

amended in 1939, the cost was reduced from £510 for the year 1929-30 to £293 for the year 1930-31.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That is because Mr. E. H. H. Hall lives in Perth.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: As a matter of fact, it got to as low as £70 5s. 8d. in 1942-43. I think that during the discussion on this motion, reference was made to the reciprocal arrangement existing between the States in regard to rail travel, and the Commonwealth line was mentioned. It could be inferred from the remarks made that there is a reciprocal arrangement between the Commonwealth line and the State railways, but apparently that is not so. When members travel on the Commonwealth line between here and the Eastern States, or vice versa, that privilege has to be paid for by the State. It does not amount to a very large sum. For 1944-45, £329 was paid to the Commonwealth. In 1945-46, the figure was £465. I have given that information so that members will know where we stand in regard to the matter. In view of the fact that the question has been raised by Mr. E. H. H. Hall, the Treasurer will give early consideration to the request, irrespective of whether the motion is carried or not.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central—in reply) [8.47]: I am grateful to the Chief Secretary for the information he has given the House for the Premier and Treasurer, and I hope, as I said when I moved the motion, that it will appeal to the Premier that the present position is unsatisfactory and that the decision made some time ago should not be kept in force. I think members will be obliged for the information given them. It shows that the company was a little too avaricious—I do not like the word “greedy.” However, that was some years ago, and the railway is now under new management. I am hopeful that the Treasurer will see his way clear to make free travel available to all members of Parliament to enable them to visit this very fine area along the Midland Railway Company’s line.

The PRESIDENT: The motion having served its purpose, and an assurance having been given by the Leader of the House that the Treasurer will favourably consider the matter, whether the motion is carried or not,

I think it would be a nice gesture if the hon. member asked leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I thank you, Sir, for your reminder, and, in accordance with the hint given, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at 8.49 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 6th November, 1946.

Resolution: War Funds Regulation Act, to approve of proclamations for transfer of assets	1791
Bills: Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 1r.	1791
Comprehensive Agricultural Areas and Goldfields Water Supply, report	1791
Hairdressers Registration, 2r.	1794
Loan, £5,050,000, 2r.	1801
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 1), returned	1801
Bookmakers, 2r., defeated	1801

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

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

BILL—COMPREHENSIVE AGRICULTURAL AREAS AND GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY.

Report of Committee adopted.

RESOLUTION—WAR FUNDS REGULATION ACT.

To Approve of Proclamations for Transfer of Assets.

Message from the Council requesting concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

That under the provisions of Section 5, subsection (4) of the War Funds Regulation Act, 1939, this House approve of the issue of pro-

clamations authorising the transfer of the assets of the Australian Comforts Fund (Western Australian Division), the Naval Welfare and Comforts Fund and the R.A.A.F. Comforts Fund, in the terms set out in the proclamations.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.34]: I move—

That the resolution be agreed to.

Section 5 of the War Funds Regulation Act, 1939, makes provision for the disposal of any surplus funds in the possession of patriotic organisations when the reason for which the funds were collected no longer exists. That stage has arrived in the case of three funds and, as a consequence, I am moving for the adoption of the resolution. The proclamations concerned are on the notice paper and it is not necessary for me to read them. The resolution deals with assets in the nature of cash and goods held by the Australian Comforts Fund, the Naval Welfare and Comforts Fund, and the R.A.A.F. Comforts Fund, comprising three of the major war fund organisations registered in this State under the provisions of the War Funds Regulation Act, 1939. That Act provides for the constitution of a War Funds Council to supervise the operations of individuals, committees, etc., raising moneys for purposes connected with the recent war. Section 5 of the Act sets out—

(1) The Governor, on the recommendation of the Council, may at any time by proclamation direct that any moneys or securities for moneys, or any articles in any war fund which it considers will not be required for the purposes for which the fund was established, shall be:—

(a) Applied by the trustees of such fund to purposes connected with the present war but not authorised by their trust; or

(b) vested in and transferred to some other war fund; or

(c) vested in and transferred to the Council for allotment for the purposes of other war funds or for other purposes connected with the present war.

The Act further provides that a proclamation shall not be issued under the section until a resolution has been passed by both Houses of Parliament approving of the issue of the proclamation. The Legislative Council has already approved of the issue of the proclamation and it is now here, as a resolution, in accordance with the Act.

Mr. Watts: It looks as though we should not do it in the circumstances.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It seems a bit suspicious. I am now getting a bit worried about these things coming down. However, I will take a risk.

Mr. Watts: It will not be much risk.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR: As the assets concerned, details of which I will give to the House, are no longer required by these three war funds, and as the trustees of the funds are desirous of transferring their assets to other war fund objectives, and the War Funds Council approves, it becomes necessary, in order legally to effect this transfer, to seek the authority of Parliament in the form of this resolution. In seeking this, however, I feel that members would like to have some information covering the very laudable work carried out by the many patriotic citizens associated with the three funds; citizens from all walks of life and in all parts of the State, imbued with the idea of assisting in every way possible in the provision of amenities and benefits for men and women in the Services. Two reports have already been tabled in Parliament covering the activities of all registered war or patriotic fund organisations, and members are well aware of that particular aspect of the State's contribution to the war effort. It is not my intention, therefore, to deal with the activities of all patriotic organisations, but to give a brief resume of the work of the three funds which are the subject of this resolution.

To deal with the Australian Comforts Fund, activities commenced in November, 1939, in the name of the Victoria League Camp Comforts Fund. Subsequently the title was altered to the Australian Comforts Fund (Western Australian Division). The objective of the fund was the supply of comforts and amenities to men and women of all the Services, particularly those overseas. Branches were formed throughout Western Australia, and these, with the co-operation of many citizens in all parts of the State, raised money, made and purchased goods and provided other assistance for the services. During 1940 and 1941, activities were mainly concerned with the packing and shipping of comforts to the Middle East. In 1942, with the return of the A.I.F. and a great increase in the number of personnel in Western Australia, activities were

directed to the organisation of amenities within this State, particularly in the North-West and other more remote areas. From 1943 onwards work within the State declined and the main effort was in the provision of comforts and amenities in New Guinea and the Islands, together with supplies for Australian personnel in England, India and elsewhere.

Referring to the finances of the fund, the total moneys handled by the central executive amounted to £263,653. This does not include moneys received from the central fund in Melbourne, which worked under a different scheme headed by the Lord Mayors of Melbourne and Sydney. In Western Australia we had our own scheme, but money was sent from here to the central fund and vice versa. Of the total amount I have mentioned, £209,656 was expended in the purchase of comforts and amenities; distribution costs and special appeal expenses amounted to £8,104; administration costs to £9,542; Federal expenses and country hostels, etc., £3,873; and donations to other war funds £7,693, leaving a surplus of £24,785 for final distribution. That is the distribution which has to be made now, at the request of the Australian Comforts Fund, by means of a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

The figures I have presented do not, of course, include all the moneys collected by the various branches of the fund. Statements in the Chief Secretary's Department disclose that the total collections, including branches, amounted in round figures to £365,000—rather a unique amount representing as it does, so to speak, £1,000 a day for a full year. Branches were very active, and whilst the greater part of the moneys raised by them was handed in to the central fund, many thousands of pounds were spent in country areas in the purchase of goods, etc., for overseas parcels, which were forwarded on through the central fund in Perth.

The proposal by the Australian Comforts Fund for the disposal of its surplus moneys is as follows:—

40 per cent. to the Perth Legacy Club for the provision of scholarships;

30 per cent. to the War Veterans' Home Building Appeal;

15 per cent. to the Wanslea Hostel Committee; and

15 per cent. to the Y.W.C.A. Building Appeal for the erection and furnishing of a wing for the particular use of ex-Servicewomen.

Dealing next with the R.A.A.F. Comforts Fund, this fund was established in July, 1940, its objective being somewhat similar to that of the Australian Comforts Fund but confined solely to R.A.A.F. personnel. Many thousands of parcels have been provided by this organisation. In the last few years its main effort was the conduct of the Rendezvous, an entertainment centre in William-street, Perth. The statements disclose that an amount of £33,937 was collected since the commencement of activities. Of that amount £26,795 was expended on amenities and benefits; £488 was allocated to other war funds, and £4,701 to various items of expenditure, leaving a surplus of £1,953. Assets in the nature of furniture, refrigerator, wireless, billiard tables, etc. to the value of approximately £950 remain in the Rendezvous, which is still being used for Service personnel, or ex-Servicemen and women. Details of these assets are set out in the files of the department.

The proposal is that the surplus moneys and goods mentioned be transferred to the Air Force Association, to be placed in trust for the amelioration of R.A.A.F. personnel, ex-Servicemen and their dependants, irrespective of whether they are members of the association or not. It is considered that such a condition should apply because the moneys were originally made available by the public for amenities and benefits to R.A.A.F. personnel, and therefore the fact that an ex-Serviceman was not a member of the association should not debar him from obtaining relief where necessary. In the event of parliamentary approval, assets will be applied to an account in the name of the "R.A.A.F. Welfare and Rehabilitation Fund."

Regarding the Naval Welfare and Comforts Fund, this was sponsored by the Ex-Naval Men's Association. The fund was established in April, 1940, its objects being to provide comforts for naval personnel and assistance to their dependants in necessitous circumstances. Provision of comforts for those at sea was the fund's first

obligation. It claims, too, that no vessel with naval personnel on board has called at Fremantle without receiving amenities in the nature of either woollen goods, sports goods, libraries, radio, tobacco and cigarettes or fruit, etc. In addition to providing various items to vessels, depots, etc. all returned survivors have been supplied with new clothing or a cash grant to assist them.

The statements submitted to the War Funds Council disclose that a total amount of £46,212 was raised by the fund. Of that amount £38,068 was expended on comforts and relief; £1,434 was donated to other war funds, and £3,739 was utilised on administrative and appeal expenditure, leaving a balance of £2,971. The proposal is that the assets of the fund be transferred to the Ex-Naval Men's Association, to be placed in a trust account for the relief of distress amongst naval personnel, ex-Service personnel and their dependants, irrespective of whether the personnel concerned are members of the association or not.

That is a brief outline of the activities of the war funds mentioned and of the proposals for the allocation of their existing assets. These proposals have the approval of the War Funds Council and the trustees of the funds concerned. Since the commencement of their activities, the three organisations have submitted quarterly financial statements to the War Funds Council for examination, and it can be said that never once did the voluntary workers concerned complain of their obligations in this regard. In each instance the affairs of the fund have been in the hands of citizens holding high executive positions in the business and commercial life of the community. Having regard to that, and to the fact that professional services have been rendered in respect of accounts, all in a voluntary capacity, and also seeing that the quarterly statements submitted have been examined by the council, Parliament can be assured that the moneys so generously contributed by the public have been wisely administered. I trust that the proposals for the disposition of these surplus assets will meet with parliamentary approval.

On motion by Mr. Thorn, debate adjourned.

BILL—HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st October.

MR. ABBOTT (North Perth) [4.50]: This Bill provides for the registration of persons who are practising hairdressing as defined by the Bill. The definition is a wide one and includes persons who are catering for men and also persons who are catering for ladies, whether by massage or by other treatment of the hair or head. The definition excludes members of the medical profession and also any person practising bona fide as a masseur. Provision is made for the constitution of a board which shall control the registration of persons who are entitled to practise the profession. Power is given to the board to hold necessary examinations of persons who are to be trained.

The Bill also provides for the persons entitled to be registered on the coming into force of the measure. A person must have carried on his business for a period of 12 months prior to the commencement of the measure. In other words, a person must have been engaged in the industry for at least 12 months continuously before he can be registered. I do not think that is a reasonable proposition. Any person who has been engaged in the industry for any period during the 12 months prior to the commencement of the Act, that is, if the Bill passes, should be entitled to registration. Provision is made for trainees at the Perth Technical College and apprentices to practise the art of hairdressing for the purpose of learning it without being registered; but the only school which it is proposed shall be permitted to train hairdressers is the Perth Technical College. Provision ought to be made for training in other schools, because Fremantle comes within the area covered by the Bill. I see no reason why at some time a school should not be provided at Fremantle. Therefore I intend at a later stage to suggest that any school which has the approval of the board may teach persons to qualify for the trade.

The board is to consist of a chairman and four other persons. Among the latter, one shall be nominated by the Master Gentlemen Hairdressers' Association of W.A. Union of Employers, Perth, and another by the Metropolitan Ladies Hairdressers' In-

dustrial Union of Employers of W.A. There are to be representatives of the employees—three, apparently, but I think that is a mistake.

The Minister for Labour: Two.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will not deal with that point now. I suggest that the chairman should to some extent represent the general public.

The Minister for Labour: He will.

Mr. ABBOTT: He should therefore be a person who has no pecuniary interest in the industry.

Mr. J. Hegney: What about his getting a haircut?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not think that would be a pecuniary interest. There is such a provision in the Victorian Act and it should be included in the Bill. No provision is made in the Bill for the admission of persons who fail to register within the required period, notwithstanding that they may be carrying on the business in the State outside the proposed area at the time the Bill comes into operation. The Bill applies only to the metropolitan area; it does not apply to Northam, Albany, Narrogin or any of the other country towns. If a hairdresser practising in the country failed to register within the prescribed period, then at no time would he be able to become qualified to practise in Perth. That seems to me to be unreasonable and I propose to make some provision for an alteration at a later stage. A severe penalty is provided for anyone who assumes the title of hairdresser without authority or who, while registered for one branch of the trade, practises some other branch. In other words, if a man were a ladies' hairdresser, and registered as such and cut a man's hair and charged for it, he would be liable to a minimum penalty of £20.

Mr. J. Hegney: Or decapitation!

Mr. ABBOTT: The question of the penalties requires attention. The maximum penalty is £50 and I think that should be sufficient without providing for a minimum penalty. Another rather severe provision is this: If a man is convicted of an offence under any industrial award governing the industry he may be immediately deregistered. Proper penalties are provided by law for a

branch of an award, so why should this additional penalty be imposed? It is unreasonable that he should suffer an additional penalty after he has already been punished and paid a penalty according to law. In my opinion that is unnecessary. As I said, the Bill contains no provision for the board to permit trainees or apprentices to get their training at any school other than the Perth Technical College. That needs remedying. All schools for the purpose should be approved by the board and conducted in such a way as to enable the students to become fully competent. But, subject to that, they should be entitled to carry on. Some provision of that nature should be made. Subject to those observations, I intend to support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Pilbara) [5.1]: I propose to support the second reading, although there are one or two points to which I feel impelled to refer, since a question of principle is definitely involved. As the member for North Perth and the Minister who introduced the Bill mentioned, the primary object is to register hairdressers, whether they be employers or employees. The board which it is proposed to set up is to be given fairly wide powers, but I am inclined to think that, as a result of this measure if passed in its present form, there would be a tendency for a certain amount of duplication. I find, on perusing the Shops and Factories Act, that inspectors appointed under that measure have fairly wide powers. They must have certain qualifications and are empowered under the Act to inspect premises, including hairdressers' shops.

Mr. Abbott: Under the Health Act, too.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Under the Health Act, they also have certain powers in regard to sanitation and other matters affecting the health of the people. Incidentally, inspectors under the Factories and Shops Act have power to inspect mechanical or electrical appliances used in connection with the trade. Another point is that there may be people practising hairdressing in country areas but, as I interpret the provisions of the Bill, only those within a radius of 25 miles of Perth would be entitled to registration.

The Minister for Labour: They would be the only ones forced to register.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The implication is that the Act would apply only within a radius of 25 miles of the G.P.O., and if a hairdresser who is now practising in Kalgoolie or Northam, or any other country town outside the 25-mile radius wanted to be registered after the lapse of six months from the time the Act came into force, he or she would require to pass an examination.

Mr. Abbott: And could not be admitted then.

The Minister for Labour: Yes, he could.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Under certain circumstances, such people could be registered. There is provision for them in the Bill. I have learnt something from the Builders Registration Act which was passed some time ago and that I think has a very definite relationship to this measure. Under the Builders Registration Act, all those people who were actively engaged in the building industry for some time prior to the passing of the measure—I think it was two years—were, on application, practically automatically entitled to registration as builders. But after a period of six months from the time the Act was passed, applicants were required to pass an examination, and I know two or three young men who are qualified tradesmen but who, because they were not skilled in building palaces or mansions, though they were competent to build cottages, were not entitled to and were precluded from registration under the Act.

My point is that if there is to be a system whereby registration is to be effected for hairdressers, both employers and employees, and if under that system it is necessary for future applicants to pass an examination, then the personnel of the board it is proposed to set up should submit themselves for and pass the prescribed examination. I think that everyone who seeks registration should have to pass the prescribed examination. It would be grossly unfair that those who happen to be in the industry for the time being should, on payment of certain fees, be entitled to registration while those people who may come from the country in six months' or 12 months' time—and there may be ex-Service personnel amongst them, including a number of young women who were hairdressers prior to enlistment, or who learnt the trade while they were in the Forces—should be required to pass examinations. If it is necessary for

such people to pass examinations, then all those now in the industry should do the same.

There is another point I desire to raise, in which a definite principle is involved. I refer to examination and registration fees which must be paid under the provisions of the measure. I am open to correction, but my interpretation of the Bill is that every candidate for examination, or any applicant for registration, must pay such fees as are prescribed. For the examination, a fee of £1 ls. must be paid, and under another clause of the Bill it is provided that the union to which employees belong shall pay, for each of its members, a fee of 5s. for a certificate of registration. That is on an annual basis. I am one of those who believes that no worker should have to pay annually to a registration board a fee for the purpose of registration under the provisions of an Act.

Mr. Needham: The union will pay it.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Of course it will, but to my way of thinking, it is an indirect method of the employee paying the fee. We have vigorously protested all through the years against men having to pay to private labour exchanges a fee or commission to obtain employment. There is a principle involved and this provision should be removed. There should be no obligation on employees to pay registration fees. Again, there may be men working in outback places—such as Geraldton and Collie—who are qualified tradesmen, and if they come to the metropolis to work after a period of six months after the passing of the Act, they will be required to pay an examination fee of £1 ls.

Mr. Abbott: And pass the examination.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Yes. I am not averse to anybody passing an examination, but I insist that everybody who is now in the trade shall do so, including members of the board appointed under this measure. Unfortunately, there is a shortage of suitable accommodation at present, and it may be that people who want to set up in business will have difficulty in convincing the board that the premises they have chosen are entirely suitable. I think that the Factories and Shops Department and the Health Department should see to that matter. I do not know that there is any great opposition to the principles of the measure, because there is no doubt that the public are entitled to

service. They have a right to be assured that anybody who is engaged in the trade shall be competent. But if the Bill is passed in its present form, within a period of six months people will have to apply for registration and pass examinations, and it is possible that a number of young ex-Service-women who are competent may not elect to engage in the profession until after this period has expired, and it is quite likely that they will thus be precluded from following their legitimate occupation. In the main, the principles of the Bill are to be endorsed, but I object to employees having to pay fees on an annual basis for the purpose of being kept on the register.

For once, I agree to a great extent with the member for North Perth regarding the provision for the cancellation of a registration if the person concerned has committed a breach of an award. I am not one who encourages breaches of awards or conditions of employment, and I am inclined to think the board would examine carefully any case before cancelling registration. But there is provision under the award at present and under the Factories and Shops Act for prosecution for breaches, and it may be that the provisions governing that matter in this measure could well be reconsidered. In conclusion, I repeat that if there is going to be any examination it should be on a universal basis, and if those who may apply for registration six months after the Act is passed have to face a theoretical and practical examination, then all those in the trade, including those selected to administer the provisions of the Act, shall also pass such examination. I hope that when the Bill is in Committee it will be amended in certain directions to meet the wishes of members generally.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [5.13]: At first sight I was prepared to oppose this measure because I was somewhat averse to the idea of creating yet another board for the management of another trade. But the Minister made out a rather stronger case than I expected he would; and upon examination of all he said, I have come to the conclusion that I must support the second reading. The point the Minister made best of all was the necessity for ensuring that skilled persons only are allowed to act in the somewhat intricate performances that appear to go on in regard to hairdressing

of both sexes at this period of the world's history. He indicated, and I have since had every proof afforded to me, that there are apparently increasing dangers in regard to the inexperienced handling of these matters, and that it is necessary, therefore, to have a check of some sort on the people who are engaged in this industry, particularly in the future. For those reasons, subject to certain alterations to the Bill that I hope will be made in Committee, I propose to support the second reading.

I do, however, entirely agree with the member for Pilbara, who has just resumed his seat, in the remarks he made, and particularly regarding the restrictions that are imposed, in this measure, on persons who have been carrying on the occupation of hairdresser and who are expected to register within six months of the passing of the measure. I see no other interpretation of the clause than that which I think was also mentioned by the member for North Perth; that anybody who desires to transfer from an area not at present coming under this measure—that is to say outside a radius of 25 miles from the centre of Perth—into Perth, and who has previously been practising in a country area, will be prevented, notwithstanding a bona fide practice over a long period, from registering without examination. I hope the Minister will give careful consideration to the present wording of the clause because, in my opinion, it can mean neither more nor less than that. That would not do at all, because there are places in the country areas where there are persons equally competent as any to be found in the metropolitan district, who cannot be asked, if they do not wish to do so, to remain indefinitely in the places where they now are.

The Minister for Labour: How are we to differentiate between a good hairdresser in the country and a poor one?

MR. WATTS: The law that is proposed—and it is not unreasonable in all the circumstances, this being new legislation—is that if they can prove that they have been bona fide engaged in the occupation for 12 months prior to the passing of the Bill they can become registered, provided they apply within six months. There will be people in the country areas, who, having been bona fide engaged in this occupation for 12 months before the passing of the measure, will not need to come under it at all, but if

they decide to move to within a 25 mile radius of the city they will find the six months has gone by, and that their opportunity of registration without examination is lost, which would be grossly unfair to them at this stage. Exactly the same point arose over the builders' registration legislation, which was twice amended to overcome difficulties of that character. The other point regarding registration, which I endorse, is that made by the member for Pilbara, relating to members of the Defence Forces. It gives them six months in which to come in, after they cease to be members of the Forces.

The Minister for Labour: Or six months after the proclamation of the Act.

MR. WATTS: Yes, whichever is the later. The member for Pilbara made the point that it might not be practicable for them to return and take up their normal avocations within a period of six months and that, when they did decide to return to their normal places of residence, or settle down, they would be debarred from entering the occupation, as was also the case in the matter of the builders registration legislation, which was dealt with in the last session by Parliament. As we have to give registration to persons who have bona fide been carrying on the industry prior to the passing of the measure, because we can scarcely take away from them by a stroke of the pen a right which they have lawfully acquired, we must be very careful in this instance to ensure that nobody who is in that bona fide position is, by extraordinary circumstances, kept out. It is undesirable that we should make a sort of close corporation for those who happen at the moment, firstly, to be within the radius and, secondly, to be in a position to carry on this occupation at the present time.

I hope the Bill will be amended, particularly in the direction of remedying those defects that I see in it. I trust, also, that we can have a smaller governing body than is proposed in the measure. It seems to me that there will be too many on the board for the purposes that are required of it. Five members are proposed and it seems to me that we would be amply served by a board of three, which would minimise the expenses that are to be met subsequently by the Bill in paying fees and other expenses of management. We are rapidly reaching a time when we must be careful about the con-

stitution of further boards of management for this and other types of industry, and, only where it can be clearly shown that a board is essential in order to enable an industry to function, should we have any board at all and, when we have determined that there must be a board, we must limit it to the lowest number possible, rather than have it of a larger number, at greater expense—in my opinion unnecessary expense. I see that there are to be two members, one of whom shall be nominated by the female employees, and one by the male employees in the Metropolitan Hairdressers' Union of Workers.

The Minister for Labour: They have two organisations.

MR. WATTS: It is one union, and I cannot see why it should not appoint one person, in order to reduce the membership of the board. I do not see why the chairman should not be appointed either from that organisation or from one of the other two organisations mentioned, rather than that there should be a separate chairman. By those means we would not destroy the representation but would cut the board down from five members to three, which I think is a reasonable proposal, because there is no real need in a board such as this, as I see it, to have an independent chairman. The board is only for the purpose of (1) registering those who are entitled to registration under the measure, (2) supervising examinations for the registration of future practitioners and (3) ensuring that, so far as the Act allows it to do so, the hairdressing businesses within a 25 miles radius of the city are reasonably and properly conducted. As I understand the measure, those are to be the duties of the board, and it does not seem to me that more than three members are required for that purpose. There are one or two other matters to which I will refer in Committee, but which do not require the special consideration of the Minister at this stage, so for the time being I will support the second reading, without saying any more.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.25]: I also approach this Bill with some degree of doubt, because it seems to some of us that the area of opportunity is being steadily constricted in this State, and I suppose throughout Australia. If one wishes to take

a piece of land and grow potatoes for sale, one will not be allowed to do so, in future, or only with difficulty, because licenses are to be restricted, and naturally those now in the business will have the first claim. We should be careful that the oncoming generation, when they reach an age and desire to seek occupations, do not find all the doors closed by vested interests and barred by boards and licenses, and things of that kind. On the whole, I have come to the conclusion that the balance might be said to lie in favour of this Bill, if it is suitably amended in Committee. In the Committee stage it will require careful consideration. It proposes to set up a board, to operate in the hairdressing industry, and it will touch on matters that are already regulated by three other statutes.

In the first place, wages and the training of apprentices in the hairdressing industry are dealt with by an award of the Arbitration Court, and that must continue. The Arbitration Court is one tribunal that is responsible for dealing with an important part of the hairdressing industry. Then we have the Factories and Shops Act, dealing with matters of safety, ventilation and conditions under which employees work. Thirdly we have the Health Act, which makes specific provisions as to hygiene and sanitation in hairdressing establishments. I understand that the policing of these provisions of the Health Act has been somewhat in abeyance, but it would be the intention of the department to resume supervision of such matters under the terms of the Act and regulations. Among other things, I think we should take out of the Bill those provisions that suggest that matters of hygiene and sanitation should be transferred to the board. They are essentially matters for the Health Department, which should be left in charge of them.

The Bill also proposes that matters of safety should be the function of the board, but I think that safety, ventilation and questions of that kind should remain under the Factories and Shops Act, whose inspectors are specialists in such things. If those aspects are transferred to the board, we will have men going round who are supposed to specialise in sanitation, hygiene, safety, hairdressing and so on, and the result will be far less satisfactory than if the matters I have mentioned are left to the Health Department

and the Factories and Shops Department. We can rely upon them to ensure that establishments comply with the existing law in those particulars. Under the present award of the Arbitration Court I believe it is permissible to have two apprentices for every qualified hairdresser, and I take it that the court has found that that gives a fair continuance to the trade through new entries into the industry, and provides a fair avenue for the oncoming generation to take part in it. I do not think the Bill gives power to the proposed board to interfere with the powers of the Arbitration Court to regulate the number of apprentices, and I certainly would not be any party to this being done, because it is essential in this and other industries that the oncoming generation should have a reasonable opportunity of participating in this trade or any other trade to which it might wish to direct attention.

The matters raised in connection with the access of hairdressers from country districts into the metropolitan area has been dealt with by previous speakers. I had the advantage this afternoon of seeing some of the amendments prepared by the member for North Perth, and I think they will meet the situation to which attention was very properly drawn. As the Bill is framed, it is proposed to make a ring around the G.P.O. in which a number of privileged people, without examination, will become registered under the Act, while those who happen to be practising the occupation outside that ring will be excluded from similar privileges unless we make some appropriate amendment to the Bill.

The measure also contains no provision for reciprocity. I consider that in this occupation, and perhaps in others as well, there is an advantage to be gained sometimes by an influx of people from other States and other countries who may bring new ideas and new techniques for the advancement of the industry and the education of those engaged in the industry here. I believe—I do not think the member for North Perth referred to this—there should be an amendment to enable people from other countries, under proper safeguards, to enter this State and engage in the industry and thus possibly bring to the State new techniques and new methods that may assist the industry and be for the

benefit of the public generally. I have some doubt as to the need for such extensive legislation for men's hairdressers. I think the result of the Bill, in conjunction with the Arbitration Court, will be that a man will have to serve four or five years' apprenticeship before he can do any barbering.

Mr. J. Hegney: There are barbers and barbers.

Mr. McDONALD: But I have yet to learn that barbering and shaving is something that entails such a long period of instruction and probation as four or five years. Regarding the women, I believe that some fairly lengthy period of training is essential. They are dealing with a highly technical process, but as far as the men are concerned, I confess that the precautions seem to be rather on the elaborate side, bearing in mind that in the country the art of hairdressing is practised by many wives of farmers in the case of their husbands and sons without any dire consequences.

Mr. J. Hegney: Your profession lays down pretty stringent rules.

Mr. McDONALD: I have heard that so often that I am getting tired of it. Mine is the only profession that contributes a sum approaching £1,000 a year for the purpose of giving free education at the University to young men and women who will become our competitors. If any other profession is prepared to do the same thing, I will be ready to give it full credit. We are doing our utmost to enable any lad or girl without means to be educated at our expense and to come in and compete with us.

Mr. J. Hegney: Provided those persons pass the examinations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not think we shall discuss the Legal Practitioners Act.

Mr. J. Hegney: The Speaker knows something about that Act.

Mr. McDONALD: Of course those persons have to pass examinations. The hon. member would not have a bricklayer who could not lay bricks any more than he would employ a lawyer who was not qualified to help him. The Bill on the whole deserves the favourable consideration of the House subject to very careful examination of the

clauses during the Committee stage and to the making of the amendments requisite to meet the various points that have been raised. In particular we want a clear demarcation of the functions of the other authorities constituted under the Health Act, the Factories and Shops Act, and the Court of Arbitration. Through the regulations being tabled in Parliament—and the Bill provides for this—members will have an opportunity of giving attention to the manner in which the Act is administered by the board.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR (Hon.

A. H. Panton—Leederville—in reply) [5.36]: I am very pleased at the reception accorded to the Bill, and I do not propose to make an extended reply. I ask members who have amendments to suggest to put them on the notice paper so that there may be ample opportunity to consider them. I do not propose to take the Bill into Committee tonight. I brought down the Bill on behalf of the master hairdressers and their employees, and if they are able to consider the proposed amendments, I will be more strongly fortified next week to discuss them.

Regarding the objection raised by the member for Pilbara, when the Bill was first submitted to me, provision was made for each employee to pay 5s. a year to the board. I was just as emphatic as is the hon. member against introducing such a provision because I am strongly averse to employees having to pay anything to get a job. The employees' union met and again approached me, and once more I refused. The outcome was that I was asked to introduce a provision under which the union would pay that amount. This being a domestic matter for the union to decide, I offered no further objection, but I assure the member for Pilbara that the first proposal was that each employee be ordered to pay 5s. a year to the board. I appreciate the fact that this is new legislation and probably experimental. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the hairdressers in the country, provided they can prove their bona fides, should be allowed to register after six months.

I again stress the need for members' placing their amendments on the notice paper because it is difficult for anybody not au fait with the trade to deal with amendments

on the spur of the moment. I should also like to submit the amendments to the master hairdressers, the people most concerned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LOAN, £5,050,000.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [5.40] in moving the second reading said: This is the usual Bill introduced each year to provide authority for the raising of funds necessary to carry out the programme of works as detailed in the Loan Estimates now before the Chamber. The amount for which authority is sought is £5,050,000, and the purposes for which it is required are set out in the first schedule. The individual amounts in the schedule do not necessarily coincide with the amounts appearing against the corresponding items on the Estimates, because in most cases there is an unexpended balance of previous authorisations, and the amounts in this Bill, when added to the unexpended balances, are intended to be sufficient to enable expenditure to be carried on, where necessary, for six months after the close of the financial year. This is the customary practice, the object of which is to ensure that there will be no break in the continuity of work for lack of parliamentary authority.

It may not be necessary to borrow the whole of the £5,050,000 this financial year as our cash requirements will depend upon the progress it is possible to make with the programme of works prior to the 30th June next. The Loan Council has undertaken to provide the requisite money to meet our expenditure up to next January, when the position will again be reviewed. The public debt on the 30th June last stood at £96,925,931, on which the average rate of interest was £3 6s. 5d. per cent., compared with a debt of £95,894,885 at £3 11s. 1d. per cent. on the corresponding date in 1945. Therefore, there has been a decrease of 4s. 8d. per cent. in the average interest rate. Contributions to the sinking fund for the current financial year will amount to about £970,000, and with a balance of £503,996 brought forward from last year, there will be over £1,400,000 available for debt redemption during the current year.

I deem it necessary to give these figures because they show the trend of the public debt and the necessity that has often been stressed by State Treasurers for applying loan moneys to works which show a reasonable chance of servicing the debt. When introducing the Loan Estimates the other evening, I spoke on aspects of our investment of loan moneys from which only indirect benefits can be expected for a time, but there is a continuing obligation upon the Treasurer of the State to ensure that loan moneys are expended in a manner to minimise the impact on the annual budgetary charges.

There is a clause in the Bill to authorise the re-appropriation of certain moneys as set out in the second schedule, moneys which are not now required for the original purposes. These moneys will be applied to the various items enumerated in the third schedule. As I explained initially, this is the usual Bill introduced each year to give authority for the raising of funds necessary for the works mentioned in the Loan Estimates. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Returned from the Council with amendments.

BILL—BOOKMAKERS.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 31st October.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [5.45]: This Bill has caused a great deal of public discussion. There is a marked difference of opinion throughout the State as to the wisdom of its introduction or passing. I approach this question as one who is very fond of horses. I have bred race-horses and I have ridden horses in races. I have even been guilty of investing in or betting on racing events and therefore I have some little knowledge of the business. I do not think anyone enjoys witnessing a horse-race more than I do myself. I agree with those people who put horseracing on a pedestal and declare that it is the sport of

kings. In my opinion it is an outstanding national pleasure. It is strong throughout the Empire and His Majesty the King, like others before him, has always taken a keen interest in it and participated in the sport to some extent.

My early experiences of horseracing were gained in New Zealand and I have not changed my views since then. There were no bookmakers officially in New Zealand at that time. Betting was done on the racecourses by means of the totalisator. I do not wish to convey that there are no bookmakers in New Zealand. I believe there were some in my day and I suppose they are there still. They are what is commonly called underground, inasmuch as they do their betting quietly if they do it at all. I am opposed to this Bill. I have stated there is a pronounced division of opinion concerning it. I do not believe that the majority opinion favours it or its introduction. Whatever doubts I may have had in regard to the passing of the measure have been dispelled by the experiences of South Australia. In that State and in the city of Adelaide—it is called the city of churches—the same conditions and the same problems at one stage were faced that we are facing today. The agitation in Adelaide was exactly the same as the agitation here. S.P. betting went on years ago in Adelaide and it has been going on in Perth for years. For quite a while the betting was underground in Adelaide. It was not recognised, and of course there were penalties for breaches of the law.

The authorities in South Australia struggled just as we have seen the struggle here, though possibly not so viciously as has been done in Western Australia, before legislation was passed in the endeavour to ensure a more general observance of the law concerning illegal betting. That went on until by some means there arose a militant minority of people who were deeply interested, people who had got together when betting was still illegal and still underground, who had built up a vested interest and therefore were keenly anxious to put the business on a better footing and a better basis in order that they might continue to operate with greater success to themselves. It was the same in Adelaide as it has been in this State. That minority was anxious to distribute the sport and make it more general throughout the com-

munity. Of course it is impossible to bring sport to the community. One can bring betting to the community but that is not bringing sport to it.

When those people talked about the sport of racing and claimed that it should be more generally available to the community they meant the sport of betting or the risk of betting, that that should be given more general application so that the man in the street might take part in it. The agitation went on. It was exactly the same as the agitation here today, and has been for the last year or two, to have legislation of this kind passed. Ultimately the Government of South Australia succumbed to that kind of pressure, the minority pressure, the militant section, and thereupon decided to introduce legislation on the lines that have been followed here, to legalise betting. Whatever doubts I had in regard to this matter, as I say, were all dispelled by the failure in South Australia of the experiment made there to see whether the authorities could get better results by legalising betting and bringing it into the public street, or whether it should be confined to the racecourses as heretofore.

After its experience South Australia expressed its regret that it had succumbed to the agitation, that it had given way to the pressure that was brought upon members of Parliament and the Government of the day. The decision had to be reversed. I have not learned how the reverse was carried out, whether some members said this and others said that. The fact remains that the Parliament which put through the Bill that became an Act, and provided for the registration of S.P. betting premises in the main streets and in the public highways, reversed its decision and admitted that it had made a mistake. It is not an ordinary thing to repeal an Act of Parliament when it has been in operation only for a brief period, but if an Act is hastily repealed then it is because the legislation has been an obvious failure. In all my years of experience there have been very few measures repealed but, in the case to which I refer, within a brief while we find the Government that introduced the legalisation of betting reversed its opinion, admitted that it had made a mistake and was sorry for having done so.

Mr. North: The same Parliament.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It was the same Government if not the same Parliament. Why should we repeat that experience in Western Australia? Surely we should profit by the failures of others. We do not want to rush in and say, "We are going to test out what was proved to be wrong in South Australia." If the circumstances were different, if there was any justification for saying that the South Australian experience was not exactly what Western Australia was experiencing, the situation might not be the same. We cannot, however, say that, and no member who has so far spoken has claimed that. As practical men we know that the circumstances in South Australia are identical with those in this State. It is the same kind of thing in the same old way. In South Australia the authorities did try to do what the Government of this State is asking us to do. They did that thing and then found it was wrong. Why did they find it was wrong? They discovered, as we will discover, that they were foolish enough to pass the Bill. When a body is consolidated it is multiplied. That could not be otherwise. After all, while a body is underground there is always a limit to its progress.

I know that we cannot eradicate betting. For generations attempts have been made to stamp it out. That cannot be done, and particularly it cannot be done in Australia. So long as it is driven underground and kept there it does not multiply greatly. Only a section of the community is involved. Only those who are deeply interested or enthusiastic will go underground in order to carry on what they think is a pleasure. Whilst it is kept underground it is, in my opinion, in its right place. All wrongs should be covered up. We cannot make saints of people; we cannot stop the breaking of the law. We can only hope for the best and try in various ways by penalties and otherwise to appeal to people who have a higher regard for the administration of that which is right as against anything that may have a demoralising effect upon the community. We must admit, if we are just to ourselves and the people, that so long as it is illegal and kept underground—I am going to use the term underground during the course of my remarks—this business will be limited. In South Australia it continued, not to the extent possibly that it does at the moment in Western Australia, but it existed illegally and underground. Then it was made legal

and immediately all the underground influences came to the surface.

When a thing is legalised it all comes to the surface, and immediately it is brought to the surface and made lawful and respectable more people are attracted to it. Those who would never dream of betting in an atmosphere of illegality find it possible to do so in the altered circumstances because the law has declared that it is no longer disreputable or wrong, and that it can be kept respectable provided the operators pay a license fee and the betting is limited to certain licensed premises. Immediately that is done, the clientele extends enormously because popularisation of these places takes place and by that means people are attracted to them.

It is not possible to popularise betting shops while they are illegal because the owners would expose their practices to the police who would pounce on them, not because the business was done under cover but because the law was not being observed. Therefore the fact that the business becomes legal naturally increases the evil, and that is what took place in South Australia and is why the South Australian Government changed its opinion and repealed its Act. The Government there could see that the whole community was more or less influenced and living in a wrong atmosphere. I have not seen the South Australian betting shops, but members have told me of them and I have read about them. I have read that they were made so attractive that women were going to them at half past 10 o'clock in the morning, by rushing through their work. They did not neglect their homes but applied themselves earlier and more diligently to their housework so that they might go to these attractive saloons where they could hear broadcasts of the racing in Victoria and other States, and generally enjoy the music at these places. That is an explanation of why the introduction of this legislation multiplied betting enormously.

The figures supplied by the member for Nedlands and, in more detail, by the member for Kalgoorlie, were most interesting. The member for Kalgoorlie overwhelmed me with his statistics. I tried but was unable to follow him and unfortunately we have not had "Hansard" with the report of his speech. The figures he quoted, however, demonstrated that there was an enormous increase in betting in South Australia as a

result of legislation of this type. I appeal to members: Do we want to encourage betting in this State? What good is it? It is only demoralising! Every speaker has agreed that it is something that should not be encouraged, but they all seem to have the idea that it is necessary. Why is it necessary? Is it required as a demoralising influence? Surely if Parliament has a responsibility, it is one to elevate. We should never encourage people to go down, but rather should we try to uplift them.

Mr. Fox: Then close the racecourses.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I will deal with that aspect before I finish. Let us take the position of the member for South Fremantle as an illustration. If he wants to attend the headquarters racecourse, he will have to leave Fremantle fairly early in the morning.

The Minister for Lands: Surely he does not go to the races!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am assuming that he might go. It would take him a long time to get there, but he would know what he was going for, and would deliberately go to all that trouble and expense to get into the atmosphere of racing and betting because he would be going inside an enclosed area specifically set aside for racing and betting. That is different altogether from his having betting brought under his nose while walking down High-street.

Mr. Fox: We shall have to make a halo for you!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am trying to get the hon. member to realise how foolish it is to imagine that there can be any enjoyment or satisfaction in regard to betting unless one goes to a racecourse. What is attractive—and I defy contradiction in this—is the racing. If one cannot enjoy the racing, one is not interested. The idea that a person can enjoy betting without seeing the racing is, to my mind, so much hooy! The man who so indulges is purely a gambler. He does not see the races and knows nothing about them. Anything might happen between the time he places his bet and the time when the race takes place, yet he puts his money on and is foolish enough to think that he has a reasonable chance of profiting as a result. I say, in reply to the hon. member's interjection, that we cannot bring the joy of horseracing into the streets; it is to be

found only on the racecourses because there have to be special conditions, and a large area. We can, in the town, only bring the worst side of the sport before the general public. To bring betting to the man in the street is positively wrong.

There are two sides to the question: There is the economic side, from the Government point of view, and the social aspect from the community point of view. I followed the figures and reasoning of the member for Kalgoorlie, but the economic aspect to which I have referred was not touched on by him, and that is a matter on which I was anxious to get information. I assume that the South Australian Government obtained a fair amount of revenue as a result of the fines and penalties inflicted on those who broke the law prior to registration. I imagine the Government had some economic reason for introducing the licensing legislation; I am of opinion that it was brought down for the purpose of getting more revenue, and getting it in a more direct way to the Government and less by means of the black market or the underground operators. The South Australian Government apparently felt that there was a fair amount of income to be derived from registration of these premises. I thought the member for Kalgoorlie might tell us whether there was an increase in revenue as a result of licensing.

Mr. Styants: The Government gets a lot more revenue now, but the figures are not given in the report of the board.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That will satisfy me. Apparently that was the Government's reason for introducing the legislation, because no Government would try to bring down a demoralising measure of this kind unless there was some economic advantage to be gained. The increased investments made as a result of legislation in South Australia meant increased income to the Government. But it was realised that the increase was gained very dearly because of the effect the new conditions had on the homes and families of the people, and the Government decided that, even though there might be more revenue, it was not prepared to continue to encourage the community to patronise the betting shops.

Mr. Styants: The greatest volume of betting was for the year 1945, when no shops operated.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I cannot understand that. Was that before registration?

Mr. Styants: No. There was an all-time high of £11,000,000 in betting in 1945.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That was after registration and would include the figures of underground establishments, plus the figures of respectable shops, as a result of the enormous amount of money available to the general public, which is something that we experienced here. I instance our totalisator revenue. I remember, when speaking to the Budget two or three years ago, I dealt with the result from the totalisator tax as compared with the estimate. It was, at that time, just double. The explanation was that we had many oversea visitors living here who were enjoying high rates of pay and, as a result, spent freely. No doubt the large figures shown in the years 1944 and 1945 in South Australia are attributable to the same cause. I am opposed to putting temptation into the main streets. I am a workers' representative and am supposed to try, and have done all my time in Parliament, to assist in every way so that the worker might lead a fuller and happier life. I am prepared to continue to do that, but on this occasion I have first of all to be convinced that it is necessary to assist him to indulge in recklessness of this kind. The very fact that in South Australia the womenfolk did so much betting is an indication of the effect it must have on the home life. We know there are certain women who bet, but the number in this State is limited because few women will participate in something that is an illegal practice.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I was dealing with the increased revenue received in this State from the duty on totalisator takings during the racing years of 1944 and 1945, and, with the assistance of the member for Kalgoorlie, it would appear to me that the same conditions applied in South Australia.

Excellent revenues were collected in South Australia as the result of the then licensed betting houses that no doubt paid a fair fee

to the Government for the licenses enabling them to continue their operations. It would seem that when the South Australian Government cancelled that procedure it did sacrifice some revenue. I have also stated that I believe the function of Parliament is to elevate and to endeavour to prevent practices that might be an economic burden upon the mass of the community. All speakers who have addressed themselves to the Bill have stated that the chance of success is loaded every time against the bettor.

The starting price operator safeguards himself with provisions and conditions that enable him to protect his interests as against those of the investors. For instance, I am informed that even if one were successful in backing an outsider that won in a race conducted in the Eastern States and a fair return for the straight-out or place bet might be expected, one does not receive exactly the amount that, it is admitted, was the reward gained on the spot by the backer of the winning horse. In other words, in this State we discount the winning chances of the bettor, and that is condoned today by allowing the starting price operator to declare his own rules and conditions.

Mr. Fox: The bookmakers on the course do the same thing.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: So far as I can tell, the bookmaker calls the odds and pays out accordingly.

Mr. Fox: But I was referring to bets on Melbourne races.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not think the bookmaker on the course pays on the basis that the S.P. operator does.

Mr. Fox: He limits the odds.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: However, the same thing applies and that is what I want the hon. member to appreciate and to recognise how unfair it is. Why should the reward be discounted? Why should the chance of success be loaded against the bettor? Why should the starting price operators have the right to say, "I shall not pay you all you have won. I will pay only the amount that I believe is reasonable from my point of view"? There is no arbitration in the matter and no reasoning as between the bettor and the bookmaker.

Mr. Rodoreda: If we pass this Bill, they will have to pay.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not know that they will, but I will deal with that phase before I sit down. I have made it clear that I am not opposed to racing. I believe it is one of the sports that can be enjoyed by those that really are interested in races. I have already explained that I do not believe that anyone can enjoy betting. Perhaps there may be an odd one or two, but, generally speaking, the enjoyment arises from witnessing the racing. I believe it is conducted all over the world on enclosed areas, which are earmarked and set aside for the special purpose. The amenities on the racecourse are such as to make it a place of enjoyment. It has park-like surroundings and the general conditions are such that one can enjoy an afternoon in the fresh air in an open space—although I admit it may become congested in certain parts.

Mr. Triat: Yes, in the bar.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: At any rate, the people can enjoy themselves in surroundings that are attractive. That is where the sport takes place, and I am not prepared to encourage the transfer of that sport, which I hold in very high regard, from such surroundings into the public streets to be abused and used for ulterior purposes. If we do that, we will be demoralising the public and discounting the value of the sport from a community point of view. I agree that the cost of racing to the general public is too high, but I believe a lot of that is due to the fact that we are not securing the return directly to the race clubs that we would if we were to conduct them on the New Zealand system. In that Dominion there is not the poverty with regard to racing and race clubs that we have in this country. The population of New Zealand is very little greater than that of Western Australia. True, the population is scattered, but, generally speaking, the people who patronise racing in the Dominion would be on somewhat the same scale as in Western Australia. Possibly there may be a slightly increased number, but the fact remains that New Zealand conditions are better and the economic return to the clubs is greater and their augmented earnings are the result of the whole

of the investments of the public going directly to the clubs.

I know there are taxes and so forth that have to be met, but the totalisator is more lucrative to the New Zealand Government than it is to the Government in this State. The reason for that is that in New Zealand the tote is not subject to the competition of the bookmakers who in this State collect such a large proportion of the public investments on our racecourses. I am not opposed to the totalisator operating on the course. I myself have been guilty of betting, but I believe I can get all I want on the tote. Then again we have to profit by the experience gained elsewhere. Just as the practice of licensing starting price operators failed in South Australia, so the limitation of betting to the totalisator in New Zealand has proved successful.

Mr. Hoar: How would the country clubs get on?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They do it in New Zealand. If the opposition of the bookmakers were removed, the country clubs would be better off and the amenities provided would be greater because the earnings from the tote would be much more than could possibly be obtained from the bookmakers. It is very difficult to check the operations and actual writing of bets by bookmakers, but all the money that passes through the tote is recorded and open to Government checking. As a matter of fact, the country clubs do attempt to improvise totes.

Mr. Hoar: But they are mostly failures.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The member for Nelson inquired as to what the position of the country people would be. They get over the difficulty by improvising totes. I have attended country race meetings and I admit that the totalisator arrangements were very crude. On the other hand, the fact that there was a tote was evidence that the public needed it and it was another indication that the race clubs wanted it as well. The clubs want it for the same reason that the people of New Zealand required it. I believe therefore that racing should continue. I do not think it possible or desirable to talk about abolishing horse racing. To talk that way would be antiquated and positively reactionary. On the other hand, we should make the sport more

accessible to the community. We would be justified in calling upon the racing clubs to appreciate the unfairness of the impost upon the community in their desire to participate in racing, because of the enormous transport costs, the high entrance charges and the other imposts associated with racing. In New Zealand the cost to the community is less because of the position I have already emphasised regarding the totalisator. Then again we know that the sport is far from clean.

Racing in Western Australia does not compare favourably with that to be seen in New Zealand. With the totalisator there is not the temptation and opportunity for spectacular bets. Investments have been known to influence races before they have been contested. It is unquestionable that the weight of invested money is a greater impost on some horses than the actual weights they have to carry. I am sorry to say that those associated with racehorses are at times influenced and do things that operate very much against the popularising of the sport. Therefore, if we get away from the bookmaker—who, after all, is the means by which betting is carried on—and adopt the totalisator only, as New Zealand has done, the spectacular aspect will vanish and the plunging that takes place in Western Australia will disappear. I believe it will be to the advantage of the clubs and to racing if the totalisator is installed and bookmaking is abolished. I again take New Zealand in order to prove that I am basing my arguments on a sound foundation. We all know that the breeding of high class thoroughbreds in New Zealand is greater than it is in any part of Australasia. New Zealand-bred horses are outstanding. The reason is the attractiveness of racing in New Zealand, with the result that more money goes into the pockets of the breeder and the owner than into the pockets of those who are exploiting racing for individual gain, as the bookmaker does. We should compare betting with the licensing of hotels. If I want a drink—

Mr. Rodoreda: You do not have to go to a brewery.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: A drink is more essential than a bet.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope we will not get to drinking on this Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I want to give an illustration which I think will appeal to you, Sir. If a person wants a drink he cannot purchase it and consume it where he likes. Drinking is essential to life—I do not mean that alcoholic liquor is essential, but it contributes to our sustenance and good health, in my opinion. To get a drink we have to travel for it, because the licensed premises are not in our backyard nor in our street; it is removed some distance. The more essential beverages cannot be obtained without travel; we must go to where they are sold.

Mr. Rodoreda: To the licensed premises.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

Mr. Rodoreda: You might live next door.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If one is lucky.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It depends. I was speaking to the member for Roebourne. If we agree that country people are denied the right to drink because of the limited population not justifying a hotel, then we must agree that those people suffer because of their isolation. They are scattered. They are pioneers in the backblocks.

Mr. Rodoreda: They get it by the case.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Those people are denied the right of getting a drink. So far as they are concerned, it does not exist. Yet members ask what are we to do for the country people in regard to betting. One would imagine that a licensed betting house is more essential than is a licensed public house. A public house provides accommodation, it gives sanctuary, it is attractive.

Mr. Withers: And it gives short measure.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is essential to the community. But the people do not get anything from betting. In betting people are giving all the time, and yet some members say that country people, who are denied a hotel, should have a betting shop. As a matter of fact, if it were not for drinking shops there would be no betting shops. It is marvellous how closely the two are allied. Take me to a hotel in the metropolitan area and I will point out a betting joint close handy, if not outside the front door.

Mr. Fox: Drink can be obtained on a racecourse.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Exactly. There is both drinking and betting on racecourses. I have already tried to tell members that the two are closely allied; they exist side by side. I wish to emphasise that there has been no public outcry for this legislation. Honestly, I do not know how it originated. The Government introduced the Bill, but why I cannot understand. There was no agitation for it. What I mean by agitation is a public demand or a public request. For instance, consider the native reform question! Members will recall the agitation that took place for such reform.

Mr. Rodoreda: All of it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We had motions in the House and questions in the House. Conferences were called. People were brought from the Eastern States to assist in educating public opinion and strengthening the demand on the Government for reform. That is public agitation. That is an organised demand for reform. That agitation resulted in some reform. The Minister applied himself to the question and we all know that the conditions of the native to-day are much better than they were before that agitation took place. Again, take the question of milk for school children! There again we had an agitation. Public opinion and public demand called upon Parliament for assistance, which ultimately was given. But we have had no such demand for this Bill. When the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition was under discussion, I pointed out that the Government should have provided better measures for suppressing more effectively illegal betting than have been adopted during the past six to twelve months. There was a good deal of concentration by the Police Force and by the magistracy in an effort to obtain greater respect for the law and to bring to a sense of decency those who practised this illegal betting.

Why did the Government introduce the Bill in view of the fact that there was that reform going on? I know that in my own electorate less betting takes place now than took place before this concentration by the Police Force and the change of penalty imposed by the magistrates. I have pointed out that if we legalise betting we will simply increase it. That is what happened in South Australia. Underground betting has been with us and will continue to be

with us; we do not want to bring it to the surface, and we certainly do not want to make it respectable. The member for Kalgoorlie made what seemed to me to be an extraordinary statement. His speech was most constructive and helpful, but he said this: "If you license premises in Western Australia, as was done in South Australia, you will have to keep them open every day in the week, because if you do not they will remain open just the same and will be operating illegally." As far as I could gather the hon. member was supporting the Bill. The Bill is designed to stop the present disregard of the law. But the hon. member argued that in order to stop this disregard of the law, we had to license betting. He then went on to say, "If you do license betting, you will have to license it so as to suit the S.P. bookmakers, otherwise they will keep the premises open and bet through the back door, in spite of what you do."

If we will not get a greater respect of the law by passing this Bill than we have had in the past, why pass it? If it is not to be observed absolutely, then why do we want it? The member for Kalgoorlie suggested that betting should be licensed, but he said, "Do not try to limit it. Have the shops open every day in the week, otherwise betting will be done under the lap and in defiance of any limitation imposed on it." I am not prepared to subscribe to the idea voiced by so many members that it is impossible to police this law and to enforce it, and that the public cannot be educated up to the standard of obeying the law.

I remember that years ago goldstealing was rife in the Kalgoorlie district. Those who were associated with the Goldfields in those days will recall that people despaired of preventing it, particularly the mine-owners and the shareholders of the mining companies. These were always deploring the fact that so much gold was being taken from the mines illegally and sold for individual gain. That went on for a long time and the matter seemed to be completely out of hand. Goldfields people seemed to be reconciled to the fact that goldstealing had to continue and could not be stopped. Then Det. Kavanagh went to the Goldfields and made a thorough investigation. He tried to enforce the law against goldstealing,

which had grown immensely and had such a grip on the community. A Royal Commission had to be appointed to inquire into the whole matter with a view to finding a solution. Legislation was passed of a most drastic character. All kinds of checks were made on the poor unfortunate miner who was suspected of taking a little gold. As a matter of fact, the gold was disappearing in such large quantities that it would have been impossible for the miner to carry it away. The miner had to change in one room, drop his mining clothes, and go into another room undressed in order to don his other clothes. This was to prove that he did not have any gold with him. The Royal Commission went into the matter and Parliament passed a special Act.

A special goldstealing squad was appointed and it only had to suspect a man and he would thereupon have to prove his innocence in order to avoid punishment. When it was a question of vested interests, when it was a question of property belonging to the capitalists, when it was a question of considering wealthy mining companies, we passed the law and said we would stop the goldstealing. Yet when we have a demoralising influence such as betting in the streets, we say we cannot stop it. The member for Kalgoorlie said that unless we allowed these shops to keep open all days of the week it would be done in defiance of us. I am not going to subscribe to that. I believe that a determined Government can keep a country clean, and this State can be kept free from those practices if the Government uses the powers given to it by this Parliament to see that those organisations of the State whose duty it is to check up and enforce the laws do so fearlessly and determinedly, until the public appreciate that Parliament's directions must be obeyed. And Parliament's directions up to date have been against S.P. betting.

Again we had the experience on the Goldfields of sly-grog selling. That grew to an enormous and alarming extent. But by concentrated Government determination it was driven underground. It was not abolished. I do not think we have abolished either goldstealing or sly-grog selling but those things have been driven underground. The law is so administered as to impose such a penalty on the law-breaker that the average man and woman hesitates before taking a risk. So goldstealing on the Gold-

fields and sly-grog selling in this State have been reduced to a minimum, and in the same way betting could be reduced to a minimum if we were equally determined to bring about that reduction.

Then again there has been talk of our penalising the public by not giving to the country people the opportunity to bet on horseracing. It is a marvel to me that members have not spoken of the advantages and privileges and opportunities enjoyed by people in the Eastern States who are able to participate in dog-racing! That is quite a flourishing sport in other States of the Commonwealth, but it cannot be undertaken in Western Australia. Why? Because it is barred in Western Australia. When it was indicated—and I was in the Government at the time, and the member for Boulder was associated with me—that there was a possibility of dog-racing being established in Perth and that certain land was being obtained for the purpose, the Government very wisely immediately brought in legislation totally prohibiting local dog-racing.

Mr. Styants: They had whippet-racing on the Goldfields.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I think that on the Goldfields whippet-racing was just condoned and was allowed as an innocent kind of sport. The hon. member knows that the hotels in Kalgoorlie are supposed to be closed, but we always allow them to be open. There is a little commonsense give-and-take in administration. The sport of racing with greyhounds has an enormous hold on the imagination of the public in the Eastern States, who patronise it in thousands and invest very heavily on the races. Although I have never seen the sport myself, I believe it is quite popular in most of the States. But there has been no resentment concerning the prohibition of that sport in this State, and I wonder that members do not go the whole hog and ask why we cannot allow our community to become involved in all kinds of demoralising practices and alleged enjoyments.

Hon. P. Collier: Why not legalise two-up, the fairest of all gambling?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There you are! We know that two-up prevails and there is no doubt that generally speaking, so long as a double-head is not introduced, two-up

is the fairest of all pastimes. But, of course, it is not permitted and people do not indulge in it without risking a penalty if caught. I want to know why we cannot also enforce the law against those that operate betting shops illegally. There is always a cry that the law should be enforced against the worker who disregards an award of the court. The worker is called upon to sell his labour and to give his services under a set of conditions declared by a tribunal, and if he disobeys in any way there is an immediate clamour for his penalisation. He must be dealt with. We must be drastic and get him to obey the law. Why should we not say that we are going to have the public obey the law? In the old days they were very drastic in seeing that workers obeyed awards and conditions prevailing.

The maritime strike is an illustration. On that occasion the Government actually brought the military out to enforce the observance of what those in authority declared to be the recognised practice and the general law of the land. Therefore it seems to me so unfair that this racing game should always be immune from drastic penalties for disobedience of the law. If there are going to be drastic penalties imposed on workers for disobeying awards and drastic penalties for goldstealing and other things, which penalties suppress what are regarded as evils, why should we be lenient in connection with a practice of this kind? After all, one is a social evil and the other is purely involved in the carrying on of good government and the general welfare of the State.

Mr. J. Hegney: Why not prohibit bookmaking on the course?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I would prohibit bookmaking on the racecourse. It has not been prohibited. It is all nonsense to say it is not legalised, because at every race meeting the Government collects revenue from the bookmaker. Before he goes to the racecourse he pays a fee to the Government and he pays it in order that he may go on the racecourse and conduct his business. How can any member seriously say that bookmaking is not legalised? I will admit that in the ordinary sense if one reads the Act of today one finds that betting on the racecourse is not permitted, but the Government has permitted it to the extent of recognising it as a legitimate source of revenue and it

collects money every time a bookmaker operates on the course.

Mr. Needham: You did the same when you were in office.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Undoubtedly I did the same, and therefore I do not subscribe to what the hon. member says.

The Minister for Education: What fee does the bookmaker pay?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: He pays for his betting ticket.

The Minister for Education: He pays a fee to the club.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I know he pays a fee to the club and he pays more to the club than he does to the Government; but he does pay a certain amount to the Government and therefore it is no good the Government's saying it does not know he is there and does not know what he is doing and that it does not condone the practice, for it assists him by issuing the tickets upon which to record his bets. I want to refer to some of the remarks made by the member for Perth. He said he was unable to see why there should be an organised attempt to prevent the legalising of betting. There is no organised attempt to prevent it, except in this House. There is no attempt outside to say that there should not be any legalised betting. The public are divided, but there is no organisation formed to deal with the matter and nothing has reached this House on the subject. I have received nothing, and I do not think other members have.

While we have to admit there is a definite division of opinion amongst the people, it seems that the launching of the Bill has so disheartened and depressed and upset the public mind that people are trying to forget about it. The hon. member said he wanted to know why it was a vice to bet off the course and a virtue to bet on the course. It is a vice in both places. The hon. member says it is a vice in one place and a virtue in another. I do not subscribe to that, and I do not see how he believes it. It is a vice wherever it is and, because it is a vice, I do not like it. I believe we can get an outlet for all our desires to bet on racehorses by using the totalisator.

Mr. McLarty: Is it a virtue to bet on the totalisator?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not think there is much harm in betting on the total-

isator. Of course, I think it is silly, but there is a little bit of satisfaction to be derived from betting on the tote. One has a chance of winning—though there is a bigger chance of losing—and while one is investing on the tote one knows that one is contributing to the welfare of the State, in that the Government is getting a portion of the investment. I object to bookmaking, and this is a bookmakers' Bill. It is true that if one bets on the totalisator, that can be called betting. But it is not betting in the sense of that practice that has demoralised the community over the years. In New Zealand it is not as disastrous to the general community. It is not the social evil there that it is in Australia, because there it is limited to betting on the totalisator as against the utilisation of bookmakers.

I cannot understand why, in view of South Australia's experience, the Government introduced this Bill. I do not want the Government to be associated with the bringing of a demoralising influence into the public streets. Not only is it brought into the public streets but it is taken right into the shopping centres! In Adelaide they were sorry for themselves when they discovered the effect of their legislation. Surely this House will not attempt to introduce into Western Australia a practice that South Australia is sorry it permitted to operate for a limited time. It is true that South Australia abolished the betting shops that it had legalised in the metropolitan area, and allowed the country operators to continue, but I am informed that now even those have been closed down. I believe the limitation has been extended now from the metropolitan area to the country districts and, generally speaking, South Australia has repented of its sins and has decided that there will be no more of that legislation.

As a Labourite, I do not wish to be associated with anything that encourages the worker to believe it is desirable for him to participate in betting on races. I have no objection to his going to the racetrack and into the enclosure with his eyes open, knowing full well what he is going to see, witnessing racing in good surroundings. He has to travel in order to do that, and knows what he will find when he arrives there, but I object to bringing anything like those conditions to the general community. I am opposed to bringing those temptations pro-

minently before the community. That was done in South Australia and it proved disastrous, in a social sense. I do not want that to happen here. I have no objection to horseracing, or to the totalisator on racecourses. If people have to go to licensed premises to drink, they should have to go to licensed racecourses to bet. I am therefore opposed to the Bill, and regret that the Government introduced it before we had an opportunity of seeing the true effect of the reform measures to which I have referred, in regard to the greater activity of the police in suppressing starting price operators, and the imposition of more drastic penalties by the magistracy on those who disregard the law.

MR. LESLIE (Mt. Marshall) [8.18]: I have approached this Bill from one angle only; the responsibility that I feel, as a member of the Legislature, for making the laws of this country. On the shoulders of every member of Parliament falls a great responsibility in the making of laws; it is to encourage and foster the things that are good and to provide the wherewithal for the people to enjoy such things. On the other hand, the task is to discourage evil and, if necessary, to compel people to refrain from doing things that are evil from the point of view of society, because we are governing as a society, for society. The first question that I meet on this matter, as was mentioned earlier in the debate, is that of good and evil. I do not propose to speak to members along the lines of a Sunday school lecture, but I have to be convinced whether betting is evil or good. It has been suggested that it is evil. What kind of evil? There are two evils against society; one is the evil against the written law, and the other the evil against the moral code. At the present time, betting is an evil and an offence against the law.

The Minister for Justice: Betting is not an offence.

Mr. LESLIE: Gambling is an offence, and betting is part of gambling, so it is an offence against the law.

The Minister for Justice: It is not.

Mr. Thorn: Then why are people being put in gaol every week for it?

Mr. LESLIE: People have been fined for conducting betting places. However the

law cares to wrap up its meaning, there is no question but that in the eyes of the law betting is illegal.

Mr. Watts: Get the Minister to read Section 211 of the Criminal Code.

Mr. LESLIE: There we have the Leader of the Opposition, who can tell us what the law does provide. I understand it is an offence against the Criminal Code to bet.

The Minister for Justice: It depends on where you get your legal advice.

Mr. LESLIE: Is it an offence against the moral code?

The Minister for Justice: No.

Mr. LESLIE: One man says it is not, and the only way in which we can judge whether any action is an offence against the moral code is through the guidance of our consciences. To one man betting is no sin, but to the same man to fornicate is a hell of a crime. Another man, who would not hesitate to live the most immoral life imaginable, would howl down betting. The question of the evil of betting is one that must rest with every individual conscience, but we are living in a society, and the welfare of society must be the guide. Our consciences must dictate to us, as responsible members of the community, what is evil, in the light of the harm it does to society. That is the angle from which I approach betting. I ask what good it does and what evil it does? Does it inflict any hurt on any member of the community? I know of many people who, because of their inclinations, bet and gamble; who possibly would not gamble in any way except to bet, but who are prepared to sacrifice some of the major comforts of their homes and to lower their standard of living. I judge the standard of living on three factors; firstly, there is the standard of the shelter enjoyed, then the standard of the warmth enjoyed, and lastly the standard of nourishment. There are people who are prepared to lower those standards—not only as regards their own existence but as they affect others—in order to indulge in betting. Of course, there are other habits in which people are prepared to indulge, and which also lower the standard of living.

Mr. Rodoreda: Such as playing golf!

Mr. LESLIE: Yes, that is possible. It might be suggested that excessive smoking,

by one who could not afford it, would mean depriving his children of the half pint of milk per day that the charming member for Subiaco is endeavouring to provide for poor people. For that individual, smoking would be a social evil. If he exercised judgment on it according to a proper scale of values, it would be an evil that should be controlled in his case. My personal opinion of betting and its evil effect is my own business, because my conscience must be my guide and must dictate what I understand to be life's scale of values. I suggest to members that in exercising their opinions and votes on this Bill, which is submitted to the House in a purely non-party spirit, they must allow their own consciences to guide them as to what they consider to be evil. Their consciences will dictate to them what is evil according to their own estimates of the values in life.

I wish to learn something about the racing and betting business. I have been secretary of trotting and racing clubs, and have acted in those capacities to encourage the sport, but I know nothing about it, except its recreational value. The importance of horseracing was mentioned during the debate and we were told how necessary it is that we should endeavour to assist to maintain it at a high standard, in order to encourage the breeding of good horses. It was suggested that unless we assist the race clubs, so that they can pay high stakes and thus provide more money to breeders and owners of horses, racing will become of low standard. I must convince myself—as must other members—of the value of horseracing and of how much it contributes to the welfare of society. Its contribution in the early days of horseracing was inestimable. At one time horse breeding was carried on in order to obtain the perfect animal for certain useful purposes. There was the heavy horse for farm purposes, the medium horse for town deliveries, and the thoroughbred, which was used for the conveyance of persons. The idea then was for the breeder to demonstrate the qualities of his horses in whatever direction he could. If he bred a heavy animal, there were the shows and other means of displaying his wares. Similarly, the medium draught animal was dealt with, while the racehorse and trotter could be shown in action only on racecourses. In those days, therefore, races

were as much a necessity as were agricultural shows; but what of today? So successful has been the supplanting of the horse by mechanical means that, in order to achieve the same objective, if we are to work for the same purpose, we should supplant the horses on our racecourses by mechanical appliances. With the development of mechanical transport the usefulness of the horse has almost disappeared.

Mr. Rodoreda: Nonsense! There are tens of thousands of them in the pastoral areas.

Mr. LESLIE: There are not tens of thousands of them in the State.

The Minister for Justice: Are you opposing the Bill?

Mr. LESLIE: The Minister for Justice will know that, in due course. In any event I suggest that the breeder of racehorses today is not raising a utility animal.

Mr. Rodoreda: He never did.

Mr. LESLIE: He is breeding an animal for racing purposes, and a majority of the horses that do not reach the racing standard serve no useful purpose and eventually become cats' meat.

Mr. Rodoreda: No, they are still running at headquarters.

Mr. LESLIE: Yes, and a lot of them will be running there next year.

Mr. Thorn: You mean they ought to be cats' meat.

Mr. LESLIE: Yes. A lot of the horses that catch the eye of the judges at the post should be cats' meat; circumstances over which the poor old horses have no control enabled them to pass the post first. Now I wish to ask some questions. How necessary is it that this breeding of racehorses should be maintained? How is it necessary to encourage public attendance at racecourses and discourage anything in the way of betting off the course? How much does horseracing contribute to the requirements of society? How much worse or better off would we be if we had no horseracing? Would it be possible to introduce some other form of sport that would be of greater use to us as humans? These are questions I should like to have answered. They are materialistic questions, but we are living

in a materialistic age. I want to be satisfied as to whether horseracing must be encouraged or maintained, whether it is the only class of sport that will meet the requirements of the public or whether it is possible to find some alternative sport?

Because of these considerations, I am inclined to the opinion that we have not received sufficient information on the subject. I regret that a full inquiry has not been made into the whole subject, and not merely into betting as was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. I supported his amendment, although I felt dissatisfied with it, because, in my opinion, it did not go far enough. Any inquiry that is made—and I am firmly convinced that an inquiry should be made—should start at the bottom and deal with the necessity for horseracing, and determine whether it is the only sport that can satisfy the desires of the community or whether any other attraction could be provided that would serve a really useful purpose.

I must say that the Bill before us does not satisfy me. However, there are aspects that must be considered. First of all there is the question that betting is illegal, that it is an offence against the law and that up to the present Governments have proved to be incapable of controlling it. Can we find some way of controlling it or some way in which the law may be enforced more effectively than it has been in the past? Apart altogether from considerations of the good or evil effects of betting, if the Bill has been introduced merely in the hope of correcting existing conditions, we must examine it in that light. I do not believe for a moment that the measure will have the effect of abolishing S.P. betting off the course. I am prepared to accept the evidence that has been quoted during the debate and the evidence that I have found, all of which convinces me that betting, if legalised as proposed under this Bill, will increase and extend. If the sponsors of the Bill are not concerned as to whether betting does increase, it may be all right to pass the measure, but if they are concerned to reduce betting by means of the provisions in the Bill, I am sure they will be disappointed, because, on the irrefutable evidence before us, betting must increase under a measure of this sort.

If the intention is to control betting and keep it within the limits of social decency, or attempt to abolish it, the measure will fail lamentably. In the first place no provision is made for what I consider should be a fundamental in a measure of this sort and that is the protection of the punter against himself and against the evil that his actions may do to others. In legislation of this sort, there should be included a provision similar to the "Dog Act," as one section of the licensing law is known. Betting does undoubtedly inflict hardship upon some families. Therefore, if we are going to pass a law of this sort, we should protect the punter against himself and against the evil he may do to others.

Another complaint I have against the Bill is that it makes no provision to ensure that the bettor will get a fair spin. If I had to frame a Bill of this kind, I would make it a fundamental objective that a person having the privilege of being licensed should be compelled to give the punter a fair deal. In some way or other the odds should be controlled so that there would be no exploitation of the bettor by working odds to an unreasonable degree against him.

Mr. Styants: That could be done by regulation.

Mr. LESLIE: I should like to see the measure drawn so tightly that there would be no opportunity for anyone to take advantage of its provisions. In South Australia we have an indication of the tremendous extent to which betting can spread. I venture to say that, while the South Australian Act was in operation, betting was the largest industry and certainly had a greater turnover than any other industry in that State. Therefore, it is vitally necessary that Parliament should lay down the conditions under which the Act shall be administered and controlled, not some official. Therefore I say that the Act should contain some protection for the punter against exploitation.

There is also a serious omission in that the Bill makes no provision for the exclusion of persons who have offended against the betting laws or have been known to be involved in illegal betting transactions. Provision should also be made that no license shall be granted to a shop if it is within a certain distance of premises such as hotels,

schools, churches, etc., because people not always in their right minds would be liable to congregate at the shops and might become a nuisance to others who were obliged to use the thoroughfare for ordinary business purposes. I confess that I am not at all satisfied with the present set-up. With illegal betting existing as it does today and the law evidently impotent to control it, we have descended to the subterfuge of using the Traffic Act under which to obtain convictions for offences otherwise provided for by our laws. Now I ask whether the Bill will provide the requisite remedy.

Mr. W. Hegney: Give it a go!

Mr. LESLIE: I believe there is a better way of dealing with the present situation. The existing laws could be administered more effectively. Instead of acting so as to make the Government and the laws of the country the laughing stock of the people and literally inviting them to offend, a better example should be set. I believe that the Bill does not provide the best method of dealing with this problem. The sponsors of the Bill have not proved to my satisfaction that betting off or on the course is necessary, that it provides a useful purpose for the community, or that it is not injurious, and so I feel disinclined to support it. There is a temptation to support it because of existing conditions in the country. As a member representing a rural area, I would like to know what will be the position of people who are forbidden to enjoy the privilege of betting that is available to those living in the metropolitan area where races are regularly conducted. There is a temptation to support the Bill to ensure that everybody in the State receives a fair spin. If the law were strictly enforced, those people in the rural areas would suffer far in excess of the people who live adjacent to racecourses and are able to go to the racecourses and bet there.

I do not think anybody will ever completely abolish betting because betting and gambling are inherent in us; we gamble every day of our lives and we will bet on anything. We can, however, divert that energy into more useful channels so as to support something that could serve a better purpose. That brings me back to the point that if betting is to be encouraged we should make certain that it will be on something that

will be useful to the community, and that the betting will be controlled so that it will not do an injury to any individual. Let us ensure that each one of us can with a clear conscience look at any person whom we permit to patronise a betting shop or other betting facilities. Let us make certain that the bettor is not in any way being exploited. If in doing that we, as a Parliament, encourage things that are good and discourage things that are evil we will achieve something. The Bill does not get anywhere near that mark. If the sponsor of the measure can prove that betting is not a social evil, then I will be prepared to support it. I do not condemn betting because I know that people will bet, but the Bill does not satisfy me that it is doing the right thing for the people with whom we are concerned. I oppose the second reading.

MR. OWEN (Swan) [8.48]: When this Bill, which seeks to authorise, regulate and control bookmaking, was introduced, I thought it might control betting by bringing it above ground where people could go and bet within the law, and that, as such, it might be a desirable measure. But since making a deeper study of the question and hearing of the experience of other States, I am not satisfied that it would do all that has been claimed for it. In the words of Tennyson, "All my mind is clouded with a doubt." I am not satisfied that the present set-up is doing everything possible to restrict betting on horseracing, nor am I satisfied that the Bill would control betting. Horseracing with its attendant betting—we might go so far as to say gambling—is one of Australia's biggest industries. Every year millions of pounds are invested in betting on horseracing, many hundreds of thousands of pounds are spent in purchasing and keeping racehorses and hundreds of persons get their livelihood by looking after those horses. The member for Mt. Marshall went to some length to show that horseracing is not necessary now because the need for light-harness horses or hacks is not so great as it was some years ago. I quite agree with that, but I do say that horseracing is still a sport and many people go to the races to witness the horses in action. Generally speaking, however, most of those who go to watch the races also have an interest by way of a bet; and that brings me back to the question of betting.

Personally I can see no great harm in betting provided the bets are restricted to the means of the individual concerned. Where the evil comes in is when betting becomes an obsession with an individual so that it interferes with the economies of his household. Many people like to have a small bet or flutter on a horserace; to them it is a means of enjoyment and makes a break in the monotony of everyday life. I know people, particularly those in some of the outback or isolated areas, whose sole recreation, practically, is the picking of winners for Saturday's races. No doubt they get quite a kick out of that and possibly they do not lose much money. I know they do not win a great deal. The member for Victoria Park instanced how a person on the basic wage could not afford to invest much money in bets. Well, it is certain that the present basic wage allows no margin for a person to have a bet, but it was stated that if a basic-wage earner invested 10s. a week in betting he might win once in every ten weeks. Let us assume that such a person won £5. The unfortunate position is that that money would not go towards squaring up his household debts. Such wins are usually considered to be something to be played with, and most of the money is spent in trying to win another £5 or £25. Therefore, even though the average punter does have an occasional win, the money so gained is only spent on further betting.

Much has been said about the legality of betting on racecourses and the matter of one law for the rich and one for the poor. Admittedly we do not frown so much on betting on racecourses, and it is said that only the rich people can afford to go to race meetings. I think it is desirable to restrict betting, perhaps not to racecourses, but to some such places which are away from residential or industrial areas so that rather than have betting brought to the people the people must go to the betting. That would offer some restriction to betting because if people had to travel to a racecourse or some other locality—out in the bush perhaps—only those genuinely interested in betting would make the effort, and whatever we say or do we cannot stop them from betting. The only way to prevent such people from betting on horse races is to prohibit horseracing; and then they

would find there were plenty of other things to bet on.

The Minister, when introducing the Bill, mentioned that in 1845—just over 100 years ago—a measure was brought down prescribing that unless wagering was excessive, fraudulent or deceitful, it was lawful. I am not sure about being fraudulent or deceitful, but I would like to deal with the question of excessive betting. Under our liquor licensing law, it is an offence for a person to serve liquor to anyone who is under the influence of liquor, and a barmaid or barman can judge fairly accurately whether a person has had sufficient liquor or too much, but how can one tell whether a person has spent sufficient money on betting without making him produce his bank book or proving his assets?

Mr. Thorn: You could find out from the butcher or the baker.

Mr. OWEN: Yes, but it might be a long time to wait until next week's or next month's accounts come in.

The Minister for Lands: The butcher and the baker might have had a bet, too.

Mr. Thorn: That is so.

Mr. OWEN: If betting were permitted only on racecourses or other places away from residential areas it would do something to restrict betting. Other suggestions have been made as to ways by which betting could be controlled or minimised, and it was suggested that instead of issuing licenses to certain places the present establishments could be kept within bounds by not allowing them to become really places of entertainment. It has been suggested that if the broadcasting of races were prohibited in the establishments that the Bill seeks to license they would not be so attractive, and would not draw so many people. For instance, I am told that the broadcasts of Eastern States racing commence at about 11 a.m. on Saturdays and anyone can go along to a betting shop, have his bet and hear the result of the races. Whether he wins or not he can wait for the next race; in fact, he often stays until the broadcast of the local races begins at about 3 o'clock. It was suggested to me that if there were no such broadcasts the punters would say to themselves, "Rather than go to the betting shops and wait till 3 o'clock or later to hear the result of the

local races, we will go to the football or some other form of sport." That would be one method by which S.P. betting would be restricted.

Mr. Rodoreda: That is burning a house down to roast a pig!

Mr. OWEN: It was also suggested that any licensed bookmaking premises should be well away from licensed hotels and that, too, is a good idea. I admit I know very little about this matter, and that is why I supported the amendment proposing the appointment of a Royal Commission. Such a commission could sift all the necessary evidence and make recommendations so that a Bill, which would allow of restricted betting without permitting the large increase that this measure would bring about, could be introduced. I will mention what happened in one instance during the depression. As members know, there were one or two S.P. bookmakers who had chains of shops throughout the city and suburbs. This particular person had one or two betting shops in Victoria Park and several in the city. On one occasion in the city he asked a punter whom he recognised as having come from Victoria Park, "Why do you bother to come here? Why do you not bet at my shop in Victoria Park?" The punter replied that, as he was on sustenance, it would not be right for him to be seen going into a betting shop in an area where he was known, and that therefore he came into the city to do his betting. That illustrates the hold that betting gets on people. Members can imagine that a man on sustenance would not have much money left after paying his household expenses.

I think the fault lies in our system, and particularly in our system of education. The aim should be to provide other and more healthy means of recreation and entertainment than congregating in S.P. betting shops. Some of my chief objections to the Bill refer to small townships that at present are not catered for by illegal S.P. betting shops. If bookmaking were legalised there would be agitation by certain persons in such localities to have licenses granted for shops in those areas, and that would lead to a great increase in betting. No doubt there are now a few individuals in such towns who place bets with bookmakers by telephone. They may telephone their bets to other townships, or even to the city,

but if a license were granted to a book-maker in a township of that nature possibly 40 per cent. or 50 per cent. of the population would indulge in betting. There has been some discussion about bookmakers versus the tote. If the Bill becomes an Act I think it would be desirable to have a tote, and that could be done, providing the betting ceased some time before the actual running of the race. If the tote were to cater for the people in the metropolitan area there could be branches here and there, and a quarter of an hour before the race started all the bets would be telephoned to the master tote so that there would be a uniform dividend. I think it would be feasible to have totes in the country also, working on a similar principle.

Another objection to the Bill is this; if we legalise betting on horseracing, why should we stop at that? Why not legalise betting on whippets or on greyhound racing, on football and on cricket? Why restrict it to horseracing? If we are to grant licenses for betting on horseraces I do not think we could, with a clear conscience, refuse licenses for betting on other forms of sport. Two-up is a form of gambling, so why should we not license betting on that game? We might even find someone who, prior to elections being held, would be willing to run a book on members being returned to this Assembly. Although this Bill might control bookmakers, it would not control betting, and would possibly result in a large increase in it. Because of that I feel that I must oppose the Bill.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands) [9.5]: It would be difficult to imagine a Bill on which there would be a greater divergence of opinion than exists in the case of the present measure. Having listened carefully to previous speakers, I do not propose to repeat what has been said on the ethics, attributes and disadvantages, economic and otherwise, associated with betting, and with S.P. betting in particular. I will address myself to what I consider to be one or two pertinent points in the discussion on the subject before the House. Whatever opinions we may hold about the Bill, or about betting, we must concede that the Minister, in introducing the Bill, dealt exhaustively with the principles of betting and with what had been done in relation to betting both in other

States of Australia and abroad. But as far as I was able to hear his speech, and afterwards on reading it in "Hansard," I was unable to discover that he paid attention to what I consider the most important factor; that is the provisions of the Bill itself.

When one looks at the notice paper, and discovers the considerable number of palpable omissions from the Bill, I say, as the Leader of the Opposition said in respect of this important public question, that when one realises that some eight years ago—it is eight years since a similar Bill was introduced to this House—members on both sides of the House, notable among them being the present Premier, dealt with such a measure, it was thought a fit and proper subject, with all its ramifications, for intensive investigation as to the conditions in this State. But notwithstanding that, and the fact that we are told today that it is a question of such moment to the country, we find the Government presenting the Bill to us when the session is almost half over, and asking us to accept it in toto. I say sincerely, and without malice, that if it had not been for the recent intensive publicity given in the Press to the imprisonment of people by magistrates for such offences, we would not have heard anything of the Bill at this stage. I have no quarrel with the magistrates in the discharge of their duties but I feel, like other speakers, that it is a farcical state of affairs when we have to invoke the Traffic Act in order to deal with something which I suggest is extraneous to the provisions of that Act. I agree with those members who have expressed themselves as being thoroughly opposed to the imprisoning of men for the offence of betting. I am unable to subscribe to the idea that people committing the offence of betting should be placed in the same category as those charged with serious offences under the Criminal Code.

I do not profess to know anything about betting beyond realising that it is uneconomic. As to the ethical side, I do not propose to set myself up as a critic of my fellow men, but I can claim that we all realise how uneconomic betting is. What we have to appreciate is that many of the unfortunate people who have been convicted and imprisoned for betting are merely the paid dummies of the real offenders. The Government knows this as well as I do, and

what has it done? Nothing. If the Government were in deadly earnest, the first thing it would do would be to introduce a short Bill to eliminate the possibility of any more of these unfortunate persons—and I think in the main they are unfortunate—being sent to gaol for an offence committed by wealthy people who do not appear.

These conditions have brought many members of the Police Force into public ridicule and contempt. I know that people in the street say that many members of the Police Force are corrupt. I know there are just as many who take the opposite view, and I believe these suspicions have been aroused through the unfortunate position in which the police have found themselves. I may be asked how I arrived at this conclusion. Let me give one experience. A man now retired from the Force told me that, some nine years ago, he was instructed by his sergeant not to issue a warrant against a certain bookmaker because he was influential. What sort of conditions can be expected if things like that can occur?

Like the Leader of the Opposition, I know nothing of the ramifications of betting; I admit that betting cannot be suppressed and therefore ought in some measure to be controlled; I agree that with human nature constituted as it is, it is inherent for many people to bet. The Leader of the Opposition, in his able speech, gave the House a real opportunity to have the whole matter dispassionately discussed. It has been said that this is not a question of party political significance. Tonight we heard a speech by the member for Guildford-Midland, which would certainly have given the lie to any suggestion that this is a party matter, and I commend the Government to the extent of its having made the question a non-party one. If the Minister were really concerned to deal with the matter effectively he would have embraced the opportunity afforded by the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister, in speaking to the amendment, said he felt that it had a tag to it and suggested that the personnel would be stacked. Yet the Minister had the right to suggest that the matter he referred—as I think it ought to be—to a commissioner, a man entirely removed from Parliamentary or other influence. We have a precedent in the appointment of a

Royal Commissioner to investigate trotting. I do not think that any member who read the report of the Royal Commissioner would suggest that there was any partiality about it. Indeed, I consider that he was strictly tolerant and brought a judicial mind to bear on the question. I trust that the House will have an opportunity before long of dealing with the report and recommendations he made.

I suggest that if betting has been a burning question for eight years, as the Government says, something should have been done before this. After the vote is taken, we shall probably have some people saying that members were afraid to take a stand on the Bill. My attitude to betting is exactly what it was when I voted against the previous Bill. However, it would be a peculiar individual who could not change his opinion if the facts adduced were substantial enough, and I am quite prepared to admit that I have changed my views as to the possibility of successfully suppressing all betting. I realise that it cannot be done. Still, I maintain that the amendments of which notice has been given are an indication of the immaturity of the Bill. Indeed, so far as I can judge, this Bill is reeking with anomalous possibilities and administrative difficulties.

Here again we have a proposal to create another board. I would not be prepared to admit that a representative of the Turf Club or the Trotting Club should form part of the personnel of the board. If the Bill runs the distance, I should like to know whether it will have the slightest chance of passing another place. In my own mind, I am quite satisfied what its fate will be. However, if as I say the Bill should stay the distance, the correct thing to do would be to place the management in the hands of a man of high standing and judicial background, and make him directly responsible to the Minister. In that way this House would still retain some control. The board could then be likened to one of the departments of the State, in which an Under Secretary works under the Minister and the matter is really left in the hands of the people. Here, however, it is proposed to set up a board to deal with one of the most contentious matters that could be entrusted to any body of men, and I say quite impersonally that this body is going to be de-

pendent for re-election upon the Government of the day. What is likely to happen if one member of the board does not please some Minister or other? We should remove this possibility, at any rate. The management should be placed in the hands of a man with a definite tenure of office, a man outside the possibility of political influence and capable of discovering all the facts relating to the Turf and Trotting Clubs.

There is another important matter to which I wish to direct attention. In another measure before us, an important provision is to the effect that the person to be licensed shall be one of good character. Nothing is said about it here. Without going into a great deal of detail, I would like to know what persons are to get these licenses. I am afraid many people who are very enthusiastic about the passing of the Bill may be the ones who will not obtain licenses. I believe, with the Leader of the Opposition, that as this matter has been going on for eight years without the Government or Parliament attempting to do anything about it, it might well have been submitted to some tribunal, consisting of one or more persons, to ascertain all the facts in relation to betting in this State. Why must we slavishly follow what has been done somewhere else? I agree with the member for Guildford-Midland that the set-up in South Australia suggests that the measure now before us will not achieve what the Government desires, which is to restrict betting as much as possible. Instead, the Bill will undoubtedly result in increasing the activities of the S.P. bookmakers.

I had expected the Minister to make some reference to what the Government proposed to do with respect to restricting the broadcasting of racing events. My first experience of S.P. bookmaking was gained during the period of the financial depression, and in my opinion much of its popularity was due to the rotten economic conditions of the 30's. In my own electorate there were many unfortunate people who, owing to their economic position, invested money in races in the vain hope of augmenting their income. Then along came the radio, and in this connection the greatest offender is the Australian Broadcasting Commission. So far as the national station is concerned, we have a paradoxical posi-

tion. On the one hand, we have programmes quite suitable for the public—and I hope to see them greatly extended—and on the other hand we find a considerable portion of the listening time devoted to racing and trotting news. Indeed, Sunday is not exempt; the national station brings the racing news right into our homes. I consider the broadcasting more to be deprecated than the S.P. shops, because it introduces the racing news into the family circle. The Australian Broadcasting Commission should be asked to co-operate with this Government in an attempt to restrict this practice. The commission's aid might be invoked to help lift the morale of the community.

Mr. Holman: What about the Press?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order!

Mr. SHEARN: I might also ask what the Postmaster General's Department will do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think the hon. member is getting well away from the Bill now.

Mr. SHEARN: I share the opinion expressed by some of the previous speakers as to the respectability of S.P. bookmakers. I know of many respectable S.P. bookmakers, and they are merely doing the business which the law permits. If it is right to bet on a racecourse, it is equally right to bet off the course. One is no more immoral than the other. The moral implications are identical. I am not prepared to give a blank cheque in connection with this Bill. It is a matter that can be easily adjusted. People innocent in the main are now being sent to goal, and that could be obviated by a short amendment of the existing law. The matter should be the subject of proper investigation by an impartial tribunal. When we have that tribunal's recommendations and findings, we shall then be able to judge. In common with other members, I know nothing of the ramifications of betting, but having the tribunal's findings I shall be in a position to give an intelligent and thoughtful vote upon the measure. In these circumstances, I find myself unable to support the second reading.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [9.26]: I could justifiably vote against the second reading of the Bill, as I have on two previous occasions spoken to and voted against a similar measure. I have not heard any-

thing said in favour of the Bill which altered my opinion. In fact, I agree with other members in their opposition to it. In my opinion, the Bill contains a lot less than a measure of this description should. The Minister, in introducing the Bill, occupied about an hour in tracing the history of betting and gambling. He did this also some years ago when introducing a similar measure. He, however, took only a quarter of an hour or 20 minutes to deal with the measure itself, which, in his opinion, is most important. There seems to be much opposition to the Bill. On looking around the Chamber to-night, I can find very little support for it. I do not know what backing the Government is getting from members on this side of the House. Interest is not being taken in the measure. I was informed when the Bill was brought down that it was a Bill which would fill the Chamber and the gallery and be a subject about which the people would talk and take an interest in. To that statement we can give the lie direct. We had book-makers in the gallery on the evening the Bill was introduced and we had a few spectators in the gallery also, but what have we had since? People in racing circles do not seem to be interested. Those possessed of gambling instincts do not come here with a view to lending support to the measure.

As the member for Maylands said, some people are being sent to goal because of their connection with starting price and street betting. There is a definite indication of lack of interest in the Bill by the people of Western Australia. I join with other members in saying that there has been no demand for the measure at all by any section of the community. I do not know what influence the Minister for Mines in introducing the measure after such a long period, whether it be that it is an obsession of his or whether he is setting himself up as a moraliser in connection with S.P. betting. When he introduced the Bill in 1935, he used a lot of data showing what had been done and was going to be done in other places. He said he had gone to South Australia and had obtained all the information on the subject there. However, he is very silent about South Australia on this occasion. That State has had some years of experience of legislation of this character.

During the war period, South Australia decided to close down the betting shops in the

Mr. WITHERS: The man who holds himself up as a paragon nearly always has some vice very well hidden. I do not claim to know very much about horseracing. I have had my bet but very seldom with a bookmaker, because I cannot reconcile my position with that of a bookmaker who can live in a mansion while the fool of a worker keeps him there. I cannot reconcile myself to the argument that there is one law for the rich and one for the poor. If there is, let it be so. The man who cannot afford to go to the races to bet cannot afford to bet and should not do so. We have years for increased wages to give men a decent standard of living, but never yet have we asked the Arbitration Court to allow 10s. a week for betting purposes.

Mr. WITHERS: If he is and has a bet, well and good! That is quite all right. I am not a prude; I have done possibly everything a decent man should do. I would not like to hold myself up as a paragon of virtue.

The Minister for Lands: Hear, hear!

Mr. WITHERS: They have not had a bet on the local races, though maybe they have done so on the Eastern States events. I bet 90 per cent. never have a wager at all.

The Minister for Lands: Do not begin starting-price betting here!

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The football fan is not a bettor.

Mr. WITHERS: That is after they have had their bet.

Mr. Rodoreda: That is after they have the metropolitan area.

the metropolitan area.

Mr. Rodoreda: Or for beer, or for poultry on Sunday.

Mr. WITHERS: One can have poultry on Sunday if one can get it. We find an evil existing and it is so prevalent that we think we cannot suppress it, or at any rate we do not try very hard to do so. I say that advisedly. We have not tried to suppress it by legislation. So we say that the evil is so prevalent that we must make it legal. One young member of the House got up a few nights ago and asked why we should not make this business respectable; why we should not allow people to go into places like hotel lounges, where they can sit on nice cushions, with carpets on the floor, and why we should not in this way make betting respectable. He wants it to be made respectable so that it will be convenient for people that do not bet today to do so. Lounges in hotels are the curse of drinking and have been ever since they were introduced. Womenfolk who would not stand up amongst men in a bar and drink can go into lounges and drink in an atmosphere of respectability and then come out, perhaps under the weather, as it is called. That is due to the fact that drinking has by this means been made respectable. Are we going to say to Bill Sykes, "This bank robbing is too prevalent, so we are going to make it easy and legalise it"? That is drawing the long bow, perhaps, but it is following the argument to its logical conclusion.

S.P. betting has become prevalent during the last 20 years. The advent of wireless has made it easy to get into contact with those engaged in betting transactions. We have advanced in every sphere and now there is a desire to take betting along with us. We did not have betting 15 years ago; we had to go without it in the back country. But now that we have made progress we want to bring betting to the people on a larger scale. That is definitely wrong. The Bill provides for the licensing of bookmakers in certain places. It does not say that this will be done on a population basis. It is not stated how many bookmakers there will be in Perth or at Bunbury, or whether there will be bookmakers at Dardanup and Boyanup, and wherever there is a pub. Betting takes place in every hamlet in the country, and we are not going to stop it; but I cling to the belief that licensing of

gambling is not an English tradition and it is not the function of a Government to legalise gambling ad lib. If that is done, then I want to play my game of two-up without having a policeman looking through spy glasses in order to pick out Fred Withers or somebody else in the ring so that he may say, when the party is scattered, "I saw you throw the penny up." Although the policeman would not be able to tell whether it was a penny that was thrown or not, the person charged would be convicted through having been on the spot.

If we are going to legalise betting for one section of the community, then we must legalise two-up, poker, and other pastimes. There is a poor old Chinamen's den in a back street, away from everybody, and because somebody has a bet, a coterie of policemen raids the place. Those people are interfering with nobody but themselves. Because that sort of thing is done, we propose to legalise this business and bring it out into the open and let people go into lounges and bet in a respectable atmosphere. I do not stand for that. In going through the Bill, I have come to the conclusion that there is no possibility of the measure being policed if it is passed. A board is to be established and the board is to control the licensing of betting shops. That board will say where the shops shall be, but there is nothing in the Bill to indicate how the measure is to be policed. There is the question of the boy under 18 not being allowed to bet, and of the man under the influence of liquor being prevented from betting. But who is to be the judge of whether a boy is 18 or 17½, or whether a man is under the influence of liquor? When is a man under the influence of liquor? That is difficult to say.

Mr. Abbott: When he bets!

Mr. WITHERS: That is a most difficult thing to police. It is said that if this measure is given effect to, a licensed bookmaker will be able to have only one licensed betting shop. But there will be dummying, the same as takes place today. There is nothing in the Bill to say that one bookmaker could not control three different men making applications for licenses in one particular town. One man could control the business in one town by putting in dummies financed by him-

self, and the main proceeds would go to him.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That operates today.

Mr. WITHERS: Yes, and it will operate again. The member for Mt. Marshall spoke about the protection of the punter. There is nothing in the Bill to protect the punter. The board may sue for certain breaches but there is nothing more provided in this Bill than the license fee for the bookmaker and the bookmaker's clerk. I do not think that sufficient money will come into the fund to pay for any losses for which the bookmaker may be liable. If anything of this sort is to be done, before the bookmaker is licensed he should enter into a fidelity bond of £1,000 or £2,000, so that when people have their bets they will have an opportunity to collect their money in the event of his default. But there is no provision for that. I do not think that punters are very happy about this measure, and judging by the absence of bookmakers from the House ever since the inception of the measure, they are not very happy either. The churches are not happy. I do not know who is happy about it: I do not think the Minister himself is too pleased about it. If we allow the Bill to pass the second reading I can see by the notice paper that what confusion there is in it will be worse confounded by the number of amendments that will be moved.

Let us not waste the time of this House by putting the Bill through the Committee stage and sending it to another place to be crucified! I am satisfied it will not pass another place and, in justice to ourselves, we should do the right thing here and take the responsibility of defeating the Bill on the second reading. During the debate there was some talk of increased purchasing power. Such an increase does not justify an increase in betting power; it is for the specific purpose of assisting in the housekeeping. It is a tragedy to see men arrested for obstructing traffic. If there are three men together and one is writing in a book they are arrested and the charge, generally, is that they are obstructing the traffic.

The streets can be so crowded that one has to get off the footpath but no-one is charged with obstructing the traffic, so it is absurd to say that because a man is writing in a book he is obstructing. Why not

come out in the open and say, "We are not arresting you for obstruction but because you are betting in the street." The Minister pointed out that a place, within the meaning of the Act, is very hard to define because it has to be an established place, that is, a building, or a particular area, or some enclosure. Once a person gets into a street where he can move about it is not a place. That is the old English law. If that is so why not alter it so as to make street betting illegal? I have wondered why Governments previously have not taken that possibility into consideration.

The Minister for Justice: Betting of itself is not illegal.

Mr. WITHERS: I do not know; if one is playing an illegal game—

The Minister for Lands: That is another matter. Only the proletariat do those things.

The Minister for Justice: I could have a bet with you on the streets.

Mr. WITHERS: Yes. Why not make street betting illegal? It is time we did something to make a street a non-betting place, or a place where it is not permitted to game under the Gaming Act. When introducing the measure the Minister referred to some information he had received from Victoria. Some of his information came from the Acting Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent Hughes, who said, "I do not think any further legislation would be any more effective than the prohibition laws of America." I do not think that remark helps the measure. That is a truism. The morals, evils and ethics involved have all been discussed. It has been said that members of Parliament have not the courage to express their views on this matter for fear of losing votes. I do not want it to be said that because I am going out of Parliament at the end of this session I have courage that I did not have before.

The records in "Hansard" will show that I have twice opposed similar measures. I felt tonight that I could not see this Bill go to the vote without having something to say. The member for Guildford-Midland outlined the whole of the proceedings and I do not want to repeat what he said, nor do I want to go through the Bill but, as I said before, it would be a worse job to police this measure than to give proper effect to the present gambling laws. If we

are going to legalise gambling for one section of the community then every section should have the same right. I do not care whether there is S.P. betting or not. If I go to a racecourse I have a bet and it is always on the totalisator; I do not help to keep bookmakers. When I was in Melbourne two years ago I went, for the first time, to the Flemington racecourse and saw the Derby run. The totalisator system there is different from what it is here. That tote shows the odds and not the number of horses, and the totalisator controls the odds of the bookmakers.

Mr. Fox: The odds can be worked out here.

Mr. WITHERS: That might be easy for those who understand the subject.

Hon. N. Keenan: The intention now is to erect a tote here of the same description.

Mr. WITHERS: That is the extent of my betting. I went as close to picking the Cup winner yesterday as did most people who picked horses. I picked Leonard, but I did not have a bet. My system of betting is such that for the last two years I have picked the winner of the Perth Cup but was game to bet only 5s. for a place on each occasion. Yesterday I picked the horse that ran fourth, while many of those who study form lost a lot of money. That is the value of horseracing. To me it has little value, other than as a sport. I listen to the football broadcast on Saturday afternoons, and when the wireless programme changes over to the races I get a certain amount of pleasure in trying to pick the horse that will win. I find more sport in that than I would in backing horses. I do not think we are doing anything to uplift the morals of the people by bringing down legislation of this description, to make legal something that is becoming a menace to the community. I cannot support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Pilbara) [9.52]: The previous speaker said he thought there was little support for the Bill, as most of those who had spoken on it before him were against its provisions. I do not think anyone in this House is less addicted to betting than I am. There is an old saying, that there is nothing that so badly needs reforming as other people's habits. Because I am not addicted to betting I do not believe that

other people should be prevented from exercising their rights in that direction if they so wish. The member for Guildford-Midland, and other speakers, were at pains to try to convince the House that it was all right for betting to take place on racecourses or trotting grounds, but that it was immoral to allow it in the suburbs or the city. If betting is to be permitted and continued on racecourses I do not think it should be prohibited anywhere, provided there is a measure of control. A good deal has been said to the effect that drinking goes hand in hand with betting, yet I know men who are teetotalers, but who bet on Saturday afternoons. I know other men who do not bet, but who spend their Saturday afternoons in the public house and go home more or less under the influence of liquor.

We will take the case of two men who leave their homes on Saturday afternoon; one frequents the betting shop, and the other the hotel. The one who goes to the betting shop spends 5s. or 6s., and eventually goes home with the full use of his mental faculties. The man who does not bet, but who spends the same amount of money in the public house, is more or less under the weather when he reaches home. I have already said that there is nothing that so badly needs reforming as other people's habits. I think those who have spoken against the measure were sincere in their convictions, but I believe we must exercise a spirit of tolerance in dealing with this matter. It has been admitted that betting cannot be abolished. I do not think betting is immoral, but the onus is on each individual in the community to exercise his responsibility towards his home. It is not the function of any person to tell another what he should do with his earnings.

At present we find that men, as the member for Bunbury pointed out, congregate in the streets on Saturday afternoons, and when there are three or more gathered together the police are entitled to arrest them and charge them with obstructing the traffic, yet the real issue is bookmaking. I will not deal with the details of the Bill, as its provisions have already been traversed and members are conversant with them, but in the main the measure seeks to control bookmaking and to regulate it, and provide that bookmakers shall be licensed, that they shall keep proper books of account, and that a

board shall be set up to control and administer the Act. Those who have spoken against the Bill would endeavour to stamp out betting altogether, but I think that if a man desires to bet he is entitled to do so, and that he should not be under any obligation to leave his home and expend money on going to the racecourse and gaining admission, if he elects to bet elsewhere.

In Marble Bar, where there is one hotel, an S.P. shop was started. Prior to that the only place to which the men of the district could resort on a Saturday afternoon was the hotel, and the temperature in that area is such that the men were naturally inclined to spend their time there. When the S.P. shop opened many of them spent their time in it, listening to the wireless. They would expend perhaps 2s., 4s., or 5s. during the afternoon, and they offended no-one; in fact they were all the better for it. Unfortunately, the local policeman did his duty, but he admitted—as did everyone else round the district—that while the S.P. shop was open there was less drinking in the hotel. I think it is impossible for anyone successfully to argue that betting should be conducted on racecourses and not elsewhere. We have legalised what we call the State lottery, and a special Act of Parliament was placed on the statute-book for that purpose. Though the lottery is given a name different from wagering or gambling, the fundamental principles are the same.

Mr. Abbott: And it is well advertised.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Every person who buys a ticket in a lottery bets, against about 100,000 other citizens, that he will win a prize. I will now deal with the position in South Australia, and I speak from a disinterested point of view. I am not interested in bookmakers, punters or anybody else connected with betting, but I say that if this Bill passes both Houses of Parliament and the Act is placed on the statute-book, and if after trial and experience it is found to work to the detriment of the people of the State, I will retrace my steps. I think a position has arisen in which this Parliament should regulate bookmaking, but before we start to restrict the actions of others we should look into our own consciences and discover our weaknesses and faults. With proper control and the implementation of a number of amendments that

have already appeared on the notice paper, I think betting can be controlled, the number of licenses limited and the general conduct of bookmaking premises successfully administered by the board.

I hope in all sincerity that the Bill will eventually find its way to the statute-book, that people will be permitted to have a bet if they so wish without the possibility of being arrested on the way or for speaking to two or three of their friends. From the moral and economic aspects, some very reasonable arguments have been advanced against the Bill. I stated earlier that I give those members who have opposed the measure full credit for their sincerity, but if the Bill is defeated and the present situation continues, I think it will be far worse than it would be if this legislation were given a chance to operate. Therefore I trust that the Bill will be passed. Parliamentary life, like gambling, is very uncertain, but if I am still the member for Pilbara in a few years' time and I find that the Act is not working successfully, I shall be prepared to readjust my ideas and act in accordance with the position as it may then be.

MR. ABBOTT (North Perth) [10.1]: It is generally admitted that the principle of gambling is against the public interest. No-one would suggest that gambling generally should be authorised. No-one suggests that we should legalise two-up schools, hazard, fan-tan or any other form of gambling.

Mr. Fox: What about the Stock Exchange?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not regard Stock Exchange operations as gambling. At the moment, at any rate, they are not.

Mr. Fox: Of course they are.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not agree with the hon. member. Having in mind what I have stated, the best way to assist public policy is by reducing gambling as much as possible. That is the admitted view of every member and it is the policy of the Government. The Minister said—

The Government desires to restrict as far as possible—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in reading from "Hazard" of the current session.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I shall be in order if I put it that the Minister said he wanted

to restrict the business of S.P. shops and gambling in every way possible. I do not believe that the Bill will assist to that end in the slightest degree. I think it will have the effect of increasing gambling and putting it in the position of being legally recognised as a proper thing to do. Very few members would like to encourage their children to indulge in gambling. We don't want our youngsters to be brought up to think that gambling is a good and wise thing. It is not, as everybody knows.

The Minister told us that in New South Wales a measure had been introduced to restrict gambling and that in South Australia an Act had been passed to legalise it. So far as I am aware, there has been no thought of altering the law in New South Wales to legalise gambling, but very serious consideration has been given by the Parliament of South Australia to doing away with or altering its Act. This is one consideration that may assist us in dealing with this very difficult problem of how best to achieve the aim of restricting gambling as far as possible. I propose to vote against the second reading of the Bill. I would have preferred to have a proper inquiry made so that all the information as to the experience in other States could have been placed before us. Then we would have been in a position to express an opinion influenced by the latest information as to the wisest attitude to adopt.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourne) [10.5]: The debate on this measure so far has reached such a high moral and spiritual plane that I am afraid I shall be unable to follow previous speakers into that rarified atmosphere. From the opponents of the measure, I gained the impression that they felt they were dealing with something distasteful—

Mr. Abbott: Objectionable.

Mr. RODOREDA:—something we should creep on to, and handle with kid gloves, because we were half ashamed of having anything to do with it. For goodness' sake, let us get down to earth! Let us deal with the situation as it exists! While I quite agree with opponents of the measure in all the high ideals they have expressed, they are wonderful as ideals but they just do not work out in practice. I commend the

Government for having the courage to bring down such a measure.

The Minister for Lands: Thank goodness, somebody loves us!

Mr. RODOREDA: The Government appreciates the situation that exists and realises its duty to give Parliament an opportunity to express an opinion upon this somewhat controversial subject. I doubt whether I should have spoken on the Bill but for the remarks of the member for Bunbury. He started by saying that no speeches had been made by supporters of the Bill. The position is that members on the Government side do not usually take up the time of the House by addressing themselves to measures which they support. That has been the accepted principle ever since I have been in Parliament, and the member for Bunbury well knows it, so I think he had some ulterior motive in making that statement.

I feel no sense of shame in dealing with this measure or in supporting it. I am not going to act in the way we make the punter act on Saturday afternoon, sneak furtively up a lane to have a little wager which some members consider he has no right to have, instead of paying a pound to go to the racecourse. How that position can be reconciled as fair is beyond me. If we have a law on the statute-book that the people simply will not observe, obviously the law is not a good one. That has been proved in every country throughout the centuries. People will not observe a bad law.

I wonder how many hundreds of thousands of people yesterday had a wager on the Melbourne Cup without going to the Flemington Racecourse. It is safe to say that wagers were made with every S.P. bookmaker in Australia. Do those people realise that they were committing an offence? I would not mind wagering that some of the opponents of this Bill had a humble two bob or a dollar each way on something in the Melbourne Cup, and they were certainly not on the Flemington Racecourse.

Mr. Fox: I do not think they would do that, would they?

Mr. RODOREDA: Did those individuals who had a wager on the Melbourne Cup yesterday consider they were committing a crime and breaking the law of

the country? Of course they did not and they never will. It is up to Parliament to face this position. I do not think the issue on this Bill is whether S.P. betting should be controlled; it is rather how it should be controlled. This is the first debate to which I have listened in this House where it has been frankly admitted by all members that S.P. betting cannot be eradicated. On other occasions, we have found people saying in all sincerity that S.P. betting could be stamped out and that the Government was not trying to stamp it out, nor were the Police Force trying to do so. But, of course, they have all been compelled to change their mind.

I agree with the member for Pilbarn that it is extraordinary that opponents of this measure—who, on their own admission, know nothing whatever about the subject, take no interest whatever in it and have never had a bet in their life—want to stop people interested from having a bet. They take up exactly the same position as the prohibitionists take up. Prohibitionists say, "Drink is a social evil; we will have nothing to do with it and therefore no one else shall." That is precisely the attitude taken up by the opponents of this Bill. I think they are sincere, but that is their attitude. They say, "We are not interested in betting and therefore no one else should be." I cannot see that that argument carries any weight or that it is likely to. Most of the opponents of the measure base their arguments on moral grounds and the social evil of betting. But the fact that people argue in that way is no proof to me that betting is illegal. What are the evil effects of betting?

Several members interjected.

Mr. RODOREDA: I do not agree that betting is such a tremendous evil. We have had sob stuff put over us by the member for Victoria Park.

Mr. Read: You do not move among the people and do not know what is going on.

Mr. RODOREDA: Be calm!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Roebourne will proceed.

Mr. RODOREDA: If we are to argue on that basis, we can take another social evil and ask how many people drink. Yet we control the drink traffic and license places

where people can obtain drink. The position is analagous. A tremendous number of people who take a keen interest in S.P. betting would never go to the racecourse, even if they could attend free. This is something altogether different from what the member for Guildford-Midland said. People who go to the course do not know as much about the racing as the people who stay at home and listen to the broadcast. A very large percentage of the people who attend races would not know whether the horse that they backed was first or last until the numbers went up. That is all they would have learnt by going to the races. The number of people who go to a racecourse merely for the sake of watching horses race and not to bet is so infinitesimal that we can afford to disregard them altogether. That is only another one of the ideals. If there were no betting on racecourses, not 50 people would attend a race meeting on a Saturday.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The people do attend the courses in New Zealand and bet on the totalisator.

Mr. RODOREDA: Betting on the totalisator is no different from other betting.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Give us the totalisator and do away with the bookmaker.

Mr. RODOREDA: I will deal with the question of the totalisator a little later on. The point I make now is that all the people I know who bet regard S.P. betting as a hobby. It is a relaxation and an escape from their week's toil. We have been asked why two-up, roulette or fan-tan or other betting games have not been legalised; but there is a difference between betting on horseracing and gambling. The difference is this: In gambling, whether it be poker or any other game, hazard or two-up, immediately the game is finished the interest is gone. It is not until the man starts to gamble again that his interest is once again roused and then it only continues while the game is in progress.

The only interest many men have in life, apart from their every-day work, is racing. They buy racing papers, they know all about racing, discuss it with their friends at work and during the lunch hour, as well as at night time. It is a hobby and a source of interest to them all through the week. From the time the nominations are published they are engaged in picking winners.

These men go to the S.P. shop on a Saturday afternoon and with the £1 that it would have cost to go to the races, they have four or five bets of 1s. 3d. each way—members will find that is the average bet—and a few pots with their friends. They have an afternoon's pleasure on an amount that it would cost them to go to the races. I think that unquestionably is the case; because a man who goes to the races seeks to recover by his first bet what it cost him to attend the course, and he bets on that scale all the afternoon. I do not uphold betting. I think it is senseless and stupid.

Mr. Thorn: Do you really mean that?

Mr. RODORED A: So are many other things that people do.

Mr. Thorn: I do not think you mean that.

Mr. RODORED A: People spend their money in foolish ways. We can all see the foolish way in which the other fellow spends his money, but we cannot see the foolish way in which we spend our own. Until human beings grow wings they will always spend money foolishly. Whether a man bets or not is a matter for his own conscience to decide. It is so much a personal matter that a man should be allowed to decide it for himself. If he goes over the odds, as men do in other walks of life, on the stock exchange, mining, or insurance, it is just too bad for him, but we cannot help it. No comparison can be drawn between gambling and betting on horseracing. That is the point I want to make and want members to consider very seriously. I do not think we have any right whatever to decide here that gambling on a racecourse shall be legal, but nowhere else. That is extending a privilege to people who can afford to attend a race meeting and denying the same privilege—if it be a privilege—to the man who cannot afford to go, but who nevertheless is keenly interested and quite thrilled to have his 1s. 3d. or 2s. each way on a couple of horses on a Saturday afternoon.

We have also to consider the man who lives in the country and cannot get to a racecourse. What I have been saying about racing being a hobby applies more to people in the country, who have no interest in life other than to say, "We will make Saturday afternoon our Sunday. We will listen to the wireless at 11 o'clock in the morning and fill in the day listening to the racing or the foot-

ball results, and we will have a few S.P. bets on the 'phone. We will work on Sunday." That is what countless scores of farmers do.

Mr. Seward: You want us to believe that?

Mr. RODORED A: I am telling members what I know. I am aware that the member for Pingelly does not do it because he does not take the slightest interest in it.

Mr. Seward: That is what you say!

Mr. RODORED A: The hon. member has admitted it himself.

Mr. Seward: I can speak for myself.

Mr. RODORED A: The hon. member admitted it. I am taking his own words.

Mr. Seward: I did not!

Mr. RODORED A: The hon. member said he did not take the slightest interest in it.

Mr. Seward: I do not take the slightest interest in what you say.

Mr. RODORED A: The hon. member need not do so. I am merely saying what I know. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have been drawn into this discussion. The hon. member can speak for himself. I was taking note of what he said previously. To get back to the Bill! It does not interfere with the club's control of bookmakers on the course other than to give a right of appeal to the board if there is any trouble with officials of the course. So far as bookmakers on the course are concerned, the position will be much the same as it is now. The Minister, when introducing the Bill—and a lot of members have made play on this—said that the measure would minimise betting. Of course, it will not do so! Anybody who tries to argue on those lines is just ignoring the facts. But the attitude of the Government in bringing down a Bill like this is that it does not want to stop a man who cannot go on the racecourse from having a bet. That is apparent from the fact that the Government has introduced the measure.

Mr. Doney: What is the object of the Bill?

Mr. RODORED A: To control the business.

Mr. Doney: With what purpose?

Mr. RODORED A: To put an end to the ridiculous situation that prevails. The purpose is the same as that for which we have licensing laws. The member for Bunbury wanted to know how we could tell when a

man was under the influence of liquor or was under 18 years of age. How is that determined under the provisions of the Licensing Act? Those provisions are in the Licensing Act and they have to be implemented; and the same position will arise in this connection. To say that the Bill will minimise betting is foolish; but it will control betting. It will have the effect of ensuring that betting is carried on under decent conditions, and it will also bring revenue to the Government and a terrific amount of revenue to the racing clubs—revenue which neither body receives at present. I think that is a far better system than the one that obtains. We were told that there was no public interest in this matter. I quite agree. I think it assumes a status far beyond its importance in the scheme of things when it comes to this House. It is something that does not matter twopence to 90 per cent of the population of this State. They do not care what we do with this Bill. Judging from those that I know, the bookmakers are not in favour of it. They are quite happy under existing circumstances. They are getting nearly as much betting as they would if betting were licensed and they are not paying anything for the privilege—not a thing!

I would say that some bookmakers, under the provisions of the taxing measure which we were told was a concomitant part of the previous Bill, would be paying from £700 to £2,000 annually in license fees and turnover tax; and they do not want that. Nor does the average S.P. punter want the measure. He does not care one iota what we do, because he will have his bet whether we pass this Bill or not. At present some men have to go on the street in front of a hotel or up a back lane to have a bet. If men have a phone at home, they are privileged and can ring up and make their bets. So everything is for the people who have! But the fellow who has not the privilege of a telephone has to go up a back lane to make his bet. He is not vociferous. He does not get up agitations to see that the Bill goes through. Previous speakers have said that pressure has been brought to bear on the Government. Who brought it? Who would bring it? Not the S.P. bookmakers! They do not want to be licensed and pay a huge turnover tax.

The only agitation that has been evi-

dent this time has come from those who have been opposed to betting being licensed. I have not heard this topic discussed anywhere—in the trams, in the trains or on the streets—since the measure was introduced; and the absence of an audience in the galleries since we have been talking about the Bill is a sufficient indication of the lack of interest in the matter. I think we are all getting hot and bothered over something that does not matter twopence. Nevertheless, I believe that the proposed board could do much to control betting, just as the Licensing Court has controlled the situation with regard to liquor. Moreover, the Government would derive revenue from the weaknesses of human beings who will continue to bet. I listened to a most extraordinary speech from a certain member tonight who drew some analogies. He actually compared goldstealing with S.P. betting! Have members ever heard anything so ridiculous!

Fancy comparing goldstealing with S.P. betting about which, after all, no-one is really concerned. S.P. betting is not a crime. Those indulging in it are not thieving the property of other persons. We also keep down murder and other crimes to a minimum. But S.P. betting is not a crime and nothing will convince me or hundreds of thousands of Australians and people of other nations of the world to the contrary. I object every time I hear someone say Australians are gamblers. Goodness me! Australians are not in the same street with the Chinese or the Americans or the Juvo-Slavs or with people of other nations. The figures prove that. The hon. member referred to sly-grog selling. I ask him how much there would be if there were no licensed premises. Let him think that out! The fact that very little sly-grog selling takes place is due to the circumstances that ample opportunity is given to men to have their glass of beer in licensed premises. We do not make them get on a train and pay 10s. admission in order to have a drink. We arrange for them to be able to have their drink because we know that there is a public demand for it; although we would agree that socially drinking is far worse than betting. Betting becomes an evil only when a man bets beyond his means and his family suffers in consequence; but that is a matter that we

in Parliament cannot control, whatever laws we pass.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We can aggravate it.

Mr. RODOREDA: Early in my remarks, I referred to the speech of the member for Victoria Park. His statements would have been quite O.K., and so would those of other folk who talked in a similar strain, if we were going to initiate something that was not in vogue now. Surely the member for Victoria Park realises that this wasting of a man's substance will continue whether we pass this Bill or not! He quoted instances that have occurred in Victoria Park in the last seven or eight years. That is when the matter was not controlled. The same things will take place in the next 10 or 12 years.

Mr. Read: Why encourage it?

Mr. RODOREDA: I am not encouraging it. I want to control the thing. I want to provide a man with facilities so that if he decides to waste his money on betting he shall be able to do so, but the Government will get something out of it. I could very easily see how we could restrict him once we could control S.P. betting.

Mr. Abbott: They could not do so in South Australia.

Mr. RODOREDA: Because South Australia did not have the ingenuity to do it, that is not to say we cannot. I can visualise a way in which we can restrict betting. One very easy method would be to put a tax on winning bets.

Mr. Watts: They tried that in South Australia.

Mr. RODOREDA: We could try it to the maximum. If we placed a big enough tax on a winning bet so that the punter did not win—when he had picked the winner—we would have the game by the throat. It has been the practice in Victoria for countless years to charge the punter 1s. for a £5 bet. We could easily make the S.P. bookie collect a percentage from winning punters. It amazes me to find men here upholding a system which gives privilege to the wealthy—to the people who have motorcars and can go to the racecourses to do their betting. Many of those people are members of the W.A.T.C. and allied clubs and they are

exploited in every way by the bookmakers and the cost of drinks and afternoon teas, and yet members want to refuse similar privileges to people who have not the money to go to racecourses.

Mr. J. Hegney: The S.P. bookie is quite wealthy.

Mr. RODOREDA: That is evading the issue. Betting is foolish, but that does not say that human beings will not indulge in it because the member for Middle Swan does not.

Mr. J. Hegney: How do you know?

Mr. RODOREDA: From the hon. member's own admission. Members get up here and say, "I have not had a bet in my life." There will be a lot of headaches suffered by members from the tightness of their halos. I agree that the tote would be a far better method for controlling S.P. betting if it were practicable.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is practicable in New Zealand.

Mr. RODOREDA: Let us get away from New Zealand and deal with our own problems. We talk of the evil of men congregating in betting shops in the city. How many totes does the hon. member suggest we should have?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: One at each racecourse.

Mr. RODOREDA: I am talking of betting away from the racecourse. Will men come from the back of Maylands to the city to have a bet at a central tote? There would be 10,000 or 20,000 people congregated around a tote in the city, and within reach of hotels. Would that be good?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: No, they should be out on the racecourse.

Mr. RODOREDA: I am suggesting an alternative—the licensing of S.P. betting. How would that be practicable? We would need to have 20 or 30 totes in the metropolitan area and in each one there would be a crowd of citizens who would have time between each race to amble up to the corner hostelry and have a jug or two with their cobbles. I would sooner have the people distributed in non-conspicuous betting shops. Previous to the shops being closed there was very little sign of people congregating, unlike the position now with 30 to 100 people standing near

to suburban hotels and really obstructing the traffic. We have forced these persons out on to the streets with our present legislation. The system of letting them stay in the shops, which was in vogue before the war, is better than what applies at present. To run a tote would require an enormous amount of supervision, and the cost would be terrific in the city. In addition, the way would be made open for questionable practices to take place. In the country, as the Minister for Education has pointed out, the suggestion is just too foolish for words. There is no need to hammer that point; it is so obvious it does not need stressing.

I agree with a few of the amendments on the notice paper, including the one of the Leader of the Opposition that we should have a clause to prohibit the recovery of gambling debts by law. I can see great danger there. No doubt credit would be allowed by S.P. bookies to punters if they knew they could recover any debts by law. We should put that position beyond question so that if a bookmaker allows a punter too much credit it will be his own fault. I want to see provision in the Bill to compel S.P. bookmakers to pay the actual S.P. odds. S.P. punters have been fleeced for 25 or 30 years on this question. When a punter is fortunate enough, as happens occasionally, to pick a 20 to one winner he gets paid 10 to one straight out and five to two for a place. As long as the present position is allowed to continue the punters will be exploited. In addition to the provisions that prevent people under the influence, and boys under the age of 18 years, from being in betting shops I would like to see women prohibited from entering these shops because the principle of allowing women in betting shops induces an undesirable type of woman to go there. That has been the experience of South Australia. Women go to the betting shops because men are there. The member for Subiaco can shake her head, but she knows why the women go there as well as I do.

Mr. Cross: Is that why they go to the races?

Mr. RODORED A.: I am not talking of the races, but of S.P. shops. They go to the shops mostly with an ulterior motive.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: If it is undesirable for women it is undesirable for men.

Mr. RODORED A.: If the member for Subiaco wants to talk to me about this subject I will discuss it with her outside. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition's amendment on the notice paper dealing with touts, urgers and tipsters. We should clamp down on them with the full rigour of the law; we should come down like a ton of bricks on anyone who sets himself up as such because if any people obtain money under false pretences they do. They batten on the punters.

Mr. J. Hegney: Including the papers?

Mr. RODORED A.: No. They do not urge or tip for hire or reward. They do not want odds to £1, or £5 for a system. They give the public what it wants.

Mr. J. Hegney: The papers make a good deal out of it.

Mr. RODORED A.: Yes. One paper, the "Morning Herald," would not publish racing notes and what happened to it? One member said we should cut down the broadcasting of races. In many homes Saturday is looked forward to as a day of recreation.

Mr. Watts: Let us have another station without race programmes so that those who do not want those broadcasts need not be bothered with them.

Mr. RODORED A.: That is beyond what I am discussing; it is a matter for the Broadcasting Commission. This is a source of interest to people who, perhaps, never have a bet in their lives. I know what a boon it is and how I was worried, right through the war, by people in the far outback of the North-West to have the racing broadcasts put on the short wave so that they could hear them. Racing broadcasts were available to the public in the southern part of the State, but the Commonwealth Government would not allow them to be put over on the short-wave. That was the main grievance of the people of the North-West, that they were not allowed to hear the racing commentaries on Saturdays. Whatever the fate of the Bill, I think the Government should take some steps to rectify the position that now obtains where men are put in gaol, ostensibly for obstructing the traffic.

It is amazing to me that the judges and magistrates of this State should administer the law and give judgment on something

that they, we, and the public know was right outside the intentions of Parliament when passing that measure. It is an absolute subterfuge, and imposes penalties on the stooges—not on the S.P. men—sending them to gaol for periods of a fortnight or perhaps a month, just as was done in Darwin with the Japs who had committed atrocities. The Government should long ago have taken steps to end that state of affairs. It is a travesty of justice and smacks to me too much of collusion between the magistrates, prosecuting sergeants and others who have to do with the prosecutions. I cannot express my thoughts too strongly on this matter, and I hope something will be done in the near future to remedy the position. We all admit that we cannot stamp out betting, so I think we should do the next best thing—control it—thereby getting some revenue from this human weakness, both for the State and for the racing clubs that make it possible for the S.P. bookmakers to operate.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [10.43]: I believe almost everything that can be said on S.P. betting has been said in this House, but of all the speeches I have heard, the last had in it the greatest semblance of truth. In saying that I refer to those members who spoke in favour of the Bill. The last speaker said—as the others did not—that one reason for the Bill was that the Government wanted to obtain revenue. That is the real reason behind the Bill. The Government does not care about the morals of the people but today, when its taxation has been curtailed, it intends to get money out of the S.P. betting shops, if possible. Thank God, the Bill will not pass. It may be passed by this House, but not by another place, and I say, with one of our ex-Premiers, "Thank God for the other House." Several speakers have said it is rubbish to give the sobstuff that the member for Victoria Park gave, about the poor women and children, but I, in common with others, have been a social service worker and can assure the House that I have been called out half-a-dozen times late on Saturday nights to get food for women and children because the husbands had spent all their money.

Mr. Fox: Oh no!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It is true.

Mr. Fox: I have been associated with the poorer people more than you have.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Almost every member who has spoken in favour of the Bill has said, "I am not a better. I do not believe in betting. It is illegal." Then they have made long speeches to show why the evil should be legalised. I think it was the member for York who referred to speeches by members of the South Australian Parliament, where it was decided not to re-enact the measure that legalised betting. The most telling of those speeches was made by a union official who said he had had more difficulties in solving domestic problems during the time when S.P. shops were in vogue than during the rest of his life.

Mr. Cross: You do not know him.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I cannot understand the member for Canning. He does not speak clearly. When this question was before the House in 1936 or 1937, the Minister who sponsored the Bill told us that it was the rotten economic state of the country that drove the poor women to take sixpence to S.P. shops in an endeavour to turn it into eighteenpence.

Mr. Cross: That would not do as much damage as would cigarette-smoking.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: That was in 1936, but the other day he informed us that betting was inherent in the people, and that therefore we must legalise it. In 1940, I brought forward a motion asking the Government immediately to use all statutory powers to close the betting shops, houses, dwellings and places of whatsoever kind where illegal betting was conducted. Most members on the Government side of the House voted against it. One member said tonight that the police have been suspect because nothing has been done, but that motion was inspired by the policemen who told me they could not do anything, because the Government was not behind them.

The Minister for Lands: You have some strange dreams.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: When that motion was before the House, the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, who had just re-

linquished the position of Minister for Justice, said—and there was applause when he said it—"I am opposed to the motion. I am opposed to permitting starting-price betting under license. I prefer the continuance of that discreet administration which has kept it within bounds and kept it on the surface, and which has permitted freer play in those parts of the country where freer play finds greater justification." I wonder how the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe will vote now, when a few years ago he took the trouble to make a fine speech, including the words that I have quoted. He was definitely against S.P. betting under license and would not vote for it.

I have stated that what lies behind this Bill is really a desire for revenue. I felt hurt when I heard the Minister for Education speaking in favour of the Bill. I wondered how he could explain his attitude when, on the previous Sunday, in opening Youth Week, he solemnly declared—

The Minister for Education: What did I say in favour of the Bill?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister supported it.

The Minister for Education: Tell me one thing I said in favour of the Bill.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister said he would support it.

The Minister for Education: No, I did not.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Then I hope the Minister will not do so.

The Minister for Education: That puts you on the spot a bit.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: On the previous Sunday the Minister said—

That influencing youth by providing an atmosphere where youth could achieve full mental, physical and spiritual stature was the obligation of the community. That was a great responsibility when there was full realisation of what influence that atmosphere would have on young people in whose hands rested the future of the nation.

I considered that was a wonderful speech. Now the Minister says he did not support the Bill.

The Minister for Education: I asked you to quote one thing I said in favour of the Bill.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister said he was supporting the Bill.

The Minister for Education: I did not.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Then I apologise.

The Minister for Education: I will vote for the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: If the Minister is not supporting the Bill, I shall add one more to the list of those I believe will vote against the measure.

The Minister for Education: No, I will vote for the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education will refrain from interjecting.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: A little while after the Minister had spoken, the gallery was filled with young people between the ages of perhaps 18 and 25, and I felt very glad that they had not heard the Minister's speech.

The Minister for Education: What did I say that they should not have heard?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The exact words I do not know.

The Minister for Education: Of course not.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It was general. My memory will not enable me to say without referring to "Hansard." Had he supported the Bill in the hearing of those children, probably a lot of them would have written to him asking him not to vote for it.

Mr. Fox: How do you know that? You would have prompted them, I suppose.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Of course. Those children belong to good religious families and to Christian Endeavour societies, and they have written to many members asking them not to vote for the Bill.

Mr. Triat: The youngsters bet with marbles at school every day.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The member for South Fremantle said he believed in the Bill and would support it. Yet he did not believe in betting; no-one believed in betting, but he would support the Bill. He said that if a man wished to bet and went

on the rocks in consequence, it was his own fault. He also said, "We in this House are not social reformers."

Mr. Fox: I did not say anything of the sort.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The hon. member said it was the duty of the parents, the churches and the educationists to teach the children that betting was wrong.

Mr. Fox: You do not believe in that?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I think it is the duty of the politicians not to legislate so that children will go wrong, and that is what members will be doing if they pass this Bill. I could quote many things that members have said on this subject, but I will not pursue that aspect. What I want to ask is: Are we here to legislate to show that the teaching children have received in their homes was wrong? Are we here to legislate to show that the churches are wrong? Are we here to say that the educationists must teach the children what is right and leave the responsibility entirely to them? We shall be guilty of a great crime if we allow the Bill to pass. It did not pass on the previous occasion. I do not suppose that I shall be able to influence one vote, but I should like to see members be men.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on members of the House.

The Minister for Lands: We do not want to be old women, anyhow.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Very well. The South Australian Parliament in 1945 condemned the betting shops as the greatest curse ever inflicted on the people, a disgrace to the State, a vicious imposition, objectionable and insulting to the people living within the vicinity of the shops. The Royal Commission said that the shops were soul-destroying and uneconomic. The Queensland Commission said they had a corrupting and destroying influence and had nothing to recommend them socially, economically, or ethically. The member for Kalgoorlie quoted a lot of figures which were very interesting. One of the members on this side of the House wired to South Australia and obtained a more up-to-date report than the one the hon. member used.

Mr. Styants: I got mine three weeks ago from the clerk of the South Australian Parliament.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The report I have bears the date the 5th October, 1946, and gives figures that are quite different from those quoted by the hon. member. According to him the turnover was about £9,000,000. The latest report states—

The outstanding feature of betting during 1945-46 was the turnover of £13,300,000. Excluding 1944-45, when the turnover was slightly less than £9,000,000—

That is the figure the hon. member quoted.—the past year's figure was nearly twice that of the highest previous year. And let it not be forgotten that in 1945-46 no betting premises operated, whereas before 1942 over 300 were open not only on Saturdays and public holidays but also on two or three week days.

When the hon. member gave his figures, he did not stress the point that in 1938-39 when the shops were operating, the number of bets laid on all meetings totalled 35,900,000.

Mr. Styants: I quoted those figures.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: In 1944-45, the total was reduced to 8,000,000 odd.

Mr. Styants: Yes, and the amount of each bet had increased by 100 per cent.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: That is true. The bettors had decreased, but the betting had increased. The average bet in 1938-39 was 4s. 5d.; in 1944-45, it was £1 0s. 3d. The shops were not operating and the number of bets had decreased from 35,000,000 to 8,000,000; but the increase in the amount was due to the additional money which was available.

Mr. Styants: I quoted those figures.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The report says—

We believe that the increase in betting was caused partly by the relaxation from the strain of war, but mostly by the fact that earnings increased while the opportunities of spending decreased.

In dealing with the Act of 1945, the report says—

Under this Act we are not to register premises outside the metropolitan area. Our first inquiries were held in corporate towns in the North. We found that illegal betting was taking place in all of them.

Mr. Cross: It is taking place all over South Australia today. It is quite easy to make bets in Adelaide.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: In most of the towns the committee found the evidence did not warrant registration. The report continues—

In towns in other parts of the State we thought that the demand for premises was less insistent than we believed it would be, and it must be made clear that the evidence may not have, and in some cases we are certain it has not, disclosed the true extent of illegal betting.

It is realised in South Australia that much illegal betting is taking place. The report goes on to say that statements were made to the effect that many of the men engaged in it would be imprisoned. The point I make is that South Australia is determined that after a certain time there shall be no registration of shops even in these outback areas. I spoke to a man yesterday who is a printer from South Australia, and he said that the sights in the legalised S.P. betting shops there were absolutely disgusting. He was a bettor, he said; but he added that anything that could be done not to legalise betting in this State should be done. If members want to know his name, I will say that he is employed at Wiggs' printing establishment. Evidence has proved that no State can control S.P. betting without the co-operation of the Commonwealth Government. So long as there are facilities for broadcasting and the telephone is available, we will to a certain extent have S.P. betting. Members will recall the time when the late Mr. Curtin, then Prime Minister, could not get through from Canberra to Perth. He was held up one whole Saturday afternoon because the lines were engaged by the betting shops. We were at war at the time, but what did it matter? Lives were at stake, but what did it matter? Today rehabilitated soldiers cannot get telephones, and yet we read in the paper the other day that Higgins, who was fined, had four telephones in one shop, and we all know he has more than one shop. In Fremantle there is a betting shop with no fewer than eight telephones, and yet telephones cannot be obtained for ordinary business people today.

Mr. Cross: You dreamt that!

Mr. Fox: You have a great imagination!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I can take the hon. member to the shop in question.

Mr. Cross: That is another bedtime story!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Members must have seen in the paper that Higgins had four telephones in one shop. The shop in Fremantle is a bigger one. It has been said that we cannot control betting and that therefore we must legalise it. Men are being imprisoned for offences connected with betting but, if they were sent to prison with hard labour, we would have very few dummies taking the place of the proprietors of the betting shops. It would be wise for the Government to show their sense of responsibility—indeed, their sense of nobility—by withdrawing the Bill. Nobody wants it. No nation should exploit the ignorance of youth and the vices of age—that is what is being done today—and continue to be a great nation. Many speakers have said they want the Bill. They are quite sure it will not affect members of their families. But it will affect others. There is a law of retribution which no man and no Government can evade. Men who think that they can exploit the youth of the community and guard the virtue of their own families, live without the knowledge of the basic law of life, which is, "You reap as you sow. You cannot defy God's law."

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. W. M. Marshall—Murchison—in reply) [11.7]: I wish to apologise to those members who have addressed themselves to the Bill for my absence this evening. I feel that courtesy demands the apology. Unfortunately, I was called away on extremely urgent public business and so was denied the opportunity to be present. I will look up the speeches made by members and avail myself of the opportunity to make some contribution in reply to them during the Committee stage. Having listened to many of the speeches made by members, may I say that were I to endeavour to reply to them I fear that you, Mr. Speaker, would challenge me upon the score of tedious repetition. This is the fourth occasion on which a Bill of this nature has been brought forward for the consideration of Parliament. I introduced the first measure, and since then I have not found anything fresh in the contributions made in opposition to this pro-

posed legislation. This is the fourth occasion, and I still find the repetition tedious. There was one exception, and that was the speech of the member for West Perth. He raised three points which were somewhat refreshing since they differed from the usual arguments advanced by those opposing this measure. He claimed that it was anti-social to wager on horseracing; that to legalise betting premises would create a monopoly; and that side by side with legalised premises in South Australia, illegal betting was rampant or was in evidence.

Whether this sort of thing is anti-social depends upon two things. The first is the personal opinion of the individual, and the second is the failure of many to keep pace with the march of time. How many dozens of things are happening in society today that would have been declared to be anti-social yesterday—things which are now commonplace practices! This idea of wagering on horseracing was said to be anti-social many years ago, and in like manner it would have been contended that the practice of women habitually visiting hotels daily and putting in a great portion of their time indulging in the consumption of alcoholic liquor and smoking cigarettes was anti-social, but those things are done today.

Mr. Abbott: It is anti-social all the same.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Those things exist today.

Mr. Abbott: Unfortunately!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Whether we like it or not, and in spite of those who believe these things to be anti-social, they will take a lot of suppressing.

Mr. Triat: Especially the liquor.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Let us look at it from another point of view. Would it have been accepted within our period that a lady should walk down the highways in men's attire? But that takes place today, and none can deny women the right. What would the member for Subiaco have said if a lady had walked down the highways of the City of Perth in shorts when she was a girl? She would have said it was anti-social; but it is here today and none can deny the right. Whether it is anti-social is a matter of opinion. There are things with which those who cling to the old conventions and the old ideas do not agree, and they accuse people

who indulge in such practices of being anti-social. But the modern idea is different, and the young person's habits will prevail in spite of us. That is what has happened with regard to wagering on horseracing. To say it is anti-social to legalise betting premises is to say that we have a higher social standard than Tasmania where these premises have been legalised for the last 12 years.

Mr. McDonald: So we have!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I venture to say that the people of Tasmania have as high a social standard as we have. The member for West Perth contended that this Bill would create a monopoly and a vested interest. Let me tell him, as one who has visited South Australia and made a keen study of the problem, that it was vested interests that closed the betting shops in Adelaide; and though I have never made a bet in my life, I will wager a cigarette—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister is not allowed to wager here.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Seeing that you will not permit me to wager, Mr. Speaker, I will suggest that within 12 months in South Australia they will have the very same features, the most objectionable features of betting, as exist in Western Australia, New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria, where there is no legislation for off the course betting.

Mr. McDonald: They have had them all along.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Let me ask those people who suggest that this Bill will increase betting: Where has betting been curtailed in any State where premises are not so legalised? Let them name one State where there is restriction on betting at all. Why, it is rampant in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane—even in boys' clubs in Brisbane. Those are the unseemly features we are endeavouring to dissociate from gambling.

Mr. J. Hegney: Have you evidence of that?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. Where is the restriction here? Where is the limit to anybody, to any child of particularly tender age taking part in betting? I am informed by reliable authorities of the very unseemly features which crept into this business in Adelaide before the legal-

isation of betting. Children ran as agents for their mothers to betting shops and to individuals and there was a regiment of pimps, the bookmakers pimping on the police and the police pimping on the bookmakers to the extent of thousands of individuals. Children were sent out on to the street to watch for the police. All the most objectionable features and the very things we desire to eradicate from betting took place, and we are told that as a result of control those are the things that will grow. But those things are here amongst us.

Mr. Abbott: You will not eradicate them by means of this Bill. The Bill will not make any difference. It will only assist betting.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There was a wise man who once said that there are none so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. Triat: Not understood!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I would point out that during my visit to South Australia, when the premises were legalised, one could not see a person exhibiting the slightest indication of over-indulgence in alcoholic liquor in one of those premises; nor could one find any semblance of illegal betting. Commissioner Leane told me that before he would tolerate a return to the old order, he would resign his position. He admitted that his Police Force was corrupt. He took the extraordinary step of calling in all his main officers and asking them to pick 25 of the most reliable men in the Force to stamp out S.P. betting. They called in 25 of the picked men of the Police Force in South Australia and he said that within 12 months he wanted 25 more to watch the first 25 who had been appointed! That was my experience in South Australia, and I think I am entitled to make a statement concerning what I witnessed.

That is in direct contradiction to those who argue that the Bill will not eradicate unseemly features and will not prevent people from betting or men who drink from betting. I shall not be particularly concerned if the member for Roebourne gets his way and females are prevented from betting, but I suggest that they will take a great deal of preventing. I would like to give members an idea of what is happening in New South Wales. I have a cutting from a newspaper. It is headed "S.P. Racket

Cheats the Treasury." I am not interested in the Treasury or the advantages the Treasurer may receive from this Bill, but I am most desirous of controlling betting in order to prevent the features that I feel are objectionable. Whether the Treasurer gets anything or not does not interest me. This newspaper report from New South Wales states—

This is the golden season of the year for the S.P. "bookie." On an average Randwick day more than £1,000,000 in off-the-course betting changes hands in N.S.W. alone. The figures for all Australia every Saturday are fantastic. So you can't even guess what the turnover is during the big Spring carnivals. Turnover runs into millions—and the State Treasuries don't get a penny in tax. If starting-price betting were legalised the State would get its cut, as it does on the course.

I am not interested in the latter aspect, but there is an indication of the volume of money turned over in one day's racing in New South Wales where S.P. betting is not legalised off the course. Do members mean to tell me that there are not young people, and persons under the influence of liquor, betting off the course in Sydney? The final point raised by the member for West Perth dealt with vested interests. He also dealt with betting on the totalisator, and said that it was anti-social to bet, and even went so far as to argue that we should eliminate the bookmaker. But he did not argue that we should eliminate the tote, and I ask him: If it is anti-social to bet with a bookmaker, why is it not anti-social to bet on a tote?

Mr. McDonald: I would eliminate the tote.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Where is the difference? It is still wagering, and it is anti-social.

Mr. McDonald: Eliminate the tote, and I will support you.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As a matter of fact, the argument advanced by the hon. member on this point was an elusive one to the extent that although he suggested we should not legalise premises, because to do so would be anti-social, he went on to argue that we might ultimately eliminate the bookmaker from the course. But the hon. gentleman knows full well that that would never be accomplished. The unjust part of it now, and has been all through, is that vested interests should have the right to operate a gaming-house,

in the way of a racecourse, and no other person in the State is so privileged. But vested interests can run illegal betting, and not a soul complains; not even the member for West Perth. Has the hon. member taken any exception to the Stock Exchange, which again is controlled by vested interests?

Mr. McDonald: It is illegal to gamble on the Stock Exchange.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It does not matter where wagering takes place, or in what form, it is still anti-social. If that applies to wagering on a horserace, it must apply equally to wagering on scrip.

Mr. McDonald: Of course, and I agree.

The Minister for Education: I have not heard of a prosecution, have you?

Mr. McDonald: No.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member put forward the argument that this would establish vested interests. Have not the licensing laws established vested interests and given a monopoly to manufacturers of liquor?

Mr. J. Hegney: And we have no control over them, either.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is about time we tackled them.

Mr. J. Hegney: It will be interesting to know the attitude of some members when that industry is being considered.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I come now to the last point raised by the member for West Perth. When the hon. member makes a contribution to any discussion here, I accept his utterances as being logical and based on sound premises.

Mr. Thorn: Not always.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There are other members, in whose statements I have implicit confidence. I am sadly disappointed when, as on this occasion, there is need to correct them. When the hon. member made the statement that, side by side with registered or legalised premises in South Australia illegal betting was prevalent, I knew from my own experience—having been there for more than a week and watched the position—that such was not the case, so I wired to the Commissioner of Police in South Australia. I will read the telegram I sent and

the reply, and members will realise that the member for West Perth made a statement not founded on reliable premises. I wired as follows:—

During debate in Assembly on Bill designed to legalise betting in Western Australia along the lines of the South Australian Act statement was made that side by side with shops in Adelaide illegal betting was prevalent stop. Would you kindly advise me as to whether this correct or not.

The following is the reply I received:—

Replying to your telegram eleventh instant when betting shops were in operation in Adelaide very little evidence of illegal betting.

During the period I was there, there was none, and it was wrong for any member to say, without reservation, that side by side with the shops operating in South Australia illegal betting was prevalent.

Mr. Thorn: Would you expect the Commissioner of Police to admit that?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Definitely so.

Mr. Thorn: He was in charge—

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If a telegram came from the Eastern States to the Commissioner of Police in Western Australia asking for information about illegal betting in Perth, I would be astounded if incorrect information were supplied.

Mr. Thorn: They were licensed shops and he was supposed to control them.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I know from my own experience, and that of other members who took the opportunity when passing through Adelaide to make a personal observation of how legalised shops were affecting illegal betting, that no illegal betting was going on side by side with the shops. Those are the facts as I found them.

Mr. McDonald: Read last year's report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I will take the opportunity of replying to the contributions made by other members when I have been able to read their remarks in "Hansard."

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

Ayes	21
Noes	22
					—
Majority against			1
					—

AYES.

Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cross
Mr. Fox
Mr. Graham
Mr. Hawke
Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Hoar
Mr. Kelly
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Marshall
Mr. Needham

Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Panton
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Smith
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Triant
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wise
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Abbott
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Collier
Mr. Doney
Mr. J. Hegney
Mr. Hill
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Leslie
Mr. Mann
Mr. McDonald

Mr. McLarty
Mr. North
Mr. Owen
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Read
Mr. Shearn
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Watts
Mr. Willmott
Mr. Withers
Mr. Seward

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Mr. Telfer
Mr. Millington

NOES.
Mr. Brand
Mr. Stubbs

Question thus negated; Bill defeated.

House adjourned at 11.32 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 7th November, 1946.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways—(a) as to "S" class locomotives	
(b) as to improving Perth-Kalgoorlie service	1838
Motion, urgency: Fremantle waterside dispute and wool hold-up	1838
Bills: Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3), 1st.	1843
Milk, reports	1843
Vermin Act Amendment, Com.	1843
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), report	1847
Charitable Collections, 2d. Com. report	1847
Fisheries Act Amendment, Com. report	1847
Land Alienation Restriction Act Continuance, 2d. Com. report	1848
Resolution: War Funds Regulations Act, to approve of proclamations for the transfer of assets, Assembly's message	1847

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

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS.

(a) As to "S" Class Locomotives.

Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Chief Secretary:

1, Will he inform the House for what purpose the "S" class locomotive was designed?

2, For what class of work are such engines now being used?

3, For what reasons were the "S" class locomotives taken off express trains?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

1, Principally for heavy goods trains on severe grades.

2, On goods services.

3, "S" class engines have not been used on express trains such as the Kalgoorlie express, excepting in emergency. They were used for heavy military leave trains during the war.

(b) As to Improving Perth-Kalgoorlie Service.

Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Chief Secretary:

Owing to the introduction of air transport between Perth and the Goldfields, can the Chief Secretary inform the House what the Commissioner of Railways intends to do regarding a better and more up-to-date train service between Perth and Kalgoorlie?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

Prior to and irrespective of the introduction of air transport to the Goldfields, planning has been in force to continually improve the Perth-Kalgoorlie train service.

New all-steel sleeping cars are now being built at the Midland Junction shops and will be equipped with modern amenities. Designs are in hand for new air-conditioned dining and kitchen cars, and quotations have been called for special equipment for same. New passenger locomotives with roller bearings and other improvements will also be built. The time schedule of the Perth-Kalgoorlie express has already been reduced approximately one hour since 1944 by providing additional trains for intermediate traffic, opening additional staff stations, etc. Renovation of existing coaching stock is in hand, but has been delayed by the shortage of floor coverings, lavatory pedestals, basins, etc.

Sheets for 2nd class passengers on the Westland and on Kalgoorlie Express are proposed as soon as material is obtainable.

MOTION—URGENCY.

Fremantle Waterside Dispute and Wool Hold-up.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Loton has informed me that he intends to take advantage of Standing Order 59 in order to move the