

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 2nd November, 1960

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	Page
Marvel Loch-Southern Cross Road : Bituminisation	2308
Racing and Trotting Organisations : Income guarantee	2308
BILLS—	
Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment Bill : 2r.	2308
Dog Act Amendment Bill : Assembly's amendments	2311
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill : 1r.	2314
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—	
2r.	2338
Com.	2339
Report ; 3r.	2343
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment Bill : 2r.	2313
Optometrists Act Amendment Bill : 2r.	2336
Paper Mill Agreement Bill—	
Com.	2314
Report	2314
3r.	2314
Supply Bill (No. 2), £21,500,000—	
2r.	2331
Com.	2334
Report ; 3r.	2335
Totalsator Agency Board Betting Bill : 2r.	2315
Traffic Act Amendment Bill : Assembly's message	2336
Veterinary Surgeons Bill : 2r.	2311
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE :	
SPECIAL	2343

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MARVEL LOCH-SOUTHERN CROSS ROAD

Bituminisation

1. The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister please advise—

- what amount has been allocated for the current year to be spent on continuation of the bituminising of Marvel Loch - Southern Cross road;
- what distance will be bituminised this year; and
- has work begun on the road?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- £16,000.
- 16 miles.
- Yes.

RACING AND TROTTING ORGANISATIONS

Income Guarantee

2. The Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:

Has any assurance been given to the W.A. Turf Club or to the Western Australian Trotting Association, verbally or in writing, that, in the event of receipts falling under the proposed new betting control legislation now before Parliament, either club would be assured of receiving payments equal to those now being paid to them from betting taxes under existing laws?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No assurance has been given to the clubs that they will receive amounts equal to those now being paid from betting taxes under existing laws. However, it has been agreed that for a period of at least six months after the date of introduction of the new scheme, the clubs will be paid the same percentage share of the total taxation collected from off-course betting as received by them under the present system.

COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [4.39]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is designed to make certain areas outside country townsites come within the provisions of the Act. This is necessary because, in recent years, country towns have become larger; and the areas taken over and included in the townsites have to be covered by the Act so that correct ratable values may be obtained. With this expansion of country towns, subdivisions of adjoining rural lands are from time to time approved and developed, but the local authorities concerned sometimes omit to extend their municipal or townsite boundaries to include these new subdivisions for the purpose of building residences. In many country towns in recent years expansion has become so rapid that the townsite has extended into rural lands.

According to the definition contained in section 5 of the Country Areas Water Supply Act "townsite" means a townsite as defined in the Road Districts Act and includes any land, including privately-owned subdivided land, which the Governor may declare, by proclamation, to be deemed to be included in a townsite for the purpose of

the Act. Although the Governor may declare, by proclamation, any land to be included in the townsite, such proclamation would give no power to rate such land as townsite land in view of the rating provisions of section 65, subsection (2), unless the definition of "country land" were amended, as is proposed in the present Bill.

It is also intended to delete a paragraph in subsection (1) of section 65 of the Act, and also to delete, in paragraph (b) of the same subsection, the words "whether the maximum rate exigible in respect thereof be 2s. or 3s. in the £ on that value," which appear in lines three and four. Subsection (1) of section 65 would then read—

In the case of ratable land within a municipal district or townsite, a water rate shall not in any one year exceed 3s. in the £ on the annual ratable value of the land rated. Provided the amount of the water rate assessed at the rate fixed and computed on the basis of the annual ratable value of the holding would be less than £1, the Minister may fix the sum of £1 as the amount of the water rate to be charged against and be paid in respect of the holding.

It is felt that a continuance of the limitation of the maximum rate of 2s. in the pound in townsites which were served by the goldfields water supply system prior to the 1st January, 1949, is no longer justified, bearing in mind that all other towns now served from the goldfields water supply system, as well as all but four of the separate country town water supply undertakings administered by the Public Works Department, are subject to a rate of 3s. in the pound. There is also strong justification for a more uniform basis of rating in all country towns.

Members will be pretty well aware that with a view to making statutory provision for the administration of the comprehensive water supply scheme, and for its regulation, the Country Areas Water Supply Act was passed in 1947.

The comprehensive scheme provided, amongst other things, for the reticulation of vast areas of farm land adjacent to but beyond the districts served by the goldfields water supply scheme.

The new scheme made provision also for the enlargement of many miles of the main conduit which has for the past 60 years been the source of supply to the Eastern Goldfields, to the towns *en route*, and to several extensive areas of farms lying adjacent to the mains.

It followed then that, with the implementation of the new scheme, a much more reliable and better supply of water was made available to the many towns supplied by the goldfields scheme, and to the goldfields itself. It is well known that over a very extensive period of time the towns on the goldfields, in particular, and

many of those *en route*, have been subject to severe restrictions because of the inability of the then existing pumping stations to maintain a sufficiency of supply through the inadequate mains.

With the introduction of the new legislation in 1947, provision was made for the repeal of the Goldfields Water Supply Act, of 1902, and its consequent amendments. The Act itself also contained two provisions which were, to a degree, along parallel lines. One provided that where the owner of any holding of country land had, at his own expense, before his holding had become ratable, provided a sufficient supply of water for his own exclusive use, the Minister, being satisfied that such supply was adequate for all the owner's purposes, was empowered under the Act to rate the land at a lesser rate than the maximum provided in the Act for a period of seven years next following the commencement of rating of adjacent land.

The other provision, which, as I have said, is to some extent along the same lines, maintained the rating existing under the provisions of the Goldfields Water Supply Act, as affecting ratable land within a municipal district or townsite.

A great deal has been said in many places regarding the desirability of a uniform system of water rating. Governments have at times appointed committees to examine this problem very closely, and there is no doubt whatever that in spite of measures taken from time to time to smooth out the many anomalies existing in water rating in country areas, we are a long way yet from achieving the goal of uniformity.

It is a slow process unless by the wave of a wand a solution can be found overnight; but I venture to say no such single solution would prove effective without causing singular and undue hardship on many persons served by public water supply schemes.

In 1958, a departmental committee submitted a report to the Minister on the matter of uniform rating. As a result the previous Government put certain of its recommendations into effect in so far as country lands were concerned. There is provision in the principal Act for rating of country lands within a range of 2d. to 5d. per acre. All lands were put on the 5d. rate in 1958 by the Hawke Ministry. This was a step towards uniformity.

The present Government, through the introduction of this amendment to the Country Areas Water Supply Act, proposes a further step in the same direction. The step taken by the previous Government was facilitated by the fact that the increase in rating called only for an administrative action. By comparison, the present proposal affecting country towns calls for an amendment of the Act. Both proposals are directed towards the same end. The

current one has to be brought before the House, while the earlier one required only ministerial approval.

Incidentally, one of the biggest obstacles which has to be overcome in the presentation of any measure directed towards the ultimate goal of uniformity in water charges is the crushing burden of losses now being sustained and which have, in effect, been sustained for many a long year in respect of most public water supplies provided outside the limits of the metropolitan area. Losses on the scheme which has its source at Mundaring Weir are approaching £1,000,000 per annum.

Consequently, it would be sheer folly for any Government, pursuing a course directed towards the smoothing out of water charges, to hope to achieve any measure of success by the simple expedient of reducing such higher charges as exist, to the lower level.

It is sometimes suggested that the middle course be adopted. In this instance this would entail increasing the 2s. rate in the pound, where it is in operation, to 2s. 6d., and reducing the 3s. rate in the pound, where it applies, to 2s. 6d. It would be all so easy were this the answer. Actually, the proposal has been looked into, and it has been found that such an alteration would, in effect, bring about a loss of revenue to the Treasury.

This fact, in itself, emphasises that the great majority of country water supply schemes are rated at the higher figure. The consumers from these schemes are paying the higher figure, and it is only the minority who are out of step.

Many years have passed since 1947 when special steps were taken to protect the interests of the consumers from the old goldfields water supply scheme; and they have had a pretty good crack of the whip.

Let us take the example of Beverley, for instance, in the Avon Valley electorate where, because of the provisions of the principal Act, the maximum rate of 2s. must apply, and let us compare this with Brookton just a few miles southward where the 3s. rate applies. It is not difficult to imagine the problem which a member of Parliament, representing such an area, has in pacifying the residents of Brookton when their neighbours in Beverley are getting off so much lighter. As a matter of fact the differential rating itself is not fair at all.

On the point of cost of supply, there is every justification for the proposed increase. The figures may not be strictly comparable, but when we are considering the impact of this proposed rate of 3s. in the pound, we have to bear in mind there is an interest and sinking fund charge of 3s. 6d. for every 1,000 gallons of water supplied to Kalgoorlie. The corresponding charge in respect of water supplied to

Norseman is 6s. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Members must endeavour to appreciate the difficulties which are being encountered in the operation of this scheme.

Members may desire to recall that valuations at Boulder, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, and Norseman were adopted as from the 1st July, 1953, by the Hawke Ministry, to be followed by further valuations at Bullfinch, Marvel Loch, and Southern Cross, from the 1st July, 1954; and so it goes on.

It may be stated that, on top of these valuations, the rates are to go up. The potent factor remains: Where are we to find the money to meet the numerous losses in maintaining supplies to our inland centres if not through reasonable rating and reasonable payments for the service provided, at times under most difficult conditions?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Spend what you've got better than you do.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: After having heard a comment of that nature, all I can say is, "Thank goodness the country is not in the hands of the honourable member."

It is not only the people who work on the mines or on the land, who endure these difficult conditions; they are endured equally by every member of the staff of the country water supply branch out in the heat of the day maintaining the pipe lines. When a similar measure was introduced into the House and defeated last year, it was pointed out that the Government expected to obtain no more than an increase in revenue of £36,000 through the proposed increase from 2s. to 3s. in the pound.

Members have since had adequate time to give this matter further thought, and I trust that with the explanation that has now been given, they will enter into the discussion of this Bill with no predetermined views. I trust all members will have an open mind on the matter and will not let their imaginations of an all round 50 per cent. increase in charges run away with them, for nothing could be further from the actual effect of the proposed increase.

As all members are aware, particularly those from the Eastern Goldfields districts, and the country areas, there is a fairly high excess water charge operating, and a very reasonable one in view of the desirability of keeping down the consumption of water, which is being pumped at such great loss, within reasonable proportions, and as an assurance against wastage. Nevertheless, the incidence of water rating is in actual fact, so low that the amount of rebate water allowed consumers does not come anywhere near their maximum needs. As a result, we find that approximately 80 per cent. of consumers are using excess water, and paying the higher rate for it.

It follows, as a consequence of the increase in the rate in the pound, that the amount of rebate water to be allowed will be substantially increased, and this will be supplied at the rebate charge which is much less than excess water charge. As a result, the increase in the great majority of cases will be a purely nominal figure. In some cases there will be no increase at all: in others, such as pensioners not paying their rates, all the money they are now called upon to pay out for excess water will be saved. Business premises and industrial establishments, the nature of which calls for a fairly substantial use of water, will not find any substantial increase in their water bills.

These are the reasons why such a small amount as £36,000, as estimated last year, will go to the Treasury. It is nevertheless, a step in the right direction; and there is always the point, that people established on the Eastern Goldfields have always complained of the high charges they have to pay for water, and the need, in their own interests, to use it economically. It may be that with the much better supply now available through improvement to the scheme, and the great improvement of storage capacity on the goldfields since 1947, people in the Eastern Goldfields district, who are now enjoying to some extent the minor boom which this State is experiencing, will in actual fact find it easier to use perhaps a little more water; enjoy more happily the amenity which it brings to them; and, at the same time, have the satisfaction of seeing they are meeting their fair share of the cost, the same as the majority of the other consumers of water from the country areas water supply scheme.

On motion by The Hon. J. M. Thomson, debate adjourned.

DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Amendments

Schedule of three amendments made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's amendment No. 1 is as follows:—

No. 1.

Clause 5, line 33—Insert after the word "or" the words "in any school grounds, within any city, town or townsite; or".

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

I would point out that I think the comma after the word "grounds" should be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: (The Hon. W. R. Hall): That can be done by the clerk.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The Assembly's amendment No. 2 is as follows:—

No. 2.

Clause 5, line 34—Insert after the word "is" the word "being".

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The Assembly's amendment No. 3 is as follows:—

No. 3.

Clause 9, line 19—Delete the figure "1" in the second column and insert in lieu the figure "0".

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

All it seeks to do is to reduce the fee for a bitch from £1 1s. to £1.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

VETERINARY SURGEONS BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.1]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Veterinary Act of 1911, which was last amended in 1923, has become completely obsolete with the passing of time which has brought with it changing conditions and requirements affecting the livelihood of veterinary surgeons and the regulation of the profession in this State. This Bill is not intended to amend the existing statute but to replace it with a completely new Act. There is accordingly provision in the first clause of the Bill for the repeal of the existing laws.

Much of the framework of the original Act has been retained, but the duties and obligation of those connected with the profession are set out much more clearly in this measure. The board has been reconstituted. Provision has been made for the exemption of members from personal liability; and provision has been made for the admission of foreign graduates to the register. The law has been tightened up in regard to the use of the title "Veterinary Surgeon." Provision has been made, nevertheless, for the first-aid treatment by

laymen in areas where no veterinary surgeon or permit-holder is available. However, such operators will not be given the recognition or status extended at present to permit-holders.

The Western Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association initiated the first move in the matter of negotiations for improvement of the legislation. These negotiations have been in course over a considerable period of time. A great deal of research has been carried out by the association subcommittee appointed for this purpose from amongst its members. The members of the committee obtained the veterinary Acts of all other States. Our existing legislation is, incidentally, based on the Victorian Veterinary Act, but while our Act has remained practically unaltered, the Victorian legislation has, it is understood, been brought up to date on several occasions. The study of similar Acts in operation in the other States has enabled the committee to present a proposal embodying what are considered to be the most favourable features of these statutes.

The action taken by the association has the support of the Veterinary Board. Opportunity was taken when this measure was introduced in another place for the expression of a full measure of appreciation of the commendable amount of time and work expended in this direction by the local division of the Australian Veterinary Association.

The practice of veterinary surgery is held in high regard throughout the world, and it is a very important profession. The profession is deserving of the best encouragement which we can give it in this State. This aspect has been borne in mind in the drafting of this Bill. We can ill afford to stand by and see members of this profession discouraged in the pursuit of their profession as a livelihood. Unless the operations of unqualified men are properly regulated, their activities could well have this effect, especially in our less thickly populated regions.

With a view to overcoming the shortage of veterinary practitioners at the time, the principal Act was amended in 1923, and by the provisions of that legislation the Veterinary Board was given authority to permit persons who proved on examination to be qualified or fitted to attend to ailing animals, to do so. The permit enabled these partly qualified persons to give a veterinary service and to charge a fee provided that no registered veterinary surgeon practised or resided within 30 miles of the location where the service was performed.

The primary object of this measure was to enable first-aid treatment to be given. The practice has not been adopted in other States as far as is known. Quite a useful service has been given under the provision

of that amendment. Nevertheless, the permit-holders were, in actual fact, given a status to which they had no real academic entitlement. The permit enabled them to use the title "veterinary" which implied in itself a special qualification. Through the processes of time there has been a tendency for this title to lose its significance, as a result of which the community, and stockowners in particular, are being misled. As a consequence, the inferences drawn through the issue of these permits have become an embarrassment to the board, and we find that very few permits have been issued for some years past.

It is not intended to deprive these operators of their livelihood through the introduction of this legislation. Current permit-holders will be permitted to perform and give for reward any veterinary service, operation, or advice as heretofore, and their names will be registered on the roll as "veterinary permit holders." The Bill does not contain provisions, however, for the issuance of any further permits.

The farming community is protected, however, by the insertion of clause 25, sub-clause (2) which reads as follows:—

Nothing in this Act shall prohibit the performance and giving for reward of any veterinary service, operation or advice by any person, if and so long as no registered veterinary surgeon or any person who immediately before the coming into operation of this Act held a current permit under the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1911-1923, resides and practises veterinary science within 30 miles of the place where such service, operation, or advice is performed or given.

This provision differs from that provided for through the 1923 amendment, to this extent, that the board, while permitting unqualified operators to give a service and charge a fee, will not extend any official status to them. There is another class of veterinary operator at present entitled to registration. He is the veterinary practitioner. There are two classes of veterinary practitioners. Firstly, the man who had practised this work continually for not less than five years prior to the introduction of the original Act in 1911; and, secondly, the member of the A.I.F. who had previously undergone not less than three years' training in a veterinary hospital in Western Australia. This Bill restricts in no manner the operation of veterinary practitioners.

It follows that after the passing of this measure the public will know that any veterinary surgeons being accepted for registration will be fully qualified men. The profession will be fully protected; and this, in itself, should be an inducement for veterinary surgeons to come to this State and enter into practice in country areas. This is most desirable because it is felt that our present permit system has not

assisted in any way in this direction. Rather it has had the opposite effect. The State is still seriously short of qualified veterinary surgeons: there is a shortage in the department and in private practice, and it is hoped that the measures now being taken will be an encouragement to the young people of the State to take the course with a view to filling the empty ranks in our far-flung areas in particular.

All members of the board at present constituted are appointed by the Minister. The board of five consists of the Chief Veterinary Surgeon, two veterinary surgeons—one of whom is nominated by the W.A. Division of the Australian Veterinary Association—and two laymen. This Bill provides that the Chief Veterinary Surgeon will continue as a member of the board. He will be supported by two persons registered under the Act and elected by those registered under the Act; one registered person nominated by the association; and one other person nominated by the Minister. This gives the profession one extra representative.

The existing one-year term of office is to be extended to three years. The Governor may fill vacancies in the event of an insufficiency in the number of nominations. The board is required to be financially self-contained. There is the provision for the prescribing of fees by regulation. A veterinary surgeon at present pays a fee of £7 7s. on registration, and his name remains on the register for life without further fee. It follows that the funds available to the board are very modest.

With a view to ensuring a regular income and also in order to ensure that the register will be kept alive, two important changes are proposed. Registration is to be placed on an annual basis with a lower initial fee. As a consequence of this innovation, it will be found that only those actively practising or having an active interest in their profession will maintain their registration. Under the old system there remained the names of many persons on the register who had actually left the State or whose whereabouts were unknown.

The new proposal will eventually lead to a much more up-to-date register. Finally, it is provided that no person other than a registered veterinary surgeon, and no firm or association other than a firm or association consisting wholly of registered veterinary surgeons shall—

- (a) practise veterinary surgery; or
- (b) use the title of veterinary surgeon or registered veterinary surgeon under a penalty of £100.

In recommending this measure for the earnest consideration of members and perhaps more particularly of those who represent rural constituencies, I desire to make it quite clear that the purpose of this Bill is not to make the requirements of the members of the profession any easier, or to grant them any protection which they

do not deserve, but primarily to maintain the high standard of the profession; to regulate it; and to place in the hands of its Board, a satisfactory statute for its administration in the best interests of its members and of the State as a whole.

On motion by The Hon. J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned.

LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.11]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Lotteries Commission has been for some considerable time providing substantial sums of money for charitable purposes. It is desired through the introduction of this legislation to provide the commission with the opportunity of using for the further benefit of the community a greater proportion of the money which it has available for investment. The commission is required, under section 9 of the principal Act, to see that not more than 25 per cent. of the gross amount received from the sale of tickets or subscriptions shall be expended in the conducting of lotteries and of the commission's business. The balance of funds remaining after deducting this percentage and payment of the prize moneys shall, together with the amount of any unclaimed prizes and all other moneys received by the commission, be paid to a special bank account in its name, or invested in Commonwealth inscribed stock.

The purpose of the Bill is to enlarge the scope of the commission's avenues of investment to the extent that it is proposed that the commission may, in future, be enabled also to invest its moneys in any security if the repayment of the moneys thereby secured is guaranteed by the Crown in right of the State. Times have changed since the passing of the original 1932 Lotteries (Control) Act. The Commonwealth, for instance, allows certain instrumentalities of the States to raise funds by way of loan quite distinct from the normal annual loan allocations to State Treasurers.

One case in point in Western Australia is the State Electricity Commission. This undertaking has a very good record in the successful raising of special loans. It would be a great advantage to the State were the Lotteries Commission enabled to invest certain of its funds in the security of the State. While it may be pointed out that already this can be done through the purchase of Commonwealth inscribed stock, it will be evident to members that Western Australia benefits only proportionately—probably to the extent of not

more than 10 per cent.—through such investment. The passing of this Bill will facilitate the Lotteries Commission making a more direct and fuller contribution to the development of the State.

I desire to say most emphatically that the object of introducing this legislation is purely to provide the avenue of investment, and certainly not with any intention of stepping up investments to the detriment of other fields of endeavour, such as hospitals and charitable organisations, the helping and encouragement of which constitutes the prime purpose of the principal Act. Lest the purpose of the proposal be misconstrued in any way or for any reason whatsoever, I believe, Mr. President, I should read to you a copy of the communication addressed by the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission to the Minister, under date the 27th September last—

Hon. the Chief Secretary,
Chief Secretary's Department,
Perth.

Dear Sir,

Re proposed amendment to Lotteries Control Act.

We have a Bond maturing on the 15th October, 1960, and my Board would be pleased to invest it in W.A. Government securities.

As the Lotteries Control Act, Section 9, Sub-section 2, provides that investments shall only be made in Commonwealth Inscribed Stock, my Board respectfully requests that this Section be amended to provide for investments to be made in W.A. Government securities in addition to Commonwealth Inscribed Stock.

Trusting you will give this matter consideration.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) L. J. TRIAT,
Chairman.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What is the size of the bond?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know the extent of the bond. The chairman, in his letter, did not say; but I shall discover the answer for the honourable member before the Bill is adopted. I suppose the letter is not limited to this bond but the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission mentions that this particular bond matures on the 15th October.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is a fact that the Lotteries Commission is looking to the future in regard to some of its disbursements.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think there is any doubt about that. In the administration of one of my portfolios, I know that the commission is committed to a substantial amount. The commission has already been generous enough to pay half the cost of the provision of flats for widows, and I am expecting it to pay the

other half at a later date. This is only a minor commitment compared to some of the others that I know it has.

It may be appropriate at this stage to say that in another place a question was asked about the intention of the Lotteries Commission to invest some of its money in the totalisator agency board scheme. The assertion contained in that question was emphatically denied by the Chief Secretary. In case anyone might wish to raise the point here, I refer the House to the assurance given by the Minister in another place.

The letter sent to the Chief Secretary by the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission is a simple explanation of the conception of the idea which has resulted in the introduction of this measure, which I heartily recommend to all members for their endorsement.

On motion by The Hon. E. M. Davies,
debate adjourned.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

PAPER MILL AGREEMENT BILL

In Committee

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.21]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

I did not rise during the Committee stage because the Bill contains only one or two simple clauses. The whole explanation of the Bill is contained in the agreement arrived at between the Government and Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd.

Last night Mr. Loton raised a question, and I was not able to give him the complete answer. He asked me about the interest rate. I have made inquiries, and it is expected that the amount of interest the Government will be called upon to subsidise will be of the order of 1 per cent. as a maximum. I am informed by my colleague, the Minister for Industrial Development, that there is good reason to believe that this figure will not be exceeded; it is for a limited period only; and it adjusts itself during the course of the agreement.

I think the other point that was raised—I am not sure whether this was put forward by Mr. Loton—was in connection with the question of security. The Government is

fully secured under mortgage; the advances by the Government are secured by mortgages.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: I asked that question.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st November.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [5.24]: The Bill follows on the report of Sir George Ligertwood, dated the 4th December, 1959. The report, in my opinion is a comprehensive and interesting document; especially when it is borne in mind that it was composed by a man who, prior to his experience in this instance, knew little or nothing about racing or betting. His analysis, generally, of the position, as drawn from the evidence with which he was confronted, reflects the greatest credit on him; although in the course of my remarks I propose to differ from him in some of the conclusions which he drew.

I do not wish to labour the point unduly, but I think that when approaching a consideration of the Bill we have to give thought to its genesis. We all remember that the question of betting, involving the conduct and administration of the Betting Control Board, and the granting of licenses to betting shops, became a very hot political issue a couple of years ago; and it became a political issue almost wholly and solely because there were grave allegations of corruption involving officials and others. I think that is a correct statement concerning the political issue.

In that regard, it is as well for us to recall what Sir George Ligertwood had to say in his report concerning those allegations. At page 42, this is what he had to say—

A considerable period of the inquiry was occupied with the question whether there was corruption in relation to the granting of applications for book-makers' licenses as to which rumours were current prior to the appointment of the commission. The result from this point of view was negative, there being no proof of corruption of any person in authority.

I venture to say that if the Government had been aware or had been convinced of that statement earlier in the piece, there would have been no Royal Commission; and there would be before us no such Bill as we are now dealing with. So I say the premises on which the Royal Commission was brought into being were, in the main, negatived.

At this stage I shall briefly report the state of affairs which existed prior to the introduction of the Betting Control Act,

1954. Unlike the majority of members who have spoken to the Bill, I think I can say that throughout my life I have acquired a good deal of experience of the sport of racing; of its administration; and of the various aspects regarding betting. For the greater part of my life I have been what is termed a moderate bettor. For many years I served as a committee man on the Kalgoorlie Racing Club and the Esperance Racing Club. For a number of years I have been a member of the W.A. Turf Club; and, on the goldfields, I practised for many years as a solicitor, especially during the period when street and shop betting were illegal.

I think that at some time or other I have been in just about every betting shop in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. I considered it my duty to inspect them and, in doing so, it has been my practice, on occasions, to patronise them when a race is in progress. I have done the same in Perth. So, with some modesty I think I can claim to have a little knowledge of this subject. All of us tend to have short memories, but it is pertinent for all of us to recall the bad state of affairs that existed throughout Western Australia prior to the introduction of the 1954 Act.

If members are interested enough to look over the debates that took place in this House on that legislation, the whole sorry state of affairs that existed at that time is recorded in *Hansard* for all to read. When I used to be present in the Kalgoorlie court on a Monday morning, there would be probably seven or eight, or even more, charges listed for illegal betting. Some poor derelict individual would be brought before the court by the police who knew full well that the individual charged was only a "front" and was doing this service for a fee of £5, whereas the real offender was going scot-free. The police knew that; the magistrate knew it; and the Government knew it, and it all added up to a very bad state of affairs.

The police officers were continually being offered bribes and were subject to corruption. Eventually the public rebelled and the Government decided to legalise off-course betting; and, since 1954, the system of licensed betting premises has operated in Western Australia. That legislation at the time was vigorously opposed; and well-meaning people both within and outside the House argued and were convinced that the Government was doing the wrong thing. They said that there would be an upsurge of betting among the youth in the community, homes would be destroyed, and so forth. I venture to say that those prophecies have not been fulfilled. In fact, the law is now respected; the great majority of betting shops are hygienic, decent, and modern-looking places; and, from my experience, the men who conduct them are respectable citizens.

Rarely, if ever, do we hear of anybody now being convicted for a breach of the betting laws. Opponents of the Bill told us that there would be drunkenness and brawls in the betting shops, but how many members have been in them on a Saturday morning to see what goes on? It is their duty to inspect them, and if they did so, they would see that in the majority of instances there is not a great amount of dissimilarity between them and a busy bank.

This Bill has been introduced simply because the Government committed itself on the assertion that there was corruption. It certainly had the recommendation of Sir George Ligertwood, an eminent jurist, whose opinion is worthy of the greatest respect; but, in matters relating to our domestic life, to racing and betting, and to the everyday life of the people, we members of Parliament should be as well informed as Sir George Ligertwood and quite as capable as he is in drawing correct conclusions.

I was hoping that the Government would not have persevered with this Bill, but would have waited a year or two, because it is taking the grave risk of upsetting a system which is working satisfactorily. I am not one to say that it is devoid of all weaknesses. For instance, I am not always happy to see a betting shop right up against a hotel. I would like some of the premises to be enlarged to avoid congestion of people in them, which I have seen in some instances. However, those are minor weaknesses which experience should rectify. Yet the Government is going to take the grave risk of upsetting the whole appellation by introducing this measure, which, I am sure, every member of this House is finding difficult to comprehend.

Is the public clamouring for this measure? Is there a strong agitation by the general public to do away with betting shops and substitute something different? I suggest that there is no such agitation. Are the churches and similar organisations advocating for a change in the system? If they are, I am not aware of it. Are the racing clubs enthusiastic about this Bill? I venture to say that they are not particularly enthusiastic over it. I would agree that the Trotting Association is mildly enthusiastic about the measure, but it is wondering what is going to happen if it is passed. Also, judging from the fact that not one member, apart from the Minister, has risen from his seat to extol the virtues of this measure, I must draw the conclusion that the members in this House are not enthusiastic about it.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is plenty of time yet.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am sorry, Mr. Baxter. I hope other members will speak, because it is the duty of everyone to consider this subject very carefully.

It is a great pity that the Bill seems to have been introduced on party lines. On the one hand we have the Government pushing it forward and, on the other hand, we have the Labor members seemingly opposed to it. In my mind the whole picture seems to have been distorted. The members of the Labor Party have been put in an invidious position by the assertion that they are the friends of the S.P. bookmakers and are opposed to the racing clubs. Such assertions are utterly untrue.

In speaking for myself, I know many S.P. bookmakers; and, over the years they have been operating, I have found them to be decent-living citizens who conduct their businesses in a correct and proper way. I know just about every bookmaker who fields on the racecourse and I say the same about them. I do not want to do anything that will take away their livelihood. I do not want to be a party to anything that will unduly handicap racing clubs, because if there is one sport I really do enjoy it is the sport of racing. There are many decent features about it. I find that members of the committee of any racing club and the majority of people associated with racing are respected citizens who are rendering their services in an honorary capacity to foster a sport they love.

I do not want to continue much longer, but I wish to remind members that there are some salient paragraphs in the report issued by Sir George Ligertwood. The Bill proposes to introduce an off-course system in this State, based largely on the system which operates in New Zealand. In many respects Western Australia is vastly different from New Zealand, and it is as well to bear in mind how the New Zealand system operates. The Royal Commissioner stated on page 7 of his report the following relating to the New Zealand system:—

The totalisator has been the sole on-course betting medium for many years and since 1951 it has been lawful to bet off-course by means of a totalisator scheme, to which I have already referred and which I will examine at length. The legislation established a Totalisator Agency Board which manages the off-course scheme. All bets laid off-course are incorporated in the totalisator on-course. All other betting and also betting with infants is prohibited.

There is a great difference between the size of New Zealand and Western Australia. The territory of New Zealand could be placed in the south-west corner of this State. I do not know whether New Zealanders are interested in Eastern States races. I do not think they would be as interested as we are in Western

Australia. Page 35 of the report deals further with the situation in New Zealand. This is what the report states—

The unit of investment on the T.A.B. is 10s. in the case of straight-out and place betting and 5s. in the case of doubles betting.

This Bill proposes that the minimum wager shall be not less than 2s. 6d. I quote from page 35 of the report again—

The majority of racing and trotting meetings in New Zealand are held on Saturdays, with the result that most of the bets are made in branches and agencies on Fridays and Saturdays. The offices are open for business from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Fridays (Friday being a late shopping night in New Zealand) and from 8.30 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. on Saturdays. It has been found that sales after 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays are negligible.

The offices provide only the minimum information to enable a punter to place his bet. Race lists are displayed showing the meeting, the number of the race and the number of each horse entered in that race.

No other information is available in the betting office, no broadcast is permitted in the premises, no seating is provided and the payment of dividends is not made until the business day next following the particular meeting. In this way, there is no loitering or congregation of persons in the vicinity of a T.A.B. office.

When the race is concluded, the results and dividends are telephoned to T.A.B. head office by the T.A.B. representative on-course and head office conveys the information to the New Zealand Broadcasting Service, which then broadcasts both the result and the dividends of the race.

The off-course totalisator scheme envisaged in the Bill will impose a vastly different set-up in Western Australia, as compared with the present position. I share the fears of other speakers that this legislation will not operate satisfactorily, because, firstly, the size of this State will impede the satisfactory operation of a scheme based on the New Zealand scheme. Over the years the people in this State have acquired characteristics which are very different to the characteristics of the people living in New Zealand. Some of our characteristics might be better than theirs, and some might be worse. Our mode of living is considerably different.

I share the view that if an off-course totalisator system is put into operation in this State, the great majority of people who over the past several years have become used to the legalised betting shops will require some other means to satisfy their desire for betting.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Will you elucidate the term you used: "the great majority of people"? Do you mean the great majority of all the people?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: A big section of the people find it difficult to attend race meetings, and they make use of the off-course facilities. I ask members to look around some of the betting shops. If they do they will see that among the patrons are old people; pensioners; shift workers who have no time to attend the racecourses; and people going to football matches, cricket matches, and the like.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What percentage of the population do you think engages in betting?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I cannot answer that question. My guess might well be off the mark. There is a betting shop situated in premises at the corner of Newcastle and Beaufort Streets. It is a clean and well-conducted establishment. I have only been there a few times and I have found it to be hygienic. There are a few seats provided in that shop. On Saturday evening recently I went into this betting shop to find out which horse won a particular race in which I was interested. I saw some 30 men and women pensioners in the premises. They had race cards and newspaper selections of the trotting races, and they were listening to the broadcasts. Now and again one would make a 2s. 6d. bet.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That speaks well for our pension scheme.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Those people were not doing any harm to others by indulging in a few bets. That was their means of spending their Saturday evenings.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I asked you what percentage of the people bet, because you referred to the majority of people who bet.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What percentage does the Minister think?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not know.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Those old people form a section of the community whose legitimate needs are worthy of consideration. Under the present off-course betting system they are being catered for. They cannot afford to attend the race meetings on Saturday afternoons or trotting meetings on Saturday evenings, so they have their bets at the shops. There are many people in the community who are keen on football, cricket, and tennis matches. They have not the time to attend the races or trots, but they like to have a bet or two on Saturdays. Is there anything wrong with those people making use of the betting shop facilities?

I have examined the Bill and I find that in all, 18 clauses—clauses 37 to 54 inclusive—deal with penalties and offences under the Act.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Government must expect a lot of illegal betting to result.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If the off-course totalisator system is to be put into operation, and if all other forms of off-course betting are to be stopped, then those clauses to which I have referred will have to be enforced. In New Zealand it was found necessary to establish a special branch in the Police Force to administer the off-course betting legislation.

Reference was made by Mr. Ron Thompson to the position in Adelaide. I have not the statistics concerning betting in South Australia, nor am I familiar with the set-up, but every week one can read in the newspapers of the penalties that have been imposed in respect to off-course betting offences. Even the Royal Commissioner stated in his report that illegal betting had not been stamped out in the other States. I know that in Queensland it is rampant.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: One can place a bet in any hotel in Adelaide.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I cannot understand why any Government should be prepared to take the risk of implementing an off-course totalisator scheme which would bring about the state of affairs found in some of the other States. I was hoping that this measure would have been approached in a different way—not along party lines. I am not one who encourages gambling among the community. I am sure that my son will be induced—as far as I am able to induce him—to keep away from betting on races; although I do not propose to stop him from having a bet on the Melbourne Cup, the Perth Cup, the Kalgoorlie Cup, or the Esperance Cup.

I am putting forward these views not because I am biased in favour of either the betting shops or the racing clubs. I have friends on both sides. It is my desire to do the right thing for the public. I honestly believe from my intense study of the situation and from my own experience of betting on races, both in Perth and on the goldfields, that the present off-course system is working satisfactorily. It may not be 100 per cent. perfect, but improvements can be made. The Government is unwise in taking the risk of throwing this system overboard to introduce something which, at the best, could be described as problematical, and which could create a lot of trouble.

I do wish that the House would postpone this legislation for twelve months or so because time and experience are worthwhile in matters of this kind. The present legislation has been operating for only about five years, and if it were not a success one would have thought there would have been a public outcry; that there would have been many abuses; and that youth would have been corrupted. We have only to look at the beaches, and

the cricket clubs, as well as the football clubs and running clubs, to see that youth today is not interested in horse racing. The few who are found in betting shops are a negligible section of the community. Mr. Strickland has pointed out clearly by statistics that the general community is losing interest in horse racing. This applies not only on the course but also off the course.

I suppose that a lot like myself will go on betting, but the younger generation will not bet to the extent I have, although I claim to be a modest bettor. There are so many avenues open to youth today, and I am sure that is the reason why young folk are not interested in betting.

I feel sorry for the Turf Club, which is a decent body, working hard and doing its best to attract attendances; but the people are just not responding. This, I believe, is because the young people of today, at any rate, are not greatly interested in horse-racing, and certainly not to the extent that they used to be in my young days. Also people have homes to pay for, and motorcars, wirelasses, and suchlike, and they just cannot afford to lose \$5 or more on a horse race.

I am going to oppose this Bill and I sincerely hope that the Government will give it a second thought and not persist with it.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [6.3]: I have only a small contribution to make to the debate on this Bill. I went to Victoria Park yesterday on business and, while there, gave someone a lift. This person was going to make a bet on the Melbourne Cup. I took particular notice of the shop which was visited, as I have done since this legislation came before the House. I was impressed with the orderly, respectable, and decent-looking people who went in, placed their bets, and then came out. I compared the conditions there with those about which I have spoken before in this House—those existing before betting shops came into operation.

I had the task of rearing a family alone while I was in business in the city. I had the misfortune to live in a house which had a lane running behind it. Every Saturday afternoon I had to send the children away because of the sordid conditions which existed at the end of the lane. Members would not believe what took place there without seeing it. There were drunks, and people being sick; and the language could not be tolerated. The conditions were so degrading that more than once I made a protest to the Police Department, but my efforts were unavailing, although I was not the only one who protested.

Any Government—or band of people—which is prepared to reintroduce those kinds of conditions into a community is wanting in integrity and intelligence, because those conditions were a blot on the escutcheon of this State.

Another unfavourable aspect of the backlane betting was the employment of stooges. Mostly they were pensioners; and I had one living in my house. He thought it was worth while to be paid a certain amount of money—generally £5—when all he had to do was to be arrested, taken to the police station, and charged. There are some things which I know men can condone, but as a woman I cannot condone that sort of behaviour.

I am speaking the truth about what I saw. I can give years, dates, and names if they are required. I do not bet except when I go to the races, and then I generally lose. However, I have no desire to spoil anyone's sport. While horse racing is the sport of kings, it will always be prevalent in the British Empire; and while there is horse racing there will always be betting. Therefore, why not make it so that it can be tolerated instead of bringing back the old degrading system of illegal S.P. betting. Men will bet on almost anything; I have known them to bet on flies crawling across hotel bars.

It was to the credit of a Labor Government that it was able to introduce legislation to wipe out illegal S.P. betting. On the other hand, the inquiry which was held into betting was nothing but a waste of public money. I do not know what good it did. I am certain that the publicity involved did not help the present Government, because the inquiry was the most degrading we have had. It had the effect of smearing the characters of decent men; and all the raffia of the country gave evidence. I cannot see that any good has come out of it, and I am going to protest in public and in private against this system which will reintroduce the old conditions.

We should not allow children to be subjected to the filthy language and scenes about which I have spoken. There is no honesty in the men who have introduced this legislation; and, as I have said, the Royal Commission was a waste of public money. It would have been far better if the money had been spent in trying to improve the conditions of those who cannot help themselves; for instance, the mentally afflicted people. And I am opposing the Bill on those grounds.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: How is it a waste of public money?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Who paid for the Royal Commission? We paid for it; and I with the rest. I did not want to pay for it; and that is my protest about the betting Bill. As I have said, I took the trouble to inspect some of these betting shops, and I found all of them were conducted quietly and decently. When this legislation is passed and the first S.P. abuse occurs, members will hear my voice in this House; and I will be pretty vocal against those who will have allowed such abuses to occur again in the community.

Sitting suspended from 6.10 to 7.30 p.m.

THE HON. G. E. JEFFERY (Suburban) [7.30]: What I have to say will not take a great deal of time. I rise to oppose the second reading of this Bill. I am amazed that the Government has presented it. Despite all that was said at the time when the present set-up became law, the system has worked admirably. Even those who are opposed to betting on moral grounds agree that the present system is conducted really well.

I feel rather like the Duke of Wellington who, when speaking of a scruffy collection of troops, said, "I don't know what effect these troops are likely to have on the enemy, but by God they frighten me!" Those are my feelings in regard to this legislation.

I feel that proof of the efficiency of the present set-up is to be found in the turnover figures of the last three years. In 1958, an amount of £27,000,000 was invested in betting; £18,000,000 being invested in off-course betting. An amount of £17,000,000 was invested in 1959, and £17,000,000 was invested during the 12 months ended the 31st July, last year. It is amazing that of £17,000,000 invested in off-course betting, there were only 22 betting disputes. It is interesting to find that of the 22 disputes referred to the board, seven were declared void; four were declared in favour of the bettor; and 11 were declared in favour of the bookmaker. In £17,000,000 worth of transactions, on only four occasions was the bettor found to be correct. I think it speaks very well for the system and those who operate it.

I feel that with a class-conscious Government such as this, the man who places his bet with the S.P. bookmaker is looked down upon. The class consciousness that exists is amazing. One S.P. bookmaker was not good enough to join the local golf club. In order to play golf he had to leave the district in which he resides and play in another area. Yet that bookmaker endowed a bed in the local hospital. That is an attitude of mind we find in the community towards S.P. bookmakers. There is an S.P. bookmaker who operates in my own suburb of Bassendean. I have seen his premises from the outside, and those who patronise his place speak highly of him and of the way he conducts his business. That man is an ex P.O.W. from Singapore and does not enjoy good health. I wonder what his future will be under this proposed legislation.

The lack of enthusiasm of members of the Government parties for this legislation is amazing. The silence is so overpowering one can almost hear it. With the exception of the Minister, I have yet to hear a comment from a Government member.

I am not in favour of clause 53. It would make Krushchev blush! Imagine the set-up where a police officer may walk into any hotel and arrest a person if he has reasonable grounds for suspicion. As

a member of Parliament I have had a bet. I will bet on anything with my constituents as a sporting gesture. I think the Government should have a good look at clause 53 which says—

53. (1) If any member of the police force of the State has reasonable grounds for suspecting that any person whom he finds on any premises in respect of which a license has been granted under the Licensing Act, 1911, has at any time on that day on which he finds him been guilty of betting or offering to bet contrary to the provisions of this Act, on those premises, or that that person is on those premises for the purpose of so betting, that member of the police force may without warrant arrest that person and remove him from the premises or cause him to be so arrested or removed.

That is a doubtful clause, to my mind. I suggest that subclauses (2) and (3) give the game away. Subclause (2) says—

If any person who has been so removed from any such premises re-enters or is again upon those premises during that day on which he was so removed, he commits an offence.

I suggest that the average punter, if removed once, might feel like going back because he cannot stay away from racing. However, if he has been arrested once for the offence, I do not think he would be foolhardy enough to get caught again on the same day. Subclause (3) removes the right of an individual to take proceedings against a police officer. I suggest there is no necessity for any police officer, who cares to be officious, to walk into an hotel and cause a disturbance. The clause should be deleted.

The board, as it is proposed to be set up, is to include three members of the Trotting Association and three members of the Turf Club, with the chairman to be nominated by the Minister. One of each of the three members from the Trotting Association and from the Turf Club is to be nominated by the country clubs. I suggest that if each of these bodies was represented by one member, that would be sufficient. Other representatives could be included from other walks of life where there is an interest in racing; for instance, the breeding fraternity, and the poor old punter.

I have not a personal axe to grind. I have found that fools are easily parted from their money where gambling is concerned. I can visualise all enterprising publicans busily engaged in having their toilet blocks painted in anticipation of a return to the scheme of things that existed in the bad old days, when the S.P. operator used those premises on many occasions as his place of business.

A working man is likely to continue to place his bets with the S.P. bookie, because he knows the return he will get. If this

legislation is passed, the illegal S.P. bookmaker will come into existence again, and all those undesirable features that existed prior to the present set-up in 1954 will return. I think everyone has a recollection of those persons who were convicted, for dummyming. Some persons had 20, or 30, or even 50 convictions. A person was paid £5, or £10, to take the rap for the rap for the bookie. I know of two or three who had 20 or 30 convictions. There is a story concerning a bookmaker at the time he died. One of the S.P. bookmakers who attended the funeral said, as he left the cemetery, "I feel sorry for poor old Alec; it is the first time he could not get somebody else to go off for him." People will take the rap on behalf of the real culprit; and therefore I think the Government should have a second look at the position.

Concerning totalisator betting, if the Government feels it is a good thing, let us introduce it on the racecourses, as in New Zealand. The inferiority complex from which we in Western Australia suffer comes up even in racing. If something comes out from the Eastern States or from New Zealand, it is, in the minds of some people, a lot better than anything we have here. Experts came here from New Zealand and said this was the only answer. I think the Government should introduce the totalisator system on the racecourses, too, if it is sincere.

Some of the Government's aristocratic friends who attend races prefer to bet with the bookie. The aristocratic racegoer may invest a pound, and the working man will invest 5s. But the latter is equally entitled to his bet, and to the same conditions of betting, as anyone else. I do not think there should be any discrimination. Let us have totes on the courses also.

This legislation could be well and truly shelved. I think the Government itself, if it were honest, would emit a sigh of relief if it could shelve this legislation and forget about it. Even members of the Turf Club are not fully in favour of it. They will lose the substance in pursuit of the shadow. Under the present set-up they have done very well. Under the new set-up they will become investors, in effect, and the Government will become a giant bookmaker. I oppose the second reading.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [7.43]: I have not a great deal to say on this measure, except to point out that during 1954, when legislation to legalise off-course bookmakers was introduced, I opposed it very strongly in favour of the totalisator system. I take the same view today.

We all remember the days of illegal S.P. betting. Did the introduction of legalised starting-price betting do away with all the evils that existed? Practically all it did

away with was the arrest of individuals—or dummies, as referred to by Mr. Jeffery—who acted on behalf of the actual operators. But as far as evil among S.P. operators is concerned, I believe it has continued through the years. It is a common belief among people who wager on races that they get a fairer deal wagering on Eastern States races. I think that is borne out by the fact that predominantly more money is wagered on Eastern States races than on local races.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: They have no faith in the W.A.T.C.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is not because of that; it is because horses in the Eastern States run truer to form. There are not the influences there that have affected racing in this State over the years. The Opposition takes the view that the State is going to be worse off under the totalisator system in regard to the tax it will receive from off-course betting. Even if the total turnover is reduced to approximately half of what it is today, the State will still receive more than it received in the past.

I believe the wagering public, from the dividends it will receive through the tote, will receive a better return for its money than it receives under the present system. The S.P. operator will be much better off. Where the price of a horse opens at 6 to 1, it often finishes up at 3 to 1, or 5 to 2. With a totalisator system the effect will not be so great. Therefore, I believe that the person who is actually doing the wagering will receive a far greater return from the totalisator than he is receiving under the present system if he backs a winner or a placed horse.

The plan to install a totalisator system in Western Australia is one I advocated and more or less outlined in this House in 1954. I suggested a system under which totalisators would be introduced into the metropolitan area and then gradually spread throughout the country districts, allowing for a transitional period during which the S.P. operators would be licensed in the outer country districts until such time as the totalisators were able to take over. Arguments were produced in 1954 that we did not have a good enough telecommunication system in this State to handle the proposal. Yet over the years since betting has been legalised, it has been easy for the country bookmakers to channel any money they desired through to Perth. As far as I know they have had no difficulty; and there is no reason why a tote operated in the country districts should not be able to do the same as the S.P. operators have been able to do with our existing telecommunication system.

We all realise that in some of the far-distant places it may not be so easy as in those areas that are closer to the metropolitan area. But the point is that

not a great volume of money will be invested in those places; certainly not sufficient to worry the tote any more than it has worried the S.P. operators. There is not such a great deal of money wagered in the far-distant places; it certainly would not be sufficient to alarm anybody.

During his speech, Mr. Jeffery referred to the State becoming a bookmaker. I do not think it is a case of the State becoming a bookmaker; this will be a *pari-mutuel* system similar to that in operation in France; and no difficulty has been found with it in that country. It is not a case of the State becoming a bookmaker; but it is a case of handling the situation as a tote system which, in the case of Eastern States races, pays a dividend equivalent to that paid on the totalisators in the other States; and, with respect to local races, pays a dividend equivalent to that paid by the totalisators on the local courses.

I am sure that the volume of money which will go on to the local courses will result in greater dividends being paid to the investors. At present, generally speaking, S.P. operators cannot help but make a profit. That must be the case, otherwise they would all have gone to the wall long ago. If that is to be the pattern, there surely should be no fears that the Government will be out of pocket when this system comes into operation. From my reading of the Bill it appears that the Government, far from being out of pocket, will be well in pocket.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The Farmers' Union doesn't believe you on that score.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not care what the Farmers' Union believes in this matter. We have been able to observe how one system has operated; and after the tote system has been in operation for a few years we will know how it operates. Then I believe members of the Opposition will be very surprised because it will be so successful.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: At the Government's expense.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Of course that interjection is not correct; there is no case of it being at the Government's expense.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: The Turf Club cannot afford it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Had the honourable member gone into this Bill thoroughly he would have found that both the Turf Club and the Trotting Association are to pay in a sum of £25,000, each, free of interest. The repayment of that money will be spread over some years, and it will be sufficient to guarantee the totalisator board for any borrowings which it might wish to make in putting this scheme successfully into operation. There should be no fears that the Government will be out of pocket, because the tax

return on the turnover will be a full guarantee. This will be like any other business. How many businesses in this State have obtained Government guarantees through the R. & I. Bank? That bank has guaranteed loans to the tune of £6,000,000; and have the people concerned fallen down on the repayment of their borrowings? Of course not.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They have some security.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: There is just as much if not more security in this case as there was with some of the businesses the R. & I. Bank has guaranteed. How can the system fall down when there is a 5 per cent. tax on turnover?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is better than Canterbury Court.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Absolutely. It is as good as the business which is situated at the corner of Murray and Barrack Streets—the Taxation Department. There is no fear of a place like that going broke, and there will be no fear of the Government being out of pocket on this venture. This scheme will be a success, as I said when I advocated it in 1954. It should have been introduced then; and in spite of the arguments that have been produced on this occasion, I still believe that this is the only system that will place racing and trotting in this State in a fair and reasonable position, and remove any possibility of malpractice. In addition it will give the punter a fair deal. I support the Bill.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [7.52]: This is a much debated subject, and I have been very interested in the comments of several speakers this evening, particularly those of Mr. Heenan, who, in examining the subject approached it from an entirely different angle from which I shall approach it. I think he showed clearly why there should be considerable doubts raised in respect of the hopes that this proposal, when in operation, will succeed. Whether it was unfortunate or not I do not know, but it was a subject which, as I think many members in this House know, I had to study because I was the one responsible for the introduction of the two original betting control Bills introduced into the legislature of this State—those Bills were introduced pre-war as Government measures.

I had to study the betting systems and gaming laws of many countries, including the United Kingdom and New Zealand. Because of this I was particularly interested in the analysis given by the Minister on the introduction of the Bill. As Mr. Strickland pointed out last evening, he gave us considerable detail in his endeavours to justify with figures what the Government hopes to realise when the legislation is in operation. As time has shown, we are dealing with a subject

which many people find difficult to debate upon its merits; they find great difficulty in analysing its pros and cons.

Usually considerable prejudices of many kinds enter into a debate of this character; and although the Minister advised us this afternoon, when introducing a water supply measure, that he hoped it could be considered without any preconceived ideas, I am afraid this legislation is not in that position; nor could it come within that category, which is unfortunate. To state in plain language what I am meaning, I say without doubt that this Bill will pass the second reading in this Chamber but not necessarily on its merits.

The proposal before us is to replace the existing system of off-course betting, and the control of such a system, with its certain substantial revenue for the Government and assured ample return for the racing clubs, with a hybrid kind of system with provision for an authority with considerable power, which will, in its detailed acts, be out of the control of the Government, but which will be able to lean very heavily on the Government for financial backing. The Government will have no assurance of adequate return as revenue. The suggestion put up by the last speaker, that the Government has no responsibility in a financial sense, was mere poppycock.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not say that.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Let the honourable member read clauses 18 and 19 of the Bill. Let him study in particular sub-clauses (2) and (3) of clause 19, and he might have a different attitude towards the Bill.

Several speakers have dealt in detail with the existing system as it operates. I would say that until very recently it was hard to get many people, including members of Parliament, and the Turf Club itself, to agree to the argument that it is impossible to eradicate off-course betting both legal and illegal. That has been the position for a very long time, but now it is obvious that that contention is indeed accepted by this Government, several members of which condemned and criticised the present control system on the ground that it was possible to suppress entirely illegal betting off the course. But that is not the position at all. The argument is a very old one and it is true to say that it is not possible to suppress off-course betting, whether legal or illegal.

That fact took a lot of accepting; but that is the situation. Many have said that the obnoxious features of the bad old days of off-course betting have gone, and strenuous efforts should be made to resist anything which might encourage their return. I think it could safely be said that there is nothing in the operations of off-course betting now which would offend even fastidious people. There must still

be, on moral grounds, opponents to this matter, but, as regards its being something offensive, I would say that unless one knew of the type of premises one was standing outside, even on a Saturday, one would not know what was going on inside.

There are no objectionable street scenes, or scenes which would offend anybody, near public places or near hotels; and from Wyndham to Norseman, and from Leonora to Augusta, and even in the city itself, where there is a public demand for betting, that demand is catered for. The present system meets that need unobtrusively and effectively, and at the same time provides enormous revenue for the Government and meets the reasonable needs of the racing and trotting clubs. It is meeting those needs at very little cost to the Government: the operators and the taxpayers are the tax gatherers; they are responsible for the collections and the payments; and they are responsible for the major part of the bookkeeping in connection therewith. Other folk, therefore, are collecting, in so far as off-course operations are concerned, £450,000 per annum without cost to the Government.

Mr. MacKinnon is able to put his finger on the percentage of people interested in the community as bettors; and I think the figure is under 20 per cent. So this is a system of levying tax on a very small proportion of the community. But those people who of their own volition allow themselves to be taxed, primarily, on their investment, as it is called, and through all the media and channels through which their investments pass, suffer, in the ultimate, at least 3s. in the pound dead loss, no matter what their complete capital loss may be.

But from the Government's point of view in a taxation-gathering sense—and that is the point I intend to focus attention on—it is an efficient system. For this portion of the revenue, under the proposed system, the present order is to be abolished in part—I stress, in part. This is a hybrid system—a composite system of totalisator and bookmaker; and it could never be otherwise in this State.

This law not only permits it, and condones it, but supports such a proposal; and it marks it out as something to be perpetual, because of the very nature of our geography. And now we find that the old system is to be supplanted by this hotch-potch, hybrid system, to be run by a board of seven, which is completely out of the control of the Government in so far as the detail of its activities is concerned. There is to be one Government representative on the board, together with six others who will represent the two racing bodies which have a monopoly of control of racing and trotting in this State.

I do not think it can be denied that they have such a monopoly; and their representatives are to dominate the board—indeed, they are to be the board. I hope the clubs realise when this system breaks down—as in my view, and as I hope to analyse later, it shortly will—that they will be the ones to be blamed for the situation. It is the clubs that will be in the unhappy position of running this show; they will be in the unhappy position of operating a system from which certain revenue for the Government must be forthcoming; but, so far as their own interests are concerned, I suggest much of the collection will be of a very doubtful quantity.

It is interesting to observe that the total income from gambling on racing in Western Australia was £791,425 for the last financial year. That is a very substantial figure, and the collection included an amount of £127,313 for stamp duty on betting tickets; £137,906 as totalisator duty; £12,124 from totalisator licenses; £1,657 as stamp duty on tote dividends; £452,224 as turnover tax and bookmakers' licenses; and £69,981 on investment tax, which is the bettors' tax. As I said, the total revenue from the varying taxes from racing, both on and off course, was £791,425. That was an increase on the 1958-59 figure of £717,770.

Of that total, £452,424 was contributed by licensed off-course bookmakers for tax and licenses; and approximately £70,000 as investment tax from the people who bet. The totalisator on the course last year paid to Consolidated Revenue £137,906. I think it is important to observe that all these collections are almost as automatic as the operation of the automatic totalisator. In addition to these figures, of course, there are substantial revenues to the clubs themselves, including the very heavy levies which the clubs impose upon the racing community.

I can only presume that the Government does not intend to forgo any of its present revenue if it can avoid doing so. I can only, through you, Mr. President, in the proper fashion, ask the Minister the direct question; but I presume that is the intent of the Government.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: When I reply I will give you the answers to all the queries you raise.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: As I said, I presume the Government does not intend to forgo any of its revenue. My objections to this Bill fall into several categories. In stating these objections I would observe, as I said initially, as one who was an enforced student of this subject very early in his political career I have, in the study of these Bills, consulted no-one, and been consulted by no-one. I have seen no starting price bookmaker, and have received no figures from them.

I have used the Minister's figures, the reports of the Royal Commission, the figures available in debate which, in particular, I am not permitted to refer to as they were given in another place, and I have come to certain conclusions which I think are logical. In dealing with these matters I shall take, in sequence, the points raised by the Minister.

My objections number five. Firstly, based on well-founded fears I feel the Government is jeopardising its chance of getting as much revenue as it is now receiving; secondly, I fear that the system proposed, even when fully operative, will be a composite totalisator-bookmaker system which cannot function, or handle all the turnover now handled by legalised off-course betting operators, because all the betting involved in the various systems, unrestricted in volume—small or large as now obtains—will cease. I will analyse all these points shortly.

My next point is that if a change is to be made to any sort of off-course totalisator, let it be a tote under license from which the Government will draw a fixed gross percentage as obtains now under the totalisator legislation, and the licenses issued under it. Let it not be a chancy sort of system; a hybrid scheme backed by Government money, and yet out of the Government's control.

I say, fourthly, that the Government should not risk unlimited sums in volume and donation for unspecified purposes in a gambling venture. My fifth point is that an analysis of the figures given by the Minister, which are obviously based on the figures given by Mr. Smythe before the Royal Commission—from which I will quote—show great uncertainty in the income to be expected by the Government, and renders the whole scheme extremely dubious.

May I now take the first point: the doubt in regard to revenue? I have mentioned that from all sources of gambling over £790,000 was paid into Consolidated Revenue last year. Off-course stamp duty, licenses, turnover tax, and investment tax now amount to over £500,000; and about that sum goes into Consolidated Revenue. Collections from the turnover tax of £12,000,000 now in the metropolitan area show that about half of it is from betting on Eastern States races. I am including, of course, on-course and off-course turnovers in that figure of £12,000,000. So about half that figure is from the Eastern States, whereas 60 per cent. of off-course transactions is on Eastern States racing.

The Government has selected a figure of £6,500,000 on which to base its calculations and anticipations of revenue for its purpose, and for the clubs. From that volume of money the Government thinks that the totalisator, plus the returns from off-course betting on Eastern States races through the agency board, plus the levies on the bookmakers off the course, allowed

to operate outside the radius of the board's control, plus the return from on-course operations, will be considerably improved. The Government is hoping for the same revenue as it receives now.

There was an interesting answer to a question this evening. Through the Minister the Government answered the question by first saying "No," and then by saying "Yes." There was no assurance given to racing clubs that they should not lose anything; but, "Yes, we have given them an assurance that during the next six months they will continue to enjoy what they are receiving from off-course collections."

Why mess about with words in that manner? The clubs have been assured of the same income, for the next six months as they are now receiving from the operations of off-course tax collections; and for the first six months after the proclamation of this Act. That is the answer the Minister has given.

The obvious point is that the situation anticipated is that from a £6,500,000 turnover, the somewhat conservative income through the totalisator agency board gradually spreading into the further areas; gradually taking up bigger centres; and gradually applying to as much of the State as is possible is, in the ultimate, going to bring in at least as much revenue as is now received under the present Act. It is not clear from any comments I have seen just where the £6,500,000 estimate came from.

Mr. Smythe—an authority on totalisators brought from New Zealand to give evidence before the Royal Commission; the man who is in charge of totalisator operations in the Dominion—said in his evidence that £7,500,000 turnover was necessary before the off-course totalisator system would work. That is in black and white. Of course, this applies to local races; and obviously so, because about 60 per cent. of the off-course betting—invariably so—must be on Eastern States racing; and it relates to the turnover of investments from that racing.

To return to my point, the Government has selected £6,500,000 as its anticipated off-course minimum turnover for the tote; and it is confident of success. Mr. Smythe was insistent that £7,500,000 was necessary for success to be achieved; and, in addition, it was contingent in his estimate that the expenses should not be above 7½ per cent. The Government has taken the lesser turnover of £6,500,000, and the lesser costs at 7.25 per cent., using the Minister's own figures. In evidence, and under cross-examination, Mr. Smythe admitted that he took the optimum figure—those are his words—for turnover to make it work; and for his expenses he took the minimum figure.

So that if expenses are any higher than the anticipated 7½ per cent., and the turnover is less, on the authority and admission of the only expert we have known

to analyse totalisator prospects and figures, it will not work. The Government has a scheme, I repeat, with lesser expenses on a smaller turnover; and it introduces, in addition, a provision to enable part of the moneys received—moneys which would normally be considered as turnover—to be free to be gambled with—an aspect that was never contemplated.

Mr. Smythe in his evidence stated he would not recommend a tote system operating under £7,500,000, with expenses more than 7.33 per cent.; and gauged by the comments by the attorney for the Turf Club at the time of the inquiry, the Turf Club believed that, too, to be the situation.

Now let us look at the margins from which the various revenues are to be derived. That is a basic test of very much importance. If these laws pass—the Bill we are now debating and the four complementary measures—16.25 per cent. will be the gross margin available as deductions, made up of 15 per cent. commission-deduction, and 1.25 per cent. of deductions on unclaimed dividends. They are the Minister's own figures. This is a total of 16.25 per cent. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that 60 per cent. of the off-course betting is on Eastern States races, in connection with which tote prices are to operate and not starting-price figures; and the rulings of the tote are to be applicable.

In Victoria the tote operates on a 13.25 per cent. gross deduction; and even if we imagine that to be half of our betting, the mean of 13.25 and 16.25 is 14.75, and not 16.25, from which to commence to make the deductions. So that in the gross calculations of the volume of money within a tote, when the totalisator agency board commences to operate and make the deductions it will not be taking it from an average gross return of 16.25 per cent., but will be taking it from a gross average return of 14.75 per cent.

Again, using the Minister's own figures of 7.25 per cent., which he mentions for expenses, 5 per cent. would go for turnover tax. He has no room then to pay 4 per cent. to the clubs, even if he has included the 1½ per cent. for capital fund redemption. It is not clear to me in the analysis given by the Minister whether in the 7.25 per cent. as expenses he did include the 1½ per cent. I think he did not. If that is so, I think the Government will get its 5 per cent. turnover tax, but the expenses will absorb at least 7½ per cent. and there will be nothing like 4 per cent. left for the trotting and racing clubs.

I point this out: Whether the turnover is £6,500,000 or £7,500,000—and let us take the higher figure—if this dare to vary by ½ per cent.—and it appears it varies by more than 1 per cent., and 1 per cent. of £7,500,000 is £75,000, and that is as much as the Turf Club and the Trotting Association expects to get from this taxation—I

would say this: Their hope of collections is definitely in jeopardy on an analysis of the Minister's own figures.

As you well know, Mr. President, and as Mr. Jones well knows, when one is dealing with fractions of colossal totals, it takes a very small percentage to make a large amount. If we take a small fraction per bushel in relation to bulk wheat in this State, .32d. of a bushel will represent millions of pounds over a very short period. So in this case, if this anticipation of the Government varies .5 per cent.—and I submit one could analyse this to show it must vary more than that—and if we are to take the average of the gross deductions initially, and then the Government's share, there will be very little left for anybody else.

Of course, much play has been made on the raising of the deduction to 15 per cent. I read of an attempt for that to be explained by another Minister in another place, but in cold stark fact it means that every bettor or every punter on the race course who invests on the tote is going to get 1½ per cent. less than he ever got before. That is the person who goes to the races. Ministers might smile, and Ministers may take any attitude they care, but it is unfortunate that although the Ministers handling this Bill in both Houses are capable men and are able to study and understand a subject much more rapidly than the average, they have never in their lives been addicted to gambling habits.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How do you know?

The Hon. G. Bennetts: That is telling them something.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: But I say this to them: There is very much to appreciate from the point of view of the person who has been described with very many adjectives in many different ways—the punter, or call him what you like; the man who must lose. There is no explanation I suggest yet been satisfactorily given to show why the extra 1½ per cent. is not going to mean a lesser dividend to those who bet on the tote on the racecourse. The Government will continue to get all that the law provides. There is no shadow of doubt about that. Whether it be from the legalised licensed totalisators, from the remnants of the licensed bookmakers outside of the ambit of the totalisator activities in the State, the Government will have its toll from all sources.

I indicated earlier that the Government has never had a simpler method of collecting a tax than the present system of operation of the starting price bookmaker methods under the Betting Control Board. The Minister said that in this State when all off-course betting is covered by an on-course totalisator, or an off-course tote

pool, the commission of 15 per cent. with fractions and unclaimed dividends, should result in a gross margin of 16.25 per cent. As the Government is to receive 5 per cent. turnover tax, this leaves a margin of 11.25 per cent. I have pointed out the fallacy of that calculation, because the Government is dealing there with more than half the money based on a deduction on the Victorian average of gross tote deduction before dividends are paid, which, no matter how we analyse it, brings that average down.

The Minister went on to say that figures submitted by the licensed premises bookmakers to the Royal Commissioner indicated that after taking out 2 per cent. totalisator tax and .5 per cent stamp duty, the average cost of conducting licensed bookmakers' premises was 4.71 per cent. of the turnover. If we add the 4.71 per cent. to the 2 per cent. turnover tax and the .5 per cent. stamp duty, we get a total of 7.21 per cent. which is a little less than the figure of 7.25 per cent. which the Minister used as the amount of total expenses.

But of course that does not explain the whole story in regard to expenses. I would like, a little later when dealing with other points the Minister brought forward, to ask for an explanation in regard to the many facilities which the totalisator off the course is to provide, and to find out who is to pay for them. The Minister in his final summary on this point said this—

If this figure is achieved, after paying 5 per cent. turnover tax to the Treasurer, the board should have a surplus of 4 per cent. on turnover to be paid out to the various racing bodies to assist in the improvement of the racing industry throughout the State. It is expected that during the first 12 months of its operation the totalisator agency board will establish between 45 and 60 agencies in the metropolitan area. The turnover in the metropolitan area, as already indicated is expected to be £6,500,000.

I now want to turn to the second point I raised in my objections: the setting up of this hybrid system with all the difficulties associated with it and its operations, in place of one which is a certain tax-gatherer for the Government, and which makes a substantial contribution to Consolidated Revenue—a contribution approaching £500,000 from one section of the tax alone.

By the proposed plan, the totalisator agency board will operate for a time in a restricted area; but this will expand. I think the Minister anticipates that within the first 12 months some 50 or 60 agencies will be created within a radius of the central point. The totalisator scheme will never apply to the whole State for obvious reasons.

Within the restricted area, premises will be obtained—on lease, I presume; and if we refer back to the criticism and condemnation made by the present Government of the Betting Control Board in regard to premises which were situated near hotels, a tremendous number of these places will be anathema to the Government; and it could not possibly consider them as agencies as they are so close to hotels.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: It is the right place for them.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is interesting to hear that observation; but I am referring to the previous criticism made by the members of the present Government of the situation of those places.

It is proposed in this legislation, and by the administration of it, that bets on local races will, where practicable, be put on the tote on the course; and the bets made up to within 45 minutes to 60 minutes of starting time will, from many of the agencies, be transmitted to the course. It is proposed that betting in smaller amounts will be accepted up to near the starting time, and that the dividends will be paid after dividends are declared on the local races.

It is commendable in the comments of the Ministers—and I use the plural—that there is to be a definite restriction in the sums acceptable from within 45 minutes to 60 minutes of the starting time of a race. But of course that will not prevent all sorts of things from happening with regard to small sums and with regard to the many multiples of large sums which will be placed on a horse, and which will represent an unexpectedly large amount because of the small amount of the investment on the tote on the course. Until such time as that practice can be stopped at a certain period, I am afraid there will be such a leakage and such a responsibility that nothing like the 16 per cent. anticipated by the Government can really be anticipated.

There is a tremendous danger so far as the tote operation is concerned because I ask: Who is to be refused? It is possible there could be no margin at all, but a very heavy indebtedness on the part of the agency for the moneys—and in total they could be considerable—invested after all the moneys to be transferred to the course had been so transferred.

A member of the Legislative Assembly showed me some figures, which were certified figures, giving a 10-weeks' analysis of starting prices and tote prices. These figures showed that tote prices, straight-out, averaged from 7 per cent. to 10 per cent. over S.P. bookmakers' starting prices. I suppose that will be all right from the punter's angle, but it will not be so good from the point of view of the totalisator agency board if it is subject to a fraction which is not visible in the expenses now

shown or in the percentages now disclosed. As I said earlier, the smallest fraction can have a very big impact on the total result.

In regard to Eastern States racing, the position is very difficult; and I submit it is rather serious in regard to the manner in which it is proposed to conduct the tote. The Minister said—

Until the totalisator scheme completely replaces licensed premises bookmakers in the metropolitan area, it has not been deemed practicable to conduct a local off-course totalisator pool on Eastern States races.

That is understandable. He went on to say—

It is intended that for the first six months, and for longer if found necessary, the board will hold bets received on Eastern States racing, and pay out according to the dividends declared by the appropriate on-course totalisators in the Eastern States. Whilst no off-course totalisator pool system for Eastern States racing has been fully developed as yet, at the present time three different schemes are under consideration, and the records prepared by the board in its first six months of actual operation, should enable it to select one which is fair and equitable and simple and easy to administer.

I think that is a pious hope. The Government admits the existing difficulties in having no opportunity to run a pool on a restricted number of horses, on a totalisator basis; and it proposes to hold all of the money, as a board, and pay out according to Eastern States tote prices. In the meantime it has three schemes of varying kinds, one of which will be found to be simple and easy to administer. Those are the Minister's words—simple and easy to administer. It is not as easy as that. This is fraught with great difficulty; and it is fraught with great danger in so far as the future of the board is concerned and in regard to the use of Treasury-guaranteed moneys appropriated by the board for its purposes, and unspecified as clause 19 of the Bill provides. The Minister went on to say—

If the weight of money for a particular horse in any event is such as to introduce too great an element of risk, portion of such money could be laid off with the appropriate on-course Eastern States totalisator.

I think that is another pious hope. First of all the time factor would be a strictly limiting one in any operation of that kind. There would have to be a specified time prior to the starting of the race when betting would be shut off. But as soon as the board lays off money it becomes a punter. Because Sparkling Blue starts in Melbourne, and the board receives £5,000

in Perth for the horse, and no money is received for Sparkling Blue in Melbourne, it might be at odds of 100 to 1.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: There is a difference of two hours in the times.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The board might then say, "We had better send a lot of this £5,000 to Melbourne." But if Sparkling Blue runs last, the money sent to Melbourne would be lost and there would be no gross deductions to benefit the tote or the punter. The money would be completely lost; it becomes a losing bet. On whose judgment is that to be based? It will be based on the judgment of one of the members of the board, not on that of the Government.

I point out that no matter how experienced the board is, it can lose. The most experienced of bookmakers, I am told, sometimes make a book on a race for a favourite; they go for it and lay all they can on it, but their judgment is not always right. Once this board is in the category of a bettor, it must end in the same way as bettors do—it must lose. Those are the Minister's own words.

If the holding of such money involves too great an element of risk, portion of it could be laid off in the Eastern States, according to the Minister. So the board becomes the bookmaker. It is going to hold all that money and take off the 13 per cent. that is deducted by the Victorian totalisators and distribute to successful investors the dividends less those deductions. However, in regard to all the money that is laid off, if the board is not successful in winning bets, such money is irretrievably lost. In the friendliest manner—not in an offensive manner or an unkindly manner—I would point out to Mr. Baxter that those provisions are in the Bill.

The Minister has explained the method by which they will be operated. I point out to the members of this Chamber that I sometimes have a quinella, and in the course of doing so I have met one or two of my opponent political friends at the window when I have gone to collect at times.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That must have been your lucky day.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I rarely have a straight-out ticket. I nearly always have a quinella ticket or a 5s. double, in the same way as my political opponents do.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: They are plunging, are they not?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: As one who is only of average intelligence, I am conscious of the fact that every time I put a pound in the totalisator and repeat my act seven times, my pound will disappear. It is irrecoverable, because the 13 per cent. takes care of that. Nevertheless, I still go there and persist, even after 40 years. I

have been enjoying myself in such circumstances, but this board is not in that position. This board is in the position of the committeeman of the Turf Club or the Trotting Association who will tell any honourable member or anybody else with whom he is friendly, "My horse has a great chance." That man may back his horse for hundreds of pounds. He is in a position to know all the handicaps and what prospects his horse has, but his judgment still turns out to be wrong. So the best-informed persons on the proposed board who intend to lay off this money will be jeopardising this scheme. There is no doubt about that.

One of the many reasons why this £500,000 for the Treasury, and the 4 per cent. that is to go to the clubs will be placed in jeopardy, is because the money is utterly non-existent if it is laid off. I would say that such a provision constitutes a very hazardous undertaking. Even if a Western Australian horse—Sparkling Blue, or any other horse one may nominate—which Western Australians may care to back because of a fancy or a whim, or even on good information, were to be followed on a certain day, such judgment may err to the point that all the moneys invested on that horse would be lost, and would not become part of the moneys from which any tax is taken.

There is another angle too. There are tens of thousands of pounds, on which tax is levied, which come to Western Australia annually. Thousands of pounds a week are forwarded to this State for investment, on which turnover tax is paid every Saturday. It is coming here in large sums from the Eastern States, and it is accommodated by big bookmakers. The money is spread around among several of them, and, in turn, they spread it among smaller bookmakers. On some of this money, up to 3s. in the pound is paid in investment tax by the time the money is fully circulated. There would be no purpose in sending that money through the tote, because that money would not be in existence; it would not come here. So it is that margin after margin must be carefully scrutinised.

I would have liked the Ministers to assure this House that not only have they been in a huddle with Treasury officers; not only have they shown an aptitude for learning all the intricacies of betting from those Treasury officers, but also that they have gone a little further afield to gain some knowledge, because if Ministers could come to either House and say, they can produce, with this Bill, a signed statement by the auditor of the Western Australian Trotting Association that he has examined, on the premises on which this Bill is founded, all its implications, and that he is satisfied that we will do as well with it in the future as we are doing under the present system; and if we obtained something similar from an accountant

nominated by the Turf Club, and from the Audit Department, in addition to the Treasury—particularly someone who knows something of racing in its application—a certificate to say that all of these assumptions are sound in their basis, this Bill would be passed without argument.

It is well known to the members of this House and the Parliament of this State that I have a working knowledge of figures. In saying that, I speak with no ego, and with no presumption, but in truth. I may have become Treasurer of the State by accident, but I have shouldered many responsibilities in connection with the analysis of accounts. I hope what I am about to say will be kept out of the Press—if members of the Press are in the gallery. I say this again with no ego, but with humility. I suppose I would be the only person in Western Australia who has been offered a position by the World Bank, in connection with its activities; and in saying this I would mention that documents in this regard have been seen by Ministers in this Chamber. So I make no apology to anyone who may sit in a corner and sneer at any comments of mine when analysing financial matters. That will not get the Minister or his colleagues anywhere.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: When you say "the Minister" you are referring to me.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am referring to the Minister now, but I was not before.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You should not refer to anyone else, really.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I will refer to anyone in my line of vision who is obviously provocative by action; and I will name him if the Minister so desires.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I only wanted to make sure I was looking at you when you said that.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is a most unpardonable attitude on the part of someone in my line of vision. Does the Minister want me to take it further?

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member should address the Chair.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes; thank you, Mr. President. There will be an opportunity to take the stupid grin off another person's face on another occasion, physically, or any other way.

I now refer to my third objection to this hybrid proposition and that is that the Government, in the financial clauses in this Bill, is giving an unlimited and an unqualified promise of availability of moneys and guarantees to this board, apart from the initial £50,000 to be found by the clubs free of interest for 10 years.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: What will the Grants Commission say?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The evidence given before the Royal Commission on betting brought to light that one of the

racine bodies in Western Australia was prepared to find £300,000 to establish an off-course totalisator. In fact, it was anxious to do so. Why has not the Government alleviated its anxiety? Why has not the Government said, "We would like you, under license, to take the responsibility of establishing and operating this tote under the existing circumstances that pertain to totalisators"? Of course, we know one reason why it has not done so. It is because the sister association, the W.A. Turf Club, had at that time—and it may still have—very grave doubts as to the success of this or any other kindred scheme.

However, if we must have totes in part or in whole, and we need £300,000 to establish them, why should the Government be in it at all as a financial body? That has never been the case since Sir George Julius first invented the totalisator. Totalisators have been operated, and at a profit, by somebody else—and always at a profit to the Government because it levied a tax according to the law of the land. This legislation could be based on similar lines. I object very strongly to this Bill, and I hope this House will agree to some other provision instead of this unlimited provision in clause 19 which reads as follows:—

The Treasurer may from time to time, upon and subject to such terms and conditions as he thinks fit, and without further authority than this section, guarantee on behalf of the Crown in right of the State, the due redemption of the principal moneys so borrowed and the due payment of all interest thereon.

Subclause (3) of this clause provides—

The Treasurer shall cause any money required for fulfilling any guarantee given by him under this Act, to be paid out of the Public Account, which account is hereby to the necessary extent appropriated accordingly, and shall cause any sums received or recovered by the Treasurer from the Board or otherwise in respect of a sum so paid by the Treasurer to be paid into the Public Account.

Sanction is to be given for the appropriation of unlimited and unspecified sums. That is provided in this Bill and cannot be denied. Is that the sort of legislation this House is accustomed to passing?

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is an open book.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I recall being taken to task quite recently by the Minister for Local Government when I suggested that under a law recently passed in this House we should not provide in the accompanying measure, for a tax to be perpetual, but that for the time being the Treasury should lend the authority certain money. The Minister said that there was

no money available. Do members recall that? Apparently it was ridiculous to assume that there could be money made available for a metropolitan improvement tax. That money was required to back a certainty, but no money was available.

Did members see the statement of the Premier published in this morning's newspaper regarding the shortage of loan moneys and the embarrassment which the Government faces? Yet, we are asked to pass the provision in clause 19 of the Bill.

If the Bill does not reach the Committee stage this evening, I shall place an amendment on the notice paper which I hope will be accepted by members. It will seek to limit the amount which may be guaranteed by the Treasury to a reasonable sum.

The passage of this Bill will launch the Government into a venture of great uncertainty. It will destroy, from the Government's point of view, the best means of taxation which has been contrived—a means by which the taxes are collected by the off-course bookmakers for the Government.

It was said by Mr. Smythe that although the people in New Zealand have been accustomed to off-course totalisators and have not known licensed off-course bookmakers, a great deal of illegal betting still goes on. He did not specify the exact amount but stated that the total was between £12,000,000 and £20,000,000 per year. This takes place in a country which is the lauded centre of an effective off-course totalisator system—in a country which in area can be placed into the South-West Land Division of this State. This expert witness said that between £12,000,000 and £20,000,000 of illegal betting per year was carried on in the Dominion. That is the sort of thing which will return to Western Australia if the same off-course totalisator system is adopted.

Hundreds of patrons in the State have been accustomed to phoning their off-course bookmakers to place bets. They do not have to make a deposit of a sum of money with the bookmakers. Their credit is good enough. These people will not support an off-course totalisator system. They have not been reared on such a system. The people of this State do not prefer off-course totalisators; the majority prefer licensed off-course bookmakers.

The proposed system which, for the time being, will be applied to a prescribed radius of Perth will bring about a return to the conditions of the illegal days. The Government could not expect, under the new system, the same amount of revenue as is now received.

Included in this Bill are penalty provisions lifted from other legislation. Undoubtedly the Government anticipates

there will be a great deal of illegal betting after the implementation of the off-course totalisator. As Mr. Heenan pointed out, some 18 clauses from clause 37 onwards refer to the application of penalties in many respects. Then there are the other iniquitous provisions.

If Dr. Hislop and I, together with our respective wives, were to walk along Hay Street after the proclamation of this legislation—in the form in which it is before us—and did some window shopping, we could be apprehended by a police officer, without any explanation, for loitering. This is a dreadfully worded provision, and it is unambiguous in its intent. It could be dangerous in application. I hope this House will have none of it.

There is the other provision referred to by Mr. Heenan and Mr. Strickland relating to reasonable suspicion. I have known the most reputable person to suffer in the case of mistaken identity. Who would deem it wise to argue with an officious policeman?

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: It is like poking a stick in the tiger's eye.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Many aspects contained in the Bill must be examined in great detail in the Committee stage. I hope that the Minister will agree to reasonable amendments. I notice that the Minister referred to the provision of certain amenities in the premises of the totalisator agency board. He said there was no reason why radio broadcasts of races should not be made available to patrons so that they would be able to listen to the races in the shops. Of course such an amenity is not provided under the New Zealand set-up. In that country, if one desired to listen to a race broadcast one would have to leave the betting shop and go to an hotel.

If the patrons of the totalisator agency board are to be supplied with what the betting shops today supply, they will have to keep newspaper references of races long gone. In their attempts to arrive at a fancy on which to make an investment, today, the patrons can refer to the record of any race run in Australia within the last few months. I wonder whether the same facilities will be provided by the totalisator agency board.

Similarly, I wonder whether the excellent service which the newspapers in this State are providing to off-course punters will continue under the new set-up. Over the years *The West Australian* and the *Daily News* have employed skilled sporting writers to cover the races. They print pages of information every Friday and Saturday on the chances of the various horses in this as well as the Eastern States. Special issues of the newspapers are printed. Special visits are made by their writers to the Eastern States at important carnivals. What is the purpose of all this? Is it to incite the people to bet

at the S.P. shops, or is it for the information of the 18 per cent. of the public who do bet?

Under the new set up, will race broadcasts be continued? This service is worth many thousands of pounds every year to the broadcasting station. I think the cost is between £10,000 and £12,000. The main station which broadcasts race commentaries is 6IX; and this station is more than half owned by West Australian Newspapers Ltd. It collects many thousands of pounds from off-course bookmakers every year. Of the shares in W.A. Broadcasters Ltd., 17,994 are owned by West Australian Newspapers Ltd. Other small holdings are owned by the directors of the company.

Yet *The West Australian* attacks any Government which does something for off-course bookmakers. I wonder whether the same sort of service will be available to the totalisator patrons under the new system? If it is, who will pay for the service? Has that expense been included in the 7.52 per cent. estimated running expenses?

Has the cost of supplying patrons in the betting shops with the results and dividends on the races as they are run in the Eastern States and in Western Australia been taken into account? At present these costs are borne by the off-course operators; and they must run into hundreds of pounds a week. Is that cost included in the 7.52 per cent?

I have raised many aspects, from the very fallacious basis of the £6,500,000 turnover, to the percentage deduction from the pool, to the amounts estimated for expenses, and to the enabling of the board to become a punter wagering capital with no security of a return. If there are no hazards under the proposed set-up, then I cannot read or reason properly.

I regret this Bill is before us. In another place the Government adopted a "take it or leave it" attitude. The Government said, "This is it. This will go through." I would like the Minister to follow the line of thought I expressed previously. Let him adjourn this debate for one week, so that he can return with a certificate signed by the chairman of the Turf Club (Mr. Edgar Meares) stating that after an examination of the provisions of this Bill by an accountant of the club's choice, his club is satisfied the estimates are based on sound premises and will raise for the Government what it expects, and will return to the club what it needs.

The Minister should do the same in the case of the Trotting Association. The Government should undertake through the Auditor-General's Department, in association with the Treasury, an examination of that kind and obtain a similar certificate to the effect that the return from a turnover of £6,500,000 a year will, after the

deduction of the various expenses, provide the revenue which is anticipated by the Government under the new legislation.

On motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), debate adjourned.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2), £21,500,000

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st November.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [9.15]: The Minister pointed out that this Supply Bill offers an opportunity to members to deal with some of the parochial matters about which they are perturbed. I must again ask the Government to tell us something about its intentions in regard to the deep-water ports in the Kimberleys and the north-west. Years are passing with very little being done, although the money has already been made available from Commonwealth sources.

We know that there have been carried out surveys and examinations of proposed areas for deep-water ports at Derby, Broome, and, quite recently, Napier Broome Bay. However, the Government has for quite a considerable time had the report from G. Maunsell and Partners in connection with the Derby and Broome examination, and it is taking too long to consider it, and make a decision known. If no decision has yet been made, it should hurry and make one, and then make it known to the people in these areas because they are very worried about what is going to happen ultimately to their ports. This Government has now been in office for almost two years.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Nineteen months.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Nineteen months, as the Minister has told us. The money was already provided when it came into office, and plans for one jetty at Black Rocks were already prepared. But nothing has been done. Not one penny of that money has been spent in the area, and now there is a situation whereby two towns in West Kimberley—Broome and Derby—are becoming quite envious of each other's prospects in relation to where this Government will provide a deep-water jetty.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Do you think it ought to be constructed at Black Rocks?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The previous Government was going to construct two. That was what it promised prior to the last general elections. Yet 19 months have passed and all this Government has done is simply to delay the work; and it has spent 19 months considering where a deep-water port should be constructed. It did not confine its investigations to Derby and Broome, either. It made investigations further north of Derby in the most

inaccessible region in Napier Broome Bay, with a view to establishing a new port altogether to serve the area.

Therefore I say that there is so much confusion and unnecessary delay that the people in West Kimberley are becoming very impatient, particularly as they know that the resources were made available long ago for at least one deep-water jetty.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Do you think it ought to go to Black Rocks?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The previous Government would have built a jetty at both towns.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: At Black Rocks and Derby?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Black Rocks was approved by the Commonwealth Government. It approved the plans which were submitted initially by the McLarty-Watts Government in 1955. The then Premier chose to sponsor a deep-water port at Black Rocks, which he had fought for all the years he was in Government, those being the years from 1947 to 1953. Therefore, I do not know what the Minister is talking about. I have read the report of G. Maunsell and Partners which was kindly provided after months of agitation.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It's a very good report, don't you think?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There is nothing wrong with it. I think it is an excellent report for anyone who has £4,000,000, £5,000,000, or £6,000,000 to spend on a deep-water harbour. There is nothing wrong with it looking a long way ahead. I am not going to criticise the report at all. I am going to say, though, that it has been proved possible to provide both of the districts with a deep-water jetty at much less cost; and the millions can be considered as development takes place, and a dockyard and the type of harbour envisaged in the report become necessary.

However, I want to stress that the people in the Kimberleys are very concerned about the delay in respect to the deep-water facilities at their ports.

It is also some time since another expert was engaged to examine the possibility of providing a deep-water entrance into Port Hedland. I do not know whether any report has yet been submitted to the Government. If it has I suggest that the Government should give it some early consideration and advise the people of that area of its contents. I am not asking that the Government should express its views in the matter, but simply make known the contents of the report, as has been done in regard to the Maunsell report, in order that the people might have some idea of the possibilities of the establishment of these facilities.

I hope that the report will be favourable, but one can never forecast what specialists in that type of work will recommend; but I trust that some dredging or deepening of the approaches to that port will be accomplished, thereby providing a means of export for our iron ore. The Minister informed us yesterday that the prospect of exporting our iron ore had not been lost sight of so far as he was concerned.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We do not take our eyes off the possibility for a second.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There has been talk of public finance, the Government responsibility, the lack of loan funds, and the need to tax people incessantly and increasingly from year to year. Those excuses are submitted when classrooms, schools, hospitals, or some such legitimate works are necessary. On the other hand, the Government is going to spend an undefined sum in arresting the siltage in the Ord River area. A great amount of ploughing and regrassing will be necessary, involving hundreds of thousands of acres of pastoral land which has been eroded. That is an expenditure which Parliament did not have an opportunity to discuss before it was decided upon.

I am not objecting to the arresting of the siltage; I am not objecting to the regrassing of the area; but I would like to know whether the pastoralists who hold those leases and are responsible for the erosion, are going to enjoy the ultimate benefits from the regrassing and contour ploughing which will be undertaken; or has the Government resumed the land? Has the Government excised that land from the pastoral leases? Surely in all fairness to those who pay taxes directly or indirectly, the Government's first action should have been to resume the areas because of the grossly abused conditions into which the pastoralists have allowed them to fall. That should have been the first move. However, instead of doing that, contour ploughing has already taken place. It is only a few weeks since I flew over the Turner River area, and I saw that extensive ploughing had been carried out.

I understand that the Government has not taken steps to get back the control of that land. It is a terrible thing to commit the State to such an unspecified expenditure. It is estimated to be in the vicinity of £160,000, but when one flies for many hours along these eroded tracts of river flats one quickly realises that the estimated £160,000 or £170,000, whatever the amount may be, will not nearly be enough. Apart from the ploughing, the areas are to be fenced. This has never been done during the 80 or 90 years the land has been under the care of the pastoralists. That is the reason the land is in such a dilapidated condition.

Now the Government is going to fence the properties, plough them, and regrass them to prevent siltage in connection with the Ord River dam; but what I want to know is: who is it being done for? Who is going to have the grazing rights of that country? It should not be those who are responsible for its deterioration. That is the burning question in the minds of those in the Kimberleys, and it is a question to which I hope the Minister will give some reply.

If the Minister desires to reply to the Bill tonight and complete its passage through this House, we have no objection. He has been kind enough on other occasions to make statements in the House in conjunction with queries raised by members, and I hope he will be able to obtain from the Minister for Agriculture and the Minister for Lands some very sound advice for members of this House in connection with that aspect; that is, the regeneration of eroded leases on Vestey's areas in the East Kimberley.

There are several items with which one could deal in connection with the north, but those being the principal ones for the moment, I will be content if the Minister will obtain some information about them. I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply) [9.30]: It is my desire that the Supply Bill should go through its various stages tonight in order that we might continue to make progress. We are now reaching the stage where we have a considerable amount of work on the notice paper and we are getting to the point where I think we will have to give serious consideration to sitting a little later than we have been doing. We have not had a bad spin this session, taking everything into consideration.

As Mr. Strickland said, it has been my practice—and, of course, the practice of my colleague, Mr. Logan—to answer all questions raised by members in the House. Where we are not able to answer them at the time they are asked, we frequently write letters to members as a follow-up.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: On a point of order, Mr. President, is the Minister closing the debate on the Supply Bill?

The PRESIDENT: Yes; the Minister is closing the debate. The honourable member is too late. I am sorry. The Minister may proceed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I regret if I happened to rise ahead of Mrs. Hutchison and deprive her of the opportunity to speak. The debate was adjourned last night in order that she might be given an opportunity to speak; and all I can say to her is that she will have to pay better attention in the future and be here.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I was paying attention. This is the second time I have attempted to speak.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must be seated when the President rises. The opportunity has been given the honourable member to speak when she has risen from time to time. On this occasion the Minister rose, and I did not notice Mrs. Hutchison. If I erred, I am sorry; but I have grave doubts whether the honourable member was on her feet.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am also sorry. If it were possible for me to sit down and give her an opportunity to speak, I would do so. Far be it from me to deprive her of the opportunity of speaking, as the House is well aware.

I do not propose to try to answer many of the questions that were raised in this debate for the reason that preoccupation of last night and tonight has not made it possible for me to make sufficient notes to give the reply that should be given. However, I would like to assure members that the points raised will be given consideration; and, at a later date, I will communicate the information that is sought by members.

I would like—because it is a subject with which I am fairly conversant—to remark on some of the comments made last night by Mr. Davies. He asserted that apparently the Commonwealth Government had changed its mind on the question of the export of iron ore, and he thought it might have been a matter of horses for courses. Whether he used that expression or not does not matter.

He did suggest that because an application for a license to export iron ore was made by a Liberal-Country Party Government in this State to a Federal Liberal-Country Party Government the application might receive more favourable consideration. I do not think that is the case at all. In fact, I am quite sure it is not the case, because an export license has not been granted. Although this State is anxious to obtain such a license, I repeat that up to date it has not been granted.

As a political party, the party to which I belong has never been opposed to the export of iron ore. We have been very much opposed—and we were opposed—to the policy that was expounded by the previous Premier of this State in which he asserted that if he obtained an export license for iron ore, and if he obtained £1,000,000 from the sale thereof, he would set up another industry with the proceeds.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: Is that the reason why the Commonwealth Government would not grant a license?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know, because I am not a member of the Commonwealth Government. Great emphasis is laid by the Commonwealth Government in respect of applications from

States other than Western Australia. This is not just a Western Australian project. If the honourable member thinks the Commonwealth Government, because it happens to have in this State a Government of its own political complexion, is going to give Western Australia a license to export iron ore, and overlook the rest of the States, I think he is mistaken.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I don't think I will live to see that day.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the export embargo is removed it will naturally be on an Australia-wide basis and will not simply apply to Western Australia.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: You are against our getting a license.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am against the honourable member having too much to say at this time, for the reasons you expressed, Mr. President, a few minutes ago. I will finish quicker if the honourable member will desist from interjecting.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I hope you will observe that rule.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do interject; but not in the same way, as members are aware. I share the enthusiasm with which Mr. Strickland approaches the question of iron ore, I share his desire to see the north-west develop; and I would say that in recent months, and in recent years, the north-west has shown a development which it had not shown previously. With the development of mineral pursuits in the north, there is no question that the north will develop in a much speedier manner than it has in the past. I believe that the right of the State to export iron ore from the north-west will really open the field to quick development in that area.

We wait—not patiently, but impatiently—for the Commonwealth Government to tell us whether or not its attitude is going to be changed. The reason we give for the possibility of a change—and I insist that it will have to be Australia-wide and not apply just to Western Australia—is that very large quantities of iron ore have been discovered in other parts of this country.

Apart from this, I do not propose to answer any of the points raised by other members to this debate, except to refer to the statement made by Mr. Bennetts when he spoke of expressions of opinion made by the Federal member for Perth (Mr. Chaney). I think Mr. Chaney, on this occasion, was trying to assist Mr. Browne, the member for Kalgoorlie, when that honourable member moved in the Federal Parliament a resolution in connection with gold and pointed out the necessity for the Commonwealth Government to give assistance in that matter. This particularly applies to Western Australia because, as is well known, we produce about 92 per cent. of Australia's gold.

I do not know what words were used by Mr. Chaney at that time, or the construction placed upon them. But I think it was an attempt to help Mr. Browne. I know that with the ore reserves Kalgoorlie has at the present time, the future of Kalgoorlie is definitely assured. This is due largely to the ability of the goldmining companies and the realisation of the men employed that they must do their part; and the realisation of management that it, too, must play its part in a set of circumstances which, for a number of years, has always operated to the disadvantage of the industry.

With ever-rising costs, the goldmining industry has been able to cope with this state of affairs only by means of good management and the co-operation of the workers. I wish that also pertained to some of the areas of the State that preoccupy me at the present time. I will close with those remarks, and with the assurance that at the first opportunity I will communicate with members on the points they have raised.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. A. R. Jones) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Issue and application of £21,500,000:

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I wish to bring forward a matter concerning the Education Act. I refer to the case of a female teacher who married during the first year of her teaching and who is now burdened with a load of debt that is breaking up her home.

Something ought to be done about our Education Act in this State. There is discrimination against women to which I object most strenuously. If a female teacher marries in her first year of teaching in Western Australia, she immediately becomes responsible for the whole of the bond she has signed, whether or not she teaches.

Half of the pay of the person to whom I have referred is being held back; and she has been loaded with a debt of about £1,500. Because she married in Western Australia, she broke her bond; and she is responsible for the whole of the bond. She was sacked before the last election.

She is teaching again now, but I learned, when I went East, that in New South Wales—and I take it it would be the same in the other States—if a girl marries it makes no difference to her teaching. As a matter of fact, when she gets married she does not break her bond; she can get leave if she is having a child and can return to teaching after the child is born. So long as she completes the time set for the bond she is not penalised, nor is she liable to pay back the bond.

I think it is dreadful that we should discriminate in this State, and if something is not done about this position I shall introduce a Bill next session to rectify it. My own granddaughter taught in New South Wales. Then she got married, obtained leave while she had a baby, and then returned to teaching. Even the department in this State admits that the situation is wrong, but nothing has been done about it. If a girl marries in the first year of her service she and her husband are liable for the whole of the bond. As soon as she marries she breaks the bond; and I want to rectify that position.

I did want to say a lot more about this and other subjects but I missed my chance. I will take good care that it does not happen again. I thought the Minister got up to answer a question, or make some observation, but by the time I realised what had happened I was too late. It was a mistake and I consider it as such.

I also wanted to discuss the question of mental health, but I understand the report of the committee inquiring into this matter is to be submitted on the 7th November. I shall wait to see what happens, and I will then discuss the matter. I am hopeful that the Minister will be very sympathetic and that something will be done to alter the conditions in the antiquated buildings that we have at Claremont. This situation has existed under various Governments. The little girls there are mixed in with the aged women, and conditions are very overcrowded. The boys are just as badly off, and their playground is very bad. It is like a home for the condemned; and I shall be very vocal when that matter comes before us.

I heard the Minister talk about gold and coal; and I wish he would look into the position which now obtains at Collie where 500 men are threatened with dismissal. Many years ago I read a book on Jarrow—the town that was murdered—and on thinking about it, it reminds me of Collie. The people in that town have built their homes there and reared their families in those homes; but overnight, because of some Government policy, their employment is threatened and they are to be thrown to the winds. This Government has been very severe and cruel in destroying the security of certain people. As a woman I know the mental suffering being experienced by the people concerned when their security of employment is suddenly taken from them.

I have been reading old *Hansards*, and I read one for the year 1912 in which mention was made of men tramping from one end of the State to the other looking for work. There is more security than that today and we know that no man will actually starve; but some come so close to it that it nearly drives them mad. I

wanted to mention those three points, even though I could not make the speech I had prepared.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The first two points raised by the honourable member will be referred to the appropriate Ministers in another place and I shall advise her of their opinions. As regards the third matter, of course I did not even use the word "coal." But apparently it struck in the right place, and I would say to the honourable member, and to all other members in this House, that on the last occasion when the coal contracts were being negotiated, the men to whom the honourable member referred were left in a state of uncertainty for 18 months before they knew what was going to happen to them, and before any arrangements were made for them. In the period from 1954 to 1959, there were 613 of them put out of the industry. Did anybody have any thought for them then?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am glad to hear it. According to Mrs. Hutchison the number of men who will be put out of work has now gone up to 500.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The men were provided for.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like the honourable member to look at the files in my office to see what has taken place over recent years. It might be wise for her to look at the difficulties which exist at Collie, and the difficult conditions through which the industry has passed in recent years. The honourable member said that she wishes I would look at the position at Collie. I have been looking at it closely for a long time.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: But you are looking at it in the wrong way.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We want co-operation both from the men and from the management so that what the honourable member talked about will not take place. In the interests of the State it is necessary for the Government to pursue a policy under which we will pay £1 a ton instead of 55s. 6d. a ton. We want the co-operation of the management and the men so that we can get 26 per cent. of our Government supplies from open-cut methods. By so doing we will save approximately £400,000 per annum for the State.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Did you say 26 per cent.?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. I believe all previous Ministers, including Mr. Strickland and Mr. Wise, have a deal of sympathy for the situation which now prevails because they realise the difficulties. As I said, it took 18 months to bring about a situation where contracts which were considered to be satisfactory at the time, and under which the State was saved

something like £500,000, could be negotiated. I am hoping that the same process of negotiation will take place on this occasion.

But let me assure the honourable member that it is not my desire, nor is it the desire of the Government as a whole, to see anybody put out of employment. We are living in changing times and we must appreciate that. In the interests of the whole of the State we cannot continue to employ a practice which costs the State money, and which could cost the consumer more for his gas and electricity. We should try to pursue a moderate course and save the State money.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: And waste it somewhere else.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We will put the people who are retrenched—temporarily, anyway—into other forms of employment, and give Collie a future that, unfortunately, it has never had before. We want to try to get for Collie an industry based on coal, so that there will be more opportunity to sell coal, thus providing more employment, giving the men security, and removing the fright from which we realise they are suffering. This is a problem which the Government can solve easily provided we get the co-operation not only of the men but also of those who own the mines.

Sitting suspended from 9.58 to 10.17 p.m.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There is only one point I wish to raise in connection with this Bill, and I am taking this opportunity of doing so while the Bill is in Committee. It has been pointed out to me by a very noble personality in Western Australia that perhaps police constables could visit various schools and lecture to the children on road safety and good citizenship. They could also speak about the acts of delinquents and the severity of sentences which can be imposed for offences of this nature. All this would have the effect of making children of tender age more conscious of being good citizens; and I think it is something that could be put into effect.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will have a look at it.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2 put and passed.

Preamble put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading

On motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), Bill read a third time, and passed.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had disagreed to the amendment made by the Council.

OPTOMETRISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st November.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [10.23]: At the outset, I am going to admit that this Bill has caused me more confusion than any other Bill that I have known. In some ways it is contradictory, and it is my intention to wait until the Committee stage to see what amendments are moved. I believe it is the intention that some amendments be moved in the Committee stage, but they do not appear on the notice paper and I do not know what they are. Therefore, if necessary, I will be prepared to amend the Bill in the Committee stage if the second reading passes. At the present time I am more in favour of voting against the Bill as there is a need for the parent Act to be redrafted and presented in a different form from what it is in now.

I have considered this legislation as it was introduced in 1940 by the late Mr. Alex. Pantou. When speaking on the Bill Mr. Pantou had this to say—

Lack of registration of optometrists in this State allows that kind of thing to take place without hindrance.

Mr. Pantou was talking about the men who went from door to door looking for business. To continue with his remarks—

The incompetent or unqualified optometrist often starts as a canvasser for some other equally unqualified optometrist. The canvasser, from door-to-door visiting to obtain business for his employer, learns some rudiments of the procedure and decides that he can earn more money by being an optometrist himself. He then starts up in business and himself employs a canvasser, who in turn gets the same idea, and so the number of so-called optometrists is constantly increased.

I agree the legislation was quite proper at that time. The parent Act has been amended three times in support of one person; and that makes me think this legislation should be overhauled.

I think one of the clauses in this Bill would discriminate against some people in this State. I refer to mechanics. It seems to me there is an analogy between these people and dental mechanics who actually make the article. A dental mechanic

makes a plate to the order of a dental surgeon and it has to fit. The fitting is the responsibility of the surgeon. I do not see the need to make it obligatory to bring in another optometrist.

The wording in the Bill has intrigued me. I looked at several English dictionaries around the place in regard to some of the words used in the Bill. The word "optics" according to the Oxford dictionary means "the theory of the laws of sight." The word "optometer" means "the name of the instrument for measuring and testing vision." The meaning given for "optimacy" is "a word which yielded in 1688 to 'aristocracy' meaning then a Government by nobles." I hurriedly searched for the meaning of "oculist" and it is listed as "one versed in knowledge or treatment of the eyes—a physician or surgeon who treats diseases and affections of the eye." In the latest *Concise Oxford Dictionary* the word "oculist" is listed as "pertaining to diseases of the eye." I then found in *New Webster's American Collegiate Dictionary* the word "optometry" means "measuring the range of vision—noun: optometrist." So we have the situation that under English law the *Oxford English Dictionary* is used in connection with legal interpretations, but the meaning of the word "optometry" in a Bill before the Parliament of Western Australia is taken from an American dictionary. I mention these things because I am a lover of plain commonsense English.

From reading earlier *Hansards* I find there has been a good deal of confusion over the word "optometrist." I was wondering how many members of the public know exactly what an optometrist is. The meaning of the word "optometrist" seems to have been accepted here, and I suppose we will carry on with that interpretation through this Bill.

The Bill is a confusing one to me. The words "and" and "or" in the clause seem to have taken on gigantic proportions for such small words. Clause 2 reads as follows:—

Section three of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by substituting for the word, "and" in line four of paragraph (a) of the interpretation, "Optometry" the word, "or";
- (b) by substituting for the passage, "vision," in line two of paragraph (b) of the interpretation, "Optometry" the passage, "vision; or";
- (c) by adding after paragraph (b) of the interpretation, "Optometry" the following paragraph—
 - (c) both such employment and such adaptation.

That is what I call stilted legal phraseology. The Act was amended in 1951 to cover the issuing of a diploma in order to prohibit quacks from issuing prescriptions for glasses. I thoroughly agree with that. I think sight is a precious commodity and we should be very careful to have properly trained persons to say what is wrong with one's sight. I do not know why the Act has to be further amended to tighten up the dispensing of glasses. This is something like dental mechanics, in that it depends on a man's skill. Some are more skilled than others when it comes to manual work.

I would like to see what amendments are moved in Committee; and I am prepared to move an amendment to reduce the period from five years to one year. This will eliminate the harm which the Bill will cause if it goes through in its present form. I was hoping for more guidance to help us decide whether we should accept this Bill; or whether it should be withdrawn and brought down again in a more concise and better form.

This is hotch-potch legislation. I have followed it through the years. It was amended in 1944 to allow one person in Western Australia to be registered; and it was amended again in 1951. Dame Cardell-Oliver moved an amendment that a diploma could be issued by the board. Up to that time examinations were conducted by the University, but it had no power to grant diplomas. One can appreciate that a diploma is important because it shows that one is receiving treatment from a qualified person.

We then come to 1957, when a Bill was brought in to allow another man in Western Australia to be registered. This made me doubt whether at the present time we are on the right track. I am not prepared to say at the moment whether or not I support the Bill. I would prefer to wait until the Committee stage and determine the Bill on the merits of any amendments that are brought forward.

Proposed new section 34C in clause 9 is to enable a certain spectacles-maker to practise in Western Australia. I believe he has done very good work here. While this Bill will allow him to carry on his work here, I know of others, just as competent to carry out the grinding of lenses, who will be debarred. Bills have been introduced from time to time to amend the Act for specific purposes. These Bills have been introduced by members supporting both Governments; they have not been party Bills at all. I am in favour of reducing the training period to one year, and I will propose an amendment to that effect at the appropriate time. I will support the Bill in principle if I am satisfied with the amendments that are brought forward.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [10.39]: I am one of those fortunate people who have not had to visit any of these people. But there is always the chance that I may have to. I recently read an article in a booklet called *The Nation*, which dealt with this profession and pointed out that a man opened up a business in the Eastern States which, in a very short time, developed into a huge business. The man concerned passed on—to a better place, perhaps—and the business proceeded to mushroom. The name of the firm was O.P.S.M.

This firm set itself up as optometrists, and had its office on the ground floor of a huge suite of offices. A person would go in and be tested for spectacles and would be told, "No, we cannot test you; but we make the spectacles." The person would then be shown to a lift and taken upstairs, where the entire area was occupied by specialists dealing with diseases of the eyes. Whichever specialist the person was ushered into would prescribe the type of glasses necessary. The person concerned was not handed a prescription. Instead, it was sent below to O.P.S.M. to have the spectacles made up.

The article in *The Nation*—and I wish I had it with me—pointed out that spectacles would be made and manufactured at a fraction of the cost that is being charged at the present time. I feel that exactly the same thing could happen in Western Australia under this Bill. The article pointed out that shareholders in the company were professional men who gained by the prescriptions being made up by this firm. If such a situation can be brought about in Western Australia as a result of this type of legislation, I will oppose it.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Do you think that is proposed in the legislation?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No; but it is possible for it to happen. As Mrs. Hutchison pointed out, this legislation will debar certain people from manufacturing spectacles. The lenses are bulk-produced.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Perhaps someone will tell us sometime exactly what is proposed.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I did explain what is proposed.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am concerned about that particular article. Whether *The Nation* is a booklet of a high standard, I would not know. However, that article was printed. If the article was not true, no doubt it could be challenged in the courts. I would not like to see similar conditions prevail in Western Australia.

On motion by The Hon. H. K. Watson, debate adjourned.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT

BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 25th October.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—in reply) [10.45]: I wish to thank those members who made their contributions to the debate on this small measure, particularly Mr. Loton who was prepared to oppose the Bill. I would like to make one remark in answer to something that that honourable member said; namely, that people go out on a Sunday to have a drink. The average person who goes out for a drive on Sunday does not do so with the idea of having a drink at a hotel situated in what I call the fringe area around the metropolis. The majority of those who visit those parts are merely out for a Sunday drive. I will admit, however, that there are some people who purposely visit the hotels situated in the fringe areas so that they may have a drink. Nevertheless, in the particular area I represent, such is not the case.

I do not want the House to be misled into believing that people will be flocking into the hills merely for the purpose of obtaining a drink on Sunday. In his contribution to the debate, Mr. Watson suggested that there were only two alternatives. He said we should either permit all hotels to be open on the Sunday, or else extend the limit from the centre of Perth to 100 miles distant. The opening of all hotels on a Sunday would be a matter for the Government. That is why I did not attempt to include such a provision in this Bill.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: The hotels do not want it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: As to Mr. Watson's other suggestion of extending the radius limit from the Perth Town Hall to 100 miles, it is a fact that well within a radius of 100 miles from the heart of the city there are facilities for people to have a drink. In various country centres, at Sunday football matches and other social gatherings, people are able to have a few drinks. This does help to brighten up their lives in country areas. I know from my experience throughout country centres in this State that where legal sessions of drinking are permitted, they are held for one-and-a-half hours at lunch-time and one-and-a-half hours in the evening.

The Bill which was introduced to make Sunday sessions legal was done to break a practice that had become common at various country hotels, and to improve the position of the members of our Police Force in regard to their administration of the licensing laws.

Mr. Watson referred to the fact that meat, bread, and eggs had to be bought on Saturdays because they were unobtainable

on Sundays. To my knowledge, those commodities can be purchased anywhere on a Sunday. However, that is no argument against having a drink on a Sunday in those areas to which I have referred.

I thank Mr. Simpson for his views on the Bill and for making reference to the drinking habits of people in other countries. I would like to stress that, in my opinion, our drinking habits are very restricted. Whereas we look upon liquor as something that can be obtained only within restricted hours, in other parts of the world they have liberal drinking hours and it has not been proved that the people in those countries drink to excess. I would say that since the introduction of Sunday sessions throughout this State, the practice has not led to excess drinking; and, in fact, there are less cases of over-indulgence in liquor than there were before.

Mr. MacKinnon referred to the transfer of trade from some of the other hotels to the hotels which come within the scope of this Bill. In my opinion the transfer of trade from those hotels will be very slight. There may be a few that would be affected, but I know them, and the small amount of trade that would be taken away from them would be neither here nor there. Customers who attend a hotel regularly generally continue to patronise that same hotel. The difference in trade would be so slight it would have no effect on the ingoing price paid for any hotel that may be in the fringe areas mentioned by Mr. MacKinnon. I do not believe that in either of the two hotels that I know of—which could only be the two that were referred to by Mr. MacKinnon—Sunday trading is a big item when considering the price paid for ingoing. That may have been so in one case where the licensee paid a fair amount of ingoing for a seaside hotel, but he has had tremendous trade in the past on a Sunday, and that trade will continue in the future, and therefore he will not lose anything as a result of the large amount he paid for ingoing.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where do you think the limit should be?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In the Bill I have provided that the limit shall be 20 miles from the centre of Perth by road. In previous legislation we have provided for a certain radius from the Perth Town Hall, but it is for Parliament to decide the limit.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you want; 16 miles?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I know the reason why the Minister wants me to make a decision now. I propose that the limit shall be 20 miles distant from the centre of Perth because that is reasonable.

I also thank Mr. Heenan for referring to the report made by the joint-party committee that inquired into licensing matters several years ago. The fact that

that committee saw quite a bit of merit in the suggestion of a limit of 20 miles by road from Perth, instead of adhering to a radius of 20 miles from the Perth Town Hall, rather supports the provision contained in this Bill.

Before I resume my seat I appeal to the House to give consideration to this proposition on the basis that there are hotels trading within a radius of 20 miles by road; and some of those were included because they are outside the 20-mile radius from the Perth Town Hall. That is, of course, as the crow flies. We are not all crows; and quite a few of those hotels are further distant than those trading within a 20-mile radius from Perth. Therefore, not being crows, we should give careful consideration to this Bill.

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

Ayes—16.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. P. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. W. R. Hall

Noes—11.

Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	

(Teller.)

(Teller.)

Majority for—5.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) in the Chair; The Hon. N. E. Baxter in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—Section 122 amended:

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am one of those who have given this Bill a second thought; and I have voted for the second reading. That is different from the way I voted previously. The administration of this Bill is a task for the police and I think their attention should be drawn to the fact that there is a number of holders of gallon licenses in the metropolitan area who are selling beer on Sundays. In my opinion it is time the police made a raid on some of these premises. In my district the members of a young family obtained drink from the holder of a gallon license on a Sunday and this could have resulted in tragedy.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I support Mr. Lavery's remarks. I know one of these places which requires the attention of the Police Department. It probably supplies

more bottled beer on a Sunday than any hotel would supply. A check of gallon license premises would be justified.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 4—Delete the word "twenty" and substitute the word "fourteen".

The purpose of the amendment is to bring within the scope of this Bill certain hotels which are placed in similar circumstances to those to be embraced by the Bill. The amendment seeks to bring in the Kalamunda Hotel, which can be compared to the Mundaring Hotel, or the Mundaring Weir Hotel. It is located in the hills and caters for the local trade as well as the tourist trade.

The amendment seeks to bring in the Armadale Hotel and Ye Olde Narrogin Inn. The Armadale district possesses numerous tourist attractions.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: What are they?

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: There are Canning Dam and Araluen; there are Serpentine Dam, the Serpentine Falls and many other attractions. Armadale is the junction of many roads radiating to the south, including the roads to Bunbury, Albany, the south-west, Fremantle and Kwinana. A great deal of traffic passes through that junction. A good purpose will be served by allowing the Armadale Hotel to trade on Sundays.

Ye Olde Narrogin Inn is known to most members. It was built before 1887. It has been maintained in very good condition and is established on attractive surroundings. The licensee keeps numerous caged birds as an attraction for visitors. The building is set among attractive lawns. This hotel caters for meals at week-ends, and for that reason it is entitled to the same consideration as the hotels intended to be covered by the Bill.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It could serve liquor with the meals.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: That is so, but the patrons cannot remain at the dining tables for very long. A very elaborate menu is offered to guests and visitors, particularly at week-ends. It is a spot at which travellers like to break their journey for a few drinks and a good meal.

Many people take a drive in the week-end through to Armadale, and then to the hills. They will be able to make use of the Sunday trading facilities at those hotels. Should a tourist scenic drive be built through the Darling Range, a great number of tourists would be attracted there. Even at the present time many people take week-end drives through the hills. They first visit the Serpentine Falls, then travel through the hills to Canning Dam, and ultimately to Lake Leschenaultia. The hotels along the route should therefore

be granted the same privilege of Sunday trading as are the hotels intended to be covered by the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I appreciate the purpose of the sponsor of the Bill in bringing forward the measure; I appreciate his action in trying to give some relief to the difficulties experienced by the licensee of the Mundaring Weir Hotel.

Now we have before us an amendment to extend Sunday trading to hotels beyond 14 miles of the Perth Town Hall. If it is agreed to, the Kalamunda Hotel, the Kelmscott Hotel, and several others will be covered by the provisions of the Bill. By reducing the distance to 12 miles of the Perth Town Hall, the North Beach Hotel would also be included. This is a case of where the line should be drawn. I am still opposed to the Bill, but as the House has agreed to the second reading I bow to the wishes of members.

If it is fair to apply Sunday trading conditions to one part of the outer suburban area, it is just as fair to apply it to another part. If the conditions are applied to the Mundaring Weir Hotel there is no reason why they should not be applied to the Armadale Hotel. If we were to agree to reduce the distance every time an argument was presented along these lines, ultimately all hotels, except those in the city, would be covered by the provisions of the Bill.

The principle that some hotels outside the metropolitan area should be granted Sunday trading facilities has been accepted. I do not see why other hotels in similar circumstances should not be given the same consideration.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: This measure has been introduced to remedy a rather blatant anomaly which exists in connection with four or five hotels on the perimeter of the 20-mile radius. I felt inclined to believe that that is as far as we should go at present. The arguments advanced by Mr. Abbey and the Minister are hard to refute. In cold logic it seems obvious that Ye Olde Narrogin Inn and other hotels similarly situated on the outskirts should be able to trade on Sundays; but I have in mind, as was pointed out by the Minister, that the North Beach Hotel and others will be either just inside or just outside this arbitrary limit which is proposed in the amendment.

For a start I was inclined to agree with Mr. Abbey, but I think the time is not far distant when we will have to make a far more intelligent approach to this subject. There is no logical reason why hotels all over the State—in the city and everywhere else—should not trade on Sundays. If it is all right to drink 20 miles from Perth, why is it not all right to drink within 10 miles of Perth, or in the city? If a person is a member of a club he is able to obtain as much drink as he likes

during the set trading hours. It is for this reason I believe there are a lot of inconsistencies and anomalies in connection with the matter.

Mr. Baxter's provisions will meet a rather pressing need as applying to the four or five hotels involved; and I do not think that any great hardship will be inflicted upon those mentioned by Mr. Abbey if they are called upon to wait until such time as a more intelligent approach is taken on this matter.

There is a consensus of opinion that if hotels are open for trading on Sundays, a lot of excessive drinking will occur. In my opinion this argument is entirely erroneous, the same as was a similar argument submitted in connection with betting. We were told that the country would go to the pack if betting shops were established, but there has been no upsurge of betting. People drink and bet now under better circumstances than ever previously existed. There is no excessive drinking taking place on the goldfields on Sundays, and no-one has ever seen a drunk in the country towns. Sooner or later this problem will have to be faced to avoid the stupid anomalies which creep in when an arbitrary limit is provided. Therefore, for the time being I believe we should leave the situation as it will be under Mr. Baxter's Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have previously made my views quite clear on this matter. If a Bill were introduced to close all clubs and hotels on Sundays, I would certainly support it. However, as we are going to provide for Sunday drinking in clubs and certain hotels, then I support the liberalisation of Sunday drinking. However, it is hard to rationalise without discrimination. The purpose of Mr. Baxter's Bill is to extend Sunday trading to certain hotels which otherwise would be faced with closure.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: It would not do any harm to close some of the hotels.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If Mr. Abbey could tell us that the hotels he is intending to bring under the scope of this Bill are in the same dire circumstances, then I would be inclined to support his amendment, but not otherwise.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I rise to support the amendment, although I opposed the original provisions. For the life of me, I cannot see why, if the House is prepared to reduce the radius to 20 miles for the convenience of some hotels in dire circumstances, we cannot be a little more generous in our approach to the matter and consider the tourist, especially in connection with Ye Olde Narrogin Inn and other similar hotels. The time is not far distant when all hotels will remain open in the whole of the metropolitan area.

If such a proposal were submitted, I would have to consider supporting it. However, as I have said, if we are going to reduce the radius at all, I feel we should

accept the lower radius and give these other hotels the same opportunity. I wanted to indicate my views on the amendment before the vote was taken.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: While I supported Mr. Baxter, I am not prepared to support any further reduction, for the reason that Mr. Baxter's amendment would affect only three hotels on the mainland. If we do make a move to come into Armadale, and bring in two more hotels, we shall finish up with bringing in even more. There is more traffic on country roads on Sundays than on any other days. A tremendous amount of traffic passes through Armadale on Sundays.

I pass the Rockingham hotel on almost every Sunday about the time the session ends. One has to keep one's eyes on the road and be fully alert at such times. From the road safety point of view I feel it would be unwise to extend the general lifting of prohibition in the metropolitan area on Sundays. It would be better to ban it entirely.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Surely you are not going to penalise Armadale because it is a busy road?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Wherever we draw the line we penalise the next hotel. Is the Government prepared to come to Gosnells; or to Cannington?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon): The honourable member will please address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Wherever the line is drawn it creates several anomalies. I am not worried about people having a drink on Sundays. But I think that one day a week could be a dry day; and that day could be Sunday. Christmas Day is a dry day; as also is Anzac Day and Good Friday. I am thinking of the road safety point of view in the metropolitan area, and I am not prepared to support any further reduction.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: While I was opposed to Mr. Baxter's Bill—and the House has agreed by its vote to give privilege to those people whom he was seeking to ease under the restrictions on Sunday trading—I do not think the House should agree to the proposed amendment of Mr. Abbey. Why not bring in the Victoria Park hotel and be done with it? I hope the House will oppose the amendment.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: When Mr. Baxter brought this Bill before the House several years ago he used—and has since used—as his line of argument that 20 miles as the crow flies just cuts these two Mundaring hotels out; but 20 miles as the road runs brings those hotels in. The line of demarcation is a very fine one. After very careful examination of the position had been made by a committee of

Parliament, and the Government brought about different trading hours in the metropolitan area on the Committee's recommendations, I saw no reason why I should not support Mr. Baxter in that very fine line of demarcation. But I am not prepared to support the amendment moved by Mr. Abbey.

If we are going to come in closer than that fine line of demarcation, we have got to bring every hotel into Sunday trading. If I could get sufficient votes in this Chamber, I would not agree to clubs being allowed to trade on Sundays. I am certainly not going to let that line of demarcation advance until the Government can grant Sunday trading to all hotels, and thereby bring about another set of industrial problems so far as these hotels are concerned. If we were going to have Sunday trading as a whole, it is the Government's job to bring that about. With all due respect to Mr. Abbey, I will not support his amendment.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I think the reasons advanced by Mr. Abbey for his amendment are on all fours with those advanced by Mr. Baxter when he introduced this Bill. I think that as the Bill was originally introduced by Mr. Baxter, we are entitled to hear his views on it. It is his Bill and I think he should give the Chamber a lead on what he thinks of the proposed amendment.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: Apparently Mr. Baxter does not intend to state his position; so I will reply to certain speakers. I am pleased to hear that Mr. Heenan thinks my amendment is hard to refute; because that definitely is the case. Every one of the hotels that will be brought in will be in comparable circumstances to those advocated by Mr. Baxter. That is quite definite. I am sorry I cannot prove to Mr. Ron. Thompson—

The Hon. R. Thompson: I didn't ask you to prove it. I corrected that.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: The hotels that will be brought in will be in dire circumstances. The Armadale hotel is only a small hotel. It would be similar to, say, Mundaring hotel and therefore would merit exactly the same treatment. The Armadale hotel would serve a similar number of people as does the Mundaring hotel. We must take into account that there is Ye Olde Narrogin Inn in the same district.

I do not think an anomaly will be created. Rather, it will be an anomaly cleaned up. If we can agree that five hotels should be included in this Bill, surely another three or four, that are in similar circumstances, are equally entitled to be included. Concerning the road safety angle mentioned by Mr. Strickland, I would say that in my opinion the adding of another two or three hotels will help to mitigate against the difficulty he mentioned.

I agree with him that there is a definite accident liability on that particular road, particularly at night, with a good deal of traffic proceeding south. If some people are travelling from Kalamunda, and others are coming from Ye Olde Narrogin Inn, there will be less people travelling on the road from Rockingham and from Sawyer's Valley, and therefore that will be an advantage. I hope members will support my amendment.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I did not support any widening of the provisions of the Licensing Act, and I am certainly not going to support the amendment because the more we broaden the scope of the Act, in regard to drinking on Sundays, the more anomalies will be created. Like Mr. Lavery, if I could get sufficient support I would ban all drinking on Sundays.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: I would support you on that, too.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: You try it.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: May be I will try it one of these days. I know what a swill some of these places become on a Sunday. One only has to drive to Rockingham, Sawyer's Valley, or Bullsbrook to realise that. Not only is there a danger from the traffic point of view, but there is also a danger of young children being left alone in parked cars. I realise that there is some merit in what Mr. Baxter wants to do, but I certainly oppose the amendment.

The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The 20-mile radius from the Perth Town Hall for Sunday trading has been a provision in the Act for some time and is accepted in the public's mind. We should not alter that provision because everyone knows what it means. I sympathise with Mr. Abbey and I think he has put up a good case, but I cannot agree with his amendment, although I agree with Mr. Baxter's Bill because in substance it preserves the 20 miles definition for Sunday trading.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I have been told over many years what happens at Rockingham on Sundays, and the dangers there are on the roads because of people drinking on Sundays and then driving back to Perth. If these places are so bad we should consider delicensing some of them so that they cannot serve liquor on a Sunday. I heard one member say that by supporting Mr. Baxter we would be keeping two or three more hotels open. In Kalgoorlie at present, grocery shops are being closed down by the chain stores. What about doing something to keep them open?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Bennett's attitude was not reflected in the way he voted on the second reading. I think a good case has been put up for Armadale and Kelmscott, and one or two other places—just as good as has been put up for Mundaring. But I realise the implications of this amendment, and the implications if we were to divide on it. I cannot see that by giving the hotel at Armadale the

right to open on Sunday we would be creating a worse traffic hazard for that road than there is now. Many hundreds of people travel along that road already and I do not think the granting of the right to Sunday trading for the hotel at Armadale would make any difference in that direction. I suggest to Mr. Baxter that he report progress so that some understanding may be reached on the matter.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Everybody should be quite clear about this Bill. There is no permanent population in Mundaring to patronise the hotel, and the same applies to Naval Base. That was the reason why I supported the second reading. I understood that to be the purpose of the Bill; if it is not, then I have been fooled. As regards the Rottnest Hotel, it has had the privilege of Sunday trading ever since it opened; it took that privilege upon itself and the hotel is not open for two hours a day but for 12 to 14 hours a day. I have known it to be open at 4 o'clock on a Sunday morning.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Were you there when it closed?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was not in the hotel. I was out in a launch anchored in the bay, trying to get some sleep. I do not think the Bill, therefore, will have much bearing on the Rottnest Hotel. I supported this measure on the basis that it would assist in keeping alive certain hotels that were experiencing most difficult times.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: In order to clear that matter up, I would like to point out to the Committee that around Mundaring there is a fairly large centre of population, although, admittedly, it is scattered. The Mundaring Weir Hotel is in a different position. It has to depend for its trade on a small local population and on those passing through. Therefore, it must be in a very difficult situation. That is not sufficient excuse, however, for the passing of this Bill. After all, there must be several other hotels in similar circumstances.

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

Ayes—8.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray

(Teller.)

Noes—19.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	

(Teller.)

Majority against—11.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [11.45]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [11.46]: I am sorry I have to rise to my feet in a situation such as this. I had already indicated to Mr. Baxter that it would be better for him to move the third reading tomorrow, and he agreed that he should. Then, following on other advice, he decided to move the third reading tonight. I had a purpose in asking him to move for the third reading tomorrow. I realise that I have asked for the suspension of Standing Orders, and when a request such as I have made is agreed to, the honourable member should adhere to his decision.

A difficult situation developed tonight, and when the honourable member was asked to move the third reading of the Bill tomorrow it was done with a view to giving him an opportunity to consult with others on a situation in which he now finds himself; namely, having had to vote for an amendment moved by Mr. Abbey against the interests of the Bill, but still finishing up with the Bill intact as Mr. Baxter desired it. It is too late now, because the honourable member has moved the third reading of the Bill.

As to Withdrawal of Motion

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Would it be competent for me, Mr. President, to withdraw my motion in view of the remarks expressed by the Minister?

The PRESIDENT: I do not think I can agree to that request.

Debate Resumed

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 2nd November, 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Bank Holiday : Gazettal of Christmas Eve	2345
Classrooms : Construction in 1959-60	2346
Collie Coal—	
Companies' commitments to Government	2346
Supplies to Government	2346
East Kimberley Leases : Resumption from absentee landholders	2345
Government Employees—	
Replacement by mineworkers	2344
Retrenchments in the South-West	2343
McNess Homes : Erection in Guildford-Midland electorate	2344
Midland Junction Workshops : Adequacy of work programme	2345
Mineworkers' Pensions : Increases	2344
Mr. Edgar Ross—	
Association with coal strike	2345
Visit to Western Australia	2345
Railway Service : Extension to Helena Vale siding	2344
State Housing Commission Homes : Vacancies in Guildford-Midland electorate	2344
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Australian Coastline : Inclusion of Western Australia in survey	2347
Communist Party : Premier's connection	2347
Legislation : Bills still to be introduced	2347
Mr. Jack Marks : Association with coal strike	2347
BILLS—	
Dog Act Amendment Bill : Council's message	2351
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	2348
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment Bill : 1r.	2348
Paper Mill Agreement Bill : Returned	2382
Simultaneous Deaths Bill : 2r.	2348
Supply Bill (No. 2) £21,500,000 : Returned	2382
Traffic Act Amendment Bill : Council's amendment	2349
ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1960-1961—	
Committee of Supply—	
Votes and items discussed	2351

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Retrenchments in the South-West

1. Mr. MAY asked the Premier:

(1) Is it correct that men have been retrenched from Main Roads employment in the south-west districts?