

through the Minister that the board can be advised of that fact. The same conditions have prevailed for a period of 12 years without any untoward interference by the Minister; but he should have the power or the authority to intervene if he thinks it desirable. The question is whether or not we shall have ministerial control. I hope the Committee will pass the clause.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It is not a question of ministerial control. What we should have is parliamentary control. If the board does not function as the Government of the day thinks fit, then the Government can bring in a Bill to alter the Act. The clause is farcical.

The Chief Secretary: That is ridiculous.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It is ridiculous. I entirely agree.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I hope the Committee will vote against the clause. I cannot see why the Minister wants this power, as the board will have three members appointed by the Governor. Surely that is sufficient protection.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	8
Noes	..	..	..	14
<hr/>				
Majority against	..	..	..	6

#### AYES.

Hon. G. Bonnetts  
Hon. J. M. Drew  
Hon. G. Fraser  
Hon. F. E. Gibson

Hon. E. H. Gray  
Hon. W. R. Hall  
Hon. W. H. Kitson  
Hon. G. W. Miles  
(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter  
Hon. L. B. Bolton  
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch  
Hon. L. Craig  
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt  
Hon. R. M. Forrest  
Hon. E. H. H. Hall

Hon. J. G. Hislop  
Hon. H. S. W. Parker  
Hon. C. H. Simpson  
Hon. H. Tuckey  
Hon. F. R. Welsh  
Hon. G. B. Wood  
Hon. W. J. Mann  
(Teller.)

Clause thus negatived.

Progress reported.

### BILL—MARKETING OF BARLEY (No. 2).

#### Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amend-

ments Nos. 3, 6 and 7 made by the Council, and had disagreed to Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9.

*House adjourned at 6.19 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Thursday, 31st October, 1946.*

	PAGE
Questions: Railways—(a) as to locomotives imported from England	1681
(b) as to rollingstock awaiting repairs	1682
(c) as to Midland Junction Workshops staff	1682
(d) as to effects of short deliveries of wheat	1682
Oats, as to production and exports	1683
Stock Diseases, as to financing investigations	1683
Bus services, as to overloading on South Perth route	1683
Social Services referendum, as to effect on State's activities	1684
Leave of absence	1684
Bills: Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), 3a.	1684
Land Alienation Restriction Act Continuance, 2a., Com. report	1684
Marketing of Barley (No. 2), Council's amendments	1684
Transfer of Land Act Amendment (No. 2), returned	1689
Factories and Shops Act Amendment (No. 2), 1a	1689
Hairdressers Registration, 2a.	1689
Bookmakers, 2a.	1689

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### RAILWAYS.

(a) *As to Locomotives Imported from England.*

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Railways:

1, Are any difficulties or delays—

(a) mechanical,

(b) industrial,

likely to arise in the assembling of the railway engines recently arrived from England that may prevent or delay their entry into service by Christmas?

2, If so, what are the difficulties?

The MINISTER replied:

1, (a) No. (b) Yes.

2, Industrial difficulty with boilermakers has arisen from a "black" ban imposed by the Metal Trades Council of Trades Unions.

(b) *As to Rollingstock Awaiting Repairs.*

Mr. THORN asked the Minister for Railways:

1, What number of railway rollingstock is at present awaiting repairs—

(a) at Midland Junction Workshops;

(b) elsewhere?

2, What types of rollingstock are involved, and how many?

3, At what rate are repairs proceeding?

4, How long will it take to complete such repairs?

The MINISTER replied:

1, Locomotives—(a) Under repair at shops, 38, waiting repair at shops 24; (b) under repair at depots 16, waiting repair at depots 11. Cars—(a) Under repairs at shops 23, waiting repairs at shops nil; (b) under repairs at depots nil, waiting repairs at depots nil. Wagons—(a) Under repairs at shops 104, waiting repairs at shops 407; (b) under repairs at depots 92, waiting repairs at depots 61.

2, Locomotives—(a) Under repair at shops, 20 goods, 17 passenger, 1 shunting; waiting repair at shops, 15 goods, 8 passenger, 1 shunting; (b) under repair at depots, 3 goods, 12 passenger, 1 shunting; waiting repair at depots, 2 goods, 9 passenger. Cars—There are no cars awaiting repair. Wagons (a) Under repair at shops, 38 bogie, 66 single; waiting repair at shops, 115 bogie, 292 single; (b) under repair at depots, 32 bogie, 60 single; waiting repair at depots, 24 bogie, 37 single.

3, The average rates of output from shops are:—Locomotives, 6 per week; cars, 11 per week; wagons, 57 per week.

4, Locomotives, 10 to 12 weeks; cars, 3 to 4 weeks; wagons, 10 to 12 weeks.

(c) *As to Midland Junction Workshops Staff.*

Mr. THORN asked the Minister for Railways:

1, What increase in staff at Midland Junction Workshops has taken place since the 15th August, 1945?

2, Has the output increased proportionately?

3, If not, what is the deficiency?

The MINISTER replied:—

1, Staff has increased from 1,756 to 2,134.

2, Yes. Output for the two years was—Locomotives, 13 new against 7 new; 262 repaired against 226 repaired. Cars, 10 new against nil; 549 repaired against 520. Wagons, 119 new against 88; 2,835 repaired against 2,592.

(d) *As to Effects of Short Deliveries of Wheat.*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

1, Has he noticed the statement made by the Secretary of the Flour Mill Employers' Union in Tuesday's Press concerning the difficulties being experienced by a number of metropolitan flour mills owing to the short delivery of wheat by the railways and the consequent loss of employment by operatives?

2, Is it a fact that ships loading flour at Fremantle are being delayed owing to the inability of the railways to maintain supplies?

3, Are supplies of bran and pollard to primary producers likely to be affected as a result of the mills working short time?

4, What are the reasons for the present limited delivery of wheat?

5, What steps, if any, are being taken to overcome the position?

6, In view of the demonstrated incapacity of the railways to maintain supplies, will he make immediate arrangements for other forms of transport to undertake the work?

7, What is it anticipated will be the further effect on the situation of the non-working of A.S.G. engines and the ban on overtime?

The MINISTER replied:

1, Yes.

2, The Department's advice is "No."

3, This information is not available to the Railway Department.

4, Scattered locations of the limited quantities of wheat remaining in the country, and shortage of locomotives.

5, Everything possible is being done to meet the present heavy demands for transport. So far as wheat is concerned, this will all be shifted within three weeks. New locomotives and rollingstock are being put in service as quickly as they can be made available.

6, See answers to Nos. 2 and 5.

7, The withdrawal of further engines from service will reduce the present limited engine power available and so adversely affect the Department's ability expeditiously to handle the traffic offering.

### OATS.

#### *As to Production and Exports.*

Mr. TELFER asked the Minister for Agriculture:

1, What was the Western Australian oat production last year—1945-46—other than seed oats?

2, What quantity of oats was sent to the Eastern States?

3, What quantity was exported to other than Australian States?

The PREMIER replied:

1, 4,080,948 bushels of oats, of which approximately 1,250,000 bushels would be used for seed.

2, Approximately 150,000 bushels from the 1945-46 crop.

3, Approximately 300,000 bushels from the 1945-46 crop.

### STOCK DISEASES.

#### *As to Financing Investigations.*

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

1, With further reference to the question of the 22nd October in respect of the need for an experimental farm in the Lower Great Southern districts, will he urgently request the Treasurer (in view of the rapid and alarming extension of sheep breeding troubles in such areas) to make available, as a matter of urgency, sufficient money to enable an extensive investigation of these troubles on the spot to be undertaken even if temporary arrangements for the use of private property for the purpose have to be made?

2, In view of the amount of money that is being collected from the wool industry, through the Commonwealth Government, for research into sheep and wool problems, will he recommend that the Treasurer make urgent representations to the appropriate Federal authority for the provision of adequate funds to assist in the further investigation of this problem on an increasing scale, as well as the investigation of soil

deficiencies, and of the need for the use of minor elements in which it appears large areas of the country may be deficient?

3, If the answer to question (1) is in the affirmative, will he agree to inform the House of the result of these representations at the earliest possible moment?

The PREMIER replied:

1, 2 and 3, Investigations into the infertility in sheep in this State have not been hampered through lack of funds.

Further, owing to the ready co-operation of farmers, such investigations as require facilities in the field are readily available.

Certain funds have been obtained from the Commonwealth Wool Research Trust Fund, and it is not anticipated that funds will be refused if greater demands be submitted.

The possibility of mineral deficiency affecting the incidence of this problem is being investigated thoroughly.

The Government appreciates fully the importance of these investigations, and wherever additional facilities are requested by the Committee of Research Officers, these have been granted.

### BUS SERVICES.

#### *As to Overloading on South Perth Route.*

Mr. CROSS asked the Minister for Railways:

1, Is he aware that many people are suffering considerable inconvenience since the South Perth buses have stopped overloading?

2, If so, what action has he taken or what steps does he propose to take to remedy the position?

3, What progress is being made to secure trolley-buses for the South Perth service?

The MINISTER replied:

1, Yes.

2, Additional buses are not available to augment the service. Crown Law opinion is being sought as to whether Tramway buses are subject to overloading restrictions.

3, Tenders for 50 new trolley-buses to serve South Perth and other routes are under consideration.

**SOCIAL SERVICES REFERENDUM.***As to Effect on State's Activities.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Social Services:

1, Having regard to the "Yes" vote at the recent referendum for social services, what part does the State now play in such matters?

2, Is the Child Welfare Department affected?

The PREMIER replied:

1 and 2, There is no need for apprehension concerning the work which this State will do in the field of social service as this field is so large that there is ample scope for the expansion of the activities of both State and Federal Governments.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE.**

On motion by Mr. Wilson, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Hon. H. Millington (Mt. Hawthorn) on the ground of urgent private business.

**BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT  
(No. 2).**

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

**BILL—LAND ALIENATION RESTRICTION ACT CONTINUANCE.***Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

Mr. WATTS (Katanning) [4.39]: I think there is obvious need for the continuance of this measure, for I do not see that in any substantial way the circumstances have changed since I introduced the parent Bill two or three years ago. It seems to me that it is just as desirable as it was, in the circumstances attendant upon land settlement, and particularly the slow progress that has been made in it up to the present time, that every piece of land which is suitable and which can be made available by the Crown for this purpose should be retained and not made available to other persons not interested in that type of settlement or entitled to it. So there does not seem to me to

be any option but to introduce a Bill such as the Minister for Lands has introduced to continue the measure which was passed on my motion some time ago. At that time, as everyone realised, it might have been desirable to extend the provisions of the Bill a little further than they went, but the difficulties in the way were—I think—realised by everyone in the House as much as by myself and the Minister who dealt with the Bill, and in consequence it was limited to the provisions that exist in that measure. It does not cover, in short, any land other than that which is the property of the Crown or of a Crown instrumentality, and available for settlement, but I think, as I said before, we must agree without hesitation to the continuance of this measure, as suggested in this Bill. I have pleasure, therefore, in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

**BILL—MARKETING OF BARLEY  
(No. 2).***Council's Amendments.*

Schedule of nine amendments made by the Council now considered.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Rodoreda in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 6, Subclause (3)—In paragraph (a), delete the word "two" in line 28 and substitute the word "three."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Legislative Council proposes, in this amendment, that there should be three representatives of the producers elected by the producers, whereas the decision of this Committee was that, although there were to be three producer-representatives, two of them should be elected by the producers and one nominated by the Minister. That point was argued here at some length, and I pointed out that the provisions of the Bill were that the producers would have half the representation on the board and, further, the chair-

man of the board was to be a person completely disinterested in the industry, neither a producer, a buyer, nor a representative of the maltsters or brewers; a person entirely apart from any direct interest in the industry. So, in fact, the producers, in having three representatives on the board, certainly had a majority of interest representation and, as regards numerical strength, had three of the six members. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 6, Subclause (3):—Delete paragraph (b).

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This amendment is really consequential upon amendment No. 1, because the Legislative Council sought not to alter the number on the board, but simply to eliminate the person to be nominated by the Minister as a producer-representative and to make him an elected member. As we have disagreed with the proposal to have three producer-representatives elected, we must disagree with this amendment. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 3. Clause 6, Subclause (3):—In paragraph (e), insert after the word "barley" in line 40, the words "or a person interested in the selling, malting or processing of barley."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I recommend the Committee to accept this amendment, which is in conformity with the idea I had when the Bill was drafted, and with the principle that this Chamber accepted, which was that the chairman should be a person who had no direct interest in the growing, purchasing or processing of barley. This amendment simply makes the position a little clearer in the Bill. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 4. Clause 11, Subclause (2):—Delete the word "two" in line 29, and substitute the word "three."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The reason for this amendment by the Legislative Council was to make provision

for the proper working of the elections if amendment No. 1 had been agreed to, where it proposed that there should be three producer-representatives, all of whom would be elected. This is a machinery clause. Now that we have rejected that amendment and adhered to the proposal for two elected members only, there is no need to provide that these two shall be on the board for three years and that then one of each shall retire each year. The principle behind the Bill was that there would be two elected members, the member getting the lesser number of votes being elected for one year only, in the first instance, and the other member being elected for two years. That would provide for a retirement each year. The Council proposed an election of three members so that it was then necessary to provide a term of three years instead of two years, and to provide machinery for the retirement of one member in each of the three years. As we have decided not to agree to the other amendment there is no need for this one. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 5. Clause 11:—Delete the proviso and substitute the following:—

"Provided that of the first three elective members first elected after the passing of this Act one of them shall hold office for one year only; one for two years and the other for three years. The elective member to retire first shall be that one who received the lowest number of votes at the election. The elective member to retire second shall be the member who received the second lowest number of votes. If there were no ballot or in the event of a tie in the election they shall determine by lot which one of them shall retire first and second."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This amendment would provide the machinery for the retirement of each of the three elected producer-representatives proposed by the Council. For the reasons already given, I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. WATTS: Should not the Minister retain the last few lines of the amendment? I cannot recall any provision in the Bill for

the procedure to be followed in the event of there being a tie or no election.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** If we disagree with this amendment, the proviso in the Bill will stand and, this being so, we shall have the procedure laid down as desired by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Watts: That is so.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 6. Clause 18:—Delete Subclause (1).

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The subclause provides for the Minister to appoint a manager, but I have no objection to the board being empowered to do that. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

If my view is accepted, we shall have to pass a consequential amendment later.

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

No. 7. Clause 18, Subclause (2):—Insert after the word "appoint" in line 30 the words "a manager to be the chief executive officer of the board."

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** This is consequential on amendment No. 6, which we have accepted. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 8. Clause 20, Subclause (2):—Delete the words "any directions" in lines 8 and 9, and substitute the words "the approval."

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** This amendment should be rejected. I have no objection to the actual words but, if they are substituted for the words in the Bill, the Minister would not have sufficient power to deal with some of the situations that might arise. The Bill proposes that, with regard to the issuing of licenses, the board shall be subject to the direction of the Minister. If the Minister, on receipt of representations from a grower, felt that a license ought to be issued, he should be able to request or direct the board to issue it. If we adopt the word "approve," then the board would have to decide whether it would issue a license and, if it did not agree, there would be nothing of which the Minister could approve. Thus the Minister would

not be in a position to rectify what might be an injustice. The Minister, being responsible to Parliament and the people would exercise such power only with the greatest discretion and the fullest justification, and I cannot imagine any Minister directing a board to do something it had previously declined to do unless he was very sure of his ground. If we provide that the license shall be issued only with the approval of the Minister, the board could decline to deal with an application and, as no recommendation would go forward, the Minister would not be in a position to approve or otherwise. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. WATTS: I think the question of direction and approval goes further than the Minister has stated. It may be desirable that the Minister should have the power of direction in regard to the issuing of licenses, but the provision will cover many other transactions the board will have to carry out on behalf of the growers. Behind the amendment, I believe, is a fear that directions could be issued similar to those which have been issued to the Australian Wheat Board regarding the disposal of wheat without statutory authority at prices and upon conditions not conducive to the best returns being obtained by the growers. This leads me to think that some alteration should be made, and I suggest that a suitable amendment could be framed whereby the question of the issuing of licenses and matters of a similar nature should be, as I consider they ought to be, subject to the direction of the Minister; but when it comes to disposal of the product for which the board is specially constituted and whose duty it will be to obtain the best possible return for the growers, we are justified in suggesting that the board should be less subject to the Minister's approval. Those are the distinctions between the two aspects of the proposition. I do not agree with the amendment in full, because it goes too far, as the Minister has explained. At the same time, the other point of view is worthy of consideration, and I trust that some compromise may be reached.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** I agree with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, who said that the amendment referred only to the granting of

licenses. It does not refer to the disposal of barley subsequently or to any other matter. The granting or the refusal of a license is a matter in which the Minister ought to have the last say. If a person applies to the board for a license the Minister could only give his approval; and then, if the board declined to deal with the application in the way in which it should be dealt with, the Minister would be powerless to do anything about it. The Minister is responsible to Parliament and to the people and he certainly would not direct the board to issue a license unless he had very good reasons for doing so. The Minister ought to have that power, and therefore I think the Committee should disagree to the amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 9. Clause 20—Add to Subclause (6) a proviso, as follows:—"Provided that this subsection shall not apply to the sale of barley for stock feed or seed purposes as between one farmer and another within a radius of 15 miles."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The purpose of the amendment is to exempt from the control of the board barley which is grown for stock feed or seed purposes, and which is to be sold to farmers within a radius of 15 miles from the place where it is grown. If the amendment were agreed to, it would leave a loophole which would make it difficult for the board to function efficiently. It is essential that the board should have complete control of all barley and therefore the board should know exactly what is happening to all barley. A person wishing to grow barley for seed purposes can make application to the board, which will grant a permit. The board would then know exactly what is happening to all barley produced. The amendment, if carried, would weaken the Bill. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. WATTS: I was hoping that the Minister would agree to the principle of the amendment. The system of granting permits is exceedingly cumbersome, and there does not seem to me to be anything unreasonable about the amendment. In view of the limitations imposed by the amendment itself, I thought the Minister would give favourable consideration to it. I would not object to his altering the phraseology to make still clearer what the limitations are,

but to reject the amendment altogether seems to me to be an unreasonable approach to the question. I appeal to the Minister to make a generous move in this direction, even if he cannot accept the exact proposal before the Committee. I consider some alteration is necessary.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If I could justify to myself the acceptance of the amendment on the case put up by the Leader of the Opposition I would gladly do so; but unfortunately the amendment would defeat the whole purpose of the Bill. If the amendment were agreed to every farmer in the country could grow barley without a license. All he would have to do would be to say that he proposed to sell the barley to a neighbour living within 15 miles of his farm. The acceptance of the amendment would make the Bill entirely unnecessary.

Mr. WATTS: I said I was not going to press for the acceptance of the phraseology of the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think that another place was seized of the import of the amendment. It believed that it would have the effect of obviating the necessity for certain farmers to apply for a permit. However, as I said, the amendment would weaken the whole framework of the Bill and for that reason I do not think the Committee should accept it.

Mr. PERKINS: I do not think there is the danger in the amendment that the Minister sees. The Bill deals with malting barley rather than with feed barley. I do not think it possible that the amendment could detrimentally affect the Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: What does it mean?

Mr. PERKINS: If by this measure we are seeking to attempt to control the production and sale of feed barley, we are taking on a much bigger job than I thought the Bill was going to deal with. There has been, over the years in Western Australia, some control of malting barley because the maltsters have bought only from the producers to whom they have supplied seed, or from approved growers of malting barley.

The Premier: They have used six-row barley as well.

Mr. PERKINS: Not to any extent.

The Premier: Of course they have!

Mr. PERKINS: As far as I know not much has been used.

The Minister for Agriculture: They have used nearly as much six-row barley as two-row.

Mr. PERKINS: I think it has been mostly exported. The position in regard to feed barley is somewhat different from that of malting barley. In the wheatbelt area where it is difficult to grow a satisfactory sample of malting barley, quite a lot of feed barley is grown. To issue permits to all the people who want to grow barley in the wheatbelt will mean the imposition of a lot of work, although I agree it can be covered by the Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: Would not this amendment remove the necessity for making application for a license?

Mr. PERKINS: Yes, it would.

The Minister for Agriculture: Then the whole thing is gone.

Mr. PERKINS: I do not know whether the amendment is watertight, but the purpose it seeks to achieve is a desirable one. If the Bill is passed without some such amendment as this many wheat farmers will have to apply for permits to grow barley. Such a man might put in 15 or 20 acres of barley with the intention of using it himself, but if he has a surplus he might want to sell it to a neighbour, but it would not be legal for him to do so. What would happen then is that the sale would be made and the Act ignored. We should not pass an Act that is going to be ignored in some circumstances in order to make it work.

Mr. THORN: A clause of this description definitely breaks down the control. No industry can be controlled with a proviso like this leaving open all the loopholes in the world. I am surprised at my colleagues in the Legislative Council agreeing to this proviso because it will permit of all the leakages under the sun in the control of barley. I do not like disagreeing with my colleagues, but I can see a great weakness in the proviso.

Mr. WATTS: I recognise, as I did at the beginning, the validity of part of the Minister's objection. This amendment is

in the wrong place in the Bill, and it should refer to sales by licensed growers, or make some reference to licensed growers. That is why I do not subscribe to the phraseology of the amendment. I appeal to the Minister to find some compromise which would prevent an unlicensed grower from growing large quantities of barley and disposing of it where he likes, but would, at the same time, permit of transactions of the sort mentioned in the amendment to be made by licensed growers without permits. That is the amendment I want, and not the one here, because this is open to some of the objections raised by the Minister. It seems to me to be capable of compromise, and I daresay that the Minister has in mind a compromise on this subject when he deals with the Legislative Council at a later stage. If that be his object, I am prepared to say no more about it now. I would, however, be glad to have an assurance that he is prepared to consider some amendment on the lines I have suggested, namely, one which will confine the extra powers to licensed growers and do away with the necessity of permits in the circumstances mentioned and within the radius referred to in the measure. If we do those two things, I cannot see that the powers of the board or the validity of the proceedings will be in any way impaired. It will simply have the effect of making the position a little easier for the licensed growers who are only concerned with barley for stock food and not with providing marketable barley for the purposes of export or malting. That would remove at once the Minister's principal objection.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:

If, subsequently, an amendment is suggested that will obviate the difficulty of having to apply for permits but which will in no way weaken the power of the board to control barley, I would be quite prepared to accept it, but the present Barley Board is fearful of an amendment of that type. If this amendment were included the control of the board would be so weakened as to make it almost impossible for it to function efficiently and satisfactorily. If a grower wants to sell feed barley to a neighbour he should be enabled to do so with a minimum of difficulty, but if in order to give him that ad-



vantage we are obliged to so weaken the structure of the legislation as to give considerable difficulty to the board controlling the industry, we gain something at too great a cost.

I am afraid it is not possible to give this facility without considerably weakening the control. That has been obvious in other cases and I can by way of illustration refer to legislation in other States to control the marketing of eggs. Under such legislation the number of poultry which a man could have before coming under the provision of the legislation, had to be fixed. The Eastern States authorities believed they could be generous in that way, but they soon discovered that by doing so they created a loophole through which many eggs were being freely marketed, and that so seriously threatened the marketing structure as to make necessary an amendment of the legislation to reduce the number of birds that a person could have without being controlled by the Act. The amendment would exempt from the Barley Board a number of producers who would be able to flout certain provisions. The board must have control of all the barley and then it can say to the growers of some of it, "We will give you a permit to dispose of your barley in this or that way." I cannot give an assurance that I will accept an amendment but, if a satisfactory amendment that will not seriously weaken the Bill is suggested, I would be prepared to agree to it.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the Minister for Agriculture, Mr. McLarty and Mr. Watts drew up reasons for not agreeing to certain of the Council's amendments.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### **BILL—TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).**

Returned from the Council without amendment.

#### **BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).**

Received from the Council and read a first time.

#### **BILL—HAIRDRESSERS REGIS- TRATION.**

*Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR** (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [5.40] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is the outcome of quite a number of conferences and deputations from both the employers—they are known as the Master Gentlemen Hairdressers' Association and the Master Ladies Hairdressers' Association—and the employees engaged in the profession. For quite a long time it has been argued by those in the industry that there is great necessity for some system of registration and the creation of a board to deal with registration matters particularly in regard to hygiene and cleanliness. Since the advent of ladies' hairdressing salons, which apparently have come to stay, the position has become more acute than ever. After due consideration and the conferences and deputations to which I have already referred, it was decided to introduce this legislation. Registration has been in force in Victoria since 1936 and was later introduced in South Australia where, it is considered, beneficial results have accrued to employers and employees alike, and particularly to the public. The last mentioned section is the one about which I am particularly concerned.

It is proposed that the registration provisions shall operate only within a radius of 25 miles from the G.P.O. The question may be asked whether there is any more danger to ladies living within that radius than exists regarding those residing further away. I am not in a position to say whether or not there is but, as this is regarded as experimental legislation, it was considered inadvisable to make it apply through the State, particularly in small centres where only one hairdresser is operating. In the circumstances, its operation will be confined to the radius I have indicated. If members have taken any interest at all in hairdressing establishments they must have been struck, particularly in latter years, by the improvements in hygiene and sanitation. If they would care to see some of the new salons, I understand from the federation that some of the most up-to-date establishments to be found in the Commonwealth are in Perth and are open for inspection by members who, should they visit them, will be shown round

and they will then understand the necessity for cleanliness, hygiene and sanitation.

Mr. Watts: Will they give members a permanent wave?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: If members visit the Technical College they will see quite a number of young pupils engaged in hairdressing operations and they will have an opportunity to secure a haircut for 3d. If they use some political influence, they might be able to get it done for nothing. At any rate, they would see there some of the bright lasses who are being taught the trade.

Mr. Watts: Why not try the member for Murray-Wellington?

Mr. J. Hegney: Have you thought of a Bill to make the hair grow?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I will convey the secret to the hon. member very cheaply. It has become more and more important of late, particularly in view of the apparatus that is now used in the salons, that there should be adequate supervision over the industry. I was astounded myself when looking through some of these establishments to see the equipment there. I could have fancied I was in an up-to-date orthopaedic department of the Royal Perth Hospital. There were all kinds of electrical machinery, apparatus for massaging and many devices to cope with the work. It was apparent to me that without proper tuition and the use of adequate safety appliances, as well as constant supervision, there was a danger to customers. The plant must be looked after properly. To give members an idea of the range of activities covered in this industry, I would quote from the Bill the definition of "hairdressing," or "the practice of hairdressing." That means—

The dressing, curling, waving, cleansing, cutting, shaving, trimming, singeing, bleaching, tinting, colouring or other treatment of the hair or beard of any person or the massage or other similar stimulative treatment of the face, scalp, or neck of any person by any other person, whether with or without the aid of any apparatus, appliance, preparation or substance, for fee, reward, salary, wages or other remuneration or consideration by whomsoever paid or payable.

This takes in a very big section of the head and face, and covers work done in almost any salon today in the metropolitan area. Many of the plants used are electrical. Only

the day before yesterday I met a lady who had gone into a salon to have her hair marcelled. That work is done with hot tongs. Evidently the operator was not as good as she might have been, and the result was that the lady had her hair burned and her scalp burned in three places. I can imagine what a tragedy would occur in the case of the member for Subiaco if she came out of a salon with that lovely hair of hers badly burned with hot tongs.

Mr. Fox: What about your own?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I do not get marcelled, and have not yet reached the age of the hon. member when that will be necessary. It will be noticed from the definition "curling, waving," etc., that a severe burn could occur if the work were not properly carried out. The definition to which I have referred provides for "bleaching, tinting, colouring," etc. I wondered why those three items were included. I hope members will keep this confidential, but I am told that these three items are covered by one word, "dyeing." I understand that no lady would think of saying she was going to get her hair dyed; what she does is to get it tinted and coloured. That is a rather complicated way for women to say they are going to get their hair dyed. I am informed that this is a particularly dangerous operation. A certain number of chemicals are used. Many people are allergic to any one of those chemicals. So sensitive are some people to this tinting that, some 24 hours or so prior to the work being done, they have to go to the salon and some of the chemical is rubbed into the skin behind the ears and left there until the next day. If those persons are allergic to that particular chemical, a rash develops behind the ear. Unless that precaution were taken, it might well be that a person who was having her hair dyed might, as a result of the use of a certain chemical, break out in a rash all over her head. It seems, therefore, that we have been living under a false impression that we can just walk into a salon, have our hair tinted, and walk out again. Those in the trade are beginning to be particularly worried over this matter.

I invite members to go to the Technical College and see the machinery that is used there under proper supervision. They will then get some idea of the danger that wives

are running into every day by perhaps going to one of these places at which there is inefficient supervision exercised. The proposal to register hairdressers is for the protection of the public. It is hoped by those sponsoring such registration to ensure a higher standard of work done, greater safety for customers and better sanitation and hygiene. The Bill has been drafted as a result of a combined meeting of those concerned. From that point of view it is unique. It was agreed to on the motion of the Hairdressers' Association, the Master Ladies Hairdressing Association and the Metropolitan Union of Employees in the industry. It will be noticed in the Bill that whereas the word "master" is used in connection with the Gentlemen's Hairdressers' Association, it is not used in connection with the Ladies Hairdressers' Industrial Union of Employers. As I have said, a combined meeting of those concerned was held and they all agreed unanimously to the necessity for registration. All were seized of the necessity for placing the profession on the highest possible plane, both from the point of view of benefit to the public and for their own good name.

Most of this Bill consists of machinery clauses. The salient feature of it is the provision for the appointment of a board. I know the member for Subiaco does not like boards, but as this one is for her protection I am sure she will agree to the proposal. The board will have no great powers, such as to deal with prices, etc.; in fact, it will have no power. It will comprise a chairman appointed by the Governor and four other persons who will also be appointed by the Governor. Each of the four persons must be one who has had at least three years' experience in the industry, either as a principal or an employee other than an apprentice, in any business in the practice of hairdressing. One of the four shall be appointed by the Master Gentlemen's Hairdressers' Association of W.A. Union of Employers, one shall be appointed by the Metropolitan Ladies Hairdressers' Industrial Union of Employers of W.A., and of the other two, one shall be nominated by the female employees and one by the male employees of the Metropolitan Hairdressers and Wigmakers' Employees Union of Workers.

There will thus be, apart from the chairman, two representatives of the employers

who will be recommended to the Minister for nomination, and two representatives of the employees, one a woman and the other a man. The board will have power, in respect of each prescribed class of hairdressing, to hold examinations and appoint examiners, to decide upon the places where and the dates on, as well as the times at, which such examinations are to be held, to issue or cancel certificates of registration and to suspend the registration of any person under the Act or annul such suspension, to cancel any registration or annul such cancellation, and to take proceedings against offences under the Act or under the regulations, and generally to exercise such other power or perform such other duty as may be prescribed in this legislation.

Mr. Seward: Will those now operating have to be examined?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Any person now employed who has been operating for six months prior to the proclamation of this Bill as an Act will automatically be entitled to registration, and any person who desires to be registered six months after that, may apply for registration entitling him to operate, either as an employer or an employee, within 25 miles of the General Post Office, but only after submitting himself or herself to the necessary examination. Provision is made for the forms of registration and as to how the examinations shall be conducted. There is one important difference about this Bill compared with other Bills that provide for the creation of boards, namely, with respect to the financial side. It is proposed that the registration fee for an employer shall be £2 2s. a year.

When the Bill was first before me—it was a copy of the Victorian legislation—it was proposed that the employee should have to pay a fee of 5s. a year for registration. I was not keen on that type of legislation, which meant that a person would have to pay 5s. a year in order to get a job, or even to hold it. When my objection was made known, I was asked to attend a meeting. Those concerned were so keen about this legislation that a compromise was effected, and it was arranged that the union would be responsible for the payment of 5s. a year as a registration fee for each of its members. That money, together with the £2 2s. paid by the employers, will go to the board.

Mr. Styants: Did the employers want this 5s. paid?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: A special meeting was held and I was asked to agree to the payment of 5s. I refused, and the other compromise to which I have referred was arrived at. I regarded that as a domestic arrangement in which I was not particularly interested. The union was unanimous about the payment of the 5s., and it is making the payment in this way. The remainder of the Bill is practically of a machinery nature. A few days ago a deputation waited on me asking me to introduce this Bill as soon as possible. I also received a letter from the secretary of the Hairdressers Joint Registration Committee, Mr. R. C. Mattiske, as follows:—

It is understood that a deputation from the State Executive of the Australian Labour Party will be waiting on you on Monday next to discuss the proposed legislation regarding registration of hairdressers.

This matter has the strong support of both the Master Ladies Hairdressers' Association and Master Gentlemen Hairdressers' Association as well as the Union of Employees as it is considered urgently necessary for the protection of the public and in the interests of both employers and employees. Similar legislation has been in operation in Victoria since 1936 and has given general satisfaction. A similar measure is now being introduced in New South Wales by the Hon. Premier of that State.

Recently a joint registration committee comprising representatives of the Master Ladies Hairdressers' Association, the Master Gentlemen Hairdressers' Association and the Metropolitan Hairdressers Employees' Union of Workers was formed in an endeavour to assist the introduction of this legislation. The attached draft Bill is the result of several meetings.

This committee would appreciate any action you may be able to take to have this legislation introduced during the present session of Parliament.

I have introduced this Bill at the joint request of the employers and employees in the industry. I do not profess to have any great knowledge of hairdressing, notwithstanding the remarks that came from members on the cross-benches on the Government side of the House about my hair.

Having taken the trouble to visit several of these establishments and seen the apparatus used therein, I have come to the conclusion that they are a great source of danger to many people who are having their hair done by that means. What is more,

as fashions change, particularly for women-folk, so more apparatus is introduced and more chemicals are used for tinting hair, and the time has arrived to protect a lot of people against themselves. The only way to do that is to have legislation of this kind. I understand that in the next few days members will receive an invitation to inspect these places. I would like them to do so and see for themselves what occurs. If they see what I have seen, I think they will come to the conclusion that they are going to do something to protect their wives' hair even if they do not protect their own! I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Abbott, debate adjourned.

## BILL—BOOKMAKERS.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

MR. READ (Victoria Park) [6.2]: With regard to the amendment to this Bill that was proposed and that had for its object the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the effect of starting price book-making and of registering people as book-makers and also the acquiring of other information relative to the matter, I felt that we already knew sufficient of what was taking place in our midst and that the appointment of such a commission would have the result of postponing what must ultimately be faced by this House. Therefore I voted against the amendment. This Bill, if passed, would lower the standard of living of thousands of workers. It should be the desire of all members to raise the standard of living of the people and to better their conditions, but I contend that this measure would be detrimental to existing standards and conditions, especially of those people who are on the lower rung. At present people are throwing money away on betting, with little or no chance of recovering any return over any given period.

To legalise this form of street betting or betting in the midst of business activities would be to enlarge its scope. I feel that there are many hundreds or thousands of law-abiding citizens who at present would not care to commit an illegal act by patronising a bookmaker's betting shop. But if

the stigma were removed through our legalising these places, those people, realising that they were entitled to indulge in betting, would do so and by that means many more would be so engaged than is the case at present. S.P. betting provides the lowest return to investors. It is always considered that there is a 10 to one chance against anybody ever drawing anything out of the S.P. bookmaker's shop. I have interviewed several bookmakers who have been running S.P. shops and they have told me that only once in every 10 Saturday afternoons do they lose. The rest are winning days, and that shows just what chance people have of reaping any reward from S.P. betting.

Mr. Fox: Did you ever see a bookmaker who won and would tell you so?

Mr. Thorn: Do not take any notice of red herrings!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria Park will proceed.

Mr. READ: An owner who backs the winning horse gets some of his money at 10 to one, some at eight to one, and some at six to one. Eventually it finishes at the starting price of two to one. That man possibly averages six or eight to one for his money if he should happen to win. But the man who backs the horse with the S.P. bookmaker gets only two to one. I think that an indication of how impossible it is for those people who patronise the S.P. shops to win is to be found in the type of house that S.P. bookmakers occupy and the property they have accumulated over a few short years. I know of one man who in 10 years has come to own three houses, each as large as that possessed by any member here. In addition, he owns six shops which are being let at a decent rental. Those properties have been bought out of the earnings of the workers on the lowest rung, on the basic wage.

The money that goes into the bookmakers' shops does not consist of large sums. The man who backs a horse to any considerable extent does so on the racecourse. It is from the small 2s. 6d. or 5s. bet that the bookmaker accumulates his money. These men are really parasites on the community. The member for East Perth told us that there was a law for the rich and a law for the poor. That is not so. There is a common law for all of us, but the trouble lies in the way some of our laws are administered, or

not administered. That is where the evil is. I want to stress to that hon. member and to other members who would speak in the same terms that the incidence of betting on the poor man is quite different from that on the wealthy or rich man. If the rich man is fool enough to throw his money away in that fashion, his action has no effect on his standard of living. He does not need to go short of anything. He lives at the same standard as that at which he previously lived.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And puts the bookmaker on the same standard.

Mr. READ: I do not know about putting the bookmaker on the same standard. The bookmaker possibly excels him in wealth because he has not only the poor man's money but the rich man's as well. Let us assume that the basic wage is £5 a week. A man receiving that wage has a modest bet of 2s. 6d. each way on two races. That is not a very extravagant bet for a man who is a sport, but it means the expenditure of 10s. a week. Suppose he has to pay £1 a week for rent. That is not a very large sum in these days when most of these people are buying houses. To the 10s. which the man loses on the races, we must add about 10s. for beer or tobacco and travelling expenses to and from his place of business. That leaves him about £3 a week to feed his wife and child and himself. The expenditure of that 10s. on betting lowers that man's standard of living and that of his family for every week in which he indulges in betting. I doubt whether a man would win a bet once in 10 times and if he had a few more bets, the winnings would soon be wiped out.

Mr. Fox: The only thing to do is to raise wages.

Mr. READ: No, it is better to reduce taxation. What is the use of raising the basic wage when the cost of everything follows the upward trend?

The Minister for Lands: It does not follow but goes ahead!

Mr. READ: The prices of food and household articles are already high enough but to waste 10s. in betting is to add 1s. per article to 10 articles. I am trying to stress not the ethical but the economic aspect of betting. We have just been told by the Minister for Labour that it is necessary to protect a lot of people against themselves.

I agree with him. That is exactly what we have to do in this instance. Whether we represent one political party or another or none at all, I feel that we are elected by the people as men capable of fostering a high moral and social standard of living for our electors; but I consider that this Bill tends to lower standards. Another point is that the starting price betting shops are always situated near a hotel. I know of many of these places but not one is far away from a hotel. The result is that while waiting for the next race a man has a drink, which further depletes his week's salary and induces him to spend more money. There is something else of which possibly some members do not know and that is the presence of the visiting bookmaker. I know of two districts where men go around on pay-day and induce employees to put a few shillings on a horse. They take betting guides and appear at the source of revenue. They tempt the employees and obtain bets from them.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. READ: Before tea, I mentioned the fact that there are starting price bookmakers visiting the shops, places of business and factories for the purpose of collecting at the source the money for bets. The day before yesterday, I was speaking to a lad, 17 years of age, who is a messenger and receives in the vicinity of 30s. a week. I said to him, "You have just been talking to a bookmaker." He said, "Yes, I have just put 10s. each way on a horse." I said, "How can you afford that?" He said, "I might win." The social evil is that this boy, as a result, will work for a week for 10s. In several districts in Cannington and Victoria Park, starting-price bookmakers ceased to function in the war years, but they still own the premises that they used. These shops have been cleaned and renovated and, in some instances, the owners have given notice to the present tenants, who are carrying on legitimate businesses, to move out in anticipation of our passing the Bill and their being licensed to carry on their previous occupation.

Many years ago, the Saturday closing at 1 p.m. was in vogue and the pay was distributed at the same time. The social effect that betting had on employees of private concerns and Government departments was

one of the reasons for causing the pay to be distributed on Friday. That allowed the people to take their wages home. I think that the betting shops and bookmakers have been licensed for about eight years in South Australia, and we should, as a result of the experience in that State, beware of that system. It was found there that when betting was licensed it increased almost 100 per cent., because the control of bookmakers and book-making premises is no easier when licensed than when unlicensed. I do not see that there is anything to be gained by licensing the premises. Gambling cannot be stopped by legislation and it is morally and economically wrong to legalise it. The Government of South Australia appointed a Royal Commission, and another was appointed by the Queensland Government in 1938, and it came to this conclusion—

We are of opinion that the betting shop is a corrupting and destroying influence; that it has nothing to recommend it, ethically, socially or economically.

I was glad to hear the Minister, who introduced the Bill, tell us that it was not a party measure, because I am sure that no political party would compel its members to vote against their principles on a Bill of this kind. However we vote we may be sure of offending one section or another of the community. Some who are interested in the profits to be made out of this business might require us to vote in favour of it, while others would ask us to vote against it. I expect that starting-price bookmakers have put pressure on some members to vote in the direction they desire.

Mr. Smith: You are wrong there, because they are against the Bill.

Mr. Fox: You speak for yourself!

Mr. READ: I am speaking for myself, and for my district. There are some bookmakers who have contributed largely to the election expenses of some members.

Mr. Needham: Which members?

Mr. READ: I name none.

Mr. Needham: Have you any proof?

Mr. Thorn: Take no notice; when they bite, there must be something in it!

Mr. Needham interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Perth to keep order. The member for Victoria Park will continue.

Mr. READ: Some attention should be paid to betting on the course. If horse-racing is a sport in the same manner as is football or cricket, it should be available to all classes, no matter where they come from or what they are. Some controlling legislation will have to be passed in order to see that the lower type or class of citizen may enjoy the sport, the same as anyone else.

Mr. W. Hegney: What do you mean by the "lower type" of citizen?

Mr. READ: I will withdraw that.

Mr. Fox: That is an unfortunate phrase.

Mr. READ: I would say, the type on the lowest rung of fortune's ladder.

Mr. Fox: The type that has to do the graft to keep you fellows where you are!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. READ: When we know that the racing clubs have been able to amass so much money that they have purchased the courses and grounds owned by other clubs, we can suggest that the sport should be liberalised by charging an admission fee within the reach of everyone. I am not advocating betting on the course any more than off the course, but I do say that with a cheap admission fee and a 2s. 6d. tote, a man would be able to go to a racecourse and enjoy the sport in the same way that he would go a few times a year to the Show, a gymkhana or any other place of amusement within the scope of his pocket.

Mr. Needham: You are trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds.

Mr. READ: I am sorry that I have upset the member for Perth, as I have a great liking for him, and friendship towards him, but I must voice my opinions here, whether they impinge on his susceptibilities or not.

Mr. Thorn: I think he regrets he supported the Bill, now.

Mr. READ: During his speech he said that licensing of bookmakers would be of advantage to the community, but I think it would be a disadvantage. Many of those who bet with starting-price bookmakers on Saturday afternoons do so not for the sport of the game, for love of racehorses, or the interest they take in racing.

Mr. Fox: Do you know of anybody who bets for the sport of the game?

Mr. READ: They bet solely for the gain to be derived from it, if any. As an illustration, though the basic wage is comparatively high, so is the cost of living, and many thousands of men have no chance of getting any overtime or of earning any extra money. Unlike those of us who perhaps have some other source from which to draw a few extra pounds, when necessary, such men only have the basic wage, and if anything is taken from that sum it must be to the detriment of the family, whose budget is based on it. If they require extra money, as in the case of a worker, who may have an old car that he services for himself, but which requires a spare part costing a few pounds, or if it is necessary to buy some article for the home, they must take it out of their weekly wages. Such a man is tempted to try to get the extra money by betting, and in nine cases out of ten he loses.

Mr. Rodoreda: They can bet now, and they do.

Mr. READ: I will deal with that in a moment. I know the evil effect of betting on the family budget, and I know what has taken place in my district over a period of years. If a husband loses 10s. or £1 through betting on a Saturday, he is not happy about having to hand over less money than usual to his wife, and his wife is not happy at being short of the money necessary for the home. She is worried all that week. In some instances the wives come to me and say, "I cannot pay the few shillings that I owe you. My husband had a bad day at the races. He backed a horse or two, and they did not win." They are decent family women. That type of workman's wife does not like having to say that sort of thing.

Mr. Smith: You should not give credit.

Mr. READ: Would the hon. member expect a child to fade away because nobody would give credit, if it wanted medicine urgently?

Mr. Holman: If we had nationalisation, it would not be necessary.

Mr. READ: There are on the notice paper amendments from both sides of the House, showing clearly that members realise that this is a nasty Bill, because

all the amendments would curtail the activities—

The Premier: Have you looked at the Comprehensive Water Supply Bill on the notice paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. READ: The effect of these amendments would be to restrain and restrict the conditions and, for fear that we may pass the measure, I am prepared to vote for them. I have received 19 letters from people and organisations asking for my assistance, or requesting that I vote against this Bill. Some of them are in the form of petitions signed by a number of people. I have only one letter, which is from a friend, asking me to see that he gets a license when we begin to license betting shops. I will read a letter which gets at the matter from my point of view—

We are more than interested in the Bill before the House that proposes to legislate for starting-price betting. We do not believe that the passing of such legislation will offer any solution to this vexed question, but rather, it will considerably aggravate it. We feel that all has not been done to enforce the present law and we are sure that if this were done betting would unquestionably be reduced. Furthermore, if this legislation is passed it will only be for the benefit of the bookmaker and we do not feel that his position should be made more secure. By opposing the proposed legislation on betting we are sure you will be in accord with the majority of citizens in this electorate.

That letter is from the local controlling committee of a nation-wide youth movement.

Mr. Needham: Who signed it?

Mr. READ: I am not here to answer any question by the member for Perth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. READ: The first section of the letter states—

We are sure that the passing of such legislation will not offer a solution to this vexed question.

That is correct. If we legalise bookmakers, we shall be no better off than we are at present. What should be done is to enforce the laws now on the statute-book or, if they are defective, amend them in such a way that they can be enforced. Going back to the time of the Collier Government, I recall that there were three bookmakers in my large

electorate and I know of 14 in that district today. I know also that the number could have been kept down if the department responsible, whichever department it might be, had administered the law. In those days I had on many occasions to go to the police station to accept bail from persons who had been apprehended. To them the sergeant of police would say, "I am going to stop this sort of thing. If you go back after finding this bail and start bookmaking again this afternoon, you will be taken in charge once more, and you will be taken in charge on every Saturday afternoon you stand on that footpath and bet and will be brought in here." The men to whom the sergeant thus spoke did not offend again. The bookmaker does not bet simply with the idea of breaking the law. He is there to make money, and if the powers that be made it unprofitable for him to operate, he would soon change to some line that would return him a profit. It is all a matter of control.

The writers of the letter I have quoted are not extremists; there is nothing extreme about them. In the second section of their letter, they say—

We are sure that if the law was administered, betting would unquestionably be reduced.

These people do not say that betting can be eliminated. We cannot abolish betting while the human race is constituted as it is, but we can keep betting under control. The third part of the letter states—

The legislation will only be of benefit to the bookmaker.

Possibly we shall hear from supporters of the Bill that the bookmaker is doing a roaring trade and that the Government by imposing fines upon him will be able to obtain some revenue from the betting habits of the people. Probably they will also say that it is better to get the money from the bookmaker than to allow him to continue as at present. We shall get neither revenue nor taxes from the bookmaker because all the money comes out of the pockets of the working men: it is money they have given to the bookmaker. Therefore, on people already highly taxed, we shall be imposing a further tax.

I feel sure that the Minister for Mines who introduced the Bill has never had to exist on the basic wage or, if he has, it is so long ago that he has forgotten the struggle he had in order to make ends meet. In bring-



ing this Bill forward, he has forgotten the hundreds and thousands of housewives who have to try to make ends meet and to keep the homes going on a smaller amount than they should be receiving. I am not attacking this question on moral grounds. Whether it is right or wrong or illegal to bet, I will leave to others to argue. What I am concerned about is the social effect if betting is legalised. The passing of this measure would have a detrimental effect on the home life of the people, particularly of the women who have to manage the affairs of the home, and I should be lacking in a sense of what I consider to be my duty and responsibility if I did not voice my opposition to this measure. I shall vote against the second reading.

**Mr. STYANTS** (Kalgoorlie) [7.56]: I propose to support this measure, not that I would advise anyone to indulge in betting on horseracing or in gambling of any kind, whether it happened to be on the racecourse or in licensed or unlicensed shops. People of course are very foolish to indulge in any form of gambling or betting, because the odds are so greatly against them. The very fact that so many parasites exist upon the results of betting indicates that, unless one is a bookmaker, it is extremely unprofitable to indulge in betting.

If I held views similar to those of the member for Victoria Park, I should certainly vote against the Bill, but I cannot believe that there is the evil which he says exists or that greater evils will follow if betting shops are legalised. The accounts of the evils arising from betting, I believe, are greatly exaggerated, and I propose to read some of authentic figures from the report of the Betting Control Board in South Australia to show that there are very few, if any, people who jeopardise the welfare or happiness of their homes or the financial status of themselves or their families by betting on horseracing, whether in shops or on the racecourse.

First I should like to deal with some of the provisions of the Bill and, if it reaches the Committee stage, I hope a considerable number of amendments will be made. I think there should be a quota of licensed premises for each district. The Bill proposes to give the board discretion to determine how many shops shall be licensed, but I believe this matter should be provided for

in the measure and not left to the discretion of the board. I should like to know how the area that is to be permitted for a betting certificate is to be defined. The Bill provides that a betting certificate shall operate in a defined area. How will it be defined? Will it be somewhat on the lines of the zoning system adopted by the bakers about which the housewives are complaining? Is it to be stipulated that a person licensed in a particular street may operate only within a given area and that anybody coming from an area outside will not be permitted to bet at that shop? Certainly it will be very difficult to define the area in which a shop shall be permitted to operate.

Despite some of the exaggeration that has been indulged in here, I find that the number of shops licensed at the zenith of betting in South Australia was 325. I have heard figures quoted which were double that amount. According to the Commonwealth Year Book, the population of South Australia in 1937 was 591,201. South Australia had 325 betting shops, equivalent to one shop for every 1,800 of the population. Then, of course, we must take into consideration the fact that the Bill provides that no person under the age of 18 years shall be permitted on betting premises or allowed to bet. If we accept the Commonwealth Statistician's figure of 40 per cent. of the population as being under the age of 18 years, then we reduce the number to 1,080; and if that be reduced by 50 per cent. to allow for people who do not indulge in betting on horse races at all, we have an average of 590 or 580 of the population who would be likely to bet.

Western Australia's population in 1937 was 457,000. Taking the South Australian basis, that would permit of our having 250 betting shops. I think it vital for us to ensure that too many shops are not licensed. A board not particularly strict in this respect would be likely to license more shops than are actually required, that is, if any are required at all. I would prefer to see a stipulation in the Bill that there shall be only one licensed premises for so many head of the population. I entirely agree with the Leader of the Opposition in his statement that no person should be granted a license under this Bill who is in any way connected with premises licensed under the Licensing Act. I would go further and say that no person who is licensed under our Licensing Act to sell spirituous liquors, nor

anyone employed in any capacity by him, should be licensed under this measure. If a provision of that kind is not inserted in the Bill, I can visualise the licensee of a hotel having his yardman licensed and conducting betting on his licensed premises. I am not sure, but I think our Licensing Act prohibits bookmaking or betting on licensed premises. I would go even further.

If it were possible, I would provide that no licensed betting shop should be within a given distance of premises licensed under the Licensing Act. One point that particularly concerns me is that almost every hotel in the metropolitan area has a S.P. bookmaker attached to it. Although we have heard much of the grievous results of betting on horseracing, we have heard very little of the associated evil of drinking to excess. I believe that drinking to excess jeopardises the happiness and welfare of more homes than does betting on horseracing. If it is at all possible, I would very much like—although I realise it would be particularly difficult—to have a provision of that kind applied to my own electorate. It would be very difficult to apply it in the central part of the town, particularly if the stipulation were that betting premises should be situated more than four chains away from premises licensed for the sale of liquor. If such a provision did apply, there would be no betting shops in the centre of the town and consequently we would find them in the suburbs and we would have the prevailing evil of illegal betting there. However, I think some effort should be made to curb the two evils, because undoubtedly they are evils when indulged in to excess.

The Bill also provides that betting shops shall only be permitted to remain open on days on which racing is being held in this State, or on such other days as the board may decide. One of the chief virtues of the Bill influencing me in its favour is that it will create a greater respect for the law and do away with the breaking of the law. It is for that reason that I think betting shops should be licensed to remain open each day of the week; because, undoubtedly, betting would otherwise be carried on under the lap. The shops should be allowed to remain open from Monday till Saturday during given hours. This matter should not be left to the discretion of the board. We must bear in mind that on most days, taking the

State from Wyndham to Esperance, there would be a race meeting at some place or other.

I consider the method which is proposed in the Bill of paying a proportion of the commission on stakes is wrong. I believe the commission should be based on the South Australian legislation; that is, the commission should be paid on the amount of money that is invested. After all, we are to get our revenue from a turnover tax on bookmakers; and as the money is derived from the bookmakers on the amount wagered, that should be the basis upon which each club should get its proportion of the commission. We must also bear in mind that one club may be subsidised by the parent body, the W.A. Turf Club. Under the provisions of the Bill, that club would get a greater amount of the turnover tax because it was subsidised by the W.A. Turf Club. Another club not so subsidised would get a lower amount. The fairer method is that which operates in South Australia; the clubs should get their share of the money available from the betting rather than on the basis of the amount of stakes which the club pays.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that some appeal should be allowed against the decision to license and open a betting shop in a certain locality. I can well imagine the feelings of a person living in a respectable locality, with probably a family of young children or possibly a number of sons and daughters of adolescent age, if a betting shop were licensed next door to his house. I entirely agree with the Leader of the Opposition that some provision should be made for a protest to be lodged against the granting of a license in any particular area. The South Australian Act provides that a betting shop shall not be open within ten miles of where a race meeting is being held. That would be difficult to enforce in the metropolitan area, but I think it is a desirable provision for the country clubs; and there was an honourable understanding—if I can use the term, in the absence of a better one—between racing clubs on the Goldfields and the S.P. bookmakers, before they were interfered with in the last 12 months, that they would not have betting shops open when a race meeting was being held at Kalgoorlie or Boulder.

In all sincerity I say I think that if we were 100 per cent. genuine in our en-

deavour to do away with S.P. bookmaking we would start on the cause rather than the effect of betting, and the cause is that we permit horseracing to be indulged in. If there were no horseracing, there would be no S.P. bookmakers. Betting has been abolished on foot-running and bike-racing—sports that did have something to recommend them in that they brought the youth of the community to a condition of physical fitness. Betting on those sports is illegal, but with horseracing it is quite a different proposition. As the member for Perth said the other night, it appears to be a virtue in the minds of many to bet on a race-course, but it is a sin and a crime to bet on the results of a horserace unless the wager happens to be made on the particular racing premises. The old excuse for horseracing has gone by the board. At one time it was said quite correctly that horseracing bred a good type of animal that was of use to the community. Such animals were used for military units in the defence of the country, but that has all gone by the board; because, with the exception of a few light draught horses, heavier than the racing type, the Army does not use any horseflesh for defence purposes.

Mr. Mann: A racehorse would not make a decent remount.

Mr. STYANTS: No. The present type of racehorse, once it gets away from intensive training, is not considered fit to run in a butcher's or a baker's cart. Sometimes when I have had a bet on such horses, I have felt that they should be relegated to butchers' or bakers' carts, after I have witnessed their performance!

Mr. J. Hegney: Some of them are used for feeding cats and dogs these days.

Mr. STYANTS: The value of horseracing as an industry has gone and those people of whom it is said that they race because of the love of horseflesh or simply as a pastime are entire myths. They do not exist. Every man that goes to the yearling sales and pays a fabulous price—up to £4,000 or £5,000—for a foal 12 months or two years old, as the case may be, does not do so because of a love of horseflesh but in the hope that it will provide a suitable avenue for him to gamble and recoup, with profit, the amount of his outlay. It is said that horseracing provides employment. Of course

it does provide a certain amount of employment, but so would a score of other gambling devices one could mention.

Mr. J. Hegney: It does provide employment for primary producers.

Mr. STYANTS: Yes, it would provide quite a lot of employment, but I could mention quite a number of other means of gambling that would also provide employment. The argument about the money that is raised for charity from trotting and racing events is fallacious. I appreciate that great sums were contributed to charitable organisations in this way during the war, but I think that if every factor were taken into consideration, it would be found it was the most expensive method of raising funds ever used in this country.

A provision in the Bill to which I think some exception may well be taken is that which provides that only one betting premises can be used by the same person in any city or town without the consent of the board. I hope we are not going to establish the position of allowing one proprietor to open what might be known as a chain of betting shops throughout the State. The Bill as it stands provides that not more than one premises in any city or town shall be permitted to one person without the permission of the board. I think the words "without the permission of the board" should be struck out, and we should say definitely that one proprietor shall not own more than one betting shop in the State. I hope we shall never see the position created in which a wealthy and influential person can have registered betting shops in Perth, Fremantle, Midland Junction, Northam, Kalgoorlie, Bunbury, Bridgetown, and all over the place. I think provision should be made to ensure that that is not possible.

We have also to take into consideration the goodwill that will probably accrue to these premises when it is known that only a certain number can be licensed in a given locality. While it may be difficult to prevent it, I hope we are not going to permit the position to arise where the goodwill of licensed premises will have a value something like that of a newspaper round or a milk round or an hotel. I do not think it should be mandatory upon the board to grant any application for a transfer of a license. That would be entirely wrong. I would not like to see any guarantee given

that, once a shop has been licensed and it changes hands, there is an obligation of any kind that the license shall be granted to the person who takes over the premises.

Mr. J. Hegney: You mean, the goodwill should rest with the board.

Mr. STYANTS: Yes. I think there should be no obligation on the board to pass over a license to a person in the event of the premises changing hands. I read with interest in "The West Australian" about a fortnight ago a statement by Mr. Winterbottom, chairman of the W.A. Turf Club, who said—

Owners of thoroughbreds either bred locally or in the Eastern States would not be keen if meetings were made possible mainly by an outside subsidy—one provided by betting shop proceeds.

That may be his opinion, and he may be right. But my opinion is that the average person who races horses, provided he can get good stakes, does not care whether the money comes from betting shops, or from the proceeds of betting on the totalisator, or from the bookmaker with whom he bets on the course, or from the gate money paid by the people going on to the course. It makes not one iota of difference, provided he has lucrative stakes for which to race his horses. Mr. Winterbottom went on to say—

It is to be sincerely hoped that shops will not be licensed and bring about a state of affairs where people, instead of supporting their amateur club and going to race meetings will be enticed into betting shops. This would have a disastrous effect on racing in every way.

So it would appear that it is not the morals or the wellbeing of the people or the welfare of the home, as mentioned by the member for Victoria Park, that worries Mr. Winterbottom, as chairman of the Turf Club, but the effect that licensing would have on the racing industry. I desire to quote some figures from the report of the Betting Control Board of South Australia. These are authentic figures from the latest report that it was possible for me, a fortnight ago, to get from South Australia. I want to show, firstly, that, contrary to the generally expressed opinion here, when the shops closed in South Australia betting increased considerably. It is true that when betting shops were first licensed in that State, in 1933, the volume of known business increased enormously, but it was well known that there was a tremendous volume of illegal betting

taking place. I want to show, secondly, how foolish it is for the average punter to bet at all. I will indicate the amount he loses to the bookmaker, and the amount extracted from his investments on the totalisator for the racing clubs and for the Government by way of tax. I also want to show that the licensing of betting shops in South Australia did not have a detrimental effect on racing because of the enormous revenue which was received as a result of the turnover tax. I have here the 1945 report of the Betting Board which is not very voluminous. I propose to read the following extracts:—

We have the honour to submit our report for the year ended 30th June, 1945.

In 1937-38 bookmakers' turnover reached £7,740,013—the highest recorded figure until 1944-45. In 1937-38 there were in South Australia 140 race meetings, 64 trotting meetings, and 321 betting premises.

In an effort to reduce the volume of betting the Lottery and Gaming Act was amended in 1938.

The main amendments were the imposition of a tax on winning bets, and the curtailment of information to be made available in metropolitan betting premises.

From 1st March, 1942, until 30th October, 1943, generally known as the period of the ban, no race meetings or trotting meetings were held in South Australia, and all betting was prohibited. The year 1944-45, therefore, was the first year since 1940-41, throughout the whole of which, racing, trotting and betting were carried on.

In 1940-41, 119 race meetings and 83 trotting meetings were held in South Australia, and 310 betting premises operated.

In 1944-45 there were 57 race meetings and 64 trotting meetings, but no betting premises.

It is of interest to examine the figures since 1937-38, and to see what effect the different conditions had on betting, or at any rate how betting varied under the different conditions.

In spite of the much diminished facilities in 1944-45—both as regards the places where, and the events on which, bets might be laid—bookmakers' turnover was higher than ever before. It reached almost £9,000,000—15.78 per cent. greater than in 1937-38, and 35 per cent. higher than in 1940-41, which was the last complete year.

Mr. Read: Did that include betting on racecourses?

Mr. STYANTS: Yes, and at trotting meetings and coursing meetings.

Mr. McDonald: It was £30,000,000 last year.

Mr. STYANTS: It is to be remembered that the amount of £9,000,000 is the bookmakers' turnover. In addition, there are the totalisator figures which I will mention later. The report continues—

A comparison of bookmakers' turnover per race meeting (including interstate races) is even more arresting. In 1944-45 it was 181.7 per cent. higher than in 1937-38, 197.5 per cent. higher than in 1940-41, and 43.6 per cent. higher than in 1943-44. This increase in turnover on race meetings was in spite of the competition of concurrent trotting meetings, caused by the prohibition of trotting by electric light.

Totalisator figures for metropolitan race meetings increased by 545.39 per cent. over 1940-41, and 49.63 per cent. over 1943-44.

After the shops were given a trial for some seven or eight years they were closed in the metropolitan area, but I want to make it clear that there are still licensed betting shops in South Australia but they are not in the metropolitan area. There is still a board controlling the licensing of betting shops in the country districts of that State.

Mr. McDonald: The authorities there have ceased to license for the country districts.

Mr. STYANTS: A few months ago, when I was in Adelaide, that was not the case because the board had just then authorised the opening of five shops in Whyalla.

Mr. McDonald: They have ceased just recently.

Mr. STYANTS: Even after the betting shops had closed there was, apparently, an enormous increase in the amount of betting that took place because it was done on racecourses, trotting courses and at greyhound race meetings. The following figures which show the bookmakers' turnover are particularly illuminating:—

Bookmakers' Turnover.  
Aggregate Turnover on all Meetings.

	£
1937-38 .. .. .	7,740,913
1938-39 .. .. .	7,639,707
1939-40 .. .. .	7,180,501
1940-41 .. .. .	6,639,093
1944-45 .. .. .	8,962,430

I have skipped from 1940-41 to 1944-45 because that is the next complete racing year. The next lot of figures deal with the bookmakers' turnover on all race meetings, including premises:—

	£
1937-38 .. .. .	51,952
1938-39 .. .. .	52,472
1939-40 .. .. .	50,418
1940-41 .. .. .	49,791
1944-45 .. .. .	146,353

The total number of bets laid on all meetings, including premises, are as follows:—

1938-39 .. .. .	35,950,103
1939-40 .. .. .	34,947,187
1940-41 .. .. .	27,186,042
1944-45 .. .. .	8,833,515

The alarming manner by which the average amount of each bet on all meetings jumped is interesting as will be seen from the following figures:—

	£	s.	d.
1938-39 .. .. .	4	3	
1939-40 .. .. .	4	1	
1940-41 .. .. .	4	11	
1944-45 .. .. .	1	0	3

Mr. Read: The last amount represents Service money.

Mr. STYANTS: I do not know. I do not think the Service men had that much money to throw about. We must look for some other reason for the jump of 500 per cent. It is also interesting to know the number of race meetings, and the following figures show how many were held each year:—

1937-38 .. .. .	140
1938-39 .. .. .	135
1939-40 .. .. .	132
1940-41 .. .. .	119
1944-45 .. .. .	57

Despite the fact that there were only 57 race meetings in 1944-45, compared with 140 in 1937-38 the bookmakers' turnover reached the all-time high of £8,962,430. The number of trotting meetings did not decrease to the same extent, being 64 in 1937-38 and 64 in 1944-45. The coursing meetings remained practically the same also. The number of premises registered was as follows:—

1937-38 .. .. .	321
1938-39 .. .. .	313
1939-40 .. .. .	315
1940-41 .. .. .	310

The year 1940-41 was the last in which there were licensed premises in the metropolitan area.

The aggregate tote figures also show an alarming increase of over 500 per cent. For 1937-38 the figure was £615,000 odd; for 1938-39 the figure was £624,000; for 1939-40, £563,000; for 1940-41, £621,000; and for the eight months of racing in the year 1943-44, after the shops had been closed, the figure was £1,010,746, an in-

crease of 545 per cent. on the 1940-41 figures. The report says—

The board believes that it was generally agreed that in 1940-41 the amount of unlawful betting was negligible. It is now persistently alleged that black-market betting is prevalent. If this is true, the increased betting is only partially revealed.

The volume of betting by bookmakers and the totalisator for 1944-45 totalled nearly £11,000,000. Seeing that this betting, with the exception of but one-tenth of 1 per cent., was confined to the metropolitan area in which roughly one-half the population of the State resides, the board cannot refrain from asking whether it is reasonable to believe that the other half of the State's population abstained from betting, or whether indeed a very considerable amount of illegal betting took place. The member for Victoria Park actually believes, and would lead members to believe, that men lose all their wages, or a great proportion of their wages, in betting on horseraces. The figures in the appendices of the report are interesting and will indicate the amount of money that the punter loses; the percentage of money lost on the amount invested. Part I is a summary of figures relating to bookmakers' operations on meetings held during the 12 months ended on the 30th June, 1945. The figures are as follows: On the course, grandstand, £4,419,091 17s. On the Derby, which is the equivalent of our leger enclosure, £1,467,341 6s. 9d., and on the flat, £721,335 15s. 3d. or a total of £6,607,768 19s. For trotting the figures show a total investment of £614,232 5s. 6d., giving a total of £7,222,001 4s. 6d.; and on coursing, £6,092 10s., or a total of money wagered on all courses of £7,228,093 14s. 6d., and on interstate meetings—this is relevant because most people believe that there is a greater amount of money bet on interstate meetings than on local meetings—£1,734,336 9s. 6d.

It was proved in South Australia where betting is permitted and bookmakers operate exclusively on interstate meetings on the course while races are in progress, that that amount was involved. The total turnover on all meetings was £8,962,430 4s. Next we come to the winnings paid to bettors, about which much wild guessing has been done. The figures, on the course, are—grandstand £4,105,315 9s., Derby £1,413,287 18s. 3d., and on the flat £680,542 14s., or a total of winnings paid to bettors of £6,199,146 1s. 3d., and on coursing a total of £5,492 4s. 9d., a total of £6,781,757 10s.

9d. On interstate meetings the amount paid out to the bettors was £1,638,630 3s. 9d., or a total of £8,420,387 14s. 6d., or about £542,000 less than had been wagered by bettors with bookmakers. The gross results to bookmakers were as follows:—Racing, £408,622 17s. 9d., or 6.18 per cent. on turnover; on trotting, £37,113 0s. 9d., or 6.04 per cent. on turnover, and on coursing, £600 5s. 3d., or 9.85 per cent. on turnover. The total profit on all South Australian meetings was £446,336 3s. 9d., or an average of 6.18 per cent. on turnover. The profit on interstate meetings was £95,000 5s. 9d., or 5.52 per cent. on turnover and the total profit on all meetings was £542,042 9s. 6d., 6.05 per cent. on turnover. Therefore it would be quite wrong to say that the bettors are losing all their money. These figures show that the losses are not so great as some people believe.

If the man on the basic wage spends £1 of his wages in betting—I assume the amount of profit to bookmakers would be the same percentage in South Australia as in Western Australia—it would mean that he would lose 1s. 2d. each week, and on the £52 that he would take from his wages in 12 months he would lose an amount representing an average loss of 6.06 per cent. on the turnover, or about £3 in the year, yet some people in all sincerity tell us that the punter only wins once in ten times, and loses the whole of his money week after week. We come now to the turnover tax paid by bookmakers which, for the year ended the 30th June, 1945, was, in South Australia, as follows:—On South Australian race meetings, £99,117 15s. 2d., on South Australian trotting meetings, £9,213 18s. 9d., and on South Australian coursing meetings, £91 8s. On interstate meetings it was £26,016 18s. 6d. and the total turnover tax received was £134,440 0s. 5d. The total turnover tax received was allocated as follows:—To the Treasury, on interstate meetings, £25,482 1s. 9d.; racing clubs, £97,079 5s. 10d., trotting clubs £9,024 17s. 6d., coursing clubs £88 12s. 10d., and the amount retained by the board on account of administration expenses was £2,765 2s. 6d. An analysis of these figures shows that of the turnover tax received—

Government received 18.95 per cent.  
Racing clubs, 72.21 per cent.  
Trotting clubs, 6.71 per cent.  
Coursing clubs, .07 per cent.  
Board retained 2.06 per cent.

Details of revenue received by Government and clubs from all betting, including stamp duty and totalisator, are interesting. I quote these particulars to show how foolish it is for people to indulge in betting, because they reveal the amount of money taken out of the aggregate of £11,000,000—

	£	£
Revenue from bookmakers received by Government—		
Turnover tax—Interstate meetings .. ..	25,482	
Stamp duty on betting tickets used and cost of printing .. ..	19,949	
		45,431
Revenue from bettors—Unclaimed winnings (bets laid October, 1943, to June, 1944)		2,281
Revenue from totalisator—		
Percentages:		
Racing .. ..	83,022	
Trotting .. ..	19,274	
		102,296
Unclaimed winnings ..	3,236	
		105,532

Total Revenue Received .. £153,244

The amount of money received by the racing clubs is even more alarming—

	£	£
Racing clubs—		
Revenue from board, share of turnover tax ..	97,079	
Revenue from totalisator, percentages .. ..	118,725	
		215,804
Trotting clubs—		
Revenue from board, share of turnover tax ..	9,025	
Revenue from totalisator, percentages .. ..	28,110	
		37,135
Coursing clubs—		
Revenue from board, share of turnover tax ..	89	
		89
All clubs—		
Revenue from board, share of turnover tax ..	106,193	
Revenue from totalisator, percentages .. ..	146,835	
		253,028

A summary of all revenue received from betting, including stamp duty and totalisator percentages is as follows:—

	£	£
Bookmakers' turnover tax	134,440	
Stamp duty on betting tickets .. ..	19,949	
Unclaimed moneys ..	2,281	

Total received from bookmakers and backers ..		156,670
Totalisator percentages ..	249,131	
Unclaimed dividends ..	3,236	
		<u>252,367</u>
Total from totalisator ..		252,367
Total all revenue .. ..		<u>409,037</u>

If we take the difference between the amount wagered with bookmakers and the amount paid back to bettors in the shape of winning bets, £542,012, there is a discrepancy of £951,049. The various shares of this revenue are—

Government—£153,244, equal to 37.46 per cent.  
 Racing clubs—£215,804, equal to 52.76 per cent.  
 Trotting clubs—£37,135, equal to 9.08 per cent.  
 Coursing clubs—£89, equal to 0.2 per cent.  
 Amount retained by board for administration expenses—£2,765, equal to .68 per cent.

There is only one other portion of the report I wish to quote and that is the schedule showing the percentages of results to bookmakers. I quote this to show that if a man took £1 out of his wages each week he would, on these statistics, lose an average amount of 1s. 2d. per week.

#### SCHEDULE SHOWING PERCENTAGES OF RESULTS TO BOOKMAKERS.

	Local Racing.	Local Trotting.	Local Coursing.	On Course Operations. All on Course Local open- tions. %	Inter- state. %	Total all on Course. Course. %
Gross profit on turnover ..	6.18	6.04	9.85	6.18	5.52	6.05
Tax on turnover ..	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
Ticket tax on turnover ..	.20	.28	.30	.21	.29	.22
Profit on turnover with which to pay salaries, service, etc. ....	4.48	4.26	8.05	4.47	3.73	4.33

The schedule shows that if one wanted to start bookmaking in South Australia, the best place to operate would be on the dog-races, because they return to the bookmakers a profit of 9.85 per cent., whereas on local horseracing the percentage is 6.18 and on local trotting 6.04. The hardest place for the bookmaker to get along is on interstate betting, because he gets only 5.52 per cent. gross profit. Thus in South Australia the fabulous amounts which bookmakers have been credited with having made are not correct. Working out the position on those figures, I consider that the fears of certain

well-intentioned people of the great amount of harm that arises from S.P. betting or from betting on horseracing or trotting are unfounded and that considerable exaggeration has been indulged in.

What we have to decide is whether the legalisation of S.P. betting shops will increase the volume of betting. The South Australian experience was that it increased the known betting when shops were first legalised in 1933; and it was shown afterwards, in 1944-45, when the shops were closed, that the amount of money wagered went to an all-time "high." The totalisator receipts and the bookmakers' turnover increased to the record "high" of approximately £11,000,000. Then we have to consider that if we do not legalise S.P. betting, what are we going to do about the very undesirable existing state of affairs, not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the State? It is well known that flagrant breaches of the law are taking place. It is also well known that S.P. bookmakers are flourishing despite the fact that the police are resorting to the subterfuge of prosecuting them under the Traffic Act for obstruction, when they know full well that that is not the correct charge. Despite all the efforts of the police to control it, S.P. book-making still flourishes.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Put them in gaol with hard labour. It will soon stop.

Mr. STYANTS: I might even agree to some extent with the member for Subiaco, if it were possible to catch the principals; but it is well known that some of the largest S.P. bookmakers in the metropolitan area are immune from prosecution. It is the unfortunate dummies that are prosecuted, heavily fined or imprisoned. We have also to consider that, if we are genuinely desirous of doing away with S.P. betting, whether we should endeavour to abolish horseracing. I do not know whether I would vote for a measure of that kind if it were introduced. What we have then to consider is, will the licensing of S.P. shops be detrimental to the standard of horse-breeding and horseracing in this State? When we bear in mind that in South Australia horsebreeding and racing and trotting interests got, as their share of the turnover, close on £250,000, I cannot see that it will have any detrimental financial effect on the racing clubs. I believe these would be

more than recouped by the amount of money they would receive in the shape of taxes.

If the Bill becomes an Act, I think it will do away with some of the undesirable features of S.P. betting. At present we are making criminals of people that we know quite well are not the principals. They are mere dummies. Some members have said that it was only the father of a family who frittered his money away on betting; but we know quite well that mothers often make a bet, either on the course or in the S.P. shop. I know of a mother who sent her girl or boy of 11 or 12 years of age with 5s., or some other sum of money, to the bookmaker for a bet. That undesirable feature would be done away with. We would also do away with another objectionable feature that I have already mentioned, the S.P. bookmaker operating, if not in conjunction with, then in the vicinity of a hotel. From the punter's point of view, the Bill would have the effect of making the people who style themselves starting-price bookmakers, but who are not except when it suits them, S.P. bookmakers in the true sense of the term. There would be no limit. A punter who is fortunate enough to pick a horse at a long price is limited at present by the S.P. bookmaker to certain odds. The member for Victoria Park pointed out the reverse.

When a man backs a horse on the course at odds from 15 to 1 down to 5 to 1, the bookmaker accepts the liability at those odds, but the S.P. bookmaker only pays 5 to 1. He is then a S.P. bookmaker in the literal sense of the term. If the Bill passes, it will make these bookmakers give a fairer deal to those who bet on horses away from the course. Some time ago a Gallup poll was taken on this subject. I was at one time sceptical of these polls. The people of Australia were asked whether they favoured the legalisation of S.P. bookmakers, and there was a substantial majority in favour of the proposal. I believe that if a referendum were taken it would be found that the majority of the people would prefer to have S.P. betting legalised, as this would do away with the conditions which have prevailed here so long. To those who oppose the measure I wish to say that I have the greatest possible respect for their opinion. I believe they oppose it in all sincerity and that there is much justice and logic in what they say, but they do not



give us any constructive ideas of what we should do if the Bill is not passed. They do not seem to take any interest in educating young people.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested a campaign of education pointing out how foolish it is for young people to bet or gamble in any shape or form. A man would indeed have to be superhuman who continually went to horseraces and won on betting. There might be 24 horses in a race and he might put 5s., 10s. or £1 on a horse. He would have one horse racing for him and 23 racing for the bookmaker.

Mr. McDonald: There are 37 horses running in the Melbourne Cup.

Mr. STYANTS: Then the odds would be even greater against the punter. I think the favourite is 5 to 1, but I was quoted odds of 3 to 1. I have read the document sent to me by some organisation—I forget its name—the members of which are opposed to this measure. It contains extracts from speeches of members of Parliament in South Australia who deplored the fact that S.P. shops were ever licensed there. I have also looked up some South Australian "Hansards," and I find that only the speeches of those members that suited the people opposed to this measure were quoted. The speeches of members who favoured a continuance of S.P. betting were not quoted in the document at all, so it would seem that an *ex parte* case was put up to suit the organisation protesting against the legalisation of S.P. betting here. South Australia did not completely abolish S.P. betting, but it refused to re-license shops in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Perkins: That is significant, of course.

Mr. STYANTS: I would prefer a different means of settling this vexed question. I would prefer to see a referendum taken on it, and that referendum should not be confused with the State elections. It would be worth the amount that it would cost to have this vexed question settled once and for all, apart from party politics. I intend to support the Bill, although I hope some very drastic amendments will be made when it reaches the Committee stage.

Mr. PERKINS (York) [8.58]: All members who have supported the Bill, and I think most of the members who have op-

posed it, have stressed the present unsatisfactory position in this State. I am quite prepared to agree with all that has been said about those unsatisfactory conditions. I agree that people committing an offence against the law should be prosecuted for that offence, and not for some other offence because it is easier to get a conviction by that means. I also consider it wrong that men should be imprisoned for an offence such as betting. Although those people are undoubtedly breaking the law, we make very sharp distinctions between those offences for which people should be imprisoned and those for which some other punishment should be meted out. I believe that the present practice of imprisoning men for breaking the betting laws is wrong and should be altered. But it does not necessarily follow that the present Bill provides the right method of getting out of the unsatisfactory position in which we find ourselves in Western Australia at present. I believe that if the provisions of the Bill were carried out, we would create a worse problem than the one we have to tackle now, and even if this measure is not passed or if it is drastically amended, no-one has suggested that there are not other ways to deal with the betting problem. Our law is somewhat different from that in the other States, in that we do not even recognise betting on racecourses, whereas they do.

I have been struck by the speeches of those members who favour the present Bill by reason of the fact that none of them has attempted to say that betting or gambling is desirable in itself. They have said it is impossible to eradicate gambling altogether; and I agree. But it is quite another thing to say that we should take any measures that are going to encourage gambling. As a matter of fact, if we followed to its logical conclusion some of the reasoning of members supporting the Bill—though they did not suggest gambling is desirable but merely tried to show that the desire for gambling exists and facilities should be provided to meet that desire—we would not only provide for betting shops in which to bet on races but we would also provide shops with roulette wheels and two-up rings. I do not see that those forms of gambling are any more undesirable, if they are to be carried on in betting shops, than is betting on races.

Mr. W. Hegney: Two-up would be a lot fairer.

Mr. PERKINS: I was going to say that some other gambling devices would probably be much fairer and would provide a much greater percentage return to the gambler than is the case with betting on racehorses. I venture to say that the member for Victoria Park would not have so much to complain about concerning some of his electors being impoverished by reason of the amount taken from them by the keeper of the gaming school under that system as he would concerning the amount lost through betting on racehorses. However, I do not intend to advocate any such policy. I believe that the provision of extra facilities for betting and gambling and any policy that is liable to encourage gambling are things this House should not support. I believe that the result of the Bill would be that the amount of gambling taking place would be increased.

I was impressed by the figures given by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Kalgoorlie concerning the experience in South Australia. Apparently the volume of betting in South Australia when the betting shops were first legalised was between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 a year. But just before the war the volume of betting taking place through the betting shops had increased to nearly £8,000,000 a year. There may have been causes for that very great increase other than the licensing of betting shops. Undoubtedly the ordinary members of the public had much more money in their pockets at the later stage and that would partly account for the increase. But I believe the licensing of betting shops in South Australia did have a very material effect on the increased amount of betting that took place, and I think it is very significant indeed that the Betting Board in South Australia, after quite a lengthy experience of legalised betting shops, has decided that there will be no betting shops in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, South Australia, and only a very limited number in some of the country towns. I think that is very significant for us in view of the fact that this Bill apparently provides for betting shops in the metropolitan area as well as on an extensive scale in the country districts.

Mr. Cross: That has not stopped betting in South Australia, all the same. It has only driven it underground.

Mr. PERKINS: Possibly it has not; but apparently the Betting Board in South Australia regarded it as being the least undesirable course to refuse to register the betting shops.

The Minister for Mines: The board did not do it or recommend it. The Parliament of the State did.

Mr. PERKINS: Very well; the Parliament of the State did it. The supreme body in South Australia, after careful consideration of the position there, decided on that policy, and I think we should take due note of that. I would remind members that a somewhat similar position arose in Victoria many years ago. I can remember when the housey-housey craze started in Melbourne, and in a short space of time housey-housey concerns had commenced on many suburban corners around the metropolitan area. Such a large proportion of housewives were spending so great a proportion of their housekeeping money on those concerns that it was found necessary to pass special legislation through the Victorian Parliament making the game illegal under the Gaming Act. I understand that up to that stage it was not illegal. That shows what can occur in a metropolitan area if facilities are provided for gambling and those facilities are made eminently respectable.

I think it is inevitable in such circumstances that there will be a sharp increase in the amount of betting by women and youths over 18 years of age as named in this Bill. That stands to reason if facilities are made available and nice surroundings are provided for betting shops. It is only natural that the proprietors of the betting shops will do their best to encourage business and will provide much better surroundings in which to follow their calling than are provided at present. The race clubs are somewhat responsible for the volume of off-the-course betting. The admission fees to the courses are far too high to encourage the average working man to attend.

Mr. Fox: Why encourage him to go to the course?

Mr. PERKINS: Because I regard betting on the course as being much more desirable than betting in the S.P. shops in the city.

Mr. Fox: It is more expensive.

Mr. PERKINS: If the entrance fee were reduced it need not be more expensive. When a man goes to a racecourse he gambles in cold blood and takes a certain amount of money with him, and he is quite prepared to lose some of it. The position is somewhat different in the betting shops because an habitual bettor may go to one and take with him a friend who does not normally bet. When they get into the shop the friend hears of a good thing and puts a couple of shillings on it, and it loses. Another person tells him of something good in a later race and he possibly loses a few more shillings on it. Then for the last race he gets an absolute certainty and finishes up losing more money than he can afford to. I am sure that much more betting by people who are not normally interested in betting takes place in the S.P. shops than occurs on the racecourses.

If people are not particularly interested in racing and betting they do not bother to go to the course with the attendant trouble of getting there. The establishment of licensed betting shops will mean that the youth of the country, who at present probably bet very little, will be encouraged to bet. The argument has been raised that the licensing of betting shops will do away with illegal betting. We have all heard of the experience of South Australia and, although I have not gone closely into the position there, I have grave doubts as to whether the licensing of betting shops will do away with illegal betting.

The Minister for Mines: Be very careful; I have just received a telegram from the authorities!

Mr. PERKINS: The Minister can correct me if I am wrong but I am going to state my opinions. A tax will be levied on all bets passing through betting shops and it stands to reason that the proprietors of such establishments, who have to meet the tax, will not be able to give as good odds as a man who is carrying on illegal betting and not paying a turnover tax. On the face of it there will still be a tendency for the illegal operator to carry on in the back streets and pay no tax. If the Minis-

ter in charge of the Bill can explain away that tendency, well and good, but on the face of it there is likely to be that possibility. I read the circular, to which the member for Kalgoorlie referred, indicating the opinions of certain members of the South Australian Parliament and I, too, discovered that those opinions were selected from members who were opposed to betting shops being created, and who were also opposed to the licensing of betting. Of course there was divided opinion, but apparently the majority was against the licensing of betting shops in the metropolitan area. I was struck with one opinion voiced by a Mr. Niess, representing Norwood, an industrial suburb. He said—

When betting shops were opened I, as a union official, had more worries and troubles in trying to settle the domestic affairs of many of the workers, as the result of the betting shops, than I had in the whole of my experience previously . . . Since betting shops ceased to operate I have not had one of these cases to deal with.

Mr. Fox: That is a prize bit of hokey!

Mr. Seward: You do not like the truth.

Mr. PERKINS: I take it he is a responsible member, and that is his opinion or he would not voice it. He belongs to the same political party as does the member for South Fremantle. What he has said is in line with what I personally would expect. I am under no illusions as to the difficulties of the position. I know that even if we could persuade the racecourse authorities to reduce their fees, to encourage people to attend on the course where I believe it is more desirable to bet than anywhere else, it would only cure the position in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hoar: What about the country people?

Mr. PERKINS: We would still be faced with the difficulties confronting the country districts. If we do nothing about them, illegal betting will still be carried on there, and I believe that even if betting shops are legalised a certain amount of illegal betting will continue to take place. Rather than take the risk of providing facilities which will greatly increase the volume of gambling, I would see the Bill lost. I do not like the present position, but I believe that the Bill will create even worse problems than those with which we are now contending. It is

imperative that the present position be dealt with to some extent, but I am not prepared to go to the lengths proposed by the Bill.

**MR. FOX** (South Fremantle) [9.19]: Like many other members who have spoken, I am personally not much concerned how the Bill goes, although I intend to support it. I congratulate the Government on having made a move to do away with the present unsatisfactory position. The gaoling of people under the Traffic Act for S.P. betting no doubt prompted the Government to endeavour to improve the existing state of affairs. If a person other than an S.P. bookmaker were fined £75 or gaoled for obstructing traffic there would be an outcry from the whole of the public. I will refer to an extract from "The Daily News" concerning a case heard in the Perth Police Court on the 16th of this month, where two men were charged with obstruction. They denied that they were starting-price bookmakers and claimed to be punters. After hearing the evidence, in dismissing the case the magistrate said he had the strongest suspicion that betting was being carried on, but that he could not reject the evidence of the three witnesses brought by the defendants. That is a lamentable state of affairs.

Surely we should have laws to deal with that class of offence, and should not prosecute men for obstructing traffic on Saturday afternoons, when in fact there is very little traffic in the streets. Like other members, I have had letters from various church people and societies interested in the suppression of betting. Personally I do not think betting is any good at all, either on or off the course, but people who have had some experience in betting and racing, and who have knocked about the country on racecourses and have associated with the working people who make up the bulk of the community, are in a better position to pass an opinion on this vexed question than are those who have never been on a racecourse. If a person bets within his means there is no reason why he should not do so, if he wishes to. The member for Nedlands said that if a man wanted to have a drink he had a perfect right to have one. Let him be logical and say that if a person wants to bet, and bets within his means, he has a perfect right to do that. I see no harm in it at all. The

Leader of the Liberal Party, the member for West Perth, said he did not like to see betting taking place in back lanes. I say the great bulk of the betting does not take place in back lanes.

**Mr. Doney:** That does not alter the fact that he does not like to see it taking place there.

**Mr. FOX:** The greatest amount of betting is not done in back lanes, but by telephone, and in clubs. That is where all the big betting is done.

**Mr. Thorn:** How do they get the telephones?

**Mr. FOX:** The hon. member must ask someone else about that, but they do get them. The man with money can get all the betting he wants without going into back lanes. Many telephone bettors invest large sums every Thursday and Friday. They often take doubles, on the doubles charts, that are issued on those days. Those are the men who set the price at which the horses will start on the following Saturday. It is only the 2s. punter who has to go down a lane to make his bet. The big starting-price bettor does not want starting-price betting legalised. There are three big starting-price bookmakers in Perth, who hold from £1,500 to £2,000 in bets taken over the phone on ordinary races each week end. I have had that on very good information.

**Mr. Thorn:** Give us their names.

**Mr. FOX:** The hon. member knows their names as well as I do.

**Mr. Thorn:** You wanted some names a while ago.

**Mr. FOX:** I did not ask for any names. The hon. member knows them as well as I do. What those men hold on the big races would be hard to determine. I would like to know how much they would hold on the Caulfield and Melbourne Cup meetings, when a large percentage of the people throughout Australia bet on those races.

**Mr. Doney:** Why do you not find out from the same people that gave you the other information?

**Mr. FOX:** I will leave it to the hon. member to find out for me. These starting-price bookmakers pay no taxes, but if such betting were legalised they would have to pay, just as do the other bookmakers.

Mr. Perkins: Why, if they were still doing it illegally?

Mr. FOX: They would not have a monopoly of the telephone betting, either, because the bettors would have no occasion to bet under the lap.

Mr. Perkins: Why would they not still bet illegally?

Mr. FOX: These big bookmakers would not be bothered with a 2s. punter. The game is all right for them as it is at the present time, and they do not want it legalised. There is an unholy alliance—perhaps unknowingly—between the opponents of the Bill and the big bookmakers in Perth, who do not want starting-price betting legalised. The member for Guildford-Midland said that betting had decreased, but I do not believe it has.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I said it had decreased in my own electorate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not interject, when out of his seat.

Mr. FOX: The member for Victoria Park pointed out that the number of starting-price bookmakers had increased in his district.

Mr. Read: That is so.

Mr. FOX: It has nearly doubled in the Fremantle district, also, and the only way to get an idea of whether starting-price betting has decreased is in this way. For a number of years it has been the custom of the bookmakers to have racing cards printed for the benefit of their punters, and the same number is being printed now as before the S.P. bookmakers were driven into the street. The big three in Perth used to take from 1,000 to 1,500 each week, when the shops were open, and now they do not take any. Every starting-price bookmaker is taking less than before they were driven out to the streets, yet still as many cards are being printed. That goes to show that there is just as much betting taking place at the present time, and the number of starting-price bookmakers has doubled, if anything. That is not desirable from any point of view, because it opens the way for undesirable people to get into the game. I suppose some of the opponents of betting would say that they are all undesirable. If a punter won a large sum from some of them

they would not be able to pay. As a rule bookmakers are honourable men. Large bets are made just by a nod of the head, and it is rarely that a bookmaker defaults. Bookmakers on the course are guaranteed, and have to pay up whether they like it or not. They also are honourable men as far as their transactions go.

During his speech the Minister referred to a statement made by the Bishop of Adelaide, who said that State control of betting did not go to the roots of the evil, and that the most urgent need was the creation of a right public opinion. I think we can all agree with that statement. The Leader of the Opposition said that the people needed some education, but I do not think it is solely the duty of the Government to endeavour to prevent people from betting, either S.P., on the course, or on the totalisator. I believe that people have a responsibility to their children. In the first place it is the responsibility of the parents. If they do their duty they will teach their sons and daughters that the road to affluence is not per medium of the S.P. bookmaker, the bookmaker on the course or the totalisator. They should tell them that there is little or no chance of showing a profit because I believe, notwithstanding the figures quoted by the member for Kalgoorlie, there are very few people who patronise racing that can show a profit at all. It is certainly very hard to find anyone who does

In the next place, the churches have their responsibility. Children of most denominations attend Sunday schools until they are 13 or 14 years of age. The churches have a duty, even apart from the moral aspect which, no doubt, they would stress. They should be able to demonstrate to the children that there is no profit in gambling. Then there is the Education Department. I believe that lessons on gambling should be introduced into the school curriculum. The lessons should be written preferably by teachers who have had some experience in connection with gambling. In all probability, the teachers would start in a small way and gravitate gradually to the racecourse until they finished up where nearly everyone finishes, as losers. I do not think there would be any harm in having lessons provided in the schools. What is wrong with that suggestion? We know that gambling is

not an evil, unless carried to excess. Therefore I say that, in addition to the parents who have their personal responsibilities to their children, the churches and the Education Department have their parts to play in the scheme.

If all that fails, then the young people will have to do as many others have done, and they will have to learn in the hard school of experience. We generally find that if a working man goes to the racecourse and loses, say, £5 or £7, he then has to stop away for quite a long time till he can build up another few pounds with which to have another fly. In the end, he, too, gets his lesson by experience, and eventually he realises that it does not pay to bet.

Mr. J. Hegney: Unfortunately, he wakes up too late.

Mr. FOX: I notice that a few weeks ago there was some discussion on the part of the churches, and during the controversy I think it was a member of the Salvation Army who said that if people wanted to bet, they should go to the racecourses. Personally, that is the last place to which I would send anyone. There is certainly more incentive on the racecourse to bet than is to be found anywhere else.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is where the racing is conducted.

Mr. FOX: Yes, but if I had a son I would advise him to keep away from the racecourse.

Mr. J. Hegney: What about yourself?

Mr. FOX: I go to the races sometimes for a little relaxation. What I am pointing out is that it would be wrong to advise anyone to go to the racecourse, for that is the wrong place altogether. Anyone who goes to the races will agree that I am correct when I assert that a person would spend ten times as much on betting if he attended the races as he would if he patronised the S.P. shops. It would cost the ordinary worker more to go to the racecourse than he would spend in an S.P. shop in one week. It would cost him anything from 15s. to £1 to get there.

Mr. Abbott: It would cost him 2s. 4d.

Mr. FOX: I am speaking of the man who would go from Fremantle or one of the other outer suburbs. It would cost him

at least 18s. 6d. It would cost him 3s. 6d. for his fare, 14s. for admission and 1s. for a racebook.

Mr. Thorn: Could he not go in the legger?

Mr. FOX: The working man has as much right to the best as anyone else, because he will leave his money behind, in any case.

Mr. Thorn: It costs only 2s. 4d. in the legger.

Mr. FOX: The smallest bet he can make on the tote either way is 5s., and I have been told that the great majority of S.P. bets are 2s. Members will agree that that is a very small amount to speculate. I have no objection to a man having a bet, notwithstanding what the member for Victoria Park had to say in the pitiful picture he drew.

Mr. W. Hegney: It was a pitiful speech!

Mr. FOX: I have no objection to a man going to an S.P. shop for a bet, especially if those shops are legalised. He can have his two bob on a couple of races, and then go home to listen to the broadcast from the racecourse. Many workers get their relaxation in that way. The average working man leads a drab life, toiling hard all the week, and many of them at the week-end like to have a few bets and then go home and spend an enjoyable afternoon listening to the racing over the wireless. Certainly I would much prefer them to do that than to hang around the pubs drinking beer all the afternoon, thereby swelling the profits of the breweries and the pubs.

Mr. Thorn: Do they not work in conjunction with each other?

Mr. FOX: I do not know anything about that.

Mr. Thorn: I mean the S.P. shops and the pubs.

Mr. FOX: I cannot say: I do not hang around the pubs during Saturday afternoon. At any rate, that is one way some people take their pleasure. Not everyone takes his pleasure in the same way.

Mr. Read: Some take it at someone else's expense.

Mr. FOX: What I have indicated is not at anyone else's expense. The hon. mem-

ber would not allow them to have any pleasure at all! He spoke about how much some people spent and how much they had left over on Saturday. He then said he was anxious to do the best possible for them. I fully appreciate that there is quite a lot that could be done in that direction. For instance I know of dressmakers who make dresses which they sell for £4 to shopkeepers who, in turn, sell them for £16. What about getting into that sort of thing and having a kick at the man who sells dresses and makes such exorbitant profits?

The Premier: What about some of those films that are exhibited and which are 'demoralising agencies'?

Mr. FOX: Yes.

Hon. N. Keenan: What about the lotteries?

Mr. FOX: We could get on with the business along those lines, too.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order! I hope the hon. member will not get too far away from the Bill.

Mr. FOX: That is not getting very far away! I was pointing out that we do not all take our pleasures in the same way. Not all of us own motorears. Some of us cannot get away at week-ends on fishing excursions with our cars loaded with bottled bait. We cannot fill up with the choicest viands and plenty of drink. Men who patronise the S.P. shops are not generally those who have cars that would enable them to take their families away at the week-ends.

The Minister for Mines: Now you are getting somewhere.

Mr. Thorn: Do not egg him on too much!

Mr. FOX: Practically every member has admitted that S.P. betting cannot be wiped out. There is no chance whatever of that being done.

Mr. Abbott: But no-one has proved that, so far.

Mr. FOX: We cannot wipe it out. S.P. betting has been indulged in ever since I have been in this State. I remember that when I went to Kalgoorlie first, in the big betting shops the prices were displayed on the wall, and bets were laid at £100 to 1s. on the Caulfield Cup and Melbourne Cup

double. I remember one chap telling me that he had 13 doubles, £1,300 to 13s.

Mr. W. Hlegney: Did he win?

Mr. FOX: No—as usual! In those days betting places could be pointed out all over Western Australia. People went in freely and openly to make bets, and no attempt was ever made to prevent them from doing so. It is only within the last 12 or 18 months that those associated with the business have been driven on to the street, where they have been a nuisance to everyone. It would be far better for the shops to be registered. When I say that, I do not want members to imagine that I would recommend anyone to take on betting. I certainly do not advocate gambling. If a man has any sense, he will not indulge in the practice. On the other hand, if a man wants to bet and cannot afford to go to the races, it would be much better for him to have his small bets with the nearest S.P. bookmaker and then listen to the broadcast in comfort at his home.

Mr. McDonald: What about licensing punters?

Mr. FOX: I do not think the punter would pay a license fee. If he had any sense, he would not. The Minister for Education said that a measure had been introduced in New South Wales that was the dream of the Police Commissioner as it gave him all the power he wanted. Yet betting is as rampant in New South Wales today as ever it was. In Victoria, one is told that no betting at all is carried on.

Mr. Cross: What about Jackson's corner?

Mr. FOX: I was in Melbourne early this year and toured several of the suburbs and found that there was any number of S.P. bookmakers in each of them. In Newport near Williamstown, I saw 70 or 80 men in a lane indulging in S.P. betting. In many places there are people who go from house to house every Friday and accept bets and return on Monday to pay the householder if he is lucky enough to have a win. That practice is thoroughly undesirable, and we do not want it to occur here, but if we do not take action to regulate S.P. betting, I feel certain that something of the sort will come into operation here.

Mr. Seward: Do you remember Wren's tote?

Mr. FOX: Yes.

Mr. Seward: The authorities stopped that.

Mr. FOX: That was only one betting place, confined to one shop. In Ballarat, there were totes that were run quite fairly. Wren's tote was stopped only after it had had a long run. Had its operations extended over the metropolitan area and had it been conducted in the same manner as is S.P. bookmaking, there would have been no chance at all of stopping it. Every member knows quite well that it is utterly impossible to prevent S.P. betting. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Victoria Park stressed the point that the S.P. bookies are housed better than the punters. Why confine their comparisons to the S.P. bookies? Why not make a tour of the Nedlands district, for example, and ask the people where they got their money for houses?

Mr. Read: From business activities.

Mr. FOX: Yes, I suppose in a more dignified way than the bookies get their money

Mr. Cross: What about the Jews' paradise?

Mr. FOX: Such people certainly get their money in a legalised way.

Mr. Cross: But what about Mt. Lawley?

Mr. FOX: The member for Nedlands stated that betting had always been permitted on the racecourses in England. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe pointed out three years ago that that was not the case, that betting took place in every hole and corner in England and was only legalised later on. I have received a statement from a friend showing the extent to which betting is carried on in England at present. Quite a number of people are in the habit of quoting what occurs in England and holding it up as something that we in Australia might well copy. Here is an extract from an article in the "Daily Mirror" of the 3rd October, 1945, written by Tom Phillips. It states—

Right now betting is booming in this country as never before. How much people spend in having a flutter, no one can compute exactly, but it must be well over £200,000,000 a year.

On the football pools last year, the estimated amount invested by "couponeers" was £15,000,000. On the dogs, according to the Church Committee on Gambling, the turnover for the bookies and the totes in 1943 was—hold your breath for this—£120,000,000. If the rise in Greyhound shares is any guide, the 1944 total must have been much greater.

Again, the money spent on pools does not take into account the vast sums wagered each week on fixed price football coupons. These have always been immensely popular in the industrial areas. They probably account for as much as the pools, another £16,000,000.

What with horses, dogs and soccer, you'd think all tastes were catered for. Not so: Having scanned the various results, the "fans" look up their weekly sweep tickets—sweeps not only on dogs, jockeys and soccer, but on newspaper headlines and wills.

The headliner is that on the "splash" in main news story on page one. Sometimes the sweep is on the forecast of the first and last letters. The sweep on the wills is usually on those published in a Sunday newspaper on a certain combination of figures.

These sweeps are within the law—just! The wording on the tickets specially printed allows the promoters to avoid legal action. They are very popular.

One bookie I know runs soccer sweep tickets as a nice little sideline. After paying for printing, postal and office expenses, as well as hefty agents' commissions, his reputed profit is £100 a week.

There's big money and nice pickings in gambling. Once the secretary of a big firm told me that, if his employers had been willing, he could have financed an excellent superannuation scheme on the income from a weekly sweep at a shilling a head.

And the boom here hasn't grown to the extent that it has in America. Recently a new world betting record was set up at a Belmont race meeting in New York, where the total amount staked through the tote, during the afternoon was about one and a quarter million pounds.

The concluding paragraph should provide food for thought for the member for Victoria Park—

And yet, to come back to England, isn't it extraordinary that with all this gambling about, people still seem to have enough money, to eat, for clothes, for shoes and for education.

I agree with the Minister for Education that it would not be practicable to establish totes throughout Western Australia, desirable though that might be.

Mr. Abbott: Why not?

Mr. FOX: In the first place, I do not believe that people in the outer suburbs would come into town to bet on a tote if they could get an S.P. bet in their own district, and, secondly, if totes were provided, I do not think they would pay. I would be prepared to hand the control of betting to the local authorities, leaving them to control it how they would.

Members: Oh, oh!



Mr. FOX: Members may demur, but I believe the local authorities would be able to do as good a job as the police have done, and perhaps better. There is any number of deserving charities for whose benefit local authorities could run totes. If the people will persist in betting, let us collect some of the money for deserving objects, such as homes for pensioners, widows and so forth.

Mr. McDonald: And pay no rates?

Mr. FOX: To prevent people from betting is utterly impossible. I do not think anyone has yet spoken about a form of gambling even more pernicious than that of S.P. betting. I refer to sharebroking. Thousands of people have been taken down by men who have merely had a hole in the ground and have sold it as a goldmine. At the present time we have in Western Australia two gentlemen from England who, according to the Press, are inquiring into a mining fraud involving £8,000,000.

Mr. Doney: In what clause does that come?

The Premier: "Clause" De Bernales!

Mr. FOX: Probably many people in this and other States, on reading a glowing prospectus issued by some investors, consider it easy to get a big return for their money by investing in the proposition, and perhaps they put their life-savings into it and lose them. I believe the great majority of men who buy mining shares do so not with the object of reaping a profit from the gold won from the mine but in the hope that the shares will rise in value, thus enabling them to get out at a profit and leave someone else to carry the baby. I understand the member for East Perth gave an instance of his having made such an investment and having been left lamenting. I know mine managers—

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

Mr. FOX: I merely wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the opponents of S.P. betting never have a word to say about a more pernicious evil—gambling in mining shares. I think that remark appropriate to the Bill in order to make a comparison. I know mining managers who have heared

the market. The member for Nedlands will know what that means. They sold shares which they did not own at all hoping that the price might drop and thus enable them to get in at a later date at a much reduced amount.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think the hon. member has made the comparison now.

Mr. FOX: The member for Kalgoorlie said that S.P. betting had not been altogether wiped out in South Australia. As he said, the only place in that State where it had been wiped out was the metropolitan area. Evidently there were people in that area with sufficient persuasive powers to induce the authorities not to issue licenses there. Every member who has spoken to the Bill has said that it is impossible to wipe out S.P. betting and I agree; but if we cannot, let us do the best we can to control it. Personally, I advise people not to bet, as I know there is no profit in betting. I have every respect for those who oppose the measure; nevertheless, I think we would be doing a greater service to the community if we registered S.P. betting shops, but we should keep women out of them. Some S.P. bookmakers have told me they do not like women to be in the shops at all. If we could keep them out, as well as lads of 18 or 21 years, and if we had the co-operation of parents, the churches and the Education Department, we would do more to stamp out betting than any Act of Parliament could do.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.54 p.m.*

---