

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 15th November, 1927.

	Page
Assent to Bill	1852
Auditor General's Report	1852
Questions: Federal road grant—1, Wooroloo-Clackline-Northam road; 2, Albany, Wandering, Waroona roads... ..	1852
Railway project, Lake Grace-East Jilakin-Kalgarin	1852
Bills: Racing Restriction, 2r., Com.	1852
State Children Act Amendment, returned	1857

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Traffic Act Amendment Bill.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from the Auditor General, in pursuance of Section 53 of the Audit Act, 1904, the 37th Report for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1927, which I now lay on the Table of the House.

QUESTIONS (2)—FEDERAL ROAD GRANT.

Wooroloo-Clackline-Northam Road.

Hon. G. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Works: What was the amount of money spent on the Wooroloo-Clackline-Northam road, from the 1st January to the 31st October, 1927, under the Federal Aid Roads Act?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: Midland Junction-Merredin road: Wooroloo-Clackline-Northam section, £31,500.

Albany, Wandering, Waroona Roads.

Hon. G. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Works: What was the amount of money spent on the Albany road south of Armadale, and in the Wandering Road Board District, and the Waroona road, from the 1st January to the 31st October, 1927, under the Federal Aid Roads Act?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: Perth-Albany road, South of Armadale to Albany, £35,500; Wandering Road Board,

£320; total, £35,820. A contract has been let to Drakesbrook Road Board for £1,000 for construction work on the Waroona East and West Road, and the work is now in progress. Payments to date amount to £713.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, LAKE GRACE-EAST JILAKIN-KALGARIN.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, What is delaying the report of the special Committee which was appointed to review the recommendation of the Railway Advisory Board in regard to the Lake Grace-East Jilakin-Kalgarin railway? 2, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill for the construction of this railway before the session closes?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The report is available, and is now laid upon the Table of the House. 2, The matter is receiving consideration.

BILL—RACING RESTRICTION.

Second Reading.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [4.37] in moving the second reading said: This Bill seeks to prohibit racing between animals other than horses, where mechanical devices are used. I need hardly remind members that there has been a good deal of comment in the Press of late concerning the new invention of tin hare coursing.

Mr. Mann: Of course we did not notice that.

MR. NORTH: Even in the Old World there has been a great deal of comment concerning this new form of sport. Members will doubtless have read the remarks of the well known writer "Touchstone" in the "Australasian." He is not looked upon as a person who can be said to favour restricting people's pleasures. He is a general sportsman, and writes for sporting papers. "Touchstone" dealt with the question of tin hare coursing in the following manner:—

But all of the innovations to be met with in Sydney are not altogether admirable. There is, for instance, the so-called "tin hare" coursing. The term is a misnomer: there is no tin about the contraption, and there is no coursing. The greyhounds simply race straight ahead against each other, incited thereto by the sight of a stuffed hare skin in front of them.

He goes on in a deprecatory way and draws attention to the class of persons who make bets in the ring. His remarks are designed to show that this form of racing will only lead to gambling, and to the possible loss of money by those who cannot spare it. It may not be his business to moralise in this fashion. I am merely giving a general resume of the facts to show that the Press have been particularly hostile concerning the introduction of this sport into Australia. There must be good reason for that. I have here some remarks made by the "Manchester Guardian." This is a paper of world-wide renown. Most members will have either seen copies of it or heard it referred to. It is one of the finest papers in the Old World, liberal in policy and broadminded. This is what a leading article published in that paper had to say upon the subject in September of this year:—

The Legislature, which presumably represents public opinion, has gone to a good deal of pains at one time or another to make gambling difficult; public lotteries, sweepstakes, and betting, except in a recognised "place"—all are illegal. Betting on horse-racing is a sufficient social evil, but even that has been hedged about with restrictions; it is the achievement of the greyhound racers that they have made betting safe—and easy—for democracy, and have, at the same time, discovered a means of great profit for themselves and the bookmakers. Presumably Parliament, which in the past has had views on the subject of betting, will take notice of a movement which, in every considerable centre of population throughout the country, is setting up a gigantic betting machine for the demoralisation of both sexes, and of old and young alike.

Mr. Mann: That deals more with betting.

Mr. NORTH: Yes, entirely.

The Premier: It relates only to betting.

Mr. NORTH: Yes. I am not trying to deprive people of their pleasures, or to restrict them from amusing themselves in watching horses or dogs, or watching fleas hop or grasshoppers jump. It is a general principle with all these sports that they cannot last five minutes if gambling is not permitted in conjunction with them.

Mr. Corboy: What about the speedways and motor bicycle racing? Has not the speedway gone on without betting?

Mr. NORTH: That may or may not be so. I am not dealing with speedways but with tin hare coursing.

Mr. Sleeman: Why not wipe out all those who bet?

Mr. NORTH: I am merely pointing out that as a general rule gambling must be associated with these sports.

Mr. Corboy: You are illogical.

Mr. NORTH: I am not attempting to interfere with any sports, as such.

The Premier: Are you trying to be a kill-joy?

Mr. NORTH: I assume that these sports will not last five minutes if gambling is not permitted in conjunction with them. No doubt that point will be common ground during the debate.

Mr. Corboy: You are apologising for your own Bill.

Mr. Mann: Surely Section 209 of the Criminal Code is sufficient to enable the Government to stop all betting!

Mr. NORTH: No. We allow gambling to go on, though it is illegal. I would be one of the first to support a measure that the Premier might introduce to legalise gambling on the turf, or, if he liked, to legalise gambling in connection with tin hares. This Bill is to restrict gambling to certain defined spheres.

Mr. Corboy: The Bill does not deal with gambling.

Mr. NORTH: But my remarks will do so. This Bill is to prevent a new form of gambling evil.

Mr. Corboy: No.

Mr. Sleeman: Pedestrianism and bicycle racing are flourishing without betting.

The Premier: What about the trots, too?

Mr. Corboy: You can race a horse and bet on it, but you are not to be allowed to race a dog and bet on it.

Mr. NORTH: I am not here as a strong partisan talking about taxi routes. I propose to put my arguments for and against the principles I am enunciating, and will finish up by supporting the Bill, because I think there is more to be said for it than against it. The chief objection to the introduction of tin hare coursing, or any other form of animal racing by the use of mechanical devices, is that there is already too much gambling in force amongst the people. In the second place, all existing forms of sport and gambling are well catered for at the present time. In Western Australia there is far more enterprise and initiative shown in dealing with the spending power of the people than there is initiative shown where efforts are made to produce wealth for the people. Let me take the case of ten men who go

into business. Nine of these will invest their money in some form of catering or amusement or a drapery establishment, while only one will start a plaster factory or something that is calculated to produce new wealth. That being so, it is essential that the legislature shall be chary about encouraging enterprises in the world of sport that will cater for the gambling evil. Already there are quite sufficient forms of amusement provided for those who desire to bet. Hon. members should realise, when they come to consider the introduction of a form of sport that must be associated with gambling, they encourage the least desirable form of amusement. Someone interjected a little while ago that there was no need for gambling in connection with football. We know that the whole distinction between horse racing, trotting and like branches of sport, and what I might term ordinary sports, is that the former class cannot exist without gambling, while the latter can. I defy any hon. member to urge seriously that tin hare coursing, or any other form of racing of that description, could last a month if gambling were not permitted.

Mr. Chesson: Then why are you so concerned about it? It can start, and it can die.

Mr. NORTH: I will come to that.

Mr. Corboy: Motor cycle racing has lasted without betting.

Mr. NORTH: I am endeavouring to show hon. members that there is already too much gambling in our midst, and that Parliament should not sanction the establishment of another sport that will mean an additional drain upon the people's earnings. In Western Australia we are well catered for with amusements and sports. In fact, we are as well catered for here as are the people in any other country in the world. To complete my arguments in favour of the Bill, I would draw the attention of hon. members to a new work on political economy entitled "The Real Wealth of Nations." It shows that an analysis of the transactions of a number of people who succeeded in business, demonstrates that 90 per cent. of their wealth was earned from money invested in drapery shops, the sale of beer, or amusements of various descriptions, while one-tenth only of it was the result of investment in forms of production that are so essential to a country. If we consider the occupations of people in the met-

ropolitan area we find that after working hours, every one is well catered for by way of sports and amusements. There are the races and the trotting meetings; there are the yacht races, cricket and so forth, while there are theatres and picture shows as well. It all indicates to hon. members the tremendous effort that is put forward by various people to cater for the public along those lines. There can be little reason for a State like Western Australia, with so much primary production before it, and so much wealth to be made, to labour under the incubus of still more people hanging on to the general public in an effort to secure their spending money. It must be recognised that efforts in this direction will not assist the State one jot. The establishment of tin hare coursing will merely mean the provision of another form of gambling that will impose a further drain upon the public. Every week so many thousands of pounds are spent in amusements of various descriptions and it must be realised that the establishment of every new sport involving the extension of gambling, means so many hundreds of pounds taken away from existing sports. Hon. members should ask themselves if it is worth while, and whether Parliament is justified in allowing the establishment of still another form of gambling. Particularly should they consider that viewpoint when we realise that the financial position of the State is not so very bright. Western Australia owes something like £70,000,000. Our staple production, upon which all amusements and sports depend, is drawn from a few major lines. Of these timber is one, and we must realise that our forests are being cut out quickly. Other forms of production on which the State depends relate to wool and wheat, which are governed entirely by the world's markets. If there were a sudden turn of the world's markets against our wool and wheat, all these various forms of amusements would fall to the ground like a ripe orange. We would be sky-high financially. Realising that position, members should ask themselves if they should encourage this additional form of gambling. It has been suggested that gambling is not covered by the Bill. I urge hon. members to consider that aspect seriously. They must realise that tin hare coursing, or any other form of sport of this description, could not last for five minutes if gambling were not

permitted. What arguments are there against the Bill? The first is *laissez faire*; the liberty of the subject; unlimited competition. I can conjure up the spectacle of some hon. members devoting a quarter of an hour to the necessity for unlimited competition. The policy of *laissez faire* is an exploded one. It was the practice of *laissez faire* in international relationship that led to the great war. *Laissez faire* in the home does not exist. Every day the people are confronted with restrictions. There is no such thing as freedom. We are hedged round with customs and regulations by which certain things are not permitted. It is to that encircling tyranny that we owe any liberty we possess. Where is there any freedom for the subject regarding gambling or betting? The whole thing is strictly confined, just as is the liquor traffic. There are reasons for that. It was found that the drink traffic should be carefully curtailed, and regulated, and the same thing has applied to various forms of sport. In my electorate there is a strong public feeling against the establishment of tin hare coursing. It was made manifest as the result of meetings and a referendum.

Mr. Marshall: Can you say why tin hare coursing is not wanted by those people?

Mr. Sleeman: You need not have it at Claremont if you do not want it!

Mr. NORTH: I am speaking for the people of Claremont, and I have sufficient authority from them to permit me to move the second reading of this Bill. We have in Western Australia 370,000 people. We cannot expect to ape all the wonderful conditions of society in London, with its population of 7,000,000 people, nor can we expect to ape Melbourne and Sydney with their huge populations. We know that money is tight and the banks have a sorry tale to tell. Overdrafts are being called up. In view of that position alone, we should not consider encouraging the establishment of another sport that will mean a further drain on the earnings of the people. In view of the vote recorded in my electorate, when the result of the referendum indicated a strong protest against the establishment of this form of amusement, I have a perfect mandate to place the Bill before the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [4.52]: I move an amendment—

That "now" be struck out with a view to inserting "this day six months" in lieu.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam—on amendment) [4.53]: I am sorry that the amendment has been moved in such a way. People who can move amendments like that have not much courage. They have not a word to say in support of the amendment.

Mr. Sleeman: We will show our courage by our vote.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Why should the Bill be read this day six months? Have members not sufficient courage to consider such a simple measure?

Mr. Sleeman: Why waste time?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is mere humbug to suggest that tin hare coursing can continue without gambling. I do not look upon gambling in the light that some people do, and I do not know that I can object if the people have the money to spend. On the other hand, I object to the wholesale gambling that goes in this State to-day. It is an iniquitous practice and will lead to trouble. I object, therefore, to any means that will increase the facilities for gambling.

Mr. Sleeman: You made no attempt to stop it when you were in power.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We may delude ourselves into the belief that if we allow this sport to be established without gambling, it will be all right, but in adopting that attitude we shall be humbugging the people. We do not object to dogs being raced. We already have our whippets in Western Australia and what are the gold-fields people going to say about the establishment of this form of opposition?

Mr. Chesson: Why should it not be established?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Are the people who pay for it going to tolerate this form of competition?

Mr. Chesson: Why not?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Why do not members discuss the Bill? I hope members will deal with the measure on its merits, and I hope they will reject the amendment. Long ago the Premier said there was too much gambling in this State.

Mr. Marshall: Why not start with the racecourses and cut out the betting there?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Any member who says that we can have tin hare coursing without gambling does not believe what he says, or else he is very inexperienced. We know what it will be. We have quite sufficient racing in this State at present and quite sufficient opportunities for gambling. The sport is indulged in in the Old Country to a considerable extent. In New South Wales it is in existence and there the bookmakers are licensed for the coursing meetings. I do not know how it is proposed to license the bookmakers in this State. I know that bookmakers have to pay license fees before they are permitted to bet on the racecourses.

Mr. Sleeman: And you know that is illegal.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is not.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: From the early days of this State, we have had horse racing and I suppose betting was conducted then as well. That, however, does not mean that we must agree to the introduction of every form of sport suggested, thus providing additional opportunities for gambling.

Mr. Marshall: If the sport is not popular it will die out, so why worry?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am not worrying; the hon. member is worrying.

Mr. Marshall: No, I am not.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then the hon. member is worried without it.

Mr. Marshall: No, but if I wished to cut out gambling, it would start where it is in evidence.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have been surprised to hear some of the interjections by hon. members. They must realise that the Bill merely sets out that we shall not have this form of gambling established in our midst. We say the sport cannot be established without gambling and everyone knows that is so. Those who vote for the Bill will vote against another opportunity being afforded to the public to gamble in a convenient fashion. Doubtless the dog races will be run at night time under pleasant circumstances. The sport will be made attractive, particularly to young people, and naturally they will indulge accordingly. Let hon. members be honest. Those who vote for the Bill will vote against any addition to the gambling facilities that now exist.

Mr. Sleeman: There is no gambling mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Those who vote against the Bill will vote for an additional opportunity to gamble.

Mr. Corboy: That is a deliberate misstatement.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is a deliberate statement of fact. If this form of sport is established here, it will be accompanied by gambling.

Mr. Marshall: You have got your opinion out of the public Press.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would be quite refreshing if the hon. member would get an opinion from anywhere at all. It is better to get opinions from a good source than not to hold any opinion whatever. I have been pretty consistent in questioning the wisdom of permitting the wholesale gambling that goes on in this State.

Mr. Corboy: You established the White City.

Hon. G. Taylor: You had better leave out the White City.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not want to leave out White City, but certainly I did not establish gambling at the White City.

Mr. Corboy: Of course you did.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Long before I came into office the thing was run at the back of the Supreme Court in a temporary structure. I said it must be removed to where it now is.

Mr. Corboy: Yes, you provided a permanent home for it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think the Silver Chain and the Ugly Men's Association were the only people concerned at the time. They had the place long before. I merely shifted it to another site.

The Premier: You made them more comfortable.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think it was very comfortable then. It was a very rough place indeed. It has been improved since then. I had no objection to the moderate gambling that in those days went on for purely charitable purposes. But it has now grown beyond control, it is out of hand altogether. The sort of thing I was always willing to agree to was such gambling as consists in guessing the number of peas in a pot. But it is no longer a question of some simple means of gambling. Day after day and night after night people are engaged upon more serious forms of gambling. I entirely disapprove of that. At Boulder they have a White City continually going.

Mr. Corboy: And even at Northam.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, even at Northam they established a White City.

The Minister for Works: Why pick Northam?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suppose because it is said to be a city of churches. But what did they do at Northam? Mr. Gray, in another place, could tell us all about it. They went up there, secured a block of land and said they wanted to build a Trades Hall. To this end they got up a gambling stunt, with the idea of raising £1,500. But when they got that amount, instead of building the Trades Hall they sold the block of land and cleared out, leaving everybody lamenting. There was decency neither in their forms of gambling, nor in their methods after they secured the sum they wanted. I believe the money was used for electioneering purposes.

Mr. Sleeman: With very good results.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, from the hon. member's point of view, excellent results.

Mr. Corboy: But you would not object to the erection of a Trades Hall?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I would not object to the erection of a Trades Hall anywhere. Anything for the benefit of the workers has my support. But when it comes to the carrying on of gambling stunts in order to get funds for an election campaign, I certainly do object.

Mr. Corboy: I wish I could have got some of it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope the hon. member did not get money for his election from gambling. If so, he was about the only one over there who did not. I hope the House will reject the amendment moved by my friend from Fremantle and will then consider the Bill on its merits. We all know that if tin hare coursing is established in this State it will lead to gambling on the part of many young people. I hope nobody here would approve of that.

Mr. Sleeman: Would you stop whippet racing and bicycle racing, because they lead to gambling?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Those forms of sport are already established here.

Mr. Marshall: There are many more risks in bicycle racing than in racing whippets or tin hares.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I believe the hon. member is an expert in these matters, and so I accept his opinion. However, I hope the House will reject the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret—on amendment) [5.7]: I cannot support the amendment. It is the most drastic action that has been taken on a second reading since I have been in Parliament.

Mr. Sleeman: It is a pretty drastic Bill.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not know that the Bill needs such desperate treatment. I hope the House will be permitted to discuss the Bill.

The Premier: It is a form of execution without trial.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is indeed. I am more than surprised at the earnestness and enthusiasm evinced by members of the Government cross-benches in this simple little measure.

Mr. Panton: They all have a greyhound each.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I remember that not long ago the Premier was pleading for a reduction of the franchise of another place. There was no enthusiasm in our friends opposite on that occasion. They certainly voted when the time came, but while the Premier was speaking we could all hear him. On this occasion opponents of the Bill have worked themselves up to an astounding pitch of excitement, and one could scarcely hear the Leader of the Opposition speaking. The Bill should be fairly discussed. If members opposing it are afraid to hear arguments in favour of it, then seemingly they have a very poor case. The member for Fremantle would be wise in withdrawing his amendment and allowing the Bill to be discussed on the second reading. Then let those in favour of it put up their reasons for it, whilst those opposing it can put the case against it. There is nothing drastic in the measure. It is idle for anybody to say that gambling will not follow any form of sport.

Mr. Sleeman: It followed bicycle racing.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, gambling has silenced more men in sport than has anything else. Some sports of course lend themselves to gambling more than do others.

The Premier: Foot-racing, for instance.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, I am reminded by the Premier of what happened to foot racing. It was very much practised at Kalgoorlie and Boulder in the old days.

Where have all our old pedestrians gone to? Let us be fair.

Mr. Sleeman: Are you fair?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am trying to induce the House to let the Bill be discussed. If I am going to support the Bill I will put up reasons for it at the proper time—I cannot do it on this amendment—whereas if I am going to oppose it, I will put up reasons against it. I have never seen such a drastic amendment since I have been in Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had better put the House right. The member for Fremantle has not moved his motion strictly in order. The question really before the House is that the word “now” be omitted with a view to adding the words “this day six months.” The question is that the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the question. That is the only point that can be discussed.

MR. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin—on amendment) [5.11]: I am surprised that the hon. member should have moved his amendment without giving any reason for it. The member for Claremont introduced the Bill and made out a good case for it, one that probably would appeal to a majority of the people in this State. Then we are asked by the member for Fremantle to guillotine the Bill, although no reason is given for the amendment.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is the new brand of democracy.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The desire expressed in the Bill is to stop the introduction of tin hare racing in this State. As far as my inquiries have gone, I have not been able to learn that tin hare racing has done any good in any part of Australia where it has been allowed to be established.

Mr. Sleeman: There are other things about which that could be said.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes, I know. But this is a new thing altogether. We have already a number of established forms of sport in respect of which gambling can be carried on. But most of them are not run by proprietors.

Mr. Corboy: Most of them are.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I am not in favour of proprietary racing. One of the characteristics of tin hare racing is that it is almost always carried on by proprietary concerns. So far as I can learn, it has not done any good anywhere in Australia. I have yet to learn that gambling on tin hare

racing conducted by proprietors is inserted in the platform of the Political Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only question before the Chair is the amendment that the word “now” be omitted.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: At any rate, I think it is a good Bill, that it was well introduced by the member for Claremont, and that it fully deserves consideration on its merits. If there is a case against the Bill, it should be put up openly. I am entirely opposed to this attempt to destroy the measure and permit tin hare racing to be established in Western Australia without any consideration by this House. I hold that the supporters of tin hare racing should come out into the open and put up a case against the Bill.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan—on amendment) [5.15]: Without expressing any opinion at this stage on the rights or wrongs of tin hare racing, I shall certainly vote against the amendment. The moving of the amendment was not consistent with the sporting spirit usually manifested by the member for Fremantle.

Mr. Sleeman: The Bill does not manifest any sporting spirit, either.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am prepared to give the Bill a run for its money, and I think we should discuss it in this House. The subject is one on which public opinion is sharply divided, and one that should be discussed fully and without any ambiguity. I would be sorry if the amendment were carried. To dispose of the Bill in that way would not be in the best interests of the State, and it would bring this House into a measure of disrepute. When an important matter—and this is important in the minds of the public—is introduced, we as the representatives of the people should face it, submit arguments for or against, and be prepared to vote on the merits.

Mr. Corboy: You do not think it disreputable for another place to treat Government Bills in that way?

Mr. Sleeman: No, it is quite right then!

Mr. Corboy: It is quite right when you are opposed to a Bill!

Mr. Latham: Such Bills are generally discussed in another place.

Mr. SAMPSON: On general principles, another place might be quite right in taking such action, but I do not wish to discuss that question now. I fear that the mem-

ber for Fremantle acted on the spur of the moment and without giving the matter the consideration that he usually gives to questions. In the circumstances I should not be surprised if he asked leave to withdraw the amendment.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford—on amendment) [5.17]: I regret that the member for Fremantle has moved the amendment because he has given no reason for it and this is a question that has occupied the public mind for some time and upon which the public are looking to Parliament to make a declaration.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Bill should be discussed on its merits.

Mr. Sleeman: And thrown out afterwards?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If the hon. member desired the rejection of the Bill, which deals with a question on which public attention has been concentrated for some time, he should have given the public reasons for disposing of it by a sudden death motion.

Mr. Marshall: He is not as old a Parliamentarian as you are.

Mr. Latham: He is pretty wise, though.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We should not take into consideration the fact that the Bill has come to us from the Legislative Council. That question should not influence us; nor should we be influenced in our opinion by the fact that a certain member has introduced it. We should judge the Bill on its merits. It deals with public morals and it is a question about which the public are greatly concerned. Consequently we should have an opportunity to discuss the merits instead of having the Bill rejected without being able to express our views. I feel that the member for Fremantle has acted on the impulse of the moment and, with the member for Swan, I suggest he ask leave to withdraw the amendment and allow the Bill to be discussed on its merits.

MR. LATHAM (York—on amendment) [5.19]: I am sorry that it is desired not to give the House an opportunity to discuss the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the amendment be lost, the House will be able to discuss it.

Mr. LATHAM: But I anticipate that the hon. member has counted heads and knows that the amendment will be carried. If it

should be carried I shall miss an opportunity to say what I wish to say.

Mr. Corboy: You cannot discuss the Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: I am aware of that, but I do not want to be told it by the hon. member. I shall rely on the Speaker. If we do not discuss the question to-day, tin hare racing may get a six months' run in this State and it would then be unfair for the House to prohibit it without giving very good reasons. We should be honest and decide during this session whether tin hare racing is in the best interests of the public. Anyone who has visited Sydney and seen tin hare racing there must be convinced of the necessity for discussing it here without delaying the question for six months. A while ago I was impressed by the remarks of a very able gentleman who delivered a speech in the interests of the working people of the world. I refer to the Rev. Mr. Barr. His remarks convinced me that such measures as the one before us should have consideration before a sport like tin hare racing is permitted to be established.

Mr. Sleeman: Some of his views would not suit you.

Mr. LATHAM: All his views suit me.

Mr. Corboy: Then come over here.

Mr. LATHAM: The trouble is his views are not endorsed by members on the Government side; otherwise we should be given an opportunity to discuss this Bill. What Mr. Barr said convinces me that we should discuss the Bill before we allow the people to invest their money in tin hare ventures. Not only are the promoters interested in the question, but a company is being floated and people will invest their money in the sport. If in six months' time we found it necessary to prohibit the sport we would have delayed a decision that should be given to-day. We should face the question manfully and not in a cowardly way, as I contend we should do if we agreed to the amendment.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon—on amendment) [5.22]: I regret that the member for Fremantle has moved a sudden death motion to dispose of the Bill. Whatever attitude I may adopt to the measure subsequently, I cannot support the amendment. The reasons why we should discuss the Bill have been ably stated by the member for Guildford. Members should have a fair opportunity to debate such a measure.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [5.23]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. PANTON (Menzies) [5.24]: To-day I received a circular, and I dare say other members have received one, dealing with this question, and if anything would tend to assist the passage of the Bill the arguments contained in the circular would, though they were intended to have the contrary effect.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not think I have the circular of which the hon. member speaks.

MR. PANTON: I cannot believe that I was the only member to receive it.

MR. NORTH: Let us leave the circulars out. I did not issue them.

MR. PANTON: I do not want to leave the circular out, because it has a lot to do with what I wish to say.

MR. SAMPSON: Is it a typewritten one?

MR. PANTON: Yes.

Hon. G. Taylor: I have not seen that one.

MR. RICHARDSON: That is from the inventor of the machine.

MR. PANTON: Yes, it is signed "A. E. Watts." I am not going to support the Bill because I have my own ideas about gambling in Australia. I hold the opinion that there is more hypocrisy to the square inch on the question of gambling than on any other question.

MR. CORBOY: Of course there is.

MR. PANTON: There is a good deal in the allegation that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor in the matter of gambling. A rich man can go to his club in the city and play poker till all hours of the night and for any stake he likes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He cannot.

MR. PANTON: He can.

MR. SAMPSON interjected.

MR. PANTON: If there is one thing from which I should like to discourage a young man like the member for Swan, it is the game of poker. If I, not being a member of an aristocratic club, wished to engage in a game of two-up, I should run the risk of being taken by the shoulder, yanked off to the court and fined £10 or £15. If I am prepared to pay my train fare and admission charge to any of the proprietary racecourses, I can bet on any race with a book-

maker or on the totalisator, but if I am not in a position to go to the racecourses—

MR. LATHAM: You can bet in the street.

MR. PANTON: If I go into a tobacconist's shop and have a bet, I am liable to be arrested and fined £5 or £6.

MR. LATHAM: But you can bet in the street.

MR. PANTON: Yes, but by so doing I render the man making the bet liable to a fine of £10. On Saturday last I walked as far as the Oxford Hotel, Leederville, not to have a bet or a drink, but for another purpose, and just as I got there a man was arrested for betting. Yesterday he was fined £10.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is a good job they did not mistake you for him.

MR. PANTON: A bookmaker must have an intelligent look, and so neither the member for Mt. Margaret nor myself would run any risk of being arrested for bookmaking. At present the Federal Government refuse to transmit my 6s. or 7s. through the post for a ticket in Tattersall's sweep, but if I get the money to Tattersalls and win a prize the Government collect 12½ per cent. on it. The whole attitude to gambling is one of rank hypocrisy from start to finish.

MR. MARSHALL: The Government collect one penny on every ticket issued by a bookmaker.

MR. PANTON: Not now. As to coursing, no one loves it better than I do, and when I say coursing I mean real coursing. I have not seen a tin hare show. The best part of my younger days was spent on a horse behind good greyhounds chasing hares.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What a pity!

MR. PANTON: If a lot more had done the same thing in their youth there would have been less need for children's courts now.

MR. NORTH: This Bill will not affect that.

MR. PANTON: That is why I remained single so long. I love dogs and hares and I could watch horseracing all day and enjoy it without betting on it. I coursed dogs for many years without betting, and many other men have done the same. I do not know Mr. Watts. I have never met him and am not interested in him or in the company that is being promoted. If a racehorse or a trotter may be indulged in by a man who can afford to buy him and train him, and to pay a boy to ride or drive him—taking the chance whether the boy rides or drives him properly—then, if I cannot

afford a horse, I am surely entitled to buy and race a dog.

Mr. North: You can do that under the Bill.

Mr. PANTON: There is not the same opportunity in this State as in Victoria for going into the country and coursing hares.

Mr. Latham: And so you will have a tin hare, will you?

Mr. PANTON: I am quite satisfied that if tin hare coursing starts and the law of the land as to betting is brought into operation—I do not think there is any doubt it will be—the tin hare will not last long. The whippets do not carry much weight without betting; they do not draw large crowds either in the metropolitan area or anywhere else in Western Australia without the gambling element.

Mr. Mann: But whippet racing still goes on.

Mr. PANTON: Yes, and so does two-up, and so do all sorts of illegal gambling devices. It is all very well for the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) to say the thing is still carried on. If the chase of the tin hare is still carried on—

Mr. Mann: You do not get my point. I say whippet racing is still carried on notwithstanding that there is no betting.

Mr. PANTON: I would like to see tin hare coursing carried on without betting. In that case I would purchase a couple of greyhounds as quickly as I could. I may mention that I cannot afford a racehorse or a trotter. Mr. Watts claims that there are certain things in favour of the tin hare. He says—

A certain crowd put up the argument that mechanical coursing cannot be run without betting. Now, that is absolutely wrong; there is no need for betting at all; the sport is both clean and fast and good to watch. I claim that, with hurdle and steeple-chasing, with treble jumps in different parts of the course it is both spectacular and interesting.

There is a good deal of this, and I will not read it all. However, he proceeds—

If you desire to course a dog you have to register it with the controlling body 14 days before it can race. Pedigree, markings, etc., are registered. It is weighed by the veterinary surgeon, who is the main figure in mechanical hare coursing. A swab is taken, also the dog is thoroughly examined to see that it is a healthy dog. After that is done, the owner takes his dog away home. The week before it is raced, it is again brought to the veterinary surgeon, and again weighed and tested; and if the dog weighs 70 lbs., that is the weight it must be the night of the race,

or within half a pound. This prevents what is termed filling a dog before racing.

In the next paragraph are set out the various penalties, and all the precautions taken to prevent what is known in coursing parlance as stuffing a dog so as to prevent it from winning a race. If Mr. Watts had given the matter five minutes' serious consideration before writing his pamphlet, he would have seen the bearing of all these precautions; he would have recognised that such precautions would not be necessary to prevent a dog from winning a race if all that was involved was the stake. I do not believe any member of this House is unsophisticated enough to believe that a man is going to run a horse or a dog, or ride a bike, or run himself, only for the stake. Such a man is either running for a "nark," or for bets, and not for the stake. No doubt, if the stakes were sufficiently large a man might take the risk of filling his dog, because the owner does take a risk when he fills his dog up with water to prevent it from winning. There is only one reason for the precautions set out in the pamphlet, and that is that the bets, not the stake, will be worth running for. In my opinion Mr. Watts is quite honest when he says that there is to be no betting on tin hare courses and that all sorts of precautions will be taken against unfair running. But now comes a paragraph to which I take the very strongest exception—

When the dogs are taken from the kennels, in full view of the public, they are handled by incapacitated returned soldiers, who parade them in colours around the racing track and back to the starting boxes, where the dogs are placed in separate compartments, so that they cannot fight. The returned men leave the ground, and the race is run . . . Now, every ground which is opened in Western Australia can employ 25 incapacitated returned soldiers, and as the Returned Soldiers' Association cannot find employment for these special cases on account of the loss of limb or limbs, it is going to be a big thing to these unfortunate men

It is most remarkable that no matter who the individual or what the company desirous of boosting something may be, if it is possible to drag in the poor old returned soldier, that is done. I as a returned soldier take the strongest exception to this country, or for that matter any other country, but this country especially, introducing a tinpot dog race and having to parade the poor unfortunate incapacitated returned soldiers to do it. I hope that if Mr. Watts sends out another circular, it will not contain state-

ments of this nature. I shall not support the Bill. My reason for opposing it is not the source from which it comes, or its introducer. My reason is that if a man wants to race a dog, he has the right to do so. He cannot race after hares in this country.

Member: Better import some hares.

Mr. PANTON: We do not want to import hares. I am satisfied that tin hare racing can be a good clean sport if people are prepared to race for stakes; but that spectacle without betting will not draw crowds of 30,000. I shall be prepared to put up a fight at any time for the prevention of betting on tin hare or any other courses. Betting has proved the bane or the downfall of every sport. In England a gentleman told me that the only race that had not been ruined by betting was the Oxford-Cambridge boat race, and he added, "We will never let the Australians get into that, because they will want to back themselves." There is no betting on that boat race, and it is a genuine race. Betting has ruined bicycle racing, foot racing, and every other kind of sport into which man-power enters. The position is much the same to-day as regards football, though I will not add as regards cricket or bowls. In the last case perhaps the old men playing the game have got beyond betting. Football, however, is becoming more commercialised every day. Only a few weeks ago I saw a man take a bet of £60 to £40 on one local match. If a backer can get such a bet, and possibly get it twice over, is he not prepared to try to obtain a hold on one of the players, though I do not say he would succeed in his attempt?

Hon. G. Taylor: There is something doing when such bets are made.

Mr. PANTON: Human nature has to be taken into account whether with a jockey on the back of a horse or a player in a football jersey. The whole subject, I repeat, is replete with hypocrisy; but I cannot resist the principle that a poor man shall be at liberty to race a dog just as a rich man races a horse.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [5.40]: I say at the outset that I support the Bill. No one will accuse me of being of the wowser type at all, but I have a strong objection to allowing the introduction into Western Australia of anything that will tend to bring about more gambling. Looking around to-day we see every imaginable invention employed in order that gambling may continue.

The avenues of gambling that exist in our midst are numerous; and this fact is to the detriment, not particularly of grown-ups but of the younger generation. At Whit City and other places of that description may be seen boys and girls of tender years indulging in various forms of gambling. There may be no harm in tin hare racing itself. Someone has stated that no betting will be allowed on tin hare courses, but at present we do not know whether that will be so or not. We do know, however, that the promoters of the tin hare racing companies are prepared to give an undertaking that they will not allow any betting in connection with the sport. But, as the member for Menzies (Mr. Panton) has stated, it is impossible to keep betting out of any sport. It matters not what the sport may be, betting eventually creeps into it somehow or other. It is my opinion that if tin hare racing is begun here, the younger generation will be afforded an easily accessible avenue to embark upon a gambling career. Many years ago the Government of this State made a definite announcement that street betting would not be tolerated; yet to-day there is not a well-frequented street corner where street betting may not be seen on Saturday afternoon. The Government gave that undertaking, and it has not been fulfilled up to date. Probably that is not the Government's fault. The fault no doubt lies chiefly with the Australian's instinct which prompts him to have his little bet on everything. Since in spite of the Government's pronouncement street betting has not been stopped, what possible chance is there of preventing betting in connection with tin hare racing? If we are to have tin hare racing, by far the preferable course would be to let betting be carried on openly, in the same way as it has practically been legalised at gallops and trots.

Mr. Sleeman: It is not legal.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am aware of that. Still, it would be better to have registered bookmakers at tin hare racing than to allow the wagers there to be taken by some of those who indulge in sly betting, and who if their losses are considerable, are not particular about sealing punters. If tin hare racing is to be permitted in Western Australia, then I personally would rather see the registered bookmaker on tin hare courses than the men who probably will bet under the lap. For many years our Governments and our people have been using their best endeavours to develop Western Australia

On the one hand we are endeavouring to enrich the country by development and greater production, and on the other hand it is proposed, in effect, that anyone is to be allowed to come along and start a thing which must prove derogatory to this great State. In this way the community loses wealth, which flows into wrong channels, Western Australia's development being retarded upon injuriously. It is well-known that in practically every sport there is betting to-day. I personally see no particular sport in tin hare racing. Indeed, I fail to see where the element of sport comes in.

Mr. Panton: Have you ever seen dog racing?

Mr. RICHARDSON: In South Australia I reared a greyhound named "Mozart," which won two Waterloo cups in succession and was runner-up in the third.

Mr. Panton: Did you back it?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The descendants of that dog "Mozart" are to-day being run in coursing matches in both Victoria and South Australia.

Mr. Panton: Did you ever back "Mozart" in the Waterloo cup?

Mr. RICHARDSON: No. I reared the dog for a gentleman named Hubble and he won £900 in bets over the first Waterloo Cup in which the dog competed.

Mr. Lamond: Did not you get anything out of it?

Mr. RICHARDSON: No. Anyhow that is merely by the way. The member for Menzies imagines that he is the only one who has ever owned a greyhound.

Mr. Panton: Not at all, but I have never bred a Waterloo Cup winner.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I looked upon it as a sport—that is, open coursing. In those days there was open coursing and one had to travel miles and miles before he put up a hare, and there was something in that sport that thrilled one as a young fellow. It is quite an easy matter to say that we should allow everyone to have their own sport and in the way they desire. Looking at it superficially, that seems quite right. But there is another side to the question, and when we look around we find all our laws are restrictive to a greater or lesser degree. It is for us, as representatives of the people, to say whether tin hare racing is going to be derogatory or not to our State, and if we believe it is going to be derogatory, we are justified in voting for the Bill before us to prevent the introduc-

tion of the so-called sport. We are not taking away from the tin hare companies anything that they have. We are simply saying to them, "We are not doing you any injury because you have not yet invested anything in Western Australia; we are not taking anything from you, but we are going to see that you are not going to take anything from us, by refusing to permit you to conduct tin hare racing." I love horses and I love dogs, but I love human nature better than either, and I am looking at this question from the human point of view, from the young people's point of view. We find that this matter of tin hare racing has created more interest in Western Australia than perhaps any other subject during the past 10 or 12 years. We find that not only have the churches offered strong opposition to it, but wherever we go the business people are decrying it. They say that too much money is going into the wrong channels, and quite recently, as the member for Fremantle knows, the Business Men's Association of Fremantle raised a very strong protest against White City and other movements of that description.

Mr. Sleeman: But they do not speak for me.

Mr. RICHARDSON: No, but the hon. member knows that the protest was actually made. The business people throughout the metropolitan area, as well as those at Fremantle, are crying out aloud about the increase in gambling and the facilities that are being offered for it. We know that in Western Australia to-day money is tighter than it has been for many years past.

Mr. Panton: Tin hares will loosen a lot of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Tin hare racing may have the effect of still further tightening the position, and also affecting the finances of the State.

Mr. Clydesdale: Rubbish!

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. member knows that what I am saying is correct. There should not be any locking up of money in Western Australia, but unfortunately there is, and there is a reason for it. I do not wish to labour the question. In my opinion, immediately we start tin hare racing, betting will follow.

Mr. Corboy: Why not be consistent and stop the whole lot of them.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If the hon. member will introduce a Bill of that sort, I will give it due consideration.

Mr. Corboy: Will you support it?

Mr. RICHARDSON: We have interjections "Why don't you do this and why don't you do that?" Why does not the hon. member do something?

Mr. Corboy: Will you support me if I do?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will give it due consideration just as I do to everything else.

Mr. Corboy: You supported a Bill to increase the number of trotting meetings, and therefore you supported facilities to increase gambling.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not quite sure that I did.

Mr. Corboy: You did; look it up.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Whether I did or did not, trotting is a recognised sport.

Mr. Corboy: It is all right for Brennan and his satellites, but wrong for anyone else.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I strongly object to anyone's name being mentioned in the discussion because the opportunity to reply is not given. Whatever Mr. Brennan may be, or what he may not be, does not enter into the discussion respecting tin hare racing. So far as I am aware Mr. Brennan is a thorough gentleman and, moreover, he is not the only one interested in racing, be it trotting or any other form of racing. A man may have opinions on certain subjects and because he expresses them freely through the Press is no reason why we in this House should endeavour to belittle him. I am not going to say anything further except to express the hope that members who are opposed to the Bill will give their reasons for voting against it, just as members who are supporting it will advance arguments in its favour.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [5.53]: It is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill. We know there are certain provisions contained in the Criminal Code that prevent gambling taking place, but notwithstanding those powers we are unable to prevent gambling. All one has to do is to walk down what is looked upon as the most respectable thoroughfare in the city—St. George's terrace—and he will find, at any time of the day, while there is racing going on in any part of Australia as well as in our own State, it is possible to make a bet. I do not know that there is a great deal of harm in betting, and

if the people associated with tin hare racing were applying for permission to conduct races with equines, I would support them. Tin hare racing, however, has pernicious effects, and if we can take any notice of what has occurred in New South Wales, we shall be foolish to permit it to be introduced in Western Australia. We should do all we can to prevent, by legislation, its being started in our midst.

Mr. Panton: Then we might get tin horses.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am not going to support this form of racing. Wherever it has been tried there is overwhelming testimony from everybody, except those in the business, that it has an evil effect on the community.

MR. CHESON (Cue) [5.55]: It is my intention to vote against the Bill. Gambling is permitted on racecourses and at the trotting course, and I do not see why it should not be allowed in connection with mechanical hare racing. I realise that the Criminal Code prohibits betting in connection with horse racing, trotting, or any other form of sport, but it is possible for any person to go to a race meeting and bet with impunity. Why, we permit bookmakers to be registered, and we have the totalisator in order to encourage people to indulge in gambling. Why do people go to racecourses? Solely for one object and that is to bet. Moreover, do we not levy a tax on every betting ticket that is issued by the bookmaker to his client? A lot of people take an interest in coursing and others prefer different forms of sport. There are those who patronise horse racing only, whilst others like trotting, cycle meetings, and even pedestrianism. Why should patrons of these various sports be denied the opportunity to derive enjoyment from them? Why, also, should they be prevented from having a little betting transaction if it is their desire to do so? It is remarkable to find the intense interest that the trotting people have taken in the proposed introduction of mechanical hare racing. We realise, of course, that if the mechanical hare is introduced, the sport will take away many of the patrons from the trotting course, and it will make a good deal of difference to the income of the Trotting Association. If we are sincere about gambling and its prohibition, why do we not enforce the law? If we enforced the law we should have to prohibit betting in connection with sport of

all kinds. The Bill says "Facing by or between animals other than horses." I suppose the member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) will remember the early days on the goldfields, when, associated with horse racing there were camel and donkey races, and even goat races at times. There was as much interest taken in the races between camels, donkeys and goats as between the horses. There is still considerable interest being taken in pedestrian races. This form of sport continues to attract attention at Mullewa, and even without betting. Bookmakers are not permitted to ply their calling on the recreation ground where the sports are held, and in spite of that fact the pedestrian races are flourishing there, so much so that the prize money is being increased, and the entries are greater than they have ever been. The State derives considerable revenue from betting, not only from the totalisator but from the bookmaker on the racecourse. Why should we be hypocrites? We draw revenue from the different racecourses and trotting grounds, and from licensed bookmakers. We also draw revenue through Tattersalls. These people have started a company. No doubt some of the money that would be in circulation in other channels will be put into this venture. People should be allowed to invest their money where they like. Persons who are interested in other avenues, however, have been instrumental in bringing down this Bill, and are endeavouring to restrict the remainder of the people. They seem to think that a lot of money will go into this new channel that should be available to go into other channels. Seeing that we allow horseracing and trotting, I do not see why tin hare racing should not also be allowed. Why have a close reserve for horse racing and trotting? The way should be left open for the promoters of tin hare coursing. They will be providing for a form of amusement for people who care for that sort of thing, but who may not care for other forms of sport. In the mining districts of New South Wales every "Geordie" had his coursing dog. The men did not take much interest in horse racing, but when it came to quoit matches or coursing they were particularly interested. I like horse racing, but I see no reason for denying the wants of other sections of the community, who may prefer to get their sport through coursing or tin hare racing.

MR. MANN (Perth) [6.3]: The whole argument against tin hare racing has been on the ground of the betting that is likely to be associated with it. The betting laws in this State are wide enough and comprehensive enough to prohibit betting on any event in any place whatsoever. The Bill is an admission that we are incapable of enforcing the law of the land when we say that tin hare coursing cannot be carried on without betting. Section 211 says—

Any house or room or any place whatsoever which is used for any of the purposes following, that is to say—(1) For the purpose of bets being made therein between persons resorting to the place; or (2) For the purpose of bets being made therein between persons resorting to the place, and (a) the owner, occupier, or keeper of the place, or any person using the place, or (b) any person procured or employed by or acting for or on behalf of any such owner, occupier, or keeper or person using the place; or (c) any persons having the care or management, or in any manner conducting the business of the place; or (3) For the purpose of any money or other property being paid or received therein by or on behalf of any such owner, occupier, or keeper or person using the place as or for the consideration; (d) for an assurance, undertaking, promise or agreement, express or implied, to pay or give thereafter any money or other property on any event of contingency of or relating to any horse race, or other race, fight, game, sport, or exercise; or (e) for securing the paying or giving by some other person of any money or other property on any such event or contingency; is called a common betting-house. Any person who opens, keeps or uses a common betting house is guilty of a misdemeanour, and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for three years; or he may be summarily convicted before two justices, in which case he is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for six months, or to a fine of £100. Any person who, being the owner or occupier of any house, room or place, knowingly and wilfully permits it to be opened, kept or used as a common betting-house by any other person, or who has the use or management, or assists in conducting the business of a common betting-house, is guilty of an offence, and is liable on summary conviction to imprisonment with hard labour for six months, or to a fine of £100.

Surely the law is clear enough and definite enough to prevent betting. It only requires to be administered. Time was when betting did take place on foot and bicycle racing, but, immediately the law was put into operation, foot racing from a commercial point of view, as well as bicycle racing from the same point of view, ceased to exist. To-day, however, we still have both kinds of races. There are road races for bicycles

every Saturday afternoon, conducted by the amateur cycle clubs of the State.

Mr. Sampson: By the League of Western Australian Wheelmen.

Mr. MANN: Foot racing as well as bicycle racing is conducted by authorised bodies. It is not now carried on as it was some years ago under electric light, for commercial purposes. Betting on whippet racing was prohibited, but we still have whippet races almost every Saturday afternoon. Whippet race meetings are conducted by those who enjoy that form of sport, and no betting takes place there. It is a matter of the authorities deciding that there shall be no betting, and no betting occurs.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You would not like to guarantee that there is no betting.

Mr. MANN: There is whippet racing at Maylands, and in the hon. member's electorate every Saturday afternoon. I do not think there is any betting in conjunction with it. If there is, it does not amount to much.

Mr. Panton: It does not affect the number of those who go to church.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The law has a restraining effect.

Mr. MANN: We know from experience that when the law was put into operation, betting very largely ceased on these forms of sport. It is a question for the Government as to whether betting should or should not be prohibited altogether, and transactions of that kind confined to the totalisator. Governments have decided that under proper control such as with the W.A.T.C and the W.A. Trotting Association, betting on horse racing and trotting may be permitted. There always is a certain amount of gambling. For that reason it has been decided that it should be permitted, under the control of the governing bodies. If tin hare racing cannot live without betting, and the authorities decide to enforce the betting laws, that sport will cease to exist. The Bill is narrow in its present form, and is not necessary.

Mr. Lindsay: Are you supporting it?

Mr. MANN: I am not supporting the Bill.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [6.10]: The Bill should be considered from the point of view in which we all regard gambling. We are all more or less gamblers. I plead guilty to being one myself, but I find it necessary to limit my gambling

to the capacity of my income. I cannot gamble as much as I might like to. I know well that there is a limit to my capacity in that respect. I am, therefore, compelled of necessity to keep my betting transactions within certain bounds.

Mr. Clydesdale: So are most people.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is the way that most people look at it. Australians are gamblers. I think every one of us likes to gamble. As to whether a person can give full scope to his desires, is a matter for him to determine. We have to take into consideration our personal capacity to meet our obligations with respect to our desires. Just as it is necessary for us as individuals to consider these limitations, so it is necessary for the Government to study the point of view of the public and see to what extent the State should go. The State has its limitations just as much as the individual has. I submit that Western Australians today have full opportunities for indulging in that gambling which goes to make up portion of our national life. We derive a good deal of enjoyment from our gambling transactions. There is full scope for us to enjoy ourselves in that way without any further extension of the opportunity. I am therefore supporting the Bill. In the public interests we should not encourage other forms of sport of this kind, especially when it is recognised by those who have taken some interest in the matter that tin hare racing has very little to commend it from the spectacular point of view. It is not at all an entertaining sport unless betting is associated with it. No doubt it will attract for a given time. So far as we know, tin hare coursing has attracted crowds elsewhere because there is betting associated with it.

Mr. Chesson: It has flourished elsewhere.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I understand that is so, but its success has been due to the facilities offered for betting on the results. We have to assume that the patronage accorded to it is due to the fact that people have been able to bet their shillings or pounds as the case may be.

Mr. Mann: That is not the case in England.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not know. I have only read what has been submitted to us from those who have viewed the matter from the aspect of an Australian. I have seen cablegrams from the Old Country published in the Press, but do not think we can draw any definite conclusions from that source. Cablegrams are not always reliable.

I like more definite information than that on matters of this kind. All I know about the matter is what I have read in the newspapers, and they do not always put forward the facts. To-day we have quite sufficient sport in Western Australia to meet the public need. The question is whether tin hare coursing is justified. The question whether we should give the same rights to tin hare racing as is enjoyed by horse racing or trotting is beside the mark. We know well that betting takes place with regard both to horse racing and trotting.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Just before the tea adjournment I was pointing out that the extent of crime associated with gambling is mainly caused by the extent of betting in comparison with the capacity of the individual to pay. If a poor man attempts to gamble in proportion to the betting transacted by a rich man, then it becomes a crime, because the poor man injures not only himself but others, and therefore it is wrong. So long as the man gambles within his capacity to pay, then, while it is illegal, it is generally recognised as part of the right of individuals to do so. Some argue that because we allow gambling to be recognised by the State, although it is illegal, there should be no restriction placed upon it. That would be contrary to public policy and to the Criminal Code, which sets out definitely that gambling is illegal. Betting on horseracing and on trotting events is against the law of the land, but week after week successive Governments have collected a certain amount of revenue through permitting to be done that which is illegal. That is done only because that action is within the scope of public opinion, which agrees that a certain amount of gambling is justified and that it is necessary to afford some outlet for the public desire in that direction. Successive Governments have bowed to public opinion and they have said in effect, "While the law gives us power to prohibit, we will not do so because we believe that public sentiment requires some latitude to be displayed on this question." While we have adopted that attitude, it does not follow that we should remove all limitations upon betting. We do limit betting to-day. We say to people, "You shall bet there, but you must not bet elsewhere." We say, too, that people may bet on horses, but not on individuals. The police are permitted to

allow betting on horse races, but they are instructed to prohibit betting on foot races.

Mr. Chesson: Do you say that is right?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That attitude is endorsed by public opinion and therefore I say it is right. I have no hesitation in making that assertion. No Government have any right to enforce a law that is contrary to public ambition and desire. Such laws have to be used with discretion. The law in Western Australia is drastic and it remains on the statute-book merely because it has been used by successive Governments with due discretion. While the Criminal Code gives wide powers to the Government, it has a restraining influence regarding the high moral tone, if I may use that phrase in regard to betting, in so far as those who are permitted to do that which the Criminal Code says is illegal, must do it in such a way as to maintain public support and demand. Probably many hon. members attend the races. I often get a good deal of enjoyment from the sport. I heard the member for Menzies (Mr. Panton) speak about his love for his dog. I love horses just as well as the member for Menzies loves his dog. I have been guilty of betting on horseracing. When we go to the races we must be struck with the high moral tone existing amongst bookmakers. In ordinary commercial and financial circles it would be impossible to transact business as it is done on the racecourses. In business circles there must be legal documents; they must be stamped; everything must be reduced to writing. There is practically no such thing as a moral agreement between individuals in the commercial and financial world. When it comes to betting on racecourses, however, a mere nod of the head or a gesture to a bookmaker is sufficient for an individual to enter into a contract with him by which the bookmaker will pay him certain moneys in the event of certain results. That goes on week after week. I do not know if there is ever any dispute regarding bets that are made on racecourses. The money involved must run into hundreds of thousands of pounds. Yet we do not hear any outcry on the part of the people that they have not received a fair and just deal. The transactions are run on a basis that enables them to be maintained by public endorsement and public support. Take away the power of the State, however, to stop betting at once, and I venture the opinion that the high moral tone I allude to will not be present. References have been made to the fact that at one time

betting was permitted on foot races and cycle races, but to-day it is prohibited. Betting on those events was stopped because public opinion demanded it. Why was that? It was because it was not legally recognised and was against the law. It was stopped because there was not that proper control exercised by the governing authorities controlling cycling and pedestrian races. The result was that people could not bet on cycle events or foot races with the same degree of confidence as they can bet on horse races.

Mr. Corboy: You think people can bet with confidence on horse races?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, from the standpoint that they know they will be paid should they win their bet.

Mr. Chesson: What about the jockeys?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not know why the hon. member wants to drag in side issues. We know horse racing is not as clean as it might be, nor is trotting. That is not the argument. Surely hon. members can follow the discussion without introducing such side issues. Betting on foot racing and cycling was not recognised by the State. Undesirable influences were brought to bear on those sports and all kinds of tactics were employed to give the public the least possible chance to succeed. The result was that public opinion revolted and that meant that the police were instructed to suppress betting on foot racing and cycle events. Despite the fact that we know that is the recognised public policy, it has to be admitted that betting does take place on foot racing and cycling events. It is a form of betting I would not participate in, but still we know it is done. The amount of betting is limited and restricted because the opportunities for doing it are so confined. That is because the police are particularly active in the suppression of that form of gambling. Coming down to tin hare racing, while we have this form of gambling and know it is illegal, it is wrong for hon. members to argue that because we can bet on galloping or trotting events we should also permit unrestricted betting in connection with tin hare racing.

Mr. Panton: No one has argued along those lines.

Mr. Mann: You have been dealing with betting all the time and that is not mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I recognise that, but—

Mr. North: It is common sense.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We know the evil surrounding tin hare racing arises from the gambling element. We are told by all the authorities that it does not flourish and is not patronised where betting is not allowed, as it does where betting is permitted.

Mr. Mann: Do you not think the Criminal Code is sufficient to deal with the position?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: While I recognise that the concession to public opinion regarding betting must be allowed, we must limit the amount of betting we ourselves do, and just as the individual is restricted, so it is logical for the Government to restrict. It is the function of the Government to limit anything of this kind—this point will appeal to the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy)—if they feel that the public demand regarding gambling is sufficiently catered for under existing conditions. I am told there is no comparison between coursing as was indulged in by the member for Menzies and tin hare racing. The former is good healthy sport because there is the competition between two animals. The question is whether the hare can beat the greyhound, or whether the greyhound can beat the hare.

Mr. Davy: It is thoroughly healthy sport for the hare!

Mr. Panton: Except that there is no hare in it at all!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The position is that the hare has a chance to beat the dog, just as the dog has a chance to beat the hare. I agree that the chances are not altogether equal, but still there is an element of fair competition between the two animals. Even should the dog annihilate the hare, the latter has the satisfaction of knowing that it has given the dog a good run and made him jolly tired.

Mr. Davy: But the hare has to take on the competition whether it cares or not.

Mr. Corboy: The competition is between dog and dog and not between dog and hare.

Mr. Panton: That is so.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I admit that the hare has to compete against the dog whether it cares or not. It is recognised that just as we have to chase a bullock or a sheep for our needs, so the dog has to chase a hare for his needs. Of course, the dog has become a domestic animal and so, in chasing a bullock or a sheep for our own needs, we also chase it for the dog's needs. Nature has provided that the dog shall have the ambition to catch the hare, and so he catches it for his needs.

Hon. W. J. George: When did nature provide that a dog should chase a piece of galvanised iron?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is natural for the dog to chase a hare for his needs, just as it is necessary for us to chase the bullock or the sheep for our needs. Therefore the dog takes a delight in chasing the hare, and the hare takes a delight in escaping from the dog. I maintain that while the dog chases the hare, the hare gets a great deal of satisfaction out of defeating the dog.

Mr. North: There is no doubt about that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The member for Menzies (Mr. Pantou) complains that more often than not the hare succeeds and the dog does not.

Mr. Pantou: It is a competition between two dogs. The hare is only incidental.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The fact remains that it is also a competition between the dog and the hare, and the dog has an opportunity to succeed. Let us come to tin hares. I am told that the dog has no opportunity at all that it never does succeed in catching the hare.

Mr. Mann: That doesn't matter.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But it does matter. Let me reason this from the dog's point of view. The member for Menzies went out on his coursing expedition. He took his dog and looked for a hare. He gave to his dog an opportunity to successfully compete against the hare. The hon. member got delight in that. He said it was a form of sport that he followed, and from which he got a great deal of enjoyment. But when it comes to a tin hare, the dog never has an opportunity to succeed. Certainly it has a chance of beating the other dog; but how long are dogs going to run and be actually keen on the work if they have no opportunity to succeed? Could the member for Menzies get the same delight out of putting a dog on a course and soiling him on to a tin contrivance that he knows perfectly well the dog will never catch?

Mr. Pantou: I back my dog's speed against another dog's speed.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The dog could get no satisfaction from the fact that the hon. member might get a reward through his dog catching the hare first. The dog would not get the same satisfaction as that of the hon. member. The dog's satisfaction

lies in his opportunity to catch the hare. The hon. member gets his satisfaction because his dog happens to catch the hare while the other fellow's dog misses. But the member for Menzies, if he has any love for his dogs, would not put a dog on to a coursing track and run him merely for the sake of running—run him after a tin contrivance that the dog could never catch. The dog enters upon an impossible task night after night.

The Premier: It is not fair to the dog.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is not. I am arguing from the dog's point of view. It is not fair to the dog. How long would members chase a bullock or a sheep if they were going to miss every time? They might continue trying within limits, but they would soon get weary when they found they could not accomplish the impossible. Why should we ask dogs to try night after night to gallop round a course, attempting the impossible, when we know they will never succeed? The only satisfaction is the knowledge that one dog will get nearer to the hare than will another. It is a vile form of gambling, a form that might be popular with the Australian public for a limited time, but will never last. It is not the kind of gambling the Australian rejoices in. He likes to see fair competition, where every competitor has an opportunity to reach the goal. In this so-called sport there is no opportunity to reach the goal. The dog can never accomplish what he sets out to do. So I maintain that from the dog's point of view we ought to support the Bill.

Mr. Mann: According to your argument, pigeon shooting ought to be limited to live birds. There ought to be no dummies.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No, for the shooter gets the satisfaction of hitting something, whether it be alive or dead. The dog sets out to catch something, but the man gets to work with his tin contrivance and says to the dog, "Although you may think you can accomplish it, you never will."

Mr. Latham: A man would never shoot at a pigeon if it were so placed that he could not possibly hit it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No, he sets out to accomplish something, and sometimes he succeeds, whereas in this tin hare racing the dog can never succeed. Again, I ask members whether we should introduce into Western Australia more dogs. Have we not got quite enough in our country to-day? To me a most

objectionable sight is to see ladies walking along, carrying dogs. We should not encourage people to foster a love of dogs, possibly to the exclusion of human beings. We can overdo the introduction of dogs and the encouragement of the public to take an interest in them. Many dogs are of no value—especially the coursing dog. Consider to what base uses dogs are put. We often see ladies with decorated dogs at the end of a chain and being dragged along the streets. Some of those ladies are more careful about the risk of their dogs being run over than they would be in respect of children in perambulators. We do not require to encourage a public love of dogs to any greater extent than it exists to-day. What we require to encourage is a class of dog that is going to be of some use to the community. The coursing greyhound is of no use to the community. The community does not want it, and has never asked that it should be introduced into the State in greater numbers for the purpose of meeting some public need. Yet these dogs, we are told, are to be brought into this State in large numbers for the purpose of tin hare racing. The public has made no demand for those dogs, but they are of commercial interest and they afford an opportunity to make profits. Certain men get together and say, "We will promote a company, not to supply a public demand, but to make a profit out of this so-called sport." I say it is wrong to encourage that kind of thing, to encourage the importation of dogs. The most useless kind of dog and the greatest cur is the kangaroo dog.

Mr. Mann: It provided the back country with meat for years.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is not a class of dog to which anybody becomes attached. It is used only because it is required for the catching of food for human beings.

Mr. Davy: Yet you say he is a most useless kind of dog!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, for any other purpose than that of kangaroo hunting. But you find the kangaroo dog in places where there are no kangaroos to be hunted. Some people seem to desire to breed a kind of animal of no advantage whatever to the community.

Member: You would have a dogless State.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have no objection to people keeping a dog. There is a dog in my own home and we are all very fond of it, but we have no desire to nurse

it. It makes one sad to see ladies nursing dogs. I sat behind two ladies in a tram within the last few days. They were beaming at one another and discussing the eyes of a dog they had, and the make up of its face, and what a kind look it had. There was more enthusiasm over that dog in that tram than I have ever known over any child.

Hon. W. J. George: Perhaps they had no kids of their own.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Well, there are plenty of other people's children to take an interest in, and if they want to nurse something, let them nurse a child. The kangaroo dog is a menace to Western Australia. The worst kind of animal we have in our pastoral and agricultural areas are the crosses between kangaroo dogs and others. They are a menace, and the coursing greyhound is of that type. So I say that from a public point of view we should not encourage importations of this class of dog. We have too many of them already, and we do not want any more of them. Apart from the gambling that is associated with the Bill, it is not fair to the dogs to bring them here. They have to try to accomplish the impossible. The dog, too, is of a kind that does not appeal to the general public and is of no value to the people. There is already plenty of scope for the people to give vent to their gambling desires, and we do not want to increase it. Just as an individual has to limit his desires in that respect, it is the function of government to limit the temptations of the public in the same direction. The State has an obligation to its people and the State should exercise that obligation, duly recognising that there is ample opportunity for gambling to-day without the introduction of this undesirable kind of so-called sport. I shall support the second reading with the object of doing something to discourage those who would endeavour to introduce tin hare racing for personal gain. I am not in love with the Bill. I candidly admit that I do not understand Clause 2.

Mr. North: Perhaps it could be improved.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: One has to look at it closely to discover its meaning. I have not done that, but I shall support the second reading, in the hope that the Committee stage will be delayed so that I may have an opportunity to examine Clause 2 closely. If I find it means that tin hare racing shall be discouraged in this State, it will have my support in Committee. I consider that tin

hare racing is not necessary, that it will tend to demoralise the people, and that we as guardians of the public welfare are justified in protecting the people against this form of so-called sport.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [8.2]: The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnston) at the beginning of his speech took us into his confidence by telling us he was a gambler. I, too, intend to take the House into my confidence, but let me inform members that I am opposed to gambling. The member for Guildford qualified his remarks by saying he believed in gambling only to the extent that a person can afford to indulge in it. I likewise modify my conviction by stating that while I am opposed to gambling, I would not try to prevent gambling of every description. I believe that people who can afford to gamble for moderate sums have a right to do so, even though gambling is against the law of the State. This Bill is designed to prevent another form of sport that must be associated with gambling.

Mr. Marshall: Why say it must be associated with gambling? There is no mention of gambling in the measure.

Mr. ANGELO: The conduct of the sport in other parts of the world proves conclusively that it is allied not only to gambling but to excessive gambling. I do not object to tin hares, but I am afraid of the ptomaine poisoning.

Mr. Withers: This Bill deals with tin hares, not tinned dog.

Mr. Mann: Do not you think the Criminal Code is strong enough to suppress gambling?

Mr. ANGELO: It is, but while I am not a gambler I should be sorry to see all gambling in a medium way by people who can afford it suppressed. I like to see people going to the races and putting their modest £1 or 10s. on the totalisator.

Mr. Mann: If the Government decided to put the law into operation against tin hare racing, that would stop the gambling.

Mr. ANGELO: I know from the utterances of the Premier that the Government are opposed to excessive gambling. They, as responsible men, realise that gambling to excess is bad for the State. At the same time they do not wish to suppress gambling entirely. I suggest the time has come when the Government should appoint a man—not

a sub-department—to inspect all kinds of sport. The Commissioner of Police should be asked to appoint one of his inspectors to keep an eye, not only on racing and trotting, but on football and all other kinds of sport.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: They would have to appoint another man.

Mr. ANGELO: No, the inspector would be already employed by the Government.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Then he would be doing nothing at present.

Mr. ANGELO: If it were necessary to put on an extra man, let the sporting bodies contribute to his salary.

Mr. Panton: Sporting bodies would be likely to contribute to the salary of a man like that!

Mr. ANGELO: We need to have our various sports inspected.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You would want a few dozen inspectors.

The Minister for Mines: Cannot you suggest a scheme to make it easier to pick winners?

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister shows that he is not a true gambler; he wants to be certain that he is going to win. If we had an inspector to do this work, he might require assistance. He would attend each race meeting—

Mr. Mann: Would one inspector do?

Mr. Chesson: Would you put him with the stewards to watch the racing?

Mr. ANGELO: That would not be at all necessary. He could perform his duties better if he were away from the stewards.

Mr. Panton: You go to a sports meeting and try to make a bet and you will find he is already there.

Mr. ANGELO: I am alluding to all forms of sport. Let him go to football matches and, if he finds that gambling is being carried on, he should prevent it.

Mr. Marshall: What about the race-courses?

Mr. ANGELO: Constables are present at the races and they know what the member for Perth is pointing out, namely, that there is a law against gambling. But they know perfectly well that the Government of the day do not want the law enforced.

Mr. Sleeman: No Government would want it enforced.

Mr. ANGELO: That is so. I do not think it would be possible to get a Government who would say that all gambling should be suppressed. At the same time I doubt whether there is a member of the House who

would not agree with me that gambling has to be controlled and kept within the limits of a person's income. That is necessary for economic reasons.

Mr. Chesson: Who is to tell what a person's income is?

Mr. ANGELO: Let me give an instance. A friend of mine, attending a race meeting, went to a bookmaker and asked, "How much so-and-so?" The reply was, "Three to one." My friend said, "What nonsense!" The bookmaker said, "I will give you ten to one, twenty to one."

Mr. Mann: Oh, go on!

Mr. ANGELO: If my friend had not known something, he would have been taken down at three to one.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Why not have Government bookmakers?

Hon. G. Taylor: Bookmaking will be a trading concern by-and-bye.

Mr. ANGELO: Some steps should be taken to control gambling.

Mr. Mann: It is controlled to-day and rigidly, too.

Mr. ANGELO: Then how is it one can scarcely pick up a newspaper without finding an account of some young fellow having gone wrong, or of someone having shot himself through over-indulgence in gambling?

Mr. Panton: They go to the racecourses to do it.

Mr. ANGELO: For every person brought before the police court or mentioned in the newspaper as having gone wrong through over-indulgence in gambling, I dare say there are five others of whom we never hear.

Mr. Mann: Then you must stop every form of gambling if you want to make people moral by Act of Parliament.

Mr. ANGELO: No, we should try to control it. Take the liquor traffic. Liquor is bad for people when used to excess, and the Government adopt various means to try to prevent people from consuming too much liquor. We have inspectors to control traffic and weights and measures and to watch the interests of the people in other ways. Members must admit that gambling is increasing almost daily. We cannot suppress it altogether. It would be hopeless to try to do so, and I do not know that I should desire to suppress it entirely so long as it is kept within moderation. It is the duty of the Government to safeguard the welfare of the public by curtailing gambling and keeping it within bounds. If this Bill is not passed and tin hare racing is introduced,

I am afraid we shall have still more gambling. Therefore I shall support the second reading.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [8.12]: It seems to me it does not matter in the slightest degree whether the measure is passed, because it will not make any difference unless the Government are going to enforce it. At present we have on the statute-book a perfectly good piece of legislation that enables the Government to suppress gambling so far as they are able to suppress any infringement of the law. In some respects, for what reason seems to be irrelevant to enter into now, they do not attempt to enforce the law with respect of some kinds of gambling carried on in this State. This Bill has nothing to do with gambling and I see no guarantee, if it becomes law, that the Government will enforce it.

Mr. Latham: You say it has nothing to do with gambling?

Mr. DAVY: Yes.

Mr. Mann: Not in the slightest.

Mr. Latham: You are very innocent.

Mr. DAVY: That is my objection to the Bill.

Mr. Panton: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clydesdale: Quite right, too.

Mr. DAVY: If it had to do with gambling I should object that it was unnecessary. It would be utterly ridiculous to put on the statute-book one piece of legislation that forbids gambling and not enforce it, and then put on the statute-book another piece of legislation that forbids gambling and enforce it. What sort of ridiculous sight would the Government make of themselves, having two pieces of legislation, both forbidding gambling, and enforcing one and not the other! The Government would make themselves the laughing stock of the world. I feel impelled to speak on this Bill because I intend to oppose it. If I do not state why I oppose it, it may be said by some of my enemies, and perhaps some of my friends, that I am endeavouring to grant new facilities to the people of Western Australia to indulge in gambling. I wish to say clearly that I want nothing of the sort.

Mr. Latham: Just now you could not connect the Bill with gambling; now you say it is a means to that end.

Mr. DAVY: I said that this particular piece of legislation has nothing to do with gambling. However, I quite realise that some people in Western Australia have minds which work like that of the member for York (Mr. Latham). I fear that that

hon. member's mental attitude may operate against me with some persons in my constituency, and that is why I wish to state my views on the subject. It has always been well recognised that to enforce a law which deals with morals only is fairly difficult. A law which endeavours to make a criminal offence of something which is merely a moral offence, is always a difficult law to enforce. That is why so much difficulty is being experienced in enforcing prohibition in America. The Bill proposes to make a criminal offence, with £500 maximum fine and the possibilities of a year's gaol, of a thing which nobody in the world could possibly suggest has anything wicked or immoral about it. Under the Bill, if a man uses a mechanical contrivance in connection with the racing of animals other than horses, he shall be deemed a criminal, dragged to the police court, put in the dock, and be fined up to £500, and if he cannot pay the fine he must go to gaol. I can do no other than oppose a measure which proposes to turn into a crime something—

Mr. Sampson: —that leads to crime.

Mr. DAVY: I cannot think of any amusement or any appetite of mankind and womankind that does not tend to lead up to crime. The footballer, we know perfectly well, is backed by certain enthusiasts. We know that if it were permitted by the Executive of this country, there would be a herd of bookmakers on every football ground in Western Australia where an important match was being played. We know perfectly well that at foot-racing and cycling the same thing would happen. Although doubtless there is some gambling on football matches, it is very limited. Gambling on football matches and cycle and pedestrian races is not a social menace. The people who do it can probably afford to do it, and are keen supporters of the games in question. To a certain extent gambling takes place on such events, but it constitutes no public scandal. At the Royal Agricultural Show there are usually a couple of trotting races, and if a man likes to thrust himself into a mob of people and work his way into the middle of a dense crowd, he will find there some doubtful-looking persons ready to lay the odds to him in a whisper, and he may get his money if he wins or he may not. The sort of people who are prepared to make a real struggle to get a bet of that sort, will get bets on, be the law what it may. If it is to be said that because the arm of the law would be unable to suppress

gambling entirely on this particular sport or some other sport, such sport should not be permitted at all, I answer that no police force in the world and no Executive yet have ever succeeded in entirely suppressing the breach of any law. We have the police force, and public opinion, and the heaviest of all possible penalties against people who commit murder; and yet every year, notwithstanding, murders are committed. The same position obtains in regard to burglary and every other crime in the penal code. We are asked, because what is on the face of it a perfectly honest and decent thing to do may cause gambling, and because that gambling could not be prevented, to wipe out this innocent thing. Then let us wipe out all other innocent things from which gambling may arise—football, tennis, and what not. Let us go down to the Causeway and feed the people on bread and milk for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Corboy: You even find fishermen betting on their catch.

Mr. DAVY: I do not think I need say anything in reply to the arguments of the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson). I think members generally will agree with me that for 15 minutes the hon. member, whether intentionally or unintentionally, succeeded in being highly amusing. But, really, to ask us to say that there is inherently something dirty about the sport of causing two dogs to race after a mechanical hare, and that there is something noble about causing two horses, under the whip, to race—horses, moreover encircled around with a lot of artificial machinery to make them adopt a particular gait at night time under electric light—is absurd. One cannot differentiate between the sport of two dogs racing each other and the sport of two horses racing each other. The animals are bigger in one kind of sport, and smaller in the other; and that is the only essential difference. Further, just as much might one argue that tin hare racing should be allowed in order to keep up the standard of kangaroo dogs, as that galloping and trotting races should be allowed in order to keep up the standard of utility horses.

Mr. Panton: More so.

Mr. DAVY: Probably more so.

Mr. Marshall: Take it from the aspect of relative degrees of cruelty. The horses

race under whip and spur, while the dogs run after the hare.

Mr. DAVY: I readily admit that we Australians are a pleasure-loving people, and can love pleasure too much. But that is not going to be cured by passing laws: it is going to be cured by education. To suggest that whenever we find the people of Western Australia deciding to indulge in, or threatened with, a new form of amusement, we shall declare that new form of amusement a criminal offence seems to me a retrogression to the days of the Blue Laws of New England of 150 years ago. I cannot believe that this House will agree to such a proposition. The object of the promoters of the Bill will be fully achieved if the Premier will in this House give an assurance that the law with regard to gambling, as that law stands, will be rigidly enforced if tin hares are introduced into Western Australia. That is all we want.

The Premier: I give you my assurance that I will vote for the Bill, and that if it is defeated I shall rigorously and vigorously enforce the law against any betting.

Members: Hear, hear!

The Premier: I will vote for the Bill.

Mr. DAVY: I am perfectly satisfied with that. If the Premier says that he does not want the Bill—

The Premier: It will do no harm; it is one of the Bills that will do no harm.

Mr. DAVY: I say it will do a great deal of harm. It will be a precedent—I say this with no offence meant—for interference with the right of the people of this country to do anything they choose so long as they do nobody any harm.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [8.25]: It has been clearly shown that gambling is inseparably associated with tin hare racing.

Mr. Panton: Where has that been shown?

Mr. SAMPSON: In a newspaper recognised as one of the leading journals, if not the leading journal, of England, the "Manchester Guardian." In its issue of the 19th September last the "Manchester Guardian" writes—

Whether hound racing and betting could exist apart need not be argued. It needs no ghost from the grave to tell us that if betting at race meetings were rigorously suppressed, racing would not continue for a month. Every candid man would admit as much.

I claim that there is an association between the Bill and tin hare coursing, because it

is feared—and apparently with a good deal of reason—that unless an Act to prohibit tin hare coursing is passed, there will be set up such a machine for gambling—

Mr. Mann: What about the Criminal Code?

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member knows as well as I know, as well as anyone in the Chamber knows, that it is quite impossible to enforce the Criminal Code in so far as gambling is concerned.

Mr. Davy: Why?

Mr. SAMPSON: I want to make a few remarks, and I shall reach that point shortly. Western Australia has always taken most liberal views as to racing, and quite reasonable opportunities have always been afforded for gambling. I admit that the gambling spirit is deeply rooted in the mind of every man and every woman. Here to-night we have heard members seeking to shield themselves from criticism by claiming that if they vote for the Bill they will be doing something that is inconsistent. They claim that to support the Bill would be equivalent to saying that in connection with horse racing they favour gambling, and that in connection with tin hare coursing they are opposed to it. In the words of the member for Menzies (Mr. Panton), it may be claimed that there is in some quarters a spirit of hypocrisy as regards the view taken of tin hare racing. To-night we have repeatedly heard the argument that because betting exists we should cope with the evil by giving to it a freer and wider scope. That, I suppose, is on the homœopathic principle that one cures a disease by injecting a further dose of the germ or poison that has caused the complaint. A homœopath would cure a person suffering from, for instance, pyorrhœa by giving him a further injection of the virus. That, surely, is what was said to-night by various members. They contended that if we want to limit gambling we can do it only by giving greater facilities for it, and by introducing such a spirit of competition that one or more methods of gambling would be wiped out. Western Australia, as has been said, has always adopted a spirit of laissez faire in regard to gambling.

The Premier: More lazy than fair.

Mr. North: An attitude of indifference.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is an attitude which, I know, the Premier believes leads to national indifference. We know that at White City, the defamed, and apparently rightly defamed, gambling resort, the youth of this country are encouraged to take chances on

all manner of gambling devices. White City has been called the hot bed of crime—

The Premier: That is not exaggerating at all!

Mr. SAMPSON: White City has also been termed the genesis of the underworld and the reception room of Fremantle gaol.

The Premier: Who said that?

Mr. Lutey: It is your imagination.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is not imagination.

Mr. Lutey: It is your own imagination.

Mr. SAMPSON: I question whether the hon. member interjecting is sincerely an advocate of White City. I have no hesitation in saying that White City is a menace.

Mr. Lutey: What has it to do with the Bill?

Mr. SAMPSON: Pardon my directing my remarks to an interloper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: An interjecter, I should say. He assumed the position of Speaker for the moment and I was led astray.

Mr. Lutey: You are always astray.

Mr. SAMPSON: I suppose the least said about White City, the better. But really the sooner White City is brought to an end the better will it be for the fair name of Perth and for the people growing up in it. Tin hare racing will provide another opportunity for betting, and I am of opinion that there is no need to provide that opportunity. I know I have the reputation for taking a serious view of racing. All the same I do attend race meetings, but with the evidence we have before us which is not confined to the Commonwealth—leading newspapers of the world have condemned betting associated with mechanical hare racing—we would be acting unwisely if we allowed this form of so-called sport to be introduced in this State. It has been proved that without betting tin hare racing cannot exist.

Mr. Davy: Then why worry?

Mr. SAMPSON: We know full well, and the hon. member knows it also, that it would be not only most difficult but impossible to prevent it.

Mr. Davy: I do not agree with you.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member admitted during his speech that even at football matches there was some degree of betting.

Mr. Corboy: Then why not prohibit football?

Mr. SAMPSON: Not at all. Football is an inspiring and exhilarating sport. Tin hare racing is anything but

that, and having witnessed it on one or two occasions without betting, I am convinced that it would be impossible for it to continue.

Mr. Chesson: Then why worry?

Mr. SAMPSON: A well known writer in a Melbourne newspaper (Mr. Norman Campbell) referred to it in these terms—

Round the bookmakers' stands the rivers of humanity turned and twisted. Twenty-five to thirty thousand of them! Surely the tin hare sport grows by what it feeds on And mostly the faces in the kaleidoscopic crowd were weary faces For unless you bet, the sport becomes deadly monotonous. The fever which at first infects you soon dies down.

I am proving that the sport can exist only if gambling is carried on.

Mr. Davy: The Premier has promised that the law will be enforced.

Mr. SAMPSON: We have heard a lot about the rights of the poor man to gamble and the restrictions placed upon the poor man as compared with the more affluent.

Mr. Panton: Absolutely correct.

Mr. SAMPSON: Such statements are pure moonshine. It is possible under present conditions to bet at every race meeting. There are surely abundant opportunities for the poor man, as well as the rich man, to bet if he wishes to do so.

Mr. Chesson: Can you bet on pedestrian events?

Mr. SAMPSON: Pedestrian events have died, so we have been told, because gambling was associated with them.

Mr. Chesson: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. SAMPSON: We know that a section of the Criminal Code makes betting illegal, but we know also that it is impracticable and impossible to administer that section.

Mr. Davy: The Premier does not say so.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not going to say I hope it will be enforced, I believe it is impossible for it to be enforced in any Australian community.

Mr. Marshall: You are not very flattering to the Australians.

Mr. SAMPSON: We have enough opportunities for gambling and in the interests of Western Australia I hope the Bill will be carried.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.37]: I desire to say a few words against what I ought to call the most lopsided Bill I have looked at since I have been a member of this House. I would not have spoken but for the remarks of some hon. members op-

posite when I moved the amendment to read the Bill six months hence. Those members said that I had not the courage to express my views. Personally I would have preferred to have got rid of the Bill so that we might have had the opportunity of listening to the Premier on the Electoral Districts Bill.

The Premier: I am quite sure I would not have had such a full House.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I would have preferred to listen to the Premier on that subject, and I was hopeful of succeeding with my amendment. Unfortunately, however, I was defeated on that move of mine, and having been challenged to make some remarks on the Bill, I am now forced into the position of doing so. We take it that the object of the Bill is to prevent people engaging in the pastime of tin hare racing. There is nothing about gambling in the Bill, though when it was originally introduced in another place there were quite a number of clauses in it that dealt with betting and mechanical devices, but it was pointed out that the clauses were merely reaffirming certain sections of the Criminal Code, and at the same time would affect vested interests in the shape of the sport of kings. Thereupon the original clauses were deleted and now we are asked to hold up the business of the country to discuss whether a few thousand people shall be denied the opportunity to indulge in the sport of tin hare racing. I cannot see any more harm in watching a tin hare being chased by dogs than watching "dead" horses in a race. We have seen owners disqualified for life because of certain practices, but on that account the whole of the sport is not condemned. On the subject of betting, every speaker to-night has expressed the belief that tin hare racing will lead to more frequent betting. I fail to see that there is any more harm in betting on a tin hare than there is in betting on a galloping horse or a trotter. But on betting generally, I would support a Bill, if it were brought down, to prohibit bookmakers from attending racecourses altogether.

Mr. Mann: That is the law to-day.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And why is it not carried out?

Mr. North: You are sitting on the wrong side of the House when you say that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Hon. members opposite had a good deal to say about allowing betting to continue, but we know that the Leader of the Opposition, when on the Tren-

sury bench, followed the example of all his predecessors and took no steps to suppress betting. He never once attempted to put down betting on racecourses or trotting courses. No, he was content to collect 1d. tax on every ticket that a bookmaker handed out to his client.

Mr. Panton: But horse racing is the sport of kings.

Mr. SLEEMAN: A bookmaker on a racecourse has no more right to preferential treatment than has anyone else. If the Premier intends to put the law into force, good luck to him. It has been said to-night that tin hare racing is going to carry gambling with it, because the gambling element is associated with the sport in Sydney and Melbourne. We know that in Sydney the bookmakers swing their bags and bet openly on everything.

Mr. Corboy: Betting is legal there.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I attended a sports meeting in a country town of Western Australia 12 months ago, and I saw a man writing away on tickets until a policeman walked up to him and told him to put his book away. So that we know betting is not carried on in connection with all forms of sport. But I would not stop a man having a bet on a pedestrian event whilst we permit others to have bets on horses. We should be consistent. Either we should allow betting in connection with every form of sport or we should suppress it altogether. It is claimed that tin hare racing will not be carried on if betting is stopped. That is an argument used to help the Bill to go through. Without betting, it is said, the racing will fall flat. We have been told the same thing in connection with cycling and pedestrian events, and also in connection with whippet racing. Whippet racing is still being carried on, even though betting in connection with it has been stopped. At any rate there is no betting publicly. I visited Kalgoorlie a little while ago and went to a whippet race meeting, but saw no betting. It was a poor man's sport and it was very interesting too.

Mr. Corboy: There is whippet racing at Maylands every Saturday.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No matter what form of sport a man takes up, we have no right to say that he shall not do this or that. So long as there is no criminal intent we should not interfere. A man may take an interest in snail breeding and snail racing, and if

would be just as interesting to him as tin hare racing or other racing is to anybody else. The Bill provides against the use of a mechanical device in connection with racing by or between animals other than horses. I can see that in the near future some of those good people who desire to stop the people from enjoying a particular form of sport will compel us to devote another night to discussing the prevention of racing with mechanical horses. This Bill will not prevent racing with mechanical horses. We learn that in the Eastern States mechanical horse racing has been introduced and that it is being patronised better than racing with tin hares. We should make a job of it once and for all and not hold up the genuine business of the country in this way. It is terrible to think that we should be wasting so much time discussing tiddley-winking things like this. The member for Guildford told us that the public endorsed betting on horses, but I have yet to learn that that is so. If a bookmaker goes to any sports meeting except on a racecourse or a trotting ground, a policeman will order the book to be put away. He is instructed by the powers that be to stop one section of the community from gambling but not the other section of the community. I am prepared to go the whole hog, but I am not prepared to discriminate in favour of one section. A sports meeting was held at Guildford last week and rumour has it that bookmakers operated there. What right had they to operate at Guildford any more than at the country town I visited where larger prizes were offered and where people had been training for 12 months?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Do you say they were prevented from betting at Mullewa?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes; they were told to put their books away and they were afraid to bet throughout the remainder of the day. I saw a man running around trying to get a bet and he was unsuccessful. I hope the Bill will be disposed of quickly and relegated to the place to which it deserves to go, so that we might hear the Premier on a much more important question than that of tin hare racing.

MR. LATHAM (York) [8.46]: I am not greatly concerned whether the Bill will permit betting. We know that it does not deal with betting, but it is a means to an end. There is no doubt that if the Premier carries

out his threat, there will be no betting on tin hare racing.

Mr. Sleeman: You know that he will.

Mr. LATHAM: That is so, but if we have our say, the member for Boulder will not be Premier after next election. Consequently we can pin him down for only a little time. When the member for West Perth was speaking, I interjected that gambling could not be dissociated from tin hare racing. I do not know whether the hon. member intended to be unkind, but he suggested that some of his electors might view the matter from another angle, although he constantly connected gambling with the Bill. I have before me an official programme of Melbourne coursing with the mechanical hare. The managing director is Mr. S. S. Swindell.

Hon. G. Taylor: A very appropriate name.

Mr. Sleeman: A man cannot help his name.

Mr. LATHAM: I merely mentioned the name as a matter of information.

The Premier: It is just a coincidence.

Mr. LATHAM: The programme mentions the names of the dogs, but the most important part is the number of bookmakers operating there.

Hon. G. Taylor: Had any of them the name of Swindell?

Mr. LATHAM: There are a hundred and one bookmakers and that in a small place like Melbourne.

The Premier: To what sport are you referring?

Mr. LATHAM: To mechanical hare racing.

The Premier: I understand it is not operating in Melbourne.

Mr. LATHAM: This is an official programme and it refers to the Epping racecourse.

Mr. North: That is Sydney.

Mr. LATHAM: I regret that I made a mistake.

Mr. Pantou: Get a geography book.

Mr. Mann: Betting is legal there.

Mr. LATHAM: I am aware of that.

Mr. Mann: Then where is the point of your argument?

The Premier: I understand it has not been declared illegal in New South Wales. Certain men have been fined, but they are appealing.

Mr. LATHAM: That is admitted, but where tin hare betting is illegal, we know that betting takes place. A bookmaker's job must be very remunerative, or there would not be 101 bookmakers registered.

Mr. Mann: There are a thousand book-makers in Sydney.

Mr. LATHAM: There may be. Anyhow, the fact of 101 being registered for tin hare racing shows what a good job it is. Book-makers do not work too hard for the money they get.

Mr. Panton: Why should they, when they have a lot of punters working for them?

The Premier: But look at the strain on their voices.

Mr. LATHAM: I suppose they should be paid for that. A simple little company is coming here to provide mechanical hare sport, but is not going to do it for the good of the public. We have a perfect right to interfere if we desire to lessen the opportunities for gambling. While the law may be administered, there will be a certain amount of betting under the lap. Scores of people have expressed their views strongly in opposition to tin hare racing. The people of Claremont and Subiaco have expressed themselves and I believe the same applies to the people of Fremantle. Consequently we have a right to say that we shall not allow tin hare racing in Western Australia. I do not contend that the Bill will meet the situation, but no doubt amendments can be made in Committee. I am glad to have the assurance of the Premier that he will support the Bill and that even if it is defeated, he will see that the law is carried out as regards betting on tin hares.

MR. CORBOY (Yilgarn) [8.50]: This is another of those Bills that seek to restrict the individual. Personally I think we have too much legislation of that kind already. The next step will be to have a Bill promoted by the Western Australian Football League seeking to compel everyone to play football instead of tennis or something of that sort. The only public protest that I have heard of against the introduction of tin hare racing has come from an interested body, namely, the Trotting Association, who feel that the attendances at their Saturday night meetings would be affected. The same people endeavoured to prevent the introduction of motor cycle racing on the speedway at Claremont. With them it is merely a matter of vested interest. We can well do without a number of those measures that place more and more restrictions on the liberty of the individual to amuse himself as he thinks fit.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We pass Bills of that kind regularly.

Mr. CORBOY: The hon. member's attitude is extraordinary. He recently promoted a sports meeting at Guildford at which trotting and cycle racing events were decided and bookmakers were present, and yet he says it is necessary to prevent opportunities for gambling. The Bill itself is the most extraordinary one I have seen. If members look at their copies they will find an interesting point relating to penalties. We have one or two members in the House learned in the law, but I doubt whether they could tell us the meaning of the clauses. Clause 2 provides a penalty of £500 for a breach of the measure and Clause 3 stipulates that if Clause 2 be broken the penalty shall be £100.

Mr. Marshall: A total of £600.

Mr. North: That is only a small matter.

Mr. CORBOY: The Bill is drafted in the most extraordinary manner of any Bill I have ever seen. I should say it had been amended in another place after a lengthy and upsetting debate.

Mr. North: We can be the House of review on this occasion.

Mr. CORBOY: There are only two clauses of importance in the Bill—

Mr. Panton: What would it have been like had it contained half a dozen clauses?

Mr. CORBOY: And the two clauses are in direct contradiction. They provide two separate penalties for the same offence. The Premier has indicated that he intends to support the Bill and that, if it is passed, he will see that the law is rigorously enforced.

Mr. Davy: He said he would see that the law was enforced if the Bill was not passed.

Mr. CORBOY: That is so. I wonder how far he intends to proceed with the enforcement of the law on the racecourse and whether he intends to refrain from collecting the 2d. on each ticket issued by book-makers.

The Premier: I take leave to draw a distinction between horse racing and sports of this kind.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. CORBOY: Then the Premier sets himself up as a judge of what is a good sport and what is not.

Mr. North: Backed up by the public.

Mr. CORBOY: Excepting for a few people, principally clergymen, the only ones

who have protested have been those interested in trotting.

Mr. North: What about the Claremont referendum?

Hon. G. Taylor: What about the Subiaco people?

Mr. CORBOY: The member for Claremont referred to the Claremont referendum. That was a pretty close thing, much closer than the hon. member would like his next election to be.

Mr. North: I do not agree with that; it was a definite majority.

Mr. CORBOY: At any rate the vote at Claremont was not large enough to reflect the wishes of the people. Almost all members who support the Bill have said they regard it as their duty to restrict opportunities for gambling. I am inclined to agree with them, but I claim that those members, except the member for Subiaco, have not been consistent. I made an interjection to the member for Subiaco that was incorrect. I said he voted for the Bill to legalise trotting at Fremantle, but he did not vote in the division. Almost without exception, and including the member who moved the second reading of the Bill, those supporting this measure voted to give 12 extra trotting meetings per annum in the metropolitan area.

Mr. North: Certainly: trotting is a different thing.

Mr. CORBOY: The member for Guildford said he regarded it as his duty to restrict the opportunities for gambling, but he also regarded it as his duty to vote for the 12 extra trotting meetings.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I would be an extraordinary individual if I could not see the difference between extending trotting and introducing tin hare racing.

Mr. Davy: Well, you did not succeed in showing us the distinction between the two.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not know that the spectacle of women rushing around the tote at trotting meetings is elevating.

Mr. Davy: Rushing around the book-makers and the stable boys.

Mr. CORBOY: The position at the trotting meetings was such that the committee of the Perth ground found it necessary to provide a separate tote for women only.

Mr. North: This Bill does not advocate horse racing.

The Premier: And the tendency of the age is to segregate the sexes.

Mr. Panton: I cannot agree with that.

Mr. CORBOY: Anyhow, it is quite beside the point. The duty of preventing facilities for gambling has been advanced as a reason for supporting the Bill, but as I pointed out, that those who advanced that argument, almost without exception voted to extend gambling facilities by providing 12 extra trotting meetings per annum in the metropolitan area. Their attitude has been most inconsistent. I give the Premier credit for being one of a little band of eight who opposed the previous measure and so he is consistent in his attitude to-night.

Mr. Latham: But you also opposed it.

Mr. CORBOY: I did.

Mr. Latham: Then why oppose this Bill?

Mr. CORBOY: I opposed the extension of trotting because I did not consider it wise to provide extra facilities for gambling. On this occasion, however, we have the Premier's assurance that no gambling will be permitted at tin hare racing.

Hon. G. Taylor: You were just as enthusiastic in your support of the six months' amendment and you did not then have the Premier's assurance.

Mr. CORBOY: The Bill does not refer to betting. I was strongly opposed to the Bill, as the hon. member indicates, because it does not deal with betting. It merely seeks to prevent people who so desire from racing their dogs. I fail to see why a man who owns a dog should not be permitted to race it against another man's dog. In the metropolitan area, close to my home, whippet racing is conducted every Saturday afternoon. The handicaps are published every Friday in the "West Australian." These races have been going on at regular intervals for the last 12 months. I have been there at times, and have never seen any betting transactions. The sport is continuing all the time. Those people find amusement in training whippets and in running them against each other. I fail to see why they should not be allowed to do this, seeing that other people are permitted to play football or lawn tennis. There is too much legislation on the statute-book that tends to restrict the rights of the people to do what they think is fit and proper.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [9.3]: I oppose the Bill, because I think the House ought to be logical. If we are going to prohibit tin hare racing, why not prohibit that suicidal business at Claremont, where motor

cycle riders take their lives in their hands to entertain a number of thrill-mad people?

Hon. G. Taylor: They take their bicycles in their hands.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Why should there be any differentiation?

Mr. Corboy: There is a spill in almost every race at Claremont.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: That is so. I do not want to see any increase in betting. I do not say it is wicked for people to bet. If a man has a pound to spare to put on a horse, or a football match, or a whippet race, and he is not hurting anybody else by spending that pound, I do not see why he should not be allowed to do so. There is no reason why a man should not follow his inclinations in this direction.

Mr. North: Do you think there is gambling going on at the speedway?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I feel sure there is.

Mr. Davy: I do not suppose one per cent. of the people who go there gamble.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I think the speedway will die out if there is no gambling allowed. If the Premier will carry out his promise to enforce the gambling laws, there is no need to fear with regard to any form of sport. Tin hare racing, at all events, will become merely a passing craze. This is a poor man's sport. Whippet racing is already being conducted as a legal sport at Maylands on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. Davy: If this Bill passes, and you go to the whippet races in a motor car, you may be fined £500.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I admit that gambling is a foolish and expensive method of amusing oneself, but it is inherent in our race. Previous speakers have admitted that it is impossible to suppress gambling. At any rate, the Government might try to divert into more useful channels some of the money that is gambled away. Some of the money that is now wasted might well be diverted to other objects that would be more useful, such as in the direction of our hospitals. It strikes me there is a lot of hypocrisy about this business. The Federal Government passed legislation prohibiting sweeps, but allowing them to be held in Tasmania. The Tasmanian Government take 12½ per cent. out of every prize that is won. In addition to that sweep there are the Katoomba sweep, the Golden Casket sweep, the Ballarat sweep, and so on. We constantly see sweep tickets sold in the streets of Perth in the cause of charity. It is time we looked things

squarely in the face, and attempted to regulate the business so as to send this money into more useful channels. I have had a good deal to do with foot racing and bicycle racing. People have always had their bets in association with those sports.

Hon. W. J. George: People have bet on the elections.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Of course. That is against the law, but betting cannot be entirely suppressed, no matter what may be done.

Mr. Davy: It can be reduced to a minimum by enforcing the law.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It is not enforced.

Mr. Davy: It is enforced with regard to most sports.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Tin hare racing is no worse than cycle racing or foot running.

Hon. W. J. George: Tell us something about tin hare racing.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The hon. member knows more about tinned dog. I see no objection to tin hare racing if the betting laws are rigidly enforced. If there is no betting associated with it, the sport will soon die out, just as the speedway at Claremont will die if no betting is permitted there. There is little doubt that betting already goes on in connection with motor bicycle races, notwithstanding what members have said in another place.

Mr. Richardson: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: We have allowed betting to go on. A man can bet at the Weld Club, and no notice will be taken of it.

Mr. Angelo: How do you know that?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I do not know.

Mr. Lindsay: Then why make the assertion.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: We know that betting goes on in these clubs. Many men cannot afford to go to the races on Saturday afternoon, but that does not prevent them from betting. Occasionally the police make raids upon them, and also upon the fan tan schools of the inoffensive Chinese, and upon two-up schools. A differentiation is made between the two classes of people, those who are well off, and those who are not. I do not favour gambling, but do not see why we should differentiate between different kinds of sport. We should be logical. If we are going to prevent tin hare racing, why should we allow motor cycle racing, where men are risking their lives in order to provide thrills

for a certain section of the people? Ordinary hare coursing is not humane. It is in fact a cruel sport, but this cannot be said of tin hare racing. Pigeon shooting is also a cruel sport, although it is allowed.

The Premier: Pigeon shooting is not allowed.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It was allowed on the goldfields when I was there.

The Premier: It has not been allowed for many years.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: These are undoubtedly cruel sports. I have seen many pigeon shooting matches on the goldfields, and thought what a cruel sport it was. There is nothing inhumane about tin hare racing, despite the comedy sketch given to us by the member for Guildford. I do not want to see gambling encouraged, neither do I want to see too much interference with the liberties of the people. It seems to be the prerogative of this House and another place to introduce legislation that interferes with the liberty of the subject. If we are going to permit motor cycle racing to be indulged in on the speedway at Claremont, we should allow tin hare racing also to be held.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [9.13]: When I first read the Bill, I asked myself what right the Government had to interfere with the liberty of the subject.

Mr. North: After that you heard some good arguments in favour of the Bill?

Mr. BROWN: We have in our midst all forms of sport, horse racing, trotting, motor cycling, and a dozen others. If we allow one form of sport, why should we not allow another? There are two sides to every question. I wish to take into consideration the other side. I am thinking of the class of people who will patronise this sport.

Mr. Sleeman: To what class do you refer?

Mr. BROWN: I refer to the poorer classes, and to young boys and girls. When I think of them I can come to no other conclusion than that we already have enough sport in this State without catering for any more. When we pick up the newspaper we read about boys and girls visiting White City, or some other place, and about their being out at all hours of the night.

Mr. Mann: Will this Bill prevent that?

Mr. BROWN: Of course.

Mr. North: It will be a step in the right direction.

Mr. BROWN: It is easy to put temptation in the way of any person. Why should we put temptation in the way of anyone? That is what we certainly shall be doing if we allow tin hare racing. What kind of sport is it?

Mr. Davy: What is the definition of sport?

Mr. BROWN: A manly sport is that which requires of participants in it a good physique and soundness of wind and limb. These qualities are required of a good foot-runner or a good cyclist. There is something in a sport of that sort. But when dogs are chasing a tin hare, where does the element of sport come in? On the other hand, the horse is the noblest animal on the face of God's earth.

Mr. Marshall: And you flog him and spur him, and force him to perform a task that is almost impossible; and many horses drop dead as a consequence. That is the treatment that is given to the noble animal.

Mr. Panton: Yes, and even batteries are put on them.

Mr. BROWN: We must study the breeding of dogs. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) was quite right in his references to that aspect. What class of dog are we to breed? I suppose that for tin hare coursing kangaroo dogs will be used. Now, the kangaroo dog is about the worst mongrel on earth. Again, if a dog on the tin hare courses proves unable to win a race, who is going to feed him? How is he to be disposed of? There are too many dogs in this State already. What classes of dogs have we now? The bobbed dog, the sheep dog, the cattle dog, the pomeranian, the dingo, and a hundred and one other kinds, most of them of no benefit whatever to Western Australia. The member for Guildford hit the nail on the head when he said that some people absolutely worshipped dogs. Ladies, and in particular ladies witho it families, turn their love towards dogs, often because they can get from the dogs the affection they cannot get from their husbands. The other day I saw in some newspaper a picture that struck me as highly appropriate. There was a bedroom with a big fat old lady in the bed, and a poodle alongside her in the bed. The husband had just got into his pyjamas, and the lady was saying to the dog, "Fido, darling, move over a bit; daddy is ready to get into the bed." When an old horse becomes useless he is

sent to the Zoo, but what is to become of useless dogs?

The Premier: They might be turned into sausages.

Mr. BROWN: Perhaps many of them are disposed of in that way. However, this matter has its serious side. Have we not sufficient sport in Western Australia? Have we catered enough for the sporting proclivities of a population of less than 400,000 in this young country?

Mr. Marshall: Outside horse racing, what sport is there?

Mr. BROWN: It has been said that there is no gambling connected with football.

Mr. Marshall: Football is played during only five months of the year.

Mr. BROWN: Does anyone want to gamble on football? No. A man has his enthusiasm for a particular club. The sport itself works up the enthusiasm. But can enthusiasm be generated by the sight of dog-chasing a tin hare? Without betting, tin hare coursing will soon die a natural death. The present object is to obtain a footing for tin hare coursing, and immediately a footing has been secured gambling will be introduced. In Sydney, where tin hare coursing is permitted, as many as 20,000 or 30,000 people patronise a tin hare meeting. Are the promoters of tin hare racing out for the advantage of the public? No; they are out for the benefit of their own pockets. When we learn that the storekeeper, the butcher and the baker will have to go short because of money lost in gambling, can any reasonable person say that more sport is required in Western Australia? I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill.

MR. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [9.20]: I shall support the second reading, and I am pleased to know that the Premier has given his assurance that under no conditions will gambling be permitted at tin hare meetings. Possibly the conduct of the tin hare business will be all right, but I do not think we should countenance the further commercialisation of sport in Western Australia. I would probably listen to the suggestion that a tin hare coursing club be established in Western Australia on the same lines as other sporting clubs, but it is an entirely different proposition to sanction the starting of a club that will enable a few people to commercialise tin hare coursing for their own personal gain. Such a proposition is, to say the least of it, highly undesirable. For-

tunately horse racing is conducted very well in Western Australia. There is no doubt about that, though some people desire to disparage the control of racing. Trotting also is conducted very well indeed, notwithstanding the fact that people who are inclined to build up an argument in favour of tin hare coursing and other forms of sport seek to disparage the efforts of the Trotting Association. My views upon racing generally are fairly well known to hon. members. I expressed them in this Chamber years ago, and I do not feel called upon to repeat them to-night. If there is to be racing in Western Australia, it should be conducted on lines reasonably acceptable to the people of the State; and so far as I know, that is the case now. But to introduce a further opportunity for people to gamble—and that, I take it, is the main reason for the desire to introduce the tin hare into Western Australia—is a proposition that has nothing to recommend it. In dispassionately discussing the merits, and possible demerits, of tin hare coursing, we need not depart from the main question, which should be paramount in our minds—the question whether the introduction of the tin hare would be in the best interests of our people. If the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) considers that the introduction of the tin hare, with all the consequent ramifications of gambling and attendant disaster—is acceptable to the people—

Mr. Sleeman: In what part of the Bill is gambling mentioned?

Mr. LAMBERT: The gambling phase was raised by the hon. member. If he thinks the introduction of a further opportunity for gambling desirable, he is quite entitled to his opinion, and doubtless he will vote against the Bill. It seems to me needless to discuss the measure at much greater length, in view of the Premier's assurance that he is strongly opposed to the introduction of the gambling element into this form of alleged sport. That being so, we can safely rely upon the hon. gentleman's assurance. I do not know that the Bill is altogether necessary. The measure, I take it, is the outcome of the expressed desire of a large section of the Western Australian community not to see sport further commercialised. It is positively ridiculous to draw, as the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) tried to do, a superficial distinction between tin hare hunting on the one hand and trotting and racing on the

other. I express this opinion regardless of whether it is liked or disliked. At any rate, it is not an opinion framed to suit a particular occasion. It is expressed, as I believe it should be expressed, in the interests of the people of this country; and, whether I gain favour or incur disfavour by such a course, I hope my opinions will always be expressed in that manner so long as I remain here. I see no analogy whatever between horse racing and trotting on the one hand, and what I regard as rather an undesirable form of sport to introduce into Western Australia. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, if only as a means towards curbing the activities of a proprietary club seeking to initiate this form of sport here.

MR. NORTH (Claremont—in reply) [9.28]: I shall not detain the House, because the arguments have been too varied and too long. I have, however, realised from the debate that a reasonable majority of members present are in favour of the Bill; and included among them are the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the deputy Leader of the Country Party. Therefore I need not weary the House by trying to answer all the arguments used against the Bill, though I have here notes of many of the points that were raised. The chief point seemed to be that there was a lot of hypocrisy in regard to gambling. Let that be admitted, but how can it be affected by this Bill? In declaring for the suppression of tin hare racing the measure does not say that, ergo, every other form of gambling is good, and that all horse racing should be encouraged, and so forth. The Bill is merely a move in a certain direction, which represents an expression of opinion to-day of the people of to-day upon a new arrival in our midst—a certain curse which has proved a burden to other communities. I, for one, hope to see gambling more carefully controlled; and if we are to have gambling defined, as was proposed to-day, I shall be glad if the Government will bring in a measure to legalise gambling in certain places only.

Mr. Sleeman: Only in certain places?

Mr. NORTH: Yes, and at certain times, just as the hours of drinking are limited. That question, however, does not arise under the Bill. We are merely asked to express, through Parliament, the desire of a large section of the community to have

this new form of gambling suppressed at the outset.

Mr. Davy: Not gambling.

Mr. NORTH: Well, this form of sport that will lead to gambling. We ask that it shall be suppressed before a penny is spent on it and before people are urged to invest money in a concern, which, we are told, will not be able to continue if gambling is not permitted. I trust the House will agree to the Bill, especially as we have the responsible leaders of both sides of the House in favour of it.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	20
				—
Majority for	2	—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Lambert	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Latham	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chésson	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Mann
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Millington
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Davy	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Willcock
Miss Holman	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; **Mr. North** in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Prohibition of racing where mechanical devices, etc., used:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I suggest to the member for Claremont that he does not persevere with the Committee stage. I consider Clause 2 requires close investigation to find out what it means. What is in-

tended, for instance, by "the use of any mechanical device or contrivance for the promotion of or in connection with racing by or between animals, other than horses"? Is it anticipated that if we leave out the three last mentioned words there is some contrivance that will be affected?

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Yes, the totalisator would be affected.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If the Bill is so wide that we have to specially specify "other than horses," it may be necessary to specify something else. When we start to to embody limitations in a clause we have to be careful that we are achieving what we desire and not providing for something that was not intended. I regret that I did not study the Bill previously. I should like to get legal opinion regarding one or two points. The member for Claremont did not explain the Bill but dealt with the principle, and it was on the principle that we voted. I suggest that the Committee stage be postponed.

Mr. CORBOY: I support the suggestion by the member for Guildford that the Committee stage be postponed.

Hon. G. Taylor: You want to rally your forces!

Mr. North: Tactics!

Mr. CORBOY: That is ungenerous. Clause 2 seeks to prohibit the use of any mechanical device or contrivance for the promotion of, or in connection with, racing by, or between animals other than horses. Clause 3 sets out that any person who promotes, engages in or takes part in any racing declared to be unlawful by Clause 2, shall be guilty of an offence, but Clause 2 does not make any racing unlawful, as it merely prohibits the use of mechanical devices, and so on.

Mr. North: But it is consequential.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not think so. Clauses 2 and 3 deal with different subjects. The former deals with mechanical devices and the latter with racing---

Mr. E. B. Johnston: At which mechanical devices are used.

Mr. CORBOY: I think the clauses deal with different subjects altogether. Then again the penalty clauses require attention. Under Clause 2 the penalty is £500 and under Clause 3 £100.

Mr. North: The first penalty will have to go out; that is clear.

Mr. CORBOY: Then that is all right. I think the Bill as a whole requires redraft-

ing because, in my opinion, Clauses 2 and 3 do not read sensibly.

The PREMIER: I do not see any difficulty in the clause, and we can proceed with the Committee stage with safety. If we were to adjourn the consideration of the Bill, we would merely have a repetition of the discussion. The clause is quite clear. If the member for Guildford considers that something may be brought within the scope of the clause that was not intended---

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Take whippet racing.

The PREMIER: That will not be affected.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Is there not a starting machine?

The PREMIER: No, the whippets are started with the hands. The hon. member has not attended whippet races for a long time. There is no mechanical contrivance associated with the starting of whippets.

Mr. Corboy: What about the whistling and the towels?

The PREMIER: The whippets are held by the owners or trainers and released from the hand. I cannot recall any existing form of sport that meets with the approval of the people, but would be debarred by the clause.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I have seen a mechanical recorder of winners used at running contests.

The PREMIER: That is in foot racing. This is for the racing of animals other than horses.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Could it not be used for the whippets?

The PREMIER: No, because some of them run with their heads well up, while others carry their heads low on the ground. So it would be difficult to construct any line that would record a finish.

Mr. Davy: There might be a paper barrier erected at the end.

The PREMIER: There might be, but I do not think there is. There is not a Bill conceivable but some highly improbable thing might be found to come within the scope of its provisions. I think, on the whole, this is quite safe, and I suggest to the member for Guildford that if between now and the third reading he should find, apart from two instances he has indicated—the judging machine for pedestrian events, and the starting of whippets—anything not contemplated which nevertheless might come within the provisions of the Bill the member for Claremont would be prepared to re-

commit the Bill. So I suggest that since we have spent the whole of this sitting on the measure we might as well proceed to put it through Committee.

Mr. DAVY: I am not at all satisfied that this clause might not carry us somewhere we do not wish to go. Apparently 22 members do not care very much where they go on the question.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is not fair.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect upon the judgment of other members.

Mr. DAVY: I am not suggesting any reflection on the character or judgment of any member.

The Premier: It would be open to members to retaliate if you did.

Mr. DAVY: Of course. I withdraw if my remark is taken as a reflection. The whole clause is extraordinarily wide, and I suggest that if we start to make a criminal offence of something which is not inherently wicked or criminal—

The Premier: That is the whole point of the Bill.

Mr. DAVY: We propose by this clause to make the use of any mechanical device unlawful.

The Premier: This is what we have divided on, this clause.

Mr. DAVY: We divided on the Bill.

The Premier: But this clause is the Bill.

Mr. DAVY: This clause makes a criminal offence, not the conduct of racing between greyhounds, but the use of any mechanical contrivance in the racing of such animals. Apparently the driving of one's whippets in a motor car to the whippet racing ground is going to be punishable by a fine of £500.

Members: No, no.

Mr. DAVY: I suggest that if I am a whippet owner and place my whippets in my motor car to take them to the whippet racing grounds, surely I am using a mechanical device in connection with whippet racing.

The Premier: Oh!

Mr. DAVY: Again, if I run a whippet racing ground and carry any cash to the whippet racing ground in my car, how am I not using a mechanical device for the promotion of racing between animals other than horses?

Mr. Angelo: According to that, one could not use a railway truck to carry his dogs from one town to another.

The Minister for Railways: It might be a legal objection, but it is not a common-sense one.

Mr. DAVY: What the draftsman was thinking of was the so-called tin hare, the mechanical lure. But these words go far beyond that. Whippets do not require a mechanical lure. A fellow at the other end of the course merely waves a red rag at them.

The Premier: Not always a red rag; sometimes it is a white one.

Mr. DAVY: At all events the whippets race after it. In this instance we get a mechanical device, and the use of that device is to be considered a criminal offence. And instead of stopping at that, the draftsman—I understand there were 30 of them on this clause; the whole of the members of another place in Committee. Originally the Bill was introduced in quite a different form. It went in at one end of the sausage machine and came out like this. The doubt raised by the member for Guildford was not an ill-founded one, and the clause certainly needs careful scrutiny.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I should like to know why racing is here restricted to animals other than horses. The original draft was quite different. It simply made it unlawful to bet on the results of tin hare racing. Was it subsequently restricted to "other than horses" so as not to offend the horse owners? Surely it is no worse to race dogs after a tin hare than it is to race whippets. I move an amendment—

That in line 3 the words "other than horses" be struck out.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Penalty for taking part in unlawful racing:

Mr. SLEEMAN: It would be interesting to know what this means. It declares that any person who promotes or takes part, etc. Does that mean anybody who might be on the gate or employed about the grounds?

Hon. G. Taylor: Yes. It is rendered unlawful by Clause 2, which we have passed.

Mr. DAVY: The clause we have passed makes a criminal offence the use of any mechanical device, whereas this makes it a criminal offence to take part in any racing declared unlawful in Clause 2. Clause 2 does not declare any racing unlawful. There

is a contradiction between the two clauses. It would be more sensible to have the same offence mentioned in Clause 2 as in Clause 3. However, if the member in charge of the Bill is satisfied, I will let it go.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Clause 2 provides a penalty of £500 for the use of a mechanical device. Who is going to pay the fine—the promoter? Clause 3 declares that the promoter shall be fined £100. The two penalties ought to be in agreement.

Mr. MANN: No doubt these two clauses are contradictory in respect of the penalties. Who could be more responsible than the promoter? Yet Clause 2, providing a penalty of £500, does not prescribe that the promoter shall pay it. Of course the man using the device will be the promoter.

Mr. Davy: No, I should say it was the man working the engine, a man getting perhaps £5 per week.

Mr. MANN: Let us pass something that is workable. The Bill as originally introduced was a much larger one and was amended in hurried fashion in another place.

The Premier: No, the discussion was adjourned and the amendment was prepared. It was not hurriedly drafted in Committee. The amendment was prepared and was inserted in the Bill at the next sitting.

Mr. MANN: At all events it has been badly drafted, for who could be more responsible than the promoter? Under Clause 2 the penalty is £500, but under Clause 3 the person who commits the offence is liable to a penalty of £100. The hon. member in charge of the Bill told me he was going to move for the deletion of that £500. Had I known he would not do so, I would have moved in that direction myself. The hon. member, however, did not move, and I was surprised when the clause was passed.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: In view of Clause 2, why do we want Clause 3?

Mr. MANN: If the £500 penalty had been struck out of Clause 2, it would have been all right, because the £100 penalty would then have covered both clauses. The penalty in the Criminal Code for keeping a common betting house is £100.

Mr. Latham: It has been argued all the evening that the Bill has nothing to do with betting.

Mr. MANN: This Bill has been introduced to suppress betting, not to stop tin hare racing.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow a general discussion on this clause.

Mr. MANN: The penalty in Clause 3 is inconsistent. Under the Criminal Code anyone keeping a common betting house, which this would be——

The Premier: This has nothing to do with a common betting house.

Mr. MANN: Does the clause mean that a man getting 12s. for taking charge of the gate would be liable to a penalty of £500?

Mr. Davy: They would chop off his head.

Mr. MANN: What about a man engaged to sweep the road outside?

The Premier: If he was outside the fence he would be all right. If he got inside, it would be £100 penalty, and serve him jolly well right.

Mr. MANN: Very well, I shall let the clause go, and ask that Clause 2 be recommitted.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I fail to see why there should be any argument about Clause 3. It is useless for the member for Perth to suggest that an offender would be tried under the Criminal Code. He would be tried under this measure. The clause is quite clear.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Bill appears to have been redrafted in a hurry, and Clause 3 seemingly was mutilated so much that the Council did not know what it contained. The penalty of £100 was originally intended to apply to betting on motor cycle racing, and in the haste of redrafting the Bill the Council omitted to alter the penalty. The member for Claremont would be well advised to report progress.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Clause 3 is unnecessary. All that I desire is to prohibit tin hare racing, and that is definitely declared unlawful by Clause 2. If a company were formed for tin hare racing, that would be using an unlawful device.

Mr. Davy: Who would be using it?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Clause 2 accomplishes all that I want. If we retain Clause 3 it will be inconsistent.

Hon. G. Taylor: Anyhow, no one will be fined under the measure.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: As the Bill stands, there is a double penalty and it is our duty to make the law clear and distinct. Penalties of £500 and £100 are provided for the same offence. My reading of the Bill is that a man must first have been fined £500 before he could be fined £100. If my interpretation is wrong, the £500 penalty could never be imposed.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: The £500 penalty is for the man who uses the mechanical device, and the £100 penalty for the man who promotes the racing. The person using it may be altogether different from the person who promotes, engages in or takes charge of the racing. Clause 3 is merely a drag-net clause.

Mr. NORTH: Certain shareholders may have formed a company to exploit this device, and under Clause 2 a fine could be inflicted upon them if they paraded the contrivance for the purpose of advertising it.

Mr. Davy: Whom would you charge under Clause 2?

Mr. NORTH: The shareholders, if they paraded this device through the streets in order to attract public attention. That would be a case where they were using the device in connection with the promotion of racing. They could then suffer the greatest penalty. Clause 3 defines certain persons as being liable to a penalty of £100. It is sufficiently deterrent to prevent the starting of this business.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. LATHAM: The person who races his dogs is liable to a penalty of £100. Clause 2, in my opinion, relates to the mechanical side of the business, and Clause 3 to the racing side.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The principal party in this matter is the promoter. He may be fined £100. Upon whom would a fine of £500 be inflicted?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The man who used the mechanical device would be fined £500. Clause 3 relates to those who assist in promoting tin hare racing, or those who take part in it. The penalties are well apportioned.

Mr. MANN: If we want to make the Bill workable, we should strike out the word "promotes." It will differentiate between the person who is promoting this contrivance, and the person who is making use of it for racing purposes. If we want to make this a good Act, we should amend Clause 3.

Mr. Richardson: You do not want an Act at all.

Mr. MANN: The Bill is like an illegitimate child, which nobody wants; but let us make the best of it. Now we all know that the measure refers to tin hares, but in

10 or 20 years' time it may be used for a totally different purpose.

The Premier: We can trust the Parliament of 10 or 20 years hence to deal with any altered situation.

Mr. MANN: The Premier and the member in charge of the Bill know that the measure is not well drafted.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The clause as it stands ropes in everybody.

Mr. MANN: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 the word "promotes" be struck out.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know why the hon. member wants to strike out "promotes." The promoter should be liable to the larger penalty, if there is one. If he is struck out of this clause, he will not be provided for anywhere. Progress should be reported in order that the matter may be further considered.

Mr. CHESSON: I do not understand why the member for Perth wants to strike out "promotes." The heavier fine should be provided for the promoter. I am not in favour of the Bill, but I recognise the inconsistency involved in the amendment. The promoter cannot be dissociated from the mechanical contrivance.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.