

tan area. I ask the Government not to proceed with the Bill in the circumstances, but to allow the district to develop and when the demand for land has been created it can be made available as required. Nobody but the member for Nelson has asked for this land to be made available.

Mr. Willmott: The local progress association has asked for it.

Mr. SCADDAN: Local progress associations would ask for the moon. I do not think the circumstances justify our agreeing to the request, and I do not agree with the contention that we will be holding up the development of the South-West if we refuse to make available this small area of 400 acres for residential purposes. Under the proposal of the Government there will be a few who will pay up to 10s. an acre for this land, and under the freehold system in a very short time the whole area will be in the hands of one or two persons. Why not open up the land down at Augusta, where we made blocks available?

Mr. Willmott: I know instances of applications for that land having been refused by you.

Mr. SCADDAN: We dealt with applications on their merits. Instead of giving up the only piece of the shore of the Margaret River still open to the public, it would be far wiser to make blocks available at Augusta. I would ask the Minister to reconsider this question and withdraw the Bill. Not by any stretch of the imagination can it be regarded as a matter of urgency.

Progress reported.

BILL—FLINDERS BAY-MARGARET RIVER RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [10.11] in moving the second reading said: This is merely a short Act to confirm the purchase of the Flinders Bay-Margaret River railway and vest the railway in His Majesty. It will be remembered that in 1913 a Bill was passed authorising the purchase of this railway from Millar's Timber and Trading Co. The Bill now before the Chamber has been prepared on the advice of the Solicitor

General, who is also Commissioner of Titles, to secure the vestment of the property in the Crown, and so avoid the expense of getting transfers of the various parcels of land on which the railway line is built, and to complete formalities. There is really nothing new in the matter. It is a formal Bill and, the principle of the purchase of the railway having been already approved by the passing of the Act of 1913, this is merely to enable the officers to complete the transaction.

On motion by Mr. Angwin debate adjourned.

BILL—TRADING CONCERNS.

Second Reading—Order discharged.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [10.13]: The Crown Law Department has informed me that there is a technical error in connection with the Title of the Bill. It will, therefore, be necessary to withdraw it this evening, and notice will have to be given under the amended Title. Therefore I move—

That the Order of the Day be discharged.

Question passed; Order discharged.

House adjourned at 10.11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 8th November, 1916.

	Page
Papers presented	719
Leave of absence	719
Bills: Permanent Reserve (No. 1), 3A. .. .	719
Betting Suppression, 2B. .. .	719
Special Lease (Stirling Estate), 1A. .. .	731
Treasury Bills Act Amendment, 1A. .. .	731
Kordia Grass Tree Concession, 1B. .. .	731
Zoological Gardens Act Amendment, returned ..	731
Execution of Instruments, returned	731

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1. Special by-laws for the regulation of traffic of the Blackboy Hill camp under the Roads Board Act of 1911; 2. Commissioner of Taxation, Eighth Annual Report; 3. Pipes supplied by Monteath Bros., return (ordered on motion by Hon. J. Duffell).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. F. Cullen leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. C. McKenzie, on the ground of illness.

On motion by Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. G. W. Miles, on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (No.1).

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—BETTING SUPPRESSION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd November.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.35]: I rise to offer a few remarks upon this Bill. Since my election to this House I have not seen such a drastic piece of legislation come forward as is contained in this Bill. I think that when proposed drastic legislation comes forward it should inevitably follow a public clamour or a public demand. I invite the leader of the House in his reply to point out where there has been any public clamour for this piece of legislation. The reasons for its introduction are based upon the report of the select committee on horse-racing. I do not want to go into the pros and cons of that select committee, but I think there are hon. members in this Chamber who will agree with me that the whole of the proceedings of that select committee were taken as a joke. Contrast the action of the Government in introducing this measure, without any public demonstration or public clamour, with their action upon the liquor question. I have been both a drinker and a bettor, and I have done more betting than drinking, and

I am not an angel in either respect, but if there is one question which has commanded public attention and given rise to public clamour, a question that involves injury to the well-being and social life of the State, it is, I say, the liquor question. But despite public clamour the Government, as a Government, have declined to take action. It is said there is never a crime without a motive. I do not suppose any Bill has been introduced into Parliament without a motive. Behind this Bill there is a motive, which at a later stage I will endeavour to place my construction upon. There are circumstances which surround the introduction of this Bill and another Bill into another place, which are closely related and have similar objects, which can only be characterised as an attempt upon certain individuals of this place, and as a fore and aft attack. They are coming at them back and front. One Bill is introduced in one place and another in another place, and the purport given out in another place and given out in this place is similar one to the other. We find that the Colonial Secretary when moving the second reading of the Bill used words much to the following effect:—

It is the object of the present Government and it was the opinion of the select committee—
which I do not take seriously—

that horseracing should be seriously curtailed. Consequently all the arguments which supporters of the bookmakers gave that it would seriously curtail horse-racing have no influence with the present Government, because that is one of the objects we wish to achieve.

That is given as one of the motives for the introduction of the Bill by the leader of the House, namely, that by cutting out the bookmaker he will, to a certain extent, minimise racing. But also there is another motive, and one in which I sympathise with the Government, seeing that they come forward with a policy and programme, and with words which up to date have not been confirmed by deeds, for squaring the finances. The main motive behind the introduction of this Bill and the introduction of the Bill when in another place is not, in my opinion, for the purpose of abolishing the bookmaker, but for the purpose of adding to the revenue of

the State. The leader of the House, in introducing the Bill, said that the Government proposed to get a greater portion of revenue than is now the case from the totalisators. He also said that the totalisator revenue is a very legitimate subject for taxation. To go further, the Premier only last evening in another place, in introducing another measure which will pass, I have no doubt, in transit this one, the one coming down, and the other coming up—because they are interwoven—said that the Bill proposed to increase the totalisator taxation by $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and to take all fractions and all unclaimed dividends. That was the purpose of the Bill in another place. The Premier also said that the licensees of the tote would not be allowed to increase their present percentage, that is to say, the Government propose to increase the present totalisator taxation by $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as stated by the Minister in this House, and also propose to take all unclaimed dividends and all fractions, which has not been done heretofore, for the obvious purpose, as pointed out by the Premier and supplemented by the Colonial Secretary. He said that by the abolition of the bookmaker and the imposition of a greater tax he hoped to minimise horse-racing. Therefore, between him and the Premier they hoped to minimise horse-racing. The Premier said, however, that he estimated that when both Bills were passed, that is, the Bill to abolish the bookmaker and the Bill to increase the totalisator tax, a sum of £63,000 per annum would be added to the revenue. Therefore I claim that in that we have the motive for the introduction of this measure. The abolition of the bookmaker is only a side issue in comparison with what the totalisator tax will bring in in the way of pounds, shillings, and pence to the Government. It seems somewhat curious to me that any responsible Minister should take this course to curtail horse-racing by starting out with the abolition of the bookmaker. Then, in the same breath almost, the Government propose to take a part of the filthy lucre that accrues from horse-racing, or the evil of betting which the bookmaker is said to have brought into existence. If there is too much horse-racing in this State the Government should deter-

mine to reduce it and take drastic action in the way that they would against sly grog sellers. I hold the opinion that the Government have tackled this question on wrong premises. If there is too much horse-racing let us legislate in the direction of curtailing it and if we have come to the conclusion that betting is illegal, let us tackle that question by itself. In regard to the overplus of racing there is much to be taken into consideration. In Victoria, not so long ago, it was recognised that there was a surfeit of racing in that State, and the Government took the matter in hand and fixed the number of dates on which racing should be carried out during the year. That, I contend, is what ought to have been done in Western Australia. At the present time, however, we have three bodies controlling the sport. There is, first of all, the W.A.T.C., which controls what is known as the pure merino body, or the real silver-tails of racing. Then we have the unregistered racing and the people associated with that are, in vulgar language, called the ringtails, who have been thrown out from the pure merino section. Then there is Mr. Brennan with the trotting and the utility horse.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Where did you get those scientific names?

Hon. J. CORNELL: There are three distinct bodies in this State responsible for the control of racing but they are not responsible to anyone, and so far as the bookmaker is concerned we have the spectacle that those who bet under the auspices of the W.A.T.C. cannot bet on the trotting or at the unregistered courses, and the position is reversed in regard to the bookmakers associated with the other places. We have three distinct types of betting people and if the Government were serious in their endeavour to grapple with this position, they should start at the fountain head by establishing Ministerial control over these bodies.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Political control?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I would not say political control. These people are not responsible to anyone. They race when they like and how they like according to their own arrangements. There is another form of racing which should be dealt with by the

Government if they are anxious to show their bona fides, and that is proprietary racing. In the days when I was a sport I did in my "bit of tin" and often walked home tired, and I always held then that when people conducted race meetings on proprietary lines for profit, then racing ceased to be a sport. If the leader of the House had any desire to tackle the question he should tackle the proprietary clubs first. I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill. I agree with a portion of the principle set out in the measure, but as it is drafted I cannot support it. I agree that shop betting and street betting should be suppressed, if possible, by the enforcement of the law which exists, and if we cannot totally suppress all betting, we should use our utmost efforts to confine it to the four corners of the locality in which it is conducted. The leader of the House has pointed out in glowing terms the benefit that has resulted from the suppression of the bookmaker in South Australia. I venture to remark from casual observation that, so far as that State is concerned, there is just as much money changing hands over horse-racing at the present time as there was before the legislation was put on the statute-book, and perhaps more so, per head of the population than in any of the other States. I have actually seen bookmakers in that State betting at the Morphettville racecourse.

The Colonial Secretary: You do not suggest that they have as much racing in South Australia as we have here.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I want the Government to start at the top and not at the bottom. There is another matter to which the Colonial Secretary might make some reference when he is replying, and it is in regard to street and shop betting. The Bill proposes to suppress street and shop betting. Why then has not the Bill been drafted so that it shall apply to Tattersall's and other sporting clubs? The leader of the House is a man who has seen a little of the world, and he knows that legislation has been passed in the Eastern States respecting street and shop betting and he knows as well as I do that in New South Wales and Victoria to-day, and even in Tattersall's Club in South Australia, the card is called regularly and wagers amounting to thousands of pounds

are made. While I desire to prevent street and shop betting, I am equally desirous that the law should be applied to the man of means who wagers in pounds as to the man who wagers in shillings. Though we may suppress bookmaking on the racecourse, though we may suppress the bookmaker in the street and in the shop, we are not going to suppress the bookmaker within the four corners of the registered sporting club, and betting, therefore, will go on as before. The evil, however, will be accentuated to this extent, that bookmaking will become a monopoly; it will be left in the hands of a few. I am not going to be a party to passing legislation which will bring that about. The leader of the House will realise that what I have said is correct and even to-day, in spite of the utmost rigour that is applied under the existing laws, it is not possible to entirely overcome the evil because a bookmaker can become a member of Tattersall's Club and he can go on betting there, and nothing more is said. If the Bill goes through to the Committee stage I will endeavour to bring clubs under its provisions and prevent betting there as well. The leader of the House, when introducing the Bill, quoted extensively from the evidence given before the select committee by men like Mr. Clydesdale, Mr. Lalor and Mr. Bolger, all of whom were against street and shop betting.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: And the evidence of Mr. Connolly.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I will come to him later. Though I favour the abolition of street and shop betting, I desire to analyse the position of the men whose evidence was quoted by the Colonial Secretary. Mr. Clydesdale is the head of the unregistered association of this State and, consequently, if street and shop betting is suppressed, and bookmakers are allowed on the racecourse it will be to Mr. Clydesdale's personal benefit to have them there. Mr. Clydesdale gave it as his opinion that a Bill should be introduced to abolish the street bookmaker. Naturally we would expect that from Mr. Clydesdale. Mr. Lalor, a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect, only bets on racecourses and at Tattersall's Club and

more grist will go into his mill if the harpies are driven off the streets. Then, so far as Mr. Bolger is concerned, he is one of the oldest and best known racing men in the State and we also know him to be one of the smallest bettors. The fact remains that large sums of money are won by someone as the outcome of bets made with bookmakers in respect of races won by Mr. Bolger's horses. And I venture the opinion that the money won on Mr. Bolger's horses is not won by betting in the street but by wagers laid at Tattersall's and other clubs. That is the position of those men. Probably if they were street bettors they would support the other view. In my opinion, their evidence is not worthy of any consideration. I would eliminate Mr. Bolger, and as for the other two, they come under the category of two persons who have axes to grind. I am almost positive that of all the bookmaking fraternity who frequent Tattersall's Club Mr. Lalor is the only one who gave evidence before the select committee: and I believe that it was at the request of members of Tattersall's Club that he gave that evidence, that it was given on behalf of himself and other members of the Club, that is for people who confined themselves to racecourse betting or club betting. I have indicated that I would support a measure to suppress street and shop betting, though as I say I do not think it is possible to draft or frame legislation which is going to totally abolish even shop and street betting. However, we might minimise that evil, and if we can do so I think we should. We now come to the question of the abolition of bookmakers on the racecourse. The leader of the House quoted from the report of the select committee, paragraph 15, which states inter alia that street and shop betting should be suppressed, and that bookmakers should be prohibited on racecourses. The Minister then went on to say—

It is only right that I should point out that the committee were not unanimous, so that should a Bill come forward members of the committee had the right to speak and vote without prejudice.

From this remark it is obvious that despite all the evidence collected by the select committee, so far as the members of the select

committee themselves were concerned they were in no way unanimous on the question of the abolition of bookmakers from racecourses. If betting be an evil, I claim that it is equally wrong to bet on the totalisator as it is to bet with the bookmaker. That is the position I take up; but the position taken up by the Government is that they say betting is not evil so long as it is done through the totalisator.

The Colonial Secretary: That is what the law as it stands says.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not propose to enter into a discussion with the hon. member on the law as it stands. I have given my opinion of the law, and I have quoted the hon. member. I am prepared to leave the law as it stands and let the bookmaker take his chance; but the hon. member is not prepared to do that, otherwise this Bill would not have been introduced. If the premises I have laid down be correct that betting is an evil whether it is done through the totalisator or with the bookmaker, then I claim that the Government, who now say that to a certain extent betting is an evil, are themselves to blame. We have had examples in the Eastern States to guide us. We find that in South Australia, despite the prohibition, betting still goes on. We have had examples in past years of the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria endeavouring to introduce the totalisator through the local legislative but without result; and the position to-day in those two States is that betting is entirely in the hands of the bookmaker. We find in those two States, the Government, recognising they have to accept the evil of betting on horse racing, have accepted the evil of the bookmaker in preference to the tote; and are now raising revenue from the bookmakers. That is the difference between East and West. The Government here say the bookmaker must go, that they want the totalisator and will tax the totalisator to get the revenue from racing, while in the Eastern States they have not introduced the totalisator but tax the bookmaker and get revenue in that way. I have knocked about Australia a good deal and I have come to the conclusion that we cannot abolish by legislative action an institution which has obtained such a hold in the hearts of Australians ever since the institution of racing

in Australia. People coming from New South Wales and Victoria do not know what the totalisator is, and when they go to a racecourse to bet they recognise only the bookmaker. I have spoken to bookmakers and to patrons of the turf on this question, unbiassed men, and have come to the conclusion that there is room here for both. There is room for the bookmaker in this country and room for the totalisator. As far as we can humanly do it we should try to minimise what is an admitted evil. It would be more logical and reasonable for the Government to accept the position as it presents itself to-day, and I think it would meet with the approbation of the great mass of the people of this State if they determined to retain the bookmaker, but to confine him to the racecourse. It may not be amiss for me to deal with one or two of the points put forward by the leader of the House; and I only quote these to show the absurdity of some of the evidence given before the select committee. Mr. Cox, chairman of the W.A. Turf Club, gave evidence which was quoted by the Colonial Secretary. He was asked—

You would not allow the bookmaker?
—No. For this reason, that the abolition of the bookmaker would stop the evil of over racing. We are not the police. We are not here to put the law in motion. I have asked the Government to do it and they will not do so.

Now, what is the position of the W.A. Turf Club so far as the bookmaker is concerned? The power of the club is such that no bookmaker can go on to this racecourse without a license; they do not want police to put him off. The club permit the bookmaker and put forward as a reason for not disallowing the bookmaker that it would minimise racing. I take it from his evidence that Mr. Cox was in favour of some minimising of racing. If so, why not use the power which the club has, and say we believe in the totalisator. That would end the matter so far as the bookmaker on racecourses is concerned. But they go further. Not only do they allow bookmakers on the racecourse, but they charge them an exorbitant fee for a license for betting there; and they say that no bookmaker shall operate on any racecourse in the State controlled

by the W.A. Turf Club unless he is licensed. Similarly no bookmaker can operate on Kalgoorlie or Boulder or any other racecourse run under the rules of the W.A. Turf Club until he pays a license fee for himself and his clerk. The W.A. Turf Club not only has complete charge of the bookmaker betting on its own course but also draws a proportion of revenue from bookmakers operating on other courses. Therefore I hold it is preposterous to put up an argument like that. The Colonial Secretary also quoted from Mr. James Brennan's evidence, saying that he would like to see the bookmaker removed altogether. Mr. Brennan said—

I think for the protection of the public for pure sport and clean racing the bookmaker should be removed. Of course, we could not carry on without the totalisator.

The Trotting Association is in exactly the same position as the W.A. Turf Club. The Association could say to-morrow that no bookmakers shall be permitted on the Trotting Association's course. That would end the matter so far as they are concerned. In the same way as the W.A. Turf Club, they say that no bookmaker who is not registered with them shall ply his calling on any course racing under the association's conditions. I have quoted two instances put forward in favour of the abolition of bookmakers from racecourses, in which legislation is asked for but in which those asking have the power in their own hands to do it. Mr. Brennan said they could not carry on racing without the totalisator. On his own admission racing cannot be carried on without some means or form of betting; and it must therefore be at once recognised that betting is closely wrapped up with the question of racing. Now I come to the last authority quoted by the Colonial Secretary. I have glanced through the report of the Minister's speech, and I find that nearly two columns of it are devoted to the evidence of Mr. P. A. Connolly. Of the men with whom I have come in contact, or know by repute, Mr. Connolly is about the last, or one of the last, whom I would accept as an authority on the purifying of sport. If rumour is correct—and it is sometimes correct—Mr. Connolly, though he says he is not a betting owner, has been accused not only once, but dozens of times, of putting up the

finest schemes ever worked on the courses of this or any other State. It came with a very bad grace from him to stand up before the select committee as an authority on the purification of racing. I question whether he would do it before a Royal Commission. In my experience, Royal Commissions are very different things from select committees. Mr. P. A. Connolly was asked—

Do you think, in the interests of racing, it is necessary to have both the bookmaker and the tote?

Mr. Connolly answered—

Of course, I am not a betting owner.

He is asked a direct question, which he would prefer—the totalisator or the bookmaker; and he replies that he is not a betting owner. But he is the proprietor of two racecourses within 12 miles of Perth. Naturally, he will not commit himself one way or the other. After all the fulsome remarks which led up to the question I have quoted, there would have been something in it if Mr. Connolly had answered the question one way or the other. I have already said that I am opposed to the Bill in its present form. I ask the House to accept the position as it presents itself. To sum up: If the Bill is passed, we shall not minimise racing; or not in anything like the degree which the Government say is necessary, having regard to the poorer section of the community. By going through the whole report of the joint select committee, or taking the trouble to consult a few men, moneyed men, interested in racing, we shall learn that, in the event of the abolition of the bookmaker from our racecourses, betting on local events will not continue to such an extent as at present, as regards the volume of money from a few individuals. I admit the passing of the Bill would have that effect. Individuals who to-day bet in hundreds, and at times in thousands, would not go racing as they now do if the bookmaker were cut off. But, on the other hand, people who can afford to bet in hundreds and even in thousands are not people on whom the time of the House should be spent, except with a view of getting from them a little more by direct taxation. There is, however, the other side of the picture, which has been stressed by the leader of the House. The abolition of the bookmaker, we are told,

would largely add to the savings of the working classes of the community. I contend that such would not be the case. I maintain that the spirit of horse-racing has been inculcated into the blood of Australians almost since the inception of Australian settlement. The Australian willingness to take a chance by having a bet represents a spirit which has not proved amiss when the hour of trial and need came.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: What connection is there?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I contend that the spirit which characterises the Australian on the racecourse and in sport generally proved advantageous to him as a soldier. Will the abolition of the bookmaker effect the reform of the wages man, as suggested by the leader of the House? No. So long as there is horse-racing, so long as there is an avenue by which a man can speculate, even if it is only the totalisator on the course, he will speculate. He will go out to the course and bet on the totalisator. This Bill will not save him from that in any way, nor will it in the least add to his store of wealth. In conclusion, I say to the leader of the House that if he is prepared to tackle the question as he should tackle it, if the Government are prepared to remedy what they now recognise as an over-plus of racing, if they are prepared to step in and control the number of meetings—we have some spurious racing bodies, which must of necessity race very frequently in order to keep going at all—then the Colonial Secretary and the Government will be taking the only logical step towards cure and prevention of an evil whose existence is admitted. I hope that such will be the attitude adopted by the leader of the House. I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan) [5.22]: I welcome this Bill as I would welcome any measure intended to suppress street and shop betting. But I think that if the Government desire to obtain revenue under this Bill, they have gone the wrong way about securing it. They are not attempting to curtail racing by this Bill. What they aim at is the control of racing. In my opinion, Western Australia, like Victoria, should appoint a board to control racing and to fix dates. In that way, naturally, a good deal of betting would be

suppressed. A reference to the list of recent fixtures shows that the Belmont Park Club has 10 fixtures only; the Canning Park Club, 10; Helena Vale, 10; the W.A.T.C., 15; and—now we come to what are known as the unregistered bodies—Goodwood, 26; Bicton, 26; and the trotting association anything from 60 to 65. Surely, in that list very material reductions could be made, and thus a material reduction, not only in street and shop betting, but in betting on the courses themselves, could be effected. Why should the old established clubs such as the W.A.T.C., Belmont Park, Canning Park, and Helena Vale have so very few fixtures, while these other clubs have up to 65, racing Saturday after Saturday and on every possible holiday? That is where the evil lies; and, moreover, the clubs which race so frequently are not under such efficient supervision, nor is their conduct of racing on such a high level, as in the case of the old established clubs. I agree with Mr. Cornell that the sport of racing is dear to the hearts of the Australian people. I have gone racing myself in the past; and my opinion is that racing cannot be successfully conducted unless the bookmaker co-exists with it. I would, however, register the bookmaker, and limit his operations to his proper place, which is the racecourse. The totalisator is permitted on the racecourse only, and the bookmaker should be similarly restricted. People who want to bet can take an outing for that purpose. In South Australia, where the totalisator alone exists, there is nothing like the same volume of betting business transacted as where the bookmaker is registered. I do not agree with Mr. Cornell on that point. Knowing Adelaide well, I say it is rather a difficult thing there to get a bet with a bookmaker. South Australia, in point of racing, stands lowest in Australasia.

Hon. J. Cornell: The difficulty is got over, there, by betting on the race day and paying tote odds the next day.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: The fact is that South Australian owners cannot afford to give the high prices for blood stock that are obtainable in this State. Racing in South Australia is at a low ebb, compared with Western Australian or Victorian racing. We know that here as much as £1,000 has been paid for a colt or a filly.

That is the kind of thing which should, within limits, be encouraged. I observed in this morning's paper a report of a meeting held in Victoria to consider steps to encourage the breeding of the best class of horses—a meeting which the Federal Minister for Defence attended. It is only by purchasing the best blood stock that we can hope to achieve that end.

The Colonial Secretary: Is not that evidence that our present excess of racing in Australia is not beneficial to the breeding of the best class of horses?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The motor car has taken the place of the blood horse.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: One means of improving the Bill, and securing its safe passage, would be to introduce into it a provision for the registration of bookmakers by the Government. Let the Government, who are in need of revenue, charge the bookmakers a reasonable fee. I would also allow the clubs to collect fees from the bookmakers for conducting their operations on the racecourses only. And, since additional revenue is required, I suggest the Government should do as the Victorian Government do—impose a stamp duty on every betting ticket. In Victoria, I believe, the duty is 3d. That in itself would produce considerable revenue. After all, the Government in bringing forward this Bill are after revenue, and not after the suppression of racing.

The Colonial Secretary: This Bill has nothing to do with revenue.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I think the House as a whole recognises that this is a revenue measure, and not a measure for the suppression of horse-racing. The leader of the House in his second reading speech never suggested that the enormous numbers of fixtures should be reduced—I refer to the 50 to 65 trotting meetings and the 52 unregistered meetings. The number of meetings held by the other clubs is quite reasonable. As regards the totalisator, I have no objection whatever to the Government increasing the tax to 5 per cent. but I think that in claiming unpaid dividends and the fractions they are going a little too far.

The Colonial Secretary: What has that got to do with this Bill? That is in a Bill before another place.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: This is a Bill for the suppression of betting, and I think I am in order in pointing out that by adopting the expedients I have suggested the Government will suppress a good deal of betting and at the same time get in revenue. As to street betting, I am with the Government that the strictest measures for the suppression of that evil should be adopted. It is a crying scandal to see loafers hanging about our street corners inviting people to bet. I think the Bill goes too far in authorising the police to arrest without warrant anyone suspected of loitering for the purpose of betting. If the Bill gets into Committee I shall certainly oppose that provision. While I hope to see some of my suggestions incorporated in the measure at a later stage, I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [5.30]: I congratulate the leader of the House on the admirable speech he made in moving the second reading. He exhausted every argument in favour of the Bill. In fact, he left me so convinced that I thought there should be no further betting on race-courses or anywhere else. I have also listened to Mr. Cornell as an apostle of the other side. I regret to say that although he made a fine speech and put forward every excuse for those who desire to bet, he did not give me that assistance which I had expected. We have heard all sorts of issues read into the Bill, which I find is merely a Bill to suppress betting, so many of the statements made in the course of the debate are beside the question. Whether it was wise for the Government to introduce the Bill at the present juncture is not for me to decide. I like sport and I have in regard to it strong opinions which have not been formed within the last few minutes. Like Mr. Cornell, I recognise that most Australians are sports, and that nearly every Australian is prone to make a bet or take some little chance in a venture. Therefore, I agree that it is impossible to suppress the betting spirit among Australians, or indeed amongst other peoples. I have heard it referred to as the betting evil. I do not look upon betting as an evil, but rather as a luxury that can be afforded by only people of means. If a man has £1,000 a year and chooses to bet £100 a year he can afford it, but if a man has £100

a year and bets £25 of it, then I think it is wrong. If a man can afford it, betting is not an evil, but an amusement. It is the same with cards. If a man with £5,000 a year chooses to spend a thousand a year on cards that is his business. Anybody who can afford it has a perfect right to bet or to play cards.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What about the man who bets with the other fellow's money?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: That is dishonesty. I intend to support the second reading because I believe it would be better in the interests of betting and sport that the bookmaker should not exist. Not because I have any objection to him personally, for I have known several bookmakers who were really good honourable men. There are two forms of gambling which I am in favour of, one being the totalisator and the other sweeps. Everybody has a perfect right to put a few shillings into a sweep whether it be the humblest maid or the richest man in the country. If they choose to put in a few shillings with a chance of winning £5,000, I think it is a fair legitimate enterprise and there is no harm in it. I am entirely in accord with sweeps and with the totalisator, for everybody who enters into either of them must do so willingly. I have three strong reasons against the bookmaker. The first is that in his transactions he gives credit. Any man can book a bet with the bookmaker, and the end of it is that probably after a certain amount of credit a man finds he cannot pay, and has to resort to such a practice as that referred to by my friend a few minutes ago. The next objection I have to the bookmaker is that he is in a position to solicit for business, which the totalisator cannot do. The third and strongest objection is that the bookmaker can influence the horse-racing and the jockeys and other people connected with the sport. Take the evidence given by Mr. Connolly, who it seems declared that one particular bookmaker controlled 10 jockeys. I did not know that the bookmakers' influence went as far as that, but as this evidence was given on oath, I am bound to believe it.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Does nobody but the bookmaker control the jockeys?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not know. However, I say that nobody should control them. All my sympathy is with the totalisator. Were the bookmaker to have an office or a room on the racecourse and sit there ready to take his business, I would have only two objections to him. I entirely believe in the totalisator, because we must have some betting. A little speculation does no harm, and the totalisator has the advantages that there is no solicitation, no credit, and one cannot have transactions with the machine except on the racecourse. We heard the other day of the evil of shop and street betting. Of course, one cannot but recognise that these forms of betting are entirely objectionable. I think a strong case has been made out in favour of the Bill. Mr. Cornell said it was of no use making this law, because it would be evaded. If that is the case, what is the use of our making any laws at all? A question touched upon in the course of the debate was the reduction of horse-racing. I am not in a position to say whether or not it should be reduced. I seldom go to a meeting, but when I do I thoroughly enjoy it, for I think there is no prettier sight in the world. From what I have heard, it is perhaps desirable that the racing should be curtailed in some directions. We are told that if the bookmaker be done away with, racing will go down altogether. But I understand that South Australia and New Zealand have carried on racing hitherto without the bookmaker. They have carried on entirely and successfully with the totalisator. Three months ago I went to a very fine meeting in South Australia. I was the guest of the chairman there. I never heard a sound of a bookmaker nor saw a sign of one there. I saw a good deal of the totalisator. The racing was carried on splendidly. There were some very fine horses running, and the whole meeting was carried out to perfection without the aid of the bookmaker. Whether the bookmakers' work was surreptitiously carried on, as has been suggested by my friend, I cannot say, but so far as I could see there was no sign of a bookmaker, and the whole meeting was carried out admirably. As the Government have thought necessary to introduce the Bill, I

have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [5.45]: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches this afternoon. Sir Edward Wittenoom may not have been particularly logical, but I am afraid what he has said is true to life. It is rather amusing to find that the ground of his argument for the totalisator is—the totalisator is a devil like every other form of gambling, but it is a dumb devil. With regard to the speech made by Mr. Cornell, I think he was chiefly arguing against a Bill that we know nothing about. The only remark I heard from him about the Bill which is before the House was a statement that it had not been called for, and that he would vote against it. As to the demand for this Bill, where has Mr. Cornell been during the last ten or twenty years?

Hon. E. M. Clarke: Sleeping.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: There has not been a month pass but there has been a great clamour in the country.

Hon. J. Cornell: Only on the part of a few hysterical people.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Every year public bodies representing a large majority of the people have passed resolutions on this question.

Hon. J. Cornell: Who passed them?

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: And nearly every year there have been deputations to the Government of the day. It was because of most representative deputations that the late Government secured the appointment of a select committee of both Houses to go into the whole question. I am not going to say much about the work of that committee.

Hon. J. Cornell: It was appointed in a weak moment of the Minister.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: But certainly much evidence before that committee is very strong, and it is evidence which cannot be got over. Coming to the Bill itself, it definitely deals with evils which I think that every member of the House should feel it his duty to take into consideration. The Bill is directed against street and shop betting. Is there any hon. member of this House who for one moment would either

support street or shop betting, or refuse to help to put either down? That is the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: It goes a great deal further than that.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: That is the object of the Bill. It will serve a further purpose in that it will enable the authorities with consistency to carry out the present law. The present law is ample for any necessary dealing with the bookmakers, but how could the authorities deal with bookmakers under it? They are practically powerless to deal with the grosser forms of the gambling evil. The parasites in the streets and the robbers in the shop betting dens the authorities have been almost powerless to get convictions against. Is it not a disgrace to our city to have its most beautiful thoroughfare, St. George's-terrace, infested with parasites, soliciting crime, leading young people into gambling debts that they can never pay? Mr. Cornell asked why should this be taken up now as against earlier times? Any time would be appropriate, but especially now when the whole Empire is face to face with the need of making the best use of every pound which can be produced. Above all times, this is the time to put the parasites out of business—

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: And to enable the people to make the best use of their money. I am sure the Government ought to have the support of every hon. member on this question. All other ideas should be put aside for the time. Party does not come into it. We are all for the purification of the social and public life of the community, so far as it can be helped by an Act of Parliament. There is one danger which I foresee. The gambling spirit of course is widely prevalent, as Sir Edward Wittenoom has pointed out, and there is this danger, that, instead of conserving every pound which can be conserved, there might be a transfer of some of this State's money to that poor little neighbour, Tasmania, through the sweeps. It is feared that any lessening of betting here may tend to increase the drain from this State to Tasmania by this means. I hope that some way will be found to get round that supposed Federal necessity of allowing Tasmania to drain the other States. There

must be some way of getting round that loss of money.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Unification would get round it.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It is amusing to find that the committee, in view of this danger, suggested that this State should start sweeps. It is just one of those shocks, which come to one, that a picked committee of both Houses of Parliament should put into cold print a recommendation that we should lessen the drain to Tasmania by starting such sweeps ourselves. However, I do not think that was a unanimous recommendation by any means, and I am perfectly satisfied that the member of that committee, who now represents the Government in this House, was strongly against any such proposal. But surely something could be done. This Bill provides drastic penalties for any publication or advertisement regarding betting. I am glad of that. That will do something towards lessening the drain to Tasmania. I hope that the Ministers in charge of the Bill in each House have been careful, not only to get the advice of anti-gamblers, but to get the wisdom of the real gambler also, so as to make this Bill gambler proof, and that there will not be a way of running a gambler's team through it.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: You could have said a motor-car team.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Yes, a motor-car team would perhaps better suit the case. Most of these bills providing penalties in this way represent chiefly good intentions, but there are loop-holes left in them which the enemy watch with great amusement and delight. I hope the Ministers in charge of the Bill will not think it above their pride to get the cunning of the gambler to help them, and find out where the loop-holes are, and so make this Bill an effective one and such that, when the police bring the offenders before the magistrates, the magistrate will not find a loop-hole excuse for saying "It has been the custom and we are not going to strain the law. In fact we will let you off this time." It is to be hoped that there will be no opening for that. There is no doubt of the truth of my reference. Nearly all the laws, which are supposed to be stringent, have great loop-holes left in

them. As a matter of fact, the present legislation against gambling was intended to be most effective. It is only when the bills come to be dealt with, and what is recognised as a custom comes in, that it is found that the general sympathy for the gambler beats the authorities every time. I remember the time in New South Wales when it was considered entirely quixotic to attempt to put down the bushranger. Indeed, there were people who said "If you put down the gangs we have now, ten to one we shall get worse ones." Frank Gardiner was one who, if he took money from rich men, would give some of it to the poor, and he was a good sort. The bushranger, people thought, was not so bad as he might be, but that bushranging could never be stopped, and that whilst there was bush there would always be bushrangers. That was the attitude of a great many people. Sir Edward Wittenoom has not gone quite so far in saying that, whilst we have human nature we will have the love of a flutter, the love of gambling. The evil is a terrible one at any time.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: It is a luxury.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I think that men occupying Sir Edward's position are men to whom we should look for a sound note on this question of gambling. I think that the attitude, certainly of members of Parliament in their positions of responsibility, should be that money should be put to the best use and that gambling is an evil, and, when we come to analyse it, a very vulgar kind of evil. It is a vulgar kind of evil that one man should be allowed to put his hand into another man's pocket and take out of it money which he has not earned.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Or to put your money into his.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Exactly. That is what it comes to, that I will put another man's money into my pocket when I have not earned it. Is it not a vulgar way of getting money?

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: Does not that apply to share dealing?

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I think that the correct idea in regard to gambling should be held up by public men and proclaimed by public men. Gambling is an evil, and it is

one of those evils which has grown upon young people so as to be an enormous danger. There is a good deal of truth in what Sir Edward Wittenoom says, that the man who can afford to risk money is not dishonest in risking it. No, but he is setting a bad example and the evil has grown to such a head that I think we cannot too strongly set our faces against it. Although men like Sir Edward Wittenoom may put money on a horse without any sense of evil at all—he would not do it if he had any sense of evil—he is yet helping a very serious evil in the community, which is sapping the business life of the people. One has only to remember what a curse the night clubs of London have become, and I suppose the same thing exists here to a smaller extent. These are institutions which have destroyed the lives of many promising men. My attitude is that the evil is so very serious that I am against it and I will take any part which will have the effect of bringing about its abolition. I feel that the public men who adopt that attitude will do great good to the rising generation. I hope that all members of Parliament will join in supporting the measure. No one has a word to say in favour of street and shop betting, and how much further we shall be able to go remains to be seen. The steps which this Bill asks us to take we have a right to take now.

Hon. J. M. DREW (Central) [6.3]: I do not propose to say very much in connection with this question, and I do not think there will be any necessity to say much beyond that I am largely in accord with the remarks of the Colonial Secretary relative to street betting and with the necessity for the abolition of the bookmaker. Street betting is admittedly a very great evil in the city of Perth and the police have been unable to cope with it owing to the inadequacy of the law on the Statute-book at the present time. Bookmaking is an illegal occupation but the law has never been administered since it was passed so far as I have been able to discover. The Government which was in office when it became law did not administer it and every other Government has followed the precedent set by that ministry. I have nothing to say about bookmakers as citizens. I have known many of them and I have

known the majority of them to be honourable men and as a rule they are highly intellectual men. I have often thought it a great pity that their talents were not diverted into some more useful channel, but the avocation of the bookmaker is demoralising. It spreads the vice of gambling and causes ruination to many as the records of our criminal courts will testify. There was a time in the history of Western Australia when racing was a sport, but it is a sport no longer and that is due to the circumstance that betting is so very prevalent, in fact, we had pretty good testimony afforded us during the sitting of the joint select committee that racing is not a sport, but an industry. It was called an industry by witnesses who gave evidence before that committee, and if I am not mistaken, it was referred to as an industry in the report. In addition to that, if I am not mistaken, the report suggested that if there was to be a restriction of horse-racing there should also be compensation, further indicating that horse-racing was an industry. To my mind, the way things are now it is an industry and a business of the worst sort. It is said that race meetings improve the breed of horses and that they would suffer if the bookmaker was abolished. That argument has no weight with me whatever. At one time it was so. Horse-racing did improve the breed of horses and the Parliament of Western Australia made an annual grant towards horse-racing in this State. I think it was £100 that was given annually for the Queen's Plate, which was run in Perth, and one of the conditions was that the race should be of three miles.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: And in the Nor'-West and at Geraldton.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I do not think that Geraldton was included. At the present time the majority of races are run over distances of five and six furlongs. The winners of such short races are totally unsuitable for the breeding of serviceable horses. No one would care to purchase a horse bred from an animal which was incapable of running over a longer distance than six furlongs. It cannot be said, therefore, that racing nowadays contributes to the better breeding of horses. If we suppress the bookmaker we need not restrict horse-racing, and I think

it is generally admitted that something should be done in the way of lessening the number of race meetings which take place in Western Australia. If the Bill be passed undoubtedly the number of race meetings will be curtailed automatically. There will be fewer meetings but there will be this compensation—that there will be cleaner sport and more genuine competition. No doubt one of the reasons which actuated the racing clubs in the direction of not abolishing the bookmaker straight away was that it was quite useless to abolish the bookmaker unless street betting was abolished also. It would be futile to drive the bookmaker off the racecourse if he could continue to follow his occupation in the public highway. Hence, the necessity for the introduction of a Bill of this character. I am very much afraid though that this measure will not achieve the object intended. It seems to me there is a weak spot in the Bill. That is in connection with the definition of bookmaker. "Bookmaker" includes any person who carries on a business or acts as a bookmaker or commission agent of any person who gains or endeavours to gain his livelihood wholly or partly by betting or making wagers. What is the reason for the limitation "wholly or partly"? If these words remain it seems to me that the measure will be evaded. Very many of the bookmakers do not obtain their livelihood by betting. Some of them are wealthy men with big bank balances, and in fact, money lenders, and any Court would say that these men were not gaining their livelihood by bookmaking.

The Colonial Secretary: That will be covered by the first portion of the Bill.

Hon. J. M. DREW: If the first part covers the whole of the position, I cannot understand the inclusion of the second part in Clause 10, which states—

Any person (which means every person) frequenting, using, or being in or on any street or public place for the purpose of any money or valuable thing being received by or promised to such person or any other person on his behalf as or for the consideration (a) for any such assurance, undertaking, promise, or agreement as is mentioned in section two hundred and eleven of the Criminal Code.

And it goes on to say that whoever makes a bet shall be liable to penalty of not more than £100. It seems to me that the introduction of the word "bookmaker" weakens the whole clause because it is shown in the definition that bookmaker may be a person who only partly gains his livelihood by making bets. However, if the Government are satisfied that it covers the whole position I shall not complain; but I would like to see the clauses gambler-proof, to quote an expression used by Mr. Cullen, because we have some very clever gentlemen to contend with in connection with the gambling evil. I have read the different clauses of the Bill and they are certainly very drastic, but in my opinion they require to be drastic in order to meet the situation. I think the House should consider carefully every clause, give close attention to them, and see that every provision is made in the direction of preventing any loophole being availed of for the purpose of evading the law. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. W. Kingsmill, debate adjourned.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. Special Lease (Stirling Estate).
2. Treasury Bills Act Amendment.
3. Kingia Grass Tree Concession.

Received from the Legislative Assembly.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED FROM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

1. Zoological Gardens Act Amendment.
 2. Execution of Instruments.
- Without amendment.

House adjourned at 6.18 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 8th November, 1916.

	Page
Paper presented	731
Questions: Resident Magistrate, Wyndham	731
Finances, Advisory Committee's Report	731
Education Department Offices	732
Potson Lands, Repricing	732
Agricultural Produce, Marketing Facilities	732
Railway Fares and Freights, Goods Classification, Increases in fares	732
Geological Survey Branch, particulars	733
Bills: Special Lease (Stirling Estate), 3s.	733
Treasury Bills Act Amendment, 3s.	733
Kingia Grass Tree Concession, 3s.	733
Execution of Instruments, 3s.	733
Zoological Gardens Act Amendment, 3s.	733
Permanent Reserve (No. 1), returned	741
Motions: Bliss Involving Expenditure	733
Railway Irregularities, case of Hugh McLeod, to inquire	743
National Cabinet during War Time	751
Freezing Works, Wyndham, Nevanas' Contract	751
Papers: Remissions of Sentence, Case of Marie Guldotti	741

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Commissioner of Taxation, report for year ended 30th June, 1916.

QUESTION—RESIDENT MAGISTRATE, WYNDHAM.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (without notice) asked the Premier: As telegrams are being received, from public meetings at Wyndham, seriously reflecting on the integrity and general administration of the local Resident Magistrate, will the Premier take an early opportunity to explain to the Legislative Assembly what action the Government contemplate taking to protect public rights and liberties?

The PREMIER replied: This is a matter under the control of the Attorney General. I will confer with my colleague, and take an opportunity of making a statement to the House.

QUESTION—FINANCES, ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Treasurer: Will he make available the report of the advisory committee, consisting of the Auditor General, the Under Treasurer, and the