

Premier had suggested a steam ferry, and of course if a bridge could not be obtained, by all means let there be a steam ferry, on which vehicles could be conveyed from one side of the bridge to the other.

Amendment (the Premier's) put and passed.

THE PREMIER further moved that the words "also reports thereon" be added to the motion.

Further amendment put and passed, and the motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10-22 o'clock until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th December, 1899.

Beer Duty Amendment Bill, first reading—Health Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Question: Telephone Service, Perth and Fremantle—Question: Railway Crossing, William street, Perth—Question: Magistrates and their Duty—Question: Government Resident at Roebourne—Mining on Private Property Amendment Bill, third reading—Sunday Labour in Mines Bill, postponement—Land Act Amendment Bill, recommittal, reported—Metropolitan Waterworks Amendment Bill, in Committee, Division, reported—Police Act Amendment Bill, in Committee, Clause 2 to new clauses, Divisions (4), progress—Totalisator Act Amendment Bill, in Committee, Division, progress—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4-30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

BEER DUTY AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, by leave, and read a first time.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the ATTORNEY GENERAL, by leave, and read a first time.

QUESTION—TELEPHONE SERVICE, PERTH AND FREMANTLE.

MR. WOOD asked the Premier:—Whether it is the intention of the Government to do anything in regard to improving the telephone service between Perth and Fremantle.

THE PREMIER replied: Yes; the service referred to has been interfered with by the Electric Tramway system, and the Telephone Department is at present engaged in devising means to improve the telephone system between Perth and Fremantle.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CROSSING, WILLIAM STREET, PERTH.

MR. WOOD asked the Commissioner of Railways:—Whether it is the intention of the Railway Department to give greater facilities to vehicular traffic at the William Street railway crossing, so as to enable carts to cross the line at shorter intervals than at present.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: I regret that greater facilities cannot be afforded under the present conditions, but instructions have been given to lessen the public inconvenience by keeping the gates closed as short a time as possible.

QUESTION—MAGISTRATES AND THEIR DUTY.

MR. VOSPER asked the Premier:—1, Whether his attention has been directed to the statements alleged to have been recently made by the Resident Magistrate at Kalgoorlie, to the effect that the honorary justices in that town were untrue to their oaths and partial in their administration of justice. 2, If so, whether he intends to call upon the Resident Magistrate to either substantiate these charges or to publicly and officially withdraw them.

THE PREMIER replied: My attention has not been so directed, but to-day I have read the report of what took place, and also the subsequent remarks of the Resident Magistrate, as published in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of 4th instant, and I gather that the Resident Magistrate repudiates any intention of reflecting upon the honour of the justices referred to.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT RESIDENT
AT ROEBOURNE.

MR. VOSPER asked the Premier:—1, Whether his attention has been called to the allegations made in open Court against the Government Resident at Roebourne, by the Resident Medical Officer. 2, If so, whether the Government intend to institute an inquiry into these assertions.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes.

MINING ON PRIVATE PROPERTY
AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by the MINISTER OF MINES, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

SUNDAY LABOUR IN MINES BILL.

POSTPONEMENT.

THE MINISTER OF MINES moved that the Bill be read a third time.

MR. MORGANS moved, as an amendment, that the third reading be postponed until Monday next.

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

Ayes ...	12
Noes ...	8

Majority for ... 4

AYES.	NOES.
Sir John Forrest	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hall	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Harper	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Higham	Mr. Leake
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Solomon
Mr. Morgans	Mr. Vosper
Mr. Pennefather	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Phillips	Mr. James (Teller).
Mr. Piesse	
Mr. Wallace	
Mr. Wood	
Mr. Rason (Teller).	

Amendment thus passed, and the third reading postponed.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the PREMIER, Bill recommitted for further amendment.

Clauses 1 to 9, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 10—Leases and other holdings granted under timber leases to be subject to the rights of the timber lessee:

THE PREMIER moved that in line 6, after "lands" the words "whether unoccupied or otherwise" be inserted; also,

that the following be added to the clause:

Provided that every lease granted or claim acquired, under any of the said Acts, of lands comprised within a timber lease, shall be granted or acquired subject to the right of the proprietor of the timber lease, with the approval of the Minister of Mines, to enter upon and construct and maintain roads, railways, and tramways thereon.

Amendments put and passed.

MR. WILSON moved that in line 10, after the word "otherwise" the following be inserted:

Provided further that notwithstanding anything contained in any of the said Acts, any miner's right or miner's license shall not entitle the holder thereof to cut, remove, or strip bark from any timber on the land comprised within any timber lease, beyond the limits of his holding.

The amendment, he said, was to prevent miners going outside their claims and stripping bark off trees.

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

Schedule:

MR. WILSON moved that after "mile," the words "or such other distance as the Minister of Lands may approve," be inserted.

Put and passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Bill reported with further amendments, and the report adopted.

PERTH TRAMWAYS AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 5, inclusive—agreed to.

New Clause:

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 5:

"The promoter" shall, within five years from the passing of this Act, complete and open for public traffic the lines of tramway mentioned and described in the second schedule hereto.

The object of the new clause was to embody in the Bill a recommendation in the report of the select committee recently presented. That report recommended that a line of tramway should be constructed starting from the junction of Barrack Street and Bazaar Terrace, and going along Bazaar Terrace and Mount Bay Road to Point Lewis. Since the provisional order was granted, the company had further agreed to construct another line which would be included in

the tramway system of the city, to start from the junction of Bennett and Wellington streets (near railway), and go along Wellington Street to Barrack Street, and from the junction of William Street and Wellington Street along Wellington Street to Thomas Street. These two new additions would be included in a schedule which he would move shortly.

MR. A. FORREST: Would the Commissioner of Railways say whether, in view of the contract made between the company and the City Council, to build seventeen miles four chains of line, the company would be bound to complete those new works also? Would they be bound to complete more than the total number of miles stated in the contract? There had not been the courtesy to invite any member of the City Council to serve on the select committee.

THE PREMIER: This did not bind the company unless they agreed to it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: This Bill was only to confirm a provisional order; but an understanding had been arrived at between himself and the promoters in regard to these other lines, and this recommendation had also been made by the select committee. It had now been decided to include the recommendation in this Bill, which would really make it compulsory to carry out this extra work, and it had been agreed that the work should be done within five years.

MR. A. FORREST: The company could not be compelled to build more than seventeen miles four chains.

MR. JAMES: The company wanted to alter the previous provisional order.

MR. A. FORREST: The line in Hay Street and the proposed line along the Esplanade, as he understood, had obviated the necessity for a tram in St. George's Terrace. He believed the company intended to make the lines so as to cover seventeen miles four chains, and they would then consider whether they would build more.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The company had agreed upon twenty miles. They were to build thirteen and three-quarter miles in two years, and six and a quarter more within five years.

MR. A. FORREST: The original contract was for seventeen miles four chains.

MR. JAMES: That was a matter between the City Council and the Tramway Company.

MR. A. FORREST: As no member of the City Council had been appointed on the select committee, he (Mr. Forrest) had not been able to follow the recommendations of the committee.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule—agreed to.

New Schedule:

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS moved that the following be added, to stand as the Second Schedule:

(1.) *Wellington Street*.—Starting from the junction of Bennett and Wellington Streets, along Wellington Street to Barrack Street, and from junction of William Street and Wellington Street along Wellington Street to Thomas Street.

(2.) *Mount Bay Road*.—Starting from the junction of Barrack Street and Bazaar Terrace, along Bazaar Terrace and Mount Bay Road to Point Lewis.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 4.—Power to board to cut off supply of water to any premises:

MR. A. FORREST: Apparently the board were to be given full power to compel every householder to use a meter. Section 20 of the Act of 1896 gave no such power. A meter would cost about £1 a year. Under the existing Act the board could cut off water in the event of non-payment of rates, and that right was sufficient without inflicting this additional charge on ratepayers.

MR. JAMES: Under Section 22 of the Waterworks Act, the City Council might supply any person with water for domestic purposes, and might compel such person to take the same by measure. This section, however, was ambiguous, and Clause 4 would make it clear. The board officers might suspect that a person was using water on his premises for other than domestic purposes, but without constant watching such offenders could not be detected, and it was therefore desired to have power to compel them to use meters. He had never heard of a

small householder being compelled to have a meter.

MR. WOOD: The use of a meter on a vacant block might be enforced.

MR. JAMES: Technically speaking, it might, but no board would do so. This was a board appointed by the Government and entirely under the control of the Minister, and the members could at any time be removed.

MR. A. FORREST: Did not Clause 5 give sufficient power?

MR. JAMES: No; the power to insist on a consumer using a meter was given by Clause 4.

MR. HALL: A householder was allowed to use a quantity of water commensurate with the rates he paid. If the meter were used, and the water cut off for a time, air would enter the pipes, in which event the hand of the dial would revolve more rapidly than if water were passing through, thus causing great loss to the ratepayer. This difficulty had been common in Melbourne, and hence many objected to water meters. The board's inspectors could detect unlawful users of water, and the clause would only heap additional expense on Perth ratepayers, who were sufficiently rated already.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Cutting off of supply not to affect liability of owner or occupier; and the board may require payment of costs, etc., before restoring supply:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved that the clause be struck out.

Put and passed, and clause struck out.

Clause 6—Agreement to be binding on subsequent owner or occupier of premises:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved that the clause be struck out.

Put and passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 7—Town clerk to deliver to board copy of rate-book:

MR. A. FORREST: The City Council complained of this clause. To make out the return would entail much more expense on the City Council than the £50 per annum which it was proposed the board should pay for the service. The City Council now paid clerks 1s. 6d. per hour to make up its own rates, and the cost of copying the rate-book for the board would be fully £100. Let the board make up their own rates from the

books; for, as they charged for water at the highest possible rate, the City Council should be put to no unnecessary expense.

MR. JAMES: Let the payment be per folio, or increase the amount to £75.

MR. A. FORREST: To make up the roll cost £150.

MR. WOOD: Fifty pounds was enough. The city valuers only received £250 for valuing the city and making up the rolls. When he was city valuer the rolls were copied for about £25.

MR. HALL: The amount should be £100. The last speaker, when a city valuer, complained of being underpaid.

MR. JAMES: So he was.

MR. A. FORREST: And he left on that account. The Council's officers, in a memorandum, said it would be impossible for the town clerk to deliver to the board a copy of the rate-book by the third Saturday in December of each year without employing a special staff, which staff was required even for making up the City Council's own rate-book. Let the board do the work themselves, as in the past.

MR. JAMES: The copy was not required to be delivered to the board before the third Saturday in December, but as soon as practicable afterwards.

HON. S. BURT: Surely a clerk could copy the rate-book in two months, and by the clause his remuneration would be £25 per month.

THE PREMIER: The work could be done cheaper.

MR. WOOD: Make the charge at per folio.

MR. A. FORREST: Why should the City Council be forced to perform this task?

MR. JAMES: To assist the citizens.

MR. A. FORREST moved that in line 2 of Sub-clause 3, the word "fifty" be struck out and "seventy-five" inserted in lieu thereof.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. A. FORREST strongly protested against the City Council having to supply a copy of the rate-book for so small a sum as £50. The work could not be done for the money. The municipality of Perth had to pay to the Waterworks Board the highest rate for every drop of water used. In the past the Waterworks Board had copied the rate-book, and this might be done in the future.

MR. HALL: This was a matter directly affecting the City Council, who represented the citizens. As a matter of courtesy, the municipality should have been consulted on a point of this kind. In view of what the mayor of the city (Mr. A. Forrest) had said, that the work could not be done for £50, he thought £75 should be provided.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	8

Majority	5
--------------	-----	-----	---

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. S. Burt	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Connor	Mr. Hall
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Locke
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Monger
Mr. James	Mr. Phillips
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Solomon
Mr. Pennefather	Mr. Wallace
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Oldham (Teller).
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	
Mr. Throssell	
Hon. H. W. Venn	
Mr. Wood	
Mr. Rason (Teller).	

Clause thus passed.

Clause 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Striking rate:

MR. A. FORREST: According to this clause, a person might be in occupation for only a few days before the expiration of the year, and the previous occupier not having paid his rates, the person in occupation would become liable for the rates.

MR. JAMES: Was that not the system everywhere?

MR. A. FORREST: The Municipal Institutions Bill, introduced this session but withdrawn, provided that the landlord should be responsible for the rates.

HON. S. BURT: A person on renting a house should ask to see the receipt for the water rate and the municipal rates. Why should the owner be victimised as had been the case in the past, for as much as five years' rates? In the past, the collectors for the municipal council did not trouble to make more than one demand, by written notice, for the rates. They let the rates accumulate when there was a good owner, and subsequently came down on him for rates for as long a term as five or six years. The only proper system was for the tenant to ask to see the receipts for the municipal and water rates before taking the house. The owner would then see that the occupier paid the rates before leaving the house.

MR. HALL: Recently a house was taken by a person, and notice was sent to that person that the water would be cut off within seven days if the rates were not paid. The occupier, who was away for several weeks, did not receive the notice, and the water being cut off, he had to pay 10s. 6d. to have the water reconnected. Although the present Municipal Act made the occupier liable, one did not see why the owner should not be made responsible. What had been said by the member for the Ashburton (Hon. S. Burt), as to collecting rates, might have happened in the old days, but it could not happen now. At the end of the financial year there would be the large sum of £9 outstanding for rates for the Central Ward of Perth, which showed not only that people were able to pay their rates, but that the collecting was well looked after. The same thing obtained in the other wards. In the North Ward only the sum of £50 was outstanding for rates, out of some thousands of pounds.

MR. A. FORREST: It was a great hardship that people should be made liable to pay money which they did not owe. Supposing a person came to Perth a stranger, took a house, and as soon as he occupied the house the bailiff came with a warrant and seized the furniture for payment of water which had not been used by that occupier: why should we retain all the old abuses in this Bill? This was one of the particular things which the new Municipal Bill would have amended. It seemed a degrading thing that the mayor of the city of Perth, or the chairman of the Waterworks Board, should have to sign warrants against persons for the payment of money which those persons did not owe. Some clause should have been inserted to put an end to this abuse.

MR. JAMES: It was not desirable to introduce a new and important rating principle in a comparatively small amending Bill, as such alteration of the law could be better made in an amending Municipal Bill. The board levied rates on the basis of the municipal rate-book, and if that plan were departed from, there might be two systems of rating. When an amending Municipal Bill was introduced, he would be glad to support a change in the direction suggested.

MR. HALL: The City Council had experienced the same difficulty in connection with the sanitary rates. At one time occupiers had to pay 2s. 11d. per month, or about 35s. per annum; but as tenants were constantly changing, and new tenants were made responsible for the arrears of the previous occupiers, the by-law was altered, making the owners responsible for an annual rate of 30s., payable half-yearly. There was no reason why the wrong should be continued, and Parliament ought not to be less progressive than the Perth City Council.

HON. S. BURT: In order to meet, in some measure, the wishes of those who objected to this clause, he moved that in line 14, after "rated," the words "or by any subsequent occupier within the year for which the rate is struck, or if any such occupier neglect or fail to pay the same," be struck out; also that, after "occupier," in line 17, the following be inserted, "or if the board have levied a distraint on the goods of the occupier aforesaid, and have failed to recover the amount payable."

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

Clauses 10 to 15, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 16—Municipalities to give the board particulars as to the level of streets:

MR. A. FORREST: No doubt the Waterworks Board wished to throw the whole responsibility on the City Council, and this clause, if passed, would result in great expense to the municipality. He did not oppose the clause, but it appeared that the Waterworks Board, if they got a chance, were going to rule the city, and it was probable the City Council would have to make terms with the Government for taking the works over, even at a loss. The board actually charged the municipality one shilling per thousand gallons, whereas private customers were charged only ninepence.

MR. GEORGE: If the City Council chose to deposit £50 with the chairman of the Waterworks Board, as private individuals did, they could get all the water they wanted at ninepence per thousand gallons. It ought to be the duty of the City Council to give the levels at which they intended to fix the formation of any street; and in the case of the old Water-

works Company with which he (Mr. George) had been connected, information was given by the city officials as to the levels, and the mains were laid accordingly at a certain depth below the surface. If the City Council subsequently decided to raise some of the levels and to lower others, the Waterworks Board ought not to be called on to bear the expense, seeing that the alteration was for the convenience of the municipality of Perth, and not for the benefit of private individuals.

MR. HALL: The Waterworks Board ought to pay the cost of obtaining these levels; but at present the board seemed to give more attention to endeavouring to make the waterworks pay than to studying the convenience of the citizens. The levels should be supplied by the City Council, but the cost of obtaining them should be paid by the board. As to the £50 which the member for the Murray (Mr. George) referred to, that hon. member seemed to think it was something extremely good that people should be able to pay £50 and obtain their water at ninepence per thousand gallons.

MR. GEORGE: It was not bad.

MR. HALL: It was not bad for the people who were wealthy enough to pay down £50; but those who could not pay down £50 had to pay 2s. per thousand gallons. It was an extremely rotten thing to enable a capitalist—because it was only a capitalist who could pay down £50 at once—to obtain as much water as he wanted at ninepence per thousand gallons.

THE PREMIER: Could that be done by him?

MR. HALL: Certainly. A person could pay down £50 and have as much water as he wanted at ninepence per thousand gallons. It was not as though the £50 did the Waterworks any good: it was simply paid to the credit of the board, and no interest was received for it. A tenant of his (Mr. Hall's) had consumed all the water allowed him according to his rating, and the next tenant received notice that in future he would have to pay 2s. per thousand gallons for all water consumed up to the end of December. Another select committee should be appointed with reference to the waterworks.

MR. GEORGE explained that the hon. member had misunderstood his statement. He would be sorry to understand that the Corporation of Perth were so poor that they could not deposit £50 to enable them to save £150 or £200 in the year. During the last few years the city of Perth had risen to the fact that it was desirable to have levels in the streets, and he believed there existed in the offices of the City Council levels of every street; therefore, whatever might be required by the Waterworks Board could easily be supplied in the way of tracings of plans, costing a shilling or two. As to the appointment of another select committee, not much good would result from that.

MR. HALL: The present engineer had stated that when he took office not long ago, there was not a single level of any street in the possession of the City Council.

MR. GEORGE: What had become of them?

MR. HALL: That was not known.

MR. OLDHAM: It was to be hoped there would be no objection to this clause. It was the duty of the City Council to give the levels of streets to any person who held any concession or otherwise. In every other part of the world, when a street was opened up, or before a person was allowed to build a house, the surveyor came along and gave the levels of the threshold at the front.

MR. A. FORREST: The city as it appeared now had been built up in two or three years.

MR. OLDHAM: If no levels were in existence, it was time that levels were obtained.

A MEMBER: There were levels for certain streets, but not for all.

MR. OLDHAM: The time when there were no levels was within his recollection, but he believed that in the last few years there had been a competent surveyor. In regard to every house he (Mr. Oldham) had to build, he had to go to the building surveyor to get the levels. There should not be much trouble in providing tracings of the plans for any particular street and giving them to the Waterworks Board if desired; and in the event of any streets being altered, surely we ought not to mulct the board in the expense of altering pipes to suit

any fresh level. The Bill only asked for a fair thing.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 17 to 22, inclusive—agreed to.

New Clause:

MR. JAMES: Under the Act of 1896 provision was made that the mayor of Perth for the time being should be one of the members of the board; but the City Council desired to have that altered, so that any councillor might be nominated to take the place of the mayor. He moved that the following be added as a new clause:

Section 4 of the principal Act is hereby amended, by adding after the words "the mayor of Perth for the time being" the following words, "Or a member of the Municipal Council of the city of Perth, nominated by the said Council from time to time."

MR. OLDHAM: So far as he could see, there was no reason why the new clause should not be more extensive. Why should it be necessary for the Council to nominate a member? Why could they not nominate a citizen?

MR. A. FORREST: That would not do. They must have a member of the City Council.

THE PREMIER: The Council wanted to be represented by a member and not by an outsider.

MR. OLDHAM: The City Council should be in a position to nominate any suitable man.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 21:

Section 6 of the principal Act is hereby amended, by adding after the words "mayor of Perth" the words "or the member of the Municipal Council nominated as aforesaid."

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

POLICE BILL (BETTING).

IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration resumed from 21st September, at Clause 2; the following amendment having been moved by Mr. James:

That all words in the first five lines be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—"Every person betting or offering to bet or crying or calling the odds on or near to any racecourse, or any grounds, building,

or premises where any fight, game, sport, or exercise is being or is about to be carried on, or on or in any street or public place, or any building, premises, or place to which the public are permitted on payment or otherwise to have access, shall be liable on."

MR. MONGER: Thanks were due to the member in charge of the Bill (Mr. James) for having consented to several adjournments. That hon. member and himself had come to the conclusion that certain amendments were absolutely necessary, and when an anti-gambler and a noted gambler were practically in accord on this question, such amendments must be valuable.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No; there must be something wrong.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. MONGER moved that all words after "pounds" in line 7 be struck out.

Amendment put and passed, and clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Persons betting may be removed:

MR. JAMES moved:

That all words after "any" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "person committing an offence against the preceding section may be expelled from and refused admission to any racecourse, street, ground, building, place, or premises whereon such offence was committed."

Amendment put and passed, and clause as amended agreed to.

New Clause—Not to apply to licensed bookmakers on racecourses:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 4:

(1.) The preceding sections shall not apply to any licensed person betting, or offering to bet, or crying or calling the odds on any racecourse owned by or vested in the Western Australian Turf Club, or whereon the races are conducted under the rules of and by and with the approval of the said Club: Provided, however, that no person shall be entitled to the protection of this section unless he is the holder of a valid and operative bookmaker's license issued by the said Club, and then only during such days as horse-racing is being carried on upon any such racecourse.

(2.) Any person acting contrary to this section may be expelled from such racecourse by any police constable or by any servant or member of the Club conducting the races being held thereon, and such person shall not be entitled to be re-admitted to or to remain upon the said course.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause—Racecourse:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 5:

For the purposes of this Act, "racecourse" means the whole area vested in or controlled or managed by any club established for or carrying on horse-racing.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause—Lotteries:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as clause 6:

Every person who conducts, or carries on, or is engaged or employed in or about the conduct or carrying on of, or who sells or offers for sale any ticket, or share, or interest in any lottery shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £100, or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for any term not exceeding two calendar months.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause—Advertising lotteries:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 7:

No person shall advertise, post, send, or deliver any advertisement, circular, notice, letter, telegram, or other document which invites, or may reasonably be implied to invite, any person or persons to enter into or take any share, ticket, or interest in any lottery, or to apply to any person or at any place with a view to obtaining any information in reference to any lottery. Every person acting contrary to this section shall be guilty of an offence against the preceding section, and be liable to the penalty, or imprisonment, therein provided.

At 6:30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause—Person advertised as selling tickets in lottery liable:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 8:

If any advertisement, circular, notice, letter, telegram, or other document as aforesaid, names or refers to any person under any real or assumed name, or by initials, or otherwise, as a person from whom, or names or refers to any address or place, as a place where any share, ticket, or interest, information, or advice, as aforesaid, may be obtained, the person or persons so named and the owner and occupiers of the place so named shall be deemed guilty of an offence against Section six hereof, and be liable to the penalty therein provided, unless he proves that he was wholly ignorant that he or the place he owns or occupies was so named.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause.—Publisher of newspaper also liable:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 9:

If any advertisement appears in any newspaper of or concerning any lottery as aforesaid, and such advertisement is repeated after written notice from any police officer of or above the rank of sergeant, or other person, the publisher of such newspaper shall be guilty of an offence against Section six hereof, and be liable to the penalty hereby provided. The notice must come from a police sergeant or some officer above that rank.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	8

Majority for ... 5

AYES.

Mr. Hall
Mr. Higham
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Monger
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Solomon
Sir J. G. Lee Steere
Mr. Throssell
Mr. James (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Connor
Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Locke
Mr. Rason
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Wood
Mr. Kingsmill (Teller).

Clause thus passed.

New Clause:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 10:

(1.) The term "lottery" in this Act shall include any sweep, consultation, device, scheme, or arrangement whereof any sum of money, land, goods, or other matter or thing is (a.) payable or deliverable on the happening of any event or contingency of or relating to any horse-race, or any fight, game, sport, or exercise, or is (b.) gained, won, payable or deliverable, or is drawn, thrown, or in any manner competed for by lot, dice, ballot, or any other mode of chance.

(2.) The term "lottery" shall not include any arrangement for the distribution of any property amongst the *bona fide* owners thereof, nor any raffle for any work purely of art, nor any raffle at and during the holding of any bazaar, the proceeds whereof are devoted exclusively to charitable purposes, nor any raffle which, in the opinion of the justices before whom any case may be brought, shall be of a private nature.

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved that in Sub-clause 2, line 4, all words after "art" be struck out. The object of the amendment was to stop raffles at bazaars, the proceeds of which were devoted exclusively to charitable purposes, and raffles which (in the opinion of justices before

whom any cases might be brought) were of a private nature. Bazaar raffles were as big an abomination as it was possible to conceive.

MR. VOSPER: The Committee would be doing right if they went further than the amendment proposed, and struck out the whole of Sub-clause 2, thus refusing to sanction "any arrangement for the distribution of any property amongst the *bona fide* owners thereof," or "any raffle for any work purely of art," as well as church and charity raffles. In what appeared to be a virtuous spasm, an effort was being made to put an end to gambling once for all; and yet it was proposed to allow raffles, so long as they were sheltered by the church or patronised by a priest or parson. If gambling was wrong in a public-house, it was far more wrong in a church, because nothing could be more demoralising than to desecrate such building by proceedings of the kind. Any objection against gambling in a tobacconist's shop, public-house, or consultation-room could be urged with ten-fold force against the system of plunder carried on in church bazaars. If the desire was to regulate the morality of the community by suppressing gambling, the Committee ought not to give churches license to perform iniquities which were not allowed in a public-house; and if it were possible to keep any place sacred, for heaven's sake let the religious organisations be kept within moral bounds.

MR. MORAN: That was not bad for the hon. member.

MR. VOSPER: It was difficult to see the point of that interjection. He was contending that if morality should be regulated outside the churches, it should also be regulated inside.

MR. QUINLAN supported the clause as proposed. If there was any immorality in betting, let betting be stopped altogether, in bazaars and everywhere; but a raffle was a very innocent means of raising money for charitable purposes, as it did no harm and did not deceive anyone.

MR. HALL: Raffles at bazaars were a legitimate means of raising funds for a church, because when a person took a share in these affairs he knew exactly what to expect.

MR. VOSPER: So people did when they took shares in a sweep.

MR. HALL: It was true that at church bazaars only a fractional part of value was given for the money, and people were more "fleece'd" on such occasions than perhaps on any other; but he saw no harm in such raffles. People were not forced to take part in lotteries, and when they did so, they were not actuated by love of gain, but by the idea of supporting charity or the church. Ministers of the gospel differed as to desirableness of these raffles, some having peculiar ideas of morality in this respect. At Kalgoorlie some time ago, when a church bazaar was being held, the rector passed round word that on no account must raffles be allowed; but at the same time he distributed to the committee pieces of papers which they might sell at a shilling each, and the investors were privileged to compete in a little shooting-gallery, the one who shot nearest the mark to get the prize. When somebody asked this rector what was the difference between this scheme and a lottery, he replied that one was a game of chance, while shooting was a game of skill. But, really, this was a distinction without a difference, because anyone who had experience of such affairs knew how the guns used in those galleries shot all over the board. A great deal of false morality was talked, in these matters.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was a marked distinction between raffles exclusively devoted to charitable purposes and the lotteries this Bill sought to suppress. In the former instance, nobody practically received any benefit.

MR. JAMES: There was no element of gambling in them.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: But in the case of ordinary lotteries, it was the incentive to profit that caused the mischief, because a man who went for plunder for himself was apt to do something shady and unpleasant.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: There was no charity when a man won a prize.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the first place, the amounts involved were comparatively trifling at bazaars; in the second place, the proceeds were exclusively for charitable purposes; and in the third place, one did not know any colony where a saving clause of this character did not appear in similar Acts. He could not agree with the argument of the member

for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth), that persons opposed to gambling should also be opposed to raffles at bazaars.

MR. VOSPER: The distinction drawn by the Attorney General was extremely difficult to see. At church bazaars the prizes offered were worth more than the amount the individual offered for a chance of winning; and as the prizes must be won by somebody, the person who contributed a shilling and won a thirty shilling article was as guilty of gambling as though he had taken a ticket in Charles's sweep or any similar venture. If it was desired to encourage gambling and give it deep root in the minds of the young and people generally, no better means could be found than placing it exclusively under the patronage of the church; and this clause undoubtedly did give the church a monopoly of what the Committee said was a vice.

MR. JAMES: There was no vice in a bazaar raffle.

MR. VOSPER: If gambling was not a vice why prohibit it?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Lots of things were prohibited by the law that were not vices.

MR. VOSPER: And, conversely, lots of vices were not prohibited by law. The experience in Perth at least was that money raised by charity *fêtes* did not go to support charity, but to support expenses; and "expenses" was an extremely flexible term. There was as much profit made from so-called bazaar raffles as from any other form of gambling, and the profit was generally obtained in a more dishonest manner. In a gambling scheme carried on for profit, it generally happened that persons who held shares took good care the affair was managed so as to give fair play to all; but when gambling was allowed under the cloak of charity, nobody supervised the proceedings, and unlimited opportunity was given for swindling. A majority of hon. members, on the one hand, had declared gambling to be illegal, and practically branded it as a vice; while on the other hand they gave to a section of the community, calling themselves by the name of "the church" and looked on as a separate class, a monopoly of this vice. He saw no logical reason, consistency, or justice in support of such views. He made up his mind, when first he saw

the list of proposed new clauses—most of which he regarded as utterly ridiculous—that he would oppose this one to the utmost of his power. He could not see why a thing should be permitted to church parties which was not allowed to people outside.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Bazaars or fairs had been organised in the name of charity, and in one local case the public subscribed £500 or £600, whereas only £26 was distributed among charitable institutions. Unless the new clause were amended, the door would be open to this process. If we were to touch this evil which ministers were declaiming against every Sunday, surely we might ask them to cleanse their own portals before they appealed to the public to attend to theirs.

MR. WOOD: It was most abominable that people should build up churches by means of this character. He intended to support the amendment.

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

Ayes ...	7
Noes ...	17

Majority against ... 10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. George	Mr. Connor
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Hall
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Higham
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Vosper	Mr. Leake
Mr. Wood (Teller).	Mr. Locke
	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Oldham
	Mr. Pennefather
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Solomon
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. James (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause:

MR. JAMES moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 11:

Nothing in this Act contained shall apply to any stakes or prizes offered by any *bona fide* club to competitors in any race or lawful sport, game, or exercise, or to the owner of any horse competing therein; nor to any stakeholder holding any stake or deposit payable to any competitor in any race or lawful sport, game, or exercise, or to the owner of any horse competing therein.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause:

MR. HIGHAM explained that he did not intend to move the amendment stand-

ing in his name on the Notice Paper. There was one principle involved in the amendment which he desired to see carried, in order that public hospitals should receive some benefit from the amounts subscribed to these funds. He proposed to move later a new clause, to stand as Clause 14, providing that persons licensed under this Bill should pay one per cent. of the funds received towards the public hospitals of the colony:

MR. LEAKE: If the member for Fremantle did not feel disposed to move the new clause of which he had given notice, he (Mr. Leake) would do so. He moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill:

(1.) Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act or of the principal Act, or the Acts amending the same, lotteries in respect of horse-racing may be conducted by the Western Australian Turf Club or by any person or persons duly authorised in that behalf by the said club, and the provisions of the said Act shall not apply to any lottery so conducted. (2.) The said club shall keep, or cause to be kept, proper accounts in relation to all the business of any such lottery, and such accounts shall be subject to audit by the Colonial Treasurer or any person appointed by him. (3.) The said club shall pay to the Colonial Treasurer, for the use of the public hospitals, two pounds ten shillings for every one hundred pounds received or subscribed in respect of such lotteries. (4.) The said club may, with the approval of the Governor, make by-laws for regulating the conduct of any such lottery.

It was recognised that these lotteries could not well be suppressed, or were not suppressed. There was ample provision in the existing law for the police to stop all these public lotteries, if they thought fit to enforce the law; but it had not been done, possibly because they thought the law could not be carried out to what was practically its logical conclusion. Whilst admitting that these lotteries were an evil, the idea should be to regulate the evil. We had recognised it practically in the clauses already passed by authorising lotteries, bazaars, and so forth. If there were to be any sort of control, it should be by some responsible body. Looking at the subsequent clauses to be proposed by the member for York (Mr. Monger), it was sought to throw the onus on the Colonial Treasurer, which of course meant the Government of the day. But one did not know yet whether the

Government approved of that suggestion, and were prepared to be saddled with what might possibly be a difficulty; but inasmuch as these lotteries which it was desired to control were promoted in connection with horse-racing, many people considered that the controlling body should be the West Australian Turf Club, which practically controlled racing. If the control were placed in the hands of the club, that body would have power to select fit and proper persons to promote these lotteries, and would take care that the lotteries promoted were within certain proper restrictions. Take, for instance, Tattersall's sweeps that were promoted in Perth: those sweeps were not confined to the prominent races held in this colony, but were promoted on every twopenny-halfpenny race run on a country racecourse. Moreover, they were promoted on races outside the colony. That sort of thing ought to be stopped, or a limit be placed on it. He was assured by tradesmen and others that this system had grown to such an extent that it was really affecting the tradespeople, and that instead of monthly trade accounts being paid, many persons reserved their five shillings or ten shillings to pop into some sweep. The system had grown beyond control. He took it that the object of these clauses was to bring the system once more within reasonable control. The Turf Club, for which he could speak, as he happened to be chairman, were willing to take this matter in hand and do what was necessary.

MR. HALL: The hon. member, being chairman of the Turf Club Committee, should have left it to someone else to move the new clause.

MR. LEAKE: Whatever was done would not make the slightest difference to him.

MR. HALL: No; still the hon. member was chairman of the club.

MR. LEAKE: And therefore he announced the fact openly, so as to anticipate criticism. This question had been considered by the Turf Club committee, who believed they could keep these lotteries within reasonable bounds. The committee were a recognised body controlling horse-racing, and all this legislation was incidental to horse-racing. In that sport he (Mr. Leake) took great interest, and sometimes he made bets.

The club committee consisted, he believed, of 13 men.

MR. MONGER: The hon. member was chairman, yet did not know the number.

MR. LEAKE hoped he had not said anything to unnecessarily excite the hon. member interjecting. It was necessary not only to control the big sweeps, but to stop all the little "totes" and betting shops.

MR. MONGER: That would be done by the Bill.

MR. LEAKE: Precisely. His object was to prevent abuse of the system. Though some hon. members would doubtless buy sweep tickets so long as these were procurable, nevertheless this public betting had become a public scandal, and must be checked. To hope to abolish it utterly would be absurd: it must be recognised and regulated.

MR. MONGER opposed the new clause. None had more respect for the Western Australian Turf Club committee than he, for those gentlemen were respected by the whole colony. The committee consisted of Messrs. Dempster and Loton, Ms.L.C., Mr. George Leake, M.L.A., Mr. S. H. Parker, Q.C., the Postmaster General, the Registrar General, the Collector of Customs, Mr. William Strickland, Mr. Everard Darlôt, Mr. Albert Clarke, Mr. Frank Craig, and Mr. Isidore Emanuel. Such a committee could better deal with questions like this than could a joint select committee of the Houses of Parliament; and Parliament had properly given the Turf Club everything for which the latter had asked, including control of the bookmakers. Without any animus against the club, he must say it appeared that they desired to get hold of the deposits to be made by sweep promoters.

MR. LEAKE said there was no mention of a deposit in his new clause. That proviso was contained in a schedule, of which the hon. member interjecting had given notice.

MR. MONGER: The Turf Club committee, with praiseworthy zeal, desired in every possible way to further the club's interests; nevertheless, to whom should these large deposits be handed over—to the Turf Club or to the Colonial Treasurer? The new clause which he would move later was identical with the Tasmanian law, and in that colony the Government preferred to trust the Colonial

Treasurer rather than the Turf Club. Why should our Treasurer be deprived of a similar privilege?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Under a similar law "Adams's sweep" could exist in Tasmania.

MR. MONGER: Yes; and the new clause he would propose was identical with the Tasmanian law.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was what we did not want.

MR. MONGER: The Turf Club committee had enough to do without regulating such lotteries. As the member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham) had refrained from moving the new clause, the member for Albany should withdraw his motion.

MR. LEAKE: The last speaker was entirely mistaken. He (Mr. Leake) had proposed that the Turf Club should control lotteries relating to horse-racing only. The hon. member's suggested clause would give a right to promote lotteries in respect of anything. Such right was not desired by the committee of the Turf Club. By Sub-clause 4 of the new clause now under consideration, the regulations controlling lotteries must be approved by the Governor, and the Executive Council would doubtless take care that the Turf Club did not overstep reasonable bounds. It would be wrong for the club to ask for any controlling power except with regard to horse-racing, and there was no desire to control property distributions or raffles.

MR. HALL: The hon. member wanted the Turf Club to conduct the sweeps and receive the profits.

MR. LEAKE: The sweeps would be subject to the control of the Government, and the Government would have the power to say the Turf Club should have no profit at all, or the Government could limit the profit of the promoters, or decide whether any percentage of the profit should go to charities or anything of the kind. The clause only meant that the Government would have the advantage of consulting the Turf Club or being advised by them. The Turf Club committee could assist the Government in a matter of this kind, and that committee was controlled by the club members. The club was not a proprietary one: no salaries were paid; and there was no personal advantages gained by members of the committee.

MR. MORAN: Sweeps could not be conducted without salaries being paid.

MR. LEAKE: Agents would have to be employed. If the club were given this power, what he suggested was that the club should negotiate with men of probity, who had acted in an open and straightforward manner in the past; men like Mr. Charles, who promoted the "Tattersall sweeps." The Turf Club could enter into negotiations with men of substance like this gentleman, and say that he should promote the sweeps, not as he desired to do so, but as the Turf Club and the Government thought he should do, within reasonable bounds. If the Committee allowed anybody who liked to put down £10,000 to promote sweeps, a regular business would be made of it, and Mr. Charles, or Mr. Adams of Hobart, or the men who had promoted sweeps at Fremantle and on the goldfields, could promote lotteries. If the Government undertook to run sweeps and had a department of sweeps, that would be infinitely better than either proposal.

MR. MORAN: As an outsider not belonging to any race club, he might say that hon. members had already placed as much power in the hands of the Turf Club to control betting as was desirable, and it was not wise to place the control of lotteries in the hands of the Turf Club. The member for Albany wanted the Turf Club to be an intermediary between the Government and the promoter of "Tattersall sweeps." He (Mr. Moran) would support the proposal of Mr. Monger, so that anyone who wished to promote sweeps should be so secured that he would never be in a position "to do a get," if he wished to, and owe the country any amount of money. He (Mr. Moran) should think that no promoter of sweeps would have in his possession £12,000 at one time, so that the promoter would not have much chance of being dishonest, because he would have to deposit with the Government the sum of £10,000 before he could promote a sweep. The West Australian Turf Club wanted a finger in the pie. They did not want any profit, mind you: they would only have a little bill of expenses. The chairman of the Turf Club had told hon. members that as soon as Parliament gave the Turf Club power to promote lotteries, the club

would go to Mr. Charles and employ him. The present conductor of "Tattersall sweeps," Mr. Charles, and "Squash" of Kalgoorlie, were men of probity: the public had confidence in them, and they were not dishonest. Well, one would rather trust Mr. Charles's "barrel" than a beer-barrel in the shape of the bookmaker who went about the country betting. In Germany the Government controlled the lotteries. The apparatus used for conducting sweeps in this colony were such that there could be no cheating. If Parliament were to legalise sweeps, let men of substance carry them on, men who were able to put up £10,000 as a guarantee. This Bill would give to the West Australian Turf Club power to control bookmakers, and he hoped the committee of that club would exercise that control wisely, while also using the pruning-knife amongst betting men, because the fewer betting men and the cleaner their characters, the better for the country.

MR. VOSPER: If there was any argument in favour of the new clause, it lay in the fact that gambling was admitted to be illegal and irremediable. The consequence was that, seeing that the evil could not be got rid of, we were asked to bring it within reasonable bounds and regulate it. If that were necessary, he would like to ask hon. members, who were the proper persons to carry on the work of regulation? We had another serious evil raging at the present time, the drink traffic; and while most people admitted it was a curse and required regulating, yet Parliament did not grant the power of control to any private association or body, or to anyone outside the Government, but the Government and the magisterial bench controlled this evil. It was thought by most people that control of the drink traffic was one of the most useful and profitable functions of the State. If we attempted to regulate the promotion of lotteries, then the State should regulate them directly, and not have any intermediary. What position did the West Australian Turf Club hold in its relation to persons who subscribed to sweeps? It was an irresponsible body. We were told that the Turf Club could be made responsible to the Governor-in-Council; but what a number of good causes were frustrated by bad adminis-

tration! If the Governor-in-Council passed regulations for the guidance of the Turf Club, which the club had to administer while not responsible to anyone in particular, then the country would have no control over the administration. Better work was accomplished by the good administration of bad laws than by the bad administration of good laws. The Turf Club was an utterly irresponsible body. How many people in Western Australia were members of the turf club? How many had a voice in it? How many knew who the members of the committee were?

MR. MONGER: There were 250 members.

MR. VOSPER: That meant handing over to 250 persons a monopoly, which seemed a preposterous idea. If the system of the lotteries was to be controlled and regulated by the Government, then the Government, which was responsible to Parliament, could deal with any matter brought before it in connection with lotteries. If the licensee or the person who invested money with the licensee had any complaint to make, that person could appeal to members of Parliament, the matter could be discussed, and the responsibility of the Government could be sheeted home. If this work was to be carried on by the West Australian Turf Club, the person aggrieved could complain to the Press, and the Press would ventilate the grievance if it thought fit. This was not a question to be confined to members of the Turf Club. The vast majority of persons who invested in Tattersall's sweeps were persons who never owned a racehorse, and never likely to own one: many never attended race meetings; and all they did was to pay their five shillings, ten shillings, or one pound, as the case might be, in the hope of receiving an altogether disproportionate reward. It was stretching the point too far to say that because these sweeps were promoted on horse races, the Turf Club should control them. The horses which raced were simply used as gambling counters, which did not give the Turf Club any right to control the sweeps. The member for Albany expressed the opinion just now that Charles's sweeps were not carried on in a manner he approved of, because they dealt with small race meetings held in the other colonies, to the neglect of larger and more important meetings held here. That fact had not

been observed by him (Mr. Vosper), and he did not think the opinion was strictly in accordance with fact.

MR. MORAN: It did not matter, anyhow.

MR. VOSPER: It really did not matter as to whether the counters were in this colony or elsewhere. But when sweeps took place on races held outside the colony, the advantage was that persons in other colonies who invested on the race would send their investments to this colony, and thus increase the money in circulation amongst us. The member for Albany also said that if the Turf Club were given control, they would, by regulation, put an end to sweeps on races held in the other colonies. Did that not mean that the Turf Club had prejudged the case, and would take on themselves to regulate the business in such a way that if Mr. Charles did not comply with their regulations, which might render his business unproductive, they could refuse him a license? Were hon. members to allow a body of gentlemen, no matter how respectable they might be, to take control of an industry, good or bad, when they had already expressed certain views through their chairman, or certain views had been expressed by that gentleman without their authority, which seemed to prejudice the whole question of licenses? If hon. members handed over those vast and extensive powers to a small coterie of 250 persons, we would be abrogating our duty as legislators, and stultifying the Government. Gambling must be abolished root and branch, as an evil and unclean thing, or the impossibility of eradicating the gambling instincts of the people must be frankly admitted; and if admitted, then gambling must be regulated by the Government, as being responsible to Parliament. Gambling, if permitted, must all be open and above-board, and that could not be accomplished by giving the entire control to a small clique or coterie, such as the committee of the Turf Club. He must oppose the proposal of the member for Albany, and give his hearty support to the alternative proposal of the member for York.

MR. HALL: It was an open secret that it had been the desire of the W. A. Turf Club to get control of those sweeps, ever since Mr. Charles had demonstrated that they could be made a big success. One viewed with

suspicion the proposal to vest power in the Turf Club, knowing as one did that one gentleman on the committee of that club, whose name had been mentioned to-night, had conducted sweeps for years until very lately, when he was compelled to abandon the enterprise, owing to the energy thrown into a rival business by Mr. Charles. It certainly did appear as if the Turf Club had already decided to kill the sweeps, by stipulating that they should only be allowed on races inside the colony. As a matter of fact, turf clubs did not care about sweeps. Only a few weeks ago he was informed by the secretary of one of the clubs that many people, instead of going to race meetings, invested their money on sweeps in town. If that were so, it was a good argument in favour of sweeps, because while there might not be much harm in race meetings, yet to attend them did not make a man any better. He intended to vote against the amendment.

THE PREMIER: The discussion had not been interesting or edifying to him. If the desire was to do anything in the direction proposed, the subject ought to have been attacked earlier in the session.

MR. MONGER: The Bill had been on the Notice Paper four months.

THE PREMIER: That was so; but it had not been reached. He was not in a position to express his personal opinion in regard to the matter. If he were a private individual, in a private position, he might express himself somewhat differently; but no doubt the feeling of this colony, and in fact the feeling of Australia, was against the general principle of legalising lotteries and sweeps. If that had not been so, there would not have been found on the statute book of every Australian colony, with the exception of Tasmania, laws prohibiting these transactions. We had laws against sweeps here, but he believed they were not enforced, at any rate to such an extent as to be preventive; and as the representative of the colony, he felt it impossible for him to advocate the legalising of lotteries and gambling generally. It was well known that people were addicted to gambling, and Parliament had legalised a certain kind of gambling on racecourses. Those of us who went to race meetings occa-

sionally did so with a desire to have a day's outing and sport, and were not averse to putting a small amount of money on the totalisator, or even to making a bet; and he did not wish to say this should be prevented.

MR. MONGER: It could not be prevented.

THE PREMIER: The time-honoured cry of the bookmaker on the racecourse was not objectionable to most people, and the calling of the odds, so long as it was regulated, was almost universal throughout the world, the bookmaker being allowed to ply his calling in every colony, and also on every racecourse of the old country. The totalisator had been legalised in Western Australia, and by this means people could stake a small amount of money which they might have in their pocket, but no more; and it was one of the great advantages of the totalisator that no one could "run up a score." He was in favour of the bookmakers and the totalisator being allowed, but it was another matter to legalise sweeps and lotteries all over the country. He was informed that in dozens of places in Perth, the smallest amount, even a shilling, could be invested on anything.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: By children of eight years of age.

THE PREMIER: To allow lotteries in this way would never do, and he was not prepared, occupying the position he did, to give any countenance to them. In regard to the proposal of the member for Albany (Mr. Leake), although it did not look very objectionable as presented, still it was objectionable in that it encouraged lotteries which were illegal at the present time. It might be said that lotteries were now carried on openly, without interference; but he believed the law even now was strong enough, if exercised, to reach them, at any rate to some extent. He was, therefore, not prepared to give the proposed control to the Turf Club, because to do so would be unwise, inasmuch as it would introduce the principle that lotteries on racehorses were desirable and should be legalised; and while the amendment might be less objectionable than the present practice, yet the matter had perhaps better be left alone at this late period of the session. If the question went to a division, he could not support the amend-

ment; because Parliament ought not, at this period of the session, in a somewhat thin House, deal with this great question in any other way than it had hitherto been dealt with, namely by prohibiting gambling. He did not think he would be acting properly, even if his personal views were not those he expressed, in lending any support he might be able to give in the House, as the representative of the Government, to legalising or even licensing lotteries.

MR. LEAKE: Then the Premier was against both proposals?

THE PREMIER: Yes; and if it would not do for Parliament to legalise lotteries by placing them under the Turf Club, how could it be wise for Parliament to take the far greater step of licensing lotteries, which might not be confined to horse-racing but be used for many other purposes?

Clause put and negatived.

New Clause:

MR. MONGER moved that the following be added, to stand as Clause 12:—

Notwithstanding anything in this or the principal Act or the Acts amending the same contained, or any rule of law to the contrary, it shall and may be lawful for the Colonial Treasurer, under and subject to the rules and regulations contained in the schedule to this Act, in his discretion to grant to any person a license to promote, conduct, and manage a lottery or lotteries; and all such lotteries conducted by the holder of such license shall be, and are hereby declared to be, lawful, and no person who shall assist in promoting or conducting such lotteries, either by advertising the same or selling tickets therein, shall, so long as the license issued as aforesaid remains unrevoked, incur any penalty for so doing.

He was extremely sorry to hear the Premier objecting, on behalf of the Government, to a clause like this. What he (Mr. Monger) desired to have placed on the statute book of this colony was already in operation in one of the Australian colonies, and he did not see why we in Western Australia should continue to hold those old puritanical ideas of legislation which it now seemed to be the desire of this Parliament to adopt. Anything in the shape of gambling or Sunday labour on the mines received a veto from a majority of hon. members, which proved to a certain extent that their ideas were similar to those held in the sixteenth century. Various articles had recently

appeared in the local Press, appertaining to the question of sweeps and sweep promoters. The *West Australian* said that sweeps were attacked, but an evil which far outweighed them was not touched; that the totalisator absorbed an amount to which the lottery takings were a mere flea-bite; that one aspect of the question was whether what was being dealt with was not an ineradicable instinct which might be controlled, but could not be extirpated; also, that people would seek excitement, and would find it in less legitimate shapes if it were denied to them in betting. Again, on Wednesday morning last he had a conversation with a prominent citizen, who said: "I have just been speaking with a couple of publicans, and they told me the depression in the vicinity of Perth is chiefly attributable to Charles's sweeps and the concerns carried on in the various gambling dens of Perth. They told me that, as far as they were concerned, the business in which they were engaged had never been worse during the time they had been associated with it in Perth." He (Mr. Monger) remarked: "If these sweeps of Charles's and these gambling dens have only caused men to try to scrape up a few shillings and invest them in sweeps with the idea of getting a competency, instead of going to the hotels your friends are interested in and drinking bad liquor out of dirty glasses, in that alone they are doing a service to the country." The *Morning Herald*, in a recent sub-leader, suggested that the evil in regard to lotteries should be minimised as much as possible, and that only lotteries should be permitted which were legitimately conducted and would stand the light of the public scrutiny, such as W. A. Tattersall's and Adams's in Tasmania.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: He (Adams) was driven out of all the other colonies.

MR. MONGER: He got there, and remained there. It had often been said that leading articles were the ideas of one man; but in these instances the articles he had quoted did pretty well echo the opinions of the bulk of the people. He had not seen a single article in the papers condemnatory of these sweeps, or saying that tradesmen and others suffered from the alleged difficulties caused by sweeps.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was a matter for regret that the hon. member (Mr. Monger), who had so ably supported so many clauses for the restriction and in some cases the prohibition—

MR. MONGER: It all hinged on the passing of this clause. An arrangement was made with the hon. member (Mr. James).

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The hon. member did not arrange with him, at any rate. The hon. member had zealously and earnestly supported clauses for the restriction, and in some cases the prohibition, of betting and lotteries, and had voted with him (Mr. Illingworth) for the prohibition of lotteries in churches; yet he now proposed a clause which would, if passed, absolutely destroy the utility of the clauses he had been supporting. He actually asked the Committee to pass a motion which would legalise the whole system of lotteries from one end of the country to the other. Taking the next question, the hon. member opposed most strenuously the motion of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Leake), that some lotteries on horse-racing only might be promoted under the direction of Tattersall's Club. The very thing the Bill purposed to prohibit was to be allowed by this clause. Our streets were rapidly filling with so-called tobacconists' shops, where tobacco, etcetera, were sold below cost price, for the purposed of promoting "totes" and demoralising the whole community, including children who were induced to risk their small savings on the chance of winning prizes. Hon. members who had voted consistently throughout the evening should continue consistent, and having passed so many useful clauses for the restriction of betting, should allow these to be put in operation. Do not play the farce of first passing good clauses, and then quietly, by a subterfuge, wiping out the whole Bill by such a clause as this.

MR. QUINLAN supported the clause. It must be beneficial to have some such control over the betting evil, which, like drink, should be regulated by license; and by requiring deposits from sweep promoters, this could be done. The lotteries conducted by the largest turf commission agent in the colony were admittedly carried on with the strictest integrity, and it was sought to make

this still surer by requiring a £10,000 deposit. If necessary, let the clause apply to horse-racing only, though the need for drawing a line was not obvious. He would agree to a proposal to abolish gambling of every kind.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No kind of gambling would be abolished if this clause were passed.

MR. QUINLAN: Hon. members were committed to restricting gambling, and were therefore logical in accepting this proposal, which would have the effect of putting down the "tote-shops." Besides the deposit, a percentage on earnings should be deducted and placed in the hands of the Government for the support of hospitals.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The charities were better without such money.

MR. QUINLAN: The hon. member had probably gambled a good deal in land, and dealing with land and with shares was just as much gambling as any matter mentioned in the Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Was it not the same with wheat?

MR. QUINLAN said he did not believe in half-hearted morality, which would put down one form of gambling by permitting all others.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: None would contend for the suppression of all buying and selling.

MR. QUINLAN: Let us be logical. If we wished to abolish gambling, abolish all speculation. Land had been bought here for £100 and sold for £1,000.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No such opportunities had come his way.

MR. QUINLAN: Such transactions were at all events within the law. The clause would be better than that of the member for Albany (Mr. Leake), for no middleman was required between the sweep promoter and the Government.

MR. WOOD: On broad principle he was utterly opposed to sweeps and other forms of gambling; but as the evil could not be eradicated, it must be brought within bounds. The W.A. Pattersall's sweep was no doubt honestly conducted, but the clause, if carried, would at once give that undertaking a monopoly. How much would it then be worth? If that sweep changed hands, there was no guarantee that it would still be conducted honestly.

MR. VOSPER: Ten thousand pounds would be a good guarantee.

MR. WOOD: Let sweeps be restricted entirely to horse-racing, and let no sweep tickets be issued for less than ten shillings each.

MR. MONGER: There was no point in that.

MR. WOOD: There was; for children saved their pennies to buy five shilling tickets, and if the clause were passed, many men would start half-crown sweeps.

MR. MONGER: Instead of a deposit, let there be a stamp duty of one penny on each ticket.

MR. WOOD: The Bill should have been dealt with months ago, the second reading having been moved last August. Great swindles had been carried out by gambling in land. He moved, as an amendment, that the words "in connection with horse-racing" be added after "lotteries," in line 4.

MR. OLDHAM: The hon. member's amendment went further than was anticipated. The Eight-Hours Committee and friendly societies promoted lotteries, and the hon. member's amendment would prevent these lotteries being got up. Hon. members should seriously consider this matter before deciding to confine lotteries to horse-racing.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Those lotteries would be exempt.

MR. OLDHAM: It was convenient for people who posed in the House as guardians of the morals of the people to say that such lotteries would be exempt.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he hoped they were not. He did not want them to be exempt.

MR. OLDHAM: Some hon. members did want them to be exempted, and we ought to consider the position in which we would be placing ourselves by carrying the amendment. The member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) had told hon. members and the country a good deal of truth in connection with "tote" and tobacconists' shops which were gambling dens. Were "tote" shops illegal at the present time?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They were.

MR. OLDHAM: If they were illegal, why were they not put down? There were good reasons why they were not put

down. Notwithstanding that the "tote" shops were illegal, it was impossible to put them down. It was illegal to sell drink on Sunday, but almost every hotel in Perth did sell liquor on Sunday. It was better to have these evils controlled by persons of substance who could give some guarantee to the public of fair treatment, than that sweeps should be promoted in an indiscriminate way. He hoped the amendment would not be pressed.

MR. WOOD: It would be better to report progress at this stage. This was a serious matter and required further consideration. He moved that progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Motion put and negatived.

Amendment (to insert "in connection with horse-racing") put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	10
Majority for				2

AYES.
Sir John Forrest
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Leake
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Moran
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Rason
Sir J. G. Lee Steere
Hon. H. W. Venn
Mr. Wood
Mr. Higham (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Connor
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Hall
Mr. Hubble
Mr. Locke
Mr. Monger
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Solomon (Teller).

Amendment thus passed.

MR. WOOD moved as a further amendment to the clause, that the following words be added: "Provided that no ticket be sold at a price less than ten shillings." The half-crown and five shilling sweeps were a most objectionable form of gambling, as they induced children and young persons to save up their earnings to invest in sweeps.

MR. MONGER: That provision could be put in the regulations.

MR. WOOD said he would move his amendment when the regulations came before the Committee.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question—that the clause as amended be added to the Bill—put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	14
Noes	8
Majority for				6

AYES.
Mr. Connor
Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Hall
Mr. Higham
Mr. Hubble
Mr. Locke
Mr. Monger
Mr. Moran
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Rason (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Leake
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Sir J. G. Lee Steere
Hon. H. W. Venn
Mr. Illingworth (Teller).

Question thus passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Schedule:

MR. MONGER moved that the following be added as a schedule:

SCHEDULE I.—REGULATIONS.

1. The word "Treasurer" used in these regulations shall apply to the Colonial Treasurer of Western Australia for the time being.

2. No lottery shall be conducted unless by some person duly authorised by license in manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, and the conduct of such lottery shall be in accordance with the conditions of the license hereinafter mentioned and with these regulations.

3. A license may be issued by the Treasurer to any person, hereinafter called "the licensee," upon application in writing by such person, and upon such person paying to and depositing with the Treasurer the sum of £10,000, which shall carry interest at three per centum per annum and be paid half-yearly, and such license shall authorise the licensee to conduct lotteries, and shall continue in force until the same is revoked as hereinafter mentioned or until the licensee surrenders the same. Such license shall contain the name, address, and occupation of the licensee and the situation of the premises in or upon which the said lottery is to be conducted; and the said lottery shall be conducted solely upon the said premises. Such license may be in the form in the schedule hereto, and the licensee shall sign the agreement at the foot thereof.

4. The licensee may, with the consent of the Treasurer, remove from one place of business to another.

5. The licensee shall keep proper accounts in relation to all the business of any lottery, and such accounts shall be subject to all the provisions of the Audit Act, 1891, in the same manner in all respects as if such accounts had been specifically mentioned therein.

6. The licensee shall give not less than 24 hours notice to the Treasurer before any drawing or distribution takes place in respect of any lottery, and such drawing or distribution may take place in the presence of, and shall be open to the inspection of, the public and such person or persons as the Treasurer may appoint.

7. Before any drawing or distribution takes place in respect of any lottery, the licensee, or some person deputed by him, shall give a certificate in writing, signed by the licensee or

by the person appointed by him, as the case may be, stating the total amount of money subscribed on account of or in respect of such lottery; and the licensee shall distribute among the subscribers to such lottery a sum not less than 90 per centum of such total amount.

8. When a lottery is conducted in respect of any horse race, the licensee shall not, prior to the race being run, publish or in any way divulge or make known to any person, other than the drawer or his or her agent, the name or names of any person or persons who may draw the name or names of any horse or horses in such lottery.

9. Should the licensee or the person appointed in his place, as hereinafter mentioned, die or take the advantage of any law relating to bankruptcy, or from any cause be incapacitated to conduct lotteries under his license, the Treasurer may appoint some person to carry on the conduct of lotteries in the place of such licensee or person until the expiration of the license of such licensee.

10. The licensee may at any time surrender his license, and such license shall become void upon the Treasurer signifying in writing his acceptance of such surrender. The said sum of £10,000 deposited as aforesaid shall be returned, but without interest for the current half year, to the licensee at the expiration of one calendar month after the acceptance by the Colonial Treasurer of such surrender.

11. Should the licensee or any person appointed in his place as aforesaid be knowingly guilty of any breach of any of these Regulations, his license may be revoked by the Treasurer, and upon such revocation the whole of the said sum of £10,000 deposited as aforesaid shall be absolutely forfeited to and shall be retained by the Colonial Treasurer for the use of the Crown as liquidated damages, and no portion of the said sum or any interest in respect thereof shall be returned to or paid to the licensee.

12. The licensee may, with the consent of the Treasurer, assign the license to any person or persons, or body corporate, if approved by the Treasurer, and the assignee shall enjoy all the rights and privileges, and be subject to all the penalties and obligations imposed on the original holder.

13. All prize money in any lottery which remains unclaimed by the winner for the space of six calendar months shall be paid into a separate account in a bank in Perth, to be approved of by the Treasurer, and if unclaimed for a further term of six calendar months shall be paid over to such charitable institutions in the colony, and in such proportions as the Treasurer shall appoint.

The principal paragraph in the schedule provided that the licensee must deposit the sum of £10,000 with the Colonial Treasurer; and considering the liberality of the terms, the Treasurer would be only too pleased to receive the money from as many quarters as it was likely to be

offered. The sum of £10,000 might be a trifle to the Government, but at the present moment, if the Premier were placing a loan in England at 3 per cent., he would not get more than £93; and though it was not desired to make any particular reference to loans, yet the Premier should take the view that every £10,000 deposited under the Bill meant practically the saving of £700 or £800 to the Government. This in itself was a fairly large fee to inflict on any person or persons for the privilege of running sweeps, and it was to be hoped a dozen deposits would be made. The other paragraphs of the regulations spoke for themselves, though it had been suggested that paragraph 8 required some explanation. In bygone days, it had been the custom to draw sweeps the day before the race, with the result that the owner, the trainer, and others interested in the horses drawn knew who held the tickets. Under this paragraph, if the licensee divulged the result of the drawing of the horses to any person other than the drawer or his or her agent, he would be liable to forfeit his deposit of £10,000.

Paragraph 3:

MR. LEAKE moved as an amendment that in lines 3 and 4, the words "which shall carry interest at three per centum per annum and be paid half-yearly" be struck out. He did not see why the public Treasurer should pay £300 a year on a deposit of £10,000, considering it was a privilege for which the deposit was made. If the paragraph were passed as drawn, a sweep promoter would have a good investment for his £10,000, as well as the advantages of running sweeps.

THE PREMIER: When had the £10,000 to be repaid?

MR. LEAKE: When the license was revoked, or when the licensee surrendered his license.

THE PREMIER: If the money had to be at call, not a sixpence of interest would be paid on it.

MR. MONGER: A month's notice had to be given.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was practically "at call."

MR. LEAKE: These licenses would confer a monopoly, because two or three sweeps could not be carried on in one centre. There might possibly be one sweep in town, another on the goldfields,

and a third elsewhere; and the result would be that the promoters of those sweeps would be practically subsidised to the extent of £300 a year, to enable them to carry on a very profitable business. He had read in a newspaper only a few days ago, a return showing that 400,000 tickets had been sold within some months.

MR. CONNOR: Within the year.

MR. LEAKE: This showed that over £100,000 had passed through the hands of sweep promoters, who, no doubt, would be only too willing to deposit £10,000 at three per cent., and have the privileges under this Bill. He had not £10,000 himself, but when his "ship came in" he intended to invest that amount in horse-racing sweeps, which were a better business than that carried on by any hon. member, especially considering this subsidy of £300 a year.

MR. MORAN: It would be much better to make the £10,000 a fixed deposit for 12 months at 3 per cent. interest, because it would not be reasonable to ask a person to allow this money to lie idle all that time; and the Treasurer, it was understood, was not unwilling to pay 5 per cent. for money at 12 months, borrowed elsewhere.

MR. A. FORREST: £10,000 was nothing compared with the profits of sweep promoters.

MR. MORAN: It did not matter what sweep promoters' profits were; it was only fair that the Government should pay interest at the rate of 3 per cent. for a fixed deposit at 12 months, to terminate with the financial year.

MR. MONGER: It was unfair to expect that a man should put up his money and get nothing for it.

MR. A. FORREST: We did not want to encourage him.

MR. MORAN: A private racing club was encouraged, and that was worse.

MR. MONGER: If a licensee surrendered his license, one failed to see why the Government should have the use of that money for 12 months without interest. He, however, was quite willing to allow the words "which shall carry interest at three per cent. per annum, and be paid half-yearly" to be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

THE PREMIER moved that the words "which shall not carry interest" be inserted in lieu of those struck out.

Put and passed.

MR. LEAKE: The promoter paid nothing at all for the privilege granted to him. He deposited £10,000, but neither the Government nor any charitable institution received any interest out of it. He would move to report progress in order that the point might be considered. There was no notice of a proposal to provide for a payment for charitable purposes, but in all probability such a motion would be submitted. He knew it had been under consideration.

THE PREMIER: Could not the idea be embodied in a new clause?

Paragraph 10:

THE PREMIER suggested that after "his license," in line 1, the words "on giving twelve months' notice" be inserted. The deposit of £10,000 would be some security to the investor, but it would be of no use to the Government.

MR. MONGER: What was proposed was exactly the same as was in operation in Tasmania.

THE PREMIER: If £10,000 were lent to a person at call, it would not be of much use, for he could do nothing with it.

MR. LEAKE: The regulation might be so altered that it would be necessary to give six months' notice to obtain the money. We did not mind the licensee forfeiting the license, but the Treasurer would not wish the £10,000 to be payable on demand.

THE PREMIER: Certainly not; 12 months would be reasonable.

MR. MORAN: The money ought not to be kept for 12 months without interest. If the Government took the money of the licensee, whether they used it or not, he was letting them have what at 4 per cent. would bring in £400.

THE PREMIER: £400 would not be obtained from it if it could not be used.

MR. MORAN: The money could be used.

MR. LEAKE: The Premier must not assume that he would always have an overdraft.

THE PREMIER: The Government had nearly £1,000,000.

MR. MORAN: Presumably some way would be found of getting £400 a year

out of the £10,000. It might be put into the Land Bank, the Agricultural Bank, or any other institution.

THE PREMIER: The Government had to pay the Agricultural Bank.

MR. MORAN: But the Government used the money; they did not let it lie idle and pay interest.

THE PREMIER: A good deal; £300,000.

MR. MORAN: That would be gone directly. If the Government held the money of the licensee, they ought to allow him to carry on the business without making him pay an extra fee.

A MEMBER: The licensee was not obliged to take the business up.

THE PREMIER moved that the words "but without interest for the current half-year," in line 3, be struck out. He would subsequently move that the word "one" in line 4 be struck out, and "twelve" inserted in lieu thereof.

MR. MONGER: It would be unfair to substitute "twelve" for "one." Supposing within a month after the depositing of the £10,000 with the Colonial Treasurer it was found that these sweeps did not pay, surely the right hon. gentleman would not say, "I am going to keep this money for another 12 months and give you nothing for it?"

MR. MORAN: On the other hand, the licensee was getting a privilege.

A MEMBER: Let the period be three months.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: This £10,000 was supposed to be a security for persons who were investing in these sweeps.

THE PREMIER: It did not say so.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was the intent.

THE PREMIER: It was to be hoped such was the case.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Perhaps three months would be long enough for the money to be retained.

THE PREMIER: The Government would accept "three months."

MR. MONGER: Let it be six.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: A man might get money placed in his hands, disappear unexpectedly, and change his name.

THE PREMIER: It was to be hoped the Government would not be responsible.

Amendment put and passed.

THE PREMIER: As suggested, it was desirable to report progress, for he confessed he had not given the matter suffi-

cient attention, as he thought it would not have reached its present stage to-night. As, however, it had done so, he must consider the matter more carefully than he had up to the present, especially with reference to the liability of the Government. These people would have the conducting of a legalised lottery; and supposing the promoter, after depositing £10,000, went away with £50,000 belonging to other people and did not pay them, how would the Government be situated? There would be no harm in making the £10,000 available. If we legalised a lottery in this manner, the people who invested in it would think they were under the law, and that the Colonial Treasurer was the guardian of their interests, and these people might look to the Government to pay the prizes they had won. The matter must be made clear. The Government were not going to be responsible in any way.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If the Government had the £10,000, they would make themselves responsible.

THE PREMIER: There would be no objection on his part for the Government to be responsible for the £10,000, but nothing more.

MR. LEAKE: The Attorney General might consider whether the Government should not take power to make further regulations to carry out the object of these enactments. These regulations were practically enactments.

THE PREMIER moved that the word "one," in line 4, be struck out and "six" inserted in lieu thereof.

MR. MONGER: The schedule was an exact copy of the Tasmanian law. It would be rather hard to keep a man's deposit for six months without paying him interest.

MR. MORAN: This sweep business was not likely to last long in Western Australia.

THE PREMIER: Indeed?

MR. MORAN said he was only supporting this schedule to protect such vested interests as there were in the colony, and to give existing promoters a chance of recouping their expenditure; otherwise he would not support the Bill at all. If he judged public opinion rightly, these lotteries, here as in other colonies, would soon cease. Promoters

should not be allowed to have more than £10,000 in hand at once.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. LEAKE moved that progress be reported.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

TOTALISATOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Fee; Schedule:

MR. HIGHAM: To reach all the racing clubs, he proposed to move that all words after "Treasurer" be struck out, and the following inserted: "a sum equal to one per cent. on the total sum passing through such instrument."

THE PREMIER: This amendment would not affect the Western Australian Turf Club. The Bill was only intended to authorise other clubs to use the totalisator. To reach the Turf Club which was the parent body, we must insert "every such club or company, including the Western Australian Turf Club."

MR. LEAKE: The object of the Bill was to legalise the use of the totalisator by proprietary clubs like the Canning Park and the Helena Vale, of which the profits went to the shareholders. The profits of the Western Australian Turf Club were used purely for the promotion of horse-racing, but this club was peculiar in that respect.

MR. MORAN: Nonsense.

THE PREMIER: The Bunbury Club was the same.

MR. LEAKE: Why penalise the genuine racing clubs?

THE PREMIER asked whether his proposal would penalise the Bunbury Club?

MR. LEAKE: Undoubtedly it would. The Government had always recognised the Western Australian Turf Club as the governing body of horse-racing, and had apparently set their faces against horse-racing being conducted by clubs as a commercial transaction. The Bill would enable such commercial clubs to use the totalisator for the purpose of personal profit.

MR. A. FORREST: Let the clause be passed, and insert a new clause, charging proprietary clubs one per cent. for the privilege of using the totalisator.

MR. MORAN: That was rubbish. He hoped the Committee would not single out proprietary clubs to penalise them. If sweeps were to be penalised, why should not those who promoted lotteries also pay something towards the Government? He was prepared to exclude country clubs, but desired that the Western Australian Turf Club and race clubs on the goldfields should contribute one per cent. What was the difference between a person going to the totalisator and obtaining a ticket on a horse, and a person going to a shop and obtaining a ticket in a sweep? He moved that progress be reported and leave given to sit again.

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

Ayes ...	11
Noes ...	8

Majority for ... 3

AYES.
Mr. Connor
Mr. Higham
Mr. Hubble
Mr. Leake
Mr. Locke
Mr. Monger
Mr. Moran
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Quinkau
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Wood (Teller).

NOES.
Sir John Forrest
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Piccse
Mr. Rason
Hon. H. W. Venn
Mr. A. Forrest (Teller).

Motion thus passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.37 o'clock until the next Monday evening.