed clubs as well, I might be prepared to support the clause. I do not believe that the lengthening of the hours of trade will mean more drinking. I cannot think of any worse conditions than those which applied in Sydney when 6 p.m. closing was in operation. People would order six or seven glasses of beer just before closing time and consume the beer hurriedly. That was the reason for many of them getting drunk. With more leisurely drinking, that state of affairs does not arise.

In the main, I support the provisions of this Bill, because at long last we are beginning to be realistic about the licensing law. In this instance I must support the contention of the member for Mt. Lawley. The restriction of hours of trading has nothing to do with the matter before us. If we want to have good hotels in this State, and if we wish to attract tourists, we should enable the hotels to have the same hours of trading as clubs.

Mr. KELLY: I cannot appreciate the reason for the inclusion of this clause in the Bill. The noon session has been customary in many country towns for a long period. It has proved to be very popular. No harm has been done in the centres where it applies. Its introduction has improved the position considerably, compared with that which prevailed before the session came into force.

During this debate it was contended that with the wide use of refrigerators sufficient liquor can be stored for consumption on Sundays. But that is not always possible, because many single men do not possess refrigerators. In my electorate, during the hot summer months, it is impossible for such men to put away liquor for their Sunday entertainment.

The clause under discussion should not find its way into a Bill which seeks to reform our drinking habits. I agree with the contention of the Minister for Works regarding the club aspect. We should not deprive the hotels of the right to dispense liquor on Sunday morning and afternoon, when they have enjoyed this right over many years. I oppose the clause.

Mr. NULSEN: I also oppose the clause. The people in this State have got used to the two Sunday sessions. I cannot understand the argument against the noon session, and its interference with the meal arrangements of families. If it does interfere between 12 noon and 1 p.m., then the session between 5 and 6.30 must also interfere with the family meal arrangements. I cannot agree to the abolition of the midday session. That concession should also apply to metropolitan hotels, and they should be all treated on the same basis. It is not compulsory for the hotels to remain open on Sunday, but they can do so if there is sufficient patronage. It would be a retrograde step to abolish these sessions.

Outside of a radius of 20 miles from Perth, there is a tremendous influx of people to the hotels in places like Rockingham and Sawyers Valley. It was suggested by the member for Mt. Lawley that *bona fide* travellers should be catered for on Sundays. The problem may not arise in the metropolitan area, but in my electorate of 92,000 square miles, *bona fide* travellers from Coolgardie to Esperance are liable to miss the Sunday sessions. Unfortunately the Bill does not cater for them. I consider that lodgers in hotels should similarly be given more consideration.

If a person is a member of a licensed club, he can go there for two hours on Sunday morning and two hours in the afternoon to consume liquor. But if he is not a member of a club and lives in an area where Sunday trading operates, he can obtain liquor for only one hour at midday and one hour in the afternoon. I would have no objection to the hotels being given the same hours of trading on Sunday as are given to the clubs.

Mr. BRADY: It appears that 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. trading will come into force. We therefore should consider the welfare of the hotel staff. As they have to work these long hours on week days, their weekends should be as free as possible. If they are to work on Sunday morning as well as in the evening, their position will become more difficult. We should try to make their lot easier. If it is suggested that there should be one session on Sunday instead of two, I may be prepared to support the move.

On the few occasions I have discussed this subject with hotel managers, they were very upset at the prospect of having to work during two sessions on Sunday. They considered they were entitled to a rest at the weekend. One session instead of two would be all right. One thing which is evident from the debate which has taken place on this Bill is that it has become a battle of vested interests. I think the desire of the Attorney-General

is to make the weekend as reasonable as possible for families. If the breadwinner is away at a morning session while the wife is slaving at home, that does not make for domestic bliss. The average man has only a certain amount of money to spend; and if he does not spend it from Monday to Friday, he can do so at the one session on a Sunday evening. One session would meet the requirements of trade unionists and hotel-owners. I support the clause as it stands.

Sir ROSS McLARTY: I remember that when my own Government was in office the matter of Sunday drinking was a contentious one. Cabinet came to the decision to legalise certain hours of drinking on Sunday, after a great deal of discussion and consideration. I feel that Sunday trading has been satisfactory. When we introduced it, certain people said there would be what is termed a swill, and very unsatisfactory conditions would obtain in country districts. That has not been the case. The only reason why I would vote for the clause as it stands has been outlined by the member for Guildford-Midland. The present two sessions do mean that we force quite a number of hotelkeepers to work on Sundays, or seven days per week. We have to consider what the majority of the people would wish: whether they would like one session or two. I am inclined to think that one session will create a rush in the evening and bring about certain difficulties. In the circumstances I think we should leave well alone.

Mr. HALL: I cannot agree with the member for Guildford-Midland that we would be doing a disservice to the workers on Sunday. In most cases they are well compensated for the work they do and are quite happy about it. Publicans have good staffs and are able to get away from the hotels on Sundays, leaving a member of the staff in charge. I think it would be more sensible if the hour were changed to 11.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.

Sir Ross McLarty: That would interfere with church hours.

Mr. HALL: I think they wind up at 11 a.m., and I do not think it would interfere in any way. It would suit the situation admirably.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Some members have envisaged that the wife will be sitting home while her husband is in the pub drinking away all his hard-earned savings. However, I am opposed to this clause as it stands. With the member for Murray, I believe that the present hours are quite satisfactory to all concerned. Some have said that the reduction to one session would give a licensee more free time. However, although it is not observed, I would point out that the Act requires a licensee to be on the premises in order to attend to his responsibilities. In my electorate people use the midday rather than the evening session. I think that to reduce the Sunday sessions to one would be detrimental to the economy of the State. Therefore, I oppose any alteration of the present hours.

Drinking is a social custom. We do not go to hotels only to drink but for social intercourse, and because we are gregarious creatures. I would suggest to "do-gooders" that instead of trying to limit drinking by restricting hours they should substitute something in the hotel's place so that men can have social intercourse and meet their fellowmen in places other than hotels. I am not in favour of any alteration of the present hours. If we abolish the Sunday midday session the odds will be further loaded against the hotels in comparison with the clubs. There are certain people who are not eligible to join clubs, and they should be remembered.

Mr. BRAND: I hope that we will not be very much longer on this debate. We have had a long time on it, and I think the feeling on this clause is fairly clear. If members care to express themselves I have no objection, but I ask them to be as brief as possible. We want to get the Bill through.

As far as I am concerned, I support it. It has been introduced as a result of many requests from organisations, mostly from the country, including women's organisations. The opinion is that although it might be desirable to have a drink at midday such a practice is interfering in many ways, particularly with organised sport. It is felt that if people must have a drink, a longer period should be allowed in the evening.

I well recall that when the previous Bill was before the House requests were made that bottled beer should be sold, and it was definitely provided that the hour's trading at the meal-time on Sundays was to allow people to have a drink and go on their way. If people desired a store of bottles they had to purchase it on the Saturday evening. It has come to my notice that bottles are being sold on Sunday, and it is the Government's intention to see that this section of the law is enforced.

Mr. Nulsen: Two bottles may be purchased on the Goldfields.

Mr. BRAND: Yes. The Bill providing for that privilege was passed through this House some years ago.

Mr. Evans: I would like the law to be that a person could buy as many bottles as he liked.

Mr. BRAND: I support the Bill as it is. I believe that if the hour's trading is abolished during the lunch-time on a Sunday it will quickly be accepted and our young people will be able to attend their

sporting activities much earlier; and for that reason, sport in the country will benefit.

Clause put and negatived.

Clauses 26 and 27 put and passed.

Clause 28—Section 168A added.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a printer's error in the number of this proposed new section, and it will be corrected by the Clerks.

Mr. EVANS: I desire to register my disapproval of this proposed new section. I have visited licensed premises in the Eastern States and was very pleased to see the children's playgrounds which were provided. Not only were they clean and supplied with many toys, but a trained employee was in charge of the children. That is a far better arrangement than having children in a car outside the hotel while the parents are inside. Only a few years ago there was a tragedy at Waroona in which two children were burnt to death in a car. They had been locked in the car for safe-keeping by their parents who were in the nearby hotel. Some ignition trouble, I think it was, started a fire which resulted in their death.

This proposed new section will make it impossible for licensees, who are anxious to improve their premises and facilities, to provide such an amenity for children. This Bill when passed will encourage licensees, because it is one that will provide dignity and bring the Act into line with modern times and thinking. However, this proposed new section is a retrograde step.

Mr. KELLY: I feel much the same about this proposed new section as the member for Kalgoorlie. I consider it is an undesirable feature that children are being encouraged or being allowed in hotel lounges, which we know is the case in many places. It is also undesirable that children should be left out in cars in all weathers, whether inclement or extremely hot. It is very wrong for parents to leave young children in cars outside hotels while they are inside. I believe the Government should have provided in this measure for the kind of amenity found at many Eastern States hotels; and if it will not agree to any amendment, I think the clause should be rejected.

Mr. NULSEN: I think it is more dangerous to leave children in cars outside hotels than in a playground provided for them. I know of a car with two young children in it being stolen from outside a hotel a couple of years ago—

Mr. Brand: The same thing happened yesterday at Carnamah.

Mr. NULSEN: That is so. I do not think this clause would improve the position at all.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am amazed at the member for Kalgoorlie being such an advocate for the brewery interests. It seems that some members think the community should now centre round the hotel, rather than the school.

Mr. Nulsen: That is an exaggeration.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: It is not. Those who fought in the war did so to provide a better land for their children; and after the war they did everything possible to provide kindergartens, and so on, so as to give their children every chance. Now we find members advocating that kindergartens should be around the hotels instead of around the schools; so that the parents can go into the hotels and remain till closing time, not caring what is happening to their children in the playground. When children are in a car outside a hotel their mother is generally with them. I think it would be a retrograde step to establish kindergartens at the hotels. I support the clause.

Mr. WATTS: For the first time during the debate in Committee on this measure I appeal to members to support the clause as it stands, because the first duty of parents is to their children; and if the clause is rejected we are likely to have the position mentioned by the member for Middle Swan. It is highly desirable that there should be no facilities for people to leave their children in the vicinity of hotels for long periods.

Mr. Rowberry: What about the children left in cars?

Mr. WATTS: I admit that that happens; but because there is one evil we should not create another, but should minimise the first as much as possible. People who have given this question much more careful consideration than I have been able to, have petitioned the Government to insert such a provision in the Act; and I think it is desirable that before this practice develops greatly the legislature should deal with it and adopt a provision such as this clause. I ask the Committee to accept the clause as it stands.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Some members seem to think that people should be permitted to drink intoxicating liquor whenever they want to; and that is hard to justify. Now we are told that the interests of the children do not matter so long as the parents can get a drink; and I am surprised at the attitude of the members for Merredin-Yilgarn, Eyre, and Kalgoorlie. We are asked to compare something which is bad with something that is worse, and then to decide that the better of the two is the right thing; but that is very poor reasoning. I support the clause.

Mr. MAY: I support the clause—or, at all events, the first part of it—but I do not see how it could be policed and how

the children of the licensee or of his employees or guests could be differentiated from those of hotel patrons.

Mr. Watts: There is that risk.

Mr. MAY: Some members seem almost to advocate that there should be a sheepdog provided to prevent the children getting out of these pens. If parents wish to go out, their first duty is to provide for the safety and well-being of their children and not to put them in pens like sheep. The length to which some parents will go is an everlasting disgrace, and one often sees them drinking while their children are not properly looked after. I do not mind anyone having a drink, but the responsibility to children should come first. Putting a pen outside a hotel, and putting the children in the pen while the parents are having a drink, is not the answer to the problem. I agree with the first part of the clause, but I cannot see how it will be policed. In all probability the children themselves would not be able to say whether they were the children of the licensee, his employees, or guests, because they would be too young; older children would not be placed in a situation such as that.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The reason I oppose the clause is that I am concerned with the welfare of children. I agree with all that has been said about its being the parents' responsibility to look after their children. But if we prevent the licensee from providing a playground where children can play, there is nothing to stop the parents from taking their children in the vicinity of hotels, or leaving them in cars, which would be detrimental to the physical and mental welfare of the children concerned.

There is another aspect, too, and it looks to me as though some of the proprietors of city hotels have been doing a certain amount of lobbying in this regard. Some of the outlying hotels which have these playgrounds adjoining the lounges are encouraging patrons, and that could be one of the reasons why this lobbying may have occurred. I agree with the member for Collie that the second part of the clause would be almost impossible to police; but if this clause prevented parents from taking children anywhere near hotels, or leaving them anywhere near hotels whilst they were drinking at the hotels, I would agree with it. However, I think it would be far better to have playgrounds than to have the children waiting around in cars, as is the case if there is nowhere to put them. We have heard of cases where there have been fires in cars and children have been burnt. That is why I object to the clause.

Mr. MOIR: I agree with the clause, although I admit it will be difficult to police. We cannot say that the publican or his employees should not have some place for their children to play, and then the trouble arises as to who can be classified as "guests." However, I do not agree that a hotel, even if a playground is provided, is the place where people should take their children while they are having a drink. I do not think the Government has given enough thought to this matter; but, in all the circumstances, I think the clause is a wise one to agree to. There are other aspects of this taking the children to hotels which should be looked at. The clause, in this instance, has my support.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 29 to 32 put and passed.

Clause 33—Section 186 amended:

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope to prevail upon the Attorney-General and the majority of members to dispense with this clause. It relates principally to the procedure by which registered clubs may obtain permits for the purpose of admitting extraordinary honorary members. I am aware that the members of the Licensing Court have been a little concerned at the increase in the number of extraordinary members who have been admitted over recent years, as compared with earlier, and I am certain the court is looking for some guidance from Parliament with respect to the matter. It is that which makes me like the provision less.

Proposed new subsection (7), if agreed to, will be more or less a guide to the Licensing Court as regards the wishes of Parliament; it is almost an instruction to the court that these extraordinary honorary members must not exceed 15 unless there are particularly unusual or special circumstances.

I am not seeking to achieve anything more for clubs than they have enjoyed in the past; neither am I unaware of the position of hotels in respect of the competition that they receive from clubs. But we must have some regard for the activities of our clubs. I put the proposition this way: Do we want the clubs to become mere beer houses where members, by the payment of a small annual subscription, are able to have privileges of extended hours, Sunday drinking, and the rest of it? Or is it better that we should encourage these people to indulge in recreational and cultural pursuits?

I am a member of several clubs, each operating differently. An earlier clause deals with bowling clubs reasonably satisfactorily, and I happen to be a member of a bowling club. This does not embrace a football club which has a license because that makes automatic provision for players, very few of whom take advantage of the club facilities. It is generally the officials of the club who take advantage of them. However, I am not concerned about that.

Some clubs have male members only; and, periodically, they like to have their wives or their girl friends join them at a social function. For example, the East Perth Football Club—during approved club licensing hours—holds a function regularly every week at which musical items, quiz contests, amateur trials and so forth are conducted. Members, members' wives and non-members are present; but comparatively little drinking is indulged in, compared to what the position would be if those visitors were not present.

[*The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) took the Chair.*]

Mr. Watts: Would the honourable member be satisfied if the reference to a maximum of 15 were struck from the clause?

Mr. GRAHAM: To be replaced by what?

Mr. Watts: Nothing: This merely applies a limitation on the court as to the number of permits it can grant during 12 months.

Mr. GRAHAM: My intention is to have it left to the discretion of the court because of many varying circumstances.

Mr. Watts: I am agreeable to deleting the whole of subsection (7) if that satisfies the honourable member.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thank the Minister for that concession because it will save me a lot of time I intended to spend in explanation of the circumstances surrounding various clubs. However, I ask the Minister to give some consideration to the balance of the clause. To meet the circumstances, a long involved procedure has to be followed. An application has to be lodged at least seven days beforehand. In many cases that would not present much difficulty. It also involves serving a true copy of the application on the officer in charge of the police station nearest to the club within the district as soon as practicable. I can visualise certain country clubs being in difficulties in complying with that provision.

What I am trying to establish is that the present system operates quite satisfactorily, particularly if the chairman of the Licensing Court imposes some limitations or conditions. For example, I am a member of a club of some 1,500 members. A certain number of women are also members. On Friday night, within licensing hours, that club conducts a small dance in what one could call the lounge. There would not be more than 20 couples on the floor. In order to have more partners available for dancing a few more women are invited.

I had occasion to make application to the Licensing Court to have a permit granted to cover these visitors, and it was not anxious to grant the permit. When I explained the circumstances, the court placed a limitation of approximately 10 on the permit issued. That was satisfactory to the club and to the court. Apparently it had the idea that there might be several hundred people attending who were not members. That might occur with a yacht or a golf club, but the ordinary club would desire to have only a few visitors admitted to any function. I suggest that the Minister should have a word with the chairman of the Licensing Court with a view to allowing the existing provision in the Act to continue subject to the limitation that he may impose.

Mr. WATTS: As a matter of fact, these provisions were inserted in the Bill as a result of representations by the licensing bench. I was not particularly keen at any time about the limitation contained in the seventh paragraph of this clause. That is why I have agreed to its deletion. However, I cannot see anything unreasonable in the remaining provisions of the clause. They represent a privilege extended to clubs in the same way as a privilege is proposed to be extended to athletic clubs for other purposes. It is something concerning which the Licensing Court feels that it did not have sufficient information and control in the past and over which it ought to have more in the future.

Although I have agreed to the deletion of subsection (7), I hope the member for East Perth and the rest of the Committee will not press for any other amendments. If the member for East Perth agrees to let the clause go, I will have another talk with the chairman of the Licensing Court; and if any modification can be agreed to, I will discuss it with the honourable member with a view to inserting the modified provision in another place. I do not feel disposed to go beyond that tonight. I move an amendment—

> Page 28—Delete paragraph (a) in lines 7 to 15.

My reason for that is that the Committee did not carry any of the provisions contained in clause 3, and therefore this amendment is consequential because this paragraph is now unnecessary.

Amendment put and passed.

[*The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) resumed the Chair.*]

Mr. WATTS: I move an amendment—

> Page 29—Delete proposed new subsection (7) in lines 10 to 18.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thank the Attorney-General for initiating the move to delete this subsection. The remainder of paragraph (b) looks like a lot of red tape to me; and when he has his talk with the Licensing Court, I would ask the Attorney-General to ensure the imposition of certain conditions and restrictions so that it will

not be a free-for-all, which, I think, is the fear of the court and holders of publicans' general licenses.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 34 to 38 put and passed.

Clause 39—Section 205A added:

Mr. GRAHAM: I trust the Committee will reject this provision and leave the existing provisions in operation to allow clubs to sell kegs to their members. Contrary to the general belief, there is no great trade in barrels of beer in the clubs of which I have some knowledge. A club constituted of 1,500 members, last Christmas sold seven 5-gallon kegs, while the holder of the gallon license at the corner shop disposed of 170 5-gallon kegs. How many were sold by the hotel I do not know.

It is obvious, therefore, that so far as the metropolitan area is concerned, if there is a threat to the hotels, it is from the holders of gallon licenses rather than from the clubs. The profit on the sale of beer, depending on a few circumstances, rests between 50 per cent. and 70 per cent. I am informed that on kegs it is approximately 20 per cent; so that as a rule people would not encourage this type of business. They would prefer to sell by the glass over the counter. It is a facility that is enjoyed and I cannot see any great detriment to the holders of other types of licenses. So why interfere with the privilege? We can be proud of our clubs in Western Australia and this would only irritate and upset them.

I appeal to the Committee to leave the clubs alone. Generally speaking, the conduct of clubs is more satisfactory than the conduct of hotels—and I do not say that disparagingly with regard to the hotels. In clubs, however, in many cases, light refreshments are provided with drinks; there are games of darts, cards, and table tennis. Apart from this, the great majority of clubs are associated with at least one sporting activity on which they are centred.

Mr. CROMMELIN: I support the remarks of the member for East Perth. It is the convenience of being able to buy kegs which is at stake rather than the question of profit made on them which, I understand, is not more than 14s. on a 5-gallon keg. Speaking parochially, we have a yacht club near us, and there are occasions when people wish to get away on a Saturday for two days and perhaps take a keg with them. If they did not have the privilege of obtaining it from the club it would mean having to go a mile or two up the street. People who buy kegs have to hire extractors which are obtained from the hotels, and I do not think the publicans themselves have any interest in this matter.

Mr. KELLY: I appeal for the deletion of this clause. Apart from the clubs mentioned by members in this Chamber, there are those in isolated areas where there are no hotels. There is one in particular where picnics and barbecues are held; and if it were not permitted to sell kegs, a great distance would have to be travelled to obtain them. It is a great convenience to those who desire to avail themselves of this facility. There is also the anomaly that clubs should dispense case lots of beer. The difference between the cost of case beer and keg beer is of considerable importance to sporting organisations and charitable institutions which run functions for the purpose of raising funds. I ask the Attorney-General to omit this provision.

Mr. MAY: I also ask the Minister to agree to the deletion of this clause. There is a very big licensed club in Collie. I do not know of any other club in a similar centre which is as well conducted. It puts on live shows, concerts, and entertainments for its members. The sale of keg beer by clubs will not make very much difference to the liquor trade. The amount involved is very small. I am now thinking of licensed clubs situated in outlying districts, many miles from any hotel. It would be a real hardship if such clubs were prevented from selling keg beer on special occasions.

Mr. WATTS: I do not propose to press for this clause. I am quite prepared to leave it to the decision of the Committee.

Mr. ROWBERRY: This clause would affect my electorate more than most others. The member for Claremont said that if the clause were agreed to he would have to travel over one mile to obtain a keg. In my electorate some of the people will have to travel 72 miles for a keg of beer if this clause is passed. There are outlying clubs in the main milling centres in my electorate, some of which are 36 miles from the nearest hotel.

In the whole of the Warren electorate there are four hotels with publicans' general licenses, to serve a population of 3,534. Against that, in Bridgetown there are also four such licenses to serve a population of 1,777. If the clause is agreed to, the people in my electorate will suffer a much greater hardship than the people of Bridgetown.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 40—Section 247A added:

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I move an amendment—

> Page 33, line 12—Add after the word "liquor" the words "and the effects of alcohol".

This amendment may not appear to be important at first sight, but one realises its importance when one examines the marginal note which states that the Minister is to arrange for tuition in alcohol to be given in schools. The tuition would

be more effective if it were specifically stated that tuition was to be given on the effects of alcohol. This subject needs to be understood by children. The clause would be more effective by the addition of the words in my amendment.

Mr. WATTS: I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. CRAIG: The amendment is superfluous. What is meant by the words in the amendment "and the effects of alcohol"? Do they refer to the ill-effects of alcohol, to something evil and frowned on? We must remember that alcohol is sometimes used as a tonic. The effects depend on the way in which alcohol is taken. If the honourable member means the ill-effects of alcohol, he should be more specific in his amendment.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I support the comments of the last speaker. It is not so much a matter of education on the effects of alcohol; such education should stress the ill-effects or the evils of alcohol. I submit that this subject should be taught in the home, although I agree with the provisions in the clause. In my view there is no need to insert the words referred to in the amendment.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I would like to see the Committee insert these words. The words "and the effects of alcohol" could be more appropriate than the words "over-indulgence in liquor." The person who would give the instruction would be well qualified to speak on a subject such as this. With the inclusion of these words the subject could be made much more interesting and instructive when lectures were given.

Mr. Lawrence: What age would the children be who are receiving post-primary education?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I think post-primary children would be 13 years of age. They would be old enough to receive instruction on a subject such as this.

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

Clause 41 put and passed.

Clause 42—Third Schedule amended:

Mr. WATTS: In consequence of the rejection by the Committee of the idea of having any further wayside house or hotel licenses issued in the future, paragraph (a) of this Third Schedule as proposed in the Bill is redundant. I move an amendment—

Page 34—Delete paragraph (a) in lines 3 to 11.

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

New Clause 26A.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I move—

Page 25—Insert the following to stand as clause 26A:—

The principal Act is amended by adding after section one hundred and thirty-six the following section—

136A. (1) No liquor shall be consumed in any restaurant unless such consumption of liquor in those premises is authorised by the terms of any license issued under this Act.

Penalty: Fifty pounds.

(2) Any person who having immediate supervision of the conduct of the business of a restaurant permits liquor to be unlawfully consumed on the premises is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Fifty pounds.

(3) In this section "restaurant" means premises in which meals are regularly supplied on sale to the public for consumption on the premises.

(4) This section shall not come into operation until the expiration of six months from the coming into operation of this Act.

The Committee has approved of clauses concerning licensed restaurants, but has made no provision to prohibit what might be called unlicensed restaurants from selling liquor. Therefore, we will have licensed restaurants and unlicensed restaurants.

Mr. Heal: We have them now.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: On page 16, paragraph 12 of its report, with regard to restaurants and other places, the parliamentary committee recommended that legislation be introduced to make it unlawful for liquor to be consumed on the premises of unlicensed restaurants. Members of the committee had an opportunity to visit certain of these places, accompanied by an officer of the Police Department and found how undersirable they were. The outcome of that investigation was the recommendation that licenses be approved for certain restaurants. At the present time these places are absolutely uncontrolled.

Mr. Heal: The liquor branch controls them.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The police have no control. What is the use of passing a Bill which will grant licenses to certain restaurants, if those which are unlicensed are able to sell liquor without any prohibition? I have added a fourth paragraph to this new clause so that there will be an

interim period while licensed restaurants are being established. This will provide for the change-over.

Mr. WATTS: In principle there is no doubt a great deal to commend this amendment: It is designed to ensure that the benefits of the Licensing Act shall be provided only for those who have obtained a license under the Act. The provision which the honourable member seeks to have included is, in my opinion, if this provision is to be accepted by the Committee, very necessary. When the Act is proclaimed it will be quite four or five months before the Licensing Court could possibly consider the granting of licenses to restaurants. Consequently, if the last paragraph of this proposal were not included there would be a period in which it would be unlawful for restaurants to sell liquor. Therefore, if the rest of this amendment is to be accepted, this paragraph must be included. I do not think that the definition of restaurant is necessary because it is identical with the definition which is already included in the Bill.

The situation the Committee has to consider in regard to this clause is the position which appears to exist now. There is provision in the Licensing Act for eating-house licenses. I was under the impression that there were quite a number of these in existence, but there have been fewer and fewer, until today there are only two.

Mr. Graham: It surprises me that there are any.

Mr. WATTS: Yes; there are two. One is the Alhambra Bars in Perth which also has an Australian wine license. As long as that place holds that license it would have no need for the provisions of this Bill to obtain a restaurant license. The theory apparently in regard to these completely unlicensed premises, to which reference has so often been made in this House, is that the customer or visitor, taking his own liquor to such places, is as much entitled to consume it in those premises as on the verandah of his own home. That is the difficulty which faces the people who object at present to that form of consumption of liquor. If the proprietor of such a place sells liquor and it is discovered, then he is committing an offence under the Licensing Act and can be accordingly prosecuted. That has happened on more than one occasion during the last three or four years.

The Committee has to decide whether the continuance of that system is desirable. The member for Narrogin obviously does not think it is, and I would go so far as to say that if, as I believe it will be, the provision in this Bill—if it becomes an Act—is reasonably used and not too restrictedly used by the court, then the necessity for such places would become less and less. I was going to move to alter the definition of "restaurant;" but as it is already identical with that appearing in the Bill, I will not do so, although I feel it is slightly redundant.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I must oppose this clause for a variety of reasons, the first being that the restaurant license will be for a limited time. It will make it completely illegal for anyone to consume a glass of anything after the closing time of a restaurant. It will make it illegal for a person to drop in to a place like the White Gum tea-rooms on the road to Mandurah for a meal and place a bottle of beer on the table. He would be prosecuted because it would be illegal for anyone to consume liquor on premises that sells meals regularly. The same situation would apply to the Beaufort tea-rooms on the road to Albany.

But there is a more serious aspect to be considered. It would be the cause of the closing up of the Cottesloe Civic Centre and the Embassy ballroom, because both of those places sell meals regularly to the public. Although I am not sure, I think the same applies to the Subiaco Civic Hall. That is because the definition includes a place which sells meals. For those reasons I say that this amendment is extremely dangerous and ill-conceived and should be rejected.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I agree with the member for Subiaco, because the amendment presupposes that the court will grant more than sufficient restaurant licenses in the city area, as well as in the country and suburban areas, to take care of those who wish to wine and dine. If the amendment were agreed to one could not, when travelling in the country, have a bottle of beer with one's lunch at a wayside inn; and so the amendment would possibly compel many restaurant owners, who otherwise would not do so, to apply for licenses.

Many country towns might not be large enough to warrant a licensed restaurant, and in that event one could not have a meal in the local tea-rooms and have a bottle of beer on one's table. Such a position would possibly lead to a monopoly of eating-houses in Perth. The court might grant only a few licenses or none at all in the city. The licenses might all be granted to hotels which had publicans' general licenses; and in that event one could not provide one's guests with liquor during a meal anywhere except in those hotels. I think the provision should be given 12 months' trial, after which the position could be reviewed. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. I. W. MANNING. I am disappointed that a provision such as the amendment was not contained in the Bill, which we understood was going to tidy up the position in this regard, instead of simply liberalising trading hours and the availability of liquor. One objectionable feature of the present position is that people are enabled to take unlimited quantities of liquor into a restaurant and consume it with a meal. The amendment, if agreed to, would mean that the granting of a

license would be an incentive to a restaurant proprietor to raise the standard of his premises; and that incentive does not exist at present.

I know of one restaurant proprietor who I feel certain would prefer not to have liquor consumed on his premises; but if such a man does not allow the consumption of liquor he is likely, under the present law, to lose trade. Admittedly there may be occasions such as wedding breakfasts, and places such as the Embassy ballroom, where difficulties could arise; but I think there could be provision for them to be exempted from the clause. We should license only those restaurants that will provide a service that is above reproach. Unless that is achieved, I do not think I could support the licensing of restaurants.

Mr. ANDREW: I would like your guidance, Mr. Chairman. I propose to move an amendment as follows:—

> Any person who having immediate supervision of the conduct of any premises registered under the Factories and Shops Act and which are not licensed premises under this Act who permits liquor to be unlawfully consumed on that portion of the premises to which the public has access is guilty of an offence: Penalty £50.

The CHAIRMAN: We already have a motion before the Chair and we will have to deal with that first. In the meantime we will have a look at the honourable member's proposed amendment to see whether it will fit in with section 124 of the Act.

Mr. ANDREW: Very well, Mr. Chairman; I accept your ruling. I now wish to support the member for Narrogin, because to section 41 of the parent Act there is a proviso under which eating-houses can be registered; but they have evaded the Act by not becoming registered. The same thing could apply under this legislation. As the member for Harvey said, the clause in the Bill leaves the position wide open. People who own night-clubs need not register under this legislation, and then they will not come within the provisions of the Act.

If members had travelled around as we did with a police officer, who showed us what was going on in Perth and some of the surrounding areas, it would have been an eye-opener to them. Many of these places are glorified sly-groggers.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Some of them are not very glorified.

Mr. ANDREW: No; and they are defeating the Act by the way in which they operate. The member for Narrogin and I are greatly concerned about it, and we believe that something should be done. The member for Subiaco mentioned certain people who, if this amendment were agreed to, would not be able to do what they are now doing legitimately. He mentioned such places as the civic centre at Cottesloe. But when the members of the Licensing Court gave evidence before us, they said that "occasional" licenses were issued for legitimate purposes. That would overcome the honourable member's objections. All the member for Narrogin wants to do is to ensure that the liquor traffic does not get into such unsavoury channels as we have seen around Perth.

Even if the amendment moved by the member for Narrogin is agreed to, and the Bill passes, there will be nothing to stop what we saw at a little shop in William Street. We saw two young couples, about 18 or 19 years of age, with a bottle of wine on the table, and they were eating fish and chips. They did not even have glasses for drinking the liquor. The police officer told us that the police could not stop that sort of thing, because the people were drinking their own liquor, as far as he knew; and he could not prove otherwise. The member for Mt. Lawley said that we were presupposing something. We are not presupposing anything; we want to prevent what is going on now. I support the amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON: I strongly oppose the amendment. The member for Subiaco gave us some idea of what would happen if it were agreed to; and I think that if we look closely at the definition of restaurant it could conceivably exclude such places as the Pagoda, Canterbury Court, the Lido, and others, to say nothing of the smaller eating-houses around Perth the proprietors of which do not want to keep them open until 12 o'clock, but who are prepared to provide glasses and a good meal, and allow people to bring their own liquor. I see no harm in that because most of these places are well conducted.

It ill behoves people like the member for Victoria Park, who has lived around Perth all his life, to talk as he did. He was shown around the unsavoury side of Perth by a wandering police officer who, no doubt, would be able to pick out suitable places to see. I could take him tonight and, with a spotlight, show him people in Haig Park and Wellington Square eating their fish and chips and drinking bottles of plonk. The police would know about what is going on in those places, too. Was the honourable member taken to such places as the Sea Crest in Cottesloe or the Latin Quarter in William Street?

Mr. Andrew: Yes.

Mr. JAMIESON: What objection did the honourable member have to those places?

Mr. Andrew: None.

Mr. JAMIESON: Of course he would not! I have been to those better-class restaurants on a number of occasions, and on each and every occasion the liquor that

has been brought into the establishment by the party has been handed over at the top of the stairs, and it is later served to the patrons at the table. Further, if there is any liquor remaining after a party has finished its meal the bottles are placed on the table when the patrons are about to leave the premises. In those places no extra charge is made for the serving of the liquor.

With the advent of better restaurants which will be permitted to sell liquor from 6 p.m. to midnight, the unsavoury establishments will disappear. I have in mind a fairly good quality restaurant which has a regular clientele. It is situated on the corner of James and Stirling Streets and is conducted by Botsis Brothers. That is a very good eating-house. The proprietors do not encourage the drinking of wine or beer on their premises; but, frequently, between 6 p.m. and 7.30 p.m., people bring in a bottle of beer and consume it with their meal. However, no extra charge is made for corkage or for any other reason.

It is the small restaurant-owners such as Botsis Brothers, who extend this privilege to their patrons when they are having a meal, who will be badly hit by this provision. They have built up quite a good clientele over the years. In fact, during Show week, many country people patronise these places because they know they can get a good meal and are permitted to consume a bottle of beer with it.

I am merely referring to these places because apparently the members of the parliamentary committee visited only the unsavoury establishments. If they are as bad as they have been made out to be by some members, the conditions surrounding them should be disclosed in this Chamber. If it is considered they are an undesirable feature in the community, people should be warned against them. To place a ban in the Bill to cover all restaurants is unwarranted. Let us try the other provision first; and if these unsavoury places still remain, we will have to amend the Act at a later date in order to cover them. However, places such as Canterbury Court, the Pagoda, and the Lido are registered with the local authority as eating-houses and are well conducted. The existing provisions in the Act are worthy of a reasonable trial. If we begin to amend them prematurely, mistakes are often made that are regretted.

Mr. WATTS: I move—

That the question be now put.

Motion put and passed.

New clause put and negatived.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommittal

On motion by Mr. Watts (Attorney-General) Bill recommitted for the further consideration of clauses 5, 8, and 33.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Watts (Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 5—Section 28 amended:

Mr. WATTS: Members will recall that, when this clause was being dealt with, part of paragraph (4) on page 4 was deleted and the whole clause was later rejected. At the time, due to the slight confusion that arose, we overlooked the provision for restaurant licenses. A list of restaurant licenses is inserted in the Act.

Subsequently, the Committee agreed on the provision of restaurant licenses; consequently it is necessary to include in the Bill the provisions for restaurant licenses that are covered in the Act. Therefore, it will be necessary for me to move a new clause which will become clause 5. I move—

Page 3—Insert the following to stand as clause 5:—

Section twenty-eight of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by adding after paragraph (q) of subsection (1) the following paragraph—

(r) Restaurant licenses.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause 8—Sections 44G-44I added:

Mr. WATTS: The circumstances here are that after this clause had been passed a subsequent clause was amended by having the words "ten o'clock" inserted in lieu of "nine o'clock" in a certain instance. In consequence the word "nine" in line 13, page 6, should now be altered to "ten." I move an amendment—

Page 6, line 13—Delete the word "nine" and substitute the word "ten."

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

Clause 33—Section 186 amended:

Mr. WATTS: It will be remembered that I asked the Committee to delete from the clause the printed paragraph (a) on account of the fact that an earlier clause of the Bill providing for delegation to the licensing magistrate for this purpose had been deleted. I overlooked the fact that in another part of the clause there is reference to a stipendiary magistrate to whom the delegation has not been made in consequence of the deletion to which

I have referred. It appears to be necessary to take out of proposed new subsection (5) on page 29 the words "or the stipendiary magistrate as the case may be." I move an amendment—

Page 29, lines 3 and 4—Delete the words "or the stipendiary magistrate as the case may be."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. WATTS: Another consequential amendment is to be found in the following proposed new subsection where appear the words, "and the decision of the Court or stipendiary magistrate on the application is final." I move an amendment—

Page 29, line 8—Delete the words "or stipendiary magistrate".

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

Bill again reported with further amendments and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Message—Appropriation

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [10.30] in moving the second reading said: In accordance with the intentions expressed in my policy speech, the Government now proposes to vary the present flat rate of tax of 2 per cent. on bookmakers' off-course turnover, so as to provide for a sliding scale which will impose a heavier tax on bigger income earners. An increase in stamp duty payable by off-course bookmakers under the betting tax is also intended.

It is further proposed to levy a tax, to be known as the betting investment tax, on off-course bettors; and principally through this agency to improve the financial position of racing and trotting clubs. Very early in the year, and on a decision made by the previous Government and continued by my own Government, the Turf Club, in particular, has been assisted financially under a formula which was laid down. We have up to this point paid out some £26,000 as a subsidy to the Turf Club. As far as I can see there is an urgent need that the money collected from racing and betting should go, in greater percentage, to this industry, if it may be so called.

I propose introducing four separate Bills, as they are necessary in order to give effect to the proposals. As these measures are all interrelated, it is desirable at this stage for me to refer to the main features of each one. In this way a clearer picture can be given of the Government's intentions and of the financial aspect of the measures as a whole.

The four Bills concerned are listed on the notice paper. They are the Betting Control Act Amendment Bill, the Bookmakers Betting Tax Act Amendment Bill, the Betting Investment Tax Bill, and the Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

A clause in the Bill to amend the Betting Control Act provides for a bookmaker to continue paying tax on his off-course turnover at the present rate of 2 per cent., up to a date to be fixed by proclamation. From that date up to the 31st July, 1960, he will be required to pay tax at a rate to be determined according to the amount of his turnover for the year ended the 30th June, 1959.

The rates of tax which are detailed in the Bill to amend the Bookmakers Betting Tax Act are as follows:—

Where the turnover does not exceed £50,000, 2¾ per cent.

Where the turnover exceeds £50,000, but does not exceed £100,000, 3 per cent.

Where the turnover exceeds £100,000, but does not exceed £150,000, 3¼ per cent.

Where the turnover exceeds £150,000, 3½ per cent.

In arriving at this basis of taxation on a sliding scale, which was intimated during the election and during many of the debates which took place in this House when the previous Government introduced legislation relating to off-course betting and taxes, the Government, the Under-Treasurer, and his officers spent many hours—indeed, I should say days—to arrive at a formula which we considered would be reasonable in all the circumstances.

It is all very well for the critics to say that a 10 per cent. tax should be imposed; or that some percentage, plucked out of the air, should be imposed. One will appreciate that this is tax on turnover; and for the bookmaker with a turnover of £400,000, a tax of 5 to 10 per cent. on his turnover represents a colossal amount.

I know it has been revealed that the income tax paid by certain bookmakers in this State varies a great deal. One, who is well known to us, and alleged to be very wealthy, stated that his income tax was between £8,000 and £9,000 last year. These are the figures given to our Treasury officers and to the Government. They have been accepted by the Taxation Department; and it is considered by the Government that to pluck a figure out of the air or accede to the various arguments which have been put forward—sometimes as a result of bias rather than

on a basis of fairness and logic—would force the Government to bring forward a taxing measure which we could not justify.

At the present time the Royal Commissioner on Betting is preparing his report. We realise that at the end of 1960 the present off-course betting law will run out, and it must be renewed. We have undertaken that we will give consideration to this matter before the legislation is renewed, if it has to be renewed.

Many suggestions will be put forward. At present the Victorian Government is considering a system which is somewhat new to the mainland of Australia. We read that, in England—and I have sent for copies of the legislation—the Government is tackling the problem to regularise and bring under control in a modern law, many of the ancient laws which govern their gaming and gambling activities.

So it is a fact that in introducing this legislation we are experimenting. No doubt the Royal Commissioner in his findings will not be recommending to the Government that a tax on any level, or of any intensity should be imposed. I would imagine that he would not consider that to be part of his duty. Therefore he will not be influenced by any action taken in this Parliament.

We will be able to see, by the end of December, 1960, how effective, how just, or how unfair or unreal is the legislation which we hope will go on the statute book as a result of the introduction of this measure. Prior to the 1st August, and in each succeeding year, each bookmaker will be advised of his turnover in the year ending on the next preceding the 30th day of June, and the appropriate rate of tax which he will be required to pay on his turnover for the ensuing 12 months, commencing from the 1st August. That provision is inserted in order to cover a problem which is created when a sliding scale of tax is imposed, and is related to a certain turnover for the year.

Provision has been made in the Bill to work out to a full year the previous year's turnover of any bookmaker who has been in operation for only part of that year. That is for the purpose of determining the appropriate rate of tax in the ensuing year. Instances will occur where a license is granted in a new location. In these cases there will, of course, be no figures available for the previous year's turnover, for the purpose of determining the appropriate rate of tax to be paid for the forthcoming year. For that reason, power has been given to the Commissioner of Stamps to determine the amount of turnover, which in turn will fix the rate of tax.

A further clause in the Bill introduces a new tax defined as the Betting Investment tax. The rates to be imposed are set out in the Bill for an Act to impose a tax on bets made by a bookmaker in registered premises. This tax is to be applied to all bets made in off-course betting premises throughout the State, and in the first instance is payable by the bookmaker.

He will then be responsible to collect from the person placing the bet the amount of investment tax payable in respect of that bet. The tax to be levied will be 3d. for each bet not exceeding £1, and 6d. for each bet which exceeds £1. It is intended to denote the appropriate rate of tax on the betting tickets, which are required to be used in off-course premises. Two forms of tickets will be printed to cover the two separate rates of tax.

The Bill to amend the Betting Control Act also provides for the distribution of the proceeds of the investment tax. The relevant sections to be inserted in the Act—namely 16B. and 16C.—are contained in the Bill; I think in clause 4. In the first place, the measure provides for the proceeds of the investment tax to be divided into four parts according to the percentage of total off-course turnover in the previous year applicable to races of ridden horses held in this State; races of driven horses held in the State; races of ridden horses held elsewhere than in the State; and races of driven horses held elsewhere than in the State.

The W.A. Turf Club and the racing clubs registered with that body—that is, all the affiliated racing clubs—are to receive that part of the proceeds of the investment tax which is applicable to ridden horses held in the State, together with 45 per cent. of that part applicable to races of ridden horses held elsewhere than in the State.

The W.A. Trotting Association and the racing clubs registered with that body are to receive that part of the proceeds of the investment tax which are applicable to races of driven horses held in the State, together with 45 per cent. of that part applicable to races of driven horses held elsewhere in the State—45 per cent. of the trots held in the Eastern States or outside the State.

The two separate groups are to stand alone for the purpose of distributing the proceeds of the tax between individual clubs. Clubs in the metropolitan area are to receive 85 per cent. of the moneys for distribution in the ratio of stakes paid in the previous year. The remaining 15 per cent. is to be distributed between country clubs, also in the ratio of stakes.

Attention is drawn to the fact that it is proposed to distribute between clubs only 45 per cent. of that part of the proceeds of the investment tax which is applicable to races held elsewhere than in

the State. The remaining 55 per cent. is to be taken into Consolidated Revenue. The justification for imposing an investment tax is considered to lie in the fact that the off-course bettor makes no contribution today, comparable with the admission charges and entertainments tax paid by the person who attends at the course.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the off-course punter simply has to walk into the betting shop as it is registered today, and he is provided with a certain service. He has his bets and then goes out; but he contributes nothing at all to the clubs' revenues. I believe he should contribute in some way to the upkeep of the industry, particularly. That is, he should contribute the money necessary to maintain racing and trotting in the State. I should say, that he should maintain it in the same way as it is maintained and subsidised from the betting tax in some, if not all, of the Eastern States.

At this juncture I think it will be of interest to the House if I read the distribution between Governments and clubs of outside revenue derived from horse-racing in the various States. In the State of Western Australia £461,928, or 32.6 per cent. will go to the clubs. The Government will receive £953,247, or 67.4 per cent. making a total of £1,415,175, which is taken from the racing industry, if I might call it such.

In South Australia, £566,724—£100,000 more than in Western Australia—is paid to the clubs; that is, 43.1 per cent. The amount that goes to the Government is £753,428, or 56.9 per cent., making a total of £1,320,152, which is slightly less than in Western Australia. I point out that with the exception of Port Pirie, South Australia has no off-course betting; it is all on course. I will not go into all these figures, but in Victoria the clubs receive 30.8 per cent.; in New South Wales, 30.6 per cent; in Queensland, 41 per cent.; and Tasmania—they really go to town—54.5 per cent.

I thought I would mention these figures because they are of interest. I called for them simply because I did not want it felt that we did not go to the trouble to assess the total moneys drawn from the industry. I have given those figures to the House so that members might be able to compare them. The figures for Western Australia represent the revenue expected in a full year of operation of the proposed new tax rates. The figures for the other States are the actual revenues for the year 1957-58. It could well be that we would receive less if the trend of dwindling patronage to races continues; or if, even with the extra money received by the clubs, they are unable to attract a greater interest in gallops and trots in this State.

I said that we were imposing this investment tax on the off-course punter in order that he might contribute something to racing. It was suggested to me that the metropolitan off-course punter should be required to pay the tax, and that the country off-course punter should not be called to pay because he does not have the same alternative as exists in the metropolitan area. However, I felt that if a fellow walks into a shop at Morawa, or any other place, and has a 5s. bet, he can contribute his 3d.; and if he has a bet for over £1 he can contribute 6d.

On the formula that has been worked out on the new basis, quite a number of country towns are to receive a subsidy very close to that which will be collected in those towns from the investment tax. In fact, many country towns are getting back the majority of the money collected for their own racing clubs, even though they may hold only one race day per year.

The course patron is contributing to the club's revenues and also to the Treasury. It is contended that the off-course bettor should do likewise. It is not intended to vary existing legislation whereby clubs now receive 10 per cent. of the turnover tax collected from off-course betting on Western Australian racing and trotting events. However, the clubs and Consolidated Revenue will both receive a greater benefit than in the past through the levy of higher rates of turnover tax.

The Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Act will, if passed, impose a further charge on off-course bookmakers by increasing the rate of duty on betting tickets. At present, the duty is a flat rate of 1d. per ticket. It is proposed to increase this rate to 1½d. on bets, the consideration for which does not exceed £1; and to 3d. on bets exceeding £1. The proposed scale of stamp duty on betting tickets has been framed to match the investment tax so that only two types of tickets will be needed. On one of these, stamp duty of 1½d. and investment tax of 3d. will be denoted; and on the other, 3d. stamp duty and 6d. investment tax. Both charges will be paid by the bookmaker to the Commissioner of Stamps when the bookmaker purchases the tickets, but he will be able to recoup the investment tax from the punter when a bet is placed.

I will now turn to the financial aspects of the proposals. The increase in the tax on off-course turnover, based on the level of business in 1958-59 is expected to yield an additional £191,000 in a full year of operation. Of this sum, clubs would receive £11,000, and Consolidated Revenue £180,000. The total collections under the heading of turnover tax, inclusive of amounts paid by on-course bookmakers, are expected to rise from £442,000 in 1958-59 to £633,000 in a full year of operation. The investment tax is expected to yield £264,000 for a full year, of which £199,000 would be paid to clubs and £65,000 to Consolidated Revenue.

In round figures it was decided by the Government that of the total investment tax collected, approximately 25 per cent. should go to Consolidated Revenue and the balance to the clubs.

The increase in stamp duty on betting tickets should increase collections under this heading from £102,000 in 1958-59 to £156,000 in a full year of operation, which represents an increase of £54,000. This will be paid into Consolidated Revenue. Total receipts under the heading of turnover tax, investment tax, and stamp duty on betting tickets are therefore expected to rise from £544,000 in 1958-59 to £1,053,000 after a full year's operation of the proposed new rates.

Of the increase of £509,000, an amount of £209,000 would be payable to clubs and the balance of £300,000 to Consolidated Revenue. The total amount payable to clubs would rise from £77,000 in 1958-59 to £286,000 in a full year, and the contribution to Consolidated Revenue from £467,000 to £767,000. These figures, of course, assume that there will be no falling off in the 1958-59 level of off-course betting.

The effect of the proposals on individual club revenues is illustrated by the following examples. The W. A. Turf Club received £8,718 as its share of the off-course turnover tax for 1958-59. This Club would receive £133,000 from the off-course turnovertax and investment tax under the new scheme provided there is no diminution in off-course betting turnover. The Kalgoorlie-Boulder Racing Club received £385 of the off-course turnover tax for 1958-59. This contribution would rise to £3,500. The Northam Racing Club was paid £212 in respect of the year 1958-59. This amount would be increased to £1,900. The W.A. Trotting Association's allocation would increase from £5,129 to more than £47,000. The sum of £11,500 would be paid to the Fremantle Trotting Club as compared with £1,245 for the year 1958-59. The Bunbury Trotting Club received £138 for 1958-59. This amount would increase to £1,300.

I think I have given sufficient indication of the benefits which would be received by racing and trotting clubs under the proposals now being advanced. These benefits should go a long way towards rehabilitating the industry, if I can refer to it as such. It should be possible for all clubs to increase stakes and at the same time bring about improvements to facilities for the benefit of the course patrons.

It is the Government's intention that once this legislation is passed to ensure that the money which we propose to give to the racing industry from the tax on betting shall be utilised not to improve the lounge-rooms of the committees of the various clubs but to improve the stakes, and provide modern amenities and appointments on the course in order to attract people who are genuinely interested in racing and who desire to go out there to do their betting. I have covered the whole proposal in introducing this Bill, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED

1. Albany Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill.
2. Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill (No. 3.)

Without amendment.

BOOKMAKERS BETTING TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [10.58] in moving the second reading said: This measure is designed to increase the incidence of taxation in respect of off-course betting. The present rate of tax payable by a bookmaker on his off-course turnover is 2 per cent.

The Bill in the hands of members provides for a sliding scale of tax, ranging from 2¾ per cent. where a bookmaker's off-course turnover for the annual period ending on the next preceding the 30th day of June does not exceed £50,000, to 3½ per cent. where that turnover exceeds £150,000.

The new scale is referred to in the Betting Control Act Amendment Bill which has already been introduced, and it is to operate from the date of commencement of that measure.

It might well be asked why the rate of tax payable by a bookmaker in any year is to be determined according to his turnover in the preceding year. In this respect it is desirable that each bookmaker and the Commissioner of Stamps should know the appropriate rate of tax to be paid in any year before the commencement of that year, in order to avoid possible overpayments and underpayments and consequent adjustments. It is not possible to assess each bookmaker's turnover in advance of any year, and for this reason it is proposed to use the figures for the previous year for the purposes of determining the rate of tax which is to be paid on turnover in the ensuing year. Examples of similar procedure are as follows:—

License fees under the Betting Control Regulations are assessed for the ensuing year on the turnover of the bookmaker for the previous year.

Totalisator licenses are also assessed on the previous year's turnover.

Estimates which have been based on figures of off-course turnover for 1958-59 indicate that the proposed new rates should yield £506,000 to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and £30,000 to clubs, making a total of £536,000 for a full year of operation.

These figures represent an estimated increase of £191,000 over collections in 1958-59, and would provide an additional £180,000 to Consolidated Revenue and £11,000 to clubs. The figures I have quoted assume of course that there will be no falling off in the 1958-59 level of off-course betting. Those are the only figures on which we can make any assessment. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

BETTING INVESTMENT TAX BILL

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [11.2] in moving the second reading said: This is a further Bill which deals specifically with the new tax proposed. In my speech on the proposed amendments to the Betting Control Act, I made reference to the introduction of a new tax—the betting investment tax. The Bill now before members aims to impose a tax payable under the Betting Control Act at the rate of threepence on bets not exceeding £1 and sixpence on bets of more than £1. The estimated return on this tax for a full year is £264,000, of which the sum of approximately £199,000 would be payable to clubs and the balance of £65,000 to Consolidated Revenue.

I have already outlined the benefits which would accrue to clubs under the proposed method of distribution and have given reasons why it is considered that a tax of this nature is justified. As this is purely a machinery measure, I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [11.5] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this amending Bill is to increase the present rate of duty on betting tickets so as to require off-course bookmakers to pay duty of 1½d. where the consideration for the bet does not exceed £1; and 3d. where that consideration exceeds £1. The present duty is 1d. on all bets irrespective of the amount of the bet.

An alternative to the proposed increase in stamp duty would be the imposition of a more severe scale of tax on bookmakers' off-course turnover than is now contemplated. After giving the matter a great deal of consideration, the Government came to the conclusion that the best course would be to limit the turnover tax to the rates set out in the Bookmakers Betting Tax Act Amendment Bill and to increase the present duty payable on betting tickets. Additional revenue for a full year of operation is estimated at £54,000, which will be paid to Consolidated Revenue.

That is the total of these associated new measures. We are hopeful that in the event of their becoming law, not only will the Treasury benefit but also the racing and trotting clubs in the metropolitan area, and throughout the State will fare as they have in other States where they receive their fair share of the taxes imposed on the industry; and that they will be able to maintain their attractiveness and secure the patronage of the people who in the past have supported them. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate ad-adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.7 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 10th November, 1959

CONTENTS

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