

the rigid attitude of one member of a conference, so far as one can ascertain, but more because representatives of the Government of the day were not prepared to compromise. I think it would be rarely, if ever, that either Chamber would appoint as one of its conference managers a member known to be adamant on the question at issue. I feel it would be unwise to adopt this recommendation, and that we should maintain the present position.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I think that the proposal of Dr. Hislop may be preferable to the recommendation. More than once there has been a conference of managers at which there has been entire agreement among the managers from another place. Under those circumstances, with four managers from each Chamber, the wish of this Chamber could be ignored. If we did decide to have conferences of eight managers, the seven-to-one majority would prevent the rare occurrence of one man, through stubbornness or stupidity or both, being able to stand out against the other seven.

Hon. W. R. HALL: Owing to the fact that there are several members away this evening, and because this is a most important amendment, which I am sure some of them would like to discuss—as it relates to the Standing Orders of both Houses—I think we should report progress.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 8.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 18th November, 1954.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Personal explanation, Mr. Yates and "The West Australian" report on betting Bill	3046
Questions: State Shipping Service, as to Darwin and North-West trade	3047
Cripples, as to special home for young persons	3048
Police Force, as to charges of corruption	3048
Education, as to Dudinin school	3048
Ministerial statement, Betting Control Bill and sitting	3048
Standing Orders suspension, closing days of session	3048
Government business, precedence	3050
Bills: State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	3048
Wheat Industry Stabilisation, 1r.	3048
Soil Fertility Research, 1r.	3048
Argentine Ant, Council's amendments	3050
Public Service Act Amendment, 2r.	3050
Betting Control, Com., report	3051

CONTENTS—continued

BILLS—continued

Milk Act Amendment, Council's amendments	3072
Vermin Act Amendment, Council's amendments	3072
Stock Diseases Act Amendment, returned	3072
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, returned	3072

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. Yates and "The West Australian" Report on Betting Bill.

Mr. YATES: May I make a personal explanation, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. YATES: As a result of the debate held in this House last night on the Betting Control Bill, there appeared on the front page of "The West Australian" this morning the following heading:—

"REBEL" M.L.A. STANDS FIRM ON THE BETTING BILL.

The report then went on to state—

Mr. Yates (L.C.L. South Perth), the "rebel" member of the Opposition, continued to support the Betting Control Bill in the Legislative Assembly last night.

I wish to make it quite clear to members and to the Press that I never have been a rebel in this House and do not have intention of being a rebel in the future.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: We will bring the reporter before the Bar of the House and try him, will we?

Mr. YATES: I voted on this Bill according to my conscience because it is a non-party measure and I would like to ask if any action could be taken on this matter through you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must admit that I was rather startled to see the headline in "The West Australian" this morning.

The Minister for Works: Most unfair!

Mr. SPEAKER: It was not only unfair; it was non-factual. It was an attempt to make a sensational headline. In fact, it almost approaches the standard of yellow journalism. If the member for South Perth will hand me his complaint in writing, I will take up the matter with the proprietors of the newspaper and endeavour to have an apology published and given prominence equal to this headline. Had the reporter followed the run of the debate, he would have noticed that it was a non-party Bill and therefore no member could possibly have been termed a rebel.

The Premier: The reporters do not write the headlines.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might mention that I have a letter here on this subject from the Leader of the Opposition which states—

18th November, 1954.

The Hon. the Speaker.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

The heading in "The West Australian" this morning which reports portion of the debate on the Betting Bill, is misleading. It refers to Mr. Yates, M.L.A. as "Rebel" M.L.A.

As it was agreed by the L.C.L. that the Bill should be treated on a non-party basis, Mr. Yates was justified in stating his own views.

Yours sincerely,

Ross McLarty.

So if the member for South Perth will submit his complaint in writing, I will take it up with the proprietors of the newspaper as soon as possible.

QUESTIONS.

STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

As to Darwin and North-West Trade.

Mr. COURT asked the Minister representing the Minister for Supply and Shipping:

With reference to the State Shipping Service vessels servicing Darwin, will he advise—

- (a) The names of State ships that have made the voyage to Darwin since the 1st January, 1954;

- (b) the Darwin arrival and departure dates of such ships;
- (c) any special circumstances that held ships up at Darwin on each voyage;
- (d) the tonnages of Darwin cargo on the voyage from Fremantle to Darwin;
- (e) the tonnages of Darwin cargo on the voyage from Darwin to Fremantle;
- (f) the tonnages of Darwin cargo on voyages from Western Australian ports (other than Fremantle) to Darwin;
- (g) the tonnages of Darwin cargo on voyages from Darwin to Western Australian ports (other than Fremantle);
- (h) the practicability of having Darwin cargo to and from Western Australian ports handled by other lines as a temporary or other measure to ease the pressure on State ships in respect of Western Australian, North-West and Kimberley ports?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied:

- (a) to (g) The particulars desired by the hon. member are as follows:—

Vessel.	Trip.	Arrival.	De-partures.	No. of Days in Darwin.	Tonnage.			
					Fremantle-Darwin.	Darwin-Fremantle.	N.W. Ports-Darwin.	Darwin-N.W. Ports.
M.V. "Kabbarli"	19	4-1-54	6-1-54	2½	528	210	10	10
S.S. "Dulverton"	40	13-1-54	14-1-54	2½	185	117	2
M.V. "Koolinda"	349	18-1-54	19-1-54	2½	281	25	1	4
S.S. "Dorrigo"	67	2-2-54	6-2-54	4	524	4	1	6
M.V. "Koolinda"	350N	17-2-54	20-2-54	2½	538	8
S.S. "Dulverton"	41	2-3-54	7-3-54	5	547	274	3	3
S.S. "Dorrigo"	68	19-3-54	25-3-54	5½	520	15	1
M.V. "Koolinda"	350S	24-3-54	24-3-54	(5 hrs.)	40 passengers landed ex Brisbane.
M.V. "Kabbarli"	22	1-4-54	3-4-54	2	565	52	3	4
S.S. "Dulverton"	42	13-4-54	15-4-54	2½	630	82	2	4
S.S. "Dorrigo"	69	6-5-54	19-5-54	13	571	78	44
M.V. "Koolinda"	352	19-5-54	21-5-54	2	477	11	1
S.S. "Dulverton"	43	28-5-54	1-6-54	4½	399	83	10	4
M.V. "Kabbarli"	24	7-6-54	10-6-54	3	583	99	4	9
S.S. "Dulverton"	44	7-7-54	15-7-54	8	1,369	353	4
M.V. "Kabbarli"	25	26-7-54	26-7-54	½	Nil—No berth—passengers only.
M.V. "Koolinda"	355	5-8-54	7-8-54	2	697	1	14	1
M.V. "Kabbarli"	26	5-9-54	7-9-54	2½	828	123	1
S.S. "Dulverton"	45	13-9-54	30-9-54	17	1,012	262	41
M.V. "Koolinda"	357	22-9-54	24-9-54	2	552	1
M.V. "Kabbarli"	27	11-10-54	12-10-54	1½	457	74	20	57
M.V. "Koolinda"	358	25-10-54	27-10-54	1½	504	8	4	1
....	11,767	1,872	128	157

Of 22 trips there were only six occasions when delays did not occur. The principal causes were lack of berthing facilities, rain and industrial disputes.

(h) It is not impracticable. The Government has no knowledge of any shipping line interested in providing such a service.

The State Shipping Service fleet is inadequate to cope with the demand widespread development has created. This problem is further aggravated by oil company's disinclination to deliver their products to North-West ports.

CRIPPLES.

As to Special Home for Young Persons.

Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Health:

Has the Government under consideration the provision of a special home, or other facilities, for the care of young crippled persons such as the six unfortunate lads accommodated at "Sunset"?

The MINISTER replied:

This is one of many social requirements which can only be dealt with in priority.

POLICE FORCE.

As to Charges of Corruption.

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Is it intended to investigate the charges of corruption in the Police Force, made by the members for Guildford-Midland, Canning and Victoria Park, under cover of parliamentary privilege on the 11th November?

(2) Does he agree that charges of this nature and made in these circumstances are damaging to the Police Force?

(3) Does he know if the members concerned are prepared to assist in any investigation, should an investigation be decided upon?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) It is not considered that the statements made by the members referred to are of such a nature as to warrant a full investigation of that section of the Police Force engaged on this type of work, but if any hon. member desires to quote any specific cases of bribery between s.p. operators and a member of the Police Force, the charge will certainly be investigated.

(2) Yes.

(3) No.

EDUCATION.

As to Dudinin School.

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Education:

(1) When was the Dudinin school first built?

(2) How many times has it been shifted?

(3) What is its condition now?

(4) How many children are enrolled?

(5) Is a new school building planned for Dudinin?

(6) If so, when are tenders likely to be called for the new building?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The building was originally erected at Woglan Gate in 1911 and re-erected at Dudinin on the 2nd February, 1921.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) The building is very old and not up to desired standard.

(4) Twenty-nine.

(5) Yes.

(6) When funds are available.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

Betting Control Bill and Sitting.

The PREMIER: Before we go on to notices of motion, I would like your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the indulgence of the House to say that if the Committee stage of the Betting Control Bill is finalised before the tea suspension this afternoon, the House will not sit after tea.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1, State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment (No. 2).

Introduced by the Minister for Labour.

2, Wheat Industry Stabilisation.

3, Soil Fertility Research.

Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS . SUSPENSION.

Closing Days of Session.

The PREMIER: I move—

That until otherwise ordered, the Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable Bills to be introduced without notice and to be passed through all their remaining stages on the same day, all messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the same day they are received, and to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those committees.

We are getting close to the end of the session, and this motion is always introduced at about this stage. In fact, I think it might be later this session than in the majority of those in which I have taken part.

Mr. Nalder: This is a much longer session.

The PREMIER: That is so, and consequently it is necessary to bring this motion forward. It could assist us materially to complete the session on or somewhere near the target date of the 2nd December. It is not necessary for me to assure members on both sides of the House that the Government will not use powers given it under this motion unfairly or unnecessarily.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There can be no objection to the motion the Premier has moved. As he said, it is usually brought down about this time of the year. I presume we have an assurance from the Premier that private members' business will be dealt with. The Premier also stated that the target date for the closing of the session is the 2nd December. I suppose this has been the longest parliamentary session on record, and there is still a great deal of business on the notice paper. Some of the legislation is most important and it is unfortunate that the position in relation to discussions on the Estimates, both revenue and loan, is so unsatisfactory. I was not here for two weeks, and I understand that the general debate on the Revenue Estimates was completed. I am not too sure about the Loan Estimates.

Hon. D. Brand: That has not been completed yet.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am informed by the member for Greenough that the debate on the Loan Estimates has not yet been finished. Apart from a few items respecting the Premier's Department—the Treasury—there has not been any discussion on the Estimates. There is very little time left for a full discussion on the Estimates, and, as we know, they are of great importance to all members because it is on them they are able to express themselves and obtain information which they desire.

Then again, the Premier should also tell us what further legislation he intends to bring down at this late stage of the session. Today notice was given for the introduction of further Bills. We know that certain legislation has always been introduced towards the close of every session. Apart from that, the House should be given some indication as to what other legislation the Government intends to introduce during the remainder of the session. I can assure the Premier that the Opposition desires to get over the business of this House as expeditiously as possible with, of course, reasonable consideration to the legislation and the Estimates still appearing on the notice paper.

I hope that at this late stage in the session it will not be found necessary to bring down any contentious legislation, and that if it is intended to introduce further Bills, notice should be given im-

mediately so that members will be aware of the programme of legislation to be dealt with.

The PREMIER (in reply): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his attitude towards this motion. It will be necessary from now on to sit much later than has been the case until last week. Prior to last week the sittings of the House generally were not of long duration. It might also be necessary to ask the House to sit next Friday and the Friday following, but that will depend on circumstances.

The only important Bill which has as yet to be explained to the House is the one relating to the redistribution of electoral boundaries, which is already on the notice paper. I hope to be in a position to explain the contents of it to the House next Tuesday. Apart from that, there will be no Bill of any size, and certainly no new contentious Bill to be introduced. The notice paper is not very substantial, excepting for the Estimates. I understand that the notice paper of the Legislative Council is very thin.

Mr. Hutchinson: What about the Local Government Bill?

The PREMIER: The Government's intention is to proceed with the Bill as far as possible this session in the Committee stage, and to revive it next session from that stage. Members must agree there is no possible chance of completing consideration of this Bill during the present session. Even if this House could complete its consideration, there certainly would be no hope of the Legislative Council even looking at it this session.

Mr. Nalder: That is a reasonable attitude to adopt.

The PREMIER: Therefore next week, considerable inroads into the notice paper should be made. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the debate on the Estimates is very important, but there is still a considerable amount of time left for members to express their views.

Hon. D. Brand: There are about eight sitting days left.

The PREMIER: Those could be long days. By making them long we can cover fairly well the ground still to be traversed.

Hon. L. Thorn: The position has been the same every year.

The PREMIER: As the member for Toodyay said, this situation crops up every year about this time. Although the 2nd December is the target date, it may not be the finishing day. It is very difficult to stick to it. It is set as the objective to be achieved, but if there is still important business before the House uncompleted by the 2nd December, then it will be necessary to continue the session into the following week.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE.

The PREMIER: I move—

That on and after Wednesday, the 24th November, Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day on Wednesday as on all other days.

This is another motion which comes on at this stage of every session. The present session has been the thinnest one on record in regard to private members' business.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You should be grateful for that.

The PREMIER: The Government is very grateful. There are only four items of private members' business on the notice paper, one of which has already been debated very thoroughly. It will not take very long to finish the debate on that and to cast a vote. The other items are not likely to cause a great deal of controversy, although the dog Bill is one which can be the subject of long controversy. Many years ago, before I came to this House, a dog Bill was introduced to the House and it caused no end of argument.

However, this and the other Bills on the notice paper in the names of private members would, I think, not take a long time to complete. I give members the assurance that private members' business remaining on the notice paper including that, notice of which was given by the member for Wembley Beaches today, will be given consideration and a vote will be allowed on each item.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Opposition does not object to this motion which again is the usual one at this stage of every session. The Premier has given an assurance that private members' business will be dealt with adequately, therefore I support the motion.

Question put and passed.

BILL—ARGENTINE ANT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of three amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. Clause 2, page 3—Delete all words after the word "fifty-nine" in line 12 down to and including the word "extension" in line 14.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Bill was amended in this Chamber to lengthen the scheme period in order to allow for a continuance of the work of cleaning up should that be necessary. The five-year scheme period was to end on the 30th June, 1959, but the Minister, on the recommendation of the committee, could

by notice published in the "Government Gazette," extend the period for another six months. The reason was that there might be isolated pockets of ants at the 30th June, 1959, which could not be attended to after that date unless further authority were given by Act of Parliament.

The proposal of the Council is to strike out all reference to an extension of the period, evidently believing that five years would be sufficient time in which to eradicate the ant. No tidying up period is envisaged, and so the amendment will destroy the possibility of further activity subsequently. This item has been raised from No. 22 to No. 1 on the notice paper because of the urgency of the matter. The committee and officers have been engaged on the work for some time, and have laid themselves open to minor liability for compensation where the spraying has caused damage, because they have not as yet received legislative authority to take action. In view of the urgency of the matter and the necessity for getting the measure passed as quickly as possible, I propose to accept the three amendments and another place must take whatever responsibility is incurred for the scheme ending at the 30th June, 1959. The matter is so urgent that to avoid delay, I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 2. Clause 2, page 3—Delete Sub-clause (2).

No. 3. Clause 21, page 19—Delete all words in the clause after the word "fifty-nine" in line 22 and substitute the words "and no longer."

On motions by the Minister for Agriculture, the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

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

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [2.47] in moving the second reading said: The reason for the introduction of this Bill is to be found in approaches made by the Civil Service Association to the Government with the object of having a public service board of three members substituted for the present system of one Public Service Commissioner. For some time the association has been anxious that a board along these lines should be established. The Government has agreed in principle to the submissions of the association, that decision having been made several weeks ago.

In the intervening period, the Government has partly investigated the board systems operating in most of the other

States of Australia and the investigation is still proceeding. A good deal of additional thought will be required before the Government can finally reach conclusions that will permit of a Bill being drafted to provide for the suggested board. There is not the slightest hope of the necessary measure being introduced this session.

A complication arises in connection with the Government's intention due to the fact that the present Public Service Commissioner, Mr. Taylor, has intimated his intention to retire from the position in February of next year. Under the Act, the only appointment that could be made to the position must be for a period of seven years. Naturally the Government does not want to be placed in the position of having to appoint a new man for a period of seven years when it is intended to present to Parliament next session a Bill to set up a public service board in lieu of having a single Public Service Commissioner. Therefore this Bill aims to amend the principal Act to provide that an Acting Public Service Commissioner may be appointed for a period which would expire not later than the 31st December, 1955.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: That is when the present Public Service Commissioner would ordinarily retire, is it not?

The PREMIER: Yes. If the Bill becomes law, the Government will be in a position legally to make an acting appointment to commence on the 1st March of next year and carry on until the end of the year, by which time Parliament will have been given the opportunity to make a decision as to whether a public service board shall be set up to take the place of the Public Service Commissioner. Unless the Bill becomes law, the Government will be compelled to appoint a Public Service Commissioner early next year, and the period of his appointment will have to be for seven years.

The members of the Government believe that the proposal for a public service board has considerable merit, because they believe that the establishment of such a board could increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Public Service in many directions. It would, without a doubt, be the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill next session to set up a public service board somewhat along the lines I have mentioned. I quite agree that arguments could be raised against an acting appointment in respect of an important position of this nature, but in the circumstances, this seems to be the solution of the difficulty. The Bill has the approval of the Civil Service Association because it agrees with the Government that this is actually the only practical, legal way of dealing with the situation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir Ross McLarty, debate adjourned.

BILL—BETTING CONTROL.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair; the Minister for Police in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after Clause 10 had been agreed to.

Clause 11—Registration of premises:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The Minister for Police and the Premier made it quite clear that their idea in introducing the Bill was to ensure that s.p. betting, which was carried on without proper control, would be brought under control in the interests of the public. Having that in view, I move an amendment—

That the words "the reasonable requirements of the public and" in line 28, page 9, be struck out.

The general interests of the community should be the only consideration of the board when dealing with the granting of licences; and only such licences as are in the general interest of the community should be granted. The Government did not put forward the proposition that the legislation was introduced with a view to meeting the requirements of the public, but rather that it was to control betting in the general interests of the community.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I do not like the amendment. For a start, we would want a definition of the term "general interest" if we left it there. My impression is that the spread of illegal starting-price betting has been caused largely by the requirements of the public. There is an insistent demand by the public for facilities to transact betting away from racing or trotting courses.

If we strike out these words there will be a clear indication to the board that consideration should be given to the general interests of the community only, without any thought about what has happened to bring about the present deplorable state of affairs. If we do not give consideration to the public requirements—I refer to those sections of the public that require off-the-course betting facilities—I think we will only create a lot of trouble and possibly a continuance of the existing undesirable state of affairs. I do not agree with the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the words "or their agents" in line 31, page 9, be struck out.

This is really a consequential amendment.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: This amendment is consequential upon the decision of the Committee to delete the definition of "agent." As this term will

occur in 15 or 20 places between this clause and the end of the Bill, I do not propose to object to its deletion, provided that in some places where the word "agent" is struck out, the word "employee" is inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by Hon. A. V. R. Abbott, clause further amended by striking out the words "or his agent" in line 37, page 9; by striking out the words "or their agents" in line 40, page 9; by striking out the words "or his agent" in line 2, page 10; by inserting after the word "premises" in line 9, page 10, the word "or"; by striking out the words "or their agents" in lines 11 and 12, page 10; by striking out the words "or (iii) on a racecourse" in lines 12 and 13, page 10; and by striking out the words "and his agent" in line 30, page 10.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I move an amendment—

That after the word "force" in line 34, page 10, the words "on Wednesdays, Saturdays and public holidays until one o'clock in the afternoon" be inserted.

I obtained this idea from an article that appeared in the "Sunday Times" of the 14th inst. which, while it commended the Government on introducing the measure, proceeded to suggest a number of amendments that it considered essential if the Bill were to give any satisfaction, even to those who expected it to do so. What appeared to be the major of the propositions of the writer of the article—who gave some reasons for it—was that the hours of trading should be limited to Wednesday, which he contended was the day on which most interest would be taken in races outside the State, Saturday up to 1 p.m. or 1.30 p.m., and public holidays. As my aim in regard to this measure, if I cannot defeat it, is to endeavour to minimise the opportunities for betting, I decided to accept, for the purpose of moving an amendment, the proposition put forward by the writer in question.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I cannot agree to the amendment as it would completely stultify the intention of the Bill and would mean a perpetuation of the present unsatisfactory state of affairs. It would mean that on Saturdays in the metropolitan area all shops would have to close at 1 p.m. I thought, when I saw the amendment on the notice paper, that it had been placed there in the interests of the racing clubs, but the hon. member has said that his intention is to prevent, as much as possible, opportunities for indulging in s.p. betting.

Some people, I realise, hold the view that we should adopt the Tasmanian system which is that on the day and in the place where a race meeting is held, shops within a radius of 15 miles of the course are not allowed to open. That, of course,

would be an inducement to people to go to the racecourse rather than make bets in registered premises away from the course. But I do not think it would have that effect because, in my opinion, the large majority of those who bet on Saturday or Wednesday afternoons, as the case may be, are not the type who would have sufficient capital to go to a racecourse.

By the time they had paid transport fees, entrance fees, the additional charge to get into the bird cage and the purchase of a race-book, a sum would be expended which, in my opinion, would be as great as the average amount used by these people—that is, £1 or 25s.—in having a few drinks and a few bets on Saturday afternoon in company with their workmates and acquaintances. It is the sole form of recreation for many of these people and if the amendment were agreed to there would be a continuance of down-the-lane betting. Our intention, by the introduction of the Bill, is to do away with that unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Although bookmakers in Tasmania are not permitted to operate if their premises are within 15 miles of a racecourse on a day on which a meeting is being held, they are allowed to go on to the course and bet. The amendment might work in places like Bunbury, Northam or York; but I doubt even that. From my observations, I would say that the person who bets at a betting shop would not go to the course and, as a result, this amendment would not affect the attendances at racecourses. As a result, I could not agree, under any circumstances, to the amendment.

Mr. WILD: I am disappointed that the Minister will not give more consideration to this amendment. As one who has devoted a considerable amount of thought to this problem over the years, I believe that, provided a person is within a reasonable distance of a racecourse, he should do his betting there. To do that, we would need the co-operation of the racing and trotting associations, and I have no doubt that they would co-operate. I cannot agree with the Minister's argument about the people in the low income group, because if the clubs co-operate there is no reason why those people would not attend the course. The clubs could provide a free flat or go so far as to make the leger free, where there are tote facilities and a bar, and other amenities.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That was tried, but without effect.

Mr. WILD: I know, but I cannot remember it.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It was tried at Helena Vale; the leger was made free.

Mr. WILD: It is a long way to Helena Vale. If we were to close betting shops while race meetings were being held, and people in the lower income group could go to the course for a cost of only 3s. or 4s., I think attendances would be increased.

Last night, the Minister said that the betting shops in South Australia did not have plush seats. I was there in 1935 and these shops did provide plush seats. Bob Duggan's shop, in the city, and Blinman's both provided plush seats; they even went so far as to reserve a place to enable women to bet. I am certain that legalised betting shops encourage people to bet. But as the Government has decided we shall have them in this State, it is no good carrying on in this vein. We should not endeavour to encourage it, and if we can minimise it, all the better. I, like some members on the Government side, like a little bet, but I still say that the women are the sufferers, especially those in the low income groups, and unfortunately they are the people who frequently bet beyond their means. We should try to get the co-operation of the racing clubs.

The Minister for Police: They have been requested a number of times and have not done it yet.

Mr. WILD: In the last two or three days I have discussed this with the vice-chairman of a racing club. I told him that I thought they ought to make some part of the course free. I even suggested a 2s. totalisator instead of the present 5s. minimum. The vice-chairman indicated to me that he felt the club would give favourable consideration to encouraging people to go to the course because it admits that is where betting should take place. I support the amendment.

Mr. LAPHAM: I am not surprised at the amendment being moved by the Leader of the Country Party because he has indicated that he is not a betting man. If he were and he knew more about his electors, he would not have moved the amendment.

Hon. A. F. Watts: You had better talk to the "Sunday Times." That is where I got the information.

Mr. LAPHAM: Perhaps when the "Sunday Times" article was written, the author did not consider clubs should be assisted in any way. The mere fact that the racing club is likely to lose patronage at the racecourse is more than offset by the increase it will receive in its turnover tax. The amendment includes the words "On Wednesdays, Saturdays and public holidays until 1 p.m. in the afternoon." Does not the Leader of the Country Party realise that the Melbourne Cup is held on a Tuesday? If his amendment were passed, it would mean that people would be barred from betting on the Melbourne Cup and there are many people who, like myself, like to have their bet on that race.

Mr. Hutchinson: If that is your only objection to the amendment, you could easily have it rectified by moving an amendment on the amendment.

Mr. LAPHAM: That is not the only objection. Probably the member for Cottesloe does not realise that the Imperial Stakes is held on a bank holiday. Many race meetings are held on bank holidays.

The Premier: The Northam Cup is held on a Wednesday.

Mr. LAPHAM: If this amendment were agreed to, the betting premises would have to close at 1 p.m. and this would make the position worse. Many people would be congregated at the shop up till that time and then at 1 o'clock the proprietor would say, "We have to close the doors now and you can all go home."

Mr. Cornell: What about the man who likes a drink and who has to leave the hotel after it closes at 9 p.m.?

Mr. LAPHAM: He can always take a bottle with him.

Mr. Oldfield: What about if he gets there after 9 p.m.?

Mr. LAPHAM: With horse-racing, as the member for Maylands knows only too well—

Mr. Oldfield: I know nothing about the game.

The Premier: Oh, yes!

Mr. LAPHAM: —the punter likes to know the barrier draws and the names of the jockeys because he always takes these factors into consideration when he lays a bet. But that information would not be available to him until 1 p.m. and the races in the Eastern States continue until 3 p.m. Therefore, if we are to give the punter every opportunity to pick a winner, the s.p. betting shop should be allowed to remain open until all race meetings have concluded.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I oppose the amendment because the proposal contained in it is not desired by the people in the Murchison district, for instance. Those people enjoy listening to the broadcast of races and they generally bet on Eastern States events. If the amendment were passed, these people would be greatly penalised.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I feel that this is an amendment which the Government should support. It will bring about a state of affairs which many Government members seek. One of the purposes of the amendment is that it will control betting and that is what the Bill itself seeks to do, as pointed out by many members on the other side of the Chamber. Furthermore, I am in doubt as to what policy will be adopted by the betting control board. Will it restrain betting or is it going to make this industry boom? Is it going to boost the industry so that the Government's coffers will benefit?

The principle underlying the Bill is to control, minimise and restrict betting, and the purpose of the amendment seeks to

do just that. If the Government sincerely desires to control betting, it should agree to the amendment. If, on the other hand, there is a subconscious desire to gain financially from the operation of the legislation, that is possibly why the Government is opposing the amendment. I consider that the closing of the betting shops at 1 p.m. will wipe out the evil of punters chasing the money they have already lost as the day progresses, and as their will is weakened by liquor consumed by them during the course of the afternoon.

Mr. Andrew: They do that on the racecourse, too.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Yes, but they have a spectacle to watch there. The member for North Perth pointed out that the amendment has some minor faults due to the fact that it would prevent people from betting on the Melbourne Cup which is held on a Tuesday and on other racing fixtures which are held on bank holidays, but a further amendment could easily remedy that weakness.

Mr. ANDREW: If the amendment is carried, it will nullify that which we are attempting to do with the Bill, namely, to exercise control over betting particularly off the course. If betting shops are closed at 1 p.m. and a person arrives at a shop after 1 p.m. that will encourage him to lay his bet with illegal operators.

Mr. Oldfield: What about the man who wants a drink and arrives at a hotel after 9 p.m.?

Mr. ANDREW: The member for North Perth told the hon. member that such a person could always obtain a bottle of beer. If, after 1 p.m. a man could not bet at a registered betting shop, he is going to turn to the illegal bookmaker so that he may place his bet.

There are other factors. One is that the bettor on the racecourse bets according to the money he can afford. He has his first bet, which may be a winner, and he can afford to bet more heavily the next time because he is betting with other people's money. If he loses he will have to tone his bets down accordingly. In an s.p. shop a man puts on five shillings and gets back a couple of pounds, which is quite substantial. But he is debarred from having any further bet unless he does so illegally. We are against illegal practices and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BRADY: I am sorry the member for Stirling is temporarily out of the Chamber because I support the principle suggested in his amendment. It would be more acceptable if it could be worded differently; instead of Wednesdays, Saturdays and public holidays being mentioned, he should provide for race days and alter the time from 1 p.m. to 2.30 p.m. I would then support the amendment. It is not a matter of driving people to the racecourse. A number of people who hang

around s.p. shops from early morning until late at night could well be encouraged to follow sports other than horse-racing, and I refer particularly to football, cricket, basketball and so on.

This Bill has been introduced to exercise some control, and, like the member for Cottesloe, I ask myself will we give the s.p. betting people an open slather? Seeing the shops are to be established legally, we should exercise control right from the start. Racing is held in various parts of the Commonwealth on days other than those mentioned in the amendment. There is a minority that is opposed to s.p. betting, and if we want to do the fair thing we should give that minority some encouragement to continue its efforts.

I have no illusion about stamping out s.p. betting in one, two, or three years, but I think it could be done ultimately. The first step should be to cut out racecourses and racehorses and members opposite should start straightaway on their friends who breed these horses. We should suppress the broadcasting of racing events and restrict the number of pages in the newspaper that are devoted to the subject.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: They are the people who encourage it.

Mr. BRADY: That is so. If the amendment were redrafted as I have suggested, I would support it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: During this debate I have gained the impression that some people think s.p. betting is confined to the metropolitan area. A large volume of s.p. betting is conducted throughout the country districts. The people in the isolated stations and outcamps cannot go to the racecourse. After their week's work, they do a few chores around the camp on Saturday morning and go into the towns on Saturday afternoon. As the member for Greenough knows, a number of them congregate at Mullewa. What would those men do if, when they got into the towns, they found the betting shops closed?

Mr. Owen: Go home and finish their chores.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That statement shows a lack of understanding of human nature.

Mr. Owen: It would be the sensible thing to do.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But we know that people do not do the sensible thing.

Mr. Owen: You want to encourage them not to do the sensible thing.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment would be of no value in the country districts where there are no racecourses. The person who suggested this amendment felt that the people who had been using the betting shops up until 1

o'clock should proceed to the racecourse; it is aimed at increasing the attendance at the racecourse. That is the real reason behind the suggestion. In Kalgoorlie today the s.p. operators close their shops at 1 o'clock for that reason. Some of the bookmakers then go and field on the racecourse.

The reason for closing down at 1 o'clock is to persuade the people who engage in betting to go to the course. There are many people who like to bet but who do not go to racecourses. The member for Cottesloe must know that many football followers who do not go near a racecourse during the football season, like to have a bet on a Saturday afternoon. At the intervals during the match they go out to ascertain the result of a race or to place another bet.

Mr. Hutchinson: On that assumption, betting shops should be closed at 1 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not so.

Mr. Hutchinson: That was what you said the football followers did.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I said nothing of the sort. Many members speaking on this matter do so unrealistically for the reason that they know no better. I do not blame them because they have had no experience. Before a bettor places a wager, he invariably finds out whether his fancy is a starter. If he is obliged to place it in the morning, he may find out later in the afternoon that his fancies have all been scratched.

Mr. Hutchinson: He would get a refund of his money.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is no satisfaction to him. He derives some pleasure in playing the horses and it is no satisfaction to him to know that he was not on a single starter that afternoon. Another aspect is this: People who play the horses seriously are very keen to know the barrier positions before they make their wagers. It is a well-known fact that horses drawing the outside barrier positions have little or no chance in certain distance races. The barrier draw does not take place until well after 12 o'clock. So the person who bets off the course would have no knowledge of the draw before 1 o'clock.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: Not even through the telephone?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. The barrier draw takes place after 12 and if bettors are obliged to make their wagers before 1 p.m., they would be doing so in the dark. This would be to the advantage of the bookmaker and not of the punter. We would find this situation occurring: Punters will not make their wagers in the morning before the barrier draw and they will look for an opportunity to bet illegally in the afternoon. The fundamental purposes of this Bill, despite what has been

said to the contrary, is not to encourage people to bet and does not provide additional facilities. It is based on precisely the same idea as that which actuated the previous Government to legalise drinking on Sundays. The previous Government knew that in certain towns in this State the drinking of alcoholic liquor was indulged in to a considerable degree. Members of the Government must have known that.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The Government did not. It did not introduce the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.6 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To limit the facilities for Sunday drinking, we attempted to deal with a situation where there had been considerable illegal Sunday drinking; and that is the fundamental idea behind this Bill, namely, to provide for controlled facilities to meet what seems to be a definite demand. Unless we substitute reasonable facilities for what is now operating illegally, we will have great difficulty in enforcing the provisions which we impose. Just as there are not hotels in all districts, so there are not racecourses in all districts to which punters can go if the shops are closed. Under our licensing law, we provide for a gallon licence to meet the requirements of the people in a district where there is no hotel. What do we provide here to meet the requirements of the people in a districts where there is no racecourse?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Would you agree with it if it were done?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In that suggestion we are up against a practical difficulty, because if a radius is determined and it is illegal to bet inside that radius after 1 o'clock but it is legal to bet outside it, we would have people travelling from the inside to the outside to overcome the position. I would otherwise be strongly in favour of it. We have to take a practical view of what occurs, and set up something that is an improvement on the existing conditions.

Mr. Court: If they were prepared to travel outside the perimeter to bet at a licensed shop, would not they be prepared to go to the course?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member loses sight of a very important fact. I agree that a man who has not got £1 in his pocket to pay for his admission to the course and buy his race-book, etc., should not be thinking about betting; but there are many people with no more than 2s. or 3s. to spend, who bet regularly. That is their pleasure. Some people spend 3s. or 4s. on drinking on Saturday afternoon, and others spend £1 playing golf. But many have a few shillings pocket money to do with as they like at week-ends, and they get most enjoyment from the expenditure of those

few shillings by playing the horses or taking a ticket in the charities consultation. They cannot attend the course as they have not enough money.

Mr. Court: The person with only 5s. to gamble would not go outside the perimeter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We would find that there would be motorcars and so on to take them there. It has been suggested that free admission to racecourses would solve the problem, but it would not. The late P. A. Connelly instituted that system at Helena Vale and it resulted in large crowds attending. Eventually it was discontinued, not because it was unsuccessful, but because the W.A.T.C. told him he could no longer do it.

Mr. Court: Why?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They did not supply a reason.

Mr. Wild: Is that not an argument in favour of this?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, because the idea apparently was to get a place on the course where admission would not be charged. I repeat that that was tried, but the ruling body of racing activities forbade its continuance. Does not the fact that it attracted large crowds emphasise that it is the cost involved in attending the course which causes numbers of people to bet off the course? They use the money they would have to pay for admittance to have their few bets.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: That was not so in South Australia.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It has been proved so in Western Australia. While it would work in places where there are racecourses, very few centres in the State have courses and so the amendment ignores the rights of people who could reach a course only under difficult circumstances, if at all. The resident in the metropolitan area is no more entitled to this facility than the country dweller and the desire of a man in Geraldton or Carnarvon to have a flutter at the week-end might be stronger than that of the metropolitan resident as he has fewer avenues of enjoyment.

Many people in this State never bet, but have fun in making selections and seeing how their judgment turns out. There used to flourish a tipping competition. People would make their selection and send it in with 6d. and stand a chance of winning some hundreds of pounds. The police stopped that as a breach of the Gaming Act although it was largely patronised, as are football pools in Great Britain. There exists throughout the community a desire to make a selection and support it according to one's means, and the amendment would strictly limit such facilities to a select few persons and ignore the rest.

Mr. MAY: I know little about betting, but try to be fair in all things. I understand that some people bet on the course and others off the course where opportunity offers. That is fair enough, but I understand the object of this amendment to be to allow those who attend the course to continue to bet without restriction and prevent those who normally bet off the course from doing so after 1 p.m. I see no reason why such a distinction should be made.

Obviously those that attend the course are favourably circumstanced as to leisure and finance and I believe those not so favourably circumstanced should not be prevented from enjoying their betting within the limits of their leisure and finance. I would not countenance such a distinction. I do not bet, but would not let that prejudice me in relation to this question. If people desire betting as a form of recreation, I would let them have it. It does not make any difference to me because I use my own judgment.

In my opinion we would be creating an unfair situation if we allowed a percentage of the general public, who are able to go to the course, the opportunity of following their sport while a race meeting was being held and, at the same time, said to the other section which is not so favourably circumstanced, "You are not to make a bet or follow horse-racing after 1 o'clock on the day on which a race meeting is in progress." As a result, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	24
Majority against	4

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Wild
Mr. Manning	Mr. Yates
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Hutchinson

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Graham	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Heal	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Styants
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. BRADY: In a clause dealing with the registration of premises I think there should be a subclause to ensure that no individual will gain from a community activity. It is well known that many hotels around the metropolitan area and in the country districts, whose capital value is between £10,000 and £12,000, change hands at figures up to £35,000 because of the licence which goes with the hotel.

Point of Order.

Hon. A. F. Watts: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's proposed amendment, which is on the notice paper, deals with the transference of a licence. We have already inserted in the Bill a provision that a licence shall not be transferable, so the circumstances he outlines can hardly arise.

The Chairman: I would draw attention of the member for Guildford-Midland to the fact that after the word "or" in line 14 of Clause 9 we have already agreed to a provision that no licence shall be transferable or passed to the personal representative of a deceased licensee. In view of that fact, the hon. member's proposed amendment, which is on the notice paper, would not be in order.

Committee Resumed.

Mr. BRADY: I think I can get over it by moving what I propose in the form of a new subclause. If that is acceptable I think it would get over the difficulty mentioned by the member for Stirling. It seems wrong that we should allow a first licensee, as a consequence of an accretion in value of betting premises, to get any value out of a transaction. I feel that the accretion in value should go to the good of the community and the money should be paid to the board. I had based my argument on the transfer of licences but as you, Mr. Chairman, have ruled that that is out of order, I will not pursue that line of discussion. I move an amendment—

That a new subclause, to stand as Subclause (7), be added as follows:—

"Where the registered premises, because of betting transactions, attract a goodwill value, such goodwill value shall, in the event of a new licence being issued, be assessed by and paid to the board by the new licensee."

Mr. LAPHAM: The amendment is wrong in principle and I oppose it. The object of the betting control board is to control betting generally and it would therefore limit the number of licences issued. As long as it does that, in a particular locality, it automatically places a goodwill value on the licence because it grants a monopoly to the individual in that area. If we permit this, we will find the board in every

instance it issues a licence, can automatically assess a value on the people in that community who they feel would normally bet, and individuals could be made to pay a considerable sum for the licence. As I understood the provision, as long as an individual complied with certain requirements, he would be issued with a licence, but under the amendment it would go to the highest bidder, and I do not like that.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I do not think the amendment moved by the hon. member could apply because the premises are not licensed under the Act as is a hotel. The bookmaker is licensed, but the premises in which he is carrying on his business is approved and he can move those premises anywhere else. The hon. member refers to a new licence being granted. I ask, a new licence to whom? In my view, the goodwill attaches to the bookmaker so long as he can find suitable premises within the locality, and I cannot see the board refusing to permit him to carry on his business wherever he likes so long as it is in the locality in respect of which it is granted. Unless the amendment is made clearer, I cannot support it.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I agree with the aim of the member for Guildford-Midland, and I do not think the problem of drafting this amendment can be solved by saying that premises are not licensed. Admittedly, the word used in the Act is "registered," and accordingly I do not think the wording of the amendment in its present form fits in with the terms of the Bill. I do not seek to deal with it on those grounds at all. I agree with the member for Guildford-Midland that there should not be any sort of trafficking in the goodwill of these premises.

This business should be as little profit-making as possible. A state of affairs could arise where permission to occupy such premises could be disposed of for a substantial sum. It is impossible to support the amendment in its present terms. A draftsman should go into it to ensure that it does what the hon. member requires. I agree with the member for Mt. Lawley that it is not sufficiently explicit in its intentions. I also appreciate the point raised by the member for North Perth that the board could charge a premium on the first issue of a licence. I know that is not contemplated, and I do not think any of us would like to see that happen. The amendment would have to be put into better shape before I could support it.

Mr. BRADY: I have no objection to any member trying to amend this subclause, but I think they all realise the intention behind it. The point has been mentioned that there will probably be a nominal premium charged on the first licence issued, but the first person to secure a licence will get an average value of £5,000 or £6,000 and if he decides to sell when he retires, it could build up to £12,000.

Mr. Oldfield: He could sell it two or three weeks after.

Mr. BRADY: He could, as has been done by several returned soldiers who have obtained shops from the Housing Commission in new areas; these people have sold out to somebody else on a substantial goodwill value. In Midland there are six men operating at the moment. On the surface, it would appear that one man would get a licence, and the business of the rest would flow into his premises. The fact that these men have been carrying on, indicates the amount of business and money involved, and the man concerned could quite easily build up a value which would be £5,000 or £6,000.

That is a community increment and not that of an individual, and it should go back to the board or the Government or be disbursed as the Government or the Treasurer sees fit. I will admit that the wording of the amendment is not perfect. I do not know how that can be overcome except by my asking members to accept it in the hope that the board will have regard to the desire of Parliament and try to frame a suitable regulation. I do not visualise that in the first few months the betting shops will be changing hands rapidly; and if the board felt that the provision should be amended to make it clearer, it could suggest to the Government that such an amendment be made.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I applaud the hon. member's proposal, but I do not consider that it will work. He presupposes that the man who has the licence will be the owner of the premises, but the probability is that in very few instances will the bookmaker be the owner.

Mr. May: He probably would be, in a country district.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The premises will probably be owned by somebody else. If something is to be done about the goodwill of the actual premises used for betting, what about the goodwill of the premises next door? There might be a tobacconist's shop alongside registered premises. It is certain that the tobacconist would get additional business because of the existence of the betting shop; and it would be as logical to take the extra goodwill from that tobacconist and give it to somebody else, as it would be to take the goodwill from the owners of premises registered for betting purposes.

Mr. Yates: There could be a loss of business.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In that case we would have to go the other way and award compensation for loss of goodwill because of the existence of a betting shop; and so we would get into all sorts of trouble. I would agree with the member for Guildford-Midland if it were provided that the bookmaker had to own the

premises in which he carried on his business. Then if he passed on the business to another licensee, he should not benefit by the accretion in value. But there is no certainty that the board will say that any particular premises shall continue to be registered. Something might occur in the immediate vicinity that would make it undesirable for the premises to be continued as a betting shop; and the board might decide against reregistration, and the bookmaker would have to go somewhere else. What would happen then?

Mr. Johnson: There would be no goodwill.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; but there might be a loss of value. While I think it is a very good idea basically to try to get for the community the accretion in value resulting from a community effort, we will run up against all sorts of anomalies over this matter. So while I feel that the idea is good, in practice it would be very unfair and unworkable.

Mr. JOHNSON: I support the principle underlying the amendment; but I am not quite sure—particularly after the remarks of the Leader of the Country Party—whether this is the right way to achieve the desired objective. Perhaps the aim could be reached by inserting the necessary powers in the clause dealing with regulations. It might be well if the amendment were withdrawn and the powers incorporated in that other part of the measure.

The idea behind the amendment is to retain for the public, and not for the individual granted the licence, the value of the licence to the person as a trading monopoly. It must be realised that these licences will be monopolies granted by the public through the Government for a specific purpose in a specific district. Although the Bill lays down that the licence is a licence to a person, I think it is implicit in the measure that the granting of the licence is subject to the availability of premises which are considered by the board to be suitable. We visualise the time when the man holding the licence will withdraw or die, and there will be a vacancy for a licence. The board will have to grant a new licence, and it is almost certain that that licence will be granted for the premises for which the previous licence was held.

As I have said, my opinion is that the better way to achieve the desired objective is for the amendment to be withdrawn, and for power to be given to the board to make regulations, the hope being that the board would be guided by the opinions of Parliament as expressed in the debate and frame provisions to give effect to those opinions. Should it follow that the board felt it was the intention of Parliament that the original licence in any district should attract a premium as a primary licence, as is the case with regard to licences issued under the Licensing Act at present, I think that would be a suitable objective.

It would not lead to the danger that the member for North Perth visualises of there being bidding for licences. The board should decide the value of the licence. I do not know whether I shall support the amendment, but I strongly uphold the principle contained in it.

Mr. LAPHAM: This deals with the granting of a licence. When an applicant desires to have a licence to operate s.p. premises, he must stipulate where he intends to conduct those premises. In effect, he applies to be licensed as a bookmaker, and he stipulates where his premises will be. If his application is granted, he is automatically licensed to be a bookmaker to operate in certain premises. This does not presuppose that there will be stipulated premises throughout the metropolitan area but that the premises will be part of the bookmaker's licence. When the bookmaker ceases to operate, the new licence that is issued might deal with new premises. If it did not, the new tenant might find the position very difficult because, if we stipulated the premises, the rents would be terrific.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Why?

Mr. LAPHAM: There is a general tendency to feel that all bookmakers are making a fortune, and consequently the landlords would think that they were entitled to a part of that fortune.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do you think the bookmakers ought to pay a fee?

Mr. LAPHAM: I think that is only right. The amendment has no value, because where would the goodwill be if the premises were moved 100 yards down the road? If this goes through, the betting control board can say that the licence will be worth so much to the applicant, and we might have the spectacle of bidding going on for the licence, if not outright, then under the lap. I think this provision is wrong.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Members may be getting principles mixed here. The principle of whether there should be trading in unearned increment does not apply. We have decided that there shall be no selling of goodwill, or transfer of goodwill from one person to another. The principle involved in the amendment is: Are we going to approve of the betting control board charging a premium for a licence? In the first place, are we going to approve of the board charging a premium for the initial licence? I think that is a doubtful procedure.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That occurs indirectly by the special tax.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The tax is a different matter. A man could be called upon to pay a premium of £500, and still have to pay the tax. Members should not think that the principle involved here is the question of goodwill as between one person and another. The intention of the amendment is that in the event of a

person vacating his premises and giving up his licence, the betting control board could charge any sum it felt inclined—it might be £5,000—as a premium for going into those premises.

It might so be that the next person would not want to go into the same premises, but assuming he did, are we going to agree to the principle that the betting control board can charge him a premium? The hon. member who moved the amendment suggested it was something that belonged to the public. I would sooner see the same principle apply to the board as that which has already been decided, namely, that there shall be no trafficking in goodwill, or that no premiums shall be paid either between persons or between a person and the board.

Mr. BRADY: Members have been worried over nothing; and if the proposed new subclause means nothing, no one will suffer any harm. I feel the subclause should be agreed to. If the board comes to the conclusion that there is no value, it does not charge anything, and that is why I say that no harm can be done. On the other hand, if it says that the premises were not worth 2s. twelve months ago but because of the betting transactions they are now worth £4,000 or £5,000 to a new man, it should be able to charge that amount.

What are members worrying about? This will depend on the assessment of the board. Let us assume we will have a fair and reasonable board. In regard to the matter of goodwill, no one is suggesting that when a hotel is built, and the sum of £20 or £30 over the capital value is paid for goodwill, the bootmaker and hairdresser next door should be assessed on that goodwill value. In my electorate a man was granted a wine and spirit licence. He paid about £500 for it, but did the doctor next door, or the owner of the draper's shop, have to pay goodwill? Of course not! This Bill does not say that registered premises will have to be in the possession of the owner; it says, in the definition, that registered premises mean a building or parcel of land or part of a building or parcel of land approved by the board to be used for the purpose of betting and registered under the Act as such.

We know that there are many places in the city where betting takes place on vacant land. Does anybody say that that is owned by the bookmaker, or that the person who has the registered premises must own it? Of course not. If members are agreed that any unearned increment in connection with the value of premises should go to the Government, or to the board for the Government, I think they should vote for this amendment, because, if necessary, we can amend it further at a later date.

Amendment put and negatived: Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 12—Bookmakers' liability to pay bookmakers betting tax:

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: It will be necessary to strike out the words "by his agent" in line 15, and I move an amendment—

That the words "by his agent" in line 15, page 11, be struck out.

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

Clause 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Payment of tax by bookmakers on bets made at registered premises:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 2, page 13, be struck out and the word "employee" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: In this clause it will be necessary to move a further amendment to cover the deletion of reference to agents, and I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 10, page 13, be struck out and the word "employee" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 15—Effect on liability for payment of tax where racing authority declares bets off, etc.:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 27, page 14, be struck out and the word "employee" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 16—Omissions of bets from records or returns does not affect liability for tax or penalty:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 43, page 14, be struck out and the word "employee" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Powers of inspection:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 15, page 15, be struck out and the word "employee" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: It is well known that the racing clubs, with a view to ensuring that racing is fair and above

board, make inquiries into the performances of horses and the conduct of their owners, trainers and jockeys. One of the factors taken into consideration in deciding whether a horse has fairly attempted to win a race is whether the owner and his connections have backed the horse. As a result, the clubs inspect the betting sheets immediately after a race to see the trend of the betting on it. In the past, they have not been able to take cognisance of the books of any s.p. bookmaker, because such people have not been recognised by the club, nor was backing a horse s.p. recognised either by the turf or trotting clubs as supporting a horse.

If this measure is passed, it will be lawful to back a horse with an s.p. bookmaker in town. As a result, I think it necessary that the stewards of the racing and trotting clubs should have the information that would be available to them if they could see the betting sheets, where necessary, of any registered bookmaker. In view of that, I move an amendment—

That a new subclause, to stand as Subclause (2), be added as follows:—

Officers of a racing club authorised in writing as the circumstances may require either by the secretary of the West Australian Turf Club or the secretary of the Western Australian Trotting Association to do so, whether generally or for a particular case, may, on producing the written authorisation—

(a) require a bookmaker to produce for inspection anything in his control or possession relating to betting or to answer questions relating to betting, and

(b) in either case make and retain a copy of the whole or part of any of those things.

This is an attempt to make the information available to the officials of the respective clubs with a view to ensuring, as far as possible, that racing is fair and above board.

Mr. LAPHAM: This will give the racing and trotting clubs an all-embracing right because, under the provisions of the amendment, the clubs could ask for duplicate copies of the transactions of every licensed s.p. operator in the State and they would have to be given. Does the member intend that that shall be the case?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Where necessary. But it would not be practicable or necessary to do it in all cases.

Mr. LAPHAM: These cases may drift on, and I do not know whether this complete right should be granted. I realise that the clubs need to get duplicate sheets from bookmakers on the racecourses, and

up to date the clubs have been quite capable of arriving at decisions from the information given to them. So I do not think it is necessary for them to have information in regard to s.p. operations, especially when they are conducted well outside the metropolitan area. In principle, there is quite a deal of merit in the amendment, but it goes a little too far. I would ask the hon. member to have another look at it with a view to making alterations along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. WILD: I think it is necessary for these clubs to send someone to have a look at these sheets. I think the member for Mt. Lawley has made it quite clear that s.p. betting by an owner is not recognised today by racing clubs and if he were to say to the stewards "I have backed my own horse s.p.," he would be in trouble both ways because they would take no cognisance of that. It is a recognised practice on the racecourse today for these sheets to be made available.

If an owner is called upon to show whether he backed his horse and he states that he backed it with bookmakers X, Y, and Z, the owner would have no right to produce corroborative evidence, whereas, on the other hand, the stewards would have power to call for the betting sheets and inspect them. Therefore, the amendment is most necessary. I appreciate what the member for North Perth has said, especially in view of the fact that if 300 bookmakers were registered, 300 sheets would have to be called for; but that would be very unlikely.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I am not altogether opposed to the principle of the amendment but I am not agreeable to the method by which it is proposed to implement it. As a matter of courtesy, this Chamber has decided to allow the W.A. Turf Club and the W.A. Trotting Association the right to have a representative on the board. I think if members had read the outburst by the trotting association prior to that right being granted they might have adopted a different attitude.

After the view expressed by the chairman of the W.A. Trotting Association that he would approach this problem with an unbiased mind, I think he is clearly out to frustrate this legislation as much as he can. He, of course, may be the representative on the board. If the hon. member would recast his amendment by making it read something like, "The board may at its discretion, upon request by the officials of this association, produce whatever evidence is necessary for the purpose of conducting an inquiry", I would be agreeable to that. But I cannot agree to the proposal that the secretaries of these associations should have the right to demand of every registered off-the-course bookmaker the production

of duplicate sheets; and not only that, but "to produce for inspection anything in his control relating to betting or to answer questions relating to betting."

They might request something which would not have any connection with a particular horse-race. It is essential, to keep racing clean, to allow this information to be obtained from off-the-course bookmakers so that it may be made available to these racing clubs. It would be possible for an owner to conduct all his betting off the course and to satisfy the club that the horse was a genuine trier, it might be necessary for this information to be made available. If the hon. member were to recast his amendment along the lines I have suggested, I would have no objection to it.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I will first deal with the proposition raised by the member for North Perth. The amendment does not say that they can demand anything. All it says is that they will have the right to call for anything, to inspect it and take it away. Of course, it would be feasible for a racing club to send someone all round the State to obtain information and it would have to be made available to him, but that is beyond the bounds of possibility.

All the club would have the right to do would be to call on the bookmaker and ask for his records in order to make copies. The Minister is not unreasonable in his attitude towards the amendment, but it is impossible for me to recast it at the moment. In its present form I do not think it is unreasonable. All that the president of the W.A. Trotting Association has said is that he prefers totalisator betting to betting in established s.p. shops. He has made a similar statement not only to the Premier but to the Press.

The Minister for Police: He said a lot more than that in this morning's paper.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I do not think he did. I took his remarks to mean that he thought that it would not be wise to licence bookmakers and he has expressed that opinion for some time. However, the amendment has nothing to do with that aspect. It merely seeks to ensure that the stewards of the racing club are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that racing is conducted in a proper manner. They can take action and place their cases before the proper authority. Is there any harm in the stewards inspecting betting sheets and, if necessary, copying them?

Mr. McCulloch: Who is to give the written authority?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The secretary of the racing club. Someone has to grant the authority and in the past it has been automatic; because after each race the betting sheets have to be supplied for the purpose of computing the betting tax.

The Premier: Would it not be better to leave this to the discretion of the board?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: There is not much objection to that except on the ground of delay. Inquiries have to be made quickly.

The Minister for Police: The records or duplicate sheets are held for three or six months.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I know, but if an owner of a horse is to be dealt with, he should be dealt with quickly.

The Minister for Police: His case could be dealt with on the Monday on a request being made to the board to get information from the s.p. bookmakers.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: That is so.

The Premier: I think we could leave this to the discretion of the board.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: If I put: "at the request of the secretaries and with the permission of the board" I think it would be all right.

The CHAIRMAN: For the convenience of the Clerks, I would suggest that the hon. member should approach another member to move an amendment on the amendment.

Hon. D. BRAND: I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "association" in line 6 of the amendment, the words "and with the consent of the secretary of the board."

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

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

Clause 19—Prohibition of betting with minors, intoxicated persons, etc.;

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 35, page 15, be struck out and the words "employee of a bookmaker" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move this amendment on behalf of the Leader of the Country Party who has had to leave the Chamber. This deals with the prohibition of betting with minors and intoxicated persons. I move—

That the word "knowingly" in lines 35 and 36, page 15, be struck out.

It cannot be proved that a person knowingly bets with a minor. The onus is on the Crown to prove that the licensee knew that the punter was under 21 years of age. Furthermore, if the Minister agrees to insert in paragraph (a) the word "apparently" after the word "person," then the clause

would conform to the provisions of the Licensing Act. Thus, it becomes a question of fact whether a punter is of apparent age or not. If he is not, the bookmaker cannot be blamed.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I trust the Committee will not agree to the amendment. The hon. member should recall the provision in the Licensing Act similar to this clause. I introduced an amendment, which was subsequently inserted in the Act, which made it conform to the verbiage of the clause under discussion. The member for Mt. Lawley was Attorney General at the time and the member for Mt. Marshall, who voted with the Opposition, was responsible for the amendment being effected. The member for Mt. Lawley suggested at that time it would be impossible for a prosecution to be successfully launched if the amendment was accepted, in the same way as he is now suggesting. The fact remains that action has been taken successfully in respect of breaches of the Licensing Act where persons under 21 years of age have been served. It is most unfair that a licensee can be prosecuted for serving or giving attention to a person who, in the opinion of some outside party, under totally different circumstances, is apparently under the age of 21.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That was your amendment. It is "apparent" in the Licensing Act.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: My amendment was in conformity with the wording of this clause. Under the Licensing Act the licensee or barman is responsible for serving persons apparently under 21, notwithstanding the fact that the licensee might be in some other part of his premises when the person was served, or that another person over 21 years of age had purchased the liquor and handed it to the person under 21.

If such a person who had not been sighted by the licensee were to appear before a magistrate, perhaps after he had shaved himself, and looked more youthful, and the magistrate thought he looked under 21 years of age, then the licensee or the barman would be found guilty. Quite a number have been so convicted. I do not know that there has been any increase in under-age drinking. I would suggest the contrary. In any event, this Chamber and Parliament as a whole have agreed that the provision in the Licensing Act was equitable and I hope the Committee will not reverse its opinion on this clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment —

That after the word "person" in line 38, page 15, the word "apparently" be inserted.

The question is whether a person looks over 21 or not. No one can prove that a bookmaker knows a person to be under 21.

The Minister for Police: How is that overcome in the Licensing Act?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: In the Licensing Act the word "apparent" is included.

The Minister for Housing: That was deleted.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I do not think it was. A boy might look to be 30 years of age when, in fact, he was 17. How would a bookmaker know that?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: This is the second attempt by the member for Mt. Lawley, to achieve the same purpose. When this Bill was drafted, the point as to whether the words "apparently" or "knowingly" should be inserted, was discussed. Because the Licensing Act had been altered and the word "apparently" was deleted, we have inserted the word "knowingly." We decided to conform to the Licensing Act. I know in one case in Kalgoolie a conviction was registered against a barman and a licensee for serving a youth of 18, although the word "knowingly" was in the Act. Now that the same word has been included in the clause, how can we justify the inclusion of the word "apparently" as proposed by the amendment?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I would point out that further on in the clause the Minister himself has used the word "apparently."

The Minister for Works: That is a different proposition. A person might be apparently under 21 and yet be 25.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: A person might be apparently intoxicated and yet not be intoxicated.

The Minister for Works: There is a difference because the licensee is serving liquor to a person who has had too much drink.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The clause provides that no bookmaker shall knowingly bet with a person under the age of 21. Consider it in this way: We do not want people under 21 years of age to bet, and if betting with such people does take place, we want to be able to enforce some discipline. How can we do that if the Crown has to prove that the bookmaker knew that the person was under 21?

The Minister for Works: If he was 22, how would you prove that he was apparently under 21?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: If the Minister said that I was apparently under the age of 25, he would not be believed.

The Minister for Works: That is a matter of opinion, not something to be proved. If the youth was over 21, how could you prove that he was apparently under 21?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: If that was the impression conveyed to one's mind—

The Minister for Works: That would not be proof.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: If a boy who looked 17 years of age made a bet and the police intercepted him, the bookmaker could be asked, "Did you know that he was under 21?" If the reply was, "I have not seen him before," that would be the end of the prosecution. How could it be proved that he was under 21? If he appeared to be 17, it would be for the magistrate to say that he was apparently under 21. A boy of 19 might pass for 25, and if a bet were made with him, the magistrate would probably decide that his appearance indicated that he was over 21 and there would be no conviction. The same thing applies to a later provision. If a bookmaker considered that, from a man's appearance, he was intoxicated, there must be no betting with him. Yet a man might appear to be intoxicated and still be cold sober.

The Minister for Housing: Age is factual, but intoxication could be a matter of opinion.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The police do not seem to have much difficulty when dealing with cases of drunken driving. The court would have to decide whether an offender appeared to be 21 or under 21.

Mr. MOIR: I support the amendment which I consider is very necessary. The inclusion of the word "knowingly" does not go far enough.

The Minister for Housing: We have retained the word "knowingly".

Mr. MOIR: I am aware of that, but the inclusion of the word "apparently" would afford a measure of protection.

The Minister for Police: I shall accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move and amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 8, page 16, be struck out and the word "employee" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Paragraph (e) would preclude a bookmaker from advertising his business of betting except as prescribed by or under the Act. This presumes

that bookmakers may do some advertising, but we should not permit them to advertise at all. I move an amendment—

That the words "except as prescribed by or under this Act" in lines 20 and 21, page 16, be struck out.

Mr. LAPHAM: While I am not altogether opposed to the amendment, if we place a total prohibition on advertising, it might be considered to mean the display of the bookmaker's name as a commission agent on his premises. Further, a bookmaker issues cards. Would they be classed as advertising? If so, I must oppose the amendment, because it would mean making a departure from a recognised practice.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 20—Offences by minors:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 21, page 17, be struck out and the words, "the employee of a bookmaker" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 21—agreed to.

Clause 22—Bookmakers must accept only money as consideration for bets:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The clause provides that no bookmaker or agent shall receive or promise to receive for a bet property other than money.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I suggest that the hon. member move to strike out the word "agent" and insert the words "person employed by a bookmaker." This would bind the bookmaker or any person employed by him not to accept anything but money.

The Minister for Housing: Then you could not put your shirt on a horse?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: No.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That the word "agent" in line 17, page 18, be struck out and the words, "person employed by a bookmaker" inserted in lieu.

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

Clauses 23 to 26—agreed to.

Clause 27—Bookmaker liable for offences of agent:

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It seems to me that this provision is contrary to British justice because it asks the person concerned to prove his innocence, instead of having to be proved guilty.

On motions by Hon. A. V. R. Abbott, clause amended by striking out the word "agent" in line 4, page 20, and inserting in lieu the word "employee"; by striking out the word "agent" in line 7 and inserting in lieu the word "employee"; by striking out the word "agent" in line 11 and inserting in lieu the word "employee" and by striking out the word "agent" in line 14 and inserting in lieu the word "employee."

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: If the employee omits to do something, that is no defence for the bookmaker, who must then prove his innocence, and I repeat that we should do something about that.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The principle to which the hon. member refers is not involved here. I am as keen as he is to see that the onus of proof is on the prosecution, but this provision is identical with that in the Licensing Act, inasmuch as the bookmaker is not permitted to leave the premises and say to his employee, in effect, "You can do as you like for a while because if I am away from the premises, I will not be responsible for what takes place."

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I am aware of the provision in several Acts in this regard and fought against it being placed there. We should not allow a man to be declared guilty until he is proved guilty.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think the member for Fremantle should be given an opportunity to understand the position. This provision says a bookmaker shall not dodge responsibility for his employee's actions by saying he had no knowledge of what his employee was going to do or that it was not his intention that the employee should do it. If an employee omits to do something, that is the employer's responsibility always, just as I must take the responsibility if I allow my clerk to act on my behalf and he omits to do something.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 28—agreed to.

Clause 29—Regulations:

Mr. YATES: I move an amendment—

That after subparagraph (i) in line 31, a new subparagraph be added as follows:—

(ii) licensing of bookmakers' employees.

At present the employees of bookmakers on racecourses are licensed and their licences are reviewed by the club. If these employees have to obtain their licences from the betting board, the types of person to receive licences will be restricted. They will be charged a fee and generally the position will be more satisfactory.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by the Minister for Police, clause further amended by striking out the word "agents" in line 19, page 21 and inserting in lieu the word "employees"; by striking out the word "agents" in line 21 and inserting in lieu the words "their employees" and by striking out the word "agents" in line 36 and inserting in lieu the word "employees."

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 30—Regulations under this Act:

As to Continuing Sitting.

The PREMIER: Might we, by some motion, be permitted to continue sitting for a quarter of an hour?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I have never known that to be done.

Mr. May: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the House Controller has made provision for dinner for members at 6.15.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid it cannot be done.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I am afraid you omitted to call me on the last occasion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: However, I shall say what I have to on this clause. I am disappointed that so much of the Bill is to be brought in by regulation. For years we have said that government by regulation is bad. I would like to see the conditions and prices paid by the starting-price shops when they are established. It is all very well to say it will be done by regulation, but it will be 12 months before we will see it; then they will be disallowed and amendments brought down, and it will probably be the following year before anything is done.

If the Committee in its wisdom brings down a schedule like the Tasmanian one, I will not support it. I do not believe in the price system they have there; they have different prices for different places. In one place it might be 10 to 1, in the next 15 to 1 and the next 20 to 1. I do not know how long it will be before I can have a go at the regulation.

Clause put and passed.

New clause:

Mr. CORNELL: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 23:—

(1) Upon proof being given to the satisfaction of any two justices of the peace that any person by excessive betting is likely to impoverish himself to such a degree

as to expose himself or his family to want, such justices may order that no bookmaker shall bet with such person for not exceeding the space of one year.

(2) Any two justices of the peace may in like manner renew such order from time to time as to all such persons as have not in their opinion reformed.

(3) No bookmaker after notice of such prohibition shall bet with the person named therein.

Penalty: Twenty-five pounds.

(4) No person so prohibited as aforesaid shall loiter about or enter any registered premises or racecourse for the purposes of betting.

Penalty: Five pounds.

(5) An order made under this section may be revoked by any two justices of the peace.

(6) All proceedings under Sub-section (1) of this section shall be heard in camera.

It is a very thin House but it would probably be a good deal thinner if I were not in it! The purpose of the amendment has been borrowed from the Licensing Act, and my desire to insert it here is for the same reason, namely, that previous Parliaments saw fit to include a similar provision in the Licensing Act. It serves the same purpose, to ensure that by over-indulgence in betting, no person shall impoverish himself, and particularly his family. I think there is merit in the amendment, and I commend it to the Chamber.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I do not like the proposal very much; it is almost a complete lift from the Licensing Act. It may not do a great deal of harm but it will not do much good in this measure, and it will be very difficult to implement. It is remarkable that members should think that the old wage plug will bet to excess and do it in the off-course betting shops. That is not the history of the unfortunate few who have bet beyond their means and got themselves and their families into trouble.

It is the man above the basic wage who invariably gets himself into difficulties and often into criminal proceedings by excessive betting; it is usually the man in a trusted position—a high-ranking clerk or executive—who has an excess of money, gets the betting fever and uses his employer's money in an endeavour to recoup his losses. He eventually finishes up in the Police Court. There has been no suggestion that a provision of this kind should have been drawn up for the purpose of protecting those who on the racecourses have brought themselves into disrepute and have impoverished their families.

The picture drawn of young people using the off-course betting shops is a false one. I have frequently visited the shops on the Goldfields and found they are generally patronised by middle-aged and elderly people. One would not find a dozen young people there. But if one went to the cricket fields or football fields or tennis courts, there is where one would find them. They are not interested in betting shops except in rare instances. I do not feel disposed to accept the amendment.

Mr. MAY: Would the member for Mt. Marshall explain how when a man or a woman has been declared under Subclause (1) by the two justices of the peace as having bet in a manner likely to impoverish himself and his family and expose them to want, he will be able to pay the penalty under Subclause (4), particularly if he is in such dire straits?

Mr. CORNELL: I am not a clairvoyant and I cannot answer that question. But there are a lot of penalties in Acts under which the person prosecuted is not in a position to pay the penalty. But Parliament does not withdraw the penalty for that reason. I agree with the Minister when he said the provision would not be easy to implement but, by the same good rule, there are sections in other Acts which are difficult of implementation. For instance, one would not say the appropriate section in the Licensing Act which deals with a prohibited person obtaining liquor is easy to implement, but it does have a deterrent effect.

Because a section is difficult to administer does not mean it should not be in the Act. For instance, despite the efforts of the police, a number of drunken drivers get through, but we would not suggest that the relevant sections of the Traffic Act be disregarded because of that. I think the proposal has some merit. It would be more easily implemented in the country than in the metropolitan area. Men could go beyond their financial limits when betting and by so doing, bring about want within the family circle. These provisions are designed to combat that sort of thing. I think the provision is worthy of trial.

Mr. MOIR: I support the amendment. The Bill is designed to control betting and we should do something to control those who bet to excess to the detriment of their families. It is idle to say that there are no such people in the community, because I know there are. During the years that betting has been illegal, they have bet to the detriment of themselves and their families.

It is shocking that anyone should be so obsessed with a mania for betting or gambling as to deprive his wife and children of the necessities of life. I quite agree that there would be a difficulty in policing this provision 100 per cent., but it

would be effective in a great measure, especially in small communities. It would be effective to a large extent in the district I come from, because people there, who brought this punishment upon themselves, would be known.

Hon. D. Brand: There are just as many intemperate gamblers as there are intemperate drinkers.

Mr. MOIR: I would not agree with that. But I do say that there are a few intemperate gamblers in the community just as there are a few persons who are intemperate in other directions. Even if this provision were responsible for controlling only a few people, I think it would be worth while. I do not see how there can be any valid objection to something of this kind being inserted in this measure when a similar provision has been in existence in connection with another Act for many years. To my own knowledge that provision has been a deterrent to people. I whole-heartedly support the amendment.

Mr. LAPHAM: I cannot agree to the amendment as it stands, because it makes provision for justices of the peace to interfere with the freedom of the individual. If the amendment had reference to a stipendiary or a resident magistrate, it would have some merit.

Mr. Heal: What difference is there?

Mr. LAPHAM: The difference is that justices of the peace treat their rights with a certain degree of casualness.

Members: No!

Mr. LAPHAM: Yes, they do. There have been many occasions on which justices of the peace have confined people to asylums when they should not have done so.

Mr. Moir: Has that been proved?

Mr. LAPHAM: Yes.

Mr. Moir: When?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: That can be done only on the recommendation of two medical officers.

Mr. LAPHAM: If for the words "justices of the peace," the word "stipendiary or resident magistrate" were substituted, so that men of learning who understood the law and had respect for the freedom of the individual would have the responsibility under this provision, there would be something in the amendment. There would still be difficulties associated with it, because, while an individual might not be able to bet himself, there would be nothing to stop him from getting someone else to do it for him. Nevertheless, the provision would have the effect of controlling, to some extent, the person who wanted to indulge in excessive betting.

Hon. D. BRAND: I hope the mover of the amendment will not agree to the suggested alteration, and I whole-heartedly support the amendment as it stands. I agree with the member for Boulder that, even if it has reference to only a few people, it will be worth while. We all know of people who become absolutely obsessed with the gambling craze, and such a provision as this would be in their interests, because they would be prevented from entering betting shops.

The Minister for Police: Would this apply to on-the-course as well as off-the-course betting?

Hon. D. BRAND: I think it would apply to racecourses. I would be all for it. I see no reason why the principle should not apply to on-the-course betting. I am in favour of this having application to both on-the-course and off-the-course betting, and will stand firmly by that principle. But even if it were not legally possible to have provision apply to betting on the course, at least something will have been achieved if it is applied to betting off the course. I commend the hon. member for submitting the amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH: I agree with the idea behind the amendment, but I do not see how the provision could be policed. It would mean that every bookmaker in the State would have to be advised when people had been put on the prohibited list.

Hon. D. Brand: Would that not apply to people on the prohibited list under the Licensing Act?

The Minister for Lands: Could a bookmaker be expected to know everybody whose name had been put on the prohibited list?

Mr. McCULLOCH: I do not think this provision could be operated successfully, even at Kalgoorlie. Bookmakers there sometimes have from six to eight employees and those employees do not know everyone who frequents the shop. If an employee accepted a bet from a prohibited person he would be liable to a fine of £25. The provision could not be policed, and it is not a fair one, though I like the idea of attempting to stop anyone from betting beyond a reasonable limit.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I have very much pleasure in supporting the amendment, and I hope the Government will see its way clear to agree to it.

The Premier: There is no serious objection.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Thank God for something good!

The Minister for Police: Do not be blasphemous!

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: When I first entered Parliament, in 1936, during the Noah period—

The Minister for Police: When you were a little girl!

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: There were little girls concerned in the matter of which I am speaking. In those days we were suffering from the effects of a great depression, and there were many families which had an income of only 28s. per week. That had to suffice for a man, his wife, and two children. Sometimes the man would take the 28s. and go to the betting places. Many times I have had to keep the families of such men over the week-end because all the money had been squandered in that way.

On one occasion a man was put in gaol and I went to see his wife. She begged me not to do anything, because she received more money from the Government for herself and her children when her husband was in gaol than when he was free. She begged me to do nothing, although she was very fond of the man. This provision will not do wonders, but it will give some air of respectability to a Bill which I think is detestable.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Some members have objected to the amendment because they say it would be hard to police. It is contended that every bookmaker would have to be circularised regarding prohibited persons. It is not the custom under the Licensing Act for every publican to be notified of everyone who has been put on the prohibited list. But in the case of country towns each publican within the police district concerned is notified. We must face the fact that this provision would be most difficult to police properly, just as is the comparable provision in the Licensing Act. It would not prevent a prohibited person from betting altogether, because he would not be known everywhere; but it would reduce the likelihood of his continuing to bet excessively.

People, like animals, are creatures of habit, and like to frequent haunts to which they are accustomed. That has been the experience under the Licensing Act. If a person has been in the habit of drinking in a certain hotel, is put on the prohibited list and thereafter refused a drink in that hotel, he knows that it is useless trying other hotels in the same district, because he would be known to the police and the publicans. And human nature being what it is, that person does not seem to have any desire to go further afield, because if he went where he was not known he would feel lonely, and like a fish out of water. No one can deny that human beings are creatures of habit.

Under the Licensing Act the people who ask for a person to be put on the prohibited list are usually the spouse or the

police if they think the man is a nuisance and his family is suffering. The person himself can also make application to be put on the list. If the home is suffering, the wife will seek to have the husband prevented from following his normal Saturday afternoon pursuit of going to the registered premises and betting with the housekeeping money. Many women can get the gambling mania too, and they could leave the home short of money. In that instance, the husband could take appropriate action. I hope there will not be many cases in which action would be necessary, but it is advisable to have a provision such as this in the measure.

THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING: As has been emphasised, there is a similar provision to this in the Licensing Act, and by and large it operates satisfactorily. The bookmaker who takes only a secondary part in the commission of the offence, is to be liable to a fine of £25, whereas the person who deliberately goes to the betting shop and is responsible for getting the bookmaker into trouble, as well as contravening the order of the justices, is liable to be fined only £5. That is out of all proportion.

THE PREMIER: I think the word "knowingly" should be inserted.

THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I agree that that would make this read in a practical way, but I understand that under the Licensing Act, when a prohibition is placed on a person and he is seen to frequent licensed premises, the police constable explains the position to the licensee, and if he, the licensee, continues to serve the prohibited person, he is charged. I would like to increase the amount of the penalty from £5 to £25. I do not think that is excessive because it is the amount that applies to the bookmaker, who is not as culpable as the person who is on the prohibited list; and also the figure I suggest would be the maximum.

HON. DAME FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: If he cannot pay, what happens? Is he put in gaol?

THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Where the law is silent in respect to the alternative to the payment of a monetary penalty, I understand there is some automatic process by which a period is spent inside. I move an amendment—

That after the word "penalty" in Subclause (4) the word "twenty" be inserted.

MR. LAWRENCE: Is it possible now to discuss proposed Clause 23?

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually there is a clear cut amendment before the Committee. The hon. member can give reasons

for or against the penalty that is proposed, rather than discuss the whole clause, although members generally get away with discussing the whole clause. I think, however, the hon. member should confine himself to the amendment. He will have an opportunity to discuss the clause when the amendment is disposed of.

MR. HUTCHINSON: The feelings that have motivated the Minister in moving his amendment are fairly apparent, and, to a certain extent, soundly based. But I am afraid I cannot agree to make the punter liable for this amount although the proposition does, on the face of it, appear to be fair. We have to understand the person who will be put on the prohibited list. He will be the type of man who suffers from a disease and cannot help himself. He should be assisted wherever possible. He will find it extremely difficult to meet this penalty.

THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING: The usual penalty imposed is one-fifth of what is prescribed which, in accordance with the proposed clause, is £1. Would that be a deterrent to a man who bets in excess?

MR. HUTCHINSON: I have pointed out that this type of person should be protected; he suffers from a disease.

HON. L. THORN: This £25 is the medicine to cure the disease.

MR. HUTCHINSON: It will not cure this type of person. I cannot understand penalising a person in this amount of money if he cannot pay it.

MR. NALDER: It is the maximum amount.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Yes, but we have to consider the penalty involved. We should try to avoid putting temptation in this person's way. It is no good trying to hammer money out of him if he has not got it. The magistrate will be faced with the position of having to send him to gaol; and no one here wants that. It would be better for the penalty to remain as it is.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: This seems to be out of proportion. According to the proposed subclause, he shall not loiter about registered premises.

HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY: That is in the Licensing Act.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I know. He might be there without any intention of betting. He might have some friends there. I do not agree with my colleague on this. The penalty is too severe.

MR. MOIR: I feel that the penalty is too severe. The prohibition is imposed because the man has wasted money to the

detriment of his family; and a fine of £25 would be even more detrimental to the family. The penalty is out of all proportion and it will react not so much on the man as on his family, because they will be deprived of this sum of money or of the man's presence if he elects to go to prison rather than pay the fine. For that reason I can understand the motives of the Minister who moved the amendment and no doubt the logic is there. But for the reasons I have outlined, I cannot support it.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I find that the hon. member has taken this new clause almost word for word from Section 160 of the Licensing Act, and a penalty of £5 is provided there. I agree with the member for Boulder that that penalty should be adopted. After long experience of excessive drinking, that penalty has remained the law of the land, and as far as I know no attempt has been made to alter it.

Mr. NALDER: I support the suggestion of the Minister for Housing. If it is adopted and a man is brought before a magistrate because of excessive gambling he will be fined probably only a few pounds and not the maximum of £25. But the power will be there, in the case of a second or a third offence, for a magistrate to impose a greater sum.

The Minister for Police: If he has lost all his money through betting, how could he get £25 to pay the fine? You would put him in gaol?

Mr. NALDER: That is the maximum.

Mr. Lawrence: Or it could be the fine imposed.

Mr. NALDER: I do not think it would be for a first offence.

Mr. Lawrence: But you would not be the magistrate.

Mr. NALDER: No, but I think the power should be there to impose a larger fine for a second or third offence.

Amendment put and negatived.

New clause put and passed.

New clause.

Mr. CORNELL: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 24:—

Whenever any justices of the peace have in the execution of the foregoing powers prohibited any person from betting no person having knowledge of such prohibition shall assist such prohibited person in laying, procuring or obtaining a bet with any bookmaker.

Penalty: Five pounds.

This is complementary to the new clause which has just been inserted and makes it an offence for any person who knows that another is on the prohibited list, to aid or abet him in the procurement of a bet. Speakers who discussed the previous new clause said how difficult it would be to implement and I agree with them. But if members look at the Bill they will find there a clause which prohibits a person under the age of 21 years from betting with a bookmaker. By the same good rule a person under the age of 21 could, by means of another person, have his bet. That clause would be just as difficult to implement as this will be. I hope members will agree to it.

New clause put and passed.

New clause.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 31:—

The provisions of this Act shall continue in operation until the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and fifty-seven, and no longer.

This will give effect to the indication of the Premier last evening that the Government would be prepared to add an additional clause of this kind. During the debate those in opposition to the Bill have, on a number of occasions, made some doleful predictions as to what will occur if off-the-course betting is legalised in this State. They have also said that once the principle became established and betting became legalised, it would be difficult to get rid of it.

As there may be a Government in office in three years time which would not feel inclined to repeal the legislation, if these doleful predictions eventuate, the Government has proposed this new clause and the legislation will automatically lapse unless it is re-enacted. For my part I believe that there will be an improvement in the deplorable conditions that now obtain with off-the-course betting. However, many others have expressed contrary views and for that reason the Government has decided to add this new clause.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: This indicates that the Government, after some thought, is doubtful as to whether the legislation will be successful.

The Minister for Housing: You have been reading tonight's paper.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No. The Government is trying to extricate itself from a difficult position.

The Minister for Police: I thought your mind would run along those lines.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think the period stipulated is too long if the legalisation of s.p. betting shops is to prove detrimental to the country, as many people believe, its effects will be shown and felt long before the end of December, 1957.

Mr. Lawrence: How do you know that?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Three years is a very long time.

The Minister for Housing: You did not say that about Air Beef.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The hon. member is completely off the track.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the Leader of the Opposition will not be drawn aside by that interjection.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No, I do not intend to be. In reply to the member for South Fremantle who asked, "How do you know that?" I would say that within a lesser period we would be able to get an indication of whether legalised betting shops were desirable or not.

Mr. Lawrence: You have still not answered my question.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It will not take three years, or anything like it.

Mr. Lawrence: Tell us why.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The hon. member has been told why all through the debate.

The Minister for Justice: Why not give it a fair test of three years?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That would be more than a fair test. Three years is a very long time.

The Minister for Justice: No, a very short time.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We would know in 12 months.

The Minister for Justice: No.

Several members interjected:

The CHAIRMAN Order! Only one member at a time, please.

Hon. D. Brand: Interjections are disorderly.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think the Minister should agree to a much lesser period and I intend to move that the words "nineteen hundred and fifty-seven" be struck out and the words "nineteen hundred and fifty-five" inserted in lieu.

The Minister for Mines: Do not be so silly!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is nothing silly about it. The Minister favours the licensing of s.p. betting shops. The amendment will give the Government enough time to find out if the legislation is a success.

The Minister for Mines: Three years is not a long period.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: A great deal of damage could be done within that time. It has been suggested to me that the legislation should remain in force until 1956. If the Minister will agree to that, I would be prepared to compromise to that extent. Therefore, I move an amendment—

That after the word "fifty" in line 3, the word "seven" be struck out, and the word "six" inserted in lieu.

Mr. HEAL: No such amendment should be agreed to. If, as members opposite consider, this legislation has encouraged a social evil, after six or 12 months, if the Government thinks fit, it can be repealed. I think they can rest assured that, if the Bill produces a social evil to the extent that members opposite have suggested, the members on this side of the Chamber will be big enough to agree to the repeal of the legislation. However, suppose the Bill is a success and restricts s.p. operations, we would be forced to go through all the procedure once more in order to re-enact it.

Hon. L. Thorn: That is the job of Parliament.

Mr. HEAL: I know it is, but why make its task more difficult? If the Bill, when passed, is not a success, it can be repealed; but if it is successful, it can operate for the full three years.

Hon. D. BRAND: I do not think that three years would be required to ascertain whether s.p. betting would become a matter of vested interests and therefore I agree to the amendment. After the 31st December, 1956, Parliament could very easily pass an amending Bill to extend the period if the legislation proves successful.

Members will recall that on one occasion, when I was Minister for Works, I endeavoured to obtain the approval of Parliament for a lease of portion of Parliament House grounds and the present Minister for Works put forward the claim that Parliament should have the right of review. At the end of two years, Parliament will be given another opportunity to review this legislation.

So much controversy has raged over this social problem—as well it is—that Parliament could well afford to review it annually, and therefore the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition is to be commended. I am pleased to note that the member for West Perth is maintaining his stand on this Bill. After launching the Bill as a permanent measure, it would appear that the Government has now decided that it might not be the right thing and has submitted this new clause to provide that it shall operate only over a trial period. So there is already some uncertainty.

Mr. Lawrence: Rubbish!

Hon. D. BRAND: That is the way the hon. member talks on the wharf.

The Minister for Police: Did you inspire Mr. Limb, or did he inspire you?

Mr. Lawrence: You would not be allowed to speak to the men down there. That is what they think of you.

Hon. D. BRAND: That would be the democratic attitude adopted by the wharfies! After reading speeches that you made in the past, I think you would agree, Mr. Chairman, that two years would be quite long enough to give this Bill a trial when we could then review the position.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am surprised at the contribution to the debate made by the Leader of the Opposition tonight—

Hon. D. Brand: Rubbish!

Mr. LAWRENCE: Is the hon. member talking about himself?

Hon. L. Thorn: What surprises you?

Mr. LAWRENCE: —when I consider the Leader of the Opposition and his confreres have opposed this Bill strongly on principle.

Hon. D. Brand: And we are still going to oppose it, too.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member should be quiet. He is only a little boy.

Hon. D. Brand: Listen to the big boy!

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member should stop his bleating.

Hon. L. Thorn: You are not bleating; you are dribbling.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member should address the Chair.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am attempting to do so, Sir, if I can get silence from these imbeciles. The point I was trying to make is that the Leader of the Opposition, in the first instance, said that he opposed the Bill on principle. Tonight he suggests an amendment to give the Bill a trial for only one year and then in the next breath says he is prepared to let it continue for two years.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: If I cannot get what I desire, I have to get what I can.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LAWRENCE: It is quite apparent that we could not agree to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Three years is a fair period of trial, having regard to the fact that if, after 12 months, we consider that the position is getting out of hand, we can repeal the legislation.

Hon. D. Brand: You will not repeal it!

Mr. LAWRENCE: Surely the Government of the day is to be trusted, just as the previous Government could not be trusted! I hope the Press will publish that.

Mr. Oldfield: Do you want headlines?

Mr. LAWRENCE: The amendment is not worthy of the slightest consideration because the Government would repeal this legislation if it were considered necessary. I did have some respect for the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition but when, to-night, he said initially that he was in favour of the legislation for one year, and then immediately moved an amendment for the Bill to operate for two years, I lost my faith in him.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Not only do I oppose the amendment, but also the new clause. No business man is prepared to spend £2,000 to erect a building to carry on this business if there is a likelihood of his going out of business in 1955. When a person builds a hotel it is not stipulated that the business may have to cease in two or three years' time. In this clause it is stated that there is a possibility of repeal of the Act in 1957. We desire to see these betting premises constructed properly. If this Bill becomes law, and the Government sees that the legislation is not working properly, it could direct the shops to close down, but that would be through the fault of the owners in not conducting their premises properly.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am interested in the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition because it displays his usual acumen. He suggests that this legislation be reviewed in some period less than three years. It must be remembered that the members of the board are appointed for three years and it is illogical to suggest that any major review should take place before that time. Furthermore, three years is not too long to try out this sort of legislation. I agree with the proposal of the Minister for Police because, although I am convinced that the principles contained in the legislation are desirable, I do not pretend to believe that every word, letter or dot, will be 100 per cent. practicable. I can remember no legislation which did not require some tidying up. If it is found that something, which is done by regulation should be included in the Act itself, then in three years' time it would be appropriate to do that. The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition comes forward purely for political advantage. It is an attempt to curry favour and to look for the headlines, which he promised to the member for South Fremantle.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: This is the sort of thing I would expect to emanate from your mind.

Mr. JOHNSON: It always interests me to see the sun affecting the countenance of the Leader of the Opposition during

my speeches, and the sunburn shows. The proposal of the Minister is sound. To say that the people responsible for putting forward this legislation are doubtful of it, is a misinterpretation of an acknowledgment that practically all legislation is not 100 per cent. perfect. We are practical people and we know there are bound to be some loopholes. As long as there are lawyers looking for loopholes, they will be able to find them. Therefore, it is necessary to review the legislation. If by some mischance the Liberal Government is returned at the next elections, it will have to take the responsibility, and not dodge it like it did the last time, of trying to improve it. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN: The Bill was introduced on a non-party basis. I consider it very fair and some consideration and credit should be given to the Minister in charge of it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like members to direct their attention to the amendment, and not to the merits of the Bill. The amendment proposes to strike out the word "seven" with a view to inserting the word "six". Members can support the amendment or otherwise.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I accept the ruling. After four days of debate and hearing all the arguments for and against this legislation, it would be fitting to give it a trial until 1957. I oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	21
Majority against	7

Ayes.

Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Owen
Mr. Court	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Wild
Mr. Manning	Mr. Yates
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Hutchinson

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Granham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Heal	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Styants
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. May
Mr. McCulloch	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

New clause put and passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

BILLS (4)—RETURNED.

- 1, Milk Act Amendment.
- 2, Vermin Act Amendment.
With amendments.
- 3, Stock Diseases Act Amendment.
- 4, Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment.
Without amendment.

House adjourned at 8.57 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 23rd November, 1954.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Assent to Bills	3072
Question: Milk, as to tabling papers on solids-not-fat research	3073
Leave of absence	3073
Standing Orders Committee, consideration of report	3089
Bills: Native Administration Act Amendment, 2r.	3073
Forests Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	3074
Dentists Act Amendment, report	3075
Mines Regulation Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	3075
Com.	3077
Point of order	3079
Report	3080
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	3080
Betting Control, 1r.	3081
Limitation Act Amendment, Com.	3081
Bush Fires, Assembly's message	3082
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), report	3089
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, recom.	3092
Native Welfare, Com.	3093

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Health Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 2, Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 2).
- 3, Physiotherapists Act Amendment.