

and the number of persons awaiting sailing accommodation at the end of August, 1959, was 2,555.

The importance of marketing karri in larger quantities is recognised, both from the point of view of State economics and from the silvicultural angle. A large-scale timber preservation plant is needed, and it is hoped to assist sawmillers to establish such an investment at an early date, together with a portable unit for demonstration purposes.

Investigations continue into the possibilities of pulping marri and karri, and a close study is being made of raw material available, including fast-growing karri regrowth. During the last financial year, additions to State forest amounted to 154,362 acres, chiefly areas for pine planting, bringing the total area of State forests to 4,323,902 acres. In the 1959 planting season, it is proposed to plant approximately 2,300 acres, and work is being developed to ensure approximately 2,000—2,500 acres per annum, depending upon land and finance being available.

Over 17,000 miles of roads, tracks, and firelines receive rotational maintenance, and about one-half of this distance will be covered this year. In addition, approximately 900 miles of new firelines and tracks are to be constructed. About 65 miles of new telephone lines will be built, and the whole network of some 1,800 miles will be maintained.

It is hoped that a further 1,000,000 acres will be covered by the State Mapping Committee by air photos and about 700,000 acres will be interpreted and mapped by Forests Department air photo interpretation staff for use in the Australia forestry inventory, for working plan data, and for general land utilisation and engineering purposes. Some 200 miles of high standard control surveys are necessary to govern this work.

Some 600,000 acres of controlled burning, together with approximately 68,000 acres of top disposal, following trade operations, will be carried out. Regeneration treatment of approximately 46,000 acres of cut-over State forest will be put in hand.

I have given a brief resume of the activities of the various departments of which, for the time being, I am the Minister.

**Progress reported.**

## ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

**MR. WATTS** (Stirling—Acting Premier): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to 11 a.m. today (Friday).

**Question put and passed.**

*House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Friday).*

# Legislative Council

Friday, the 20th November, 1959

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>	
Midland Junction Workshops, details of five-year plan .....	3366
South-West camping sites, water supplies and sanitary conveniences .....	3366
<b>BILLS :</b>	
Licensing Act Amendment Bill, Assembly's message .....	3367
Stamp Act Amendment Bill—	
Com. ....	3368
Report .....	3369
3r. ....	3383
Electoral Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—	
2r. ....	3368
Com., report, 3r. ....	3368
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment Bill, 2r. ....	3369
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill, 2r. ....	3371
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Bill, Assembly's message ....	3384

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

## MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS

### *Details of Five-Year Plan*

2. The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY asked the Minister for Mines:
  - (1) Has the proposed five-year plan for the W.A. Government Workshops, Midland Junction, been finalised?
  - (2) If so, what are the details?
  - (3) If not, when can it be expected that the details will be made known?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).
- (3) About mid December.

## SOUTH-WEST CAMPING SITES

### *Water Supplies and Sanitary Conveniences*

3. The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: On the 4th November I partly answered a question asked by Mr. Lavery and promised him that when I obtained all the information I would convey it to him. That information is as follows:—

The camping area at Augusta is under the control of the Augusta-Margaret River Road Board.

The camping areas at Meelup and Dunsborough are under the control of the Busselton Road Board.

In relation to Augusta, the road board advises as follows:—

- (a) Drinking water supplies are dependent upon rain water catchment whilst the well water which is not regarded as satisfactory for drinking purposes is used for toilets and laundries. Adequate supplies are available in the near vicinity but they are not reticulated to the camping area.
- (b) Sanitary conveniences consist of five septic installations at various parts of the camping area whilst in another section the sanitary conveniences consist of pan removals.

A caretaker is employed at the camping area for general supervision and cleansing arrangements.

In relation to the Busselton Road Board the answers are as follows:—

- (a) (i) Meelup Camping Area.

Water supplies received from wells pumped into storage tanks and reticulated to the camping ground. The quality of the water is good and is used for drinking purposes.

- (ii) Dunsborough Camping Area.

Water supplies pumped from spears by hand and the quality of the water is good.

- (b) (i) Meelup sanitary conveniences are of the septic system type with three blocks for men and three blocks for ladies; and the caretaker, during holiday seasons, carries out cleaning of these. During off seasons, cleaning is carried out by employees of the board, during which only one block of lavatories is open for each sex.

- (ii) Dunsborough conveniences are of the pan system type and are cleaned by the board's collector during holidays and during the off season by the board's employees.

## LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive made by the Council, and had disagreed to No. 6.

### *In Committee*

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

No. 6.

Clause 37, page 29, lines 28 and 29—Delete the passage, "the evils of over-indulgence in liquor, and the effects of alcohol," and substitute the word "alcoholism."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reasons for disagreeing to the Council's amendment are—

The word is inappropriate. The meaning of it given in *Webster's Dictionary* is "a diseased condition caused by excessive use of alcoholic liquors." On the other hand the wording in the Bill indicates clearly what is intended.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Committee will recall that Mr. Watson moved this amendment the other evening in an endeavour to delete superfluous verbiage from the Bill. I do not think there is any need to argue with the Legislative Assembly over it and I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I do not propose to vote against the Minister's motion, but the Assembly's reasons for not agreeing to this amendment suggest to me a rather extraordinary state of affairs. In the House of Commons, the House of Lords, the Commonwealth Parliament, the High Court, and the Privy Council, the *Oxford Dictionary* is always accepted for the definition of words—not *Webster's Dictionary*. The *Oxford Dictionary* defines the word "alcoholism" simply as "the effect of alcohol on the human system."

The other evening Professor Saint used that word or title when he delivered his lecture to us; and to me it suggests that the Legislative Assembly is right off the beam and that my amendment expresses more aptly, and more accurately the intention of the Bill. However, far be it for me to tell the author of the Assembly's reasons what I think of him—apart from what I have already said—and I will not oppose the motion.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

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

## STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *In Committee*

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

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—Section 76 repealed and re-enacted and sections 76A and 76B added:

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I acknowledge entirely the correctness of the submission of the Minister when he commented upon the figures I used. I still maintain the view that there will be a considerable transference to other forms of instalment payment transactions which carry no stamp duty. I hope the Government will not lose too much revenue from that transference.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have been asked to accept an amendment to this clause. There is a little variance between the proposed amendment of Mr. Watson and the one I had in mind. For that reason I ask that progress be reported and that the Committee be resumed at a later stage of the sitting.

Progress reported to a later stage of the sitting.

*(Continued on page 3369)*

## ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**THE HON. J. D. TEAHAN** (North-East) [2.47]: Within the last three years the Electoral Act was amended in a way which was considered to be imprudent. The application of the Act, and the amendments made thereto, was pretty severe, and did not work out as well as was expected.

The Bill before us will improve many of the shortcomings in the Act as amended up to date. Firstly, it will alter the period which must elapse between nomination day and polling day. In the Bill it is proposed to extend that period to 21 days. This amendment is warranted, especially when it is realised that in most of the outlying districts in the North-East Province, and I presume in other provinces as well, there is only one mail a week. The time which must elapse between the making of an application and the receipt of a postal ballot paper is at least two weeks. The provision in the Bill will now make it possible to deal with these outlying postal votes.

What is an extremely good move in the Bill is the simplification of the application form. Up to now the form that has been used has frightened the elector when he has examined it. It has taken a good

deal of study to fill in the form correctly. The new form will be more suitable to a sick person who is confined to bed, than the existing one.

It is also a good move to make it possible to apply for ballot papers by letter. I struck several cases where the particular form was not available, and a communication had to be sent to Perth for more forms; and that does not give sufficient time for votes to be lodged. The new provision states that an application may be made by letter so long as the reasons for seeking the ballot paper are given.

In regard to hospital votes, I had the experience of visiting a hospital a fortnight before one election, and several people asked me what I could do about getting their votes recorded. I said I would obtain the application forms. Subsequently I found that it was an offence to do that, or even to hand out a form.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you were a candidate it would be an offence to be in the hospital.

The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: I was not a candidate. I knew that much. As has been stated, under the existing Act an officer in a hospital is generally appointed as the issuing officer. A few of them have been very unwilling to take over these duties, and have not carried out what is required of them until a day or two before the elections; and that is too late.

Another provision in the Bill will provide a portable mobile ballot box for the recording of votes. A vote will be able to be taken by the deputy returning officer or another suitable officer.

I now refer to the provision in the Bill dealing with the distance from a polling booth at which canvassing may be done. Too well do we all know of the disputes that have occurred in defining the distance of 20 feet from the entrance of the booth. The provision in the Bill states that a distance of 20 feet is to apply from the building. There should be no ambiguity in the future.

In the past there were districts where no issuing officer was available, and where there was no police officer residing. In those cases, no-one was available to receive application forms or to issue ballot papers. In the Bill provision is made to enable a J.P. to do that. The Act can be further improved, but the provisions in the Bill are improvements to the existing legislation. For the reasons I have given, I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

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

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time and passed.

**STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL***In Committee*

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

**Clause 3—Section 76 repealed and re-enacted and sections 76A and 76B added (partly considered):**

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: This clause imposes a new tax. It also provides that the tax shall not be passed on but shall be borne by the vendor. I would like the Minister to be clear on this point. So long as the Stamp Act has been in existence and hire-purchase agreements have been stamped, the stamp duty of 2s. 6d. has been paid. This duty has been borne by the purchaser. Now it is proposed to vary that practice, even to the extent of the 2s. 6d.; it is provided that henceforth all of the stamp duty shall be borne by the vendor.

The big hire-purchase companies will complain, but the tax will not cripple them; but I remind the Minister that there are other firms affected by this Bill. There are the comparatively small furniture manufacturers and retailers in the metropolitan area, who carry their own terms and sell their own goods under hire-purchase.

A tax of 1 per cent. on their turnover will be very serious. I have received information from various sources that this tax will be virtually unbearable. It does not require a very vivid imagination to appreciate the point, when one realises that a retailer works on a fine margin of 2½ per cent. to 5 per cent. If we are to take 1 per cent. of that in tax, the imposition will have a very serious effect.

I am concerned about the portion of the Bill which provides that this tax may not be passed on. Persons of the type I have mentioned will have to pass the tax on, and if they cannot do so in one way they will have to in another; they will have to devise ways and means of passing it on indirectly, which will be undesirable. I move an amendment—

Page 5, lines 7 to 23—Delete proposed new subsection (5).

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If this subsection were deleted, the principle of the introduction of this Bill would be defeated; and the principle is to obtain revenue without any increase or charge on the purchaser. If this proposed new subsection is deleted, the increased charges will go to the purchaser; and this was never intended. I therefore appeal to the Committee to reject this amendment.

**Amendment put and negatived.**

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 4—Second Schedule amended:**

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The purpose of my amendment, copies of which I have circulated among members, is to have percentages used instead of amounts. It provides for a fixed amount of 1 per cent. of the amount which is the rate provided for in the schedule. However, the effect will be that instead of an approved hirer having to present a thousand documents of transactions for varying amounts, and having to calculate the percentage on each of them, he will render one statement which will be extracted from his records for the month; and, assuming those transactions amount in all to £1,000, he will simply take 1 per cent. of that amount without bothering about the details. It will permit the hire-purchase company to pay its duty in bulk instead of in a series of individual transactions. I therefore move an amendment—

Page 7, lines 37 to 42—Delete the following:—

Amounts to £10 or more but does not amount to more than £100—2s. for each £10 or part thereof.

Amounts to more than £100—5s. for each £25 or part thereof, and substitute the following:—

Amounts to £10 or more—1 per centum of the amount.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I thank Mr. Watson for some prior notice of this amendment. I intend to accept it because it will make it much easier from an administrative point of view, and therefore any slight loss of revenue which might be experienced, will be compensated for.

**Amendment put and passed.**

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

Page 8, lines 10 to 15—Delete the following:—

Amounts to £10 or more but does not amount to more than £100—2s. for each £10 or part thereof.

Amounts to more than £100—5s. for each £25 or part thereof, and substitute the following:—

Amounts to £10 or more—1 per centum of the amount.

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

**Title put and passed.**

**Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.**

# **STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)**

*Second Reading*

**Debate resumed from the previous day.**

**THE HON. E. M. DAVIES** (West) [3.13]: This Bill has been introduced to authorise the State Electricity Commission to implement a method of self-help in regard to certain electricity extensions. A limited capital expenditure is to be permitted in any period of twelve months; and for the current financial year a maximum of £50,000 has been set aside for this purpose. The Treasurer of the day will determine the amount to be made available in subsequent years. The commission is protected by a provision in the Bill for a statutory charge on the land to be connected; and protection can be obtained by *caveat*.

The commission has been assured by the Government that it will not be involved in any losses. Also, the commission would require an applicant to pay the estimated cost of erecting the necessary means of distribution. There is no compulsion upon a person to enter into an agreement, but the proposal in the Bill would enable the supply of electricity to persons within a reasonable period, whereas at present they may have to wait for some considerable time before it could be made available. The applicant would have to guarantee a minimum annual revenue for a period of 30 years; and there are other provisions which safeguard both the applicant and the State Electricity Commission.

Generally speaking, I have no objection to the measure, because I feel it will be a means of permitting people to have electricity extensions made to their properties whereas, under the existing policy of the State Electricity Commission, that is not possible. As members will know, in the metropolitan area the policy has been in existence for some considerable time, that if a property is beyond the distance of two poles from the supply, it is not possible for the owner of the property to get the convenience of electric power. There have been many misgivings over past years because of that policy.

However, when the Minister replies I would like him to tell me how far the provisions of this measure will apply; whether it is being passed principally for work in country districts; or whether the metropolitan area and the towns will have the same concessions made available to them if the residents so desire. We must bear in mind that there is no compulsion on anybody to enter into an agreement with the commission for the supply of electricity, unless he so desires. It appears to me, from a reading of the Bill, that it does not definitely state whether the provisions shall apply only in country districts, or whether they shall apply to the metropolitan and outer metropolitan areas. With those few remarks I support the second reading.

**THE HON. J. G. HISLOP** (Metropolitan) [3.18]: I, too, would like to know whether the provisions of the Bill will apply to the

city, and what will happen to those people who are at present beyond the stipulated distance from the supply, but who have their properties connected under the provisions of this Bill and then find that other houses are built between there and the power lines.

**The Hon. A. F. Griffith:** I explained that.

**The Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** I would like it to be made perfectly clear. Will such individuals, because of these other houses having been built and connected to the supply, get back any deposits they have made?

**The Hon. A. F. Griffith:** It will be similar to the guarantee made under the Metropolitan Water Supply Act.

**The Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** When speaking on the Supply Bill, and on the Address-in-reply, I drew the attention of the House to the fact that even schools have been left without electric light because of this policy adopted by the State Electricity Commission. A school erected at North Marmion was for months without a supply of electricity, until the ex-Premier intervened and made provision for electric current to be made available to the school. It seems to me that there should be some co-operation between the various departments in this regard. I want to make the position clear; and to find out whether the provisions of the Bill will apply in areas around the city, and whether they will apply not only to private individuals but also to such buildings as schools, and other public buildings which, in some cases, are built and left without an electric supply because they happen to be built by a governmental or semi-governmental authority.

**THE HON. L. C. DIVER** (Central) [3.20]: I think this is an excellent measure as far as it goes. Mr. Davies pointed out what can be done if the Bill is passed, and I agree with what he had to say in that direction. But members will note that, the Bill deals mainly with the individual, or those small groups of people who want electricity; but it makes no provision for a settlement, or even a school, as Dr. Hislop pointed out, to be provided for. When the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I propose to move some amendments to make it more workable and to make it possible to provide for a settlement, which is without electricity and which, as a whole, is not an economic unit so far as the S.E.C. is concerned, to be connected.

I propose to move to add a new section to allow the local authority to give to the State Electricity Commission a guarantee that it will not lose by such an extension. To me that should be the prime object of legislation such as this, so that whatever extensions the State Electricity Commission puts in under the terms of the

Bill cannot be a charge upon that body, but must be a business proposition. Therefore if we make provision for the local authority to enter into an agreement with the State Electricity Commission, where a group of residents desire electricity, the local authority in turn can be guaranteed and protected in any case where a consumer may try not to meet his commitments. If the amendments I propose are agreed to, the local authority could be in a similar position to the people mentioned by Dr. Hislop. This Bill will fill a much-needed want, especially in the outskirts of the metropolitan area.

Certain questions have been asked as to whether it will apply to the metropolitan area. I could give specific instances of where it will apply in districts which are on the outskirts of the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Wembley Downs is a case in point.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: Yes I imagine that if, in an area such as that, the local authority were given the power I have indicated it would overcome many of the problems. The local authority could be required to put up the necessary capital required for the construction of these extensions. That certainly would be preferable to the state of affairs that exists today; and I think every thinking person will agree that no area can prosper and become highly developed until such time as it has roads, a water supply, and a supply of electricity. Those essential services must go hand in hand.

With those few remarks, and with the intention of moving, when we reach the Committee stage, the amendments I have indicated, I support the second reading.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply [3.25]: As I indicated by interjection to Dr. Hislop, if a set of circumstances arose, such as was envisaged by him—that being when development works overtook the contribution works—the commission would be in a position to repay, either in part or in full, the capital contribution required in the first place from the consumer. The position is similar to the guarantee under the Metropolitan Water Supply Act. Under that Act, the same as the State Electricity Commission Act, the extensions made by the department must show a return. That is the reason why the State Electricity Commission cannot undertake these extensions at present unless they do show a return.

In regard to Mr. Davies' inquiry, I cannot see anything in the Bill that limits its provisions in any way, except the question of finance. As I said when I introduced the measure, it is proposed to allocate for this work this financial year the sum of £50,000. In later years it will be up to the Treasurer to set aside an appropriate sum from year to year.

I think the Minister for Electricity had more in mind the assistance to areas slightly outside the metropolitan area; places where there would be no hope of people getting electricity under the conditions which operate today.

Under the present circumstances there cannot be an extension of power from point A to point B unless the return to the S.E.C. is equivalent to a sum necessary to cover the capital cost of the works and interest. To the best of my knowledge this measure does not limit the S.E.C. in any any way. The work can be done where it chooses to do it.

Mr. Diver has indicated that he will move some amendments in Committee; and, a short time ago, he was good enough to give me a copy of those amendments.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: The Bill was only introduced last night.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I appreciate that, and I am not being critical of the honourable member; I am merely explaining the situation. I have had a quick look at the amendments, and there does not seem to be any objection to them. But I point out to members that this is not my Bill; it was introduced by my colleague, the Minister for Electricity, and I think, perhaps, he would like Crown Law Department officers to look at the amendments, particularly the last two—proposed new sections 7 and 8.

Therefore, if the Bill is read a second time, I propose to adjourn the Committee stage until the next sitting of the House; and, in the meantime, I can have the amendments examined, and I will tell the honourable member on Tuesday whether or not they are acceptable.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North) [3.30]: This subject of betting control is one of great public interest. Governments are usually in a position to give the fullest consideration to all problems, including indeed very vexed problems; and interwoven into this subject are many controversial matters. We hear, almost daily, criticisms of the gambling of the bettor, or punter, himself; of the book-maker, and of the Government in connection with control of such matters. But I would say that uninformed critics will never really submit a solution to any subject.

The parent Act was introduced in 1954 for two main purposes. The first was to try to clean up a very difficult and, to some extent, unsavoury situation in regard

to off-course betting, by regulating and controlling betting off course by legislation carried in both Houses of Parliament. The second purpose was to give substantial revenues from such control to the Treasury.

I contend that both objectives have been fairly satisfactorily reached—the cleaning up of conditions which were unsavoury and unsatisfactory; and the payment to the Treasury of very substantial sums. So far as revenue is concerned, in the last financial year the Treasury obtained from turnover tax alone—and I am using the Minister's figures—an amount of £442,000; and there were many other sums incidental to taxes levied in the course of betting operations.

I want to say at the outset that I support strongly the field of betting as being a medium for taxation; but I object very strongly, at the other end of the scale, to inequities within the system used in the imposing of such taxes. In the Bills before us, such inequities exist; and I hope to analyse the situation sufficiently to ask the Government to follow the advice of several speakers who have gone before me, and to have another look at these proposals.

There is no merit in a long speech, simply because it is a long speech; although I intend to speak at some length. I can be blamed for a speech covering 19 pages of *Hansard* when introducing a Government measure for the control of off-course betting in 1938; when I reviewed, in a world sense, the history of gambling, and the history of betting control operations in England and other parts of the world. I also had the responsibility of investigating the worthiness of two measures introduced in the Legislative Assembly in the late 30's and early 40's.

Accordingly, I have had an opportunity, not being a punter of note or magnitude to study the subject. I have been to the racecourse twice in the current calendar year, 1959, though I have been to the trots more frequently. But I illustrate that to show that I am not actuated by any sense of being a gambler or bettor; and the contribution I have to make is from one who has from time to time had an opportunity of studying the subject.

It is true to say that we cannot stop off-course wagering on horse-racing; and any person who suggests we can is expressing much less than a pious hope. I should say we would use, and could use, and should use, the habit as a valid means of attaining revenue of a substantial kind. We should tax fairly and equitably at all levels in the two spheres of taxation—turnover tax and stamp duty, in particular—which are valid in almost all circumstances.

But I oppose very strongly the tax which provides a heavy burden on the bettor himself; the man who in the ultimate provides all the money to be taxed in this

manner. The Government, unfortunately, has framed all its proposals for recoupment to racing and trotting clubs on and within the framework of a tax on the bettor; the investment tax. That tax is to be imposed on a person who is continually making his contribution. It is an iniquitous tax, and the proceeds from it are to be used to give largesse in very large quantities to the racing clubs and the Trotting Association. The help to be given to these clubs, I repeat, is to come from the tax on the punter himself.

That is to say, the Government collects turnover tax from the bookmaker, off-course in this proposal; levies the bettor on all bets made; and gives to the clubs the proceeds of that tax. My first comment against the proposals in the Bill is that it is obvious that there have not been sufficient consultations and conferences between the authorities affected by these measures. I refer, indeed, to the Turf Club itself, to the Trotting Association, and to the taxation authorities or anyone else.

Has the Government, in regard to these proposals, received a substantial and written report from the Treasury? It has been conceded by the Premier in another place that it has not. Has the Government conferred with the Betting Control Board on the matter? I suggest it has not. Has the Government asked the Turf Club itself whether its needs are of such magnitude as this Bill suggests? I submit it has not. Has the Government asked the Trotting Association whether it needs returns under section 61B. of proceeds from on-course and off-course betting, and betting on trots in other States? I suggest it has not.

But here we have the Government acting in this manner while awaiting the report of the Royal Commissioner on this very vexed problem. It is, in a form, experimenting with something that could destroy a large proportion of the taxable capacity. I was not in this State at the time of the introduction of the legislation which is now law; but I do know from my reading of its introduction that it was introduced for the two specific purposes I have already enumerated. If it is to be said that betting should be a medium for a continuing tax, it surely is a very important matter to see that the measure of taxation to be recouped by the Government from this source is, in fact, continuous, as well as affecting the controls, incidentally, I should say, continuously.

I repeat that although the Government on almost all subjects is in a position to give the fullest consideration to all such problems as this, it has not on this occasion given the fullest consideration that might be available. None of us knows what the course of the inquiry followed by Commissioner Ligertwood may take so far as recommendations are concerned. We do not know whether he will refer—or, if he does, to what extent—to legislation; to

taxing proposals. We have no idea in that regard. We do not know what he may be prepared to advise.

It would be more appropriate if we did; and, as this legislation is continuing, it would be more appropriate to have a special session to deal not only with this matter specifically, but many other things which could be tidied over even before the normal sitting. We would still have plenty of time. Since the Government admits from observations that have been printed that it is experimenting, it should, in all fairness, re-examine these things in which a doubt has been quite firmly expressed by many members in this Chamber; members who spoke yesterday on this subject. I think there was only one member who gave unqualified support to this measure; all the other speakers raised some doubt as to the ability of the Government to impose the taxes as represented in these measures to have the level of taxable capacity as a continuous factor.

It is also vital that all examination of this problem should be shorn of any spleen or feeling against any section of the community. Unless we approach it not actuated by any feeling of vindictiveness against any group or any particular section of the community, we will not get a proper assessment. Nor can we get a proper assessment of the possibility of continuing this tax unless we examine the position of those who are bookmakers, and whose margins now are so small that their continuance is very questionable if the rates applying in the second Bill before us are not altered.

I would not for one moment support the contention that S.P. betting is the cause, and the only cause, of the decline and embarrassed condition—or allegedly embarrassed condition—of the racing clubs. The last time I was on a racecourse in Perth some months ago, it was a sort of stimulus to a latent memory to see faces older—as I suppose mine is considerably so when I look in the glass; I mean the mirror—and wondering what those faces looked like 25 years ago; because the faces one sees at the racecourse are not those of young people; they are the same faces, in an older degree, as those of 25 years ago.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How many lessons have they learned in that period?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: They have learned no lessons. The punter never learns a lesson; not even when he sees in print the astronomical figures which he contributes to taxation and to other people's incomes. It is no use our moralising about it; it is a habit which will continue. Other sports have contributed. Men and women in their thousands spend their Saturday afternoons on the river, and on the sporting field engaging in many types of sport. This is not the age of the horse; it is the age of something different.

People are not as interested in the horse as they are in other sporting events. That does not apply to the country districts.

*Sitting suspended from 3.47 to 4.5 p.m.*

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is idle and incorrect to say that the younger generation are being attracted away from racecourses and into betting shops, because the population in betting shops and on racecourses is almost the same population which constituted the betting public when I was a much younger person. The sports on the river and on the recreation ground are, fortunately, media attracting many young people of today.

A few moments ago I commented on the fact that the Government had not sufficiently consulted people qualified to speak on this subject at either end of the scale—those who are to be the beneficiaries under the legislation, and those who are to pay the piper. What information have we to justify the proposition that from the iniquitous investment tax the Turf Club should receive money at the rate of £350 for every day of the year? Has the Turf Club been so well managed that we can expect from it, no matter what sum it receives, some inspiration as to the better spending of the money; or have we had the reverse? On the other hand, have we made sufficient provision for the Trotting Association in the proportion of off-course betting money to be paid to it? I suggest that we have not.

The Trotting Association has an important and creditable record in the annals of sport in this State. I know the circumstances of the charity meetings that were held in the war period, because I arranged them. Trotting and racing meetings were held on alternate Saturdays; and I arranged them in conference with the committees of both clubs. I know what the Trotting Association did. It ultimately distributed over £100,000 to charity, while at the same time fostering interest, wherever it could be fostered, in the country districts where trotting was a sport. Without further comment, I say that the Turf Club's record is nothing like that.

I think Mr. Mattiske said he had seen the figures of some bookmakers in his district, and that those figures suggested that the people on the lower rungs, who were having this tax levied on them, would be sorely pressed. I will deal with that aspect in a moment. I wish to draw attention to the next statement he made when he said he had no reason whatever to doubt the authenticity of the figures. Some doubts have been raised as to the ability to substantiate the figures in the returns, which have been mentioned in this Chamber, of 124 bookmakers. It was suggested that these figures had been examined by the Commissioner of Taxation. But it



has been suggested as being almost ridiculous that we should not believe the figures. I suggest that even in the field of S.P. bookmaking there are very reputable citizens; and there are people whose taxation returns are subject to the same strict scrutiny as are the income tax returns of members of Parliament.

We must not cast a slur on the Commissioner of Taxation in regard to his vigilance, or that of his officers. Nor should we cast a slur on the veracity of people, in a very different walk of life from our own, in regard to their income tax submissions. Amongst those of us who are on different political sides in this State, and who vigorously oppose each other's opinions, is a feeling of trust for each other, because we trust each other's word; and so do these people about whom I am speaking. I am not, as members will gather as I proceed, presenting a case for them, but these people, at the nod of the head and without a scratch of the pen, will honour an obligation involving tens of thousands of pounds; and they ensure that such obligations are honoured because there is no room in their business for a man who dishonours his obligations or does not keep his word.

I simply raise that point to illustrate the fact that we must be careful and not freely cast slurs on men who, within the law, earn incomes of the proportions shown in the returns to which I have referred; and who, within their profession, are honourable men.

I have already mentioned that there is no power within the control of humans to stop off-course betting. We cannot prevent people from gambling, so we legalise it in order to get some revenue from it, and to make sure that it will be well controlled and conducted. I suggest it is still the objective of this Government to endeavour to ensure that this source of revenue shall be kept above board, and that the industry shall continue in such a manner as will enable us to extract taxation from it at a rate commensurate with the ability to pay.

The possibility of putting people out of the S.P. betting business in towns where the public cannot attend racecourses is an important part of the matter to be dealt with by this legislation. In some towns, far from the metropolitan area, and perhaps 300 miles or more apart, the people can attend only one race meeting a year—I speak of such towns as Wyndham, Hall's Creek, Derby, Marble Bar and Landor. Unless we are careful and have a look at the figures presented to us, we will impose a serious burden on the Treasury by putting out of business dozens of people on the lower rungs of the S.P. ladder.

In no place that I know of has the landlord missed the opportunity of extorting his toll from the tenant, if he is a bookmaker. Recently, when speaking

to a man in the suburb in which I live, I heard some figures of a most astounding kind. I was told that £30 a week rent was charged to an S.P. bookmaker, when the man in the adjoining shop, of the same dimensions, paid £15. I heard also of an instance where £19 was paid by a bookmaker whilst the next-door tenant, in a shop of the same size paid £9.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It sounds like another source of extra taxation.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: They are fair game for the landlord. Therefore I suggest that S.P. bookmakers are not allowed to have things all their own way even if, as is alleged from time to time, it is a way of easy money.

I do not accept the proposition that all the ills of the racing clubs can be placed at the door of the legalisation of S.P. betting. People today just have not the money. There are tens of millions of pounds tied up in weekly contributions under hire purchase and instalment plans; matters which we have discussed in this Chamber recently. As an illustration of the unattractiveness of racing, I would point out that in the last week in October 15,000 people attended a motor sports meeting at Caversham; tens of thousands attended physical exercises and sports on our esplanades and playgrounds; hundreds went on the river, and 2,500 people went to the races. That is probably a good trend; but it has nothing whatever to do with S.P. betting; and the Government, in its plan to give the racing clubs large sums of money without sufficient examination of their needs, or the way they will handle the money, is asking us to do something which Parliament should not be expected, under the circumstances, to agree to.

All of the distributions provided for under the Bill are to come from the investment tax—a most obnoxious tax and one which should not be approved—but in case it is approved I propose to place on the notice paper certain amendments which have as their objective, firstly, the desire to have the situation of the race clubs and the trotting association reviewed as to their needs; and, secondly, to have the ratio of distribution properly aligned; and, thirdly, to take from the local clubs any moneys or tax on bets on races in the Eastern States. What have the local clubs to do with those races? They do not do anything about them.

I suggest that if we give them the incentive, they may be able to make sufficient advances to get much greater figures from within. I would prefer to see the racing clubs and the Trotting Association get all the taxation collected on the course; the Treasurer to take the rest. I would prefer to see the Treasurer take all the taxation on the Eastern States racing; but that would require an amendment outside

my scope and outside the scope of the Bill, although not if it were moved by a Minister.

I would like to see taken into Consolidated Revenue the sums represented by Eastern States collections. Let us see what the clubs now get. From the on-course turnover for 1958-59, of which 60 per cent. went to the clubs by statute, the W.A. Turf Club got £27,518 as its 60 per cent. of the on-course taxation, quite apart from its domestic taxation; and the Trotting Association, on its on-course turnover, received £14,337 as its 60 per cent. of the total collections thereon. I would like to see framed a provision which would give all that revenue to the clubs—not just 60 per cent. of it—and that would lift the Turf Club's return to £45,860 on last year's figures, and that of the Trotting Association to £23,890. I think we would then begin to get equity, not only in the placing of the income where it belongs, but also in the retaining by the Government of taxation which properly belongs to it.

I make that suggestion for the Minister to present to his Government. The Government should examine the on-course taxation collections, with a view to increasing the contributions to the clubs from that source; but if we have to accept this iniquitous tax to which I have referred as the basis for the distribution of the moneys under this Bill, let us do it properly; and, after inspiring the clubs to do more under their own steam, let us take away from them the revenue supposed to come from the Eastern States, which in the case of the racing clubs is real and in the case of the trotting association, I suggest, fictitious. That suggestion in the Bill is just padding—that the Trotting Association should keep a proportion, from races of driven horses, held elsewhere than in the State. There would not be many half-crowns there in the year.

The only time the Trotting Association would benefit from that provision would be when there was an inter-Dominion championship held in another State, in which Western Australian horses were competing. How many investments are there on a Saturday on trots in Sydney, Adelaide or Melbourne? Practically none! Therefore that is not a fair representation of the situation. I have no brief for any of these entities, but I suggest that the Trotting Association is getting an unfair deal, under these proposals, in comparison with the Turf Club.

I have referred to what the Trotting Association did during the war years; and I have personal knowledge of that. It must be remembered, as an argument which is difficult to refute, that the Trotting Association, under the very system under which it races under lights, comes in after a lot of the punter's money has

been expended during the earlier part of the day. It gets only what is left, in addition, of course, to its regular patrons who go only to the trots. But as far as the betting shop punter is concerned, the trots get only what is left. I believe that not only in this State but also in other States, and in many other parts of the world, one would travel far to see a better spectacle than the Trotting Association presents in this State.

Let us examine the Bill more intimately. I propose to furnish the Minister with typed copies of amendments that I intend to move; so that he will not be at any disadvantage; because I could not get them done in time for the notice paper; and I still have not got them all done. I propose, in the case of the Betting Control Bill, to delete the portion which refers to ridden and driven horses in other States; so whatever income there is from that source of taxation will go to Consolidated Revenue.

That would reduce the £133,000 to be given to the Turf Club to about £60,000, which I do not think is unfair or unreasonable. It would not affect the figure for the Trotting Association for the reason, which I gave, that no bets of any consequence are in that instance made on the Eastern States races. I propose to try to take out those paragraphs and to move the relevant amendments which will be consequential. I notice that Mr. Willesee proposes to reduce the proportion of the distribution, which I think is worthy of the Government's consideration.

In regard to the second Bill, which levies the tax on bookmakers; several members have said that it will, in a very wide bracket on the lower rung, dry up the source of income and put out of business people who are meeting a need or providing an expected facility which is available to people in country districts—the local bookmaker. I suggest that it would be far better to have this on an entirely different basis; that of a sliding scale. I propose a scale, which increases as it progressively rises, to take off a substantial percentage from the bottom and gradually increase it towards the top.

The proposal, which I intend to submit in an amendment, which I cannot have drafted until Monday, is something to this effect: That the £25,000 top limit off-course bookmaker remains as he is at 2 per cent.; and that for every £25,000 increase on that figure an additional one-quarter per cent. be added. It will not mean that the top man will pay his full rate on the top figure; but that he will pay at the average of the figures throughout that range. The percentage would reach  $4\frac{1}{4}$  per cent., but not  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. overall. The  $4\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. would apply only to the last £25,000 of the top figure.

If the Government would agree to something like that, the burden would be taken from where it can least be borne and

placed where it can better be borne. I concede that the very big operator has great risks. He has a big turnover; but from the Betting Control Board's returns we can see that there are not many such men. However, I think they would agree—because I do not think they are unfair people, although I have not spoken to any of them—that they would pay more under this suggestion of mine than they pay now, but I think they would also agree that they have had a very fair deal in the past.

I put this suggestion forward, not as a law of the Medes and Persians, but as a basis for the Government to examine; because it would not mean a flat rate such as exists now, but a system which would give a more equitable distribution of the burden over this class of taxpayer. These men have other taxes to pay. I remember that during the course of the Royal Commission certain large income figures were mentioned as the total income. Under this proposal there would be a lowering of the tax to be paid to the Commonwealth; and that in itself is not a bad idea, provided there is not an unfair impost placed on them at any stage. So, in essence, the proposals I have submitted so far are that we should take into the Consolidated Revenue Fund all the revenue obtained from the tax imposed on bets made on Eastern States racing; that we should consider giving to the racing clubs a much greater proportion of the revenue obtained from off-course betting; that anything obtained from on-course betting should go into Consolidated Revenue; and that the scale of taxation in the Bill should be seriously reviewed for the purpose of revision, not necessarily in accordance with the submissions I have put forward, but they could be used as a basis of thinking about the position.

In regard to the third measure, the Betting Investment Tax Bill, I have only a limited vocabulary, and I cannot select the most suitable word to describe the proposal contained in that Bill even though the premise for the collection of this tax will be a medium for giving to the clubs those contributions. The proposal contained in the Bill is simply this: The investment tax collected from punters off-course, based on a calculation of the turnover on all races in Western Australia, will be paid into a fund to be distributed, in part, to the racing clubs. I suggest there should be another source for the collection of this money.

I oppose the fourth Bill which will cause, if I am any judge, the greatest confusion in an S.P. betting shop. If passed, the Bill will lessen the opportunity of collecting half the bets when the race is about to start: including all bets made by telephone or at the counter. I do not know how many clerks work at the counters of the large betting shops. Suppose there are four or five at the counter. Each of

them must have two sets of forms or books in which to record a bet, and when the bet is recorded, the original slip is handed to the punter. Further, the bettor may wish to make two separate bets of £1. If those bets are written on the one slip, it would simplify the procedure, I admit.

However, if a clerk has to write, five minutes before the start of a race, 30 or 40 bets a minute—which I think might be a reasonable number—and he has to fiddle around with carbons in two or three sets of books, I think we will be making a very big rod for our own back. We are certainly going to make it practically impossible for the operator to cope with the bets that are made. I do not know what the Government would lose on a flat rate of 1½d. stamp duty, but such a flat rate is worth considering. A flat rate of stamp duty would be an advantage both for the operator and the Government, because this medium of collecting revenue was initially presented as a continuing source of money for the Treasury.

The inequity of the proposition contained in the Bill is terrible. I am not going to mention the pensioner, because he is mentioned too often.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: He is fleeced too often.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That may be so, but that is of his own volition. The average person who has a bet would pay 1½d. stamp duty, so long as his bet was below 20s. It might be only 2s. 6d. However, the man who rings up a bet of £50 each way pays only 3d. Trainers and owners sometimes have a bet off-course involving such amounts. They telephone the bet through to a betting shop, but they cannot collect by telephone, even though they might deny making the bet. Therefore, why should those people on their £50, £100 or £500 bet pay only double the amount of stamp duty paid by the man who has a small 5s. bet? If the tax is to be in that form, it would be much better to impose it at a flat rate.

Therefore, I say to this Council and to the Government that this Bill reeks of inequity. The proposal contained in it suggests it has not been properly examined by those who recommended it to the Government. The Treasury officers of this State are those most skilled in the levying of taxes. Therefore, I would like a report laid on the Table of this House from those men on what they think should be the Government's share of the toll from the S.P. punter. The Treasury officers, including those engaged in the Stamp Office and those engaged on the more intricate work of probate duty assessment, are the advisers to the Government on taxation; and they are the only officers who know much about the levying of taxation on bookmakers. They gained that knowledge long before starting-price bookmakers were legalised.

The Government would be wise to consult those officers, and racing club representatives who have had experience of racing over many years, on the question of needs. Indeed, it could include the people who are to pay this tax; namely, the bookmakers. Why deny them the right to submit a case? If they were permitted to put a case to the Government it should be examined with the closest scrutiny.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: The man in the street should be consulted, too.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: He will bet just the same. He could be brought into the discussions if that were agreed upon; but he will still bet despite the amounts of tax that are taken from his pocket. I cannot support the third Bill, but I have no intention of voting against the passing of the Bill now before the House.

**THE HON. A. L. LOTON** (South) [4.40]: Most members will recall the chaotic conditions that prevailed, just over five years ago in the metropolitan area, particularly in regard to S.P. betting in this State. Bookmakers operated in back lanes and on street corners, and the punter would whisper the name of the horse on which he desired to place a bet as he walked past because he did not wish to be apprehended by the police on a charge of obstructing the traffic. The reason why such a charge was laid was because betting was illegal at that time; and this absurd position was created.

The circumstances in those days were that a bookmaker would be standing on the corner of a street, someone would come up and whisper a few words to him, following which he would pull a book out of his pocket and write on one of the slips a horse's name and hand it to the person who had spoken to him. If he were unfortunate and were apprehended, he would be charged with obstructing the traffic. Further, in many cases, when the case was brought before the court on the following Monday morning, a stooge appeared for the bookmaker so that he could take the punishment instead of the bookmaker.

The penalties that were inflicted included, in some cases, £5 for a first offence; but the most significant feature was that the penalties varied from place to place. For example, in one centre a man would not be charged at all for betting illegally; in another town the penalty for the charge would be the minimum that could be imposed; and at another centre the magistrate in charge of the district may have been trying to stamp out betting, and he would inflict a fairly severe penalty on any offender. That was the position before betting shops were legalised.

I was not a member on the floor of the House when the Betting Control Bill was introduced and debated in this Chamber,

but fortunately or unfortunately—according to the point of view as to whether the Bill was desirable or otherwise—the measure was passed; and I would certainly have voted in favour of it if I had had the opportunity. In reviewing the position today, I cannot remember when the last charge for obstruction of traffic was heard in a police court; that is, when the charge was laid to prevent illegal S.P. betting. Also, today we hear very few cases of any person receiving a bet and absconding with the money paid to him for the wager. That blot on society has completely disappeared.

Those bookmakers who are now operating, are doing so under the provisions of an Act on our statute book; and as we have accepted that law, they should be entitled to the protection of it instead of being regarded as men of an obnoxious type. Mr. Jones quoted quite a few figures to the House. He was the first member to speak following the Minister's introduction of the Bill. He appealed to the members of this House and the Ministers of the Government to study the figures he submitted. Also, Mr. Mattiske had this to say—

Therefore I do hope that the points that have been raised in this Chamber will be given full consideration by the Treasurer to ensure that no injustice is done.

Then he went on to say this—

I can only ask that the Minister will take the appropriate action so that the Treasurer will have another look at the matter before the legislation is assented to, so that if any injustice is being done it can be corrected before it is too late.

That is what I hope, and most of the comments made by Mr. Wise were made along those lines; namely, that something should be done before it is too late; or, in other words, the Government should review the Bills to ascertain whether a more equitable levying of the taxes and disbursements proposed in them can be made.

The first measure, the Betting Control Act Amendment Bill, deals with the disbursements of the collection of the tax. The worst of the three measures is the Betting Investment Tax Bill. Mr. Wise mentioned that an amendment was on the notice paper. I have requested that an amendment should be made to this Bill in another place because we cannot amend the legislation in this House. I realise the difficulties surrounding what I am trying to accomplish, but I am anxious to avoid the absurd position that will arise if this Bill is passed. I will now quote some figures to prove that an absurd position will be created by this legislation. For example, if a man makes four 5s. bets, he pays 3d. tax on each bet. Therefore, he pays a total tax of 1s. On each of those four tickets there is a tax of 1½d. which makes another 6d. in tax. So in all he pays 1s. 6d. If a big bettor went into an S.P. shop and

placed £100 on a horse he would pay only 6d. as an investment tax, and 3d. for the stamp duty on the ticket, and the total would be only 9d. In that case the big bettor pays only 9d. while the small bettor pays 1s. 6d. If we make the comparison on the basis of 10 bets of 2s. each, the position is even worse.

The evidence before the Royal Commission was that the average bet laid by a punter is less than £1. Therefore it is the small punter who is penalised. I hope something can be done to overcome these difficulties. I would prefer to see a winning bets tax imposed, but as there is no proposition of that nature before us, we cannot do anything about it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The punters do not like that one either.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: The Government is of the opinion that those who derive a benefit from the sport of racing should make some contribution towards its maintenance. I am in agreement with that; it is the matter of the collection of the contribution to which I am opposed. It is most unfair that the punter who makes small bets should be called upon to contribute more than the big punter.

I hope that the Minister will be able to confer with the Treasurer over the weekend, and impress upon him the iniquity of the investment tax; and that he will ask the Treasurer to consider whether the amount which the Government proposes to give to the racing clubs could not be raised in some other way. That matter could then be dealt with in Committee.

I have given a great deal of thought to the measure before us. I do know something about horse-racing and betting, but I have given both away. There is much merit in the proposal for the introduction of a sliding scale of tax. I have figures which show that there are 55 S.P. bookmakers with a turnover of less than £25,000 per year, and 43 with a turnover of less than £50,000. That is a total of 98 with an average turnover of just over £26,000. Yet, under the proposals in the measures before us, those are the ones who are to be asked to carry the greatest burden of these taxes.

There are many small bookmakers operating in country towns. They supply a service to the community; but they cannot make a living out of their operations. If they tried they would earn well below the basic wage. To provide the benefits to the community—because betting, like drinking, has become a social habit in the community—some person establishes himself in a country town to take bets, and, in most cases, to pass them on. Such a person could not make a living out of the business.

If these taxes are to be imposed; this type of bookmaker will cease to operate. What will be the result? We will revert

to the old days so that people will be operating illegally as bookmakers, with punters going down the back lane to place bets. In that process the Government will lose some of the revenue which it now derives from S.P. betting. In many country centres there are no police officers stationed, and therefore there will be no check on such illegal betting. In the overall, the Government will lose; and society will also lose because we will have a return to those deplorable conditions which prevailed prior to the passing of the Act in August, 1955.

Regarding the Bill to amend the Stamp Act—the last of the four measures dealing with this matter—it would be better for all concerned to have a flat rate, instead of two rates of 1½d. and 3d. depending on the amount of the ticket. Whether the rate is fixed at 1d. or 2d. per ticket is up to us to decide. If this proposition is put into effect, the staff in betting shops will find their work easier. After all, they are entitled to some consideration, because they are the same as persons engaged in legitimate business. I am hopeful that when these Bills are discussed in Committee next week, the Government, as a result of the debate in this House, and as a result of the discussion between the Minister and the Treasurer, will be amenable to some of the suggestions which have been made.

**THE HON. E. M. HEENAN** (North-East) [4.52]: I want to express a few sentiments on these rather contentious measures, particularly as I am one of the members still in this House who considered the original measure when it was introduced and debated. I can claim to have taken a prominent part in that debate. I used whatever influence and knowledge I possessed on the subject to support the legislation which is now on the statute book.

All my life I have been associated in a small way with racing and betting. In the whole of my life my largest bet has been £5; and I have only placed two bets of that size. My normal rate of betting is 10s. each way on the tote. I lived on the Goldfields for many years, and I practised as a solicitor there for over 20 years.

I saw first hand the state of affairs which was brought about by the old system. I used to go to the Kalgoorlie Police Court on Monday morning, which is invariably a busy morning; and it was common to see a procession of half a dozen or so derelicts being charged with keeping betting premises, when everyone knew quite well that they had not. Even the magistrate would know that the poor derelict was only lending his name and being convicted in consideration of the payment of £5 for lining up. I also know how corruption of individuals in important positions was attempted and sometimes achieved under the old system.

So it is little wonder that I supported the measure which legalised off-course betting. Over the few years in which it has been in operation I have derived great satisfaction from the largely satisfactory manner in which that legislation has operated. I travel widely; I travel on the Goldfields and in the outback portions of the State, and I am in Perth quite a lot. I see betting shops operating in Perth; I see them in Kalgoorlie; and I see them in Leonora. Only a few weeks ago I saw one operating at Meekatharra, and a week later I saw another at Mt. Magnet. I say without hesitation that Parliament was wise in introducing the legislation some years ago to legalise off-course betting.

I have no prejudices in this matter whatever. I am not beholden to the Turf Club, the Trotting Association, the turf bookmakers or the S.P. bookmakers. For many years I served on the committee of the Kalgoorlie-Boulder Race Club. As a solicitor I drafted the constitution of the Boulder club and the Kalgoorlie club when they amalgamated. As a member of the committee I observed the way our clubs kept going down, in spite of everything that was done. I am a member of the W.A. Turf Club, and have been for a number of years. I patronise the betting shops. I am not ashamed when I go around my electorate to enter the betting shops to see how they operate. I invariably meet a number of, my friends and acquaintances in those places.

I think, therefore, I hold fairly liberal views on the matter. When I go to the Turf Club, I am frequently treated with considerable courtesy by the committee, and likewise at the trotting course. On numerous occasions I have accepted their hospitality. I admire the way they conduct their affairs. I know a number of bookmakers operating on the racecourse and at the trotting course, and I hold them in high regard. I have known them over a number of years. The same remarks apply to some off-course bookmakers. I know many of them also. A few of them are personal friends of mine, and I respect them as highly as I respect any other close friends of mine.

The measure before us arouses in me considerable interest and causes a degree of anxiety, because, like everyone else, I am anxious to do the right thing by all concerned. I do not want to do an injustice to any section of the community. However, we have to face the fact that in spite of what people say about racing, it is undoubtedly an industry which employs a great number of people. For instance, there is the breeding side of it.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: And there are the farmers and the chaff merchants.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: There are a number of women, presumably widows, who work in the totalisators; and a lot of

old men, returned soldiers and others, who work at the turnstiles, to say nothing of those people who attend to the horses. There must be hundreds of people directly and indirectly earning their living from this industry.

Some of my happiest days are those when I patronise the racecourses here and at Kalgoorlie, and also the trotting ground in Perth. They provide decent amenities. Of course, with more money they could provide better amenities. Pleasant surroundings are provided and afternoon tea can be obtained. Patrons can meet their friends in a pleasant atmosphere, and the sport is, to a lot of people, something more than pure gambling. There are people who go to the races and bet very little, and some, not at all.

A lot of people are precluded from engaging in other sports. I do not know how other members find themselves placed in regard to spare time now they are in Parliament. I know that once upon a time I used to be keen on golf, and later on bowls, but I cannot play now. As sure as I make arrangements to do so, I find I have some other commitment.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You are not the only one!

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: For that reason I obtain a lot of pleasure from going to the races and trots whenever the opportunity presents itself. Racing is a legitimate sport which appeals to a lot of people, and I do not see anything wrong with it in moderation. Members must realise that the remarks I am making in regard to racing apply equally to trotting.

People gain a lot of enjoyment from seeing good horses in action at the carnivals that are held, and from seeing the horses ridden by expert jockeys.

Over the years, for more reasons than one, the clubs have got into financial difficulties, and the maintenance and stability of this industry or sport has been jeopardised. There is the other side of the picture. A lot of people do not want to go to the races; and others cannot afford to. It is still an expensive sport, no matter how it is viewed.

Many people in the country cannot come to Perth to attend the races; and it is right and proper that we should provide facilities for them to make investments, in the same way as facilities are provided for their more fortunate brethren who can go to the races. But it seems to me that the source of the sport has to be maintained, and for that reason the courses at the trotting and racing clubs have to be kept at the required standard; decent horses and officials must be maintained; attractive amenities for the people have to be provided; and stakes of a standard that will obviate the crooked methods that are

always a temptation in this sort of sport, must be offered. Therefore there has to be some equitable adjustment of the revenue that the sport, in its various spheres, provides; and that is where the difficulties arise.

I have here a letter from the Kalgoorlie Race Club. The clubs on the Goldfields have done a great deal over the years to contribute to the happiness of the life on the Goldfields. My friends, Mr. Bennetts and Mr. Hall, will bear me out in that contention. The Kalgoorlie Race Club provides a lovely park with lawns and trees. It also makes its course available for picnics and the like; and the carnivals which are held there have become well-known in the sporting life of Western Australia. I wonder whether members know that last year from the taxation derived from betting, the Kalgoorlie club received only £385.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Terrible!

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It is essential that we give the clubs a fair go. Their costs have risen; and I for one do not want to see the Kalgoorlie club go out of existence. However, if all it is to get is £385 in a year, it will not have any chance at all.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You know what it will get under this Bill, don't you?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Under these proposals, the Kalgoorlie club is to get £3,500; and that pleases me considerably; but the increase of 1,000 per cent., or thereabouts, is such a steep jump—

The Hon. G. Bennetts: But even that will not go very far.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It will not go far; but it is such a steep jump that I wonder whether it is not too good to be true. After listening to Mr. Willesee, Mr. Wise, Mr. Jones, and others, I am in some doubt as to whether too much is to be taken out of this game; whether we are going to impose too much taxation; and whether, as some speakers have contended, we are going to kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: This is an attempt to rejuvenate it.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I want to do the right thing by the off-course book-makers. I know a lot of them, and I have seen their shops. They are well-conducted; and, as Mr. Logan has pointed out, we have no prosecutions to speak of, and no corruption. According to their figures which have been reliably checked, none of them is making excessive profits. The question of whether this legislation is soundly based causes me some concern because if we are going to take more from them in the way of taxation than they can pay, and so put them out of action, we will be penny wise and pound foolish.

I am inclined to think that something has to be done under this proposal; and the clubs will have to receive considerably more assistance than they have received in the past. But because we are going from one extreme to another is something that concerns me. For those reasons I share the point of view expressed by Mr. Loton and others that the whole basis of this taxation should be given another careful check. If the Government can assure us on unimpeachable authority that no harm will be done to anyone, I will support the measure. However, at the moment I have considerable doubt about the proposition, and I am going to err on the safe side by supporting those speakers who urge that more consideration should be given to the matter before a vote is taken on it.

**THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North)** [5.13]: Previous speakers have covered most angles in connection with this legislation, and there is very little more I can say. However some thoughts have presented themselves to me. I do not agree with my colleague who just stated that perhaps this proposed legislation might kill the goose that lays the golden egg for the racing clubs. He need have no fear that that goose is going to die. The goose that will be killed is really, in my opinion, the goose referred to by a lot of racing people as the one which keeps the S.P. industry going; in other words, the ordinary people who cannot get to a racecourse for any one of several reasons. For instance, they may not have the finance; or the nature of their employment may be the reason. On the other hand, they may be too far away from the course to make it possible to attend.

I feel that this additional taxation, which will all have to come from the punter initially, could quite easily kill some of the pleasure that a lot of isolated punters enjoy. It will turn some of them away from betting. They will say, "Well, if we are to be taxed just because we cannot go to a racecourse"—for any reason—"and those who are in a position to attend the course and can afford to do so, are not going to be taxed in the same manner, why don't we give it away?"

Actually many thousands have drifted away from the racecourses already; and not only in Western Australia. I was amazed when I studied the figures in relation to the totalisators, to see that the turnover at the trots had actually increased. But racing is suffering the same disability in the Eastern States, and even in England, where they now propose to license off-course bookmakers in order to help the industry. I suppose it can be called an industry, but it is usually referred to as a sport. In some senses it is an industry, and in others it is a sport, depending upon which point of view is desired to

be pressed. Apart from the breeding side, I do not think there is anything of an industry about it; because I know people employed in this so-called industry who are able to follow their usual business activities throughout the week, or they are able to carry out their responsibilities as employees, and still join in the sport, or industry, whichever it is termed.

If the Government chooses to look upon it as an industry, and say that it shall be subsidised, why not subsidise it in the same way as any other industry is subsidised—from Consolidated Revenue or by way of a normal subsidy? But the Government is not doing that. I am afraid this Government has become intoxicated with the power it has to tax. I can see both Ministers smiling; but the number of taxing measures that we have had before us this session, and the viciousness of this one—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: How many have we had?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: —show quite clearly that someone is intoxicated with the extraordinary powers he now has to tax; and that is evident from the methods the Government is using to tax the people.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What makes me smile is the amount you want to take out of Consolidated Revenue; and put nothing back into it.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Do you think they are tax happy?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not know the correct term. I have heard of people being punch-drunk, but I think the public, and not the Government, on this occasion could be called tax-drunk. The proposals represented by these four Bills are vicious. At present the Government has been collecting slightly more than £500,000 from off-course bookmakers only; and those people collect that sum of money from off-course bettors only. According to the Treasurer, this measure will double that sum, so off-course bettors are to suffer a 100 per cent. increase in the tax.

Whether that £500,000 is called an investment tax, a turnover tax, or any other tax, it comes from only one source—the off-course punter; and if a 100 per cent. increase on the money paid by off-course punters is not considered vicious, I do not know what is. Mr. Heenan said that the killing of the goose would seriously affect off-course bookmakers, and the racing industry generally. But what will happen to the £1,000,000 that the Government will collect if these Bills are passed? It is £1,000,000 to be collected from off-course bettors only. Approximately £280,000 of it is to go to the racing clubs, and the other £720,000 is to go to Consolidated Revenue.

It looks to me as if the Government is intoxicated with its power to tax, and it desires to get as much money as it possibly can from the off-course punters. Out of the £1,000,000 that the Government will collect over-all in one full year, the racing clubs will get only £280,000, whereas from the extra £509,000 that the Government will collect the Government will take over 50 per cent.—the Government will get £299,000 and the clubs £210,000. Obviously the Government's expressed desire to raise these taxes in order to protect the industry is only an excuse to get extra money to help its own financial position. The Government does not care who has to pay the tax, or where the people live. Whether they are in Kalgoolie, Esperance, Wyndham, or anywhere else, they are the ones who will have to find the money to keep this so-called industry alive.

If it is an industry, why not subsidise it from the £500,000 the Government already collects? Why not give the clubs 50 per cent. of that sum? It would be almost as much as the Government intends to give the clubs out of the total of £1,000,000 which the Government will get if these measures are passed. It seems to me, looking at these measures objectively, that the Government is taking full advantage to help itself to the punters' money; and the Government will get far more out of it than the racing clubs.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You disagree with Mr. Wise?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I know that Governments must have money, and they have to look around to see what avenues they can tax to get money. But when a Government taxes a certain section for a specific purpose it should not use the money for its own ends. In this instance the Government is taxing a particular section of the community—the unfortunate section that cannot, for some reason or other, attend the racecourses—while those who can attend are to be allowed to go scot free. They are not to be taxed at all, because these Bills affect only the off-course bettors.

One of these Bills might have the effect of diverting some of the racing trainers' money to the racecourse, instead of its going to the off-course betting shops; but I very much doubt it. Evidence given before the Royal Commission was to the effect that one particular trainer was betting large sums of money away from the racecourse. But if he had a £100 or £200 bet, under these Bills he would pay only 6d. investment tax, and so a £100 bet would cost him only 100 0s. 6d.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: He would miss the 6d.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: He would! But the chap who frequents licensed betting premises, and has only £1 or 25s. to



spend on his bets and beer for the week, will have to pay 3d. for each 2s. 6d. bet he has, whether it is a straightout bet or a place bet; whereas the smart Alec trainer, who is in the industry, and who wants to get a long price for his money has to pay only 6d. on a £100 bet. Surely that is not equitable! But that is the position which will arise if the investment tax is agreed to. I am very much opposed to that Bill, and I shall vote against it at the second reading.

I do not believe that anybody who lives in an area where it is impossible for him to attend a race meeting should be penalised when he has a bet. I can see no logic in penalising such a person and I am opposed to the proposition. The Government is avaricious in this grasping legislation it has introduced. I repeat, if these Bills were passed in their present form the Government would collect 100 per cent. more than it is collecting at the moment from off-course bettors. Out of the £1,000,000 collected, if these Bills are passed, the clubs will get £280,000.

Have the clubs said to the Government, "We can't get these people on to the race-courses and we want their admission money. We want them to bet on the race-courses and have their refreshments there, but we can't get them there." Has the Government said, "We will compensate you for that. We will make them pay a couple of hundred thousand pounds and that will be yours." Has that been the position? Because out of the investment tax the Treasurer tells us £199,000 of the £210,000 to be collected is to be given to the racing clubs. It seems to be a matter of, "You won't go to our races, you bettors, but you will pay your admission fee, anyway. We will tax you to that extent." I cannot see any fairness in that sort of legislation.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Who creates the opportunity for them?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I shall certainly vote against it. If the Minister does not mind the people who live in and around Geraldton being taxed the equivalent of an admission fee because they are not able to go to the races, that is all right; but I do not agree with it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Who creates the fun and the opportunity for them?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I can understand the Government creating a fund. We know that special taxing measures are passed to cater for special industries, but I would not like to call the racing game an industry.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Other people have done so.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Breeding might be an industry; but not racing.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: A lot of people on your side have called it an industry.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: They might have done so, but I am speaking for myself. I would not term it an industry. There are many people living and working in the North-West, who go to the races there; but they do not miss a day's work, except on the day of the races. They still train and feed their horses, and go hundreds of miles to a race meeting. They would be insulted if anyone said they were in the racing industry. I do not think they would have a bar of it.

I want to make it clear that while I support the second reading of this Bill I feel that a much more equitable scale of taxation should apply and a much lower scale of taxation should be imposed, unless the Government is prepared to do that which it claims it will do with the money from these measures, namely, assist the racing industry. So I reserve my judgment on three of the Bills. I want to say very definitely that I am opposed to the tax on off-course bettors—that is the investment tax of over £200,000 per annum which they would be required to meet, based on the 1958 financial figures.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [5.31]: We have heard many figures quoted this evening, and at previous sittings, in relation to this Bill. We cannot disregard those figures, no matter from what source they have been supplied. They have been obtained from people who are competent in the S.P. betting industry; and I for one am quite prepared to acknowledge the fact that there is some justification for a review of the legislation before us.

I am strongly of the opinion that the Government has every justification for imposing a tax on the S.P. betting industry; what does matter, however, is the extent of that tax. I feel the Government could have been more lenient in its attitude to the small operator; and that aspect could be considered by the Government even at this late stage. I would support a move to have a tax of, say, 2 per cent. on a £30,000 turnover. I would say that those with a turnover between £30,000 and £50,000 could afford to pay 2½ per cent., while those with a turnover in excess of £50,000 should be able to stand the taxation prescribed in the Bill.

However, I do not think that we should pass legislation that would tax people out of business; business which Parliament legalised. I feel that is exactly what we will be doing if no revision is made of the scale of tax contained in the Bill. No doubt

the rate of taxation could be better borne by those in the higher turnover group, than it could by those in the lower turnover group. Nor have I forgotten the fact that in the days when S.P. betting was illegal there was a 10 per cent. commission paid to agents acting on behalf of the S.P. bookmakers. Accordingly I cannot feel that this legislation will mean the end of the S.P. betting industry altogether. But it has been said that, so far as the investment tax is concerned, it is inequitable as applied to the smaller man. I will reserve my decision on the matter until the Committee stage of this Bill.

I am of the opinion that anybody who has a bet should pay a tax on the bet, and the money so derived should be applied to the benefit of the racing clubs; particularly those in the country, although, of course, clubs in the metropolitan area must also be considered. This, however, is a matter that can be considered in committee. I agree in principle with an investment tax, but I will not delay the House any longer. I shall reserve any further discussion on the Bill for the Committee stage. I support the second reading.

**THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON** (Suburban) [5.35]: I rise to oppose the tax on the small bettor. I am not a racing woman myself, but I am inclined to call this Government "the Taxus ranging Government"; and I object very strongly to the amount of money that it has continually sought to take out of the pockets of the man in the street with a view to placing it in Consolidated Revenue. This is a sectional tax. I am fairminded, and I would not object to it if I thought it a fair thing. But it is completely unfair.

At the time I was earning my living in the city, I conducted a large guest-house in the days when S.P. bookmakers were operating illegally. The things I used to see and hear cannot be mentioned; and it was dreadful when I had to send my children out on Wednesday or Saturday because of the activities that took place in the lane at the back of my premises. The whole set-up was a complete disgrace. Although, as I have said, I am not a racing woman, I was very anxious to see legislation placed on the statute book to provide S.P. operators with some form of respectability, and in the hope that it would stop the abuses that were rife at the time.

I also had men renting a small room in my premises; these men were stooges for the bettors in the S.P. shops. The only reason that they took on these jobs was that they were very poor, and £5 meant a great deal to them. There are many other avenues that this Government could have explored without running the risk of re-introducing a state of affairs that existed prior to S.P. operators being legalised. If this legislation is passed that is exactly

what will happen. We will have illegal betting operations taking place; there will be those who do not want to pay the tax; and there will be plenty of opportunity provided for them not to do so!

I realise that the racing clubs must be helped, and I have nothing against them whatever. Where people gather together socially, it is necessary to provide all the amenities possible. But these amenities are not provided at the racing clubs. Racing is considered to be the sport of kings and queens, and while there are lovers of horses it will not be possible to do away with racing in Australia or anywhere else. It certainly would not be possible to do away with betting, because that seems to be inherent in the Australian.

But we must endeavour to control betting. The Government of the day is giving us a very poor lead, and is displaying considerable lack of commonsense in the imposition of this sectional tax on the people. Of all the taxes that have been imposed, this is the most iniquitous. I do not know enough about the racing clubs or the trotting clubs to express an opinion; although I have heard our trotting course spoken of very highly. It is certainly a lovely sight for anyone who cares to visit it on a summer night. I do not know much about betting, although if I felt like going to the races I would certainly attend them. But we must have good amenities provided on the racecourse. My main objection is that this is a sectional tax, imposed on small bettors to whom £1 means more than £50 to those who can afford to attend the racecourse.

The Government of the day seems intent on continually taxing the people. Every Bill introduced contains some form of taxation imposed, particularly, on the poorer people. I must take cognisance of the figures mentioned by Mr. Strickland. When one considers that £280,000 per annum is to be paid as an investment tax, and that £720,000 is to be paid into Consolidated Revenue, there seems to be something wrong. I am quite sure that this type of taxation will have repercussions that we do not expect. This will not prove of benefit to the racing game at all; it will have the opposite effect.

I object to the tax being put on a section of the people; particularly a tax as vicious as this. It is the worst example of sectional taxation I have seen; and I hope we do not have any further Bills of a similar nature brought down.

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

## STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

## METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME BILL

### *Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly notifying that it disagreed to the amendments made by the Council now considered:

### *In Committee*

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

No. 1.

Clause 38, page 23, lines 3 to 5—

Delete paragraph (a) of subclause (2).

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reasons for disagreeing to the Council's amendments are—

The deletion of these provisions from the Bill will prevent the Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority from having any funds specifically provided for the purpose of enabling it to service loans and cover administration costs necessary to implement its plans and/or to recompense land owners whose property is adversely affected by the Regional Improvement Scheme.

To have the Authority subject to such allocations as might from time to time be made from Consolidated Revenue Funds would hamper it most unfairly in its planning.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I hope the Committee will not insist upon the amendments made by the Legislative Council. I endeavoured the other day to give the House the reasons why this tax was essential. During the course of that debate I gave an assurance to the House that the promise made by the Premier that land tax would be reduced would be fulfilled. At the time, I stated that I could not say for certain whether legislation would be introduced this session or next session. I said that if it were introduced this session the reduced rates could not apply until the 1960-61 assessment. Therefore, if a Bill is not introduced this session, it could be introduced early next session in time for reduced rates to apply to the 1960-61 assessment.

I have given a considerable amount of thought to ways and means of overcoming this problem and, to be frank, I have not found an alternative. Certain alternatives have been suggested; and I realise the concern of Mr. Watson, Mr. Mattiske and Dr. Hislop in regard to this tax. They are concerned that the tax of one halfpenny is likely to grow. However, I can give them an assurance that while the present Government is in office—at least until 1962—there will be no increase. I would like to go further and say that if the Government is returned in 1962 there will still

be no increase; but unfortunately it is not within my province to make that promise.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You have been reading the stars.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I said it was not within my province. If it were, I would willingly give that promise.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Do you propose to spend the money or fund it in loans?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It will mainly be funded in loans. Obviously, £140,000 would not cover the expenditure.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Would you fund £2,000,000?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Probably a little more, but roughly £2,000,000. Whether it will be necessary to fund £2,000,000 for a start I do not know. A survey will have to be made to ascertain how much will be required. I promise to take to Cabinet the suggestions made by Mr. Watson, Mr. Mattiske and Dr. Hislop that this money be found from Consolidated Revenue. At the moment, the Government is unable to accept that proposition. As I have given an assurance that the one halfpenny tax will not be increased, I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and a division called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the tellers tell, I give my vote with the noes.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—13.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. A. L. Lofan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	(Teller.)

Noes—12.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. R. F. Hutchison
	(Teller.)

Pair.

Aye.

No.

Hon. A. R. Jones

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery

Majority for 1.

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 2.

Clause 41, page 26—Delete.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: As this is a consequential amendment I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Unfortunately I was called from the Chamber on urgent business while the Minister was giving his reasons why we should not insist upon amendment No. 1. I did, however, hear sufficient of his speech to hear him say that the tax would be limited a halfpenny in the £ and that certain representations would be made to Cabinet.

When speaking to this measure previously I made representations on behalf of the people in the metropolitan area who had approached me requesting that the tax be not imposed purely upon metropolitan dwellers, and I endeavoured to have that tax made State-wide. Unfortunately, my proposed amendment could not be accepted. I then had one alternative open to me; that was to speak against the imposition of any tax at all. That matter was referred back to another place and was given full consideration.

My alternative at the present time is to risk the whole of this measure going overboard or support a tax which is now limited to one halfpenny in the £. With a full knowledge of the urgency of this measure, I am prepared to vote in favour of the tax of one halfpenny in the £ rather than that there should be further delay in having the necessary arrangements made; and they can only be made with the authority of this legislation. I felt I would like to take this opportunity of expressing those views, rather than have my vote recorded without any explanation whatsoever.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I would like the Minister, if he can, to give me an explanation. Earlier today during the debate on another measure he stated that racing was an industry. Could the Minister tell me whether the racing establishments which come within the metropolitan regional zone, such as stud farms where trotters and gallopers are bred, are exempt from this measure.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not remember speaking on any measure this afternoon; and I do not remember saying racing was an industry.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You said it by interjection.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Interjections are highly disorderly.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is so; and they should not be recorded.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They should not be noted, you mean.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If the honourable member looks at the definition of the word "agriculture" he will get his answer.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: There is nothing said about horse-raising.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If it does not come within that definition, it probably will not be exempt. That is all I can say about it.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The vote on the previous question was put rather hurriedly, which precluded me from making a couple of remarks that I intended to make. The Minister, when speaking, broke no new ground at all but left the position as it was when we debated the main issue. The Assembly's reasons for disagreeing with our amendments are, in my submission, quite invalid. The Assembly says that these amendments would leave the planning authority without any specific funds.

Previously I made it clear that in my opinion the proper source from which to get this amount of £140,000, is the land tax. This money should come out of the extortionate amount of £1,250,000 raised by land tax in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Not only the metropolitan area.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Well, 90 per cent. of it comes from the metropolitan area. Under the Vermin Act, the amount of £100,000 which is required, is provided each year from Consolidated Revenue. A similar provision could be included in this measure so that each year the sum of £140,000 could be specifically appropriated from the land tax collected in the metropolitan area.

During this session, we have been asked to swallow an increase in motor fees; an increase in hire-purchase tax; a proposed betting investor's tax; and now this amount of £140,000 extra land tax.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Give us a little on the credit side.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: If this is a taste of what we are to expect during the next two years, I do not look forward to the next two years with any enthusiasm.

**Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.**

No. 3.

Title—Delete the words "to regulate the assessment of a Metropolitan Improvement Tax."

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This is a consequential amendment, and I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

**Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.**

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

*House adjourned at 6.6 p.m.*