

again later when merchants were endeavouring to obtain exclusive rights for the sale of sandalwood. A considerable royalty was offered, and members of Parliament were deluged with circulars pointing out the advantages that would accrue if certain firms succeeded in obtaining the sole right to the sandalwood export. Those in authority at the time acted wisely when they decided that control should be exercised, for without it we should be cutting out a very valuable product. At that time the wily Chinese were obtaining considerable advantage from the competition that was carried on amongst the merchants in Western Australia. It is only wise that members should be given a chance to discuss this subject each year. It will be remembered that 10 per cent. of the value of the sandalwood cut, or £5,000, whichever is the greater, is credited each year to a special account at the Treasury. I should like to see some efforts made to continue the experiment of growing sandalwood on the goldfields. I saw in the newspaper recently that it had been successfully grown in the South-West, but that from the oil-extraction point of view it was not as valuable as sandalwood from the goldfields areas. If we were to re-establish the planting of sandalwood in those areas, we should be creating a valuable asset for future generations. I hope that, amongst our other timbers such as jarrah and mallet, sandalwood will not be overlooked. I will support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Elliott, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 12th November, 1936.

	PAGE
Questions: Federal aid, distressed farmers ...	1765
Unemployment, sustenance workers ...	1765
Bills: Financial Emergency Tax (No. 2), 3a. ...	1766
Fair Rents, 3a. ...	1766
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, report ...	1766
Child Welfare Act Amendment, returned ...	1779
Betting Control, 2a., referred to Select Committee ...	1779
Bunbury (Old Cemetery) Lands Re-vestment, 2a., Com. report ...	1801
City of Perth Endowment Lands Act Amendment, 2a., Com. report ...	1802
Vernin Act Amendment, 2a., Com. report ...	1803
Motion: Water Supplies, Great Southern Districts, to inquire by Select Committee ...	1766

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

QUESTION—FEDERAL AID, DISTRESSED FARMERS.

Mr. LAMBERT asked the Premier:—1, Is it a fact, as reported, that a loan of £1,000,000 has been granted to the Government for the amelioration of distressed farmers? 2, If so, when will the amount be made available? 3, What policy has been framed for its distribution, and by whom?

The PREMIER replied: The position will not be clear until a full report of the recent Loan Council meeting is available.

QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT, SUSTENANCE WORKERS.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Employment:—1, Is he convinced that payment of money in lieu of work is having a bad effect on many men who are temporarily in need? 2, Is it a fact that sustenance workers on completion of working periods are being stood down until after the Christmas holidays, and that in the meantime they are provided with rations and are not called upon to work? 3, Having in view the bad effect which this will have and the great importance of maintaining the habit of working, will he give consideration to subsidising approved farmers who are agreeable to giving sustenance workers a start; alternatively will he, to ensure the spirit of self-reliance, arrange for work to be provided by local authorities?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied:—1, Yes, in certain cases. 2, No. 3, It is not intended to provide subsidies as suggested. The Government frequently co-

operates with local authorities for the purpose of having necessary works carried out.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX (No. 2).

Third Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.33]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [4.34]: I desire to raise one point in particular on this Bill. Attached to the measure—there are schedules dealing with 4d. rates, 6d. rates and other rates of taxation. During the debate last night proposals were made to alter some of these rates, but no information was forthcoming from the Government as to the value that each rate would represent to the finances of the State. If it were possible for the Government to issue a statement showing the block figures represented by the amounts that these particular rates would bring in to the Treasury, it would be a great convenience to members who might desire to move to amend the rates. For any member to suggest substituting 4d. for 3d. or 3d. for 2d. is simply shooting in the dark, unless we have some knowledge as to the block figures representing the money that will come to the Treasury in connection with each different rate. I urge upon the Government that they should, in future, furnish a statement of this kind for the information and guidance of members.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FAIR RENTS.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

MOTION—WATER SUPPLIES, GREAT SOUTHERN DISTRICTS.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Debate resumed from the 21st October on the following motion by Mr. Watts (Kataning):—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into—

1, Existing water supplies in the districts on and adjacent to the Great Southern railways,

having particular regard to—(a) the towns in such districts on whose behalf applications have been made; and (b) the requirements of the farming areas.

2, What action (if any) should be taken for improvement of existing water supplies in places where they are inadequate and the provision of public water supplies where none is available, including practicable sources and cost of supplies.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [4.36]: The position in which we find ourselves to-day is that after a succession of good seasons with bountiful rainfalls, for the last two years we have experienced a drought. The schemes devised to furnish water supplies for the towns along the Great Southern are recognised as being generally inadequate, in that the storages provided are insufficient to bridge over the lean years. That is recognised as appertaining to the existing facilities in those towns. This means that where—as the supplies have been adequate in good years, now that the test is applied, we have discovered that they are inadequate. When these facilities were designed, they were considered to be reasonably adequate for the requirements of the towns concerned. We have now entered upon another phase of the position, particularly in respect to the Great Southern, as this applies to the current year and, to a certain extent, to last year. The Government are fully seized of the position. We have not allowed the grass to grow under our feet in an endeavour to find a remedy. The towns in the Great Southern, with the exception of Wagin, have been in a bad way this year, and were in a bad way last year, but I think members will realise that even more severe conditions obtain in other parts of the wheat belt, and that any consideration that is given to this subject must have regard for districts other than the Great Southern. There are two reasons why the appointment of the select committee is inadvisable at this stage. One reason is that such an inquiry would be sectional, and would not embrace other districts that are in distress, and some are in the greatest of distress. That will be realised by all members. Every day I am receiving applications from various districts in the wheat belt that are badly off for water. Although this motion refers to town supplies, I would point out that the Government are being continually importuned with respect to water supplies other than town supplies, for which we have to accept some responsibility. I do not

know that I can say much in amplification of this question, but the exclusiveness of the proposal carries its own condemnation, in that it is merely designed to have a sectional inquiry, namely, into town supplies along the Great Southern.

Mr. Doney: When we have approached you by deputation, we have always joined the farming districts to our own in the matter of water requirements.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That may be true, but I have to take this motion as it reads. It applies to towns along the Great Southern railway. The whole question of water supplies as it affects different parts of the State is so involved that it must be considered in a comprehensive manner, otherwise a decision with respect to one district might be to the prejudice of another. Mundaring has been mentioned as a potential source of supply for the Great Southern districts. It is true that the overflow at Mundaring might be used for the purpose, but it must not be forgotten that there have been years when the Mundaring reservoir has not overflowed. Neglect to consider this fact, in supplying Katanning and other Great Southern districts, would lead to such conditions as we are experiencing to-day, and probably worse. Who is to say, without an authoritative investigation, that Mundaring is the physical and economical source of supply for these districts? According to the Director of Works and hydraulic engineers, departmental thought on this matter is rather to the contrary. It is considered that such a source of supply should be reserved for districts north of the goldfields water supply main. That is the opinion in departmental circles, though I do not say that it may not be subject to revision later on. It is generally known from the publicity which was gained in the Press some months ago, that a departmental committee of experts was appointed to investigate the subject of rural water supplies. That committee is still functioning. Furthermore, the Directors of Works has submitted a report setting out that in his opinion a comprehensive survey of the whole position is necessary so that the State's resources in the matter of water supplies may be economically utilised. That recommendation is at present receiving the active consideration of the Government. It must not be thought that the Government, or any previous Government, have been callous or indifferent to the need for water supplies in

the Great Southern districts. As far back as 1929 the subject was being actively considered. In that year the then Government Geologist, Mr. T. Blatchford, investigated the possibilities of securing artesian supplies. I admit that this report has not disclosed any ray of hope. Our hydraulic engineers are not geologists, and it is not for them to set about discovering water. The Government Geologist was, therefore, called in. Although the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) has read this report, and probably derived very little comfort from it, it is just as well I should show that we have endeavoured to remedy the situation in the way I have mentioned. Naturally we were perturbed at the position, and resorted to every means to discover adequate local water supplies for domestic consumption. I do not know that it is necessary to read the whole report dealing with the geological aspects, but Mr. Blatchford's conclusion was very definite. He stated:—

In conclusion, there seems to be no possible chance of obtaining underground water supplies in sufficient quantities suitable for town supplies at Katanning.

He pointed out as well that supplies could be obtained at shallow depths, but that there was always a possibility of that water being salt. In those circumstances, we cannot gain much comfort from the report of the former Government Geologist, who was asked to deal with the possibility of obtaining water supplies in that particular district. Close consideration has been given to the possible improvement of the Narrogin supplies. The Pingelly scheme has been exhaustively considered, and, we have to admit, without any feasible solution being discovered. The water supply problem there is one that has been given up by all the experts. I am not sure that the local people, anxious as they are about the position, can suggest a feasible scheme for that township.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then why do you impose a water rate there?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are not discussing rates, but the provision of water supplies.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are not providing them with water, and yet you charge them water rates.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If, and when, Pingelly gets a decent water supply, I do not think the people will argue about the rates.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, but you are charging them rates now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Pingley people are very independent, and I do not think they would like the rest of the State to pay for their local water supply.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The trouble is that they have not got any water there.

Mr. Patrick: And don't you forget that you charge 3s. for salt water at Geraldton.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am afraid that is not an isolated instance. What is required is a comprehensive scheme that will take in the towns that are now inadequately provided with water, and also the rural areas adjacent to the pipe line. That is what has to be considered. In the light of what I have already said, that problem cannot advantageously be resolved by the appointment of the suggested select committee. If I thought that were possible, I would offer no objection to the motion. On the other hand, I think the appointment of such a select committee might have the reverse effect, and hamper departmental investigations.

Mr. Doney: Why?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will explain that later on. As I indicated previously, a sectional investigation, such as would follow the appointment of a select committee in pursuance of the motion under consideration, might result in decisions and recommendations that might prove prejudicial to possible supplies in other parts of the State. If we are to have an investigation, let it be a comprehensive one. If the Great Southern district is entitled to a select committee to consider the water supply problem in that part of the State, only in respect of town supplies—

Hon. C. G. Latham: And other parts.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the inquiry is to be restricted to town supplies, or even district supplies, in the Great Southern, it must be remembered that there are many other districts where the need for a thorough investigation of the problem is also urgent. Therefore it seems to me we shall have to tackle this problem from the point of view of those districts where such an investigation is most urgently required.

Mr. Doney: It is for the member for the district to advance the requirements of his constituents.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) acted

quite rightly from the point of view of his district in calling attention to the problem, but that does not imply that his suggestion would provide a solution of the difficulty? What would the select committee do? Where would they secure their evidence? What expert advice could the select committee obtain apart from departmental channels? Firstly, I do not know of any competent practising hydraulic engineers apart from the departmental officials. I find that the local authorities at Quairading, Northam, Merredin and Kalgoorlie have had to borrow the services of the departmental hydraulic engineers. If there were an outside hydraulic engineer available, I can assure the House we would not be disposed to make the services of our engineers available. Therefore it seems to me that expert advice to be gained by the proposed select committee would have to come from the departmental engineers with regard to country and town water supplies, and the technical advice of our officers would certainly have to be secured. Not only should any scheme advanced be proposed authoritatively, but the recommendations should be made by someone of whom we could take notice. The Government are giving active consideration to the question of a departmental inquiry. A suggestion has been advanced that a pipe line could be taken from Mundaring to Katanning. I think Narrogin is 160 miles from Mundaring, and Katanning is a further 60 miles away.

Mr. Doney: It is a hundred miles from Spencer's Brook.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member can do the sum in his own way if he likes.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is the worst of figures; you can make them prove anything.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I made inquiries regarding this point, and the departmental estimate is that Narrogin is 160 miles from Mundaring whereas the distance from the Wellington Weir to Narrogin is 80 miles, and from Narrogin to Katanning a further 60 miles. It must be remembered, when consideration is given this problem, that expert advice is required. There are two standpoints from which this entirely a matter for engineers. Then there is the question of finance. There is the capitalisation of the scheme. An estimate would have to be taken out. The possibility of financing the scheme from the collection of rates derived from those

residing along the pipe line, from the farming areas and from the townships to be served would have to be reviewed. There are two standpoints from which this problem may be considered by the experts. One is that a large pipe line, 16 inches in diameter, might be constructed from Wellington Weir to Narrogin, and the cost of that would be about £3,500 per mile. When we get down to tintsacks, it becomes a matter of finance. It will be seen that the cost of a pipe line from Wellington Weir to Narrogin would run into something in the vicinity of £250,000. It may be that a smaller pipe line would serve the purpose, if a series of adequate reservoirs were established in the country areas. It would mean that those reservoirs would be filled and would represent reserves that could be utilised when heavy draws occurred. Recently we constructed a pipe line from Coolgardie to Norseman, and that line commenced with 11-inch pipes and finished at Norseman with 9-inch pipes. That line is capable of delivering between 150,000 and 180,000 gallons per day. A pipe line of that description for the whole scheme would run into upwards of £180,000, to cover a distance of little over 110 miles, and having the capacity I have indicated. Provided we had an adequate reservoir on a high site at, for instance, Narrogin, a pipe line of less capacity might serve the purpose of providing Katanning with suitable water supplies. Until a survey is made and a thorough investigation carried out, it cannot definitely be said whether water would gravitate from Narrogin to Katanning, but I am informed that the smaller pipe line would probably prove suitable. Already Wagin, which is 30 miles further from Narrogin, is well served, and if we are to take water that far, we shall probably be asked to take it still further. There are districts outside Katanning that require attention. For instance, I understand that the Tambellup district is in difficulties, although the people there generally suffer more from floods than from droughts. During the last two years, we have had to face the problem of inadequate water supplies, although, so far as I can gather, such a position has not arisen in the past. I have already indicated that any inquiry undertaken must deal not only with the engineering problems but with the financial phases as well. I presume the member for Williams-Narrogin

(Mr. Doney) will agree that a suitable site could be found at that centre for a central reservoir.

Mr. Doney: The only difficulty might be the porosity of the catchment area.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But the reservoir itself would be filled, so that would not present any difficulty. Then we would require an investigation regarding the estimated revenue to be secured. I do not know that the member for Katanning would treat that part of the inquiry very seriously. All he wants is the water. I will give the House some information regarding the position of country water supplies during the past nine years. It is just as well for members to appreciate how difficult it is to finance such schemes in the country districts. Country water supplies, including agricultural extensions and goldfields water supplies, cost the State in 1927-28 £188,000; in 1928-29, £253,000 and in 1929-30, £53,000. I think that must have been during the regime of a Labour Government, for it does not appear that we neglected this activity.

Mr. Seward: When you say it cost that much, what does the expenditure cover?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In 1930-31, an anti-Labour Government spent £7,000 on country water supplies. In 1931-32, those supplies cost the State £8,000 and in 1932-33, £15,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do not forget that we were cleaning up your mess then.

Mr. Raphael: And you created a pretty decent mess yourself.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In 1933-34 we spent £29,753, in 1934-35 we spent £30,170, and in 1935-36 we spent £40,626. The total spent in nine years was £627,629. No State Government can spend any money except by the grace of the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And they gave you assistance.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The money having been made available during our term of office, this was what was spent.

Mr. Seward: But what was that expended on?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On country water supplies, including agricultural extensions from the goldfields water supply main.

Mr. Watts: There was nothing done down the Great Southern.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member must be sympathetic with towns that are even worse served than his own. I remind the hon. member that when these schemes were unofficially put forward the agriculturists in those districts rushed in with motions at public meetings stating that they were not prepared to be rated, although they wanted the water. I remind him, too, that under the Act controlling the installation of country water supplies, before we could rate those people they would have to agree by a majority to be rated. Unless their consent can be obtained it will mean that in order to serve Narrogin, Katanning and Pingelly, and some other towns on the Great Southern, we would have to put in a scheme that, I suggest, might be inquired into, without any prospect of levying a rate on all those farming districts. Now that is not done anywhere else. In South Australia, where these schemes are prevalent and popular, those benefiting from such schemes are all rated. Even then those schemes only just about pay working expenses, but provide nothing whatever for capital cost. So there is the utmost difficulty in getting such schemes to pay, even when you levy a rate of 6d. per acre, which means that a farm of a thousand acres pays £25 per year.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do not forget the holding fee that you charge as well.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, that is what has to be charged to them; but there is a distinct difference between what we charge and what we can successfully collect.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Under present conditions, of course.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I remind the Leader of the Opposition that he is partly responsible for what I am now going to divulge, namely, that on the 30th June, 1936, there was outstanding in rates on water supplies in agricultural areas no less a sum than £167,052.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Surely you do not blame me for low prices and bad seasons?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I say the hon. member was partly responsible for the fact that those rates were not collected.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I could not collect them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We find that in connection with all these schemes some at least of the people are encouraged to adopt the view that the Government should not be paid. After the water has been used the Rural Relief Board say that

there is nothing to show for the water that has been used, and so they suggest the cost be written off. So it will be understood that there are great difficulties to be encountered in these schemes for the provision of water in country districts, and, in this instance, in country towns. I suggest that the people to be served be asked to give an assurance that they will take their liabilities seriously. That, I think, is not asking too much. In respect of any suggestion for a sectional inquiry I may remind the House that there are more than the towns of Katanning, Narrogin and Pingelly to be considered, Pingelly I suppose being the worst, or the best, case to consider, according to the point of view. A comprehensive scheme would have to be contemplated, and so we must have experts to tell us definitely what the engineering costs would be, and what would be the most economical way of getting the water there, and also what the capital cost would mean as against the prospect of getting revenue. I am not suggesting that estimates could not be shown that would satisfy many that this scheme would be a payable proposition. I think we have got past that. Then, of course, having estimated the possible revenue that we would be able to collect, and whether the indirect benefit to the whole community—about which we hear so much when considering Government schemes—would make the work worth-while, a work that would be justified from the point of view of the State, there would remain the financing. Of course that has been considered. We knew that perfectly well when, at the expense of £65,000, we decided to pump the water into Barbalin reservoir, well aware that there was no possible prospect of getting revenue to compensate that additional capital cost. Yet since the scheme had been put in, this had to be done. I can see no possible hope of these country water supply schemes becoming financial propositions. But it appears to me now that during the last two years we have reached one of those testing periods when we have to look at the problem of water supplies from a totally different viewpoint. And, as pointed out by the Director of Works, in Western Australia the water supply schemes have to be so designed that they will provide for the lean years; otherwise we strike a calamity when droughts occur and there is no water available. It is not then of any use telling a man that he has had a fine water supply during the preceding ten years. As for local

sources for the supplies contemplated in the motion moved by the hon. member, our expert advisers are satisfied that there is no prospect of a local supply. We regret to say that they regret to say that this fact has to be faced, and that if Katanning is to be supplied with water it will have to be pumped there. When the scheme was devised it was thought that the catchment would fill the dam, but we find now that is has not done so. Even if we went to the cost of improving the catchment by a very expensive method, we would have no guarantee of an adequate supply. It seems to me, too, that as the years advance the demand in all these country towns and districts must inevitably increase, and so a scheme that would have been considered satisfactory a few years ago would not now be regarded as adequate. I do not know that all this is a matter for a select committee. With all due respect to the hon. member, I did not go for advice on this question to the Crown Law Department, but went to the engineers, the right source of the information required. In respect of certain other matters, I would rather go to the member for Katanning than to the Director of Works, but touching this matter I had to take the opinion of the hydraulic staff of the department. If it can be shown that there is a source of information not available to the Government officially, that might justify the appointment of a select committee. Therefore, although opposed to this motion, it must not be thought that the Government do not appreciate the problem that it is proposed to investigate. I can give the hon. member an assurance that the Government are actively having this matter investigated departmentally, and that the information thus gained—even if we find it impossible at an early stage to go on with the scheme—will be available if at any future time the scheme is approved of. That is the point. The first thing is to get the necessary technical information and the financial estimate in connection with the scheme. Needless to say at this stage no Government could undertake the scheme. The first thing is the necessary investigation. We propose to have that done, and I think from the point of view of the hon. member that would be more satisfactory than giving him all the unnecessary trouble that he proposes. By the expert advice of the hydraulic engineers of the Works Department we shall see that a proper investigation is made. And this investigation will refer, not only to

Katanning or Narrogin or Pingelly, but I should say it will be into a comprehensive scheme for supplying with water all those districts that are at present in sore need. I oppose the motion, but at the same time I give an assurance that the whole question of supplying water to those towns at present inadequately supplied, and other districts, will be undertaken by the Government.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin) [5.13]: The Minister has given us a great deal of useful information upon a very difficult subject, but at the same time he has left us somewhat in the air. We had hoped to hear from him some indication of the solution that he favoured. In that regard he had nothing to say. It is plain from the Minister's concluding remarks that he does not want a select committee; yet the tenor of his remarks shows that some form of inquiry is essential. Now we members representing the Great Southern do not greatly care whether or not there is a select committee appointed, provided the Government show that they intend to acquaint themselves with the highly unsatisfactory conditions that prevail along the Great Southern towns and in the agricultural country adjacent on the east. The Minister admits that not only is there a water problem along the Great Southern but that it is to be found almost everywhere, and he says we should have sympathy with towns worse off than our own. Quite so. That is readily conceded, and if the Minister cares to extend the scope of the proposed investigation so that it may embrace other towns and areas with water troubles we here will, I am sure, raise no objection. Nevertheless, in this discussion we are by the wording of the motion restricted to the needs of the Great Southern towns and the country eastward, and therefore we must confine our remarks to them. I am glad that the Minister realises that a problem exists there and I take it this means that sooner or later he will go to some special trouble to make an investigation. The Minister indicated that the trouble under review was one which had cropped up only during the last couple of years. Not at all; it is periodically existent. All those towns affected experienced a very critical time last year and there is no substantial improvement in the position this year, which would surely indicate that the problem might recur at any time and that therefore provision should be made against a recurrence. Unless early action is taken to

prevent this constantly-recurring trouble, the prosperity of the towns mentioned will plainly be endangered. There is every reason why the members for Katanning and Pingelly in particular should feel some anxiety. It is necessary only to remind the House that Katanning is in the position of needing some 30,000,000 gallons of water annually to see it through, whereas this year and last year there were but 2,000,000 gallons available. That reveals an amazing disparity—2,000,000 gallons on supply and 30,000,000 gallons needed. Pingelly, I suppose, is just as badly off. Pingelly certainly has a larger quantity of water, but it is very muddy and very salty. Narrogin is moderately well off in comparison with towns to the north and south of it, and at the moment I am not submitting any particular complaint on behalf of Narrogin. This year a substantially larger quantity has been conserved as compared with last year. We have 40,000,000 gallons on supply, whereas normally we need 70,000,000 gallons. The Minister indicated that certain action had been taken regarding the Narrogin supply. That is quite true. A sum of money has been set aside to lay a main with the object of connecting the two wells in the centre of the town, which in earlier days formed the supply, with the service reservoir at the top of the hill. The idea is to inject the well water into the main supply and thus eke out the availability of the latter. The Minister has gone to some trouble to show his dislike for the long distance schemes that have been mentioned. I do not know that I am particularly enamoured of them either. There is the Mundaring scheme which was referred to by the Minister and also the Wellington dam scheme. To my mind the Wellington dam scheme would be preferable on the score that it would give an equal quantity of water and be less costly. For reasons of expense, I consider the Mundaring scheme to be quite out of the question. The towns under discussion have generally an annual rainfall a little short of 20 inches. If we can conserve a reasonable proportion of that rainfall, it is our duty to do so. If we experience difficulty in doing so, as we certainly are doing, it becomes the responsibility of the Minister's department to show how it should be done. The task of the proposed select committee or whatever body of inquiry might be elected would first be to investigate thoroughly the local possibilities

—the possibilities of rock catchments and other catchments, as well as catchments already in existence. There is also the question of linking up local supplies. These matters should be exhaustively examined before we would be justified in going further afield to consider either of the two large schemes. If there is no safe and sound catchment within a reasonable distance of the towns, we would be justified in searching the locality say within a radius of 20 miles of the towns before we would be entitled to regard local supplies as impossible. Will the Minister inform me what distance the investigation of the geologist at Katanning, which he said had yielded no information of value, was carried north, south, east and west of the town of Katanning, or whether it was restricted, as I understand it was, to the mere outskirts of the town? Plainly, it would pay to travel 20 miles in any direction and probe the possibilities of the district before searching, say, in the Darling Range for a supply.

The Minister for Works: The Katanning district.

Mr. DONEY: I regret that a little more information was not given on the point. If water could be located say 20 miles out, to pump it into the towns would be a payable proposition.

The Minister for Works: It would be wrong not to present what he considered to be a truthful report.

Mr. DONEY: I am not saying the report was not truthful; I am expressing regret that he did not indicate exactly what ground was covered by the investigation.

The Minister for Works: You can have that information.

Mr. DONEY: I shall be glad to have it in due course. I agree that the goldfields scheme is likely to prove altogether too expensive. We must have regard to the fact that the distance from Spencer's Brook or East Northam—both are about the same—to Katanning is about 165 miles. If the scheme were undertaken the existing main between Beverley and say East Northam would have to be rooted up and replaced with larger pipes. The first section of the new length of piping, I am informed, would consist of 24 inch pipes, which would cost £7,000 to £8,000 per mile. The next section would be laid with say 20 inch pipes costing £6,000 a mile; the next section again of 18 inch pipes costing something like £5,000,

running down the scale to 9 inch pipes costing £1,800 to £2,000. If we average those several costs we find that something in the vicinity of £4,000 per mile will be required which, for the mileage between East Northam and Katanning would entail an outlay of £660,000. Provision would also have to be made for necessary works and other appurtenances, bringing the total to approximately £800,000. If we had to divide the burden of that huge sum between the five towns likely to be concerned—Wagin would not be concerned and I am not conceding that Narrogin would be for a year or two, if ever—the average burden would be £160,000. Of course the larger towns would have to carry a larger sum and the smaller towns a lesser sum, and the new burden would be in addition to the existing capitalisation which in Narrogin is something like £55,000, Katanning £23,000 and Pingelly £20,000. Thus a total burden of £200,000 and over would be one that the towns mentioned certainly could not bear, and I cannot see any likelihood of the Government—which means the rest of the country—carrying any portion of the burden. What makes the tapping of the goldfields main more expensive is the necessity for negotiating the Cuballing bank, which is something like 1,320 feet high. Spencer's Brook has an altitude of about 500 feet, so there would be a rise of 800 feet to negotiate and that would add considerably to the cost. The Minister said that a comprehensive investigation was afoot now and indicated that in due course a report would be submitted, from which he would gather the necessary information as to the conditions in the Great Southern towns. I remember having heard some little time ago a statement by the Minister himself that the committee had no authority to investigate conditions in the towns but had to restrict their work wholly to the country areas. Therefore I cannot see that the work upon which they are engaged can have any beneficial connection with the motion before the House. I quite agree with the Minister that a difficulty to be faced is that there are no hydraulic engineers of any repute outside those belonging to his department. If a select committee or any committee held an inquiry, I take it the Minister would permit his hydraulic engineers to give evidence and generally to assist. There should be no objection to that. In South Australia there are several schemes in operation—

The Minister for Works: I said that they are the people competent to do the job.

Mr. DONEY: If the Minister prefers to put it that way and says that his engineers will do the job, that is all for which we are asking. I have no doubt that if the Minister said the hydraulic engineers would regard the work as urgent and would set about it, my friends from Katanning and Pingelly would be quite satisfied. I certainly would be satisfied because irrespective of the nature or scope of any investigation set afoot we should be in the hands of those officials, seeing that there are no competent hydraulic engineers outside the department controlled by the Minister.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.29]: I listened attentively to the remarks of the member for Katanning and also to the reply of the Minister. I consider that the member for Katanning really made out a case for an investigation, and the question is whether an investigation sufficiently beneficial to give effect to his wishes can be conducted by laymen, or whether those laymen could get such evidence from the departmental officers or others capable of tendering tangible evidence to enable a report to be made as to the best means of giving effect to the desires of the House. I think it is agreed that the most important thing in this State is water for our inland areas, right from the North to the South, Western Australia not being blessed with inland rivers. In the old days, thanks to the brains of some engineers and parliamentarians, an excellent water scheme was designed for the goldfields; though, as the Minister for Works has said, it has its limitations. Now we have to turn our attention to providing permanent water supplies in the agricultural areas. For many years the No. 1 pumping station on certain days in summer has pumped to its full capacity. The proposal now submitted to us is that the Goldfields Water Scheme should be utilised during the winter months, when the drain on it would not be so great. It is time, however, to provide permanent supplies in our agricultural areas. The agricultural industry is recognised to be highly important, not only in Western Australia, but throughout the world. It is useless to say that local people can provide their own water supplies. In many districts it is impossible to obtain local supplies sufficient for the summer

period. Again, there are many districts where it is impossible to get down below 8ft. 6in. for dams. The Minister knows the reason—8ft. 6in. is the salt water level. One can cover up those dams, but 8ft. 6in. does not give sufficient water for stock. I know that the engineers advocate the covering of these dams like the Public Works dams are covered; but, nevertheless, the supplies are not sufficient. During the last few years the Government—I give them credit for it—have embarked on a scheme of harnessing the water from the rock catchments, a good and wise scheme. Last year it was found that the dams became exhausted, and very early.

The Minister for Works: They cannot be guaranteed, either.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I acknowledge that; but to a certain extent they can be used and do supply wants. I admit that the report read by the Minister seems convincing. If we ask our experts to advise us whether there is subterranean or artesian or semi-artesian water to be found in a locality, we must accept their word for it unless we are prepared to put down a test bore. I noticed the other day that the Minister's Under Secretary said that a boring plant would be loaned to these people and an expert supplied to take charge of it. The point is whether it is a power plant or a hand plant.

The Minister for Works: A power plant.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then it is worth the Katanning people's while to accept the offer, for there may be some place where they can obtain a supply which will tide them over dry periods. In normal years, such a supply would not be needed. When we on this side were on the Government benches we proposed to try, but were prevented by lack of finance from trying, a deep bore in some of the agricultural areas. I do not pretend to be an expert in the matter, but Kalgoorlie offers a good indication of what may be expected, because the country there is similar. I know of no instance where deep boring, say by sinking a shaft down to 3,000 feet, in the Kalgoorlie district has resulted in anything except salt water being obtained. Thus I see no hope in that direction. We cannot do any better than use our own officers; but I do not like to see them sitting in their offices, doing very little, while they might be turn-

ing their attention to providing some relief for the people who are in difficulties. The Minister said his officers had had very little money. For some considerable time a large number of single men have been employed in the South-West, at a cost of £16,912, doing certain improvement works. Those works must now be pretty well completed; and if it is the duty of the Government to provide employment for those men, can they not be employed in doing something towards establishing a permanent water scheme there? I know the whole State cannot be done at once; its area is too vast. The Collic River, I understand, is regarded as the eventual source of supply for the Great Southern district. The scheme might be investigated, and its cost estimated. If it is a matter of pumping stations, I admit that a lot of the money would have to be spent on pumping plant and piping. If Collic is high enough to permit a gravitation scheme to the Great Southern district, it would be an excellent thing. However, that is entirely a matter for the engineer to determine with his level and staff. I do not know what other works the engineers are engaged on now. A little while ago they were doing drainage and irrigation works in the South-West. The same men presumably are qualified to do the work which I have suggested. However, there is an immediate demand for water; that is the trouble. Whether the Government are able to meet that immediate demand or not, I do not know. On Monday next I am invited to a meeting at Bruce Rock. I thought the Minister might have helped me out in that respect, because, after all, I shall go to that meeting as a layman, merely able to listen to what the people put up. I cannot tell them whether their proposals are reasonable or unreasonable, as an engineer would do. He might say, "What you suggest is an impossible proposition, and you had better leave it to the Government to determine what is the best course." Normally, it is impossible for a layman to put up a scheme. In the case of Bruce Rock I believe the catchment area could be increased, though of course I speak as a layman. The reservoir has overflowed only once since it was put in—before Mr. Collier became Premier in 1924. That reservoir has overflowed only once. There is a rock catchment in an adjoining property which could, I believe, be resumed. The question is one for the engineers. If the Government sent an engineer to have a look at the position,

that would go some way to satisfy the local people. Presumably the only relief to be given this year will be by means of a pipe run out from the Goldfields Water Scheme. As the Minister pointed out, the matter is one which will have to be decided by a majority of the people in the district. I know the people are most reluctant to pay water rates if they have provided water supplies of their own. There is a considerable area of that Bruce Rock country which has a tendency to supply better underground water than the forest country. Still, it is always a question whether such schemes will pay. Of course there are other means of their paying than through the imposition of direct rates. The Goldfields Water Scheme paid handsomely until the depression in the mining industry set in; and then the general public paid. The goldfields themselves have never paid for the scheme. The State used to find about £25,000 annually to make up the deficiency on the working of the scheme. To-day, I believe, the scheme is again paying. The same thing applies in the agricultural areas. The Minister did not convey anything much to me when he stated that I was responsible for the outstanding water rates.

The Minister for Works: No, I did not say that. I said we were all responsible.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is a question of what the state of the agricultural industry will permit us to do. The people engaged in the industry did their work, but the price of their commodity did not permit them to meet their obligations. That was the trouble. This year, when the price of wheat is reasonable, unfortunately they strike a drought again. The farmer will pay his way if he gets a chance to do it. In times of stress and trouble the Government should try to give these people some heart. I have recently been in the Katanning district. I do not wish to cover ground already traversed and probably to be gone over again in the reply of the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts), but the Katanning people convinced me that their problem is a governmental problem which cannot be solved by the local residents unless they strike a permanent supply of water by a bore.

The Minister for Works: We shall be very pleased if they do.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No doubt. The Government still collect rates and taxes from those people although not supplying them with water. No wonder the people get up

in arms! At Bruce Rock there is a rate of 3s. in the pound on the annual value, and for three months of last year there was no water available just when the people wanted it, at the end of summer. Naturally I do not blame the Government for that, but they might give those people some relief now. Investigations should be made at once. I believe there is a sufficient engineering staff to-day to allow some of the junior men to get out in the country. I will allow no one to say that our engineers are not just as capable as engineers anywhere else. I have in mind the engineer at Northam, who has put up some wonderful schemes and carried out the work very well indeed. He is a junior officer, but just as capable as the seniors.

The Minister for Employment: You cannot have him.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We do have him. He does all the agricultural work. I do not know that officer intimately, but I have seen his work and its results. I have also seen the estimates, and I know that his work has always been completed within them. He has always been regarded as an engineer capable of doing work as efficiently and as cheaply as possible. The Collie scheme to provide water in the Great Southern district is a work to be done by the people of the State. The people generally will have to be asked to bear some of the cost, and I do not think they will refuse. If they do refuse, it will mean centralisation and never getting out of our financial difficulties. The only way to get out of them is by increasing our production. That is not a new theory, but one which has been voiced frequently in this Chamber. I am sorry that the Minister opposes the motion. It would have been some consolation to the people who are in difficulties if they could have discussed the matter with the engineers. I shall forgive the Minister for opposing the motion if he will get those officers out into the country. Let the Collie scheme be investigated.

Mr. Sleeman: Would not that be better than having a select committee?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes; but I am afraid the work will not be done. It should be worth while to send an engineer to inquire whether the rock catchment area alongside the Katanning reservoir could not be extended. I do not know what the Commissioner of Railways proposes this year, but he is going to be in a serious position with regard to water supplies unless we get rain.

So far as even the scheme of which the Minister spoke is concerned, I doubt whether the water will last until he gets his pipes there.

The Minister for Works: They are engaged on the work now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is a class of rolling stock not kept in hand. Last year the department turned out those beastly trucks used for bulk handling and turned them to good account.

The Premier: Why "beastly"?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We had to pay for them, and we are still paying 9d. a ton for all wheat they remove. I remind the Premier that when he was Minister for Railways he said the trucks used for bulk handling could not be used for any other purpose. That was the reason that 9d. a ton extra was put on wheat. But the very first time trucks were wanted for something else, those trucks were used. They were used for the conveyance of water. I am glad the Minister was wrong in that respect.

The Premier: I was not wrong. I authorised their construction, and they have been a wonderful success.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! This has nothing to do with the motion.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, it has. It is a question of supplying water along the Great Southern line. So long as the Government will give an undertaking to have the matter investigated, I shall be satisfied. The matter ought to be investigated. Bad seasons are going to come again. We will perhaps have a good period of four or five years. Governments have short memories. When it comes to a matter of expenditure of cash, they will say that nothing need be done, as things are all right, and the position will eventually become more acute. I commend the member for Katanning for bringing this matter forward. We have to find employment for a number of people, and I do not think there is any better way of employing men than in making provision for water supplies in these areas. It has been asked why the people do not put in thousand-gallon tanks. There is a limitation to that. What is the use of tanks if the rain does not fall? I propose to support the motion but will be prepared to accept the Minister's assurance that an investigation will be made.

The Premier: You will see a lot of things done if I get the money.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: This will not cost a lot. The men's salaries will have to be

paid. If they could be released to do this work, it would be very useful.

MR. WATTS (Katanning—in reply) [5.49]: In speaking to this motion the Minister said that it arose because there had been a new condition of affairs this year. I do not think the Minister could have followed very closely or read the observations I made when moving the motion, because I then informed the House that, so far as Katanning was concerned, the scheme had been in operation for approximately 19 years. I pointed out that during that time, on the authority of the secretary of the water board, there had been restrictions on water for ten years, and the railways had had no supplies for six years. So far as that particular place is concerned, it is not a new phase at all. Notwithstanding that we have had for a period of ten out of 19 years an insufficiency of water supply—at times a complete absence of supply—we are asked to take such class of water as the sample I now produce as a supply for the town in question. The Minister says the Government are seized with the position and realise the conditions existing down there. I am going to say quite frankly, and also in a most friendly manner, that this is the first time I have been acquainted with the fact since I entered the House 15 months ago. It has always seemed to me that an inadequate water supply in the Great Southern district was regarded as something impossible. I remember not so very many months ago, when the Minister was in Albany, the Katanning Water Board were anxious that he should visit Katanning and discuss the problem. I think an invitation was sent in the first place from myself, and secondly from a member of the Legislative Council who was in Albany at the time, and lastly an offer of a motor car was made to the Minister to enable him to travel to Katanning for the purpose. I was not able to judge the reason why he could not come. I have no doubt there was other important business in hand; but the fact remains that at that time it was obvious to him that the matter required consideration. Yet we have had very little satisfaction. The Minister said that the inquiry suggested was a sectional one. I made the motion as wide as I could. For some time I wondered whether I was right and reasonable in going outside the lower Great Southern areas. I represent the whole district from Katanning to Mt. Barker, but I felt that the circum-

stances of the remainder of the Great Southern district were equally difficult, and they should also be inquired into. I specifically mentioned the requirements of the farming area around the Great Southern line. I do not propose to repeat what I said three weeks ago, but I think I said enough to show that in the agricultural districts around the Great Southern the position is very grave. It is not for me to suggest an inquiry into the position in other parts of the State in which, as a member of the House, I have no direct concern in a matter of this kind, at any rate. The interests of other areas can very well be left in the hands of those who represent those districts. It seems to me that there is nothing lost by reason of what the Minister calls a sectional inquiry. Here is an area of the State which it had been considered had a sufficient water supply, an area where there was going to be plenty of water, but an area which finds itself in the position that it has not got water. What has happened this year—I am told by old residents of the district since this inquiry was mooted—has happened before. It may be assumed that it will happen again; so there are particular circumstances, I think the House will agree, why this area should receive special consideration. When the Minister was making observations concerning the amount spent on water supplies in country districts, I do not think he was able to establish that any considerable amount had been spent on the Great Southern. For that reason alone this inquiry is well warranted. The Minister also referred to the rating of places adjacent to pipe lines. I submit that reasonable provision for that is made in the motion. I am well aware that when a proposal for a pipe line was put forward, those liable to be rated in connection with it would be entitled to object, and if their objection were upheld, would not be obliged to contribute. That is fair and reasonable. I have no desire to make any farmers adjacent to the Great Southern line pay any amount in rates. Many of them have already expended considerable sums of money on the provision of water supplies for themselves. Some of that money has been wisely expended, so that although there have been bad seasons, they have had a sufficiency of water. I am not asking for a tax to be imposed on those adjacent to a pipe line. Personally I should be much better pleased if satisfactory local schemes could be devised to deal with these places. The local authorities should have control, as at

Katanning, of the water supply of their particular towns; but it is a question of any port in a storm and, so far as I am concerned, there is a very severe storm raging, and it is essential that an inquiry should be made as to what can be done to improve the present position. I am prepared to admit that the proposal regarding Mundaring is difficult; that the proposal in connection with the Wellington weir is equally difficult, but these proposals have been made by various people, and there has been no sufficient answer as to what they would cost and whether they are practicable or impracticable, nor has any information at all been supplied concerning them. I believe that a select committee such as I have suggested could obtain the necessary evidence from departmental officers, collate it and make some report which would indicate to this House and the people concerned in the country what are the prospects of something being done. I am informed that when deputations have waited upon the Minister, he has always asked the question, "Are there any local schemes available?" An inquiry would enable full consideration to be given to that question, which is rather a moot point at present. The Minister said that the engineers were satisfied that there was no local scheme available around Katanning. That may be so, but I was talking to one of the officers of the department a few days ago, and he inquired if I thought it likely that a sufficient supply could be obtained anywhere near Kojonup, 25 miles from Katanning, and considerably nearer than other places mentioned. He would hardly have inquired from me had he known whether any supply was available there. As a matter of fact, I have not the foggiest notion. There may be a place where water could be obtained. I am convinced that neither I nor the Minister knows whether water can be obtained in that area. It is known to be an area of greater rainfall, and investigation might produce a solution of the difficulty at a reasonable cost. What I have suggested I think would be the means of finding out by careful inquiry whether a supply of water can or cannot be obtained. The Minister referred to the rural committee which he appointed in connection with the investigation into country water supplies. I would point out, however, that this committee do not purport to inquire into water supplies connected with country towns. In a letter

dated the 17th March, 1936, the Minister writing to the member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) said, amongst other things—

You ask that this committee should be required to advise in regard to Pingelly, Katanning and Kulin town water supplies. It is unnecessary for me to refer such subjects to the committee.

No inquiry has been made with regard to the towns, and up to the present time no inquiry has been made by the committee referred to in the Minister's letter in such places as Nyabing, Gnowangerup and Tambellup. Nothing whatever has been done in regard to any of those places. The Minister also referred to the losses which had been incurred on country water supplies. I am prepared to acknowledge that there have been such losses, and I am prepared to believe there will be similar losses in the future, but I point out to the Minister, as I previously informed this House, that of the £19,000 borrowed from the Treasury, Katanning has repaid £9,000 to the sinking fund, and the annual commitments are regularly being paid. Therefore, whatever may be said of some of the unfortunate places, nothing like that can be said of the people of the community I have the honour to represent. Thus I claim, those people are entitled to double consideration rather than less, because they have honoured the obligation they undertook to carry out, and will be prepared to honour it to the last penny. At the same time the people of Katanning ask for some value for the expenditure they have incurred. It will be realised that I am concerned, not only with the town of Katanning, but also with the towns of Gnowangerup and Tambellup. The people of Gnowangerup have been obliged to ask for the loan of a boring plant. I do not know whether the results of their efforts will be satisfactory. I hope they will be. The same remark applies to the people of Katanning, who, as a last resort, and in face of the opposition of the Government Geologist, are prepared to expend such funds as they have in endeavouring to find water by boring. I am not very hopeful, but I admire their courage. But at the present time they have no other recourse open to them. There is all the more reason why the engineers of the department should be brought before a select committee and examined on this question, and that the information thus made available should be made public. People in the areas in question con-

sider that up-to-date the whole question has been more or less ignored. It is high time that information was obtained and made public as to what the engineers think of the possibilities of local supplies of water being obtained, what information they have been able to obtain. I believe that a great deal of what I consider to be essential will be obtained if the select committee is appointed. I have no wish to go outside the department for information. I believe there are men in the department definitely capable, if given the opportunity, of putting up propositions well worthy of our consideration; but at the moment we do not know what propositions they are. We do not know whether the schemes that some of our settlers have in mind and which they would put up to the engineers, are or are not worthy of consideration. I suggest that neither does the Minister know anything about the possibility of obtaining local supplies of water in places out of the way for the time being. I admit that an examination has been made in the immediate vicinity of Katanning, and that it has proved a failure. But there are places a little farther afield which might be able to provide us with some suggestion, though we have nothing in mind of the magnitude of the Collic weir scheme. I was sorry the Minister introduced the question of what had been spent on water supplies in past years by respective Governments. I wish to make this plain, that the motion was brought forward entirely in the interests of my electorate, and those of the adjacent electorates which are in a similarly difficult position. And there was nothing further from my mind than the suggestion that this or any other Government had failed to acknowledge its obligation to spend money on country water supplies where they were badly wanted. Nothing of the kind ever entered my head. I brought the matter forward entirely in the interests of the people I represent, and those of the adjacent areas. The Minister told us that there was no supply that he knew of to be got adjacent to Katanning, and he also told us that the expense consequent upon some comprehensive scheme in effect made that proposal almost prohibitive. Take the two statements in combination, and where do the people of my constituency stand? They stand between the devil and the deep sea, according to the Minister. According to the Minister too, there is nothing near Katauning, and there is nothing practicable

farther away. And so, according to him, the people there stand in the position that they can go on as they have been going on for the last few years. I feel quite honestly that if that sums up the Minister's judgment of the position of the water supplies in the Great Southern areas, it is high time that an investigation took place so that the question might receive careful and close scrutiny.

The Minister for Works: I did not say that; no one can say it is impracticable until you have a survey.

Mr. WATTS: The Minister said it was impracticable on the ground of expense.

The Minister for Works: That is why I gave you the figures, to show it was an expensive job.

Mr. WATTS: With regard to the trouble the proposed committee may take, may I say that nothing is too much trouble which will in the one case give to this House any information of value to it, and in the other case may have the effect of solving the problem of water supplies in the Great Southern areas, or indeed any other part of the State. I commend the motion to the House. I believe a reasonable case has been made out, and I do not think that the Minister has advanced a case in opposition to it. I believe that those who are prepared to consider the matter in a fair minded way will realise that the question has been brought forward in a perfectly bona fide way, that a considerable amount of good may result from the inquiry, and that a great deal of information will be obtained and made public which will not otherwise see the light of day. Before I resume my seat I desire to thank the Premier for making available this opportunity to have the motion discussed. I appreciate his courtesy.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	20
					—
Majority against	1
					—

AYES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. Sampson
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Seward
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Hill	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Warner
Mr. Latham	Mr. Watts
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Welsh
Mr. North	Mr. Doney
Mr. Patrick	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Fox	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. F. O. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Troy
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wise
Mr. Needham	Mr. Withers
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

BILL—CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—BETTING CONTROL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 28th October.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gaseoyne) [7.30]: I express appreciation of the industry displayed by the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) in compiling the information on the Bill.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Now do not get too flattering.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE: The hon. member desires that betting in its unsavoury aspects should be regulated and controlled. He has gone to considerable personal trouble and expense to build up the case which, on two occasions, he has presented to the House. Though he stated that the Bill before us is almost similar to the Act in operation in South Australia, there are many differences, and important differences, with which I intend to deal. An analysis of the South Australian Act and of the report of the board in control of betting indicates that there is a very wide distinction, particularly from the Government point of view, in the Bill before us and the Act of South Australia. All Australians are prone to gamble on something. Whether it be as to which swallow will first fly from a telephone wire, on cards, on horse-racing or in other ways, one of the inherent traits of Australian national character is an inclination to gamble. I am reminded of a story told of a teacher who was endeavouring to develop the observation powers of her pupils. She produced a florin and placed it on the desk, hoping that the children would notice that she was handling a florin. On

her asking the class what it was, several voices piped up, "Tails." Australians, from youth to an advanced age, are prone to indulge in gambling. Many opinions have been expressed as to the wisdom of following the example of South Australia. We are told that betting is increasing alarmingly. We hear that it has led women to leave their prams and enter premises to bet. The board in control of betting in South Australia claim that much of the social evil associated with betting in its many forms has been removed as a result of their operations. I have copies of the reports of the board for the past three years which reveal some interesting experiences. Most members are aware that the endeavour to control betting in South Australia resulted from an inquiry made by a Royal Commission in 1932. The report of the Royal Commission showed that illegal betting was rampant. It flourished in hotels, hairdressers' shops, billiard rooms, many private shops and private houses, and other places. The ramifications of the illegal business were State-wide. The board claimed that the number of people known to be participating in it exceeded 50,000. Evidence was produced that habitual bettors betting with illegal bookmakers exceeded 54,000. The police estimates at that time showed that there were 643 bookmakers operating in 426 hotels, 69 billiard rooms, and 59 hairdressers and tobacconists' shops, while 30 were operating in private homes and 24 in streets and public places. Those 643 bookmakers were known to be operating publicly and without license. Since control, according to the latest report, there are 382 licensed bookmakers and 318 licensed premises. The board also claim in their report that illegal betting, now that betting is controlled, is diminishing annually, and in spite of the fact that there are fewer premises in which betting is conducted, there are very few instances where prosecutions have been necessary against persons for illegal betting. After the first year of control by the board, it was claimed that there was a decrease in the number of bookmakers, a decrease in the number of betting premises, a decrease in the number of recipients of Government relief, a decrease in the number of people betting, an increased respect for the law—an important aspect of anything that might be termed a social evil—an increase in lawful employment and an increase in the number of persons earning an ascertainable taxable income, as well as the dissocia-

tion of betting from drinking. According to the latest report of the board dated the 30th June, 1936, the number of bookmakers and the number of premises used for betting are decreasing under the system of rigid inspection and control. The board point out the very many difficulties with which they were faced in their initial endeavours to overcome betting in underground ways—betting resorted to in unsavoury places and in all sorts of questionable ways in which people desiring to bet could satisfy their desire. One very pertinent point raised by the control board deals with the attitude of the Postmaster General's Department towards the supply of telephones to assist those engaged in betting.

Mr. Marshall: That is the silent telephone.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: It is mentioned in this year's annual report that the main object of the law under which the board operates is to eradicate illegal betting. That is the board's job. With a view to overcoming that situation, an appeal was made to the Postmaster General to co-operate with the Commissioner of Police by placing at his disposal information concerning persons who use the telephone for unlawful betting. To that request, the Postmaster General replied that whilst the department viewed sympathetically the endeavours made towards the suppression of betting in South Australia, it would be impracticable to supply information in respect to persons using the telephone for illegal betting. That was unfortunate, and led to the board experiencing a great deal of difficulty. It was impossible for the board to obtain information from the Postmaster General's Department concerning those who were evading the Act for the control of betting in South Australia. Before dealing further with the reports, I should like to refer to the figures of income and the distribution of that income of the board. It has a very important bearing on something I intend to say later, when dealing with the Bill before the House and the Act in operation in South Australia. The 2 per cent. collection known as the turnover tax in South Australia shows that a very large sum was gathered in from that source. The Treasurer received over £64,000 on all betting, and from racing clubs, coursing clubs and such-like institutions received £58,000 during the past year from the 2 per cent. turnover tax. That is a very

important factor when betting in all its aspects is considered, particularly when the control of betting by legislation is under discussion. I must express my appreciation of the attitude of the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) who enabled me to view several documents and publications dealing with investigations into betting in this and other countries. The final report of the British Royal Commission appointed to inquire into betting is most illuminating and interesting. By obtaining other views on betting, and inviting every body, organisation, or person who had any interest for or against the legalising of betting, or even those who opposed it merely on ethical grounds, to give evidence, the commission was able to obtain a wonderful collection of information upon which to base its recommendations. I should like to quote one or two paragraphs from the Royal Commission's report for 1932-33. In summing up their recommendations concerning the legislative policy for the control of betting, the Royal Commissioners say—

In taking this view we do not ignore the objections to gambling on ethical grounds put before us by the representatives of the churches. But the field of ethics is not co-extensive with that of the criminal law. On the one hand there are many forms of conduct which are generally considered to be morally wrong or reprehensible, but which are not contrary to the criminal law. On the other hand, there are matters in regard to which the State has found it necessary to make laws, independently of any question of morality. In any case, public opinion generally would not support legislation based solely on ethical objections to gambling.

That is very true. There may be many in this Chamber and in another place who from moral or religious grounds, or because of sentiment, or because they are not inheritors of Australia's trait, to which I have already referred, are disposed to oppose all forms of gambling and betting. These are not sufficient excuses to oppose the control of betting, for we have to admit that betting in all its forms and on all occasions does exist. I should like to quote paragraph 236 of the report, which reads—

In framing legislation with these objects in view we regard it as of the utmost importance that not more prohibitions should be made than are absolutely necessary. Every new prohibition creates a new class of potential offenders. It must, of course, always remain a matter of judgment, based on the facts of each case, whether a particular social evil is sufficiently serious to justify criminal legislation. But as

a general principle the criminal law must not lightly be invoked; and the evils which result from any prohibition, however desirable the object aimed at, must be set in the balance against the evil it is sought to diminish.

Mr. Marshall: That is very logical.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Yes. If there is an evil present in our midst, and increasingly present, and if control is desirable, it is very necessary, whatever form that control may take, to see that the cure does not ultimately prove to be worse than the disease.

Mr. Patrick: What was the result of the report of the Royal Commission in England?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I am quoting the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners.

Mr. Patrick: Did the Government take any action?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The report was issued after it had been reviewed by people of both sexes and after the Commissioners had been armed with the fullest authority to investigate every phase of betting.

Mr. Patrick: What legislation arose out of it?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Legislation based on the recommendations.

Mr. Patrick: Was any legislation brought down?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I understand so.

Mr. Sleeman: It had to do with the licensing of shops, for one thing.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The legislation extended the operations of existing boards in country boroughs, and placed more rigid control upon lotteries and games of chance. Whilst the member for Murchison has endeavoured to define the restrictions that should be placed on betting, and the facilities for organised gambling, I am sure he will concede that the facts assembled by the English Royal Commission, and by the Commission in South Australia, indicate that whatever form of control may be decided upon, some Government authority should be connected with it. In the betting report of South Australia, there is a very clear indication that there should be some State authority with special responsibilities for handling the control of betting. Whilst I am inclined to agree with much of the sentiment and the opinions expressed by the hon. member, I think this subject is so

wide and diverse in its ramifications, that it is a subject for inquiry by a select committee. The British view is that religious opinions and sentimental opinions form insufficient objections to the legislative control of betting, whether it be merely restricted or entirely controlled. It can justly be claimed that every organisation and every school of thought in Western Australia, should, in the different circumstances obtaining in this State, have an opportunity to express their views. I would submit to the hon. member that it is not his desire to drive betting into the highways and byways, or, if it may be so expressed, drive it underground. I feel that we all agree there is a public demand in the matter, and moreover a public demand which cannot be subdued. That being so, even if the House is mixed in its attitude towards the control of betting, there are many points of view to be considered before any legislation on the subject is introduced. We have to consider whether it is wise that bookmaking should be deemed an unlawful calling, particularly when we take into account the human element and that inherent tendency which is a desire to bet. Undoubtedly the inclination of the present Australian generation is that betting should not be subdued; even if drastic action were taken, the tendency would still continue, and it might continue under very different and highly undesirable circumstances. If betting cannot effectively be prohibited, it surely can be directed into channels where its harmful consequences can be controlled. Therefore it seems there is a just claim that the wisest course would be to have a law capable of enforcement rather than that the existing law should continue to prohibit practices which, even though undesirable, cannot effectively be controlled. It may be contended in this Chamber that an organised endeavour to control existing forms of starting-price betting in Western Australia could be successful. I would not disagree with that point of view. Control would be successful in subduing existing forms of betting, but would probably raise them in a different form which, with or without control, would be less desirable. There is a highly important aspect in the differences between this Bill and the South Australian Act as regards the channel through which the taxation levied ultimately flows. I have instanced that racecourses in South Australia last year received £58,000 from the 2 per

cent. turnover tax obtaining there. In Western Australia we have, as the member for Murchison indicated, betting which is practically legalised by the fact that it is condoned, and by the further fact that a tax is collected from it—the tax on bookmakers' tickets on a racecourse and the totalisator tax. That is an important aspect from the standpoint of any Government. It may be that if the Bill were passed, racing clubs in this State would have indeed a difficult time unless some endeavour were made for the board to collect a justifiable amount in taxation from betting and permit the racing clubs to benefit from that taxation.

Mr. Marshall: How much do the clubs get out of the illegal betting to-day?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Fines imposed for illegal betting to-day go to the Treasury, naturally. I think that not any member of the Chamber would say that it is a satisfying or a sufficient method which is left open to practice in Western Australia to-day. No one desires that that position should continue. However, an effort has been made to keep betting away from hotels and off the streets. Probably we can all see that the police have indeed a difficult task in the circumstances prevailing.

Mr. Sampson: The Government do collect the betting card tax.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The hon. gentleman informs me that the Government collect a betting tax. That is so. They collect a betting tax on all tickets used on racecourses.

Mr. Marshall: Have you any idea of the amount thus collected?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: It is to be found in the Taxation Commissioner's report. Thus there are many points of view to be considered. A highly important point of view is that of the racing clubs, and another is that of the religious bodies and those who oppose betting in any circumstances. We have also the important point of view of the parents of our present generation, in seeing amongst them something that is highly undesirable. Something the South Australian legislation has accomplished is that no one under the age of 21 years is allowed to bet. There has been, in consequence, a great shrinkage in the amount of betting which did prevail amongst the youth of that State. It was brought out in evidence that formerly every

district had its betting agent, who on race days called from house to house. In some instances there was the youngster at the gate letting father know that the betting man was there in time to take a bet on the first race. But all that is gone; and it may be claimed, therefore, that for those who take a tolerant view of the subject betting in South Australia now is in a more satisfactory position and is better controlled, and is less objectionable from the social-evil point of view—if I may use that term—than it was prior to the existing legislation. Thus, though many evil consequences would arise from unrestricted betting, there is something in the contention that with betting under control the aspect of the social evil towards our generation is to some extent limited. In view of all those circumstances, in view of our desire not to place a registered or controlled section on a plane which would give them an advantage over the section not under control—if we place in the hands of starting-price bookmakers a legalised form of betting, we put them at an advantage over bookmakers betting on racecourses—it is evident that there are very many points of view to be considered. In submitting this opinion to the House, I respectfully commend to the attention of hon. members the desirableness that the Bill should go to a select committee.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [7.59]: I feel that I should support the member for Murchison in his desire to put betting in Western Australia on a better or higher level than it occupies at present. In my opinion, nothing could be worse than the system now operating in the State. While there is talk about legalising the s.p. "bookie," it is about time that something was done in regard to the "bookie" on the racecourse. The Minister for Police said that the Government are at present obtaining a tax from people on the racecourses. This, of course, is purely illegal. The Crown shuts its eyes to the fact that though illegal betting is going on every week end, and also on most holidays, the small men are debarred from having their little bets in the various towns in which they live. In order to attend a racecourse, a man who desires to have a small bet on the first race may have to neglect his work by taking the Saturday morning off so that he can arrive at the course in time. If he is not anxious to do

that but wants to have his little flutter with a starting-price bookmaker, the law says he shall not do it. It is another instance of one law for one individual, and another law for someone else. If we go to any racecourse on Saturday where races are being held, we can see people betting with impunity. The State stands by and collects taxation from the proceedings. If a man does not go to the racecourse but has his bet elsewhere, the law comes down on him heavily for so doing. I regard the betting laws of Western Australia as the most rotten we have. When the State is content to close its eyes to what goes on in one place, but acts stringently if similar proceedings are indulged in elsewhere, it is time something was done to rectify the position. My opinion is that the introduction of such a Bill should not be left to the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall).

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is not a job for a private member at all.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Certainly not. A private member is hamstrung when he attempts to bring such legislation forward. The argument is advanced that the Bill is altogether different from the South Australian legislation. The explanation of that is simply that in South Australia the Government introduced the legislation, and a Government is all-powerful. If the member for Murchison were to bring down a Bill in the form he would desire, you, Mr. Speaker, would have no option but to rule it out of order, because of the financial considerations. That indicates the disabilities suffered by private members when they attempt to introduce such legislation.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The member for Greenough has some knowledge regarding that phase.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I commend the member for Murchison for introducing the Bill in order to secure the opinion of Parliament as to whether members are in favour of legalising betting. When we embark upon a consideration of that matter, we should deal with the whole situation and not only with starting-price bookmaking. Race clubs and trotting clubs have no more right to tell bookmakers that they can enter upon their courses and indulge in their business, which is an unlawful one, than has any other section of the community. I will inform members regarding what the Criminal Code has to say on

this point. Subsection 2 of Section 211 reads:—

Any person who, being the owner or occupier of any house, room, or place, knowingly and wilfully permits it to be opened, kept, or used as a common betting house by another person, or has the use or management, or assists in conducting the business of a common betting house, is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to imprisonment with hard labour for six months or to a fine of £100.

The Western Australian Turf Club or any other club or company, incorporated or otherwise, registered by the Western Australian Turf Club, and authorised by the Colonial Treasurer, and any person, with the permission of any such club or company, may have, use and play with on the racecourse of such club or company, during the days of any race meeting, the instrument known as the totalisator.

So the Criminal Code sets out plainly that any person who is using a place for the purpose of betting is doing an illegal act.

Mr. Marshall: The same thing applies under the Police Act.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I hope something will be done to make the betting laws more fair than they are at present. The Leader of the Opposition will agree with me that they are at present most lopsided. At the latest annual sports meeting at York, which is one of the leading gatherings of that description held each year in this State, the police arrested bookmakers who were fined for doing an illegal act. Despite that fact, within a few yards of the court-house where those people were punished for doing an illegal act, they could do the same thing with impunity on the York racecourse. If it is right to permit them to bet on the racecourse, it should be equally right for them to bet at the athletic meeting. I trust that action will be taken, and that the Government will not force the Bill to a select committee. If I had any faith in select committees, I would have voted in favour of the appointment of one earlier in the evening. My opinion of select committees is that if you want something held up, let slide, set aside, or pigeon-holed indefinitely, you appoint a select committee to deal with it. Then, when you get the report from the select committee, you pigeon-hole it and nothing more is heard of the business. I am not prepared to vote in favour of referring the Bill to a select committee any more than I was in favour of a similar motion regarding the proposition submitted by the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts). On the other hand, I hope the Government will take the initiative and inform the mem-

ber for Murchison that they are prepared to introduce a Bill on the lines of the South Australian Act. I am convinced that that measure operates fairly well because, in a report submitted by the Commissioner of Police in South Australia, he dealt quite sympathetically with betting as conducted under the Commission. In his annual report submitted to Parliament the Commissioner stated:—

While it is impossible to state with any degree of accuracy that betting or the number of bettors has increased with the advent of bookmakers and licensed premises, the inference is that there is a greater volume of betting because of the increased facilities provided and the increased opportunities to bet.

While it may appear to be a retrograde step to legalise off-the-course betting, in actual fact it is more desirable that betting be indulged in openly, under proper supervision and control, than that we should revert to the practice of illegal gambling, with its "nit-keepers" and general disregard of the law.

When we find the Commissioner of Police in South Australia reporting in those terms, it must be very gratifying to the member for Murchison to note the support he receives for the action he proposes to take in this State. I hope the Bill will be passed either in its present form or that it may be set aside on an assurance from the Government that they will introduce a Bill on all fours with the South Australian Act. I hope that the law will be administered effectively and impartially with regard to all sections of the community. I do not stand for a one-sided law. I want it to be administered impartially. It is most unfair to say that the followers of horse-racing shall be allowed to bet while the followers of other sports shall be debarred from doing so.

Mr. Thorn: What about the whippets?

Mr. Raphael: He is a trainer of whippets.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know whether the member for Toodyay is a trainer of whippets but his interjection reminds me that at Boulder the bookmakers can swing their bags with impunity and bet on the whippet races, whereas at Maylands and South Perth they would be arrested if they attempted to do the same there.

Mr. Marshall: They can swing the bag and take the cash.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If the member for Murchison desired to conduct a bicycle meeting and the Minister wanted to conduct a race meeting, the latter would be allowed to bet, while the former would be debarred from having bookmakers at his meeting.

Point of Order.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I desire your ruling. You will notice that in paragraph (d) of Clause 10 the following appears:—

Whenever in any licensing year it appears to the board that the license fees for the year will be insufficient to cover its expenditure for the same period, the board may strike a levy pro rata on all persons licensed under this Act in order to make up the deficiency.

It seems to me that in view of that section, this Bill is out of order inasmuch as a private member's Bill is not allowed to make an impost. I would like your ruling on the subject, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Subiaco has raised a point of order whether the section mentioned by her brings the Bill into conflict with the Constitution, in view of the fact that license fees are provided to be charged and the Bill is introduced by a private member. If the member for Subiaco will turn to Subsection 1 of Section 46 of the Constitution Act she will find the following:—

Bills appropriating revenue or moneys or imposing taxation shall not originate in the Legislative Council; but a Bill shall not be taken to appropriate revenue or moneys or to impose taxation by reason only of its containing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines or other pecuniary penalties, or for the demand of payment or appropriation of fees for licenses, or fees for registration or other services under the Bill.

The hon. member will see by that section that the Bill is perfectly in order.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: May I say that to my mind—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member cannot discuss my ruling unless she moves to disagree with it.

Mr. Marshall: You should get better legal advice.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Marshall: When you catch me on the Standing Orders you will be smart.

Debate Resumed.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [8.12]: After listening to the Minister's remarks regarding a select committee to go into this matter, I am going to move that a select committee of this House—

Hon. C. G. Latham: You can't do that!

Mr. RAPHAEL: I will ask the Speaker whether I am in order in moving for the appointment of a select committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this stage.

Mr. RAPHAEL: That being the case, I am going to support the measure moved by the member for Murchison. When in South Australia, I took the opportunity of investigating the conditions of betting houses and obtaining information not only from the police and legislators, but from the persons licensed to run the betting houses there, and on every occasion it was proved to me that a step in the right direction was taken when that State passed an Act to control betting. In Western Australia to-day, as other members have stated, it is illegal for one section of the community to bet and legal for another section. The politician or the business man who desires to have a bet can go to the racecourse and do so. But with regard to the ordinary working man who cannot afford the admission money to the racecourse, the law says that he may not bet. We can readily understand the member for Subiaco rising to a point of order in opposing this measure from the legal aspect on the advice of the member for East Perth.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: How do you know?

Mr. RAPHAEL: The member for Subiaco must not support this Bill because at the present time in the Subiaco electorate it is quite legal to bet in certain directions there. When the hon. member has been here a little longer she will realise the fact—

Mr. Sampson: You do not improve with age and experience.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The member for Swan would not improve if he lived another thousand years.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RAPHAEL: If the member for Subiaco took the opportunity of attending the foot races at the Subiaco oval, she would find no interference whatever with betting there. Why should the member for Subiaco get up in this Chamber and on a point of order try to upset the member for Murchison when he is endeavouring to give the same facilities to Victoria Park? I would like the member for Subiaco to digest that and perhaps realise the disabilities of the people of Victoria Park as compared with the advantages of the people of Subiaco.

Mr. Thorn: Has that only come about since the change of representation?

Mr. RAPHAEL: No, I think the previous member for Subiaco introduced it and the

present hon. member is just carrying out the work he commenced. Not only from the viewpoint of persons desiring to bet should the Government legislate, but also from the viewpoint of those who do not bet. In South Australia the people who control the betting shops have to provide decent accommodation, in most instances in the way of a decent-sized hall, in which the people bet. They are not permitted to stand in the streets and the conduct of the business is of the best. There is not bad language and no drinking and there is no standing around the street corners as in Western Australia to-day. We realise that Governments do not like to touch betting; it is one of the things tabooed by Parliament on every occasion. I congratulate the Minister for Police on the attitude he has adopted in coming into the open and giving this House the opportunity to expose the conditions that exist in Western Australia in regard to its betting laws. There are all phases to be considered and that was why I was prepared to move for a select committee to investigate the conditions of the betting system in Western Australia. The member for York suffers a great disability inasmuch as when his athletic races take place the bookmakers are not allowed to stand up and call the odds. I should think that was sufficient reason to persuade the member for York to give his support to the Bill. Again, as the member for Fremantle has told this House, whippet racing in certain parts of the State is permitted. In other parts the police step in with a heavy hand and it is put down. There is also the gambling in clubs in this State to be considered. In one section of the community some young chaps decide to have a game of cards. They are haled before the magistrate and promptly fined, but a man with sufficient capital to become a member of a club is allowed to carry on. Legislation should be introduced in connection with betting in conformity with the legislation introduced by Governments in other parts of the world. The Minister has referred to the legalisation that has taken place in England. If that is good enough over there, surely to God it is good enough for Western Australia! Here we have betting around the corners on the Saturday afternoon, and even in Victoria Park that sort of thing requires a good cleaning up. It is nothing at all to see hundreds of men hanging around the betting shops every Saturday afternoon. As the member for East Perth

knows, I wanted to get one man out of trouble, but he said it could not be done.

Mr. Hughes: Did you get him out?

Mr. RAPHAEL: You can find that out for yourself.

Mr. Thorn: You got into a bit of a rough-up yourself, did you not?

Mr. RAPHAEL: Yes, I backed one of your whippets and it went crook. On Saturday afternoons in Victoria Park hundreds of men and women are to be seen standing about in various parts of the suburb. Those people, if they want to bet, should do it off the street. They are not game to go into the betting shops for long; they just dash in and dash out again, because they do not know when the police are going to change their attitude.

Mr. Hughes: I thought you controlled the Police Department better than that.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I have nothing whatever to do with it. It is a pity the hon. member cannot control himself.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Can you control yourself?

Mr. RAPHAEL: If betting is legalised here, and the conditions that exist in South Australia are brought into operation in Western Australia, the men that will be given license to run these betting shops will be forced to provide decent accommodation, decent rooms, and see to it that the betting public do not stand about the street corners preventing ordinary pedestrians from walking along the footpath. At present on a Saturday afternoon women with kiddies in prams have to move out into the roadway to get past the betting crowd. Surely to God that has been brought under the notice of the Government time and time again! The position regarding betting on race-courses and the tax that is collected and the loss that would be suffered by the race clubs is one, as explained by the member for Murchison, that should be well considered by the authorities. In South Australia to-day some of the racing clubs are in a far better financial position than they were before the Government legalised betting over there. When the betting was not legalised, many of those clubs were always £1,000 behind on their overdrafts, but the increased revenue that has come to them in consequence of betting control has put them in a vastly improved financial position. Opposition to the Bill will come from two sections of the community; that

is to say, that section concerned with the running of race clubs, and the section of the community that does not believe in betting at any cost. If all the available information were put before that section concerned with race clubs, it might be proved to them that the innovation would assist them, and so they might change their attitude. As for the other section of the community whose religious beliefs preclude them from supporting a measure such as this, I believe that if there were to be a clean-up of the people standing around street corners on a Saturday afternoon, the religious people also would give some support to the control of the betting system. The police have a pretty difficult job to perform. I believe they try to be as fair as they can in the matter of prosecutions. I definitely believe that. But the position is that in Western Australia many of the betting shops are run on the chain-store system by three or four men who have unlimited money at their disposal. So when the police come along to raid those places, those men, through their substantial financial position, have a clean-skinner there, and he is picked up and, it being a first prosecution, he gets off with a very light fine. But then we have the small betting man who cannot afford from time to time to introduce new assistants to act on his behalf when the police come along. This man, when picked up on the second or third occasion, is fined anything up to £60 or £70, as the member for East Perth can tell us. I hope the Bill will pass, and that the Government will decide to take definite action in cleaning up the betting laws of Western Australia.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [8.27]: I am prepared to vote for the second reading, but only on the distinct understanding that the Bill will then be referred to a select committee. I have no hesitation in saying that this is not a matter upon which any private member can dictate the legislation.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Are you prepared to move to send the Bill to a select committee?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, I am prepared to do that. The hon. member sponsoring the Bill is too much limited by the Standing Orders, and meagre opportunities for gaining inside information, essential information, to enable him to draft legislation that would be peculiarly suitable to the

existing conditions in Western Australia. I am prepared to admit that similar legislation in other parts of the world, and in other parts of Australia particularly, would be useful, but still we require to have care for the peculiar circumstances of the State. There are things done in the Eastern States in regard to betting and dog racing and that kind of thing that we have precluded in Western Australia, and so the conditions here are not the same as those in the Eastern States.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The tin hare is one of those things.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course. Apart from all that, I believe that something is essential in this State. We have allowed the system to grow until now the public are looking to Parliament to find some means of controlling or regulating or prohibiting this betting. It cannot be left where it is at present. Neither can we say that this House is competent to decide what is best to do. I have been in Parliament for a long time, and I have said over and over again that there are two matters upon which Parliament seems to be unable to legislate, namely, gambling and drinking. We all seem to be authorities on these questions, and we all have different opinions in regard to them. And so, while Bills are introduced to cope with these problems, they never seem to be finalised on the lines on which they were originally introduced, and in the end they are so horribly mixed that the legislation is not much good. The reason why our liquor laws are so satisfactory is that Parliament wisely submitted the matter to a Royal Commission, who did very good work and the Licenses Reduction Board was the outcome. We are all aware of the improvement that has been made in the public houses, the accommodation, and generally in the administration. We need something of the kind in the matter of betting. Normally I should vote against the Bill; I am afraid of it, but as a public man I have to realise that we cannot allow the problem to rest where it is. As to how best to cope with betting and to regulate it, I have not the knowledge to declare, and while I do not possess the knowledge, I am not prepared to admit that the member for Murchison possesses it. True, he has studied it more than has any other member, and he has taken great trouble to investigate it, but it is not a problem upon which he could draft legis-

lation and convince me that it would meet the needs of to-day.

Mr. Marshall: You are biased.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: On the contrary, I have an open mind. I am prepared to vote for the second reading on the understanding that the job will be done as it ought to be done—by having a complete investigation before legislation is attempted.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [S.32]: There is very little doubt that the question of gambling and betting has about as many points as the fretful porcupine.

Mr. Thorn: What point are you going to make?

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member had better not interrupt; otherwise I shall be shockingly severe with him. No matter from what angle the problem might be approached, some people will disagree with the proposals. I was particularly struck with the reasoned speech and considered viewpoint delivered by the Minister for Police. I certainly incline to the view expressed by the member for Guildford-Midland that if we are going to attempt to place gambling, betting and racing on a reasonable, common-sense basis, the only way is to submit the Bill to a joint select committee of both Houses. As far back as 1905 a select committee investigated the question, and in 1915 another select committee inquired into the matter. If members take the trouble to peruse the recommendations then made, they will find that the problems of gambling, s.p. bookmakers, the confining of betting to race-course totalisators, and the position of the proprietary race clubs in relation to the W.A.T.C. are still the same. Towards the end of 1916 the then Premier, the late Mr. Frank Wilson, introduced a Bill to abolish bookmaking and make betting the exclusive prerogative of the totalisator.

Mr. Sleeman: We should do one thing or the other.

Mr. LAMBERT: On that matter I shall not offer an opinion. The measure was introduced late in the session and was defeated. The member for Guildford-Midland will recall that during the war period an effort was made to reduce the number of race days in this State. Members felt that legislation should be introduced to regulate and, to some extent, limit the number. I believe the racing clubs were allowed to hold 72 meetings, and that as a result of the amendments then made, the number was

considerably reduced. As I remarked members will find that the position has altered very little since the occasion on which the select committee under the chairmanship of Mr. C. A. Hudson reported to Parliament. The chief alteration has been that starting-price bookmaking has developed alarmingly. As the Minister for Police rightly pointed out, regard must be had for three or four definite objects. There is the matter of the W.A.T.C. in relationship to racing in Western Australia, the extent to which racing as a sport contributes to the progressive breeding of useful horses, and the position of the proprietary race clubs.

Mr. Sleeman: What are you going to do about them?

Mr. LAMBERT: We should consider the extent to which we would be justified in allowing the commercialising of horse-racing in this State. I believe there are only two proprietary racing clubs in this State.

Mr. Sleeman: There are four in the metropolitan area.

Mr. LAMBERT: Well, say four. In other parts of Australia, and in other parts of the world, the matter of the proprietary ownership of racecourses has been faced. I do not know that in this State the growth of proprietary or private racecourses has been of such dimensions—certainly not of the same dimensions as is noticeable in the Eastern States—that for the moment we need have any special regard for them.

Mr. Raphael: The Canning racecourse is never used, for one thing.

Mr. LAMBERT: Many members enjoy an afternoon at the races, and sometimes, when finances permit, I may also have a bet on a racecourse. In other parts of the world people approach this question not from that puritanical view which ordinarily savours so much of British institutions. There is a definite atmosphere of hypocrisy, a distinct and cloaked hypocrisy in all human beings so far as our British institutions are concerned. They are either right or they are wrong. There can be no doubt about the logic of that assertion. What we have to consider is whether people shall be allowed to gamble on the racecourse, through the totalisator, by means of shops—

Mr. Sleeman: Or sharebrokers.

Mr. LAMBERT: Or stone-brokers, or be allowed to gamble at all. Before the hon.

member can frame legislation, however commendable his desire may be to bring racing and gambling on to a reasonable plane, we must arrive at a decision on those points. The decision of the joint select committee in 1915, 21 years ago, was to abolish betting altogether.

Mr. Raphael: I wish it had been abolished then. I would have been a few pounds better off to-day.

Mr. LAMBERT: The only riches I hope the hon. member will be endowed with are the riches of intelligence.

Mr. Raphael: That is something you need.

Mr. LAMBERT: Beyond that I will not explore the riches of the hon. member. At that time the select committee recommended the absolute abolition of betting other than through the totalisator.

Mr. Raphael: The Trotting Association is about the "crookedest" thing in the State.

Mr. Sleeman: The only legal way to bet to-day is through the totalisator.

Mr. LAMBERT: If we are going to allow racing we must allow betting. We must elect to do that by one or two ways. The bookmakers in this State, and the starting-price bookmakers constitute just as honourable a body of men as any other body of men in Western Australia. I do not know of any section of the community who have such a high regard for their moral conduct and stick so rigidly to their monetary obligations, having regard to their calling, than that section associated with betting.

Mr. Thorn: You will get good odds next Saturday for that.

Mr. Styants: They never default, do they?

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think so. This is a question which has troubled the Legislature since 1906. The work of the select committee certainly tickled the public conscience to an extent that from time to time since there have been agitations for the suppression of betting. As the outcome of a broadened observation of the frailty of human nature, I have arrived at the conclusion that we are not going to abolish either betting or gambling in this State. Most commonsense people who take a reasonable view will arrive at the same decision. That being so, we must meet the position as we know it and see it. The member for Murchison is to be complimented upon the infinite amount of time and trouble he has put into this Bill. He will agree that, having regard to all aspects of gambling, its extension, its curtailment, its regulation,

etc., his interests would best be served, and he would more quickly earn the thanks of the Legislature and the people of the State if he agreed to this Bill being referred to a select committee of the House, or a joint select committee of both Houses. By that means the full evidence could be brought before Parliament, and on the information presented we would be in a better position to give a clear and logical judgment as to how far we can go in framing legislation to bring about the proper control of gambling.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [8.48]: There is no necessity for this Bill, and I intend to oppose it. I do not like, from my place in the House, laying a charge against the police force, but before I sit down members will be able to judge from my remarks that the police are not administering the gambling laws as they should do.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you think they should go on the courses?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Under the Act of 1893 there was plenty of provision for the punishment of offenders against the gambling laws.

Mr. Rodoreda: Do you want to punish them?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If that is the case, let us repeal the Act. We should not waste the time of people by putting on the statute-book laws that we have no intention of enforcing. That will soon turn us into ridicule. The police do not administer the gambling laws as they ought. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) mentioned an incident that occurred at the York athletic sports. The same thing has occurred there on more than one occasion. The local police did what the law required of them, and took action against certain persons engaged in bookmaking there, with the result that those persons were fined in the police court. I was specially requested to attend some athletic sports at Subiaco. I went there, and standing not more than four or five yards away from me were two policemen in uniform, and close at hand were half a dozen or eight men calling the odds. Certainly those men did not have bags over their shoulders like the ordinary bookmaker has, but they were calling the odds loudly enough for me to hear. I venture to say our police have not such defective hearing that the two

uniformed constables did not hear the odds called. That statement is as true as that I am now standing here. I went to Subiaco to ascertain the situation.

Mr. Raphael: The police did not touch the bookmakers on the York racecourse, did they?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I agree they did not.

Mr. Raphael: Did you bet there?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. member has had all the say he wanted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria Park must keep order.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The same remarks apply to the law relating to starting price bookmakers. The police do not attempt to enforce that law as rigidly as it might be enforced. In fact, I have previously charged the Government with using the law as a means to collect taxation. There is plenty of power in existing legislation to prevent gambling if the police choose to take that legislation seriously and carry it out. The Act of 1893 provides a penalty of £100 or six months' imprisonment with or without hard labour for the offence. If that law were enforced, these people would be deterred. Again, the Act in question provides that any person caught in a gambling house may be convicted and fined. At one time that was the practice in Western Australia, though the Minister says the statement is not correct. In 1933, for some reason or other, the police ceased to take action against men caught in gambling houses. If the law exists, it ought to be enforced. If the penalties are not heavy enough, it is for Parliament to increase them. Racecourses without betting are nothing uncommon. In the case of New Zealand, though I do not know what has happened there just recently, I can say that during my residence in the Dominion there was no such business as bookmaking, all the betting being done on the totalisator. And that is what the law of Western Australia provides, that the only betting machinery to be used is the totalisator. Indeed, that is definitely stated in the Criminal Code. If the law were enforced as we ought to enforce it, we should get back to that system. Either we want gambling, or we do not want it. We have a certain responsibility for the morals of the people in that respect, and I contend that we should discourage gambling in

every possible way. The figures available from South Australia are so astounding as to lead me to the belief that there must be some South Australians who do not get sufficient food and clothing; otherwise the huge sums which go through the betting houses there could not possibly reach them. Somebody is suffering on that account.

The Minister for Police: A lot of it is the same money.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, but even the Minister will admit that the total is very large indeed. I do not charge the Government with any desire to encourage gambling. Probably the suggestion of the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) may be wise.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It seems to be the only suggestion.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am afraid that its adoption may induce the public to believe that Parliament, in its wisdom, is in favour of gambling. I am not in favour of it. I have no desire to gamble. Our young people would be far better removed from the temptation to gamble instead of having it put in their way as it is now. We have laws, but we are not enforcing them. That is the charge I am making. We have not attempted to enforce those laws until the evil has grown so as to become almost uncontrollable. The Government have to admit that, and we other members have to admit it.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Gambling existed while you were in office.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not excuse myself.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: No Administration has been strong enough to oppose it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Parliament ought to be strong enough. Personally I shall vote against the Bill. If I were in authority to-day, I would tell the police that they had to carry out the law, and that if the law said there should be no betting houses, then there should be none. If the Criminal Code declares that the only means of gambling shall be the totalisator, then the totalisator should be the only means. New Zealand had a similar law, and I presume still has it; and New Zealanders are no worse off than we are. It is wise for us to take stock of what we are doing in this matter. To me it is a most serious question. I hate to walk down the street and see young people spend money on betting when I

know they can ill-afford to do so. Looking at the bookmakers, I judge that they have the big end of the stick. One does not hear of many of them passing through the Bankruptcy Court, for instance. When I have some of their residences pointed out to me, those residences strike me as indicating that bookmakers are very much better off than the people who bet with them. Therefore I oppose the Bill. There is no necessity for it. The Government ought to see that the existing laws are carried out. It is no use our passing laws unless the Government enforce them. The member for Guildford-Midland said that gambling existed while I was in office. That is true. However, I was not Minister for Police; and I would not be a Minister long if I had not the rest of the Cabinet behind me. Parliament must stand behind any Minister who has to enforce laws. If we are not going to enforce the existing laws relating to gambling let us repeal them. I submit that view to the House.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourn) [8.58]: I support the second reading of the Bill. In respect of this gambling evil, as it is termed, the Government have two alternatives: either to set out to abolish the evil, or else to control it. Probably no one holds that the present intolerable state of affairs should be allowed to continue. I was somewhat surprised to hear the Minister for Police advocate the appointment of a select committee after making a speech which pointed out all the advantages that had accrued to other States from the control of betting. It is about time that the Western Australian Government took a decision one way or the other in this matter. They have sidestepped the question long enough. The proposal to appoint a select committee appears to me another attempt to sidestep. The select committee, if appointed, would have to furnish their report before the end of the session. That certainly does not give them sufficient time to collect the mass of information that various speakers would have us believe is essential to enable the House to form an opinion. We already have all the information that we require in the report of the Betting Control Commission of South Australia, and in the reports of the Commissioner of Police on the working of the system. It is asserted that conditions here are altogether different from those in South Australia. I doubt it very much.

We may have two or three more mediums of gambling, but that does not affect the principle in the slightest degree. If the Bill becomes law, the Government will be forced to administer the measure. I realise that the Bill will be useless if passed in its present form. The State is hard up for additional revenue and here is a means by which considerable revenue may be raised. If the Bill be passed, the Government should amend it in the requisite directions. The South Australian Government collect a large revenue from this source, and gambling there is conducted in the daylight and under control. The Leader of the Opposition advanced arguments against the Bill that I would have used in support of it. He said that the law was not enforced. We are all aware of that, and that is the reason why I would legalise betting.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Oh!

Mr. RODOREDA: We know there is no desire to enforce the law.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then we should repeal it.

Mr. RODOREDA: The Government could eradicate starting-price betting shops immediately, if they so desired, and the Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, could have done so in their time.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is so.

Mr. RODOREDA: But it is realised there is a public demand for these facilities.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There might be a public demand for the killing of people.

Mr. RODOREDA: I have not heard of any such desire, but in this instance I say the desire exists.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We are the leaders of public thought, and we should accept our responsibilities.

Mr. RODOREDA: We cannot look after the morals of the people by passing legislation. History has proved that down the ages. How could we expect to control the morals of the people by Acts of Parliament? We must accept the facts of the situation. The history of the growth of starting-price betting is interesting. Years ago there were no shops as we know them now. The starting-price bettor did all his work over the telephone with his circle of clients, and settled with them on the Monday following the Saturday racing. With the advent of broadcasting,

however, public interest in racing has grown. To the majority of people who follow racing and bet, even in a small way, the sport is their main interest apart from their work. In fact, it is their principal interest in life. Amongst the toilers in the bush everywhere, practically the only topic of conversation is racing. We should recognise that fact and provide facilities for them to indulge, however mildly, in their favourite pastime. What has produced the great growth in starting-price betting is the fact that starting-price bookmakers are allowed to pay all bets on the afternoon or day of the race. That has led to a huge expansion in that industry. That practice could be stopped by the police in one Saturday if they were asked to do it. It would minimise the reputed evil to a great extent if bettors had to wait until the following Monday to receive their winnings. In those circumstances there would be no hanging about starting-price betting shops at all.

Mr. Hughes: If he had a book, he could still bet up to the extent of the winnings.

Mr. RODOREDÁ: Yes, but the man who loses will have no money to bet with.

Mr. Raphael: Most of them would go home pretty soon.

Mr. RODOREDÁ: I emphasise that starting-price betting could be stopped by the Government if they so desired, or, at any rate, they could minimise it at once to a great extent. A law that cannot be enforced or that Governments do not desire to enforce, is a bad law, and we should do our best to remedy the position when we recognise it as such. We all have varying opinions about gambling. It is largely a matter of upbringing and environment. Some people have a religious objection to gambling. Whether they are in the majority is difficult to say. It is a moot point as to whether a select committee could provide us with any more information in that respect. The main reason why I support the Bill is because of the insistent demand for these facilities. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, we cannot beat the bookmaker. Despite years of experience, we still keep on chancing our luck. It is inherent in our nature. One of the truest sayings I know is that the best race for the bookmakers is the human race.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [9.6]: I oppose the Bill. I recognise that the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) was very sincere, in advancing the legisla-

tion, in his desire to better the conditions of the people generally with regard to betting. I have been struck with the fact that during the discussion the point has not been stressed that the laws of the country should, and do, improve the morals of the people. Education should, and does, work along those lines. The member for Roebourne (Mr. Rodoreda) stated there is a demand for improvement regarding betting facilities. I contend that vice creates a demand. If we consider other commodities, we appreciate the fact that the demand creates the supply, whereas with vice it is vice versa. That is one of the reasons why I am entirely opposed to the Bill. I cannot discuss the South Australian Act because I do not know enough about it. I have, however, some clippings from the principal daily newspaper in Adelaide, in which it is pointed out that there are about 164 starting-price betting shops in the State. In a report in that paper there appeared a criticism of the betting shops. Mr. Tassie, the retiring president, when addressing the triennial conference of the Australian National Football Leagues, said that last year the South Australian League had experienced its worst season. According to Mr. Tassie, there were 150 betting shops in South Australia, and they were frequented by hundreds of footballers on Saturday afternoons. He went on to issue a warning to other States against the introduction of the system which, he said, would have a detrimental effect upon football. As members know, football is played extensively in Subiaco, and I do not want starting-price betting shops set up in competition with football clubs. I may mention that I do not know very much about starting-price betting shops. I have never been in one. I do not know what happens inside, but I know that outside men congregate on the footpath, and they are often poor-looking men, and some I know definitely to be on sustenance or relief. It seems to me that that is wrong. The Minister for Police quoted from the Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting in England of 1932-33. He quoted paragraph 236. Paragraph 240 might also have been quoted. It states—

Another consideration which must be borne in mind in framing legislation as to gambling is the total volume of the facilities for gambling which can be permitted without causing serious social consequences. The undesirable social consequences of gambling result in large part from over-indulgence in the habit. Since experience

shows that excessive gambling can to some extent be checked by a limitation of the organised facilities, provision to achieve such limitation is a common feature of gambling legislation.

I should like to quote other extracts from the Royal Commission's report. The Commission was under the chairmanship of Sir Sydney Rowlatt, with Baroness Emmott, Sir James Jackson, Sir James Leishman, Mrs. Stocks, and several other well-known people, and inquired into the whole problem of gambling. The following were the findings in connection with off-the-course betting:—

1. That some legal facilities for ready-money betting should be provided which would be an alternative to street betting, and would enable the street-betting Act to be effectively enforced.

2. Cash betting offices or shops for starting-price betting are not recommended. (Reason: that the establishment of such offices or shops would be an inducement to gamble.)

3. That postal cash betting be made legal (linked up with the rigid restriction of bookmakers' advertisements).

4. Nine members of the Commission recommended that facilities should be allowed for the deposit of bets in a letter box attached to or appurtenant to a bookmaker's office.

The Commission was opposed to legalisation of starting-price betting shops because—

1. Increased facilities for gambling become the instrument for fanning and encouraging the spread of gambling.

2. Increased Press, wireless and other publicity afford a powerful stimulus and incitement to gambling.

3. One of the most potent factors in the growth of gambling has been the increased facilities for organised gambling. (For some reason the present illegal starting-price betting has been allowed to grow in every town and village without any effective means being taken to enforce the law.)

4. The streets become the favourite hunting ground of those who make a living out of imposing on other people's credulity.

5. We were told that the Lotteries Bill was for the purpose of controlling and restricting gambling, but it has not had that effect. The habit has spread to starting-price betting. If this is made legal, there will then be an endeavour for some other form, say tin hare racing.

6. The aim of the State should be to prohibit or place restrictions upon those facilities for organised or professional gambling as can be shown to have serious social consequences if not checked.

7. In 1928-29 a joint committee was appointed in the Irish Free State to review the Betting Act of 1926 which established starting-price betting shops and gave a very adverse report affecting—(a) public order and decency; (b) economic welfare of the people, particularly the poorer classes; and (c) character of young people.

8. Experience teaches that easy betting leads to an increase in betting.

Those are extracts I took from the report referred to by the Minister for Police. It seems to me that even in a select committee we will get diverse opinions as to how this matter should be controlled. I do not know whether what I am about to say really comes into the subject, Mr. Speaker. You may rule me out of order if you feel I am out of order. I refer to what are called two-up schools.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is gambling.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Is that gambling? I do not know anything about it.

Mr. Needham: It is a national industry.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I have received a letter from Kalgoorlie which was sent to me for the reason that the sender felt the matter could not be brought before the notice of the members for the district, because there would be no notice taken. I will not deal with the first part of the letter. The writer continues—

There have lately been a few prosecutions for keeping betting places in Kalgoorlie. Few if any of the men prosecuted are the real owners of those premises. They are dummying there for a purpose. There are a number of shops in the main streets of Kalgoorlie and Boulder in which the internal fittings have been pulled out and the walls covered with blackboards which are devoted solely to horseracing results. These places are crowded on Saturday afternoons by men and women, though very few women. Why are they allowed to flourish in the main thoroughfares of the town? Who is responsible? If certain people's banking accounts were examined I think that you would turn green with envy.

Then there are the two-up schools—one in particular conducted by one F. Bougher, who has run it for years. It was conducted in an old quarry at the halfway between Kalgoorlie and Boulder. It got too big, and so shifted to a spot along the Brown Hill road. I passed there Sunday, 18th October. There were 43 motor cars, runabouts, and trucks parked and about 160 men of various ages and callings playing two-up behind a hessian fence. There was a cool-drink stall, and a man selling oranges. This has been going on for years. Remarks have been made by some who frequent the place that there would be more money in it if they had not to pay so much out. Who are they paying and why are they allowed to flourish unmolested? Why not get the proposed Royal Commission to embrace the above? I can promise you some startling information. If you visit this town I will place a car at your disposal and show you Saturday and Sunday gambling in operation.

I wish to say in conclusion that I entirely agree with the Leader of the Opposition that if the law had been enforced there would have been no need for this Bill. It is useless to make laws unless we enforce them. There is a suspicion abroad that starting-price betting shops are allowed to continue because they are making revenue for the Government. That is horrible. We can only ask the Minister for Police to see that the law is enforced.

MR. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle) [9.20]: The Bill under discussion represents a commendable effort on the part of the member for Murchison to control betting in this State. Of course it makes no attempt to suppress betting. Nor could we suppress betting if we tried. We might close all the starting-price shops in the State; we might drive all the bookmakers from the race-courses, but so long as we allowed races to be held, we could not suppress betting. If we cannot suppress betting, the only thing that remains to be done is to control it, and the Bill is an attempt to bring about that end, although I agree with the Minister for Police that the provisions of the Bill are not adequate, and that something more is required. Wagering is respectable or otherwise, according to the person or persons who carry it out, and according to the circumstances in which they indulge in it. I suppose there is not a member in the Chamber who has not wagered in some way, possibly without knowing it.

Mr. Marshall: I have not.

Mr. TONKIN: Has the hon. member ever insured anything?

Mr. Marshall: No, I had no money.

Mr. TONKIN: Then, of course, the hon. member wagered by the fact that he did not insure. Everyone of us gambles on something; we all take a risk.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You take a fair number.

Mr. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition sets his face against gambling and says he is wholly opposed to it. But I dare say he insures his crops against storm damage. When he does that, he wagers with the insurance company. A special Act of Parliament was necessary to make that legal. It was well-known that such an arrangement was a gamble and so a special Act was necessary to make it legal. Let us suppose that a committee of men decide to hold a sports meeting. They invest a certain amount of

money in the preliminary arrangements, and then they fear they might lose their investment through rain falling and marring the sports. So they decide to insure the sports against rain. When they do that they gamble, and the insurance company gambles too. The insurance company has certain information before it by which it is able to work out the odds against rain, and therefore it is prepared to enter into an agreement that, in return for the payment of a premium, it will pay a certain amount in the event of rain falling on the sports. So that company is wagering against a fall of rain. That kind of thing is going on every day, and is looked upon as being quite proper. Nevertheless, it is a bet, a wager. Then take the man who does his gambling on the Stock Exchange. We make no attempt to control him or to harass him, indeed we provide the facilities on the main street, and we have the Stock Exchange, to which men are refused entrance or are admitted. And there are hundreds of men in the country who make their livelihood simply by wagering on margins, buying and selling on the rise and fall of the market. All that they are doing is simply wagering or gambling on the result of certain undertakings, or on the result upon the public of the issue of certain prospectuses, or of certain reports on mining. So we have gambling again in that instance, and we make no attempt whatever to prevent that or to control it. We say it is a legitimate thing to do, and we provide the necessary facilities. And, as the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) says, there is gambling on wheat futures; men endeavour to calculate the rise or fall of the market, and buy or sell accordingly. Sometimes they make fortunes, sometimes they lose. All the time we are taking risks and are prepared to invest a certain amount on the risks with the idea of getting a bigger return later on. The member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) is also against the Bill and against gambling. I wonder if she has ever had an interest in a sweep on the Melbourne Cup. Every year in almost all the offices in the State, and in all the emporiums, and in all the small shops, a little sweep is held on the Melbourne Cup.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: And at Parliament House.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, here too.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And in the schools.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, and in the schools too. It would be difficult to find any place

where a sweep is not held on the Melbourne Cup. Every person who invests half-a-crown or 10s. or £1 in one of these sweeps is gambling on the result of the race. A person pays a half-crown into a sweep in the hope that he will draw a horse, and he is very disappointed indeed if he draws a blank.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What about sweeps for hospital funds?

Mr. TONKIN: They do not come into it. We have the spectacle of people wagering or gambling, possibly without realising it. They have an interest in a sweep and so are wagering on the result. They make their investment and expect to get a return that will repay them for the amount of money they have invested. They take a certain risk, and the odds against them can be worked out. So we find it is very difficult in our everyday life to get away from gambling or wagering in some form or other. Therefore we cannot be hypocritical about this. We have to realise that betting is here because horseracing exists, and that if there were no horseracing, there would be betting on something else. Why does horseracing exist? We have been given various reasons in answer to that question. Some people say it exists to improve the horse-breeding industry, but I have had it on excellent authority that the value of horse-racing to the horse-breeding industry is practically nil. So we can dismiss that aspect of the matter. Horseracing would not continue very long if people did not have facilities to bet upon the results. Most men who race horses do so in order to get a pecuniary benefit. They expect to win the prize money and win money as a result of wages. If people did not have facilities for betting, the race clubs would not be able to give such substantial prizes and it would not be worth the while of owners to feed and train horses to race for small prizes. Therefore, only very wealthy persons could afford to own horses and race them, and they would soon get tired of going along at intervals to watch half a dozen horses race if there were no opportunity to wager on the results. Thus horseracing continues because betting facilities are provided, and the bulk of the people who attend the races go, not because they enjoy the sport—although many do—but because it gives them facilities to bet upon the results. I believe that all those persons who take their wagering seriously go to the course in preference to betting in the shops, because they realise that

on the course more information is to be obtained. They are able to keep in touch with the movements in the betting ring, find out which owners are supporting their own horses and follow the lead of those owners. If they bet away from the racecourse, they would be unable to get that information. Hence there must be a definite reason why many people who bet do not attend the racecourse but favour the betting shops. Of course the main reason is that those people cannot afford to pay the charges levied for admission to the racecourse. On race days the Railway Department take advantage of the fact that races are being held to put up the price of train fares. The distance is the same whether it is a race day or an ordinary day. Yet for some reason or other the Railway Department see fit to charge extra for people to make the journey to the racecourse. The buses do the same thing; they run a few yards off the ordinary route and double or treble the fare for the journey, taking advantage of the fact that people are going to the races. The price of admission to the racecourse is fairly high. The further away a man lives from the course, the greater the expense for him to get there. If a person were travelling from Fremantle and wished to enter the grandstand and provide himself with a book, he could not do so for much less than £1. He would have to pay his taxi fare or train fare from Fremantle to the course, the price of admission to the course and the price of a book, and the total would be fairly close to £1. That is about four times as much as many persons wager during an afternoon. Quite a number of men do not stand to lose more than 5s. or half-a-crown. They might have one bet. If it is successful, they will have others. If it is not successful, they cannot have others and they stop. But they have had their afternoon's enjoyment and have probably derived as much pleasure from their modest wagers as has the man with hundreds of pounds who has been able to wager on a large scale. That is one reason why s.p. betting in this State—and I suppose in other States and countries—have increased; people who could not possibly face the outlay necessary to attend the racecourse wager their money away from a course. We also have another contingency to contend with. Men who bet on racing read the newspapers in an en-

deavour to follow form, believing that the only way in which one can select a reasonable number of winners is to follow the form of the horses. I have not much experience of what happens in other States, but the general belief is that the form of horses in the other States is much more uniform than that of horses in Western Australia. If a horse runs a good race in the East on one Saturday, the reasonable assumption is that it will run a fairly good race on the following Saturday, and if it does not win on either the first or second occasion, it is worth following up because it is showing form.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are you showing us the system?

Mr. TONKIN: No, I am not. I believe that cannot be done in this State with equal success in picking winners, because it is said that the form shown by horses here is not so true. No doubt there are reasons for that—very good reasons which need not be mentioned here. Among people who make wagers, it is generally accepted that Eastern States form is more reliable. For that reason many people in Western Australia never wager a sixpence on the local races. They make their wagers on Eastern States races because the form there is more reliable and the prices are better. The odds are better if a man happens to select a winner. Here, because wagering is on a smaller scale, the betting ring is not so strong and the odds are not so wide as in the Eastern States. Therefore a person selecting a winner does not get the same return as he would reap if he selected a winner in Melbourne or Sydney. I believe there is a difference even between Melbourne and Sydney in the matter of reliability of form and prices for successful horses. If people desire to wager on Eastern States races, unless they are wealthy people who can command the services of friends in the Eastern States, the only way is to enter a betting shop. A wealthy man who has travelled considerably and is acquainted with racing men in the East is able to send a telegram if he wishes to make an investment there. A few weeks ago a local horse, "Balkan Prince," was running in the Melbourne Cup. It is owned locally and most racegoers in this State knew that the horse was a good one. They also knew that the horse was in form. Quite a lot of people desired to make an

investment on the chance of that horse being successful. An ordinary person wishing to wager on the horse had to go to or ring up a betting shop. Committee-men of the W.A.T.C. or wealthy owners in this State had no need to do that, although possibly many of them did. They could send a telegram to a friend in the East and ask him to make a wager for them or, as many did, they could take a trip East and back the horse on the course. For all the hundreds of persons who desired to wager upon that horse, and could not make the trip to Melbourne, and had no friends in the Eastern States, the only facility open was the local betting shop, and no doubt they availed themselves of that facility. The Leader of the Opposition said that the police made no attempt to enforce the law and he admitted that when his Government were in power the police made no attempt to enforce the law.

Hon. C. G. Latham: For a long time they did. They arrested everyone they caught on the premises.

Mr. TONKIN: Did they?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: I have been told dozens of times that when the Labour Party are in power, the starting-price bookmakers are worried and harassed more than when the Government of another political party are in power. That is what starting-price bookmakers say.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is only said to endeavour to influence you in their favour.

Mr. TONKIN: No. They produce figures to prove their statement, and mention the names of different men, saying, "Look at the numbers of times so-and-so has been fined during the regime of the Labour Government."

Hon. C. G. Latham: The member for East Perth made a wilder statement than that.

Mr. TONKIN: I am responsible only for my own statements. These men definitely say that when the Labour Government are in power they are harassed and worried more than at any other time. Whether that be true or not I do not know. There is one very unfair aspect of the present system, or the lack of system. Some men are picked out by the police fairly frequently and are heavily fined. Other men, for some reason, are practically immune.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: How do you account for that?

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot account for it. Some men are never worried. It must be known to the police that they are carrying on starting-price betting, whereas other men are worried almost from the outset. I dare say that the existence of every starting-price betting shop in the State is known to the police, and that they also know when people are thinking of starting one, and in many cases warn them against doing so. It is not right that some men should be harassed and others let off. If we are going to enforce the law, it must be enforced all round, without fear or favour. As we have no chance of suppressing betting, the best thing to do is to control it. This Bill attempts to do that, to bring order out of chaos, and to control betting in such a way that the police can take proper action in accordance with the law and see that it is strictly enforced. I am satisfied that the present position can be improved and will be improved by the passing of this Bill. If it is not passed, there may be an improvement for a week or two, but we will then fall back into the present position, whatever Government may be in office. We do not want that. We want to see the business tightened up and properly controlled. The Minister for Police told us that in South Australia order had been created out of chaos, and that, whilst everything was not as might be desired, the present position is a great improvement upon that which existed before. Believing that we can improve the position, I intend to support the second reading, and if a move is made to refer the Bill to a select committee, I shall also be in favour of that. The Bill is hardly adequate to deal with the situation. If a select committee reports favourably, the Government might be induced to bring down a measure which should be satisfactory in every way.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison—in reply) [9.45]: Only two members have spoken in opposition to the Bill, namely the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver). It is remarkable that notwithstanding all the investigations over periods of years in various countries, not excluding Western Australia, people still have to confess that betting on horseracing is more prevalent now than ever before. The member for Subiaco reminded me of the ostrich which, having buried its head in the sand, imagined it could no longer be seen. What a frightfully flat, straight-out contra-

diction of facts the hon. member offered in opposition to the measure. She said it would encourage the volume of betting. I gave the Chamber facts and figures, so far as it was possible to obtain them, to show the position as it prevailed in South Australia prior to the legalisation of betting, and what it has been since. The hon. member can take up what attitude she likes. I challenge her to show where there is any restriction upon betting in this State to-day. It is possible to make a bet anywhere. To say that it is possible to increase the volume of betting is hypocrisy in the extreme. How is it possible to do that when there is no limit to the amount of betting that can go on? What a ridiculous argument to advance, that it could increase the volume of betting! It cannot be increased beyond its present limits, except so far as the pockets of the people are capable of stretching those limits. The hon. member has no desire to protect the juveniles who drift into this rotten environment after they leave school, and who because of lack of control are educated into the art of betting while still in knickerbockers. That is what hurts me. I devoted the best part of half an hour to that subject 12 months ago. Under the Act that was framed to regulate betting, no individual has a legal right to make a bet. There are no facilities enabling him to bet. But the member for Subiaco would let the present betting go on. She does not want it stopped.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Don't tell lies!

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member opposes the Bill which will stop that betting. That is the point.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They cannot legally do it to-day.

Mr. MARSHALL: I shall reply to the hon. gentleman in due course. At present I wish to deal with the member for Subiaco. However, I am fully acquainted with the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes, you are!

Mr. MARSHALL: All the facts are here, and facts from all over the Commonwealth show the hopelessness of the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is a trouble that your law will not be enforced any more than the present laws are.

Mr. MARSHALL: The trouble is that the hon. gentleman has not given two minutes' thought to the subject. He has merely

adopted an attitude which he thinks in keeping with the Orders of the Day; he is Leader of the Opposition, and therefore must oppose.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then I must be unpopular with the House!

Mr. MARSHALL: Let the hon. gentleman deny the facts as to legalisation of betting in South Australia, and as to betting in Victoria in the absence of legalisation. The former betting laws of South Australia were of the severest type. Did they stamp out betting? Of course they did not. It has been said in this Chamber, by way of interjection, that in Victoria, which has one of the strictest statutes against betting, one cannot get a bet.

Mr. Sleeman: In Victoria bets are made in every shop.

Mr. MARSHALL: I took the trouble to write to some very important persons in Victoria to ascertain whether illegal betting, as we know it, obtains in that State. The Victorian law is most drastic. Did that law, on which the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Subiaco pin their faith, prove effectual? Victoria tackled the problem by a law making the landlord responsible for the business conducted on his premises. Did the law stamp out betting in Victoria? Hear what these Victorian gentlemen have to say. My first letter is from the Chief Commissioner of Police of Victoria, who ought to know exactly how effective the law is.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What is his name?

Mr. MARSHALL: Blamey.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He was Chief Commissioner.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am speaking of 12 months ago. I wrote for information then, and I have not gone over the same ground again, as it was not necessary. What prevailed in Victoria 12 months ago, prevails there to-day.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Was he not put out of office?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know what he was put out for.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I do.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then let the hon. member give the information, so that all of us may know. The fact remains that he was Chief Commissioner of Police in Victoria. This is what he had to say—

Mr. Withers: Was there not a woman in the case?

Mr. MARSHALL: I cannot say. I do not know which is worse—betting or women.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are dealing with betting at the moment, and women may be left out.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Victorian Chief Commissioner wrote under date of the 11th October, 1935—

With reference to your letter of the 2nd inst., I have to state that although provision is made in the Police Offences Act for severe penalties against persons convicted of illegal gaming, a large volume of illegal betting is carried on in Victoria off the racecourse, and thousands of pounds are collected every year from fines for these offences.

Such is the outcome of the very severe legislation of Victoria. The second letter I wish to quote is from Mr. Kent Hughes, Acting Leader of the Opposition in the Victorian Parliament. Under date of the 9th October, 1935, he wrote—

With reference to your request of the 2nd October, it is impossible to obtain any accurate information as to how much betting takes place outside the racecourse. Undoubtedly a very great deal goes on, and people are continually being caught and fined for being starting-price bookmakers. I do not think that any further legislation would be any more effective than the prohibition laws in America. Actually our legislation in Victoria of course forbids this form of betting, but the effectiveness of such legislation is another question.

Such is that gentleman's opinion of what is taking place in his State. I have a third letter from Mr. Tunnecliffe, leader of the Victorian Labour Party, dated 10th October, 1935—

Yours of the 2nd instant to hand re the efficiency of betting legislation in Victoria. Betting outside a racecourse is illegal. Street betting and starting-price betting are widespread and general. It is safe to say that anybody who desires to put any sum from 1s. to £1,000 on horses will find no difficulty whatever in being accommodated. Every public building—

I want to give this information to the member for Subiaco in particular. It also represents the position in South Australia.

Every public building has somebody who is prepared to accept a commission, and even in the public offices betting takes place. Prosecutions are frequent, and fines are heavy.

Mr. Sleeman: There are agents going round and getting two shillings from housewives.

Mr. MARSHALL: One cannot convince people who are not willing to be convinced. I desire to remind the Leader of the Opposi-

tion of the debate which took place on the lotteries legislation. The Lotteries Commission has cost four members of Parliament their seats. We had then the self-same argument which was advanced by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Subiaco this evening, that the effect of the legislation would be to increase the volume of betting. I venture to suggest that the Lotteries Commission have not done one atom of damage to the morals of this community.

Mr. Styants: Was not last week's lottery a record?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know. I do not take too much interest in the subject. However, our people are just as moral today as they were before that legislation was enacted. Let us have a look at South Australia. I wish to inform the member for Subiaco, who seemingly knows little about illegal betting, that all the laws which can be put on the statute-book will not get the real offender. That is the trouble. We cannot get the bookmaker. No matter how severe the law, the bookmaker does not suffer any penalty. He always has a substitute. The bookmaker himself is never caught. He was never caught in South Australia. The member for Subiaco was eager to quote one report, so eager that she omitted to quote the final majority report, which recommended the legalisation of betting. She religiously kept away from the latter report. That document also mentions that all the laws against betting enacted over a period of a hundred years proved unsuccessful. The bookmaker could never be caught. He paid a premium to others to bear the penalty. And that was the position in South Australia. The penalty was heavy, and in consequence the bookmaker never appeared. But when the substitute was caught, he paid the penalty. If the substitute had to go to gaol, the bookmaker kept the substitute's wife and family or other dependants during the period of imprisonment. The bookmaker never has been caught, and never can be caught, by any law whatsoever. The figures I am about to quote are based upon the number of bookmakers and the number of premises used for betting actually known to the South Australian police prior to the introduction of legislation. In making that statement I want it clearly to be understood that those represented only the persons and premises known to the police. How many more were there not known to the police? That is the

point. Then, again, in South Australia, as is the position also in Western Australia, the number of men known to the police as engaged in betting represents the minimum. The member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) talked about the volume of betting. In South Australia there has been an increase with regard to both bookmakers and registered premises, but, nevertheless, they are 40 per cent. and 45 per cent. respectively below the number known to the police to be operating before their operations were legalised. In the 1934 report of the Betting Control Board in South Australia the following appears:—

As to the provision made for betting legally, the board has registered 370 bookmakers and 60 agents—a total of 430 compared with 643 before the board's appointment. This shows a reduction of 33 per cent.

What does the member for Subiaco say about that? Has the volume increased there?

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: You said there had been an increase.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am giving the facts; I am not saying anything myself. The report continues:—

In respect of premises the figures are 244 registered as against 528 knowingly used illegally prior to the passing of the Act—a reduction of 53 per cent.

It was also known to the police in South Australia that there were no fewer than 590 "nit-keepers," who were employed by the bookmakers on the look-out for the police.

Mr. Sampson: And they had to work hard.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is nothing to jest about! Here we have it stated that the bookmakers kept an army of pimps and informers, and conditions that lead to that sort of thing are no credit to any State. That shows what arises from the passing of severe laws.

Mr. Sampson: I watched them at Walkerville.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know what the hon. member has watched. It is also known that no fewer than 35 homes in South Australia were specially fitted up for betting purposes, with telephones attached and accommodation for persons known to those in charge. Children were sent on to the streets to watch for the police. Fancy that state of affairs existing in which children are educated to go out and watch for the police!

From infancy they are taught to despise the law and what it stands for.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Would you run a starting-price betting shop?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know enough about it.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Why do you want others to do it?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not want anyone to do it. If others were like me, there would not be any horse-racing at all, because it is due only to betting that the sport exists. As I have never made a bet in my life, there would, therefore, be no horse-racing in Western Australia. I do not desire to make people moral by law, because I realise that cannot be done. To talk about making the law severe and enforcing it, as Opposition members propose, would merely serve to drive those participating in betting into hotels, into the byways and highways and elsewhere, and thus enable women and children and men under the influence of drink to bet in secret, and encourage them to hate and defy the law, the police and those associated with the law. And we stand for that! We adopt that attitude towards betting rather than agree to legalise it as we have legalised the liquor traffic. Does the member for Subiaco suggest that we should do away with the licensing law because of immorality associated with drinking?

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I know that law is not enforced.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but the hon. member does not expect to cut out the immoral aspect by controlling the evil. Why not allow all to have an open go because she contends that legalising the practice means that we condone it. Nothing could be further from the truth. By controlling it, we go as far as is humanly possible to sever it from the immoral aspects associated with both betting and drinking. I could quote quite a lot of other facts, but it is not worth while. Those who have taken the trouble to observe what is going on in this State and in the Commonwealth, apart from the two States where betting has been legalised, must appreciate the fact that the conditions are no credit to any Government. I tell those who oppose the Bill that there is nothing so demoralising as poverty. If it were not for their rotten impoverished state, people would not be running to the betting shops in the hope that their last sixpence might be multi-

plied into eighteenpence. That is the desire that drives them there.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I agree with you there.

Mr. Sampson: That is balderdash!

Mr. MARSHALL: That is the rotten position that exists, and we should not have to stand here talking about it in this enlightened age.

Mr. Sampson: Hear, hear!

Mr. MARSHALL: It is the desire to get away from the poverty and misery that prompts many people to take a chance. By legalising and controlling betting we would at least stop children from having facilities to indulge in betting. We would assure that no one under the influence of liquor would be able to bet and invest money beyond his means. We would eliminate the congestion that is apparent in the streets in the vicinity of betting shops and abolish the use of obscene language that is so frequently indulged in where betting goes on. I desire the Bill to be passed, and I do not desire it to be referred to a select committee. I will delay the House no longer. The Bill is there for members to deal with. Members know why I have introduced it. Those who desire to do something in the interests of the children of the State will vote for it. Those who wish the present conditions to continue will vote against it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

To refer to Select Committee.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [10.9]: I move—

That the Bill be referred to a select committee.

It is not necessary to repeat what I have already said. I voted for the second reading of the Bill with a view to having it referred to a select committee, who could get to work and provide us with additional information.

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

Ayes	29
Noes	10
					—
Majority for	19
					—

AYES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. Patrick
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Cross	Mr. Seward
Mr. Doney	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hawke	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Warner
Mr. Latham	Mr. Watts
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wise
Mr. Needham	Mr. Wilson
Mr. North	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Doust	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Fox	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Styant
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. Raphael	Mr. Nulsen
	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Select Committee Appointed.

Ballot taken and a committee appointed consisting of Mrs. Cardell-Oliver, Messrs. Marshall, Tonkin, Warner and Johnson, with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on the 3rd December.

**BILL—BUNBURY (OLD CEMETERY)
LANDS REVESTMENT.**

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [10.25] in moving the second reading said: The land in this cemetery, Bunbury Lot 294, was originally granted to the Church of England for a burial ground, but was in 1928 transferred to the Bunbury Municipality, subject to certain special conditions. In the same year it was closed against further burials, except in cases where persons produced their title to an area of ground therein. The Bunbury Municipal Council advise, and the Diocesan Trustees agree, that the land is no longer required for burial purposes and that no further burials should be allowed therein, and desire to obtain possession of the land in order to convert it into a closed cemetery and public park. Due notice of such intention has been published in the local Press. It is not intended to disturb the remains, but to preserve the tombstones. A public cemetery has been proclaimed at Bunbury, so there is no necessity to continue the use of this one. The Bill therefore provides that the land shall be revested in His Majesty, freed and discharged from all trusts and encumbrances, and to be set apart as a

Class "A" reserve for a closed cemetery and public park, and granted in fee simple to the municipality. It also provides power to change the positions of the monuments, headstones, etc., and to grant permission to any person establishing his right to remove a monument, headstone or grave sitting from the reserve. The Bill relieves the municipality from any obligation to remove the remains of persons buried in the reserve, but provides for permission being given for any person to remove any such remains who can prove that, prior to the closure of the cemetery on the 26th January, 1929, he had a title to the land in which such remains are buried. I do not think there can be any objection whatever to the measure, and so I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [10.28]: I will support the second reading. This question has been agitating the minds, not of the Municipality of Bunbury, but of the citizens generally, for a considerable time past. It is something like 25 years since the district established a general cemetery outside the municipality which, of course, is for the burial of persons of all denominations. In the early days this old cemetery was looked upon as being in a remote portion of the town. But as the town progressed, it became evident that the cemetery was too small, and the surrounding area became popular for the building of homes. To-day this cemetery is quite surrounded by homes and is adjacent to the principal beach of the town. The municipality has had it in mind to beautify the area contained in the old cemetery without disturbing to any great extent the present tombstones, but giving people who have the right permission to remove the tombstones to the other cemetery if they so wish.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is it not in a hollow among the sandhills?

Mr. WITHERS: Yes.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Eventually it will be covered by sand.

Mr. WITHERS: Like other old cemeteries, it is in a dilapidated condition. Most of the old residents of Bunbury have their dear ones interred there, and most of the graves are of very long standing. Very few remains could be found in that cemetery to-day. It would be far better to have the tombstones removed to the boundary of the

cemetery with a view to ornamenting the ground, or to have the tombstones removed altogether. The idea is to convert the cemetery into Pioneer Park and place in the centre a monument to commemorate those who are buried there. That, however, is a question for the council to decide. The cemetery at present is not a credit to the town, and the fact of utilising it for what I might describe as a more modern purpose would enable it to be put to useful service.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [10.31]: I shall not oppose the measure. The plan, however, reveals the presence of other cemeteries. There is one of four acres which belongs to the Roman Catholic community.

The Minister for Lands: I am told that is not correct.

Mr. Withers: That area is not a cemetery.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There are two other small cemeteries also shown on the plan. I know the locality where this cemetery is situated, and I am satisfied that the drifting sand will in a few years cause it to lose its identity. The Bill mentions the discontinuance of the use of the land as a burial ground as from the 26th January, 1929, which is not very long ago. I hope the municipal council will pay due regard to the feelings of the relatives of the people buried there.

Mr. Withers: All of them have been consulted.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suppose the cemetery might as well be used in this way as in any other. A while ago the State Gardens Board took over the East Perth Cemetery and made great improvements there. In London the same thing is being done to many of the historic burial places as is proposed at Bunbury. The tombstones are removed and placed around the boundaries of churchyards and burial places, and the land is turned into recreation grounds for children. Though some people might be sensitive on that point, there is probably no real objection to using the land and having it controlled in a proper way rather than that it should remain uncared for.

Mr. Withers: It will not be used for sports purposes.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—CITY OF PERTH ENDOWMENT LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [10.37] in moving the second reading said: The locality known as Floreat Park is a subdivision of part of the area referred to in Section 3 of the Act as the Lime Kilns Estate. A portion of the Floreat Park subdivision has been purchased from the Perth City Council by the Workers' Homes Board under the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act, 1911. The sale by the City Council, however, is subject to Section 46 of the Act, which provides that any of the land sold by the council shall be held by the purchaser subject at all times to the provisions of the Act and any amendments thereof and all by-laws, and regulations made thereunder. That provision constitutes an encumbrance on the title. The Workers' Homes Board desire to surrender the land to the Crown in order that it may be dedicated to the purpose of Part III of the Workers' Homes Act, which provides for the dedication of Crown lands and for their leasing. Because of the encumbrance, the Workers' Homes Board have no power to surrender the land. There is a lively demand for workers' homes in the locality, and the demand cannot be met while the title to the land is subject to the restriction. The purpose of the Bill is to remove the restriction so far as it applies to any land subject to the Act that has been or may be purchased by the Workers' Homes Board from the City Council. The Bill provides that Section 46 shall not apply to any of the said land purchased or acquired by the Workers' Homes Board from the City Council before or after the commencement of this measure. Authority is also provided for the Registrar of Titles, on receipt of an application under the seal of the Workers' Homes Board to make the necessary alteration in the endorsement on the certificate of title of land already purchased by the board, and to accept with regard to future acquisitions a notification under the seal of the board that the encumbrance in Section 46 no longer applies.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What is the area?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Seven or eight acres, I believe. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [10.40]: I do not desire to hold up this Bill. Apparently it is intended not only to apply to land already acquired by the Workers' Homes Board, but to any land acquired by the board in the future. By what the Minister said, this land has been acquired from the City endowment lands which the Workers' Homes Board were empowered to purchase. It is now desired that this land should revert to the Crown so that it may be let out on lease. I do not know whether that is right. I should have liked to know the total area that will probably be covered.

The Minister for Lands: It is seven or eight acres.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Is this to apply to further purchases?

The Minister for Lands: If further purchases are made.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have always advocated that the Workers' Homes Board should buy cheap land. If the locality is suitable, it seems to me an opportunity to acquire cheap land there.

The Minister for Lands: It is on the main road.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suppose this land will be hemmed in by all sorts of restrictions as to building requirements, tiled roofs, approved designs and so on. That I should very much regret, because it prevents the board from having the opportunity to provide cheap homes.

The Minister for Lands: This land is on the main road.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If any more land is purchased in that locality I hope it will be acquired free of all these restrictions. If the board cannot get the land free, Parliament will have to take a hand in the matter. We must be able to provide cheap homes. I know of no land more suitably situated for the erection of cheap homes by the Workers' Homes Board than in this particular locality.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [10.42]: I do not want to vote in the dark on this subject, but I have been unable to hear what the Minister for Lands said: It is difficult to gather from the Bill itself what it pur-

ports to deal with. It appears on the surface as if it was designed to enable the Workers' Homes Board to acquire certain land.

The Minister for Lands: The board has already acquired it.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Is the object of the Bill to give the board a title to that land?

The Minister for Lands: A title subject to the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Is the object of the Bill to enable the board to get a title?

The Minister for Lands: Yes.

Hon. N. KEENAN: And the land has already been acquired?

The Minister for Lands: To get a title freed from the trust.

Hon. N. KEENAN: In that case I propose to offer no opposition to the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [10.45] in moving the second reading said: This is a simple Bill designed to relieve from vermin taxation road boards and municipalities in whom are vested lands and under whose control are lands known as reserves. The Vermin Act makes no provision for reserves under the control of municipalities and road boards being exempt from the incidence of the tax imposed under Section 100A of the principal Act. Although the amount of money involved is not great, it is considered that, as it is a function of the local authorities to rid all their reserves of vermin, it is an imposition upon them to rate them and charge them a tax upon the reserves under their control. It is a question which has agitated the minds of all who control reserves in different districts. After a discussion with the Commissioner of Taxation, I find it is only in recent years that the tax has been imposed, and that the local authorities have been called upon to pay. He assures me that the amount is a trifling one. As is usual with the Commissioner of Taxa-

tion, he is prepared to take a generous view in such matters.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Your experience is different from ours.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: He is prepared even to waive the claims which have been submitted in the past.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: He will receive more claims now following upon that statement.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Commissioner of Taxation is prepared to refund all moneys which have been paid in that connection. Clause 2 provides that any reserve under the control of a municipality or road board should be deemed to have been exempt from the assessment of rates. I went into the matter carefully and saw that it was a just thing to do in the circumstances. It may be submitted by members of the Opposition that certain reserves represent an earning power to some municipalities and road boards. They certainly lease portion of their commonages for grazing rights from time to time, but the income is very small. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [10.49]: There will be no opposition to the Bill from this side of the House. As I know the Minister understands, local authorities have been looking forward to the release from payment of vermin tax. They have contended that not only were they entitled to this release because an obligation was cast upon them to keep down vermin on reserves in many cases, but that they were also entitled to relief because as local authorities they were deputising as it were, for the central Government, and in a measure acted as tax collectors themselves. They have felt it was improper that they should be taxed by the central authority and that there should be extracted from them revenues which they collected by the authority of the central power for the carrying on of affairs in their own districts. Therefore, since the Commissioner decided that it was a question of taxing local authorities under the Vermin Act, there has been some agitation by the local authorities for relief. When the agitation came under the notice of the Minister for Agriculture, it was only natural that he would see the justice of the claim advanced by the local authorities, and in consequence bring down this Bill at the earliest

opportunity. The local authorities that have paid the tax which has been assessed will be even more pleased, I believe, than other local authorities, in that such amounts as have been paid may now be refunded under Clause 2 of the Bill. The measure is a most satisfactory one, and I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [10.51]: I also have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, and am greatly pleased that the Government have brought it down. During various conferences of local authorities there has been considerable discussion regarding the improper imposition of fees in connection with these reserves. I realise, however, that there is an obligation on local authorities with respect to reserves, in that vermin should as far as possible be controlled. Reserves are always a potential, and in fact a definite, danger to other properties from that aspect. I hope boards and municipalities will do everything possible in those few instances where reserves may become breeding grounds for vermin. I am indeed pleased to know that the Government realise that the payment of these fees is not properly due from the local authorities in question.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.
