

COAL MINE WORKERS (PENSIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

On motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), Bill read a third time, and passed.

DAIRY CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

PAPER MILL AGREEMENT BILL

First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 7.45 p.m.

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued	
State Deficit : Reasons for improvement	2133
Traffic Accidents : Number between Guildford and Midland Junction	2136
Traffic Offences : Convictions for speeding and dangerous and negligent driving	2135
Veterinary Service : Surgeons and permit-holders	2136
Wellington Dam Opening : Presence of police	2136
Wyndham Electricity Supplies : Provision	2134
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—	
Precedence	2136
CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION—	
Standing Orders suspension	2137
BILLS—	
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	2161
Betting Investment Tax Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	2166
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill : Returned	2161
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill : Returned	2161
Optometrists Act Amendment Bill—Report : 3r.	2167
Paper Mill Agreement Bill : 3r.	2137
Pawnbrokers Act Amendment Bill—2r.	2167
Defeated	2167
Property in Bottles Bill : 2r.	2169
Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) : Returned	2161
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill : 3r.	2137
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax Bill : 3r.	2166
Totalisator Duty Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	2167
Traffic Act Amendment Bill : Returned	2161

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 26th October, 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Beacon Research Company : Control of activities	2132
Broome Water Supply : Action to meet inadequacy	2134
Control of Dingos—Government assistance for pastoralists	2133
Doggers employed and bounties on scalps	2133
East Fremantle Water Main : Danger to local residents	2135
Land Valuations—Bicton and Palmyra valuations	2134
Shortage of qualified valuers	2134
Method of calculation and levying of taxation	2133
Liquor Sales in Goldfields Clubs : Proclamation of amending legislation	2133
Moore Street, Perth : Widening	2135
Napier Broome Area : Port facilities	2134
North Kimberley : Land leased and leases abandoned	2134
Off-Course Betting Tax : Disbursement of proceeds	2135

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Roberts) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

BEACON RESEARCH COMPANY

Control of Activities

- Mr. NORTON asked the Attorney General:
 - Has he any knowledge of the company operating in Western Australia known as the Beacon Research Company of Sydney?
 - Can he advise the House of the aims and objects of this company?
 - From whom or by what means does it derive its income?
 - Does he consider it right for its canvassers to pester housewives on weekends—particularly on Sundays?
 - If his answer to No. (4) is in the negative, will he have steps taken to stop this practice?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) I am advised that the Beacon Research Company is a registered business name whereof Lintas Proprietary Ltd., a company incorporated in New South Wales and registered here as a foreign company, is the sole proprietor.
- (2) Yes. The business of Beacon Research Company is recorded as that of market research. Lintas Proprietary Ltd. appears from its memorandum of association to be an advertising and publicity specialist. It belongs to the Lever (Soap) Group.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).
- (4) and (5) There is no legal bar against this activity except where trespassing is involved.

CONTROL OF DINGOES

Government Assistance for Pastoralists

2. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it a fact that Government doggers are allowed to trap only on open country?
- (2) What is the policy of his department with respect to giving pastoralists assistance, either practical or financial, to combat the increasing influx of dingoes from the open country?

Doggers Employed and Bounties on Scalps

- (3) How many doggers are employed in the Upper Gascoyne, Murchison, and Meekatharra Road Board areas?
- (4) What amount has been paid for scalps in the areas mentioned in No. (3) and including the Gascoyne-Minilya Road Board area?
- (5) What is the amount of vermin tax paid by pastoralists in the four road board areas mentioned?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes, to reduce the number of dogs reaching settled areas. But they may assist with demonstration trap-setting and baiting when in the vicinity of a station.
- (2) About £50,000 is spent in pastoral areas each year by the protection board for employing doggers, aerial baiting, and ground-baiting drives. This includes a subsidy on the employment of local doggers by sharing in the costs with pastoralists and road or vermin boards.
- (3) Six doggers are authorised, but at present three of the positions are vacant because of the difficulty of finding suitable men.

- (4) £872 was paid for uniform bonuses during 1959-60.
- (5) Detailed statistics of State vermin tax collections are not kept by the Taxation Department, but the total amount received from all pastoral areas, including the goldfields and the Kimberleys, has been assessed as not exceeding £10,000.

LIQUOR SALES IN GOLDFIELDS CLUBS

Proclamation of Amending Legislation

3. Mr. EVANS asked the Attorney-General:

When is the recent amendment to the Licensing Act 1911-1959 concerning Sunday sales by clubs in the goldfields district, likely to be proclaimed and gazetted?

Mr. WATTS replied:

The Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1960, was assented to on the 6th October, 1960, and is now law. It was not a requirement that the Act be proclaimed.

STATE DEFICIT

Reasons for Improvement

4. Mr. TONKIN asked the Treasurer:
 - (1) How much of the estimated improvement in the deficit stated as £646,000 on the 22nd September is estimated as being due to increased charges and valuations in the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department?
 - (2) How much is due to "a higher level of Commonwealth financial assistance"?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) The estimated improvement in the deficit arises from a combination of a large number of factors both in revenue and expenditure, and full details are set out in the Budget.

LAND VALUATIONS

Method of Calculation and Levying of Taxation

5. Mr. TONKIN asked the Treasurer:
 - (1) Were the Land Tax and Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax for the present financial year calculated and levied upon land valuations which were uniform with regard to year of valuation?
 - (2) If so, when were the valuations made?
 - (3) Were the valuations used arrived at by actual observation or inspection by valuers, or by office adjustment of earlier valuations?

Shortage of Qualified Valuers

- (4) Is it a fact that the Taxation Department in this State has been advertising for qualified valuers and the response has been inadequate?

- (5) How frequently are land valuations made for land tax purposes?

Bicton and Palmyra Valuations

- (6) When were properties in Bicton and Palmyra last valued by the Taxation Department for land tax purposes?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Valuations of the metropolitan area have been carried out over the past six years.
- (3) All revaluations of the metropolitan area are carried out after complete reinspection.
- (4) Yes; the department has advertised, and the response has been adequate.
- (5) As and when considered necessary.
- (6) The Melville area, which includes Bicton and Palmyra, was revalued as at the 30th June, 1956.

NORTH KIMBERLEY*Land Leased and Leases Abandoned*

6. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Following the survey of the North Kimberley District by Mr. Morgan—

- (a) how many leases were made available;
- (b) what is the acreage of each lease; and
- (c) to whom were these leases allocated?

- (2) Have any lessees abandoned their leases. If so, who are they?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) (a) Seven (7);
(b) and (c)—

Station	Acre (approx.)	Allotted to—
"A"	830,000	J. E. Ingleton.
"B"	731,400	Beverley Springs Pastoral Pty. Ltd.
"C"	742,100	J. A. Witter.
"D"	520,300	C. A. Mattson and J. E. Walden.
"E"	668,700	E. C. Hansen.
"F"	875,000	J. F. Cunneen.
"G"	981,300	R. H. Hamblin.

- (2) Messrs. E. C. Hansen; J. F. Cunneen and R. H. Hamblin failed to take occupation of the areas allotted to each. Two of the three stations have been reallocated—
Station "E" to E. Zola.
Station "G" to G. K. Allen.
The third—"F"—will be made available shortly.

NAPIER BROOME AREA*Port Facilities*

7. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for the North-West:

As, according to Press reports, survey and soundings to provide port facilities in the Napier Broome area are now completed, will he indicate when Cabinet will make a decision on this matter?

Mr. COURT replied:

It is not possible to indicate when a decision will be made on this matter as extensive work on plotting soundings has to be completed and an outline design made before a preliminary estimate will be available for consideration.

WYNDHAM ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES*Provision*

8. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for the North-West:

What action have he and the Government taken to provide the town of Wyndham with electric light?

Mr. COURT replied:

The Government is currently considering all the needs of the town of Wyndham, including electric light, in view of the anticipated increased numbers of people in and through the town as a result of development work taking place in the district.

BROOME WATER SUPPLY*Action to Meet Inadequacy*

9. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Because of the serious deterioration in the water supply in the town of Broome, and the many complaints which he has received from the Broome Road Board, what action is he taking to provide the residents of Broome with an adequate water supply?

Mr. WILD replied:

An entirely new scheme is proposed for supplying potable water from bores about eight miles from Broome. This calls for pumping from several bores just recently proved as suitable in quality and quantity.

The proposal calls for a service tank in Broome of 1,000,000 gallons capacity as a vital part of the scheme.

The partial failure of the No. 5 artesian bore in Broome has made it essential that No. 4 bore, which

was out of operation, should be restored to service as quickly as possible in case No. 5 bore fails.

Relining and drilling is in progress. A depth of 1,425 feet has been reached, and a further 40 to 50 feet should ensure a good supply of water.

A suitable supply from the 8-Mile cannot be given at a reasonably early date.

10. *This question was postponed.*

MOORE STREET, PERTH

Widening

11. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware of the bottleneck and hazard to traffic existing in Moore Street, Perth, due to the narrowness of this street between Lord and Hill Streets?
- (2) Is he aware that an ever-increasing volume of traffic is using the Moore Street-Hill Street route since the opening of the Moore Street railway crossing?
- (3) Will he make urgent representations to the Perth City Council for the widening of Moore Street to aid the more efficient flow of traffic?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) It will be arranged for this matter of the capacity of Moore Street, between Lord and Hill Streets, to be investigated by the Main Roads Department.

TRAFFIC OFFENCES

Convictions for Speeding and Dangerous and Negligent Driving

12. Mr. ANDREW asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many drivers and riders of motor vehicles were convicted for the 12 months ended on the 30th June, 1960, for—
 - (a) speeding;
 - (b) dangerous and/or negligent driving?
- (2) Will he give the numbers for each in the following age groups:—
 - (a) 17 years to 29 years (inclusive);
 - (b) 30 years to 39 years (inclusive);
 - (c) 40 years to 49 years (inclusive);
 - (d) 50 years to 59 years (inclusive);
 - (e) 60 years and over?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) (a) 5,265.
(b) 508.
- (2) (a) to (e) Statistics not maintained by the Traffic Branch nor by the Government Statistician.

OFF-COURSE BETTING TAX

Disbursement of Proceeds

13. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

- (1) What was the total amount of money paid last year from the proceeds of taxation levied on legal off-course betting operations to—
 - (a) W.A. Turf Club,
 - (b) all other racing clubs combined,
 - (c) W.A. Trotting Association,
 - (d) all other trotting clubs combined?
- (2) Did the clubs and the association concerned receive those amounts as a result of legal rights guaranteed to them under existing off-course betting legislation?
- (3) What amounts (if any) are those clubs and the association to be guaranteed under the Government's new off-course betting legislation?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) The total amount of money paid during the racing year ended the 31st July, 1960, from taxes levied on legal off-course betting operations, to racing and trotting clubs, was as follows:—
 - (a) £58,780.
 - (b) £11,792.
 - (c) £31,648.
 - (d) £14,348.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No amounts are guaranteed under the new off-course betting legislation.

14. *This question was postponed.*

EAST FREMANTLE WATER MAIN

Danger to Local Residents

15. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Will he give immediate consideration to the necessity for safety measures to be taken to safeguard life and property from the undoubted danger which exists in East Fremantle because of the proximity of the 24-inch cast iron main which has burst on several occasions, the most recent being a few days ago?
- (2) As people in the immediate locality of the most recent burst are greatly concerned at the danger

existing, will he, after consideration of the matter, make an early announcement of the department's plans in connection therewith?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter is receiving urgent consideration, and an announcement will be made as soon as possible.

16. *This question was postponed.*

VETERINARY SERVICE

Surgeons and Permit-Holders

17. Mr. LEWIS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) (a) How many registered veterinary surgeons are in this State?
 (b) Where are they located?
 (2) (a) How many veterinary permit-holders are practising in this State?
 (b) Where are they situated?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) (a) 21.
 (b) Perth 11
 Geraldton 1
 Northam 1
 Pinjarra 1
 Harvey 1
 Bunbury 1
 Busselton 1
 Department of Agriculture—Perth 1
 Department of Agriculture—Bunbury 1
 Department of Agriculture—Manjimup 1

One registered veterinary surgeon is retired and there are another six qualified veterinary surgeons in the State who are not required to be registered under the present Act. Five are in the Department of Agriculture, and one is consultant to a private firm.

- (2) (a) 4.
 (b) Kalgoorlie 1
 Moora 1
 Wyalkatchem 1
 Margaret River 1

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Number Between Guildford and Midland Junction

18. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many accidents occurred between Guildford Grammar School and Viveash Road, Midland Junction, during the last 12 months?
 (2) How many accidents took place at—
 (a) pedestrian crossings;
 (b) outside pedestrian crossings?

(3) How many have occurred between—

- (a) motor vehicles; and
 (b) motor vehicles and pedestrians?

(4) Will he arrange for warning lights to be put on all crossings along the highway?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Over the last twelve months for which records have been completed—that is, from the 1st July, 1959 to the 30th June, 1960—183 accidents occurred in this section of Great Eastern Highway.
 (2) (a) At pedestrian crossings—29;
 (b) Outside pedestrian crossings—154.
 (3) (a) Between motor vehicles—175;
 (b) Between motor vehicles on crosswalks 4
 Between motor vehicles off crosswalks 4
 — 8
 —
 (4) Warning zigzags have been marked on the road on all pedestrian crossings on this section of the highway, and it is not proposed to arrange additionally for warning lights at the pedestrian crossings.

WELLINGTON DAM OPENING

Presence of Police

19. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is it a fact that Bunbury, Collie, and Brunswick members of the Police Force were on duty before and at the time of the official opening of the Wellington Dam last Friday, the 21st October, 1960?
 (2) If so, for what reason were the police placed at the weir on that date?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) To preserve law and order.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Precedence

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [4.45]: I move—

That on and after Wednesday, the 2nd November, Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day on Wednesdays as on all other days.

This is the motion that is moved about this time of the session. It simply aims to give Government business precedence

throughout the remainder of the sittings, and to set aside private members' day. However, we are prepared to give an undertaking that private members' Bills, and other legislation now on the notice paper, in this place or in another, will be dealt with. As a result of this move, I hope that Government legislation can proceed. It will enable the passage of the Loan and General Estimates to be expedited, with the object of finishing this session before the end of November, I hope.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [4.46]: I have no objection to the motion. It is understandable that it would be brought forward about this time. The Premier just gave us an assurance that all private members' business on the notice paper in this House, or on the notice paper in another place, will be dealt with in this Chamber. I take it for granted his assurance will cover a Bill which is midway between the two Houses.

Mr. Brand: I had that in mind when I referred to the other place.

Mr. HAWKE: Thank you very much.

Question put and passed.

CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION

Standing Orders Suspension

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [4.47]: I move—

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

Once again this is a motion which aims to set aside Standing Orders, to enable various stages of legislation to be dealt with on the one day. I do not feel I can add any more to what I have already said. We have a few more Bills to introduce—perhaps half a dozen or so more, though I cannot give the exact number—but we shall make every endeavour to get them here quickly, with the hope of ending the session as soon as possible.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [4.48]: I have no objection to offer to this motion. Its purpose is obviously to expedite the transaction of such business as might remain to be dealt with before the end of the session. The wording of the motion could imply the use of the gag. However,

I give Ministers credit in believing that they will not at any stage, between now and the end of the session, have resort to that very doubtful practice.

Question put and passed.

PAPER MILL AGREEMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.49]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

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

Ayes—24.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Mann
Mr. Brand	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Noes—20.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Majority for—4.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING BILL

Third Reading

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police) [4.54]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [4.54]: This is the major Bill of the five measures which are now at the third reading stage in this House, in connection with the Government's proposals to supersede, to a large extent, the existing licensed off-course bookmakers with a proposed off-course totalisator system. Therefore, on the third reading of this Bill I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to state again the main objections which are held by members on this side of the House towards the legislation.

Under the present off-course betting system, such financial risks as exist—if there are any—are taken by the individual licensed off-course bookmakers, and are not

taken in any way by the State. Under the proposed system, the totalisator agency board will be guaranteed by the Government. This guarantee will operate, in the first place, in relation to approximately £250,000 on capital which the board will be required to raise under Government guarantee to enable the new off-course system to be established.

It is true that the W.A. Trotting Association and the W.A. Turf Club will each make an unsecured, non-interest-bearing loan of £25,000 to help to meet the total capital costs of the board. In addition to the Government giving a guarantee under this legislation on loans to the approximate value of £250,000, the Government could also find itself in the position, after the new system has been operating for some length of time, of having to provide the board with additional guarantees to enable the board to obtain moneys with which to meet current operations.

On that basis alone the new system represents a financial burden to the Government, and therefore a financial risk to the Government. It should not be the responsibility of the Government to shoulder such burden or risk, more especially in view of the substantial risks which will be associated with the operations of the totalisator agency board.

As I have said, the W.A. Turf Club and the W.A. Trotting Association will each make an unsecured, non-interest-bearing loan to the board of £25,000. It speaks volumes for the faith which the leaders of the Trotting Association, if not the leaders of the Turf Club, have in the proposed new system—when each of the organisations has agreed to make such large sums of money available by way of capital to the board, without any security of repayment, and without the payment of any interest on those advances at any stage.

On the other hand, it speaks very poorly of the Government's faith in the proposed new scheme, when the Government has not offered to guarantee the Turf Club, through this legislation, and has not offered to pay interest on the money made available by that club to the board. The same remarks apply in relation to the Trotting Association. Had the Government had any degree of faith in the likely success of the proposed new system, it would not have hesitated to guarantee both organisations in regard to the repayment of their loan moneys; and also to undertake to pay interest at a reasonable rate through the board for the money so advanced.

Another serious objection which I have to the legislation is related to the questions which were asked of the Treasurer by me on notice this afternoon. These questions sought information as to the respective amounts of money received during last racing year by the Turf Club, the Trotting

Association, all other racing clubs combined, and all other trotting clubs combined. The information which the Treasurer gave to the House was very informative indeed; and it highlights the dangerous situation in which the racing clubs and the trotting clubs all over the State will be placed should the legislation now before this House finally be passed into law.

The Treasurer's reply showed that the Turf Club during the last racing year received over £58,000 from moneys collected by the Government from the off-course betting operations under the existing off-course licensing system. All other racing clubs combined received nearly £12,000. The Trotting Association received over £31,000; and all other trotting clubs in the State together received over £14,000. The Treasurer then told us that the amounts which I have just mentioned were received because they were guaranteed to the clubs and the associations concerned under the existing off-course betting legislation and the taxes imposed in connection with it.

In other words, the Government had no option but to pay out these amounts to the organisations concerned, because the amounts were guaranteed under legislation passed by the Parliament. I am not suggesting the Government would have wished to deny the organisations this money, or any part of the money. However, I stress the vital fact that the clubs and the associations were guaranteed this money by Parliament through the legislation which Parliament passed, and which is still in operation.

In reply to my final question on the matter, the Treasurer told us that no amounts are guaranteed under the new off-course betting legislation, which we are now considering, to the racing clubs, or the trotting clubs, or the Trotting Association. Nothing at all—not a penny. So it becomes clear, as we have stressed in previous stages of the debates on these Bills, that the Trotting Association, and the trotting clubs, and the racing clubs together are abandoning the substance of approximately £100,000 per year, which is now guaranteed to them by law, for the shadow of receiving some share of any net profits which the proposed new totalisator agency board might or might not make in its operations, should Parliament approve this legislation.

I think it cannot be emphasised too much that even though the Trotting Association and the W.A. Turf Club might have agreed to this legislation when it was in draft form, they probably have had some second thoughts since. That would apply, particularly, to the W.A. Turf Club. However, if they have not had any second thoughts since, it is surely up to the members of the Government to have some second thoughts in the matter and not allow the trotting clubs and the racing

clubs to be pushed from the very secure guaranteed legal ground on which they now stand into a situation where they have no guarantee at all, and where they will be dependent entirely upon the ability of the proposed totalisator agency board not only to make a profit but to make a net profit.

During this debate we have had stressed several times the financial dangers which are inherent in this legislation—financial dangers which could easily put the operations of the T.A.B. into Queer Street at any particular period. It has been stressed several times, and should be mentioned again in the summing up of the main objections against the legislation, that the totalisator agency board will not only have to pay on winning straight-out bets and on winning place bets at the on-course totalisator odds, but will itself, in relation to a substantial number of investments which will be made with it, be its own bookmaker.

Therefore, in view of the uncertainty of the board from the financial point of view, and because no-one can guarantee that the board will in its operations make net profits, it seems to me that Parliament should not let down the racing clubs, and the trotting clubs, and the Trotting Association by taking away from them this legally guaranteed £100,000 per year and leaving them in a situation where they will just have to wait, and hope, and possibly pray, that the operations of the new board will regularly and in every year return a substantial net profit in order that the organisations concerned might receive something by way of payment from the board's net profits.

I stress again that unless this legislation is very drastically amended under the heading which I am now discussing, and should it become law in its present form, Parliament will absolutely have let down all of the racing and trotting clubs, and the Trotting Association as well. And should Parliament do that, it will be a rather poor reflection upon Parliament, and particularly upon those members of Parliament who are supporting this legislation; because those members are the ones who verbally, at any rate, are all the time saying how much they want to help the racing and trotting clubs; how much they want to assist them; and how much they want to encourage more people to go to the courses at which race meetings and trotting meetings are held.

So I would appeal to the Minister in charge of this major piece of legislation to have another solid look at this situation. I said on a previous occasion that the president of the W.A. Trotting Association is almost fanatical in his belief in, and support of, an off-course totalisator system. I think we all know that Mr. Stratton is 100 per cent. plus in favour of an off-course totalisator system. I am

also inclined to think he has been responsible, to a large extent, for rushing the Turf Club into giving approval to this legislation.

However, I would be strongly inclined to think that, were the chairman and members of the Turf Club made aware of the actual situation which would exist under this proposed legislation as against the situation which exists under the current legislation, they would go into reverse gear in the matter, and insist that substantial alterations be made to the Bills now before us in order that they should be guaranteed at least as much under the proposed legislation as they are legally guaranteed under the existing legislation.

So I strongly emphasise my objection on that basis, and I trust that the objection will receive adequate publicity in order that those associated with the Turf Club and all racing clubs in the State, and those associated with the Trotting Association and all trotting clubs in the State, will come clearly to understand just what is involved in this new legislation as compared with the Acts of Parliament which exist and are operating in the matter at present.

Briefly, therefore, those are the strong objections which I would restate against this legislation, and I hope even at this late stage that the legislation will, in another place, meet the fate it deserves. It is obvious that the supporters of the Government in this House have been very severely disciplined in regard to the support they must give to this legislation, so there is no hope of its being defeated or even substantially amended in this House. However, some Government members in another place have shown refreshing signs of independence in the last 24 hours—

Mr. J. Hegney: Rare courage!

Mr. HAWKE: — so it could easily come to pass that this legislation will be much more closely examined in another place at least by a few of the Government members, in which event such members will be brought up against a problem whereby they will have either to conform to logical thought in relation to these measures, or abandon them altogether.

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [5.15]: As far as can be judged on present indications, we have reached the final stage in this House in a discussion on a Bill under which the Government establishes a public authority to gamble to the amount of £3,000,000 a year, just as bookmakers do. I have endeavoured to find out whether there is any other country in the world where a public authority has been established for the purpose of gambling as a bookmaker. I have not been able to find that out; but so far as I know, there is not another place. It cannot be urged that it is done in New Zealand, because there the totalisator closes its business in sufficient time to place its money on the tote. It does

not accept money to hold as a bookmaker, and I do not know of any place where that applies.

This Government, under the present legislation, establishes a public authority which has the same rights and privileges as has, for example, the State Electricity Commission or the W. A. Meat Export Works, and it does not differ in any particular. This public authority is guaranteed by the Government against losses, because it is enabled to raise loans and use the borrowed money to finance gambling losses if they occur.

It is anticipated that at least £3,000,000 of the turnover will be on Eastern States races. In connection with the whole of that turnover, the public authority set up by the Government will act as a bookmaker. It will do what up to a few years ago was illegal in this State. It will do that for which men were fined heavy amounts and, in some cases, imprisoned.

This public authority now, with the hallmark of the Government upon it, is to be authorised by this Bill to engage in the business of bookmaking on a very large scale. There are men in the ministry who are strong churchmen. I am wondering how they could possibly have swallowed this proposition. The United Council of Churches, through its representative appearing before the Royal Commission, said that its concern was with principles rather than policy. There is a principle in this, and it is a new principle. It has never been in operation in Australia before; and as far as I have been able to ascertain, it has never been in operation anywhere else in the world.

This new principle is that the Government itself establishes a public authority like the State Electricity Commission or the W.A. Meat Export Works, but it does not engage in trading but in gambling as a bookmaker. Further than that, it is authorised to engage in gambling as a punter. That is to say, at any time it is entitled to take any proportion of its holdings as a bookmaker, and endeavour to judge the market and invest that money on totalisators elsewhere, or possibly with bookmakers elsewhere. To the extent that it does so, it is punting with the money it holds.

So I repeat that this is a new principle: a principle where a Government authority, with Government financial backing, can engage to the tune of more than £3,000,000 a year in open gambling—a thing for which a few years ago people were prosecuted. We fined them heavily; and, I repeat, in some cases they were imprisoned.

Here is the State itself establishing a public authority to enable it to do just that. I am wondering how it is that not one voice has been raised in the community against this new principle upon which this Government has embarked—the principle of establishing a public authority to

engage in bookmaking and punting; and if it suffers losses, the Government's guarantee can be brought into operation to make good those losses.

There was no necessity for the Government to do this. Even though it was bent on establishing off-course totalisators, there was no necessity for the Government itself to set up a public authority and to back it financially; because if we are to believe the Royal Commissioner, the offer was made before him, on behalf of the clubs, that they would finance this off-course tote.

I quote from page 39 of the report of the Royal Commission on betting, in which the commissioner had this to say—

The Western Australian Trotting Association has undertaken to finance the scheme in Western Australia, and through its President stated that it has £50,000 in bonds readily available and is prepared to provide the additional money required. The moneys would be supplied free of interest. In return it asks for a levy on turnover such as was provided in New Zealand to reimburse the Association for its capital expenditure.

So there is a straight-out offer on behalf of the Trotting Association to assume the full financial responsibility for the establishment of this off-course tote. And Mr. Ainslie, the counsel appearing for the Trotting Association and the Turf Club, told the commissioner that Mr. Stratton had said—

We will finance an off-course tote system. If the deal costs £300,000 it does not deter us. We can give an undertaking that we can do it.

So it is perfectly clear that the Government was not obliged to establish this public authority, and back it financially to enable it to indulge in gambling on a colossal scale. The Government could have had its totes and not been involved in it; and the financial cost would have been underwritten by the racing clubs and the trotting clubs. But no; the Government chose to blaze this new trail; to break this new ground, hitherto unheard of in Australia.

Why, if anybody had suggested a year or two ago that a sovereign Government in Australia would itself establish a public authority and permit it to gamble as a bookmaker and a punter, it would have been laughed to scorn. But here we are about to pass a Bill to authorise just that.

And what reasons were we given to justify it? We were given four expectations by the Minister. He did not supply any proof that these would be realised. So far as I am concerned, they are pious hopes, completely without proof of any sort. The Minister said the State will not suffer loss of revenue. How does he know? Somebody told him! But how does

the person who told him know, when Mr. Smythe, who was before the Royal Commission, did not know? He was not sure. He submitted certain figures with regard to necessary turnover, and admitted that if that turnover were not achieved the scheme could not be a financial success.

But the Minister told the House—it was only a statement of opinion—no proof was adduced in support of it—that the State would not suffer loss of revenue. He did admit it is expected that the turnover will drop to £6,500,000; and that it might rise later to £11,500,000. Anybody who has done any arithmetic at all will know that if the turnover drops to £6,500,000 the Government will be battling to get as much revenue from it as it is getting now.

The next expectation mentioned by the Minister was that the racing clubs would receive a better return. Again, no evidence in support of the suggestion—just a mere statement of an opinion, backed up with nothing. Not even an opinion from another Minister; not even figures from some expert source; but just the straight-out unsupported statement that the clubs will receive a better return—a statement not worth anything.

The next bait which the Minister dangled in front of the members of the House was that off-course punters and on-course punters would receive a slightly higher dividend. Again, not a single figure to support the idea; no information to back up this opinion. Whose opinion is it? Is it the Minister's opinion? Is it the Government's opinion? Or is it the opinion of some expert adviser, that off-course punters and on-course punters, as a body, are going to receive a higher return for their investment?

The fourth and last bait which is offered for members' consumption, if they are gullible enough, is that the community will benefit by a reduction in the total volume of off-course betting. Again, no reference is made to what has happened anywhere else—because the Minister dare not make it. He dare not turn to any other place to support that idea, because he would be in real trouble. It is a mere unsupported statement of somebody's opinion, that off-course betting will be reduced.

Those were the four so-called reasons why this legislation should be supported. And I repeat that not one of those four reasons was backed up by a tittle of evidence—not one of them. Therefore, we cannot call them reasons. I cannot even call them reasonable expectations; because the Minister has not supplied any evidence at all in support of them.

Let me take the last suggestion first—that off-course betting will be reduced. One would have thought that as our scheme is partially based on New Zealand's experience, the Minister would have

some regard for what has happened in New Zealand. But apparently he is not interested. As I see the situation it is this: A few years ago, when off-course betting shops were in operation illegally, and people who frequented those shops were liable to fines for breaking the law, and those who ran the shops were also liable to fines, there was created in the minds of the community a feeling that those were places where respectable people did not go. In the minds of the majority of the people there was some revulsion against them, and a very strong disinclination to use the facilities.

It is my view that even though in recent years such places have been legalised, that feeling of antagonism still remains with a lot of people. They have a feeling that one just does not go into an S.P. shop, because the old stigma still lingers. Once we establish a public authority to take the place of these starting-price shops, and it becomes a Government-backed institution, it is given an air of respectability which up to now it has not possessed. As a consequence, we will find that people who right up to now have studiously avoided using those facilities will no longer have any inhibitions with regard to the matter, and they will start to frequent the off-course totes.

I am telling the Minister from my place now that that is what is going to happen in Western Australia; and instead of a continual falling-off in patronage, once these places become established on the new basis, which will be considerably lower than the present one, there will be a gradual growth in the volume of off-course betting until it reaches tremendous proportions. Let us have a look at the New Zealand experience.

Mr. Perkins: Then it ought to be more profitable than you forecast.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot have it both ways. He cannot say it will be less and then in the next breath say it will be more profitable.

Mr. Perkins: But that is what you are saying.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister has to know which way he is going. It must be one thing or the other; either it is going to grow less or it is going to be greater; and the Minister has already told the House that the volume will grow less and now he wants to change his mind.

Mr. Perkins: No; it is you. You are the one whose mind is changing.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot change his mind. What I am saying is that there will be a very substantial reduction in the volume of turnover immediately. There has to be because there will be no laying-off, as there is now, which is a substantial proportion of the turnover; and there will be no hot money which comes over in large lumps. There will not be the same facilities for betting

at whatever period we like to mention; so it is inevitable that the turnover will fall. But when it is established at the new level, from that time onwards it will continue to grow until finally it will be ever so much greater in volume off course than it will ever be on course—the very opposite of what the Government seeks to achieve.

Now the proof. I wish to quote from page 820 of the *New Zealand Official Year Book, 1960*. We go back to the year 1955, and we find that in that year the totalisator turnover on course was £24,000,000 odd; whereas off course it was only £19,700,000. In the next year the on-course totalisator turnover fell and the off-course turnover rose; the figures were £22,700,000 on course and £21,275,000 off course. The next year the totalisator turnover on the course fell again, and the totalisator turnover off course went up; and so we got these figures—on course, £22,500,000; and off course, £21,900,000. But we have to note, of course, that the on-course turnover was still ahead of the off-course.

In the next year, 1958, the on-course turnover was £23,591,000, and the off-course turnover £22,839,000. In 1959, for the first time since the establishment of the facilities, the growth in off-course betting had enabled the turnover off course to exceed the turnover on course, and so we got the figure of £21,679,000 on course. The volume had fallen by £2,500,000 on course in five years, and it had grown by £4,000,000 off course in the same five years. The figures for 1959 were £21,679,000 on course, and £21,995,000 off course.

I was a bit disappointed that I could not obtain the figures for the current year; but, fortunately, *The West Australian* this morning helped considerably because there was a statement about the totalisators booming. But what the paper did not say was that it is the off-course totalisators that are booming in New Zealand. These are the figures it supplied: During the year, £24,429,915 was wagered on official premises; and I would point out to members that that means a growth of £2,500,000 off course in the last twelve months.

Mr. Lewis: What did you say the off-course figures were for 1959?

Mr. TONKIN: Off course, £21,995,000.

Mr. Lewis: That is about £1,000,000 less than the year before.

Mr. TONKIN: That is so; and the on-course figure was down £2,000,000 on the year before. Last year, for some unexplained reason, both on-course and off-course totalisators suffered a reduction; but for the current year the turnover off course reached an all-time record, and showed a figure of £24,429,000.

Mr. O'Neill: Would that be due to the extension of off-course tote facilities?

Mr. TONKIN: It is due to the fact that people are becoming more used to going into these premises with an air of respectability, and using the facilities provided. Only last week I had the opportunity of speaking to a resident of New Zealand who was on holidays in this State. This individual was a professional man. He told me that, in New Zealand, one does not think twice of going into a totalisator agency and having 10s. or £1 each way on a horse, or a double, according to what he wishes. It is part of the life of the community in New Zealand because it is regarded as the right thing to do if one has any inclinations that way.

That is the point I want to make. There are people in Western Australia who would never, until the day they die, enter an off-course betting shop, because they have at the back of their minds that at one time betting shops were illegal and there is a stigma attached to them. However, set up a totalisator in the midst of the people, established as a public authority by the Government, and authorised by the Government to act as a bookmaker, and what inhibitions will those people have? They will just enter the totalisator as they enter a post office, or an agency for the Lotteries Commission, to buy a ticket in a sweep.

Mr. Burt: You legalised off-course bookmakers.

Mr. TONKIN: That has nothing to do with the Minister's forecast. It has nothing to do with whether the Minister's statement is true or false. In any event, if the honourable member has anything to say he should get up and say it. But apparently he prefers to sit in his seat and snipe rather than rise from his seat and state his views on the statement the Minister has made.

The statement made by the Minister that off-course betting will wither and get less and less is contrary to all experience, and I am making the forecast quite confidently from my place here that, after it finds its new level, off-course betting will continue to grow at the expense of betting on the racecourse in precisely the same way as it has done in New Zealand.

So those people who have thought long about this matter and who are so keen about the totes as the method by which we will attract people back to the racecourse are in for the greatest surprise of their lives; because not only will there be fewer people going to the racecourse, but also the Government will receive less revenue from this source and so will lose both ways.

In an experiment of this kind, I suggest it is not sufficient merely to rise to one's feet and express opinions without authority or without any proof; but that is just what the Minister did in regard to these four suggestions which were put forward as attractions in order to induce the House

to agree to the proposition. Let us have a look at the chance the clubs have of getting an increased return.

If what the Minister said about these matters is true, we would have the millennium. If what the Minister said is true, the Government is going to get more, the public is going to get more, the racing clubs will get more, and there will be more betting on the racecourse than off course. The Minister said all those things.

How is it physically possible to achieve all those objectives at the one time? The clubs are to get more and more; the Government is not going to lose anything; the punters are going to get more for their investment; but there are going to be fewer punters betting. That is the prognosis upon which the Minister built his speech.

If members doubt me, they should read the speech. It just does not make sense. Another aspect of this matter which has not received sufficient consideration from the Government is this proposal to pay out at totalisator odds which, undoubtedly, will result in the punters getting more for their investments. I mentioned yesterday that I had the opportunity of actually examining the books which are used by bookmakers in their operations, so the figures I am about to quote are not cooked up for any particular purpose, but are routine figures taken by me in sequence just as they appeared.

I will start with bookmaker No. 1. Over the last five weeks—that is, five weeks back from now—his pay-out was £808. Had he been paying out on the totalisator dividend, instead of on the starting-price dividend, he would have had to pay out 10.6 per cent. more.

Mr. Perkins: Are these figures based on local races or on Eastern States races?

Mr. TONKIN: They are on Eastern States races: the races upon which the public authority is going to gamble as a bookmaker. It is going to hold the money in the pool and gamble as a bookmaker as bookmakers do. In that period of five weeks, bookmaker No. 1 paid out £808 to successful investors. Had he been obliged to pay out on the totalisator figure, he would have had to pay out 10.6 per cent. more; or, roughly, another £80. That is £16 a week.

I will now deal with bookmaker No. 2. His pay-out, in the same period of five weeks, was £654. Had he been obliged to pay out on totalisator figures, he would have had to pay out 6.7 per cent. more than he actually did; or approximately one-fourteenth more than he actually paid, which is near enough to an additional £45.

In the same period, bookmaker No. 3 operated on a much larger scale than bookmakers Nos. 1 and 2; and, during that period, his pay-out to successful investors was £3,200. Had he been obliged to pay out on the totalisator figures, instead of

on starting-price figures, he would have had to pay out an additional 5 per cent. on that total holding. That would have cost him another £160 in pay-out.

Mr. Crommelin: That means the figures of his holding were less.

[The Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. TONKIN: No; it does not mean that, because it is a different class of business. But the point I am trying to make is that—no matter what class of business it is—there appears to be a minimum of 5 per cent. additional pay-out involved. My belief is that if I had time to take out the figures for a full 12-months period, the additional pay-out would average 10 per cent. over-all.

Mr. Perkins: We have had a check made of the bookmakers' betting sheets, and the bookmakers would have made a nice profit if they had been paying out at totalisator odds.

Mr. TONKIN: I made a check of bookmakers' sheets last week, too, and I found that those figures did not show that they would have made a nice profit.

Mr. Perkins: Are you sure the figures you checked were not doctored?

Mr. TONKIN: I am absolutely certain they were not doctored. I have the figures with me, and I give the Minister an assurance that I will make them available to him for his inspection. They could not possibly have been doctored because the sheets were the duplicates that were sent in to the Treasury.

Mr. Perkins: We have made inspections, and we know what is going on.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister might think he knows what is going on; but if he thinks that they will make a profit if they pay out on totalisator odds, he is in for a rude shock.

Mr. Perkins: We will still make a profit.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister is in for a rude shock; because, from the information made available to me, I was not able to find, anywhere, a period during which it would not have cost the bookmakers more to pay out on totalisator odds than it would have if they had paid out on starting-price odds. On that information, I came to the conclusion that some bookmakers will find it completely impossible to operate in the future if they still have to pay the same tax as the Treasury requires them to pay now; and this will be in the form of an additional tax. If they have to pay that addition, their margin of profit will be reduced, without any comparable reduction in their expense ratio; and so it will become a question of arithmetic that they will not be able to function.

Mr. Perkins: You told us they would all go broke with the additional tax.

Mr. TONKIN: Some of them did; and I think the Minister, if he is honest about this, would know that some of the biggest

operators at the present moment are just hanging on, and that is all. There is nothing in it. The Minister must know. I do not want to mention any names here; but all my inquiries to ascertain what is happening point that way, and I am assured by quite a number of them that they have actually been operating on balance since this new tax came into operation.

Some of them, of course, with a lower expense ratio, might be making some profit. But there are others—and some quite big ones—for whom, under the existing conditions, there is just wages, and nothing else. The Minister would know. He has access to the sheets, and it would be easy to calculate it. As a matter of fact, the Treasury admits that the bookmakers only gross about 12 per cent. on Eastern States races, and about 7 per cent. to 8 per cent. on local races. The Treasury will not argue about that. If they gross an average of 10 per cent., and it is going to cost them 5 per cent. on the Eastern States investments to pay the totalisator odds, then they cannot gross sufficient to enable them to meet their commitments; and neither will the totalisator board be able to do so.

Do not tell me that those who are going to be associated with this machine will be better at the game than the bookmakers, who are already practising! If it were completely a totalisator business, it would be a different matter; they could not lose. There is no question of gambling in New Zealand; one cannot possibly lose in New Zealand. The only thing happening there is that fewer people are going to the races, and more people are betting off course. But the clubs are getting increased dividends from the totalisator board, so there is no squeal about that.

But do not let us lose sight of the fact that the whole of the business is totalisator business on which the totalisator, first of all, levies this commission, and then distributes the balance. Who would not be in a proposition of that kind! But this is different; because, at a minimum, half the turnover is going to be fielded. Quite a lot more than the Minister anticipates will have to be fielded with regard to local races—quite a lot more. Practically the whole of the Eastern States turnover will have to be fielded. That amount which will be invested in the local pool will be so small as to be negligible; and so, for the sake of argument, we can assume that the Eastern States turnover will be fielded by the board as a bookmaker. The board cannot expect to make any more profit than is the experience of bookmakers generally; in my opinion it will make less, because it will not be so well-informed.

If the board starts laying off in large lumps, and starts punting with part of the turnover, and it is backing losers, it will have to dip into kitty to find the money to pay the successful investors.

That is the risk the totalisator does not run in New Zealand, or anywhere else, so far as I know.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; that will be ample. I will close on this note, and say that it shocks me to think that, without precedent, the Government will establish a public authority, and clothe it with sufficient legality to enable it to gamble to the extent of £3,000,000 to £4,000,000 a year as a bookmaker; to do the very thing that we punished people for doing a few years ago. We punished individuals for doing this. Nothing was too bad for them; it was a shocking thing to bet off-course with the bookmaker; it was a shocking thing for the punter, and a shocking thing for the bookmaker!

We were told that the place for betting was on the racecourse. But what do we get now from members of the Government who used those words? We find the Government setting up a public authority, and giving it Government financial backing, to enable it to do the very thing about which members of the Government complained before; namely, to act as a bookmaker to the extent of £3,500,000 a year. I wonder if there ever was a bigger bookmaker than the one the Government itself is establishing, and standing up for as being a desirable course to follow; and defending it on four counts, none of which I accept!

I do not accept that off-course betting will dwindle. I say when it gets its new lawful authority, it will find a new level and it will from that day start to grow; and it will grow at the expense of the on-course betting, which will commence to dwindle from the same time, and will get less and less. The Government will lose revenue, and so will the clubs. It is possible that for the time being, because payments are to be made at totalisator odds, the investors will get more for their money; but when the totalisator board starts to experiment with pools on Eastern States races, where the fields contain Western Australian horses, then, instead of the punters getting more for their investments, they will get considerably less.

We will then have the situation where a horse will pay 25s. in Melbourne and 3s. 6d. or 3s. 9d. in Western Australia. If we have too many of these, the investors will not be getting a bigger return for their money. That could have happened recently when Aquanita and Queen of the May were racing, and Aquanita won. Had the totalisator been operating in Western Australia on that race, my guess is that the dividend on Aquanita, instead of being 30s., would have been 15s.

Since the bulk of the punters were in support of that horse, they could have sustained ample losses. I have explained

my views in regard to this matter, and have endeavoured to show that no proof whatever was advanced by the Government in support of its belief in connection with this. Instead of reasons being given for the course for us to follow, we have not even been given a reasonable expectation. I oppose the Bill.

MR. HALL (Albany) [5.59]: In opposing the third reading of this Bill, I would point out that I have some misgivings that the Government has gone on with the measure. These misgivings are borne out by the passage of the Bill through the House; particularly when we recall that the House divided some 28 times, and well into the small hours of the morning. Apart from this I think the gag was applied some five times—although I may be wrong in the exact number. However, the whole thing savoured of pushing the Bill through with a barrow. It is my contention that when this Bill reaches the public in its true significance, it will receive the same attention from the people who frequent betting shops and derive some entertainment from the privilege of betting therein as it has received from the Opposition in this House; that is, those people will express the same objections to the measure.

If we examined the provisions in the Bill, we would find that clause 48, which caused so much discussion, permits a police officer to almost override any authority and enter private premises. There is another provision relating to loitering; and under this a police officer can order a person to move along. The Minister has referred to the offence of loitering in relation to people standing, but I wonder what would happen if they were sitting down. I wonder whether the Bill would be applicable in that case. There is a likelihood that the provisions in the Bill could be defeated on a technical point.

The people who are affected by the existing Act, together with those who are not at present affected but who will be affected when the Bill is passed, will show resentment when the legislation is implemented. These people are the ones who now enjoy the privilege of going into off-course betting shops and placing their small wagers. I have discussed this measure with a number of such people, and I pointed out to them some of the passages in the Bill. Their general reaction was that the existing betting shops should be left as they are entirely. They consider that they now have a facility which they did not have before off-course betting was legalised.

Before legislation was passed to legalise off-course betting shops, the Government derived very little revenue from off-course betting. In the year before the legislation was passed, the Government received about £5,000 from fines imposed for betting offences; but neither the Trotting Association nor the Turf Club received any

of this revenue at all. We should examine this aspect clearly and realise what legalised off-course betting has done not only for the revenue of this State, but also for the race clubs and trotting clubs. The revenue from licensed off-course betting has assisted those clubs considerably; it has helped them to re-establish their courses and improve their facilities, because they believed the main cause of their decline was the lack of adequate facilities.

However, that was not the main cause of their trouble. The main cause was the competition from other sources, where the people were able to obtain greatly improved amenities. People who formerly were stuck for something to do on a Saturday afternoon, and went to the races, are now finding other forms of entertainment. The clubs will find the competition from these sources, as outlined by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, very strong. Whereas the Turf Club and the Trotting Association are trying to force people back to the racecourse and trotting course, they will be defeating the very object they are seeking to achieve by the passage of this measure.

I want to refer to another aspect—one that concerns the punter. At present he has to pay an investment tax on off-course betting. There is no proposal in the Bill to give the punter any representation on the totalisator agency board. I have already outlined my views on this matter. The board is to consist of the ingredients or components which make up the Turf Club and the Trotting Association. It is a fundamental principle that finance must be available for the creation of any public authority. Finance is required for such an authority, as it is for private enterprise, in respect to which funds are raised by the issuing of shares and debentures. Public authorities and private enterprises must all start off with this first ingredient—finance by the public.

The totalisator agency board must therefore be started off by the betting public; but the betting public can engage in betting other than on horse racing. The investment comes first, and the race afterwards. In this case there is no question of which comes first—the egg or the hen. People can bet on forms of competition or sport other than horse racing. The Bill is confined to betting on horse racing. I predict that the existing punters will find other forms of betting.

Should that happen, the police State which has been referred to frequently in this debate will come into existence. The police will have to endeavour to enforce this legislation and make criminals out of ordinary people who seek relaxation at the weekend, after a week of hard work. If apprehended they will have to face judicial authorities, and perhaps serve a term of imprisonment. The wives of such people—people perhaps without a blemish

for many years—and the firms in which they work, will take great exception to this legislation.

I have advocated the retention of the existing off-course betting shops. Another point I made when speaking to the second reading debate was the effect of an off-course totalisator on the general populace. In my view the introduction of television, computing machines, sausage machines, beer machines, and peanut machines, etc., into this State are making robots out of the people. The people are being discouraged from fraternising with one another as human beings. Today it seems that people are becoming mechanically-minded, and are losing the real trend of human relationship.

The off-course betting shops do give the patrons the chance of fraternising with one another and rubbing shoulders on Saturdays. Perhaps over a glass of beer they enter into a discussion before making another investment. Today we do not come across the spectacle—which existed before the off-course shops were licensed—of people hanging around streets and of youths betting. All that has been done away with. We now see the adult punter, and we do not see the drunk of the old days hanging around the shops. The present system has proven itself conclusively.

It is doubtful whether the W.A.T.C. is making the utmost use of the money it receives by way of tax. It has certainly endeavoured to improve racing to some extent by lifting the stakes slightly, and it has provided starting gates. However, if the Turf Club is so financial that it can pay £25,000 into a scheme which it hopes will destroy the hand that feeds it, I doubt very much whether it was very poor before the introduction of the taxes. If I had something that was showing me a lucrative turnover, I would be loth to do anything to destroy it, just as an employer would be loth to dismiss a good employee who was showing him a substantial return. One does not dispense with something that is to one's advantage.

What is the ulterior motive behind this? Is the W.A.T.C. being forced by someone who is interested in mechanical contrivances? If so, we might be able to have a first-class sale of secondhand totalisators. We all know the composition of the board; we all know that it will include one country representative, whose appointment was resisted by the Minister; it was only by constant pressure from one member of the House that the Minister gave way and allowed that representation.

An ulterior motive of the board would be to destroy the machine which, in my opinion, it is pretending it wishes to exist. That will be clearly borne out if the board feels that the totalisator system is not obtaining the dividends which it should receive. It will apply pressure to force the populace back to the racecourse.

However, that will not happen, because the totalisator will be doing exactly the same thing as the S.P. shops are doing today. Under these circumstances there will be a total collapse of the system, which has taken a long time to reach its present-day standard.

If the present system has faults, they could have been ironed out by this Government or any incoming Government. The system has proved itself in all forms of betting. If any member in this House has seen the system which operates in South Australia, he will know that we have something of which we can be reasonably proud. We have a vice, but as far as is possible that vice is controlled—so much so that other countries are giving consideration to adapting our system of off-course betting to suit their requirements.

In expressing my opposition to the third reading of this Bill, I have aired the feelings of the electorate which I represent. The people there are definitely in favour of retaining the present system. I would say also, without fear of contradiction, having read some of the letters which have appeared in the Press, that the general public of this State are desirous of retaining the betting shops. I have expressed my feelings on the closure of S.P. shops; and I am certainly not in favour of the totalisator system.

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [6.11]: I feel I cannot allow this occasion to pass without again voicing my objections to some of the provisions in the Bill. The question of the setting up of the totalisator board and its financial effect have been dealt with by other speakers, so I do not propose to cover that ground. However, I wish again to emphasise my opposition to some of the penal clauses of this Bill, and to some of the provisions for dealing with people—not people who infringe the Act, but people who are suspected of infringing the Act.

I do not think there is legislation anywhere in this Commonwealth which borders on the type which we are now considering. I think it would be difficult to find similar legislation in any British country. This Government has included these provisions in the Bill in order to protect a totalisator proposal, yet the Commonwealth Government did not see fit, even in wartime, to impose the same provisions in any Act of the Commonwealth Parliament.

Provision is made in this Bill for the arrest and removal of a person from a place even if that person is only suspected of having an illegal bet on that day. So long as a police officer believes that a person is engaged in illegal betting, that police officer may remove that person from the particular place. It means that a person would be in grave danger if he produced his wallet and counted his money. A police officer might come to the conclusion that

the money in that person's possession had been obtained from illegal betting. That may sound silly, but it could happen under this Bill.

There is also provision in the measure for the arrest and removal of a person from licensed premises if that person is suspected by a police officer of having engaged in illegal betting on that day. I think we all agree that the offence of drunken driving is far more serious than that of illegal betting. At least, I think so. Does this mean that on some future occasion the Traffic Act is going to be amended so that a police officer can arrest a man he sees going into a hotel because he suspects that man is going on to licensed premises for the purpose of becoming inebriated, after which he will drive his motorcar?

Members opposite would probably say that that was a silly assumption to make, but it is on all fours with the provisions contained in this Bill.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MOIR: Before the tea suspension I was pointing out the ridiculous position we could have if this type of legislation were applied to other Acts of Parliament, and if people could be arrested on suspicion that they were going to do a certain thing or break a certain law. We know how easy it is for one's actions to be misinterpreted; and one can readily appreciate the mistakes that could be made under this type of legislation.

Under the present Acts of Parliament in force in this State and, indeed, in all other States of the Commonwealth, if law enforcement officers do make mistakes they have to be answerable for those mistakes; and any person who considers himself aggrieved by any action on the part of those officers has redress. In this measure we find that any person who is aggrieved through any action taken under this Act has no right of appeal.

It is quite true that the Minister has stated that he will give consideration to the proposal put forward from this side of the House that any person who feels he has been wrongly dealt with should have the right of approaching the Governor. But the Minister has only stated that he will give consideration to that suggestion. He has given no firm promise on it. However, it was the intention of the Bill, when it was first introduced in this House, that a person should have no right of appeal at all.

It is absolutely unthinkable that we should have legislation of this type which would enable a police officer to enter a person's house merely on suspicion and without a warrant, and remove that person from his premises. This situation becomes far worse when we look at the next portion of the clause. We find that an offender will be punished if he returns

to those premises within 24 hours. I am not going over all the ramifications and possibilities that could arise, because they have already been ventilated.

We have the further extraordinary position that if a person is charged with an offence against this Act, the person hearing the charge must, if there is a suspicion in his mind, deem a *prima facie* case to have been made out. That is extraordinary. In various other proceedings when a person is charged and evidence is brought against him, if there is any real doubt in the mind of the person hearing the charge as to the guilt of that person, the person charged is invariably given the benefit of the doubt.

But under this legislation no benefit of the doubt is to be given at all; because if the person hearing the charge has any doubt about a person's innocence he must also have a doubt about his guilt. Under this measure he does not need to have a doubt in his mind, but merely a suspicion that the person charged was acting in the manner of which he was accused; and if he has that suspicion he must accordingly convict him.

That would be an extraordinary provision in legislation dealing with matters of a serious nature, let alone in this type of legislation under which a person may be proceeded against merely on suspicion.

The Minister did agree, after considerable pressure from this side of the House, to include an amendment to the effect that, where a person is arrested a report must be made to the Attorney-General. That may be some safeguard against irresponsible actions by members of the Police Force.

I do not mean to cast any aspersion on members of the Police Force who, in the main, are fairly responsible people and exercise their powers in a responsible manner. But there are individuals in any part of the community who act in an irresponsible manner; and, as has been pointed out here, the powers contained in this legislation are to be conferred on even the newest recruit to the Police Force—one who may be out on his first assignment. Such a person will have the power to arrest a man if there is a suspicion in his mind that that person has contravened the provisions of the Act. I repeat it is an extraordinary state of affairs.

I speak with some feeling on this matter. I am well acquainted with actions that have taken place on the goldfields during the past under the Gold Stealing Act, whereby officers of the law are clothed with powers nowhere near those contained in this Bill. On possession of a warrant they may search a person's residence. From past experience as a union official I know that bitter complaints have been made by people who considered there had been an abuse of those powers, inasmuch as warrants were obtained and private premises searched where, it was maintained,

no inference could be drawn from the actions of the owners of the premises that they were concealing any gold on their premises.

There have been numerous complaints; so much so that the matter has, from time to time, been taken up with various Ministers for Police. I am very pleased to say that in latter years these complaints have not been heard to the same extent as they were previously.

How much worse is this legislation when we find that police officers are given the right of entry to a person's premises without possession of a search warrant! Surely if any privilege is to be respected in a democratic community it is the privilege that one's home shall be private, and that only when it is considered that something in the nature of a crime has taken place—and only after a warrant has been sworn out before a responsible person—namely, a magistrate or a justice of the peace—shall a police officer be allowed to enter a private dwelling.

Is it any wonder that we on this side of the House object most strongly to provisions of this nature being placed in a Bill? The Commonwealth Government, in the midst of war, did not consider it necessary to place such provisions in Commonwealth legislation in order to safeguard the security of this country. Any responsible member of Parliament would be prepared to go to great lengths to place provisions in legislation designed to protect the security of this country. But even in wartime such provisions, to my knowledge, were never suggested.

Here we find these vicious—if I may use the term—provisions included in a Bill merely to deal with the offence of illegal betting. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I believe that people should observe any law passed by Parliament, and if that law is broken they should pay the penalty. I believe, however, that certain fundamental rights of the people should be preserved, and that we should be ever prepared to safeguard those rights in the future, and do everything in our power to prevent repressive legislation of this nature from going on the statute book.

I place on record my objection to this Bill. If, in the future, citizens come to me stating that they have been unjustly dealt with by this legislation, I will not hesitate to place their grievances before the responsible person, whether he be the Minister for Police or the present Attorney-General.

I consider there will be many instances where people will be unjustly dealt with under this legislation. I am not concerned with guilty people. I am concerned with the rights of the ordinary citizen who may be going about his business quite legitimately, and who finds himself taken into custody by a police officer merely because that police officer had a suspicion in his mind that the person he

arrested had contravened this Act. I cannot emphasise too strongly my objection to this Bill.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [7.44]: I feel that I must again voice my protest in respect of this Bill. It is not my intention here to say whether the Bill does what it sets out to do so far as betting is concerned. The Bill contains two principles to which I am totally opposed, and to which I referred in my second reading speech, and during the committee stage.

The first point is that by this Bill the Government will set up a body corporate for the purpose of conducting betting, and with the right to use other people's money to lay off bets. This body corporate is to be run by two organisations—the W.A. Turf Club and the W.A. Trotting Association. Both of those bodies are prepared to assist the finances of this totalisator system only to the extent of £50,000 out of an estimated total cost of £300,000. The other moneys required are authorised to be raised by loan when the Treasurer gives approval. This means that the Government will be responsible for any debts that are incurred; and the Bill stipulates that should the totalisator board fall down on its obligations such debts shall be payable from the public account.

Other bodies corporate have the right to raise moneys without Government guarantee; and they do not have the right to call on the Treasurer to pay out of the public account any losses which they may have incurred. If the Government wishes a body corporate such as this will be to carry on under the terms laid down in the Bill, the Government should take over far more control of the board than it proposes to.

Under the Bill a board comprising seven members will be established, and one of these members will be a Government appointee and the chairman. The other six will be appointed by the racing and trotting clubs. What jurisdiction will one man have over six others? He will not be able to guide or influence them in any way; and he will have only one vote. It will simply mean that those six people will be able to do practically what they like. They will have power to borrow, with the Treasurer's consent; and they will have power to lay off any moneys which are paid into their pools; and so on. Yet the Treasurer is responsible for the payment of any debts from money belonging to the people of the State.

It is not right or just that a provision such as this should be incorporated in a Bill of this nature; and a body such as is proposed in the Bill should not be given such powers, especially when the Government does not have full control over it. Had there been one representative from each of these bodies and five nominated by the Government, the position would have been slightly different. But still I

would not agree to the Government financing betting transactions. It is not the Government's province to enter into gambling in any shape or form, and on this point alone the Bill should be condemned.

The other point I wish to raise concerns the onus-of-proof clauses. As the member for Boulder has said, in no other Acts anywhere in Australia is such power given to the police as is given in this Bill. No other Act in Australia allows a person to be moved on, for no reason whatsoever, when he is standing on the street. There is no Act in Australia which allows a person to be removed from his home; and, although not even found guilty, debarred from returning to it, just because somebody has a suspicion that he may have been betting.

When one looks at clause 50, one sees that a person does not even need to be charged. That clause says that a member of the Police Force can arrest on suspicion and can remove such person from the premises—and the suspicion is that of gambling or betting. If a person is removed from the property concerned, he is prevented from returning to it, or to a property adjacent thereto, for 24 hours.

The property might be his own home, or his neighbour's home; but because somebody has a suspicion that he is gambling, or others are gambling there, he is not to be allowed to return to that property. Not only that, but he can also be taken before a magistrate; and if the magistrate has a reasonable suspicion, he can be deemed to be guilty on *prima facie* evidence. The part of the Bill in question reads—

which, in the mind of the court, raise a reasonable suspicion that the money or thing was so given, received, or paid in contravention of the purposes and provisions of this Act, or any of them, such giving, receiving, or paying shall be deemed *prima facie* evidence of the commission by the accused person of the offence charged against him . . .

Such clauses as that appear throughout the Bill; and if we look at the interpretations of such words as "place", we find that those interpretations are all-embracing, and could apply practically throughout the State.

It is generally known in British law that a person's home is his castle. That being so, surely a person is more or less free to do as he pleases in his own home. But under this Bill, if it becomes law, that will not be possible. If this legislation becomes law, a person can be arrested on suspicion, tried on suspicion, and found guilty on suspicion. I oppose the Bill.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [7.53]: I rise to oppose the third reading of the Bill, and I think it is evident to

everybody in the House that when all Opposition members oppose the third reading of a Bill it must be of more than normal importance. As far as I am concerned this Bill is of more than normal importance largely because I think it has degraded—and I repeat the word "degraded"—our methods of government. That Ministers should waste their time in introducing legislation such as this, which will have the effect of setting up a totalisator board in Western Australia, when there are so many other important matters to which they could apply themselves, is nothing short of scandalous.

Nothing can justify the Government's action in going into the betting business. It would appear that if the Bill becomes law the Government will do some fielding, because the Government guarantees the board's debts. The Board will not be able to place all the money it holds on the totalisators at the racecourses, and will have to hold some itself. In that case this Government department will be holding money as a bookmaker.

I think this matter so important that I intend to quote the words used by the present Premier (Mr. Brand) when the Labor Government introduced legislation to legalise S.P. betting shops. At that time betting in S.P. shops was illegal and the Government sought to bring the matter under control. The present Premier (Mr. Brand) said this—

Somebody might have switched the light on them; I do not think they have seen it. People who believe in the principle contained in this Bill—that of legalising S.P. bookmaking—do not easily change their minds when in *Hansard* we find page after page of the record indicating that they think to the contrary. It looks to me that there might have been a very big whip cracked, or a great deal of discussion, and pressure brought to bear to ensure unanimity on that side of the House.

Mr. Heal: You do not know what you are talking about.

The Hon. D. Brand: Do I not? The whip cracked and well the member for West Perth knows it. We took the Government at its face value when it said it would make this measure a non-party one, and we decided to do the same.

Before continuing to quote the Premier's remarks, I would remind all members that this legislation was passed by this House with the vote of a Liberal member. The legislation was not passed with only the Labor members supporting it, but as a result of a Liberal member supporting it. In another place the Bill was also passed by those members who support the Liberal

Party and the Country Party. I will now continue with the remarks made by the Premier in November, 1954. He said—

I have given up hope. I am sorry the churches and those people who represent the other side of the argument, and who are interested in the social problem of betting, have not been given an opportunity to regiment their forces and place their arguments before the Premier.

It would be interesting to know whether the Premier and his Government submitted this Bill to the churches for consideration by them; because the Premier, in the speech I am now quoting to the House, referred to the various churches and the Council of Churches that were opposed to this legislation.

The remarks he made during this speech in November, 1954, appear on page 2908 of Vol. 3 of the 1954 *Parliamentary Debates*. His actual words were—

I have been told that the Council and the Methodist Church in particular was anxious to obtain the services of one of its leading representatives in South Australia—a man by the name of Woolacott. He has been most active in the matter of opposing the legalisation of bookmaking in South Australia. The Methodist Church was anxious to obtain his services here so that he could present his views and theirs before a decision was arrived at. But no such opportunity was given, and as the Minister for Housing knows, it was deliberately avoided by driving this measure through the House so early on Friday morning.

Mr. Roberts: Now read what the Premier said in his policy speech.

Mr. BRADY: Now we see one of the Ministers of this Government, led by Mr. Brand as Premier, introducing a Bill which will legalise betting through the totalisator; and, if the totalisator channel is not available for betting, the board will do the fielding itself.

As I said before, I know nothing about betting; but I do know that the people in the betting game are very powerful financially. I also know they have a great voice and their knowledge of the betting game extends from A to Z. They will be able to catch out the Government and the totalisator agency board, and they will do it!

It is all very well for the Government to have a clause in this Bill which provides that the totalisator agency board intends to accept certain bets in certain instances; but how is the Government going to keep a check on 30 or 40 totalisator agencies at the one time? For instance, if a bookmaker cannot get his bets on, say, totalisator A, he will be able to get them on totalisators B, C, D, E, and F, and he will beat the Government every time.

I oppose the Bill because it is a very retrograde step for the Government of Western Australia to take. As I said during the debate on the second reading, I am absolutely amazed and surprised at the morals of these people in the betting and racing game and their lack of ethics; because when they came before me, as the Minister in charge of the Betting Control Act, they said that they had no finance, but now we find that they are saying they can find £50,000 to assist the Government in establishing a totalisator agency board. Some of these people should review their ethics in this matter.

I am also concerned that the Bill gives the board power to borrow from the Treasury with almost the sky as the limit. Another provision in this measure states that the Treasurer does not have to report to this Parliament to have such a proposition approved; but one of the clauses in the Bill gives the Treasury the right to guarantee money to the board. Therefore an impossible position could arise if those connected with betting in Western Australia were to combine to destroy the totalisator agency board, as I feel they will.

Betting is like big business; the people engaged in it have no conscience. Everybody is fair game, and it is the law of the jungle. Just as the Government is going to try to put the S.P. bookmakers out of business, so the bookmakers, in turn, will try to put the Government out of business. What a great old spectacle that is going to bring about!

There are some people in the community who will not have a bet at any price; they are not interested in betting. Yet the Government is going to use their money to establish the totalisator agency board. Other sections of the community, who are not opposed to betting, are indifferent to what goes on so long as they are not brought into the question; but they will be brought into it, because their money, too, will be used by the Government to establish the board.

As a member of Parliament, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not speak on the third reading of this Bill to point out to the Government what I feel about this particular activity. The Government would be more profitably engaged in setting up a board to investigate what could be done to improve the hospitals in the metropolitan area—particularly private hospitals—which are catering for aged people who are unable to gain admission to Mt. Henry Home or Sunset. These old people cannot afford £15 15s., £16 16s., and £17 17s. a week to be accommodated in a private hospital. The Government could well set up a board of inquiry to ascertain why we cannot have more hospitals established to cater for the aged persons of Western Australia.

If the Government agreed to let the S.P. bookmakers operate this business, it might be able to make a profit, because the bookmakers know the game. But I venture the opinion that the body of civil servants that will be appointed by the Government to this board will not have sufficient knowledge of racing to make a profit.

First of all, the board intends to deduct 15 per cent. from the holding before any dividends are paid. In addition, 5 per cent. is to be deducted for the tax payable to the Government. That makes a total of 20 per cent. to be deducted from the takings. I venture the opinion that it will cost another 5 per cent. or 6 per cent. for administration expenses and contingencies associated with betting. Therefore, 25 per cent. of the money invested by punters is already tied up before any punter is paid a winning dividend.

In the circumstances people who bet are fools, because only one man can win and that is the man who is in the know. I ask the House this question: Are those people who make big bets going to accept the position that 25 per cent. of the holdings by the board is going to be deducted before any dividend is paid to the punters? I am sure that those people will pull their horns in and say, "We will not support the totalisator, because there is too much money deducted from the pool by the powers that be before the money is distributed."

They will feel that the 25 per cent. which is to be taken out is too big a cut for anybody to stand, and betting will start to fall off. It will start to fall off because these people will not support totalisators, as a result of the tremendous amount of money that will be taken out before there is any return to the punter. That is one aspect.

The other aspect is that there will not be the turnover in these agencies for the totalisator board, because the people who indulge in betting are not going to wait around for hours to have the return on the last race, or the race before, posted. They want the money immediately the race is finished, as is the practice in the S.P. shops. They will not get it from the totalisator board. That will have the definite effect of slowing down betting.

Then again, in the private betting shops, where the bookmaker runs his own show, he has his eye on all members of his staff, to see that they stand by to accept the bets offered by the patrons. But civil servants will not have the same incentive, because they will know that the big boss is in Perth, or Albany, or Kalgoorlie, or Northam; and that, too, will have the effect of slowing down betting.

The more one looks at this proposed system of totalisator betting, the more one wonders where the Government is leading

itself, particularly as the board is to be allowed to operate on any terms it likes, on any matter on which it wishes to raise money. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the clause is so important that I think I should read it because I do feel that some members on the Government side do not appreciate what they are doing in supporting the Government in this matter. Clause 19—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot quote the clause of the Bill.

Mr. BRADY: Very well, Mr. Speaker. Without quoting the number of the clause, I would point out that it says—

(1) With the prior approval of the Treasurer of the State, the Board may borrow moneys, whether by way of mortgage, debentures, bonds, overdraft or otherwise, and may mortgage or charge any of its real or personal property, whether present or future, in such manner as the Treasurer thinks fit.

(2) The Treasurer may from time to time, upon and subject to such terms and conditions as he thinks fit, and without further authority than this section, guarantee on behalf of the Crown in right of the State, the due redemption of the principal moneys so borrowed and the due payment of all interest thereon, but this subsection does not apply to the loan made by the Club and the Association referred to in subsection (2) of section eighteen of this Act.

(3) The Treasurer shall cause any money required for fulfilling any guarantee given by him under this Act, to be paid out of the Public Account, which account is hereby to the necessary extent appropriated accordingly, and shall cause any sums received or recovered by the Treasurer from the Board or otherwise in respect of a sum so paid by the Treasurer to be paid into the Public Account.

I will stop there; because, as I said before, in my opinion it is wrong in the interests of the people who do not believe in betting, as it will mean that their money which is going into public funds, is to be utilised for the purpose set out in the Bill. That is definitely wrong. Accordingly I feel I should add my measure of protest to that of other members who have spoken in opposition to this Bill.

I will draw my speech to a close by saying that a figure of 5 or 6 per cent. of the investments was quoted as the overhead for running an S.P. shop. Unlike the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have not seen any figures, and I do not know what the figure is; but I doubt very much whether an S.P. shop could be run for 5 or 6 per cent. of the investments.

It would appear to me that the take out of investments will be well over 25 per cent.; and as a result of that, I feel the betting community will ease off in its betting activities. This will be very similar to what occurred with some friends of mine, who gave up drinking when the last 1d. was added to the price of beer. They had been drinking all their lives; but when that last penny was added, they were not prepared to pay it. The same effect will be experienced in the betting game.

There is another important matter which the Government has overlooked, but which must not be overlooked; and that is the TV business. It would appear that in the hotel trade, and in the amusement trade, television has had the effect of reducing the number of patrons by half. I am sure that any betting patrons who are watching TV will not leave their lounges, and their dining rooms, to go to a totalisator and bet. Accordingly, that will be another factor that will slow down betting turnover.

There is another feature on which I feel I should touch before I close my remarks. It is a most important matter. I refer to the fact that the Government is giving its seal of approval to betting. Many members on the Government side today, both those in the Ministry, and those supporting the Government, have, in the past, spoken against betting. Yet we find the Government is now going to give its seal of approval to this Bill which, if passed, will allow young people to bet.

As somebody said earlier, people from the age of 21 onwards will be able to go to the totalisator shops, as to the post office, or to the courthouse, or to any other Government department, to carry out the business of betting. It is a very bad feature of government when it seeks to encourage young people to bet, particularly when they have no interest in horses, or in racing, or in betting. The fact that they have no interest in this pursuit has been proved over the years.

So the provisions of this Bill will demoralise the young community in our midst, who at this time and age should be persuaded to walk in paths other than those of betting. With the tendency towards hire-purchase systems, the reduced wages, and the high cost of living, people already find great difficulty in raising their families; as a result of this, young people tend to become unstable.

One of the features which will make them more unstable will be this fact of the Government conducting totalisators, and placing on them the seal of the Brand-Watts Government to enable them to bet. These young people will lay 10s. in the hope of winning £1, so that they can pay the butcher, the baker, the milkman, or the dressmaker. It will have a demoralising effect, and it will be a reflection on the Government.

I will have no part of this Bill. Every clause in the measure is objectionable. One half of the Bill contradicts the other. One half of the Bill says to the totalisator board, "You can bet till the cows come home"—with all due respect for the member for Harvey. On the other hand, it says, "You people who like to stand in front of the totalisator shop are going to be pinched for loitering; or you will be told to move on." If that is not one half of the Bill laughing at the other, I do not know what is.

The very fact that the Government has seen fit to introduce a clause into the Bill which will keep immune from the police, and from the court, people who are indulging in betting—and there are two clauses in the Bill that do that—is tantamount to saying it is a betting Bill, even though I know there are some people who say it is not.

I feel we are quite justified in trying to steer the Government out of this particular channel of governmental activity. Let the private people bet if they want to; let the bookmakers bet if they want to. Let the Government tax this proposition in such a way that it will be able to control betting and gradually reduce it.

I said when speaking to the second reading, and I repeat, that the sports of horse racing and trotting are on the way out. They should be allowed to die a natural death, instead of being subsidised with public money which should be utilised for the more essential purposes I have mentioned—the subsidising of kindergartens, St. John Ambulance, homes for the aged, homes for pensioners, and similar projects. Those are some of the activities in which the Government should interest itself, without being interested in the business of betting. Down the ages betting has not been considered to be a desirable activity for the community to engage in.

The so-called racing industry does not provide gainful employment. It does not add to the economic capacity of the State. It ties up finance and labour which could be better used in enterprises returning something of economic value to the State. There is plenty of other work for the people of this State to engage in, without wasting their time on non-productive enterprises which return nothing concrete.

If the Government were to build more hospitals and schools, the effort would be worthwhile. If the people engaged in the racing industry were to be employed in raising cattle or growing crops there would be little objection. The people to be engaged in the totalisator agencies in 20 to 30 parts of the State will not be doing any productive work.

This Bill is the very antithesis of good government. I hope the third reading will not be agreed to; and if the Bill does pass in this Chamber, I hope that members in another place will see their way clear to reject the measure.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [8.17]: I do not want to let this opportunity pass without voicing my further protest against a very iniquitous piece of legislation. I do not propose to debate the efficacy of the totalisator agency board; suffice it to say that the action of the Government in introducing this measure is an unparalleled example of hypocrisy.

No member can deny that this is a betting Bill, because the very title is—

An Act to constitute a Totalisator Agency Board and to Authorise, Regulate and Control Betting off a Race Course on Totalisators through the Board and Betting with the Board and for incidental and other purposes.

The short title is the "Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960." It will be at once evident that this is a measure which has a definite relationship to betting. The provisions relating to the responsibility imposed on the Treasurer indicate very clearly that the Government is interfering with what I might term private enterprise; namely, betting. The Government is to be a definite agency in the matter of betting. It has agreed to accept very serious financial responsibility for the implementation of the board and the conduct of its business.

I defy any member supporting the Government or any Minister to deny that the Government will be involved in betting if this Bill is passed; and that if there is any deficiency in conducting the activities of the board the Government will be financially responsible. That is quite evident. I would like to know from the Treasurer what will be the attitude of the Government if there is a serious deficiency, as envisaged by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition this evening. We are entitled to know.

Mr. Brand: We will cross those bridges when we come to them.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The taxpayers who in the final analysis will have to meet such deficiencies are entitled to know. It has been suggested there will be great deficiencies, and this House is entitled to know the attitude of the Government in regard to meeting them.

Mr. Brand: Reduce the price of coal.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: When we as the Labor Government were in office for six years we were continually and incessantly criticised by members of the present Government. They vilified us by saying that we were a socialistic Government.

Mr. Brand: Was that not true?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: This Bill contains a good dose of socialism. I would like to know from the Treasurer what will be the attitude of the Government if there are deficiencies in conducting the business of the totalisator agency board.

I now refer to two points in the measure. The first concerns the constitution of the board, and the second concerns the power of the chairman. I have said previously, and I repeat, that this board is lopsided, and its constitution is unfair. It will not be representative of the various interests. Indeed, the board is to consist of seven members, only one of whom may have no vested interests in the industry. The other six will have very definite vested interests. As the Government is involved very deeply in the venture, it should have stronger representation on the board.

I now refer to the powers of the chairman. It is provided that out of the seven members of the board, four shall form a quorum at any meeting. If there is equality of votes, it is provided that the chairman shall not only exercise a deliberative vote, but also a casting vote. In these days of our vaunted democracy, when every person is supposed to have equal rights, that principle should be applied to the board by giving the chairman either a deliberative vote to which he is entitled, or a casting vote in the event of equality of votes.

I know I am not permitted to quote clauses from the Bill to support what I have to say. I have been a member of this House for a long period. Members who have been here for as long will agree, if they are truthful, that it has been a long time since a Bill with provisions as vicious as the provisions in the Bill before us was introduced. The liberty of the subject is being unduly curtailed by those provisions. If we refer to the definition of "place," it will be seen that this includes any street, vacant block, shop, tent, caravan, or private premises.

If a member of the Police Force suspects that a person is engaged in betting contrary to the provisions of the Act, the police officer can enter the place and remove that person. If that person, after being removed returns to the place, he commits an offence for which he will be liable to a fine of £50. This provision is absolutely unnecessary. Its inclusion in the Bill shows the attitude which the Government is adopting towards the public of this State. It is an undignified attitude.

A subsequent provision in the Bill empowers a member of the Police Force to enter licensed premises to apprehend a person he suspects to be betting, or offering to bet. In doing that the police officer has to interpret the intentions of the person. A police officer can merely suspect that a person is on licensed premises for the purpose of betting, and that person will have committed an offence and can be fined. He can be arrested and removed.

The situation would be amusing if it were not amazing. If the person is occupying a room in licensed premises and has paid for that room in advance, he may be

removed from the licensed premises; and if he returned to those premises on that day in order to have a sleep or to have his meals, he would be committing an offence.

Members of the Government might say that no member of the Police Force would implement that provision unless the implementation was warranted. But what is it there for? If it is not there to be enforced, what is it there for?

Mr. J. Hegney: The penalty is £50.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: There is no need for this provision in the Bill; and I would suggest to the Government that if it is necessary to include such outmoded, vicious, and undignified provisions in a Bill to make its policy tick, then the Government is hard up against it in making its policy tick.

As was said by the member for Guildford-Midland, it is very rarely that long discussions take place on the third reading of a Bill—it is usually a formal procedure. I know of one Bill which I introduced that passed this House and went to another place. In another place it passed the second reading, and it passed the Committee stage; but something happened between the Committee stage and the third reading, and there was a somersault on the part of a few individuals, with the result that the third reading was defeated without its being discussed. I am referring to the State Government Insurance Office Bill.

However, there has been no deviation of attitude on the part of members on this side of the House in regard to this measure. The Government is entitled to carry out its policy, but in doing so it is also entitled to treat the public of Western Australia with decency and dignity; and it should not, at this stage, include in one of the statutes of this State provisions such as those I have referred to. I have no doubt in my mind that the Government is anxious that somewhere along the line this Bill will be thrown out.

Mr. Brand: You are very wrong there.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: It does not matter to me personally whether the Bill is passed or not. What I am opposing very stringently are the penal provisions; and, I repeat, some of the metropolitan members on the Government side of the House would be pleased if this measure were thrown out. Anyhow, it will be thrown out if I have anything to do with it, because of its general provisions. I hope that the Bill will be defeated in either this or another place. I oppose the third reading with great pleasure.

MR. ANDREW (Victoria Park) [8.29]: As the member for Mt. Hawthorn stated, it is quite unusual for a third reading debate to take place. In regard to this

Bill members of the Opposition feel that its provisions are odious, obnoxious, and very much against ordinary British justice. I do not think I have spoken on a third reading previously, and I would not speak on this occasion except that I feel I would be failing in my duty if I did not, as other members have done, register my protest against the Bill.

The Government has a right to introduce whatever Bills it wishes, because it has a majority; and although I do not protest against this Bill, I do protest against certain provisions which the measure contains, as they are bad. I never expected that a Government of Western Australia would introduce legislation containing such odious provisions. Whether a totalisator set-up in Western Australia will be better than the betting shops is a subject on which people have their own opinions.

Actually, when the Labor Government did make provision for licensed off-course betting shops, it made the business of betting a respectable function for those who wished to indulge in that pastime. However, that Government took no actual part in the betting; that was left to private bookmakers in registered shops. But this Government, under this Bill, is becoming a bookmaker itself and is taking away the rights of private individuals to run betting shops.

Actually the Government put itself in the position where it had to do something about betting shops, as its members have always been opposed to them. I suggest that the betting shops did fulfil a function; and they were convenient for those members of the public who desired to have a bet. All the Government had to do was to collect a certain amount of revenue from the people who were operating the betting shops and from members of the betting public who used the betting shops. Under the present system, immediately a race is over and the result is through, the price is made known and the people can collect their winning bets. Now they are going to be inconvenienced by having, in many cases, to put on their bets for a much longer period before the race is run; and it is problematical when they will receive their money after the race is run. The Government is entitled to set up this new system, but there are many people—and I am one of them—who consider that the present system is operating more efficiently than will the proposed method of totalisators.

Actually, the Government is going to set up totalisators only in proclaimed areas. Therefore we are going to have what could be called the hotchpotch betting system in Western Australia. In certain areas, betting will be through the tote; but in other areas which are not proclaimed, bookmakers will be allowed to operate. So

on the assessment of the situation in Western Australia, the Government admits that a totalisator set-up cannot operate fully in this State.

A provision in this Bill which I do not like, and one that should be emphasised, is that a person can be charged with betting, even though he has not made a bet, so long as a police officer has grounds for believing that that person is at a place or on premises for the purpose of betting. In that case the police officer can arrest the person concerned, and that person will be guilty until he can prove that he is innocent. This is quite the opposite of British justice.

There are many other provisions of a similar nature in this Bill which place the onus of proof on a person to prove that he is innocent. It is not necessary for a member of the Police Force to prove that a man is guilty. Actually, that is French law—one is guilty until one can prove he is innocent. That is not British law and never has been. I am wondering whether the members of the public know what is contained in this legislation. If they did, I am sure they would rise up in arms against the Government.

Now if I go to a football match with some friends, one of them might ask me whom I barrack for. If I were to say "Perth," he might tell me that he barracks for Subiaco and that he bets me 2s. that his team will beat mine. If a policeman were nearby he could arrest us for betting, and we would be guilty until we proved our innocence. Of course, in that case, we could not do so because we would have been betting. It is quite common in Australia for people to have a small bet; and there would be very few people who at some time or another do not.

Time after time we have asked the Minister to give his reasons for the inclusion of these odious provisions. The only reply he has made is that the Government is satisfied the provisions are necessary; but not once has he given us a logical argument for their inclusion.

As the member for Mt. Hawthorn pointed out, a person who made a small bet while in his own home could be arrested and prevented from returning to his home within 24 hours. If he did return, he would be liable to a fine of £50. If that is not an objectionable provision, and one about which everyone should protest, I do not know what is.

We did endeavour to have a few amendments included which would at least have made the Bill a little better. We wanted to have the word "substantial" inserted before the word "grounds" in order that some protection would be afforded the public. However, the Minister would not accept even that amendment. I did not believe that I would live to see the day when a Government would introduce a Bill with such odious penal provisions, and I oppose it.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [8.39]: I, too, must add my objections to those already expressed to this Bill. I would first of all like to take the Government to task for its action in applying the gag many times during the debate the other evening. On referring to the original betting legislation, passed in 1954, I find that after considerable discussion had taken place from early one afternoon until 5 a.m. the next day, the gag was applied, this being the only time it was applied in the whole of the six years the Hawke Government was in office.

Mr. Brand: How many divisions did we call for?

Mr. JAMIESON: The gag was applied on that occasion because the present Premier had attempted to kill the Bill by moving that it be read a second time six months hence.

Mr. Brand: How many times did you attempt to kill this Bill?

Mr. JAMIESON: After such a lengthy debate, the application of the gag at that particular juncture was, perhaps, to some degree justified. But I fail to see how the application of the gag was justified in connection with certain of the clauses the other evening, because some of them had not even been debated at all. As a matter of fact, when the member for Kalgoorlie rose to speak on a certain clause, the Chairman sat him down.

This was done on a couple of occasions; but the motion for the gag was accepted by the Chairman although the mover had not even risen to his feet. On that particular clause I required some information, but no chance was given to me or to any member to discuss the clause. I intend directly to deal a little further with that matter, but at present I would like to say that I consider the action of the Government in introducing this Bill is of a vindictive nature.

The Bill proposes to abolish a system which has proved to be reasonably efficient in the community. I go so far as to say that in my opinion, at any rate, the Cabinet subcommittee, one member of which has had a long-standing vindictive attitude towards S.P. bookmakers in this State, was the author of this Bill. No doubt he has allowed his vindictiveness to influence the drafting of the Bill. Any member of a Cabinet who would do that is to be despised. I say that there is very little justification for that sort of performance, and if he has any objection to certain people, surely he should not take his feelings out on everyone.

I say it is very obvious by his constant attack over the years when he was in opposition, and now by the part he has played in the drafting of this Bill that he is expressing his vindictiveness against the S.P. bookmakers for something which occurred in the past. As I have said, anyone

who is prepared to take such action, and those who support him, are to be despised. This person had a considerable number of dealings with S.P. bookmakers some years ago, and because of those dealings he has built up this intense hatred which has been manifested in this Bill. Such a feeling being expressed in a Bill will be, to say the least of it, very detrimental to the people of this country.

No-one should allow his personal feelings to influence his actions in connection with those associated with the industry concerned; if betting can be called an industry. I draw attention to this situation to justify my remarks that this member has a vindictive streak because of something which occurred during the days of illegal betting.

At the time, a bookmaker requested payment of a certain amount which this person paid, but with very ill grace. He did pay it; and I understand it was stated at the time that he was very unhappy with the bookmakers and he would, in the future, do everything in his power to see that they were severely dealt with if he ever got the chance. That person has been cited in a summons, of which I have a copy. It has been taken out by a person named Cliff Derby of Murray Street against Gerald Percy Wild of Bromley Street, Kenwick. In view of the vindictive nature of many clauses, I feel they have been included in the Bill as a result of the Minister's vendetta against S.P. bookmakers from 1951, after the 26th April of that year when this particular action was taken.

Mr. May: Now we know!

Mr. JAMIESON: The position is very clear. The Government has set out to do something that is quite foreign and detrimental to its make-up. Last year we heard the discussions which took place on private enterprise versus State enterprise. Considerable debate ensued in this Chamber comparing the merits of day-labour schemes against contract schemes. The measure before us is an effort to convert something that has been a private enterprise—whether it is the ultimate in book-making or gambling, I would not like to say—from an efficient organisation into something which on the surface looks as though it is not going to be such a good enterprise as a State socialistic machine.

The fact that control will be in the hands of a totalisator board is an approach to socialism. Had we suggested in the past that certain aspects be socialised, there would have been a considerable throwing of hands in the air and statements that we were trying to implement our socialist platform. This all proves that a degree of socialism is inevitable. No matter what Government is in office, it finds itself bound to include in its make-up some moves towards socialistic enterprises. And this

is an effort on the part of the present Government to do away with a private industry.

The member for Narrogin expressed his objection in regard to the clause dealing with loitering, during the the second reading debate. He condemned the Minister for including such a clause. After opposing it and giving a considerable amount of weight to his argument, he voted in support of the clause when it was in Committee. I feel that the about-face of the honourable member indicates how closely controlled are members on the Government side of the House.

I would not like to think that any Government from this side of the House would not expect some of its members to rebel violently if it tried to enforce legislation of this nature. As members will recall, on more than one occasion the previous Government had to withstand considerable attack from its own back-bench and side-bench members.

On this occasion we have had the spectacle of the argument—even on an issue that is morally important to the community, and on which there is usually a considerable amount of argument from both sides of the House—coming only from this side. It has been a rather one-sided affair with the Minister versus the rest. This fact, in itself, indicates that members on the Government side of the House are tightly bound.

Nobody can tell me that the moral make-up of this House is any different from that of previous Parliaments, or that there is not the same number of differing religious views. We have the same cross-section of characteristics that are present in any Parliament. Having on previous occasions seen divergent views manifest themselves in the course of a debate, I find it strange that that has not occurred on this occasion.

It also seems strange, as I remarked at the second reading stage, that those lantern-jawed Puritans have not been hanging from the balconies of Parliament House criticising every move of the Government as they did when the Labor Government introduced its original Betting Control Act. That would indicate to me that in the minds of church people it is wrong for the Labor Government to introduce certain of these aspects, but it is quite all right for the Liberal-Country Party Government to go ahead with such matters.

I would like the Minister, when speaking in reply, to clarify the second last clause in the Bill. This clause went through rather hurriedly. I cannot altogether blame the Minister, because I think there was some confusion on the part of the records of the Legislative Assembly in that this was not recorded as it actually took

place. I would like the Minister to explain whether he feels it desirable that that clause should be included.

The clause requires the person operating the totalisator on a commission basis to deduct a certain amount before his commission is determined. Does the Minister feel that such persons—who work for the totalisator board and whose machines are subject to considerable wear and tear—should be completely cut off from any revenue from the amount that is being placed on the totalisator? I feel they are justified in getting something out of it for operating the totalisators for the totalisator board.

Unfortunately I was unable to raise the matter earlier. The Minister may be able to explain the position to the satisfaction of myself and other members. At this juncture I feel the position is not clear, and that more equitable terms could be arrived at for those who run the totes on a commission basis. They should receive some recompense for controlling the totalisators on behalf of the board.

I reiterate my objection to so many gags being applied. However, the Government has the majority. While one Government found it necessary to move only one gag in six years, the other finds it necessary to move it at least four times, or probably five, in one evening; and that indicates the tyranny imposed on the Government forces. I would say it reflects the make-up of various members of Cabinet, and it was no doubt at their bidding the whip on that side applied the gag on so many occasions.

I continue to oppose the Bill because I believe that the clauses which have been referred to by various members in the debate tonight as being un-British in their character are most objectionable. In the main, the fact that betting is to be through a totalisator rather than through book-makers, because it is somewhat of a move towards a State-controlled enterprise does not worry me very much; but there are so many provisions in this measure which are objectionable and completely untenable that I must strongly oppose it at the third reading stage.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [8.56]: I rise to express my opposition to the Bill for many reasons, the most cogent being the attitude adopted by the Government on Thursday, and in the wee small hours of Friday when it accepted and supported motions moved by the member for Harvey, and in particular in relation to one clause—

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member can reflect on votes of the House.

MR. EVANS: I accept your warning, Mr. Speaker; but with your indulgence I would like to protest at the Government's allowing the gag to be moved on one particular

clause without permitting any debate to take place. You, Mr. Speaker, would not allow me to mention the clause in question; but I repeat: The Government applied the gag on one clause in Committee without allowing any debate whatsoever on that clause. I believe that is a reflection not upon the voting of the House, but upon the Government.

MR. ROBERTS: Do you want us to apply it now?

MR. EVANS: There are many other reasons why I oppose the Bill. But I do not wish to be verbose; nor do I wish to cover ground that has already been covered most capably by other members earlier in the debate. However, I do voice my strong protest at the action of the Government and also at the contents of the Bill.

Apart from its provisions, the machinery clauses of the Bill are most unlike what one would expect from the Government of a country which is a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. In my view the clauses are unwarranted from the beginning and completely unjustified right to the end. I wish to place on record my strong protest regarding this Bill.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [8.58]: I propose to vote against the third reading of the Bill for various reasons, but particularly because of the reprehensible clauses at the back of it, which undoubtedly attack and undermine the fundamental rights and privileges of the citizens of this State; inasmuch as a police officer can arrest a person without a warrant and remove him from a building.

There are four or five clauses in the Bill—and one follows the other—which I consider are of the worst possible type. It is said it is difficult to catch a person who infringes the law in connection with betting. But illegal betting has been brought under control, and the measure before us only brings into operation a hybrid system inasmuch as it does not completely abolish the present system. It will merely mean two systems working side by side; but in the foisting of that system upon the people of the State, the fundamental principles of what we believe to be British justice are vitiated.

As I mentioned in the Committee stage, there is a case at present under discussion in the Press concerning a boy who was done to death in New South Wales. The police have suspected a person of this crime; but at this stage he is only a suspected person, and he has all the rights and privileges of an innocent person under British law. Although the police say that they have all the information required, and have sufficient evidence, they will finally have to go to the court to prove that the man concerned is guilty.

Yet in five clauses of this Bill, there is no such obligation on the Crown. Merely on the hearsay statement of a

policeman a person can be accused and arrested without a warrant, simply because he is suspected of being engaged in betting, or of having intentions of betting.

In such a case a police officer can remove a person from a building, or from a ground, and can arrest him and put him outside the premises; and, as other members have emphasised, that person cannot re-enter the building within the next 24 hours. If he does, he can then be dealt with, and the minimum fine is £50. In my view it is not Australian justice and is a poor show on the part of the Government.

For those reasons the Bill ought to be condemned; and if the people outside only knew the principles contained in it, and the wording of it, they would certainly give short shrift to the Government on this issue; because, over the years, men have fought for the fundamental rights of the individual.

We boast about the fact that individuals in our country enjoy so many rights and privileges. Members on the other side are always prattling about it; but when it suits them, they take away the rights of the individual, as they have done by the principles incorporated in the latter part of this Bill.

As has been suggested, this Bill will set up a hybrid socialistic concern to be known as the totalisator agency board. That brings me to this point: The board will be a close preserve for the two racing clubs, and other people who are interested in the racing business—such as the Owners, Trainers, and Breeders' Association, and the country trotting organisations—are to have no representation at all. They are to be subjected to the will and the decision of the two racing clubs concerned. In the Committee stage the Government should have been prepared to agree to alter the legislation to cover that angle. But the Minister, of course, apart from accepting one small amendment, would not agree to our proposals.

I also want to take the opportunity of protesting against the action taken by the Government in Committee when it applied the gag so many times in the early hours of Friday morning. I have been a member of this Parliament for many years, and only on two occasions that I can recall has the gag been applied. On one occasion it was applied on the second reading of the King's Park Aquatic Centre Bill.

In that instance, a private member sitting behind the Premier, but supporting the Government, moved to apply the gag. I know it was against the will of the Premier at the time, even though 40 members had spoken on that occasion. But on this occasion practically every member who has spoken on the Bill has been on this side of the House. The Minister, and on one occasion the Premier, did all the speaking

from the other side; no other member over there spoke to the Bill. Yet the Government Whip applied the gag.

One would have thought an important action such as that would be taken by the Leader of the House, and not left to the Whip. In this Parliament we have a tradition, no matter what Government is in power, and no matter how much criticism is being levelled; and Governments are loth to apply the gag, even though it is provided for in our Standing Orders. I express my protests against what the Government did in that regard last week.

The Government, in setting up this totalisator agency board, is going to make advances available to the board over and above the £50,000 that will be provided by the two racing clubs. On the approval of the Treasurer, according to the provision contained in the relevant clause in the Bill, substantial loans can be made to the totalisator agency board; and not only is the loan guaranteed, but also the interest thereon. Immediately, the Government is brought into the picture as a bookmaker, because it has a vital and financial interest in the proposal.

Under the existing legislation, private individuals conduct the betting operations and deal with the punters. That is the difference between the existing set-up and the proposal contained in this Bill. The totalisator agency board, as the operator under this legislation, has the right to take over an establishment now occupied by a licensed S.P. bookmaker and carry on the business with another person in charge. Therefore, on that basis, it is a question of Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Under this Bill the Government must accept the responsibility of making a loss, and therefore the taxpayers immediately become involved.

This measure has been debated at considerable length. Although I live in Belmont, I am not a betting man, and I know only one horse that has been entered for the Melbourne Cup. I do not know whether it is advisable that the Government should bolster up racing as an industry. Many people refer to it as an industry, but it is certainly not a productive one. It does not produce anything useful for the benefit of the community. It is purely and simply a sideline or recreation for most Australians who are interested in racing.

The Government endeavours to rake off as much taxation as it possibly can from betting, and last year it gained considerably more from racing than it has done for many years past. But I doubt whether it will be raking off as much revenue under this proposal as it has done previously. I object to the Bill because of the many repressive clauses contained in it, and I intend to vote against the third reading.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police—in reply) [9.8]: Members on the other side of the House have reiterated most of the arguments during this debate on the third reading of the Bill that were heard during the debate on the second reading as, of course, they were entitled to do. One aspect with which I have been rather intrigued is the variety of arguments that have been advanced.

In the early stages of the debate on the Bill the Deputy Leader of the Opposition particularly stressed that there would be a substantial fall in turnover if this legislation were passed. Tonight I listened to him telling the House that if the same result was going to develop here as has developed in New Zealand, we could expect a drop in turnover in the first instance, following which there would be a substantial increase in turnover. Whether that is correct or not, I do not know.

All I can say is that the Government has allowed for there being some drop in turnover. I said that quite clearly when I was speaking on the debate on the second reading of the Bill. Obviously, if there is an increase in turnover, as envisaged by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, some of the other financial problems he has prophesied will not be likely to occur, because it will be possible for that anticipated increase in turnover better to absorb the administration expenses.

I do not wish to deal with that aspect in detail but merely to reiterate the arguments I used during the second reading debate and to say that the Government has carefully considered the question and, on the information available to it, it is anticipated that whilst there may be some drop in revenue it is not likely to be substantial enough to cause the Government serious embarrassment.

At the same time, members of the Opposition argued that, under this Bill, the punter will be badly treated. There was a great deal of debate on the punter on the course being disadvantaged because of the operation of the 1½ per cent. deduction on the course. My reply to that argument has been—and I am making it once again—that the pattern of betting seems to show that the off-course punter is not as well informed as the punter on the course, and the result will be that the punter on the course will do better in the future, if this legislation becomes law, than he has done in the past.

On the other hand, I notice that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other members on the Opposition side of the House have said that at this later stage, the punter was going to be a great deal better off under this Bill, and the off-course bookmaker was going to have difficulty in carrying on because the prices that were going to be paid as a result of the alteration from starting-price to totalisator odds would make it impossible for the off-course

bookmakers to carry on successfully. There again, I am convinced, as a result of the advice I have received, that the alteration in the method of paying dividends will not be such as to make it impossible for off-course bookmakers to carry on in the areas not covered by the totalisator agency board.

Also, at times, the members on the opposite side of the House have told us that the Government should have been tougher with the Turf Club and the Trotting Association and made those organisations find all the capital necessary for setting up the totalisator agency board, instead of their providing only £50,000. Then, at other times, members of the Opposition have chided us because the Government has not given the racing bodies some guarantee that their revenue is going to be protected. I wonder whether the members on the other side of the Chamber realise that there is a contradiction between the arguments they have produced at different times during the debate on this Bill.

Mr. Jamieson: There is certainly not a contradiction on the Government side of the Chamber.

Mr. Watts: Quite certainly.

Mr. Jamieson: There has only been one speaker on the Government side.

Mr. PERKINS: The Government has had very frank and continuing discussions with the Turf Club and the Trotting Association, and there has been no attempt on the part of the Government to mislead those bodies as to the information we have, and as to how the project might eventually work out. I am also satisfied that the racing bodies, as a result of the fairly tough time they have had in recent years—at least until this Government took over—have not been in a position to find the full amount of capital required to set up a totalisator agency board.

Mr. Tonkin: Why did they tell the Royal Commission they were? Did they tell lies to the commissioner?

Mr. PERKINS: I can only say it seems strange that members of the Opposition are showing such a tender regard for the welfare of these racing bodies when, during the period in which they were the Government, they treated them less generously than this Government has done.

Mr. Evans: With the taxpayers' money.

Mr. PERKINS: Not with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Evans: Too right it is! Whose money is it?

Mr. PERKINS: It is all money coming out of the racing world. I would stress it is in the interests of everybody associated with racing and trotting that the control of the sport should be kept on a sound basis. As things were going we would soon have arrived at the position where racing was carried on for other than stakes. If and when that position

developed, we would have arrived at a very dangerous situation indeed. For this legislation to be a success it is necessary to have full co-operation between the racing bodies and the Government; and the reason why the racing bodies have co-operated is that they feel the substitution of totalisators for off-course betting shops will mean a major reform in the racing world.

Mr. Tonkin: It is certainly a major reform when a public authority goes book-making; I agree.

Mr. PERKINS: I emphasise that the success of the legislation will depend upon the responsible approach of those bodies to the creation of the totalisator agency board, and the interest they have in making it a success. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other members on the opposite side of the House have tried to state that the Government is setting up a public authority which is going to engage in gambling.

Mr. Tonkin: That is what the Bill says.

Mr. PERKINS: It is a distortion of the truth.

Mr. Tonkin: Read the clause in the Bill.

Mr. PERKINS: The Bill proposes to set up a totalisator agency board composed mainly of representatives of the Turf Club and the Trotting Association, with a Government representative present, in the first instance, to protect the borrowed money which the Government will have to guarantee in the early stages, as a result of the financial arrangements proposed in the measure. The totalisator agency board will merely conduct an off-course totalisator in a manner similar to that which the totalisator is conducted on course.

Mr. Tonkin: No; it is very different.

Mr. PERKINS: How the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is able to construe that into meaning that the Government is setting up some type of gambling authority is beyond me. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is quite wrong, and is letting his imagination run away with him.

Mr. Tonkin: You deny that this Bill establishes a public authority? You deny that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PERKINS: A further provision is set out in the measure for the guarantee of the Government to be liquidated fairly quickly, in that a sinking fund is to be set up from which 1½ per cent. of the 15 per cent. to be deducted under the various measures will be used—

Mr. Tonkin: Why not be frank about the matter and stand up to it?

Mr. PERKINS: —to liquidate that liability until, I hope, in the not too distant future, the totalisator board will be in a position where it will be the body conducting the totalisator and where it will

have only a very loose connection with the Government. The Government will always have some interest in it, in that it will always provide a very substantial source of revenue for the Government. I contest very strongly any suggestion that this constitutes the Government as a party to a concern which will engage in gambling on its own account.

There was one other question raised by the member for Beeloo regarding the payment of the operators of the on-course totalisator. Perhaps the member for Beeloo is not quite clear as to how the machinery will operate for the placing of the money from the T.A.B. on the indicators on the on-course totalisator. I understand it will not be necessary to actually punch the apparatus in order to keep these units on the indicators; but some special adjustments are being made to the on-course totalisator so that before the totalisator opens on a particular race on the course, it will be possible to put those units on in bulk. Actually there will be very little additional work involved in the collating of that money, and the placing of it on the indicators on the totalisator on the course.

Mr. Evans: We understand that investment of moneys in an off-course tote will close 40 minutes before the race, and that money will be sent to the tote and reflected in the dividend. If the money is to reach the tote before it opens for betting on-course, will that money be shown on the totalisator barometer?

Mr. PERKINS: The units will go on the barometer showing on the indicators.

Mr. Evans: That is before betting starts?

Mr. PERKINS: Yes; and they will go on quickly. I was emphasising the point that it will not be necessary to punch the machines. Some adjustments are being made to the machines—I do not know what they are, and I did not think it was necessary to inquire into that aspect. I would emphasise that although I have only a very general knowledge of the racing world, since I have had the responsibility of introducing this legislation I have attended the racecourse when races have been run; I have arranged to be in the totalisator itself, and have watched very closely the procedures that have been followed.

Mr. May: Have you found out who is going to win the Melbourne Cup?

Mr. PERKINS: I do not think it is necessary for me to deal in detail with the various points raised. I appreciate there is a very sharp difference of opinion between members in the Opposition and members supporting the Government. I stress again that the Government has not gone into this matter lightly; it has made a very careful examination of the system which will be put into operation if the Bill is passed.

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

Ayes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	(Teller.)
Mr. Mann	

Noes—22.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (4)—RETURNED

1. Traffic Act Amendment Bill.

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.

2. Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

3. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill.

4. Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police) [9.31]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [9.31]: One of the purposes of this Bill is to substitute the totalisator agency board for the existing Betting Control Board. When a Minister, in defending a Bill he is introducing, misleads the House with regard to its contents and does so in ignorance, I am prepared to accept the situation; but if he does so deliberately he is beneath contempt.

If the Government believes in a policy I respect its policy, provided it is prepared to acknowledge what it is doing and stick to its point of view; but if it denies that it is taking a certain line of action when it is clear for all to see that the Government is taking that line of action, I say it is beneath contempt.

The Bill which this House has just passed constitutes the totalisator agency board as a public authority for the purposes of any Act; and the Minister knows that. Yet the Minister tries to create the impression in this House and in the minds of the public that the Government is not creating a public authority. Why does the Minister deny the fact? If it is the desire of the Government to establish a totalisator agency board and to engage as a bookmaker, he should acknowledge that fact; he should not run away from it or lie about it; he should not deny that the Government is doing it.

A few moments ago the Minister in charge of the previous measure got up and denied that the Government was constituting a public authority. I ask members to read the Bill, which says in plain unmistakable English that a public authority is to be constituted for the purposes of any Act, so that it will derive the advantages of a public authority. It will be no different from the Government meat export works, the State Electricity Commission, and any other body established as a public authority.

What is the purpose of establishing the totalisator agency board as a public authority? The purpose is that it will not be subject to the costs and expenses of a body which is not established as a public authority. The Minister cannot have it both ways. Everyone knows that this proposed authority will be able to have its cheques cashed without having to pay commission.

If I, as an individual, were to sell some shares in the Eastern States, receive a cheque from my stockbroker, and present it to the Commonwealth Bank, I would have to pay the cost of transferring the money from the Eastern States; but in a similar case the board will not be subject to the cost of transference of the money for the simple reason it has been constituted as a public authority and for no other.

If the Government wants this authority to get the rights and privileges which only public authorities can get, and it constitutes the board as a public authority for that purpose, why deny it? Why run away from it? Why disown it? Why does the Minister stand up in his place in the House and deliberately distort the situation? Of course the Government has no answer. That is the attitude of a miscreant—of a person who is ashamed of what he is doing and who wants to keep it under cover. That is what it is. If the Minister and the Government were not ashamed of this they would not hesitate to allow it to be known; but they want to cover it up and misrepresent the situation by conveying to the people that they are not creating a public authority.

I ask any member in this House who doubts the truth of what I am saying to read the Bill we have just passed—to read the clause in the Bill which constitutes this board as a public authority, and then ask himself whether the Minister was being honest with the House when he denied it and said that I was misrepresenting the situation by stating so. I repeat: I can respect the views of a man who differs from me if he has the moral courage to stand up for them and fight for them; but when he wants to smother them up, disown them, distort them, and create a wrong impression, he is beneath contempt.

If the Government is not proud of the course it is following it should not be following that course. Why has it to hide this matter? Because it is ashamed of what it is doing—that is why. If we did not have a Press that was supporting the Government, and if this particular feature were known, there is not the slightest doubt there would be considerable pressure on the Government for it to alter its course. This Bill is superseding the Betting Control Board, which is not a public authority, with a board to act as a bookmaker—with a board which will be a public authority and which will be authorised, to the tune of £3,000,000 to £4,000,000, to engage in gambling in the same way as a bookmaker does, but with not the same expenses.

For example: If a bookmaker lays off money in the Eastern States and a cheque is sent to him for the settling, he has to pay at 5s. per cent. in one State; 7s. 6d. per cent. in another, and 10s. per cent. in another on the money sent over; but the totalisator board will not. Why? Because it will be a public authority, and as such it will get the special privileges of a public authority. So it will be able to do what the bookmakers can do, but without the expenses to which the bookmakers will be subjected, because it will be constituted as a public authority—something which the Minister denies.

Mr. Perkins: I did not deny it.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes you did!

Mr. Watts: Nobody over here denied it.

Mr. TONKIN: The Attorney-General must have been asleep.

Mr. Perkins: You tried to get me to, but I would not answer you.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister previously denied it in his statement.

Mr. Perkins: You will not find it anywhere in *Hansard*.

Mr. TONKIN: I will when I get a transcript of the Minister's speech.

Mr. Watts: You will be clever if you do.

Mr. TONKIN: If members are honest they will know very well that the Minister sought to distort the situation and twist it. My allegation before was the same as that which I am making now; that is,

that the Government is setting up a public authority and clothing it with the power to gamble as a bookmaker and gamble as a punter.

In so far as it gambles as a bookmaker it will make money; but in so far as it gambles as a punter, it will lose money, just the same as any other punter must do.

Mr. Perkins: The people who will miss out as a result will be the racing clubs.

Mr. TONKIN: I am dealing with the point made by the Minister a few minutes ago when he was trying to get out from under with regard to this allegation that the Government is deliberately setting up a public authority and giving it power to gamble in the same way as the bookmakers are gambling today—in exactly the same way—with the same risks and the same opportunities, but with this difference: that because it will be a public authority it will not be liable for the same expenditure. Furthermore, if the board makes any losses, the Government will have to make them good in the ultimate. That is the difference.

Why get out from under? If that is the deliberate policy of the Government, and the Government believes in it and believes that it is the right course to follow, let the Minister stand up to it—let him defend it. Do not run away from it. Do not try to convey the impression that it is not so, because it is so—and one can look at it whichever way one likes.

I thought the Minister would make some attempt to prove that this happened somewhere else in the world. But no. Why? He could not find an example; that is why. I do not know of any place where a public authority has been set up and has been guaranteed its losses by a Government, and then permitted to gamble as a bookmaker and as a punter. I know of places where there are *pari mutuels* run by the racing clubs, but they are the same as the totalisator where the commission is taken out beforehand and the pool is divided amongst investors. But here, this board which will supersede the Betting Control Board will be permitted to invest half its turnover in totalisators and to hold the other half of its turnover in precisely the same way as a bookmaker does.

Mr. Perkins: I think you must have fears that this is going to be too successful.

Mr. TONKIN: I am fearful the people will not know what the Government is doing. So long as they know what the Government is doing, I will be happy; but the Government should take the consequences of what it is trying to do. It should not dodge the issue; it should acknowledge to the people what it is trying to do. That is where I part company with the Minister. I could admire him if he believed in this and had the courage to stand up foursquare and defend it. But

when he takes the attitude he did a few minutes ago, he is beneath contempt so far as I am concerned.

I have the greatest admiration for the strongest opponent of mine if he is prepared to stand foursquare for what he believes in and defends it; but when the Minister wants to put the blame on me for what he is doing, my attitude is different. If the Government thinks it is a good thing to set up this public authority to gamble like a bookmaker and to break new ground and do something which, so far as I know, has never been done anywhere else in the world, the Minister, on behalf of the Government, should stand up like a man and defend it. He should not try to twist it and create the impression that he is not doing what he is doing. If he wants to salve his conscience by convincing himself that he is not establishing a public authority to gamble as a bookmaker, he, and members of the Government, must have consciences which are easily salved.

I would much prefer that any man or Government proposing to adopt a new policy line should believe in that policy; should have the guts to stand up for it and defend it. But what do we find? One Minister only talking about it, and he acting like Judas Iscariot.

Well, if the Government wants to be proud of that sort of conduct, all right! All I am asking is that the people shall know the facts and the truth of what the Government is doing. The results will affect this group or that; but that is their concern. My concern is that the people in this State should be aware—as they are not up to date—of what the Government is proposing to do, that being, so far as I can ascertain, something which has never been done anywhere else in the world. If that is so, and I think it is, this Government's action in that regard is unique.

And what a strange thing it is that members who express such hostility to bookmakers and off-course punters should themselves form a Government to be the first to establish a public authority to indulge in that very same practice. And that is what it is; and no attempt on the part of any Minister or anyone else can extract the Government from that situation.

I know what is the convenient thing to think: "We are setting up a totalisator board which is an outside authority. We are only going to draw a commission. What it does is not the Government's business." I know that that is how the Government would like us to think; but that is not the situation in law. The situation in law, according to the Bill, is that this totalisator board is being constituted as a public authority for any Act. It could not be more embracing. Therefore, if the Government deliberately creates it a public authority, it cannot deny this subsequently, but has to stand up to it.

It then becomes a question of what this public authority is permitted to do; and that is something which no other public authority has ever been permitted to do before—to act as both bookmaker and punter to the tune of some £3,000,000 to £4,000,000 a year. It will be left to this totalisator board—this public authority—to decide whether it is going to hold this £3,000,000 a year as a pool, or whether it is going to invest, from time to time, some proportion of its holdings in order to reduce its potential liability. And when it does that, it is doing the same as a punter, because it is not going to deliberately throw money away; it is going to put money on horses which it thinks might win. If they do not win it loses the money, and it will then have to refer to what is left in the pool to pay the successful investors on the horses they have supported. To that extent it departs completely from the principles of the totalisator, because a totalisator can never lose; whereas this totalisator board can lose if the results are against it and its judgment is bad.

If it loses more than the £50,000 which is advanced to it, and such moneys as it is able to borrow, and it is still losing, the Government will have to come up with its guarantee and enable the board to repay its loans. We have to contemplate the possibility—in my view the strong probability—that this board will not be successful; and if it has to wind up and it has loans outstanding, the Government will have to supply the money to repay the loans; and so everything we said in connection with this board as a public authority being allowed to gamble, is absolutely true in every particular, although the Minister is trying to deny it and to create a different impression.

We cannot let him get away with that. If he had not adopted that course, I would not have spoken on this Bill. I would have contented myself with the remarks that I and others made on the Totalisator Bill. But I could not sit here and listen to the Minister attempt to create a false impression deliberately; because he knows better. If he does not know, I suggest he read now the clause in the Bill which states, in language which is completely unambiguous, that this board is being constituted as a public authority for the purpose of any Act—and that means every Act.

And so, for the purpose of every Act in Western Australia, the totalisator board is a public authority, and thus it is a public authority for every member of the public, with the same privileges and same advantages which accrue to all public authorities as against organisations which are not. Well, why deny it? Why try to cover it up?—unless, of course, the Government is ashamed of it, as well it might be, and as I think it will be when it finally filters through to the large sections of the public that could not possibly support this line of conduct.

I say again that it amazes me, knowing the members of the Ministry as I do, that some of them would be prepared to swallow this proposition which, so far as its provisions are concerned, stands out in legislation in Australia as a complete departure from what Governments are expected to do.

This Government does not believe in Government trading. It believes that trading should be left to private enterprise. If bricks, houses, timber for houses, or wheels for locomotives are to be obtained, they should not be obtained from a Government instrumentality, according to this Government, because it is bad policy. Such things should be obtained from private enterprise.

But now, that very same Government is entering into the betting business and constituting a public authority to permit it to swing a bag holding £3,000,000 to £4,000,000 a year; and when it suits it, to use a proportion of those holdings for investment as a punter, the same as investments are made by other punters, who want to benefit from the result of a horse race.

If this totalisator board is holding £500 or £1,000 more than it wants to hold with respect to any horse, it will invest that money—or portion of it—with a totalisator or with a bookmaker somewhere else, and according to the result of the race, it will make a profit or loss the same as every punter. That is what this public authority will do with Government backing, in the knowledge that there is a Government guarantee to any lender.

Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that you would find many lenders prepared to lend this board money without the Government's guarantee knowing that the board was going to gamble to the tune of £3,000,000 to £4,000,000 a year? Do you imagine it could go to the Commonwealth Bank or the Bank of New South Wales and get a loan of a quarter of a million pounds in the knowledge that it was to be used to finance the business of bookmaking and punting? Of course it would not get any money!

But in order that it will get it, it is to be constituted a public authority; and written into the legislation is the provision that the Government will guarantee all approved loans. Therefore, any lending authority is not really lending to the board—it is lending to the Government. That is the view that will be taken; "We are not lending this money to the totalisator board. We do not care what happens to the board. We are lending to the Western Australian Government." And because of that, this board will be placed in a situation where, if it loses, the State will have to pay.

Why deny it? If that is what the Government wants; if that is what it proposes, why run away from it? Why deny that that is so? I repeat: because the Government is ashamed of it, and does not want

people to know that is what the legislation provides for! Well, sooner or later they will know. You cannot keep that sort of thing from the public the whole of the time. The Press, of course, has refused to publish that aspect of it up until now; very few people know, and the Government has been protected. But it will percolate through to them finally.

If one sows the wind, one will reap the whirlwind; and that is precisely what I expect will happen. When those people who have an interest in these matters come to realise finally that they have had the truth kept from them, they will not, in my view, be very happy about it; and that is when pressure will come upon the Government—as well it might. That is when it will have to stand up to its policy and this course of action upon which it has embarked.

When the Government follows a line of policy in which it believes—and I do not blame it for that; it is in accordance with its own thinking and experience—I would ask that its members be men enough to stand up for it, and not run away from it and try to present it in a way that is quite foreign to what is intended. That is what I charge the Government with in connection with this Bill.

It is significant that although strong arguments were advanced from this side assailing this Bill, with one exception—where the Premier intervened on a small matter—the defence of this legislation has been left to the Minister for Labour. He has been the only spokesman; and instead of standing up to the arguments which were levelled at his side, he ran away from most of them and distorted those with which he dealt.

I give, as an example, the one with which I have been dealing during these last few minutes. When I pressed the Minister to deny that this board was being constituted a public authority, he would not go that far; which only convinced me that he knew very well that he was deliberately misleading the House. Otherwise he would not have hesitated. He would have denied it straightaway, if he felt he had cause. He knew that he could not; and that fact makes his course of action all the more reprehensible.

I thought the Government was proud of this legislation. I thought it believed it had brought forward something that was wonderful; epoch-making; striking. But instead of that, it is ashamed of it. It wants to get it through with as little publicity as possible, and with the people knowing as little about it as possible. Why? Heaven knows why!

As to the point raised about the clubs being in a position to finance this scheme, the Minister came forward with some cock-and-bull story that their finances had deteriorated to such an extent because

of treatment received from the Labor Government. I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the Labor Government was out of office when the representatives of the Turf Club and the Trotting Association went before the Royal Commission and told the judge that they were in a position to finance these totes; and, in the words of Mr. Ainslie, they would not be deterred, even though the cost was £300,000. Either Mr. Ainslie was lying to the learned judge, and had no authority to say what he did; or else, if he was telling the truth, the Minister is misrepresenting the situation in this House. It has to be one or the other.

The Minister says the reason why the clubs were not asked to finance this scheme was that their funds were depleted and they could not finance it. And yet the legal representative of these clubs, in endeavouring to get a satisfactory finding from the learned judge; in an endeavour to get a finding which they wanted from him, assured him that there would be no difficulty from the financial aspect; that they had the money; that they had £50,000 in bonds, and they could raise more. In the words of Mr. Ainslie, £300,000 would not deter them.

Do they sound like the words of clubs whose finances have been so depleted by a Labor Government that they cannot accept the financial responsibility? But that is what the Minister is telling us. That is his answer to our charge that as the clubs are to be left in control of this establishment they should be taking the financial responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think this Bill refers to finances of the board.

Mr. TONKIN: I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference, that this legislation provides for the totalisator board to supersede the Betting Control Board. Therefore I feel I am entitled to discuss the conditions under which this totalisator board will supersede the Betting Control Board and, through representation upon this board, to show that it will have control. Through this board the racing clubs and the trotting clubs will now take over the control of betting in Western Australia, where previously the Betting Control Board had the say as to who would be licensed as bookmakers, and so on.

That is what I am now endeavouring to show: that this board, which is comprised of three representatives of the trotting clubs and three representatives of the racing clubs—so that they are in complete control—will be looking to the Government for finance if it falls down; whereas the type of board which the learned judge envisaged was one which would not be looking to the Government for finance, but which would acquire its finance from the racing and trotting clubs.

Anyone who reads the report will find out that that particular aspect was stressed. The learned judge said—

However, the evidence relating to cost was presented to me on the basis that the New Zealand policy would be adhered to in this State.

And, of course, it is not. He went on—

The Western Australian Trotting Association has undertaken to finance the scheme in Western Australia, and through its President stated that it has £50,000 in bonds readily available and is prepared to provide the additional money required. The moneys would be supplied free of interest. In return it asks for a levy on turnover such as was provided in New Zealand to reimburse the association for its capital expenditure. In New Zealand this was a tax-free levy of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. from both on-course and off-course totalisator turnover. The suggestion here is that 1 per cent. on off-course totalisator turnover for, say, five years from the date of commencement of operations would provide in the vicinity of £300,000.

Then the learned judge followed that up by suggesting that in exchange for this financial assistance the control of the totalisator should be left in the hands of the clubs through the board. The Government has agreed to that suggestion; it has left control in the hands of the clubs because they have the majority of the representation; but with regard to finance, the Minister said the clubs did not have enough money. Yet they told the commissioner they did. I leave members to draw their own conclusions. Who was telling the truth? Was the truth being told before the Royal Commission or has the truth been told in this House by the Government?

Mr. Watts: In this House.

Mr. TONKIN: If the truth is being told in this House, then the witnesses who gave evidence before the Royal Commission were misleading the commissioner, which should call for some reprimand or punishment of those responsible. I wonder whether the Government proposes to do anything about that aspect.

Mr. Perkins: Not in this Bill anyway.

Mr. TONKIN: No, not anywhere; because it is certain that that evidence which was given to the commissioner weighed very importantly with him in the findings which he subsequently delivered; and if he came to the conclusion as a result of being told lies, he ought to be informed about it.

But what a sorry mess it is! Now we have had a statement in here from a senior Minister that when the clubs went before the Royal Commission they did not tell the truth.

Mr. Watts: I did not make that statement.

Mr. TONKIN: No; but it amounts to the same thing; because I wanted to know whether they were telling the truth or whether the Government was telling the truth.

Mr. Watts: Amounting to the same thing does not do.

Mr. TONKIN: It does me.

Mr. Watts: It may do you, but it doesn't do anybody else.

Mr. TONKIN: It means the same thing. Because if two opposite statements are made they cannot both be right; and if only one is the truth the other must be a lie. If the Attorney-General can use his forensic ability to unravel that one, and reach a different conclusion, I am ready to hear it. However, it will take some mental contortions to be able successfully to prove it. So we have a situation where the Government embarks upon this course and it is ashamed of what it is doing!

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police—in reply) [10.10]: I have a word or two to say in reply, but I do not wish to enter into any further debate with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I would like to emphasise that in the financing of the totalisator agency board it is not envisaged that this liability will rest indefinitely on the Government. If members examine the legislation carefully they will note that a 1½ per cent. sinking fund is provided for; and, on a £10,000,000 turnover—which, judged on what members opposite have said, is not unlikely when the totalisator board operates over most of the State—that will mean a sinking fund of £125,000 per annum.

A figure such as that will fairly rapidly liquidate any contingent liability which the Government incurs in the early stages of the operation of this legislation. Once the totalisator board gets on to a self-supporting basis it only has to comply with the law, the same as any other bodies set up under Acts of Parliament, and the same as the racing clubs themselves.

If this legislation becomes law, and the totalisator board is established, and the system we envisage comes into effect, the racing bodies will then control the sport both on course and off course, and I hope racing and trotting will flourish on a sound basis in Western Australia.

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

Ayes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Noes—22.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING TAX BILL

Third Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [10.16]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

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

Ayes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Noes—22.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BETTING INVESTMENT TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [10.20]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

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

Ayes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Noes—22.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May
	(Teller.)

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

TOTALISATOR DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [10.23]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [10.24]: I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House in speaking to the third reading of this Bill, but I want to reiterate that our opposition to it is based on the fact that it is, unnecessarily, imposing a tax on people who attend a racecourse. For many years, the totalisator duty deduction in this State has been 13½ per cent. In order to assist the financing of this off-course public authority, the Government now proposes to increase the tax imposed on the on-course punter by 1½ per cent.

It is perfectly clear, of course, that the more that is taken out of the pool, the less that is available for division among the successful investors. As the people who ordinarily invest upon the totalisator do so throughout a day's racing, if 1½ per cent. is taken out of the pool after each race, that amounts to a considerable sum at the conclusion of seven races. So the amount of money which the tote investors will be putting into the pool represents a very substantial loss, by virtue of the additional 1½ per cent. deduction which is now being made.

We on this side of the House see no justification whatever for increasing the totalisator duty on course, and so reducing dividends available to on-course investors. This has been done in order to

provide additional finance for this public authority which is being set up as a totalisator board. We do not agree with that, and for those reasons we are opposed to the Bill.

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

Ayes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Noes—22.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May
	(Teller.)

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

OPTOMETRISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

On motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health), Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

PAWNBROKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 19th October.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police) [10.30]: I have had some difficulty in finding out very much about pawnbrokers; I have not had any personal acquaintance with them. I understand from the Police Department that there are now only four pawnbrokers left in the City of Perth. So it seems that a Bill dealing with pawnbrokers is not as important at this stage of our development as compared with an earlier stage when, perhaps, they played a greater part in the life of the community.

As the member for Mt. Lawley said when introducing the Bill, it contains two main points. The first is in relation to the control of interest, and the other seeks to give the police greater control over pawnbrokers. I have not been able to obtain any

reliable information as to whether the rates of interest mentioned in the Bill by the member for Mt. Lawley are satisfactory or not. With the pressure that has been experienced at this stage of the parliamentary session, it has not been possible for me to do very much research into this matter, and I must admit I have not been able to spend much time on it.

The member for Mt. Lawley quoted certain figures detailing interest charged in other States, and I have no reason to doubt that the interest figures he quoted are correct. I would point out, however, that the interest charged by pawnbrokers is perhaps not as important now as it was in an earlier stage of our development when pawnbrokers played a greater part in the community life. My information is that their scope and activity have been very greatly reduced by the development of hire purchase and personal loans; I think members are well aware of this fact.

Mr. May: They have all retired on the money they have made.

Mr. PERKINS: I do not know whether that is so or not. The point is, that without some authentic information on this matter I would not like to take the responsibility of saying that the interest rates proposed in the Bill are satisfactory; I can only leave it to the members of the House to decide for themselves whether they think this approach is worth while. I am not sure the Bill is necessary. The member for Mt. Lawley did not make much of a case to indicate there had been a great abuse by pawnbrokers of the unrestricted right they have at present to charge whatever interest they desire.

Mr. Oldfield: I said they were charging 90 per cent.

Mr. PERKINS: The honourable member never made a very clear case of it. The attitude of the Police Department is that there have been few complaints about the unduly high interest rates being charged by pawnbrokers in the circumstances in which they ply their trade.

Mr. Nulsen: Would you not agree that they should be on a similar basis to that which applies in the Eastern States?

Mr. PERKINS: In Melbourne or Sydney, pawnbrokers may have a much greater scope for their trade than they have here. I take no responsibility at all for the rate set out in the Bill. It is a matter which should be further investigated before this House takes the step of agreeing to the provision. For my own part, I am not keen on it.

The next provision in the Bill seeks to give the police the right of inspection of pawnbrokers' records. This would be helpful to the Police Department. The department has informed me that it would welcome a provision along those lines; but there are other aspects to this proposed power of inspection being given to the

Police Department. The detective branch, in particular, has made other submissions to me which I wish to investigate further. Perhaps a more comprehensive provision than the one contained in the Bill is desirable.

While I do not see anything seriously wrong with the provisions in the Bill, I do not think there is any necessity for their inclusion in the Act at the present time. The Bill is an attempt to deal with the problem in a piecemeal way. It is for the House to decide whether or not to agree to the measure. Personally, I am not keen on it, and I would not like to vote in favour of the second reading.

MR. OLDFIELD (Mt. Lawley—in reply) [10.37]: The Minister has just said there was no information as to whether or not the rates prescribed in the Bill were satisfactory. When introducing the Bill, I said that the rates prescribed were merely suggestions, because I had to set out the rates so that a maximum could be agreed upon. The rate I arrived at was 3d. on every 10s. per month, which is equal to a rate of 30 per cent. per year. That was done with a view to having some maximum rate of interest determined by this House. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage, members will be able to decide whether the maximum rate prescribed in the Bill is too high or too low.

In introducing the Bill, I explained that the rate charged by pawnbrokers in the city in general was 90 per cent. per annum. The Minister stated there was no evidence of exorbitant rates of interest being charged by pawnbrokers. Some people may not think that 90 per cent. per annum is exorbitant; while others contend that 30 per cent. per annum is exorbitant. It is purely a personal point of view. We have other legislation in this State, such as the Money Lenders Act, in which the maximum rates of interest are prescribed. Only last session there was an amendment to that Act.

The scarcity of pawnbrokers operating today is beside the question as to whether or not the maximum rate of interest should be prescribed. As the population expands, so will this type of operator. The Bill deals more with a matter of principle than the number of operators involved. I trust the House will agree to the second reading so that during the Committee stage an equitable maximum rate of interest may be agreed on.

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes—25.

Mr. Bovell
Mr. Brand
Mr. Burt
Mr. Cornell
Mr. Court
Mr. Craig
Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Grayden
Mr. Guthrie
Dr. Henn
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Lewis
Mr. Mann

Mr. W. A. Manning
Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Nalder
Mr. Nimmo
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Owen
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Roberts
Mr. Watts
Mr. Wild
Mr. I. W. Manning
(Teller.)

Majority against—3.

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

PROPERTY IN BOTTLES BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 19th October.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police) [9.45]: This Bill introduced by the member for Fremantle is, I think, the result of considerable controversy that has been going on in the bottle-collecting trade for some considerable time. This is not the first occasion on which we have seen legislation in this Chamber dealing with this particular subject. I think members who have seen similar legislation before will realise there are considerable pitfalls associated with it.

The objective of the Bill is contrary to the existing common law ownership of vessels designed to purvey liquids—which is universal throughout Australia and indeed the world—and which has worked so successfully in assuring a maximum number of uses of certain types of bottles, thereby minimising costs. I think the present system of collection is economically sound and efficient, and assures maximum return of empties; and the proposals under the Bill would wreck the present satisfactory and well-organised collection system, with the certain result that only a fraction of used bottles would be recovered.

Beer bottles, for instance, under the present system enjoy a high percentage of return for subsequent re-use, the present proportion of use being roughly one new bottle to five secondhand or recovered bottles. The cost of a bottle is averaged so that the cost of a bottle in every bottle of beer sold is less than half the cost of a new one. Any lesser return of empties than is currently prevailing would increase the wholesale cost of beer proportionately; and under the system advocated in the Bill, could conceivably be the cause of raising the cost of bottled beer by as much as fourpence per bottle.

Mr. J. Hegney: That would be terrible!

Mr. PERKINS: The proposals in the Bill could affect the free availability of bottled beer by being the means of causing a shortage. The present free supply of bottled beer depends upon the high percentage of collection of empties. If new bottles had

to be used in excess of a certain percentage of turnover, the bottle-manufacturing company would not be able to maintain, with its present plant, the requisite quantity of new bottles, and there would most likely be a shortage of supply of bottled beer during the hot summer months.

The objective of the member for Fremantle seems to be to increase the price of bottles recovered for further re-use. It is as well to remember that many liquids formerly marketed in bottles are now retailed in cans or plastic containers. If the cost of bottles were increased, alternative packaging might well replace the use of bottles and would mean the disappearance of the need for collectors and bottle-dealers.

The present set-up in regard to empty bottles collection is an economically sound one. Instead of every manufacturer who uses bottles to dispense his product having his own collection, sorting, and cleaning establishment, thereby increasing costs, there are two main organisations established to handle this side of the industry.

This assures organised and efficient collection, and expert handling, and cleaning in modern machinery approved by the Health Department; minimum handling; lower costs; and many other advantages, including steady and permanent employment for between 300 and 400 men.

The public health angle must also be considered. One of the reasons for branded bottles is to ensure that certain bottles are utilised for one particular liquid only. Under the present system, this is reasonably well policed. If indiscriminate ownership of bottles were permitted, they could be used for all and sundry purposes; and bottles tainted with obnoxious liquids and even poisonous substances could well find their way back into general use.

Unless the present systematised collection methods were continued, municipal rubbish removal men would undoubtedly be called upon to handle extra bottle removals; and as at present most local authorities prohibit removals with ordinary household rubbish unless by the expressed wish of the householder, it would mean increased men and vehicles. Under the system suggested in the Bill, a great bottle litter would be created—bottles would be left on beaches, reserves, roadways, and in other places, not only creating a greater hazard, but also causing considerably more cleaning up to be done by local authorities, thereby increasing costs and ultimately, perhaps, affecting rates.

I referred the Bill to the Branded Bottles Association, and that association made four particular points: First of all, it said that the system envisaged in the Bill would not be in the best interests of the public. Secondly, it said that it is necessary for orderly marketing to have a properly organised collection of secondhand bottles, which would not be the case if the

Bill were passed. Thirdly, it said that for public health reasons, it is a definite advantage to have branded proprietary bottles; and that such bottles should be returned through duly authorised agents of the owners of such bottles. The obvious reason for this is that it prevents persons using the bottles for purposes other than those for which they were made. Fourthly, it said that costs would be increased, which could mean an increase in wholesale prices with consequent retail-price increases to the public. Those were the comments of the Branded Bottles Association.

I also referred the Bill and the comments made by the member for Fremantle to two of the principal milk companies operating in Perth. The first company said—

In the event of the title to a milk bottle passing to the purchaser of the contents of the bottle, then the full cost of that bottle would need to be charged to the consumer of milk to ensure return of the bottle to the milk treatment plant. The full cost of a 20-oz. milk bottle is 6d.; and members of this association believe that such a charge would affect the sale of milk adversely to the detriment of all engaged in the wholemilk industry including the producer of milk for the liquid milk market.

The keeping of detailed records by milk vendors for every bottle of milk returned from each customer on retail rounds would involve that section of the industry in very heavy costs which could only result in further price increases to the consumer.

This is the comment from the other large milk distributing concern in Perth—

My company considers that the successful introduction of this Bill would be quite definitely detrimental to the milk industry as a whole for the reasons set out below.

At the present time, the Milk Board in administering the Milk Act sets the price of milk in a bottle to the consumer and this price is based on each bottle being used for approximately 30 usages. No provision at all is made for a deposit to be charged on a bottle, consequently deposits cannot be charged by companies. Thus, the companies are allowed to claim the bottles which remain their property, and in this way can re-use the container and so keep the prices down.

We feel that if this Bill were to be successful, it would have the effect of allowing householders to sell their milk bottles to dealers who would in turn sell them back to milk treatment plants. This would increase costs in the industry and the milk companies would be forced to seek a further increase in the price of milk to the consumer. Thus, the householder would be the sufferer in the end.

I think members will realise from those comments that if the Bill were passed in its present form, very serious difficulties would be created in the milk trade; and I am sure there must be many aspects which the member for Fremantle did not sufficiently consider before he introduced the legislation.

I am aware of some of the arguments which have taken place in the bottle-collection trade in the last year or two; and, as I said in my opening remarks, I think maybe the introduction of this legislation is a result of some of the unrest which has been experienced in the trade.

The Branded Bottles Association is a very old body, going back to the 1920's. Up until the war, I think it was the practice for the glass company to receive both beer bottles and other branded bottles at its one receival yard. Then, during the war, the various firms who had their own branded bottles got together and produced the one-brand bottle. This was so until about 1956 or 1957; and then, for reasons with which I am not entirely conversant, the glass company decided that the bottles belonging to the Branded Bottles Association would not be received with the ordinary beer bottles, and arrangements were made for a separate firm—Hayes Bros.—to receive these bottles at two yards the firm had established, one being at Morley Park, and the other at Fremantle.

Apparently some inconvenience was caused to the collectors of bottles in that process. Whereas in the past the collectors were able to deliver the beer bottles, as well as the other branded bottles, to the one yard, under the new arrangements it became necessary to separate the bottles belonging to the Branded Bottles Association, and deliver them to a yard some distance away.

I received a deputation from the bottle collectors and representatives of the four dealers, together with some members of Parliament; and partly as a result of some discussions which took place, arrangements have been made for a yard to be established closely adjacent to the glass company's yard in Perth. I understand that at present very little inconvenience is being experienced by the bottle collectors in delivering the beer bottles and the bottles belonging to members of the Branded Bottles Association, when delivering them to Perth.

Mr. Nulsen: I think there has been a great deal of exploitation in regard to the bottle industry.

Mr. PERKINS: I think all sorts of queer things have occurred in this trade, and I do not think the exploitation has been on the part of members of the association. I think that some kind of vested interest has been developed by certain small dealers in the metropolitan area; and I have been very much puzzled by the fact that

strenuous efforts have been made to protect the interests of the four small dealers, even to the extent of ignoring the interests of the ordinary bottle collectors.

There are many aspects of this matter with which I am not entirely conversant, but I can say that I am certain that the legislation proposed by the member for Fremantle will do nothing to improve the situation. The position is very much more complex than he realises, and by legislation of this type he would only create other difficulties in the trade. I would strongly advise him to give some more consideration to this question; and I suggest that perhaps he might agree to postpone further consideration of this Bill until he has had the opportunity to examine some of the aspects I have mentioned.

Mr. Cornell: That was a damned good speech! Who wrote it?

On motion by Mr. J. Hegney, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.2 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 27th October, 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Ltd.: Conditions of establishment at Kwinana	2171
Builders' Registration Act: Implementation of provisions	2172
Morley-Embleton Area: Provision of police station	2172
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Apprentice Jockeys: Employers' share of earnings	2172
CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION—	
Standing Orders Suspension	2172
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL—	
Personal Explanation: Incorrect statement	2173
BILLS—	
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill—	
1r.	2174
2r.	2183
Betting Investment Tax Act Amendment Bill—	
1r.	2174
2r.	2184
Brands Act Amendment Bill: 2r.	2175
Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Bill: 3r.	2173

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
BILLS—continued	
Optometrists Act Amendment Bill—	
1r.	2174
2r.	2174
Paper Mill Agreement Bill: 2r.	2177
Supply Bill (No. 2), £21,500,000—	
1r.	2177
2r.	2185
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill—	
1r.	2174
2r.	2179
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax Bill—	
1r.	2174
2r.	2184
Totalisator Duty Act Amendment Bill—	
1r.	2174
2r.	2184

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ANGLO-IRANIAN OIL COMPANY LTD.

Conditions of Establishment at Kwinana

- The Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Minister for Mines:
 - What area of land has been made available to the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Ltd. and its subsidiaries, if any, at Kwinana?
 - What was the value of the land at the time of the signing of the contract for the establishment of the above industry and its subsidiaries, if any?
 - What amount was paid by the Government by way of land resumption for the aforementioned company and its subsidiaries, if any?
 - What quantity of water was made available and at what price was it supplied to the aforementioned company and its subsidiaries, if any, for the year ended the 30th June, 1960?
 - Was this a special concession price?
 - What quantity of electricity was supplied to the aforementioned company and its subsidiaries, if any, for the year ended the 30th June, 1960?
 - Was this supplied at a special concession price?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- 963 acres—as per agreement ratified by Parliament in 1952.
- £83,300—calculated at £86 10s. per acre.