

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 14th November, 1916.

	PAGE
Papers presented	832
Questions: Railway Revenue, increase in Goods Rates, Fares and Freights	832
Government Analyst, leave of absence	832
Hansard reports and members' corrections	833
Bills: Flinder's Bay-Margaret River Railway, 3a.	837
Totalisator Duty Act Amendment, 2a.	838

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

: By the Honorary Minister: W.A. Government Railways; report for year ended 30th June, 1916.

QUESTIONS (2)—RAILWAY REVENUE.

Increase in Goods Rates.

Mr. SCADDAN asked Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): 1, What was the total revenue earned by the Railway Department for the year 1915-1916 from goods classed as 1, 2, and 3? 2, What is the additional revenue that will be earned by the increase of 10 per cent. on these classes? 3, Would it not be more equitable to apply any such increase on a sliding scale? 4, Are the following included in classes 1, 2, and 3, to which such increases apply:—(a) articles of food, such as dairy produce, fish, bacon, hams, beef, pressed pork, groceries, canned fruits, and tinned milk; (b) agricultural machinery; (c) mining machinery, other than second hand; (d) mining explosives and chemicals such as cyanide; (e) building material and galvanised iron; (f) oils, including kerosene?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, £373,257; 2, £37,326 per annum; 3, As the rates are calculated on a sliding scale, the percentage increase is equitable—for example, Class 1, 100 miles, the rate is £2 4s., whilst for 400 miles, the rate is £6 9s. 1d., and not £8 16s., which is a proportionate increase; 4, (a) Fish, beef and fruit in truck loads are carried at less than classes 1,

2, and 3. Quantities under truck loads, in common with the other articles mentioned, come under the increased rate. (b) Yes. (c) Mining machinery, in truck loads, is carried at Class "C," which is a lower rate than 1, 2, and 3; the increase would therefore only apply to smaller quantities. (d) Yes. (e) Building material, such as bricks, stone, lime, cement, hardwood, is carried at the lower special class rates when in truck loads; galvanised iron, yes. (f) Yes.

Fares and Freights.

Mr. GREEN asked Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): 1, How long is it proposed to continue the 66½ per cent. increase on railway fares on second class tickets to the suburbs of Maylands, Burswood, and Victoria Park? 2, How long is it proposed to continue the recently imposed 10 per cent. increase on goods in classes 1, 2, and 3 to the mining centres? 3, Is he aware that the industry was previously carrying a heavy handicap in this direction? 4, Will he consider the advisability of raising the rate on the carriage of fertilisers to the original rate, so that the farming community may bear an equitable share in assisting the railway revenue?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, The increase on railway fares to the stations mentioned is the same as to all other suburban stations, viz., 1d. on single tickets and 2d. on return. It is proposed to continue these increases so long as they are considered justifiable. 2, The increased rates apply to the whole of the traffic throughout the State under the classes mentioned. They will be continued so long as the necessity exists. 3, No, not under the conditions then existing. 4, No. The action in question was only taken after full consideration, and the farming community also have to bear their share of the increased fares imposed.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT ANALYST, LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SMITH asked the Premier: 1, For what periods during each of the financial years ended June, 1910-11-12-13-14-15-16 has Mr. Mann, the Government Analyst been absent from duty as Government Analyst?

2, For what reason was leave of absence granted? 3, What sums have been paid Mr. Mann during the financial years mentioned, showing each year separately and under headings—(a) salary; (b) bonus (fees or grants); (c) expenses? 4, Have any of the sums been repaid to consolidated revenue, if so, how much, and by whom? 5, Who is responsible for the conduct of Mr. Mann's duties during his absence? 6, Is the officer paid any special fee or allowance when in temporary charge?

The PREMIER replied: 1, 1909-10, two weeks, annual leave; 1911-12, three weeks, annual leave; (a) 1912-13, three weeks, including annual leave; (b) 1913-14, eight months three weeks three days, including annual and sick leave, and seven and a half months long service leave; (c) 1914-15, four months one week four days; (d) 1915-16, three weeks five days; (e) four weeks; (f) three months. (2), (a) To attend Food Conference in Melbourne; (b) Food Conference in Melbourne, also to visit England to make investigations in connection with standardisation of whisky. Seven and one-half months of the time spent on the latter comprised long service leave due to the Government Analyst; (c) continuation of investigations of whisky standards; (d) to visit Melbourne in connection with manufacture of munitions of war; (e) annual leave for two years; (f) to attend the meetings of the Council of Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry in Melbourne, he being a member of the executive. 3, (a) 1909-10, salary £510; 1910-11, salary £550; 1911-12, salary £550; 1912-3, salary £576; 1913-14, salary £468 16s.; 1914-15, salary £598 14s. 10d.; 1915-16, salary £583 3s.; (b) bonus (fees or grants): for his investigations in connection with the standardisation of whisky, the Government Analyst received the sum of £2,100 from the Scottish Whisky Exporters' Association, which sum was to cover steamer fares for himself and assistant, salaries for same, provision of laboratory, and necessary assistance, travelling and all other expenses. Members of the Executive Council of Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry receive a fee of £2 2s. per sitting. There are no records available as to amount of fees drawn by the Govern-

ment Analyst; (c) expenses: the expense in connection with the Government Analyst's visit to Melbourne on munitions of war question were defrayed by the State Government, the total being £48 13s. 10d., also expenses in connection with Food Conference, which totalled £44 5s. 4, No. 5, The Assistant Government Analyst and the Assistant Inspector of Explosives. 6, Yes, the allowance prescribed by the Public Service Regulations.

HANSARD REPORTS AND MEMBERS' CORRECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to read a letter which I have received from the Acting Chief *Hansard* Reporter dated 10th November, 1916:—

Sir,—I desire to bring under notice the attached extract from this morning's issue of the *West Australian* which purports to be a copy of the proof of the *Hansard* report of a portion of Wednesday evening's debate on the motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the circumstances of the Nevanas contract; also a duplicate copy of the speech delivered by Mr. E. B. Johnston.

Copies of speeches are supplied to members for revision, and in the ordinary course Mr. Johnston received on Thursday morning, the 9th inst., a copy of the report of his remarks of the evening before. Mr. Johnston made a number of alterations in the duplicate, and also added words which he did not use in the debate. Presumably then, Mr. Johnston supplied the *West Australian* with that copy as altered by him, and in that form it was published.

In the accompanying newspaper extract, I have underlined a number of words which were not in the duplicate copy of the report supplied to Mr. Johnston, and two members of the staff of *Hansard* who were in the reporters' box at the same time declare emphatically that they were never used by Mr. Johnston.

It is open to me to point out that what Mr. Johnston handed to the newspaper was not a copy of the *Hansard* report as it will appear next Tuesday.

Mr. Underwood: They have a habit of doing this sort of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I need comment upon that letter.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin [4:47]: I would just like to say that this thing has come upon me with suddenness. You did not give me the courtesy of letting me know. I should just like to—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member resume his seat? I am not called upon to extend these courtesies to the hon. member. I am called upon to read to the House, without comment, a letter which I have received from the acting Chief *Hansard* Reporter. If the hon. member desires to make an explanation he can make it, but he must not reflect upon the Chair.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The proof that I handed to the newspaper was an exact copy of the proof that I handed to *Hansard*.

Mr. Underwood: Of course.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I am speaking on the spur of the moment, but I do not think there is anything in the report of my speech as I returned it to *Hansard* which is inconsistent in the slightest degree with the general tenor of my remarks upon that particular subject. I was subjected—

Mr. Carpenter: You added second thoughts.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: To a very considerable measure of interruption from the Opposition side of the House whilst I was speaking. I was entirely put off my guard by the attack which the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. Scaddan) made against me without any justification.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not discuss the matter.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Consequently my remarks may not have been uttered as loudly as usual.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: You only make things worse.

Mr. Bolton: I do not think it ought to pass at that.

The PREMIER (Hon. F. Wilson—Sussex [4:49]: It is the custom not to make alterations in the report of a member's speech which affect the sense of the subject matter. Alterations should be avoided as far as possible, unless they are made in order to rectify an obvious

error. I take it that the *Hansard* staff is not bound to accept alterations made otherwise than on the lines I have indicated. I hope that is so, at any rate. Perhaps the hon. member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston) was not aware of that, and thought he could alter the phraseology of his speech. It is regrettable that this has taken place. Perhaps members would have a better opportunity of judging whether there was necessity for complaint if they knew what the alterations were. Then, if we knew that, we could judge whether the sense or meaning had been altered by the words which were added, or struck out, or substituted, as the case may be.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: Surely it is a reprehensible thing to deliberately alter a speech and say that it is a copy of *Hansard*.

The PREMIER: It is regrettable that this has taken place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Premier has correctly placed the position before members. Members are allowed to make such corrections as will render their remarks more clear, but the additions which have been made by the hon. member for Williams-Narrogin are, I regret to say, remarks which were alleged to have been made during an exchange of personalities. My experience of the House is that, although members indulge in personalities on occasions, the less we hear about them subsequently the better. I thought it was my duty—and it is my duty to have done so—to read the letter so that the House might know what the position of members is for the future. There would be nothing improper in the hon. member making corrections in order to make his remarks read as they should have been expressed, but objection is taken to the hon. member having added words to personalities which were never used. In my opinion that is decidedly improper.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I deny that that is so.

Mr. SPEAKER: During an exchange of personalities Mr. Scaddan said—

I will pull your nose.

That is quite correct and *Hansard* has correctly reported what took place. Mr. Johnston then said—

That is worthy of the hon. member.

And then he put in the words—

It is his standard of politics.

Which were not reported in *Hansard*. The hon. member then goes on—

That is his idea of dealing with a big public question of this kind.

Mr. Scaddan then said—

Why do not you go and enlist instead of taking advantage of your Parliamentary exemption?

And Mr. Johnston replied—

You were lately out of work and you did not join the colours, you big, fat—
And Mr. Johnston has here added the word "slacker."

The Minister for Works: I heard that word.

The Minister for Lands: There is no doubt about it.

Mr. Scaddan: He did not.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Absolutely.

Mr. Bolton: I would rather take *Hansard*.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the *Hansard* staff brought that report to me I found that Mr. Johnston did not use the word "slacker," but he got as far as "you big, fat" and then, I think appeared to choke. Mr. Johnston then claims that he said—

I ask for the withdrawal of that lie.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I did say every word of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that. I distinctly remember the hon. member stopping at the words "you big, fat." I was listening to hear what was coming next. I did not hear the words, "I ask you to withdraw that lie," because I should have asked the hon. member to withdraw that expression. The hon. member may have said it all the same.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I appealed to you and you made me sit down. It was upon my appeal that that should be withdrawn that you said, "No," and added, "Honours are easy." In both these cases the words were uttered and I am glad to have the confirmation of hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think there is any need to discuss the matter further. There are other additions, but I do not think there will be any advantage gained—

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Let us have them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I can assure the House that if I had heard the hon. mem-

ber say, "I ask for the withdrawal of that lie," which *Hansard* did not hear—

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You immediately—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I should have asked the hon. member to withdraw that expression.

The Premier: You may not have heard it.

Mr. Nairn: I heard it here.

The Minister for Lands: And I was surprised that you did not ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: *Hansard* did not hear it and I did not hear it.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: It was like a bear garden.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not make these remarks. If the House is like a bear garden he is responsible for it. He must not reflect on the Chair on occasions of this character. I hope we have heard the last of the matter and also any reference to what occurred that evening.

[Later.]

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [7.30]: With the permission of the House I would like to make a personal explanation in regard to the letter from the Acting Chief *Hansard* Reporter which you, Mr. Speaker, read to the House this afternoon. During the tea adjournment I had an opportunity of looking through the proof of my remarks to which attention was drawn and also of seeing the letter which was read by you in connection with this matter. It is true that I added words which I used in the House and which appeared to me to have been missed by *Hansard*. As you, Mr. Speaker, will remember, the debate at that time was somewhat warm and on more than one occasion several members were interjecting. I notice in the letter from *Hansard* it is pointed out that copies of members' speeches are supplied to members for revision. When a copy was supplied to me for revision I understood that it was the privilege enjoyed by members to fill in words which had been omitted.

Mr. Bolton: Surely you did not understand that.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It is a practice which I have followed without interruption since I have been a member of this Chamber, for the past five years.

Mr. Underwood: The practice should cease.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The practice has never been questioned until the present time. May I point out to you how small these alterations were.

Mr. Foley: They were pretty big to the public, though.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I would ask the hon. member to keep quiet until I have made my explanation. I fear that the letter from *Hansard* which has been read to the House will convey a false impression.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not a false impression, a wrong impression.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: A wrong impression. I would ask the House to bear with me while I show what the alterations were to which exception has been taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not argue the question.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There are other alterations made in red ink by *Hansard*. In the first alteration it is reported that I said, "It reflected little credit on him." My alteration strikes out "him" and adds "his political reputation" which was certainly what I did say.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not argue. He can quote from the copy without arguing.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Then it goes on to say that I used the words "like a great big child." I put in the word "school" before "child" and I believe I said it at the time. Then I put in the words "the colours" after "you did not join," which *Hansard* has accepted. Next we come to the words "you big fat slacker." I certainly used the word "slacker." There is a line drawn in the copy after the words "big, fat;" that line shows that it was put there for something to be written in, just as has been done on the previous page where *Hansard* filled in a word in red ink.

Mr. Bolton: No doubt taken from their own notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not argue the matter.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I wish to reiterate that I thought it was the usage that,

where a dash was drawn, it meant that there was a word missing which had to be filled in. I have certainly filled in words on previous occasions. In regard to the rest of my remarks I think that practically all the alterations made have been accepted by *Hansard*. The next thing to which exception was taken I referred to this afternoon. Mr. Scaddan said, "Some of those anonymous letters came from you no doubt." That suggestion hurt me very much. I have never sent an anonymous letter in my life and the words I used after that were "I ask for a withdrawal of that lie." Those words were omitted from the proof; I inserted them and then afterwards follow Mr. Speaker's remarks. Then, Mr. Speaker called "Order!" and added "the member for Williams-Narrogin by his remarks almost invites such interjections. He tells the member for Brownhill-Ivanhoe that he crawled back in a way which was not creditable." I believe you, Mr. Speaker, then said that honours were easy. Later on I went on to refer to my personal responsibilities. I crossed out the word "personal" and inserted "family." That alteration was accepted by *Hansard*.

Mr. Underwood: You made quite a few alterations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member go back to the first alteration which he made and which reads "It is his standard of politics."

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I said, "That remark is worthy of the hon. member; it is his standard of politics." I inserted the words, "it is his standard of politics."

Mr. Bolton: That was a big insertion, too.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: *Hansard* follows that on by saying, "That is his idea of dealing with a big public question of this kind." The next three alterations on the proof were made in red ink by *Hansard*. Then, according to *Hansard*, I say "They sent another resolution to the Australian Workers' Union in Perth expressing want of confidence in the Scaddan Government, who had money to spend on the Nevanas contract."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The statement to which exception is taken by *Hansard* does not refer to those remarks at all.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Practically the remainder of the alterations were accepted

by *Hansard*, but in regard to those included in the copy I handed to the Press exception has been taken. It is significant that exception should be taken to—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is arguing the matter.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: What appears in print in the *West Australian*—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member may make a statement, but he must not argue.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I wish to make it clear that the only words I inserted were words I had used, and that I did it in accordance with the practice and custom obtaining in the Chamber ever since I have been in it. There is no alteration in the meaning of anything I said. I really only supplied missing words. Indeed, I believe exception is taken to only one missing word supplied, and that was heard by the Minister for Works and others, but was missed by *Hansard* in the interruption that was taking place at the time.

The Premier: May I make a statement in regard to the expressions I heard used when this matter came up?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Premier can only make a statement with the permission of the House.

Mr. Bolton: What is it all about? What are we to have from you?

Leave given.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex) [7.47]: It would be the first time on record that the Premier was refused a hearing. Before tea I laid down what I considered was the interpretation of the custom of the House in regard to the revising of reports of members' speeches. To support what I said, I have since read through the *Hansard* report of the hon. member's speech. I see no reason to take exception to any of the alterations he has made. To the best of my belief the words that have been inserted he uttered, and I heard him.

Mr. Bolton: He has said himself that he did not.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I did not say so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think any good purpose will be served by prolonging this

discussion. There are points about the question which have never arisen in regard to any similar proceedings. The exception taken by the acting Chief *Hansard* Reporter was, in my opinion, a perfectly reasonable one, because the reports of *Hansard* are the property of *Hansard* and of the House until the weekly number of *Hansard* is issued. I accept the assurance of the member for Williams-Narrogin that he used the words stated, but he acted wrongly in that, after making the additions, he gave the revised copy to the Press as the *Hansard* report, which was not correct, and this before the *Hansard* report was issued to this House. The *West Australian* in introducing the subject, said—

During the debate in the Assembly on Wednesday night on Mr. E. B. Johnston's motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the circumstances of the Nevanas contract, some warm passages occurred between the member for Williams-Narrogin and Mr. Scaddan. In one of these the leader of the Opposition asked Mr. Johnston why he did not enlist. Mr. Johnston's reply is given more fully in *Hansard* than in our necessarily abbreviated report in yesterday's issue. The member for Williams-Narrogin has submitted to us a copy of the proof of *Hansard* containing a report of the incident, and has asked us to publish it in order that the public may be informed of all that was said on the matter.

The hon. member acted improperly in taking the *Hansard* duplicate copy of his speech, making additions, and giving it to the Press as the *Hansard* edition. When a complaint was made by the acting Chief *Hansard* Reporter I felt that it was my duty to read that letter to the House. Everything that can be said on the matter has been said and I think it may well now be dropped. Members will now know their position, so far as *Hansard* reports are concerned.

BILL—FLINDERS BAY-MARGARET RIVER RAILWAY.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—TOTALISATOR DUTY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 9th November.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison) [4.58]: I was very much disappointed that the Premier should come down with paltry measures of this nature and allow others of very much greater importance to go by. The methods of taxation of the present Government are not by any means fair or satisfactory. The taxation outlined strikes at the poorer class of people and the harder these are struck the more it appears to suit the Government. Take the taxation on the railways. People in the back country pay through the nose for everything, and the further they are away the higher they are called upon to pay. Increased railway freights and fares in the taxation outlined strikes at the poorer class of people who have to travel on the trains with their children. This increase does not affect the big man at all because he has his motor-car, like the Attorney General, and can take his children and family everywhere in it. The poorer people in the back country have to pay these increased railway freights and there is also a consequent increase in the cost of their food supplies. The Bill endeavours to inflict further taxation on the class of people who frequent the racecourses. If the intention of the Government is to do away with racing they should come forward and say so. They should be men enough to say they are going to abolish racing and not do it in what is practically an underhand manner.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): This is a taxation measure and has not to do with racing.

Mr. HOLMAN: The taxation is going to make it impossible to carry on that sport. If the Premier thinks he will increase his revenue by this means he is making one of the greatest mistakes of his life, because instead of increasing the amount of revenue the effect of this Bill will in all probability be that the Government will lose a great deal. The revenue gathered from racing is derived from very different sources to that from which the revenue by direct taxation is raised. Why is only one class of sport

sought out to be taxed; why not bowlers, tennis players, golfers, and so forth? Surely there is no reason why the taxation should be limited to those who patronise racing and prefer that class of sport; but this Bill aims at the taxation only of the sporting fraternity. It seems to me that the Government's method is to tax those who are already sufficiently taxed. If the amount anticipated by the Government to be raised under the Bill is realised the racing clubs will not be able to carry on. There will, at all events, have to be a reduction in programmes and prize money, and that means that the class of horses competing at race meetings will deteriorate, with the consequence that the people will not patronise the turf.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): It will probably reduce the number of race meetings.

Mr. HOLMAN: If we at present have too many race meetings would it not be better for the Government to take over the control of the racing and say straight out that only a certain number of race meetings are to be held. That would be the better method. The argument used by the Premier is that we want revenue and it must be raised. It seems strange if that be the case that the Government is looking only to one source from which to raise that additional revenue. It is also strange that the Government should have decided to prohibit bookmaking. I think that action is unfair and that it will not do much good. It will be merely penalising the clubs and practically spoiling the sport of racing. It is proposed in the Bill that 12½ per cent. of the money going into the totalisator shall be taxed, as well as the fractions, say another 2½ per cent., making a total of 15 per cent. No other sport is taxed to anything like that extent. It has to be remembered that the money put into the totalisator is the people's money, and they are entitled to claim that they shall not be robbed, whether it be by the Government or by the racing clubs. The proposal in the Bill means that if £1,000 be placed in the totalisator on the first race, £150 will be deducted. If the balance, £850, be again placed in the totalisator on the next race, £128 would be deducted, leaving £722; on the third race £108 would

be deducted, leaving £614; on the fourth race £92 deducted, leaving £522; on the fifth race £78 would be deducted, leaving £444; and on the sixth race—assuming always that we are dealing with the original £1,000—a further sum would be deducted, leaving £377.

The Premier: Your argument is not sound.

Mr. HOLMAN: It is perfectly sound. But if the Premier desires to do away with racing by all means let him do so at once, but let him not in the process rob those people who go to races.

The Premier: You are against the taxation then?

Mr. HOLMAN: I am against any one section of the people bearing the whole burden of taxation. I would be in favour of the Premier introducing a comprehensive scheme of taxation whereby every man and woman in the country shall bear a fair share of the taxation according to their ability to do so. Why should the wowser who goes to church and never spends his money go scot free, and why should the moneyed man with his thousands of pounds not be taxed at all? Let us be fair. If we are to tax one section of the community, then we should tax all. The time has arrived when we as a community should bear in equal proportion, according to our ability, our share of taxation. The former Government on one occasion endeavoured to bring in a form of fair taxation but it was rejected by members opposite. The Government's proposals for taxation are not fair to the people. In the metropolitan area the poor people are to be taxed on the railways, and the only ones who escape are the friends of the present Government, people who have never been taxed and who never will be taxed so long as the present Government retains the Treasury benches. The sooner the people realise that fact the better it will be for the general community. I believe in sporting people hearing a fair share of taxation equally with the rest of the community, according to their capacity to pay, no more and no less. This system of differentiating one section of the community from the others is absolutely unfair. Probably the Premier has realised that he must obtain further revenue, and he would be right in looking to racing men for

some portion of that revenue. We have heard the statement that it is the desire of the Government to curtail racing, or to do away with it altogether; but the statement of the Premier was that he desired to obtain further revenue. If so, let him do it in a proper manner.

Mr. Thomson: Would you support him if he did?

Mr. HOLMAN: If I thought his proposals were in the interests of the whole community I certainly would support him; but I would never be a party to forcing the hands of the Government into introducing Bills as has been done by some members of this House. The Government should seek a means of obtaining this further revenue by the licensing of bookmakers. I do not believe in doing away with the bookmakers. If that be done it would introduce a pernicious system of underhand betting, which will be good neither for the moral nor material interests of the community. In my opinion it is impossible to stop betting altogether. People will bet, and if betting be legally suppressed they will do it in an underhand manner. Horse-racing is a fair form of sport. Members opposite must realise that there is no more gambling in horse-racing than there is in the share market, probably not so much. In my opinion, the Premier could raise treble the amount proposed to be raised by this Bill if he were to agree to the licensing of bookmakers, and introducing what is in operation at present in the Eastern States, that is the fixing of revenue stamps to bookmakers' tickets. Members on this (Opposition) side of the House are of the opinion that racing should be continued because it is a factor in improving the breed of horses which we consider should be encouraged. There are men in the racing game in Western Australia—Roberts, Grant, and others, not big betting men—in fact I do not know that they bet at all themselves—who have introduced some of the best blood stock in the country. Is it likely that they are going to continue to enter their horses for races unless it is possible for them to win a decent stake? If racing is to be interfered with in the way proposed in this Bill, it is not likely that men of this stamp will be encouraged to bring here a good class of horse.

If the effect of this legislation be to stop racing, because the clubs cannot carry on, then these men will be driven right out of the country, and the country will suffer as a result because the breed of horses will deteriorate. Those gentlemen pay high prices for horses which they bring into this country, and they race for sport. Unless they have a chance of winning a prize worth competing for, it is not likely they will continue to introduce this better class stock. The attachment of the people of Australia to sport of all forms has been the means of producing men who have nobly done their duty by their country. The encouragement we have given to sport in this country has produced those men who have done so well at the front. I repeat that the Premier is likely to get three times the amount of revenue proposed to be raised under this Bill by the licensing of bookmakers. I would like to point out, further, that if racing be done away with, the Government also would lose a fair amount of revenue which is now paid by people using the railways, travelling to races by train and in other ways. Take the racecourses on the Eastern Goldfields. A fair amount of revenue is derived from that source from water alone, but if the number of race meetings is to be reduced, owners will not carry their stock that distance, they would be absolutely ruined. It would be better if the Bill, instead of amending the totalisator tax, introduced legislation for the licensing of bookmakers, confining their operations to the racecourses. No one agrees with the practice of street betting. Retain the totalisator if you will, and allow the people to bet through the totalisator, but allow them also to bet with the bookmaker as well. Because if one is betting on the racecourse the one form of betting is just as bad as the other. It has been stated that the totalisator has done away with the bookmaking in South Australia. That is incorrect; the bookmaker is there to-day just as he was before. It certainly has done away with the payment of license fees, but the betting is done just the same, with the difference that it is now done in the dark. It is far better to have the bookmakers in the open, paying a license fee.

The Premier: How does the hon. member know that the bookmakers exist in South Australia?

Mr. HOLMAN: Because I have been there and betted with them.

The Premier: Well, I have been there and seen no signs of them.

Mr. HOLMAN: I have been on the racecourse and have seen telegrams sent from Western Australia instructing money to be put on certain horses in South Australia. The same statement has been made in connection with New Zealand. There also there is as much betting as before, while the public are not protected to anything like the same extent as they are wherever bookmakers are legalised. I happened to be in the street a few days ago when a friend of mine received from New Zealand under date 26th October, 1916, a letter from which the following is an extract—

I think the bookmakers in Perth, or the recognised ones, would be on a better wicket if they were absolutely prohibited from betting, because then they could fall in line with the New Zealand bookmakers who although absolutely banned by the authorities, make heaps of money. Their starting price limit is £7 10s. for first horse and £3 10s. for second, and their double cards are a scream, 25 to 1 are the standard odds. One bookmaker who operates in Wellington told me the other day that on a recent suburban meeting in Auckland he held over £1,000—and mind you, he is over 400 miles from the scene of the races. Anyhow I hope they won't stop the business on the racecourse, as legitimate business is always better than having to operate under the lap.

That is an extract from a letter received from New Zealand. I do not wish to make public the names of either the sender or the receiver, but if the Premier wishes it I will let him see the original letter. It shows that the bookmaker has not been done away with either in South Australia or in New Zealand. They are carrying on just the same as before. If we increase the totalisator duty and abolish the bookmaker it will mean that instead of having as bookmakers men who, before they can get a license, must undergo the strictest inquiry, an altogether undesirable class will spring up. I maintain

it is far better not to attempt to abolish the bookmaker. Probably the Premier has had before him the full figures of the W.A.T.C. Those figures show that if extra taxation is placed upon the club, they will not be able to carry on. For the twelve months ending 30th April last the expenditure exceeded receipts by £9,028. The sum of £4,035 was donated to war funds although not included in the above expenditure, and £6,000 was spent on work to relieve the unemployed. Totalisator receipts amounted to £14,355, totalisator tax and license to £2,802, totalisator wages to £2,504, totalisator cab and car fares and police escort to £105, and totalisator tickets to £661, or a total of £6,072, leaving a balance from the totalisator of £8,283. The net commission from the totalisator is only $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. out of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The receipts from bookmakers were £4,830, and the fractions £2,400, or a total of £7,230. It means that under the Government's proposals the club's loss would have been £7,316. It would be impossible for the premier club to carry on racing if the totalisator duties were increased and the bookmaker done away with.

Mr. Bolton: That applies to every course.

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes, and more particularly in country places where, owing to the fact that there are but few horses running, the clubs are not in a position to profitably carry on the totalisator. Racing cannot be carried on except with the aid of betting, and in small country places where the totalisator cannot be run profitably they will have no revenue at all.

Mr. Bolton: They will have to race for a bag of chaff, with a tin of insectibane as second prize.

Mr. HOLMAN: Last year the W.A.T.C. received £4,830 from the bookmakers. The cost of collecting this was practically nil, but in the case of the totalisator the cost represents very heavy expenditure. The wages they paid to temporary hands employed during race meetings amounted to £2,310, and to regular racecourse hands £2,574, which with totalisator wages of £2,504 amounts to £7,388. If the racing is done away with a very considerable amount paid in wages will be withheld from the wage-earner, and I am convinced that if the measure now before us, together with that in another place,

is carried, the result will be the ruination of racing.

Mr. Heitmann: Are you prepared to limit the activities of the bookmaker?

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes, although if the Government were to introduce a system under which we have good sound men licensed in the same way as are the auctioneers, betting would be carried on away from the street altogether.

Mr. Thomas: Would not the bookmaker then have the loafer around his office?

Mr. HOLMAN: No, his business would have to be carried on in a strictly proper manner. I do not think betting should be obtruded upon those who have no desire to bet. It is disgraceful to see men betting in the streets to-day. Of course those who go to a racecourse have no objection to betting, and they are entitled to get as much support as they can. During last season the W.A.T.C. raced on 15 days and paid away in stakes £24,885. That money has been freely circulated throughout the community. At the annual meeting to be held in six weeks time they are committed to £9,350 in stakes and to a further £9,000 up to Easter. Of this amount they anticipate receiving about £3,000 from the bookmakers and the totalisator fractions. To encourage the breeding and importation of a better class of horse the W.A.T.C. during the past season included special races for two-year-old and three-year-old horses, allocating to them prize money to the extent of £7,775. This is proof positive that they are encouraging a better class of horse. It means a great deal to any country to have a thoroughly good class of horse. At Belmont Park during the last two years £2,723 have been received in the shape of bookmakers' fees, while the fractions totalled £1,382. During that period the club sustained a loss of £1,072. How then is the club to carry on and face increased taxation? The proposals of the Government will do away with the better class of racing altogether, and we will have an undesirable class with small prizes, and instead of being carried on as at present, racing will be much worse and there will be no revenue from it at all. The Premier said that racing had increased on the Eastern goldfields. That is not so. Apart from the trotting, racing there

has decreased by 50 per cent. Instead of holding a meeting every week they are now running only one a fortnight. Up there they have two of the best courses in the State. On other than race days those courses are always open to the people, who are free to bring their families along and hold picnics, utilising the splendid courses as public parks.

Mr. Heitmann: Are you prepared to limit the number of racing days?

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes, the Government should have more control over racing than they have at present. Personally, I consider one meeting a week in the metropolitan area would be quite sufficient.

Mr. Heitmann: Are you prepared to wipe out the ponies?

Mr. HOLMAN: No, I would do as has been done in the Eastern goldfields; I would remove the ban from them and allow them to run in their proper sphere. In other words, I would place them on the same footing as other horses, and not allow them to run at both registered and unregistered meetings. Under date the 11th inst. I received a letter from the Eastern goldfields racing conference as follows—

I have to confirm my urgent wire of 9th inst. reading as follows:—"Can you obtain postponement of further consideration of the Totalisator Bill until views of Boulder Kalgoorlie clubs conference to be held to-morrow can be laid before the House. There is a strong feeling here that Bill in its present form will put an end racing and our courses altogether;" and acknowledge your reply of 10th inst. as follows, and for which I thank you:—"Your wire received. Have arranged adjournment Totalisator Bill till next week. Advise you forward all possible information immediately. Will probably speak early. Holman." A conference of delegates from the committees of the Kalgoorlie and Boulder racing clubs met yesterday afternoon and decided that the new Totalisator Bill if introduced in its entirety immediately, coupled with the suppression of the bookmaker from the racecourses will have such a detrimental effect that in all probability the clubs will find it impossible to continue racing. The Premier's contention that the whole of the money now handled by the bookmakers

will revert to the totalisator is of course merely conjecture and open to doubt.

The Premier: Even if they do not have the bookmakers they will have the totalisator.

Mr. HOLMAN: But betting with the bookmakers is much preferable to betting on the totalisator. Everyone who knows any thing of the subject knows that the average odds from the bookmaker is considerably in excess of those paid by the totalisator.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): It depends on when you get in with the bookmaker.

Mr. HOLMAN: I am speaking now of a fair average of the odds. I quite understand the Government coming forward and saying "We are not going to allow betting," but when they say to a man that if he must bet then he must bet with the totalisator, such a position is absurd. Their reason must be considerably warped.

Mr. Underwood: They did not have any reason to become warped.

Mr. HOLMAN: If the Government attitude is that they do not believe in gambling why not bring in a Bill to stop racing? In this Bill the Government merely say that it will prevent men betting with men, and will insist on their putting their money into a machine, because the Government want revenue. The letter continues—

Conference is not concerning itself in regard to the suppression of the bookmaker, but views with alarm the proposal to increase the tote tax to five per cent., to take all the fractions, and the unclaimed dividends. The last item is not very serious; indeed one of the clubs has made a practice for years past of giving the unclaimed dividends to local charities. It appears almost certain that for a time the absence of the bookmaker from the racecourse will tend to keep a section of the racing public away from race meetings, and until such time as the owners of horses and the public get used to the new order of things it is improbable that the totalisator receipts will show any material increase, insufficient at all events to compensate the clubs for the loss of the fees usually received from the bookmakers. Conference considers that the proposal to

take all the fractions and increase the tax on the totalisator receipts to five per cent., even though the clubs will be permitted to charge $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. commission, will result in the stoppage of racing on the fields, firstly for the reason that it is doubtful whether the totalisator receipts will increase to anything like the extent the Premier is figuring on, and secondly that $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is too heavy a deduction to make from the investments of the public, in addition to the fractions. Since the commission on racing visited the fields last year, racing has been reduced by almost 50 per cent., and the only meetings held are those promoted by the non-proprietary clubs at Kalgoorlie and Boulder on every alternate Saturday. It will be readily admitted that the people of the goldfields in particular are entitled to some consideration in the way of obtaining healthy and clean sport. With the proposed new totalisator tax in force, it seems fairly certain that horse-racing on local courses will be denied to them. The maintenance of both the Kalgoorlie and Boulder courses costs approximately £3,500 per annum, of which amount nearly a third is spent on the gardens and grounds, free to the public at all times of the year, week days and Sundays, except race days, of which privilege every advantage is taken in the hot months of summer, particularly during the State school summer holidays, the children of the district spend most of their days on the lawns, and in the ample shade provided by the trees and under the grandstand. Permission to hold picnic parties is never refused, and most of the sports gatherings of the various trades organisations are conducted on one or other of the courses. Adverting to the question of revenue paid by the clubs to the Government, the Goldfields Water Supply Department receives annually about £1,300 for water supplied, the Railway Department for railage on horses and attendants about £1,200, and in addition the ordinary or excursion passenger fares of people travelling from and to the coast to attend the races, and finally the totalisator tax which since its inception in 1905 amounts in round figures to £35,000. For the financial periods ending 28th February and

30th June, 1916, both the Kalgoorlie and Boulder clubs made considerable losses, and there appears to be little likelihood of an alteration in this respect at the close of the current year. It is unnecessary for conference to point out that the clubs on the fields have contributed handsomely to the various war funds; that is really a matter that will carry no weight with the Government, although it certainly should. In conclusion, Sir, the main points that conference considers should be brought out are these, the clubs on the fields are absolutely non-proprietary, race meetings are promoted for sport and the improvement of the breed of horses, and to afford a little amusement in places which, by reason of their situation, are entirely devoid of natural advantages in this direction. In so doing the clubs have been able to provide and maintain free parks for the use and pleasure of many hundreds of people who are not racegoers, and lastly contribute handsomely to the revenue of the State, all of which will cease directly racing is stopped. The Government has decided the bookmaker must go, this alone is a drastic step and one, at the moment, it is impossible to determine the result of. The Premier states that he has no desire to see racing put down altogether. Such being the case, conference considers that the Government would be well advised, before introducing increased totalisator taxation, to wait until such time as it is proved, by actual results, that the racing clubs are making the increased profits, due to the suppression of the bookmaker, the Premier estimates they will make.

That is public opinion on the goldfields. There can be no gainsaying the fact that the racecourses on the fields constitute two of the finest parks we have in that part of the country, and they are largely utilised by the public, who show their appreciation of these courses by making extensive use of the grounds. Personally I am of opinion that the Government are making a mistake in deciding to increase the totalisator tax. I do not think it is necessary. If the Premier is desirous of obtaining more revenue I think the community as a whole should be called upon to bear a fair proportion.

Mr. Underwood: As ordinary citizens, not as racing men.

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes. If the racing fraternity are to be taxed as sports, then the Government should tax every other kind of sport. No man should be penalised because he favours the racecourse above other classes of sport.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Your objection is that the Bill shifts the line of taxation from the bookmaker on to the totalisator.

Mr. HOLMAN: No. My objection is that you have increased the taxation to such an extent as has never been known of anywhere before.

Mr. Seaddan: Increased it until the sport cannot possibly stand it.

The Premier: The sport stands it now, anyhow; it pays the money to the bookmaker.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Premier is making a serious mistake, and it is a pity that he did not inquire further into his subject. There is not nearly the amount of money in the game which the Premier has stated. I hope the measure will not be gone on with, because it is neither fair nor reasonable, and, as I have said, the Government should not put a tax on one section of the community. If the Premier will bring down a fair taxation measure he will have the support of members on this side of the House. But when his taxation proposals cover only one section of the community and penalise the poorer people—the poorer you are the more you have to pay—while the man with the money escapes scot-free, he will not get the support of members on this side. So far as the bookmaker himself is concerned, in my opinion he is a better citizen than many of the wealthy men of Western Australia. He is always giving to some charitable institution, and he pays his way all the time. No one knows the number of calls there are on the bookmaker.

The Premier: Where does he get all the money from; does not the sport provide it?

Mr. Seaddan: Where do the clubs get their money from?

Mr. Heilmann: Where do the wealthy men get their money from?

Mr. HOLMAN: I am pleased to say that the bookmakers have done their duty patriot-

ically. They have sent away from among their own number men who have done well at the front. One of them gave his life—I refer to Lieutenant Cosson, a man who was always known to be very generous to charities, and who, on one occasion, gave £400 to the worn-out miners' fund. I repeat, the Government should not step in at this juncture and endeavour to create trouble, as will be done by this Bill. I consider there is no necessity for this form of taxation, and I trust there will be sufficient sense in the House to say that it is not to be gone on with, and that a proper measure of taxation will be introduced in its place. I am opposed to this form of taxation, and also to the abolition of the bookmaker. I trust the Government will see the error they have made and withdraw the Bill, and if they will introduce an equitable measure of taxation I will support them.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): You are candid about it, anyhow.

Mr. HOLMAN: Certainly I am.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): That is more than some others are.

Mr. HOLMAN: Why does not the Government be equally candid, and if they want to reduce racing why not do it in a straightforward way?

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): We do not say we want to reduce racing, but we do want revenue.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Premier said distinctly that he wanted to reduce racing. Then why not do it?

The Premier: We want the Bill passed.

Mr. Bolton: You will not get it.

Mr. HOLMAN: If there is too much racing in the State then the Government should stop it, but they should do so in a proper manner; and if gambling is wrong the Government should not take a share of the money which comes from gambling. It is disgusting to think that a Government in Western Australia, which announced that it would create a wonderful change in the finances of the State, has to resort to drawing an additional 2½ per cent. from a gambling transaction. Speaking now for those who patronise the totalisator, I hold the opinion that when people go to a racecourse to enjoy themselves, they should be afforded proper protection. The Govern-

ment should not rob them. If, on the other hand, the Government realise that people will bet, they should license men and have betting conducted in a proper manner. I like to see a race, and I like to have my bet.

Mr. Heitmann: They are going to tax the threepenny pictures next.

Mr. HOLMAN: That is another form of taxation to which I am opposed. I maintain that while we are taxing the poorer class of people in the back country, and in the metropolitan area, the man with money is allowed under this Bill to go almost scot-free.

Mr. Nairn: Is that your experience?

Mr. HOLMAN: I have a family of nine to keep and it is more than I can do to keep them as I should like to do with the existing taxation and other things sprung on one in different directions. I hope the Premier will withdraw this measure because it will not do any good and will not increase the revenue in the way that he desires. If he wishes to raise revenue let him tax the community according to their ability to pay. I will assist him if he desires to legalise book-making by granting licenses to bookmakers. They will then be under the eye of the people and the police and if a man is then mixed up with a transaction which is not honest in the way that was mentioned by the Premier—and I should like the Premier to have given us a definite instance of such a thing—such a person could then easily be. The present Government have shown by got rid of by having his license cancelled. the introduction of this measure that they do not possess any business acumen. The previous Government endeavoured to introduce a measure of taxation which would affect all fairly and not pick out a few on whom to inflict hardships. If the Government will introduce a general measure of taxation they will have my support.

Mr. SMITH (North Perth) [5.48]: This Bill has been wrongly named. It should have been called "A Bill for an Act to kill the goose that lays the golden egg."

Mr. Heitmann: Are you speaking feelingly?

Mr. SMITH: I intend to support the second reading of the Bill because I recognise that the Government urgently require

revenue to make up the losses of the previous Administration, and they are justified in introducing a Bill to impose a tax on any luxury or sport at this juncture. While going so far, when the Bill reaches the Committee stage I shall support any amendment which will have the effect of amending any clauses which may seem to be obnoxious at the present time. I have never been on a racecourse in my life and I do not bet and for that reason I think I can speak without bias and with an open mind on this question. I have read the Bill carefully and have gone into the matter thoroughly and I see no real justification for many of the clauses which the Government are attempting to enforce. Only last night a well known citizen in the person of Mr. Prowse, addressing a public meeting at the Perth town hall, told his audience that there was no call for this measure. Mr. Prowse is a good judge, and when he says publicly that there is no call for such a Bill as this we may take it that there is really no call for it.

Mr. Scaddan: That is the end of it.

Mr. SMITH: It has been truly said that "Horse-racing is the sport of kings," and in England where there are many wealthy men it can flourish, and it does flourish, without bookmakers' fees and fractions, and other petty sources of revenue. In Australia, however, and particularly in Western Australia, where there are no wealthy men—

Mr. Heitmann: Rubbish.

Mr. SMITH: We have to look to all these avenues in order to procure revenue to keep the sport going.

Mr. Heitmann: I do not see why we want to keep the blessed thing going at all.

Mr. SMITH: It is the national sport of Australia, and the great bulk of the people enjoy racing. Does the hon. member wish to deprive the great bulk of the citizens of this sport?

Mr. Heitmann: I want to hear you justify its existence.

Mr. SMITH: This Bill proposes to take away from the clubs a very large amount of their revenue. Its object is to take away the fractions, and the Premier announces he is going to enforce the law against bookmakers, which means that the clubs will not be able to levy license fees from the bookmakers as

they have been doing in the past. That particular source of revenue will disappear.

Mr. Walker: That is practically the Bill and you ought, therefore, to vote against the second reading.

Mr. SMITH: It seems to me, if this Bill is passed, the result will be inevitable. It will mean that the revenue the Premier expects to get will disappear altogether. The clubs will not be able to maintain their present high standard of horse-racing in the State, and the public, as a consequence, will not patronise the sport. I will give an example of racing as it is followed, and it will clearly show members that the Bill, if it is passed in its present form, will operate harshly on the clubs. It will also be to the detriment of the sport. Let me give an illustration by taking the race meeting held at Goodwood on the 1st November last. The investments on the totalisator on that day amounted to £1,358. The club got £110 16s. 6d. out of the fees. The Government got £34 17s. 6d. In addition the club got £116 10s. bookmakers' fees, and also got the fractions amounting to £36 15s. The last two items, amounting to £153 5s., the Government propose to take away from the club. If those sources of revenue are taken from the club, it follows that the club will have to make it up in some other way. In order to make up the £153 at 5 per cent., which the Government are going to allow the clubs to take from the totalisator, they will have to put an extra £3,200 through the totalisator or a total of £4,558. That will be absolutely impossible. At that particular race meeting there were 485 people present, and if those people have to find the increased amount that I have named to go through the totalisator it may mean that each person will have to invest £9 10s. Hon. members will know that it will be quite impossible to expect that. The high percentage which the Government propose to deduct from the totalisator will simply mean that at the close of the day the Government will have nearly all the money.

Mr. O'Loghlen: There will be less money every week.

Mr. SMITH: Suppose a crowd of people went to a race meeting with £1,000, and they put that sum of money on the machine

on the first race, the Government, at the rate of 15 per cent., which is what they propose to take, would get £150, leaving £850 for the next race. On the second race there would be deducted £127 10s., and £122 for the third race. After that there would be deducted £108, leaving the public £614 to invest in the fourth race, out of which £91 10s. would be deducted. For the fifth race the public would have £522, for which they would have to pay £78. On the sixth race they would have £444, and would have to pay £66 12s., leaving in the hands of the public altogether out of the original £1,000 an amount of £377 8s.

Mr. Thomas: How does the present rate work out?

Mr. Scaddan: What percentage of that do the Government get?

Mr. SMITH: I did not work that out. It is immaterial from the point of view of my argument. There is no doubt that the racing public cannot possibly stand that heavy penalty on every race. The result will be a deterioration of racing, and once that deterioration has set in we shall have a falling off in attendance and the amount of taxation derived, which will hit the Government in another way.

Mr. Bolton: We do not mind hitting the Government.

Mr. SMITH: The Government charge very heavy railway fares at the present time to the different courses, and if we are going to discourage attendance at the races the result will be that what we may be likely to make up with the totalisator we will lose in other respects. The proposed Bill to suppress street betting will have my fullest support. I do not think there can be any two opinions about it.

Mr. Bolton: Confine betting to the race-course.

Mr. SMITH: Bookmakers are strongly in favour of the measure for the suppression of shop betting with a strong hand.

Mr. Foley: This is putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. SMITH: When the Bill comes before us I think it will meet with the support of members on both sides of the House, and I have no doubt it will be carried. With reference to the bookmakers, it has been said on

several occasions that they have been abolished in South Australia. I made it my business to inquire if that was the case, and I am assured now that bookmaking is flourishing in that State.

Mr. Foley: Under the lap.

Mr. SMITH: I find that it is one of the biggest bookmaking centres in Australia. In order to prove that, I took the trouble of having a telegram sent to a bookmaker in South Australia asking him if he could lay me anything about the Melbourne Cup. I asked him if he could lay me the odds up to £10,000 or £20,000 for a particular horse in that race. So anxious was the bookmaker to do business that he sent me the following reply—

Can secure £10,000 £400, £20,000 £1,000.

Here is absolute proof that bookmaking is rampant in South Australia. I read a report in one of the Adelaide papers that bookmakers are erecting a palatial club in Adelaide. If they are able to build that, it shows conclusively that the bookmaker is flourishing. A friend of mine who was over in Adelaide the other day told me that he went into a hotel there and that there were at least 20 bookmakers in the bar waiting to do business. In other words, owing to the law operating against the bookmakers in South Australia, the bookmaker has been forced into the hotels where he meets his confrères and where he does business.

Mr. Thomas: Can they not catch him there?

Mr. SMITH: I do not know. It is quite clear that they have not caught him there, or taken any steps to catch him. In almost every hotel there it seems that there is a little coterie of bookmakers, and that people frequent these hotels to make their bets.

Mr. Scaddan: A fair percentage of those will take the money and say they will fix up the bet for you.

Mr. SMITH: It would be desirable that the bookmakers should be brought more under control.

Mr. Thomas: It is quite impossible to suppress the bookmaker altogether.

Mr. SMITH: I quite agree.

Mr. Bolton: Restrict betting to the race-courses.

Mr. SMITH: When we find that it is impossible to suppress bookmaking we ought to legalise it. New Zealand is also held up as a country where bookmakers are suppressed, but if we take up any of the sporting papers of that Dominion we find that they contain bookmakers' quotations, which is ample evidence that bookmaking is being carried on there. It is no use, therefore, holding up South Australia or New Zealand as countries where bookmaking is suppressed by law.

Mr. Munsie: The only thing they suppress is that of the calling the odds on the courses.

Mr. SMITH: When it is recognised that bookmaking cannot be suppressed I think the Government would be acting wisely if they took it into their own hands and licensed bookmakers. By this means they would receive a very substantial sum of money. There are upwards of 170 bookmakers in the State, and they are almost all willing to pay a very substantial license fee. The Government would not have the slightest difficulty in collecting the money. They are also, I understand, prepared to pay a stamp tax on every ticket issued by them. As some of the bookmakers issue as many as 500 or 600 tickets at every race meeting, members will see that the Government, by means of such a tax, would be able to receive a considerable sum of money.

Mr. Foley: That would be unfair.

Mr. Angwin: Why should they do it?

Mr. Scaddan: Because they are willing to do it.

Mr. SMITH: They are willing to be taxed.

Mr. Underwood: Why should I pay more than anyone else?

Mr. Foley: Why not make bookmakers put in duplicate sheets and the man who does the biggest business pay the most tax?

Mr. SMITH: We are also told that by the abolition of the bookmaker all the betting would be diverted to the totalisator.

Mr. Thomas: The Bill is not to abolish the bookmaker.

Mr. SMITH: The one dovetails in with the other. Bookmaking is going to be suppressed, and if we do that we are going to take away a large proportion of the revenue

of race-clubs. There is also the betting in the Eastern States. If we had no book-makers the racing people who bet on races in Melbourne would wire their money away out of the State in order to make these bets. We cannot put bets of that sort through the totalisator here unless we establish one in the streets, in which case we would be setting up a sort of public lottery.

The Premier: A sort of legalised Tattersall's.

Mr. SMITH: It would be a good thing to have a legalised Tattersall's, as they have in Tasmania. That would provide a large revenue to the Government, and it would be a wise thing to consider it. It is rather extraordinary that the Premier should want to put down the bookmakers on moral grounds, and on the other hand wish to promote the totalisator. If it is immoral to bet with the bookmaker, it must be equally immoral to bet with the totalisator. If the Premier wants revenue the bookmakers are willing to submit to any reasonable taxation, and I am quite certain that this would be the means of providing a large sum of money for the coffers of the State.

Mr. Bolton: Much more than under the present proposal.

Sitting suspended from 6.12 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [7.50]: I regret very much that it is necessary to speak on this phase of the question when there is another phase of it to come down from another place. When we have the two phases we will even then have not more than half a Bill on the question. I sincerely regret that the Government have not seen fit to deal comprehensively with the question. There is too much racing in the vicinity of the metropolitan area.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Why did not you stop it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Because the hon. member would not help me. Why does not the hon. member stop a lot of things which he thinks wrong? The Bill will not stop racing altogether, but possibly it will do away with the best interests in racing and maintain the worst. What should be done is to eliminate the worst parts of racing and retain the best. On the Bill we cannot deal

with the whole question. There is another Bill to come down to us. It is unfair for the Government to put this legislation up piecemeal. We should hold this measure over till we have before us all the proposed legislation on the question. This Bill deals with the totalisator and the totalisator tax. We have to assume—the Premier has assumed—that we are going to abolish the bookmaker when the Bill becomes law. That being so, we should have that other Bill down here so as to deal with the whole question as one. It is a pity that the Government should divide things up and put one portion in one House and another in the other House.

Mr. Walker: All dealing with the same subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes. The question of the totalisator and the bookmaker are absolutely inseparable; so much so that the Premier, when introducing this Bill for the totalisator tax, dealt chiefly with bookmakers.

The Premier: I did not. Read *Hansard*.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No; you might have cooked it, as Johnston did.

The Premier: I ask that that be withdrawn. It is most offensive.

Mr. SPEAKER: It must be withdrawn, on two grounds: The one, that it is offensive, and the other that the hon. member must not make reference to what has occurred.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I withdraw. It is regrettable that we have not the whole question before us. I agree that there are many things requiring remedy. A little racing is absolutely necessary in any Australian community. The Bill will eliminate the best owners, those who run straight for stakes and who want to see their horses win, and will retain those who only want to win the wagers they make on their horses. I speak in all seriousness as one who has looked on at racing for something over 30 years. Under supervision, the bookmaker is one of the cleverest and most honest of men. I have been betting on courses and off courses for over 30 years. The bookmakers pass hundreds of thousands of pounds through their hands, yet I have never had an argument with a bookmaker.

Mr. Heitmann: You have never had to collect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have got from a bookmaker what I am not likely to get from an ordinary commercial man possessed of business acumen; I have lost my ticket, and on my telling the bookmaker of my loss he has paid me my bet without the ticket. Notwithstanding all the money they put through their hands they do it without a single argument, and without a mistake. It is one of the things that business men could learn from them. Under the Bill it is proposed to levy extra duties on the totalisator, but we are only assuming that we are to do this if we do away with the bookmaker. It is my experience and the experience of many others, that it is impossible to do away with the bookmaker. When we come to something we cannot abolish, the best thing to do is to control it. The member for Murchison (Mr. Holman) and others have told us that they can go to South Australia or to New Zealand and bet as much as they wish to on the course, but under the lap, and can book their bets. My experience is that book betting and betting under the lap are infinitely more dangerous than cash betting.

Mr. Walker: Certainly more demoralising.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: And more dangerous. A man goes on the course with, say, a fiver and does it in. If he can book bets he tries to recover what he has lost in cash. It is when he comes to book betting that he is likely to get into trouble. All those people whom the judges say go to the dogs through racing—and the judges talk a lot of tripe at times—mostly go to the dogs because of being able to book bets. Properly supervised, straight-out cash betting is infinitely better than betting under the lap.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Would you abolish the booking of bets?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No. What I desire is that the Government should say, "There shall be so many race meetings held within the metropolitan area. Within a certain area of any racecourse bookmakers will be allowed to bet. Outside that area betting is illegal." I wish to tell the Premier he is making a mistake absolutely if he thinks that because he abolishes the bookmakers all the money they ordinarily take will pass through the tote. It will not.

Member: So much the better if it does.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It will not for this reason: Instead of betting as now under a controlled system with men who are licensed the money will go through unlicensed bookmakers.

Mr. Walker: And some of it will go to the Eastern States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Not much of it. It is an absolute certainty that betting is carried on in Adelaide and in New Zealand to-day, although for the past thirty years the authorities in Adelaide have been endeavouring to abolish the bookmaker and have failed. That being so we should accept the inevitable and control the bookmaker, control what we cannot abolish. The hon. the Premier thinks that because he proposes to abolish the bookmaker, all the money which previously has gone through the bookmakers will go through the tote. I am telling him that it will not, that the money will go to the bookmakers; but there will be this difference, that he will abolish the bookmaker who to-day contributes a very large sum towards the stakes which the racing clubs provide.

Mr. Thomson: Where do they get it from?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I do not think they get it from the hon. member.

Mr. Thomson: They do not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I do not think the hon. member may be regarded as a very shining example on that account. I do not think he is much better than myself, and they get a bit from me. No one, I think, is entitled to blow out his chest because he does not do his money in with the bookies; the chances are he does something worse. I like those people who have no vices.

Mr. Taylor: And few virtues.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I think those who have no vices do not know what virtue means. I repeat the Treasurer is mistaken on this question, that his calculations are entirely wrong, when he says that if we abolish the bookmaker we will abolish betting. The result will be that he will compel betting "under the lap," compel it to be done dishonestly, and then we shall lose the best owners we have in this country and we have many of them, including Sholl, Roberts, Grant, Brockman—all good owners—who race their horses to win. Those are the men

this Bill will lose to the country, and it will retain only the worst features of the sport. I regret very much the Government has not seen fit to bring down a comprehensive measure for the curtailment of racing and the control of bookmakers. A good deal of nonsense has been talked in regard to taxation. It is claimed that a man who enjoys going to races should be supertaxed above all other men. I want to know why. Why should I pay a half-crown to go to a race-course to attend a race meeting when I could go the same journey for 3d. if I were going to a Sunday school picnic? I want to know whether the Treasurer is assuming the position that he will tax us for our sins. If that is not the position, then I assume that the specially reduced rates in connection with Sunday school picnics are because they are likely to increase the population. I want to know why I am charged more for attending a race meeting than a Sunday school picnic, a cricket match, a football match, a yacht race, or any other branch of sport, when I travel on the railway. Am I charged for my sins? If so, I want to tell the Premier that I shall be taxed for my sins in the next world, and he has no right to assume the functions of the Deity.

Mr. Taylor: He is taking the "old chap's" place and punishing you here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We have sneered at the Kaiser for going into partnership with the Deity, but when the Government propose to tax people who go to races on the assumption that racing is sinful, they are absolutely ignoring the Deity and attempting to assume His place. And I want to tell the Premier that he is rather small for that job. I want this House and the people generally to answer that question. Why should people who go to races pay more taxation than those who go down the river? Why do we not tax those people who save up their money and take a trip to the Eastern States for their holiday? There are hundreds of civil servants who accumulate their leave, and when they have a month or six weeks' leave coming to them they go for a trip to the Eastern States. That is regularly done, it is quite the proper thing in the Railway Department. And, after they have had that trip to the Eastern States they again save

up their money until long leave is due, when they take a trip to Europe and spend their money there. I wish to know why I am to be taxed for going to races and they are not taxed for going to Europe. That is a fair question to ask. Are races sinful? If so, then they should be abolished; if not, then I have as much right to go to races as the Premier has to go to a cricket match. We provide subsidies for cricket clubs, we subsidise them in every way, we give them cheap fares on the railway. Cricket is a sport of its devotees; racing is my sport. The Government are never satisfied with the taxes levied, or attempted to be levied on those patronising racing. There are those who say that people who go to races will be condemned in the next world, while they themselves will have a box seat. I say that those who are to have a box seat in the next world should pay their fair share of taxation in this world, and not attempt to put it upon those who are going to "cop it" in the next world. I have heard a lot of nonsense spoken by many wise men in regard to the breed of horses. Quite a number assert that racing does not improve the breed of horses. There are men better able than I to give the House information on this point, but I will say that if we had no racing, there are in this country to-day many fine blood-horses which would never have come here. By having racing here we have the addition of that blood stock in the country which is highly valuable. I have read again and again a platitude spoken by somebody which has caught on, that present day racing does not improve the breed of horses because they are five or six furlong squibs. The blood horse that can run four furlongs at top pace will beat any mongrel ever bred in a three or four day journey when hard work has to be done. The statement that we have only five or six furlong races is absolutely wrong. We have to-day longer races in Western Australia than we have had for years.

Mr. Holman: The five furlong race is not allowed here now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is so; five furlong races are not allowed except for two-year-olds. The people who talk that rubbish know nothing of the subject. I want to say further in that regard, that the great-

est racehorse we have ever had in Australia. Carbine, won over four furlongs. He won from four furlongs to three miles; and the greatest mare that ever raced in Australia, Wakeful, started her career by winning the five and a-half furlong Oakleigh Plate, finishing her career by carrying 10 stone into second place in the Melbourne Cup. The best horses will race from five furlongs to five miles; to the horse that has blood in him it does not matter what the distance, he can always beat the mongrel-bred. That was proved years ago by explorer MacDonald Stewart, and it still stands to-day. If you are looking for a horse to carry you through a hard journey, get one with blood in him; he will carry you infinitely better than one without blood. In my opinion, it is not desirable to abolish racing in Western Australia, nor to abolish the blood horse. We should encourage the breeding of blood stock. If it is not desirable to abolish racing, we should not, by a measure of this description, do something which will wipe out from racing the best part of it and leave only the worst. We should endeavour to eliminate the worst and retain the best.

Mr. Thomson: Would you retain the book-maker?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes. The book-maker comes into this question. He pays huge fees to the clubs, and the clubs pay the money out in stakes. Were it not for the bookmakers' fees the clubs could not pay such large stakes, and without those large stakes, owners who race for money could not afford to bring blood stock here. There is another matter which arises in this connection. I trust that the mandate that book-makers shall be done away with as from the first of next month will be withdrawn. The W.A.T.C. has entered into agreements to pay certain stakes, their programmes have been printed, and they are liable for them, to the extent of over £18,000. To make a drastic alteration of this description while the club has that commitment hanging over it, is totally unfair to the club, and when we speak of the W.A. Turf Club we are speaking of some of the best citizens this State possesses.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [8.14]: I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. I am not a racing man, but I con-

sider it is the duty of the Government to seek ways and means of raising revenue, and in the opinion of the Premier this is one of the avenues whereby money can be raised. We have heard a good deal from members on the other side of the House in their anxiety to look after the bookmaker. I am surprised to find what a valuable asset to the State the bookmaker is. He is not valuable in my opinion. I was under the impression that the bookmaker gentry toil not, neither do they spin.

Mr. Underwood: You do not spin much.

Mr. THOMSON: As far as I am concerned I look upon them as parasites. I am not using that word in any derogatory sense so far as the individual is concerned. They do not produce anything.

Mr. Taylor: They are not the only people who do not produce.

Mr. THOMSON: We have heard a good deal about the sport of racing. I will refer hon. members to paragraph 4 of the report of the joint select committee which reads—

Racing has now become largely a business, carried on directly or indirectly in the pursuit of profit; and the element of sport, so far as the great majority of horse-owners are concerned, is almost entirely absent. The object of racing, the improvement of the breed of horses, appears to the committee to have fallen from its original place, and is now little regarded.

Mr. Foley: The Government are doing nothing to abolish that class of racing.

Mr. THOMSON: I am answering some of the arguments of hon. members opposite. Some of those hon. members have contended that one must not interfere with a man's sport. We know that, as a matter of fact, at least 75 per cent. of those who frequent the racecourse go there to see what they can make.

Mr. Taylor: You are incorrect. Not that percentage.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Murchison (Mr. Holman) appeared to be very anxious about the poor man. He feared that the Government were going to tax the poor man's sport. In all seriousness, can racing be considered a poor man's sport? The member for Murchison said that when-

ever the Government were looking for revenue they taxed the poor man.

Mr. Holman: That is correct, too.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Murchison endeavoured to prove that this Bill represented another effort on the part of the Government to tax the poor man. I maintain that the genuine poor man has no place on the racecourse.

Mr. Holman: No. He ought to be working all the time.

Mr. Scaddan: He ought to go to the Weld Club.

Mr. THOMSON: As far as the betting part of horse-racing is concerned, I mean. I am prepared to admit that horse-racing is good sport, so far as regards the actual racing of the horses. But, unfortunately—and this is fully borne out by members who have spoken from the Opposition side—if one abolishes the bookmaker, that does away with racing. No other conclusion can be drawn from the remarks of hon. members opposite. I wish to quote what is being done in New Zealand. We have heard about the bookmakers being rampant in New Zealand.

Mr. Scaddan: Who is your authority for that statement?

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood). New Zealand draws from the totalisator £100,000 for 250 days' racing, or roughly £400 per day.

Mr. Scaddan: What is the population of New Zealand?

Mr. THOMSON: I am simply stating that New Zealand raises an annual revenue of £100,000 from the totalisator. Population has nothing to do with the question. The fact proves that the totalisator is a source of revenue to New Zealand. Seeing that we must have horse-racing, then, if hon. members are desirous of reducing the temptation to bet, why do they not support the totalisator? In New South Wales, we learn, the bookmakers within a radius of 40 miles of Sydney pay £80,000 per annum for licenses to bet. I contend that the public provide that money. I maintain that the public provide every penny of the money which those bookmakers pay to the race clubs. To judge from the arguments brought forward by hon. members opposite,

we have no right to interfere with the bookmaker because the bookmaker is the man who confers a boon on the public. How? By fleecing the public of their money? So far as I am concerned, I do not consider the race clubs at all. They are well able to look after themselves. But I do say that revenue is required and must be obtained. The Government unquestionably need additional revenue. I believe even hon. members opposite will admit that. They know the condition in which they left the finances.

Mr. Scaddan: What is the use of that?

Mr. THOMSON: It is absolutely necessary to raise money to carry on the government and to develop the country. Revenue being absolutely necessary, let us raise it upon the superfluities and not upon the necessities of life. I fail to understand hon. members opposite being so anxious to retain the bookmaker and so anxious that additional income tax should be imposed. Here we have a proposal which is not going to affect the individual at all. The totalisator gives larger odds to the public than the bookmaker gives.

Mr. Foley: Is that all you know about it?

Mr. THOMSON: At all events, if people waste their money on the racecourse they cannot be considered as spending it on necessities. The Government are justified in trying to abolish the bookmaker. To judge from paragraph 15, sub-paragraph (b), of the joint select committee's report, betting on racecourses otherwise than through the totalisator ought to be prohibited. If members of the joint select committee, who heard evidence from all the witnesses interested in horse-racing, bring forward such a recommendation, then, more especially in view of the abnormal times, I certainly consider this Bill should be carried. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) seemed very much concerned for people who, as he said, bet book bets. He contended that if the Government licensed the bookmaker and so did away with book bets, and only the system of cash betting remained, the danger of misappropriation of money by employees would be greatly reduced. If that is the hon. member's argument, why does he not support the totalisator? The totalisator represents absolutely nothing but cash transactions.

Mr. Foley: The member for Pilbara is not against the totalisator.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for Pilbara also said that the Government are putting a super-tax on the man who goes racing. The member for Pilbara wondered why the Government did not tax those who go to Sunday school picnics. If there is any analogy between Sunday school picnics and racecourses, that argument might possibly be sound. In my personal view, betting is not a necessity. A man can live without betting. If additional revenue is needed, the Premier is justified in looking to obtain it from other avenues of taxation than that of the necessities of life.

Mr. Thomas: What about a graduated income tax?

Mr. THOMSON: I am prepared to support a graduated income tax.

Mr. Foley: You did not support it when you had the opportunity before.

Mr. THOMSON: We shall see whether the hon. member interjecting is prepared to support it when it is introduced. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading, and I hope the Bill will be carried.

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna) [S.27]: I have listened with interest to this debate, in the hope of ascertaining the reason for the bringing down of the Bill. I am not satisfied with the Premier's statement, because it is too broad and covers too much. One minute the purpose of the measure is moral, to do away with the bookmakers. Another minute it is to diminish the number of race meetings. Then, again, it is to raise revenue by an indirect method of taxation. One moment we are all as moral as the hon. member who last spoke, who said that betting was a superfluity and parasitic in its effects upon the community, having an immoral tendency.

Mr. Thomson: I said the bookmaker was a parasite.

Mr. WALKER: The member for Katanning further stated that betting was generally to be condemned. But there is the hypocrisy of the whole thing. The Premier, like the member for Katanning, wants to condemn as injurious that species of betting which is represented by wagers; and yet the Premier wants to have

a sole monopoly of this terrible evil. If it be an evil, I object to its being fathered, monopolised, entirely worked, by the Premier of this State. There can be no less evil in it because of the State's monopolising the whole thing.

Mr. Thomas: It would be only a question of degree. If one is going to be immoral, one may as well go in for it properly.

Mr. WALKER: If the Premier is going to be immoral, he must not condemn immorality in others. That is the point. The hon. gentleman must not say, "Now I am going to have a monopoly of this immorality, because I want to kill that immorality in my fellow beings." The Government are playing to the gallery by saying they want to diminish and destroy betting, and at the same time take a step that gives legal sanction to betting and gives it the stamp of authority.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Gives what the stamp of authority?

Mr. WALKER: Betting on the totalisator.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): It has been in existence for years.

Mr. WALKER: I do not care how long it has been in existence.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Your own side has been advocating the legalisation of bookmakers.

Mr. WALKER: Suppose we have?

Mr. Bolton: What is the difference, if it is on the racecourse?

Mr. WALKER: What difference does that make to the argument? The hon. member misses the point. I am complaining of the Government playing to the gallery by saying they want to diminish betting and at the same time take a step to legalise it.

Mr. Scaddan: And put it through their own channels.

Mr. WALKER: Yes, and put it through their own channels.

Mr. Angwin: It is only to stop further action on the liquor question.

Mr. WALKER: That may be so. At any rate it is rank hypocrisy, and to do it in the way they advocate is still further evidence of what I must term hypocrisy, playing to the outside public or a certain section of it.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): The hon. member is an adept at that.

Mr. WALKER: At what?

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): At playing to the gallery.

Mr. WALKER: I am not ashamed of my playing to the gallery. I try to do it fairly and honestly, not by stating two things in the same breath. The Premier in one instance says he wants this Bill for revenue purposes, and purely for revenue purposes. In the same speech he says "Give us this Bill and we shall abolish the bookmaker, diminish the number of races and destroy the gambling evil, or go a long way in that direction."

The Premier: Will you quote my words?

Mr. WALKER: I am not allowed to.

The Premier: Do not let your imagination get the better of your memory.

Mr. WALKER: It is not doing so.

The Premier: You are quoting words I have never used.

Mr. WALKER: Is not that the meaning of them?

The Premier: No.

Mr. WALKER: Did not the Premier tell us that this would tend to lessen the number of horse-races?

Mr. Allen: It would be a good thing if it would do so.

Mr. WALKER: That is the point I am making. It is to diminish this evil—if it be an evil—

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): It would take the imagination of the hon. member to get that meaning out of what he has put into it.

Mr. WALKER: If the hon. member insists upon it I will try and get the paper containing the remarks.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Get it.

Mr. WALKER: Why does the hon. member desire to delay the House? He knows I am telling the truth. That is one of the arguments that he uses, that it will diminish the evil.

Mr. Allen: So it will.

Mr. WALKER: If it diminishes the evil it will not raise revenue. If it is a revenue Bill the evil must continue in order that revenue can be obtained. If it is to dim-

inish the evil then it will not produce revenue.

The Premier: The revenue tariff does not afford any protection to industries, I suppose?

Mr. WALKER: Not always.

The Premier: I say it does.

Mr. WALKER: If it does one of the things the hon. member says it does, that is, lessens the racing, and diminishes the evil to that extent, then it cannot be a revenue Bill. We were given some figures by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Smith) which put the case precisely so far as the revenue is concerned, and its relation to the supposed evil, that is, attendances at these gatherings. I am going to read from a similar extract to that read by the member for North Perth, and to take a meeting held on Wednesday, 1st November, 1915. There were 485 people at this meeting, and at this fixture 485 people paid for admission—

These people would, therefore, have to provide for an increased amount of £4,558, or just on £9 10s. per head. The totalisator investments were £1,358. The net profit on that amounted to £110 16s. 6d. The totalisator tax paid was £34 17s. 6d., the bookmaker's fees were £116 10s., and the totalisator fractions were £36 15s., a total of £153 5s. The revenue received from the totalisator and the bookmakers combined was £227 6s. 6d. To get this amount of £153 5s. at five per cent. which would be received under the new taxation scheme, it would have required £3,200 extra to have gone through on a total of £4,558, or nearly three and a-half times as much as went through at this fixture. This would have cost the Association an extra £153 5s., plus what they received from their totalisator without the fractions of £36 15s. as specified. The receipts from this problematical amount of £4,588 would then be—Government £341, at 7½ per cent. (ten times more than they receive at present); club £227, at 5 per cent. (working costs are nearly 4 per cent. in Western Australia), working expenses £114, or 15 per cent. of the total investments; a total of £682 or 15 per cent. on the total investments. If the fractions were al-

lowed to remain to the club the totalisator would require to put through £3,000 at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to give them the amount they now lose, namely, £225. This would give the Government, without the fractions, £150, or four and a-half times as much as they get at the present time. This is accounted for by the fact that although the proposed extra amount taken would only be doubled by the percentage rate from $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 5 per cent., the actual amount would be increased by the extra amount put through the machine. It is just problematical whether even this extra amount would go through.

Mr. Heitmann: How does this affect the Bill?

Mr. WALKER: If we are to trust these figures, and if this is to give revenue, this shows that we must expend, not £1,000 but £4,000 on the racecourse to get that amount.

Mr. Heitmann: You do not care whether the Treasurer gets the money or not. Where is your objection?

Mr. WALKER: I do care. I object to partial and limited taxation, to the special selection of a portion of the community which is to be penalised in this way instead of the whole of the community being dealt with.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Have you the returns of that particular racecourse that you quote, of the money which was handled by the bookmakers? If it was an unregistered course, it is said that they are generally pretty thick upon them.

Mr. Foley: On the unregistered course one can get a duplicate sheet of the betting which one cannot get on any other racecourse in the State.

Mr. WALKER: I would point out the inconsistency of the Premier's method of introducing the measure. It was one of absolute contradiction. One minute the Bill is to raise revenue, and the next minute it is to diminish the evil.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Which do you object to, raising revenue or curtailing racing?

Mr. WALKER: I object to raising revenue by these methods. The burden of the Government should be borne equally in pro-

portion to the capabilities of each citizen to pay, and there should not be any penalty for the choice of one particular sport. That is the position I take up.

Mr. Bolton: What about golfers paying extra?

Mr. WALKER: Quite so. I make a strong protest against the selection of those who delight in the excitement of seeing a good race horse, and I am objecting to the pharisaical nature of legislation of this kind in pretending that there is evil in betting and yet insisting that it should be legal, and making provision for its continuance and extension. I say that all this is hypocritical, and the Government cannot do any good by that species of legislation. Moreover, I say we cannot possibly destroy either by this Bill, or any other Bill, the instinct to bet, to wager, to gamble. The hon. member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) spoke of the bookmaker as a parasite, because he did not produce. What about the wheat buyer, may I ask?

Mr. Bolton: He produces nothing but debts.

Mr. WALKER: The member for Katanning is a wheat buyer. What does the wheat buyer produce? The wheat buyer is a gambler every time. He speculates.

Mr. Seaddan: One wheat buyer produced a million—John Darling.

Mr. WALKER: He won a million upon his gamble.

Mr. Bolton: He is a parasite.

Mr. WALKER: He gambles in the food supplies of the people. Is not much of our business life, indeed the whole of our life, a gamble? Take the farmers in this community. The life of every farmer is one continual gamble. He bets against the seasons.

Mr. S. Stubbs: We have proved that, have we not?

Mr. WALKER: We have lost heavily on the year's gamble in that direction. We wagered our labour, we wagered our fertiliser, we wagered our wheat, and we wagered our debts in the machinery department and seed wheat board, and I know not what. We have backed all that with the expectation of winning a big crop.

Mr. Seaddan: You ought to take a ticket on the place tote.

Mr. WALKER: On this point "Anson" in his famous work on the *Law of Contract* writes—

A wager is a promise to give money or money's worth upon the determination or ascertainment of an uncertain event; the consideration for such a promise is either something given by the other party, or a promise to give upon the event determining in a particular way. The event may be uncertain because it has not happened, or because it is not ascertained, at any rate to the knowledge of the parties. Thus a wager may be made upon the length of St. Paul's, or upon the result of an election which is over, though the parties do not know in whose favour it has gone. The uncertainty then resides in the minds of the parties, and the subject of the wager may be said to be rather the accuracy of each man's judgment than the determination of a particular event. But the parties must contemplate the determination of the uncertain event as the sole condition of their contract. One may thus distinguish a genuine wager from a conditional promise or a guarantee. If A promises to paint a portrait of X and X promises to pay £100 if M approves the likeness—this is a contract for the sale of a chattel, the payment to depend upon a condition. A agrees to do a piece of work, for which he is to be paid in the uncertain event of M's approval. If A, wishing to be sure that he gets something, promises D to pay him £20 if M approves, in consideration that D promises to pay A £10 if M does not approve—this is a wager on the uncertain event of M's decision. A bets D two to one that M does not approve. Again, if A desires X to advance £500 to M, and promises that if at the end of three months M does not pay he will,—this is a promise to answer for the debt or default of another. If A, wishing to secure himself against the possible default of M, were to promise D to pay him £100 if M satisfied his debt at the end of the three months, in consideration that D promised him £250 if M did not satisfy his debt—this would be a wager upon the solvency of M. It is obvious that a wager may be

a purely gambling or sporting transaction, or it may be directed to commercial objects. A man who bets against his horse winning the Derby is precisely in the same position as a man who bets against the safety of his own cargo. Yet we call the one a wager, while the other is called a contract of marine insurance. A has a horse likely to win the Derby, and therefore a prospect of a large return for money laid out in rearing and training the horse, in stakes and in bets; he wishes to secure that he shall in no event be a loser, and he agrees with X that, in consideration of X promising him £4,000 if his horse loses, he promises X £7,000 if his horse wins. The same is his position as owner of a cargo; he has a prospect of large profits on money laid out upon a cargo of silk; he wishes in no event to be a loser, and he agrees with X, an underwriter, that in consideration of his paying X £—, X promises to pay him £— if his cargo is lost by certain specified perils.

On the subject of life insurance "Anson" says—

A life insurance is in like manner a wager. Let us compare it with an undoubted wager of a similar kind. A is about to commence his innings in a cricket match, and he agrees with X that if X will promise to give him £1 at the end of his innings, he will pay X a shilling for every run he gets. A may be said to insure his innings as a man insures his life; for the ordinary contract of life insurance consists in this, that A agrees with X that if X will promise to pay a fixed sum on the happening of an event which must happen sooner or later, A will pay to X so much for every year that elapses until the event happens. In each of these cases A sooner or later becomes entitled to a sum larger than any of the individual sums which he agrees to pay. On the other hand, he may have paid so many of these sums before the event takes place that he is ultimately a loser by the transaction. So that we see the meaning of the commercial dealings of life which involving the spirit of betting. We cannot eliminate that spirit from human nature. We are every day of our lives risking something with the

expectation of something happening for our benefit. It is so all through. We are not going to get rid of the instinct of gambling by a pettifogging leaflet of a Bill such as we have before us.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Why did your Government bring in a similar Bill?

Mr. WALKER: We did not; it was quite different. These mere sticking-plaster measures over a sore that simply hide the sore, if it be a sore, do no good. So long as life's future is uncertain we are bound to have the betting instinct. We are putting our money in the Savings Bank for the purpose of providing something for the future in the event of necessity. The whole career of man is one of the dread possibility of want, and whilst that dread possibility of want is inherent and goes with us through life, we cannot kill the instinct to try and get rich quickly if a chance occurs. We cannot possibly by machinery of this kind stop the gambling instinct. We cannot prevent the bookmaker from operating, but we may drive the gambling instinct into a hidden space and make illegal that which is now done openly.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): This is not an amendment of the Police Act; it is a taxation measure.

Mr. WALKER: It is held by the Premier that even this measure will have an effect in the way I have described. The Premier says this is a fair way to raise revenue and at the same time to minimise horse-racing. He pretends to have the measure double-barrelled. He says it will remedy an evil which has been allowed to grow to unwarranted dimensions.

The Premier: Is that from *Hansard*?

Mr. WALKER: I am quoting the hon. member's speech. It is what the hon. member said. It is a Bill of a double-barrelled character, and as such I condemn it. The Premier will not raise the revenue he hopes to do. For a time he may, but the ultimate effect will be a diminution of racing and then the destruction of it. The Bill will defeat the object the Premier has in view. The love of horse-racing is not demoralising. We cannot do away with the bookmaker any more than we can with betting. In no part of the world where an attempt has been

made to prohibit betting has it succeeded. In South Australia and New Zealand it has been shown that bookmakers still exist and is possible to bet in the same way as before. The only difference is that it is illegal and there is a moral stigma about betting. Here there is nothing immoral about it and the consequence is that the degradation and secrecy and evasion of the law is not in evidence, and that is something to be considered.

The Minister for Works: Do you propose to restrict the operations of the bookmaker?

Mr. WALKER: That can be done by regulation, but not through any process of taxation and not by punishing those who love the sport and who believe in it, and not by class or sectional taxation. I believe in doing the thing frankly and fearlessly as part of the policy of the Government. The Government are capable of judging how a race should be run. Let them fix the dates and places of racing and then they can regulate the bookmaker and betting by saying that it shall not be done in the public street. I am with the Government in suppressing street betting, but on the race-course I would sooner bet with a human creature than I would with a machine through a window. I consider the Bill will not serve its purpose either in ultimately raising the required revenue or in destroying the evil. I shall vote against the Bill.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [9.0]: My remarks will be brief, because I realise that a good deal of time has been taken up by those members who have spoken from experience on the question and can claim to be authorities on the subject. Personally I have little knowledge of the subject dealt with in the Bill, and knowing little, I do not propose wearying the House by a repetition of the many arguments which have been advanced. I wish, however, to express regret that the Premier should have brought on this Bill before the passage of another Bill in another place. It would be infinitely preferable if in dealing with this Bill we knew exactly where we stood and had absolute knowledge of the action being taken by the Government in regard to the abolition of bookmakers. The last speaker after quoting several authorities on contracts wound up with an attack on the totalisator. Person-

ally I have no objection whatever to the totalisator. I believe the two systems of betting could be carried on side by side. I am prepared to help the Premier to obtain that extra revenue which I believe he is in need of; but like other members who have spoken I think he is on the wrong track when he supposes that he is going to abolish the bookmaker. The remarks of the member for North Perth (Mr. Smith) should, I think, convince him on that point. Some months ago I was on a racecourse in Adelaide and I there saw bookmakers openly plying their trade. I was told by reputable men in that State that many of those who were supposed to be watching for the purpose of putting down the nefarious practice of betting, were shutting their eyes to it, and that temptation was placed in the road of the police. When the Bill for the suppression of street betting comes before this House, I shall support it; but some of the clauses are, in my opinion, too drastic and place too much power in the hands of the authorities. The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) spoke disparagingly of the bookmakers' calling. I have no wish to be the champion of the bookmaker; but I think the member for Katanning, like the Premier, has not that actual knowledge of the question which is gained from personal experience by frequenting racecourses to make it possible for them to give a true and correct opinion on the matter to this House. The Premier has a big call on us in regard to most subjects, but I think on this question he would be wise were he to accept the advice given him by hon. members on this side and even by some members on his own side.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): What do you recommend?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I recommend that the two systems of betting be run side by side, the Government to take control if they wish, the bookmaker to be licensed by them, the Government to make arrangements with the club to take over the bookmakers' fees. By running the two systems side by side there would be ensured that amount of patronage which would give an even greater revenue than the Premier expects to raise under this Bill. The Premier proposes in

this Bill to abolish the bookmaker, believing—

The Premier: There is nothing in this Bill about abolishing the bookmaker.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Premier was debating the point for three-quarters of an hour explaining how detrimental to the interests of the community the bookmaker was.

The Premier: I did not speak for anything like three-quarters of an hour. You had better read my speech.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The whole of the debate on this Bill has turned on the question of the abolition of the bookmaker.

Mr. Angwin: Yes, on the wrong Bill.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Premier set the House a bad example.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! This Bill has nothing to do with the question of the abolition of the bookmaker. This is a Bill to increase the totalisator tax.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is dealt with in another Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know anything about any other Bill.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Several members of this Chamber have been speaking about another Bill. They have referred to the abolition of the bookmaker and I think I am in order in referring to the remarks made by the member for Katanning who made a serious indictment of the bookmaker's calling. The member for Katanning aspires to be a leader of the moral forces of this State, and like the member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) he is the white-haired boy of those moral forces. But I am quite certain the member for Katanning has not had that experience to justify him branding as black the whole of the people who follow that calling. In my opinion, members on this side of the House are justified in opposing the second reading of this Bill if only as a protest against this form of taxation. We have fought for an equitable system of taxation which will not single out one section of the community, whether they be patrons of the racecourse or of picture shows. That is what is contemplated by the present Government, and I am justified in entering my protest. The member for Katanning has referred to the bookmaker as a parasite. That term, with equally good reasons as

those given by the member for Katanning, might be applied to many other callings, agents, auctioneers, and others who operate with other people's money. With regard to the fractions this question was seriously taken in hand in Queensland, where, after the matter had been one of long standing abuse, the Government seized the whole of the fractions.

Member: What was the objection to that?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not objecting. It was the result of an agitation. The public was being defrauded of a large sum of money through the fractions, the Queensland Turf Club retaining the lot.

Member: That is what they are doing here.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: There was a public agitation in Queensland, and the Government now earmarks all the fractions, which go into the Treasury. We have to admit that racing in Western Australia is on a different plane from that in New Zealand. In New Zealand racing is supported by wealthy owners, consequently they are not dependent upon betting transactions to make ends meet. In Western Australia many people in a small way of business have established themselves in the racing business, have put their savings into it; and if the Premier anticipates that this extra impost on racing will bring him in anything like £60,000 from the racing community, he will find that he is very far out in his estimate. Because when the owners find themselves compelled to put their money through the machine they will leave the State. We have many splendid owners in Western Australia and they will take their strings of horses to the Eastern States where they will be received with open arms, and so also will the bookmakers who as a class are most generous. It has to be remembered that so far as the registered bookmaker is concerned, there is a guarantee to the speculating public that the bookmaker's word is his bond. I challenge the hon. member to give one instance in recent years in Western Australia where a registered bookmaker "took the knock." Week by week, on the other hand, members of the speculating public take the knock and the bookmaker has to suffer.

Mr. Allen: If he has not got the money he cannot pay.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: As a business man he should see that he has the money. I do not think an hon. member can give me the name of one bookmaker in recent years who has not met his obligations. But it frequently happens that the speculating public do not recognise their just liabilities to the bookmaker. If this impost on racing is passed, not only will it mean the driving away of several racing strings from Western Australia, but also the best of the bookmakers. And it will mean the diverting of their brains to illegitimate channels. It means simply that the betting people of Western Australia will wire money out of the State which is badly wanted here. I have not been on a racecourse for the past 12 months. I am not a racing man, though I like racing as a pastime; but I do not think the member for Katanning and the member for Bunbury should belong to the kill joy brigade and say that because they like football we should not have racecourses.

Mr. Thomas: I never suggested that we should not have racecourses.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If this Bill be passed the member for Katanning will find there will be an end to the business, because of the absence of the competitive spirit amongst the bookmakers. As I have already said, when in Adelaide I saw half a dozen bookmakers on racecourses plying their calling where it is supposed to be illegal for them to operate. And if this Bill be passed, a similar position will arise here. If it is expected that the police will put down betting, I do not think the hope will be realised.

Mr. Allen: That is a serious reflection on the police.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: But if it is possible to suppress betting by this means, why is it that they have not stopped betting in the last 10 years?

The Premier: Because the law is defective.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Why do they not stop it in New South Wales and in New Zealand?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I was wondering what was the point to which the hon. member was leading.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I was speaking of the position in New South Wales as it affects the totalisator and the bookmaker running side by side. If I have not made it clear to you, Sir, I will endeavour to explain it. With regard to the position in New South Wales there has been a public agitation for many years for the legalisation of the totalisator, and it has been openly asserted in many journals that the public men had been got at in order to defeat the Totalisator Bill. That charge has been refuted, but it is stated that the Parliament of New South Wales was afraid to do its duty. I do not subscribe to that opinion. I believe that Mr. Holman of New South Wales is as honest and sincere as any man in public life, and I think that if Mr. Holman, with a full knowledge and experience of the matter in question, did the right thing when instead of wiping out the bookmaker he decided to run the bookmaker and the totalisator side by side. That decision has resulted in enormous revenue being raised in New South Wales and also in Victoria. This Bill seeks chiefly to deal with the abolition of the bookmaker and to force the money of the betting public through the totalisator. The hon. the Premier—

On procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think this debate is somewhat out of order. This Bill does not deal with the question of the abolition of the bookmaker. I have been reading the speech delivered by the Premier on the second reading, and in the course of that speech he said that one of the objects the Government had in mind was the abolition of the bookmaker. That is not the question before the House and I must ask the hon. member not to discuss it further.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I regret that you did not give your instructions earlier. It surely is an extraordinary position—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has no right to make any remarks on my ruling. If my ruling is not right, there is a proper course to be followed.

Mr. Scaddan: May I be permitted to point out that this is a measure dealing with the question of the raising of revenue contingent upon the abolition of the bookmaker.

That being so, members are surely entitled to point out that if instead of abolishing the bookmaker we control his operations by confining him to racecourses, and taxing him and also taxing the sport by means of a totalisator tax, we will get more revenue than by the means proposed by the Premier in this Bill. One cannot do that except in the way in which the member for Forrest has endeavoured to do it. The Bill which is for an increase of the totalisator tax is contingent on the abolition of the bookmaker and the member for Forrest is attempting to point out that the bookmaker should be allowed to continue his calling.

The Minister for Works: You are disputing the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Scaddan: As leader of the Opposition am I not entitled to discuss a question of procedure without being subjected to a lesson on procedure by the Minister for Works?

Mr. Speaker: The only ruling I have given is that the major portion of the remarks made on this Bill to-night apply more properly to a Bill for the abolition of the bookmaker. The arguments adduced have been on the question whether the bookmaker shall be retained or shall be abolished. Such remarks do not apply to the Bill now under discussion. The question whether the bookmaker is to be retained or abolished is not dealt with in this Bill. The hon. member must confine his remarks to the subject matter of the Bill.

Debate resumed.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: May I remark that from the point of view from which I am speaking—and that is, the bookmaker on registered courses—we are going to get a second Bill to discuss. The Bill that is coming from another place deals only with the suppression of street and shop betting. The Government have now the power to abolish bookmakers on registered courses, without consulting Parliament at all. Consequently, if members had not taken the opportunity which they have taken of discussing possible contingencies, the Government could take action as regards bookmakers on registered courses without Parliament being consulted at all. Undoubtedly, the Government can

take that action; but it is a question of members on both sides of the House giving their individual opinions as to the possible operations of this particular law, which opinions may induce the Government to take another course. That has been the object of members on both sides of the House—to assist the Premier to get additional revenue without killing the sport. I believe that the result of this legislation will be to kill the sport, because public patronage will fall off to such an extent, when the machine only is in operation, that the investments will decline considerably and that racing will be in a parlous position. If the main object of the Government is the obtaining of additional revenue, we are prepared to give it to them.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): What part of the Bill are you objecting to?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not objecting to the Bill, or to particular clauses; but I am objecting to the Premier's diverting into the totalisator all that money from which he expects to obtain revenue. I believe that it has been demonstrated that the Premier will not get that revenue. If the measure is carried, it can never be enforced, because there will be a lot of betting under the lap; and the result will not be to the benefit of the community as a whole. For hours past the debate has hinged on the Government's proposed abolition of the bookmaker for the purpose of getting more revenue from the totalisator. The estimate submitted to the House in this connection was framed on the basis of the money which the Premier was to receive from the totalisator but which now goes to the bookmakers. If this legislation is enacted, however, the best of the bookmakers will leave Western Australia and register in the Eastern States, where they will be welcomed, and those bookmakers who do not leave will bet in defiance of the law—they will bet in the streets every day when a race meeting is being held. On a question of this description one cannot but admire the attitude of the leader of the Opposition. That hon. member does not gamble; he rarely goes to race meetings; but he is sufficiently broad and tolerant in his outlook on public affairs

to say that although he personally does not patronise that form of sport he declines to interfere with those who do patronise it. Betting, let me point out, is not confined to Australia; but, wherever the British race is domiciled, there is the gambling spirit to be found.

Mr. Scaddan: The war is a gamble, unfortunately.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If the farmer sows a bushel of wheat he expects to reap a bag. If a man goes on the stock exchange it is in the hope of gain. The goddess of chance is worshipped by all of us. In connection with the American Presidential election, we are told, a million dollars is hung up pending the decision of the ballot box. Wherever the white race is to be found, and indeed wherever other races exist, there is a spirit of gambling; and I believe that spirit will be in evidence as long as the world goes round. Well-judged legislation would endeavour to control that spirit, and get it into clean channels, rather than, in a greed for revenue, bring about a state of affairs which will not reflect credit on the community.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [9.25]: The Premier has stated that this Bill is one purely for revenue purposes, and I shall approach the measure, and also the measure contingent upon it, purely from the utility point of view. I am with the Premier in his desire to raise revenue, and I consider that this is one of the taxable sources which we may rightly approach. But I must part company with the Premier when he expresses the belief that he will either get additional revenue from this proposed legislation or diminish racing in Western Australia to any appreciable extent. If I thought that to any practical extent the hon. gentleman would get the results which he desires, I would have pleasure in supporting the Bill. I believe that many men who bet—particularly owners and those associated with owners—indulge in ante-post betting on all important events. It is useless, therefore, for the Premier to imagine that any of the money turned over in ante-post betting would be diverted to the totalisator even if the abolition of the bookmaker were brought about. I desire to bring under the Premier's notice, in a few words, the posi-

tion of the Kalgoorlie Racing Club from their point of view, if this and the contingent measure are carried. Last year the club paid for water alone to the Government £1,300. For railage on horses alone they paid about £1,200. They are emphatic—and I do not implicitly accept the word of horse owners, but I do accept the word of those disinterested sportsmen whose opinion is practically unchallengeable—in stating that if the Premier persists in taxing the totalisator to the extent of a further 2½ per cent., and also brings about the abolition of the bookmaker, racing, at all events on the goldfields, will, if not entirely cease, very materially diminish. During the 11 years' operation of the present Totalisator Act the Government have received from the Kalgoorlie Racing Club alone about £30,000. That is a fair sum. Let the Premier ask himself whether he can expect that sum from the Kalgoorlie Racing Club under this proposed legislation? Then, from bookmakers alone last year the club received £1,300. That revenue of £1,300 will be wiped off immediately on the passage of the measure which we can reasonably anticipate will be laid before this Chamber.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): What about the extra 2½ per cent. which the clubs are going to get?

Mr. Scaddan: No; they are not going to get it.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Kalgoorlie Racing Club emphatically state that if the Bill which is expected in this Chamber should be carried they will lose £1,300 per annum in bookmakers' fees alone. They also said—and I believe with a deal of force and persuasion—that very little of the money which goes through that channel will be diverted to the totalisator. I do not think, therefore, that the Premier can anticipate any great increase in the turnover in that direction. That is the opinion held by men who are qualified to form one, and whose opinion I accept, not knowing much about the subject myself. I could not, and anticipating another measure, support this Bill in its present form. The Government should make a reasonable attempt to minimise racing in Western Australia. I believe that this indiscriminate racing throughout Western Australia is detrimental to the interests of

the country and that if the Premier did make an attempt in that direction he would be supported by probably nine-tenths of the population of the State.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): You admit that the Bill is going to do that, and yet you object to it.

Mr. LAMBERT: I was quoting the opinions of other people. I was not stating my own opinion, but that of prominent racing men in Kalgoorlie. I believe that the Premier would have been justified in bringing in one comprehensive measure dealing with racing and the whole of the relationship of the totalisator and bookmaker to racing in Western Australia. Had he brought down a comprehensive measure of this description he would have had practically the unanimous support of the House. We find a Bill introduced here to raise revenue, and there are other measures which we can anticipate will be brought before us dealing with another phase of betting or gambling on the racecourses and we are not in a position, as this Bill has been brought down, to get any information as to the exact relationship of betting to racing when the Bill leaves the Chamber. I should like to see the Premier deal with the amount of racing which should exist in Western Australia. It is regrettable to see women betting at the trotting meetings in the evening. I hardly see the necessity of trotting taking place in the metropolitan area at night time, but possibly on the goldfields, where the climatic conditions are different, and where the attractions are few, there is just the semblance of an excuse for night racing. For the life of me I cannot see in a beautiful city like Perth, where we have the attractions of the river and the beach and a hundred and one other attractions to take our sport-loving population away, why we should have night racing.

Mr. Scaddan: Is it not a matter for the public who patronise it to say whether they shall have night racing or not?

Mr. LAMBERT: It is not my own opinion.

Mr. Scaddan: Why is it not so? Why should picture shows be open at night time and why should we have church services at night time?

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know. It is absurd for the leader of the Opposition to try and side-track the matter in this way. I understand he attends church. If he does not he looks the part and I accept his advice in that direction. He apparently mixes his sport.

Mr. Scaddan: I never try to dictate to others what form of sport they should follow.

Mr. LAMBERT: I have no desire to dictate to others. I was only indicating what I consider to be a benevolent way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. Scaddan: What benevolence is there in advocating that the people should go to day racing and not to night racing?

Mr. SPEAKER: This Bill does not provide for either day or night racing, neither does it provide for the abolition of racing. The Bill provides for a totalisator tax for the purpose of raising revenue.

Mr. LAMBERT: I thought I was justified in making a few passing references to what I considered were some of the abuses attached to racing. I am not like the leader of the Opposition, a bit of a mixed wowser in this direction. I am prepared to accept the advice of others.

Mr. Scaddan: I can be a wowser in the daylight or the dark, but evidently you cannot.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am prepared to accept the opinions of those whose opinions are worth having upon the utility of this Bill, and I believe that the Premier will find very little utility in the measure from the point of view of raising revenue. I wish that, even if this Bill was defeated, some reasonable and sincere effort could be made in the direction of curtailing racing in the State. Theoretically, I do not believe in the proprietary clubs running racecourses for private gain or profit. We have, however, the instance of the Kalgoorlie racing clubs giving the whole of their earnings during the war to patriotic funds. It is a splendid lead which could be well followed by other clubs in Western Australia. I think these proprietary clubs which are making big money out of racing in Western Australia could contribute to a larger extent to the revenue of the State than they are now

doing. If the Premier could show some desire to tax those who could be rightly taxed in that direction I should have much pleasure in supporting him.

Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle) [9.40]: I should like to offer a few remarks on the Bill, purely from the point of view of revenue. A few months ago, when the Premier sat on this side of the House, he kept up a constant and sustained bombardment against the Treasury benches, because, as he put it, the ship of State was heading for the financial rocks. When the then Treasurer brought down proposals for heading the ship off by raising the necessary revenue—

Mr. Taylor: In a legitimate manner.

Mr. CARPENTER: The then leader of the Opposition, who is now the Premier, just as consistently opposed every effort which was made to raise that revenue. I remember that on one occasion the then Treasurer appealed to him as to what ought to be done, and his reply was that when the ship was going on the rocks there was only one thing to do, and that was to change the pilot. The pilot has been changed through some political accident, and so far as one can judge, the ship of State is going as straight for the rocks as ever she was.

Mr. Taylor: She is on them.

Mr. CARPENTER: If anything, she is going more rapidly than ever towards them.

Mr. Green: She will soon be in the hands of the pirates.

Mr. CARPENTER: Although we have had promises from the present Treasurer as to what is going to be done to restore confidence and put everything right which has been made wrong by his predecessors, up to the present we do not know just what is to be done. So far, this is the first proposal for raising fresh revenue. It occurs to me that it is like trying to save a water-logged ship with a soup ladle. If the Premier has not got anything more statesmanlike than this to save the ship of State from financial wreckage, we are bound to get on the rocks, and that very soon.

Mr. Green: Put the old captain back.

Mr. CARPENTER: I am quite sure that every party in the House and outside of it, is thoroughly agreed as to the necessity for

putting our finances straight. I have on more than one occasion, on both sides of the House, raised my voice in advocacy of some honest method of taxation, in order to make both ends meet. I have tried to point out that for years past the State's income cannot possibly meet the expenditure. We had the assurance of the present Premier, and we have it still at times, that all the wrong which has been done by the Government which preceded his Government could have been avoided, and that he is the man to save the situation and to bring us back to financial prosperity.

The Minister for Works: Do you not think so?

Mr. Taylor: Not by your last month's returns.

Mr. CARPENTER: I do not think that anyone is of that opinion. The last time I mentioned financial matters in the House I quoted the saying of a prominent Liberal outside who declared that he had been waiting in vain to see the Premier do something adequately to square the finances, and that he had come to the conclusion that the present Government had obtained office under false pretences.

The Minister for Works: We are a bad lot then?

Mr. Angwin: You could not be worse.

Mr. CARPENTER: We agree that additional revenue must be raised. There are two methods of raising it, namely, one by a straight-out, honest taxation proposal which the preceding Government tried on several occasions to pass, and another, the indirect method of taking from the people surreptitiously, under the guise of increased charges for services rendered, an impost which ought not to be laid upon them in that form. We have so far increased railway rates, which amount to indirect taxation, and we have the promise of the amusement tax.

The Minister for Works: And you will get it.

Mr. CARPENTER: If the Government intend to bring down anything like a comprehensive amusement tax, why have they not brought it down in a comprehensive form instead of in a piecemeal fashion like this? Why have they given us the first instalment, dealing with one section of the

community only, and promising at the same time that when we shall have penalised that particular section they will bring down a Bill for the next section? Having got one section enmeshed, the Government will then expect support from them in getting someone else into the net along with themselves. If that is statesmanship I am sorry we have such an exhibition of it from the present Government. The whole of the people recognise that we must have additional revenue, and, so far as I can gather, everybody is prepared to do his share to meet the extra impost which, it is seen, is inevitable. The complaint I hear is that the delay, the dallying with the thing which the present Government are guilty of, is making matters so much worse. Because our Federal Parliament, facing the position honestly from their own point of view and raising revenue for their own purposes, do not wait to see which way the financial cat is going to jump, but say to the people of Australia "We want so much money, and we propose to get it by levying taxation in a certain form." And they do it, and every time they do it the chance of a State Government levying taxation on similar lines becomes more remote. I see by the newspapers that only yesterday, when in the course of his reply to a deputation the Premier spoke of an amusement tax which he proposed to bring in, the deputation said, "The Federal Government are going to tax our amusements"; and the Premier said "That will not prevent me from putting on an additional tax." But what will be the state of public feeling if we get a Federal amusement tax first and then the State Treasurer comes along and says "I also want an amusement tax," and imposes it on top of the Federal tax?

Mr. A. A. Wilson: The people will not go to amusements.

Mr. CARPENTER: It has been pointed out during the debate that, so far from raising revenue, the result must be to deter people from spending money in this particular direction, and the Premier will not secure anything like the amount he hopes to get. If, as I say, we get first of all a Federal amusement tax and, on top of that, a State amusement tax, people will not spend

so much money in amusements, and the amount returned from the tax will not be anything like the sum the Treasurer hopes for. The Government have not faced the position honestly, as the people expected them to do. They have not come along with a comprehensive taxation scheme and said, "We must have this money to keep the ship of State sailing." They have tried to sound public opinion to find the line of least resistance, until to-day the trouble with which they are faced is bigger than ever before. I regard this as a pettifoggish measure which is not going to help them in any degree, and is going to antagonise a section of the taxpayers and make them less ready to meet an honest taxation Bill when it comes down, if ever it does. Although I am quite prepared to admit that the principle of taxing amusements—because I regard them as luxuries—is a sound one, while I am quite prepared to promise support to any Bill which contains to any equitable degree the principle of taxing luxuries—

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Is not racing a luxury?

Mr. CARPENTER: I am prepared to support any comprehensive Bill which taxes sports, amusements, or other luxuries as luxuries, but I cannot see my way clear to support a half measure of this sort which, as I have said, is simply playing with the question, and, so far from raising the revenue which the Premier expects, will not do it, but will simply antagonise the people and make them less ready for comprehensive taxation.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth) [9.52]: When the Premier introduced the Bill I was under the impression that it was a taxation measure pure and simple, taking power to increase the tax levied on the totalisator by the Government. That is the whole essence of the Bill.

Mr. Bolton: No, it is not; according to the Premier it is to reduce racing.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): A great deal has been said in regard to bookmakers. Why members should go out of their way to stand sponsors for the bookmakers on a Bill which provides an extra tax on the totalisator is altogether beyond me. It is hard to understand the

advocacy of the bookmakers on a measure which does not touch the subject.

Mr. Underwood: The Premier introduced the question of the bookmakers when he introduced the Bill.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Not to the extent the hon. member would infer. The Premier correctly remarked that we are in troublous times in respect to finance.

Mr. Bolton: We showed him how to get the revenue.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I do not think the hon. member showed the Premier much on the subject of finance. The Premier remarked that we were faced with a deficit of a million and three-quarters. It is necessary to do something to reduce that deficit, and to meet our just obligations, to find the necessary interest on money that has been borrowed.

Mr. Scaddan: You had net revenue from the trading concerns over and above the interest bill.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Allowing that to go for the sake of argument, there is still a deficit and a crying need for further taxation.

Mr. Underwood: Why charge it up to the people who go racing?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): This is a tax on amusements.

Mr. Underwood: On a few individuals.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): So is every tax. The hon. member need not worry about that. The other sections will get their turn soon enough. Unfortunately, it will be necessary to tax all sections. We are in a state of war, and I ask, is there any more legitimate means of taxation to supplement our falling revenue in war time than a tax on racing?

Mr. Bolton: We agree. Tax the bookmaker.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The issue before the House is not the question of what good fellows the bookmakers are, or what fine places unregistered racecourses may be. That is not the question. Certain hon. members may possess a very special knowledge on this particular point. They are welcome to that special knowledge. I do not envy them anything in that regard. But the issue before

the House is, are we justified in withholding from the Government full support on a tax on totalisator dividends to supplement our falling revenue in war time? Even though it wiped out racing altogether, is there any real argument to adduce why there should be racing in war time at all?

Mr. Bolton: If you knock it out where will you get your revenue from?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I am not talking about knocking out racing at all. I repeat that this is a taxation measure. It is a legitimate measure in war time. It has been asked, why bring it down piecemeal, why not bring down a comprehensive taxation measure? The totalisator in this State is governed by a special Act, and the tax levied by the Government on the totalisator is also governed by a special Act. I know of no way of dealing with a special Act except by a direct amendment of that Act. Therefore, there is no other way of bringing down a measure under which to derive more revenue from the totalisator than by a direct amendment of the Totalisator Act.

Mr. Bolton: Do you say it was fair to issue the order for the abolition of bookmakers while this Bill was before the House?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): There is no connection between the two. At any rate there is nothing unfair about the abolition of the bookmaker. It is perfectly right. It is only carrying out our duties as a Government. If the bookmakers were abolished at five minutes' notice, it must be remembered that they are illegal and their operations are breaking the law every day on which they continue.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why is the law allowed to be broken?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Because it is defective, and we desire later on to amend it so that the Government may give true effect to the law on the statute-book to-day.

Mr. Bolton: The Bill is contingent on that other Bill.

Mr. Foley: Why not abolish the bookmaker on the street?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I refuse to discuss the bookmaker.

This is a taxation measure to levy an extra tax on the totalisator.

Mr. Thomas: If it is a taxation measure it is unfair.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): In one breath hon. members appear to be extremely anxious as to what effect this will have on the racing clubs; then they express great anxiety that the Treasurer shall have more revenue. They have no interest in other things. We are told that the great objection to this measure is that it takes the fractions and that in consequence horse-racing will be killed in Western Australia. Last year the fractions amounted to £12,000 and it is contended that if we take this sum of money a reduction in stakes will follow. Last year there were held no fewer than 261 race meetings, so that the fractions amounted to approximately £50 per race meeting. We have been told by the member for Murchison (Mr. Holman) that breeders will not run their horses because the stakes will be too small. I venture to say that they are the very men who will continue to race their horses. This taxation will not suit the professional horse owner or the man who has one horse only. He is the one who requires large stakes.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I do not think the public will patronise the machine. They do not patronise it to-day with the two systems running side by side.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The hon. member need not concern himself about that. If the hon. member is right in his contention that he wishes to help the Treasurer to get more revenue, let him support the Bill. If it will not work out then the Bill can be altered.

Mr. Bolton: In the meantime you will abolish the bookmaker.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): We had a lecture this evening by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Walker) and we were called cold-blooded for being desirous of abolishing the bookmaker so that the money might be put into a cold, unfeeling machine. I find on looking up *Hansard* that the member for Kanowna was a member of the late Scaddan Government in 1911 when they introduced an amendment of the Totalisator Act, the main principle of which was to enable the State to assume

control of the machine. Prior to that the Western Australian Turf Club, the governing body of racing, had control of the totalisator, but in this Bill of 1911, which the then Treasurer introduced, the object was to take control of it, and that was the first time such a proposal was ever made. The member for Kanowna was a member of that Administration and now he will not support the measure introduced by the present Government because he says it is too mechanical.

Mr. Foley: That Bill did not provide for the alteration of the percentages they were going to take from the machine.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The leader of the Opposition, speaking on the second reading of the measure a few evenings ago, said he had no intention of opposing the Bill because he recognised that under existing conditions the State was justified in calling upon those who indulged in sport and amusement to contribute something additional to the revenue. That was a fair and manly statement to make and it was consistent with the attitude the leader of the Opposition took up when he occupied the position of State Treasurer. His supporters, however, are not consistent.

Mr. Scaddan: What did I say in conclusion? You only partly quote my remarks just to suit your purpose. I said in conclusion—

I want it to be known that I am not hostile to the proposal to increase the totalisator duty, but I do not consider it desirable to tax the fractions and the unclaimed dividends or at any rate not to go beyond taking 5 per cent. as suggested by the member for Wagin.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The hon. member said he had no intention of opposing the second reading and he recognised that under existing conditions we should call upon those who indulged in sport and amusement to contribute something additional to the revenue.

Mr. Scaddan: I said distinctly I would not support it unless it was modified.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The leader of the Opposition, when Treasurer in 1911, spoke as follows:—

While they have so far assisted the West Australian Trotting Association by

permitting them to hold trotting races on one of the registered racecourses, they point out that, under their rules, they cannot permit them to make use of the totalisator, because only clubs registered by the Western Australian Turf Club can make use of the totalisator machine, that is, under their Act. Viewed from another standpoint, to-day we are making use of the totalisator as a means for obtaining revenue, and while we exclude the totalisator from some sports gatherings we do not exclude the bookmaker. If we are going to allow betting at sports gatherings it is better to encourage people to bet through the totalisator, which cannot be up to the tricks of the bookmaker, and thus benefit the State.

Mr. Scaddan: What has this to do with the tax on the totalisator?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Supporters of the leader of the Opposition to-day are opposing this measure, forsooth, because it will injure the bookmaker. In 1911, when the leader of the Opposition introduced the Bill as a taxation measure, he said that if people were going to gamble it was better that they should put their money on the totalisator than with the bookmakers who were up to all kinds of tricks.

Mr. Thomas: That would be an argument in favour of the abolition of the bookmaker, but not to unjustly tax the people. The whole thing is contained in that.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The whole argument on that side has been this: Do not raise the tax because by doing so we shall make it impossible for the bookmaker to live.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Are we discussing bookmakers?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I am replying to arguments which have been used. We are told a great deal about the injury which will be done to racing clubs. I think I know something about horse-racing.

Mr. Bolton: You do not know a horse from a cow.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The hon. member may know something about unregistered racecourses, and I

will give him credit for having that knowledge.

Mr. Bolton: It is not courses, but horses that we are discussing.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The hon. member and a number of other frequenters of the unregistered courses call themselves sports, but I claim to know something about the sport itself and about horses.

Mr. Bolton: You do not.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I know more about horses than 95 per cent. of the frequenters of unregistered course. I am a member of a *bona fide* turf club, not a proprietary nor an unregistered course. I have been an owner of horses and I have indulged in amateur racing in Queensland. I do not, however, desire to be classed with that type of man known as the tout of the racecourse, who is not by any means a sport.

Mr. Thomas: How will the fact that you are increasing the tax do away with the abuse?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): We offer every opportunity and encouragement to-day to all the touts to whom I have referred by not being able to enforce the Police Act. What do we see in St. George's-terrace daily?

Mr. Bolton: Why do you not stop it?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Because it is not in the power of this or any other Government to do so. The Government, however, are taking an early opportunity of getting rid of that exercise which exists in our streets to-day.

Mr. Bolton: I am supporting that, and you know it. Do not put a halo round your head.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Let the hon. member be straightforward and take up a definite attitude on the Bill and not side-track it. This is a Bill to increase the taxation through the totalisator.

Mr. Bolton: No fear.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): And there is no reason why it should not be passed except that it is being opposed in the interests of one class, the bookmakers. The argument has not been adduced that the Bill will not produce additional revenue, and so long as it will do that members are not

justified in voting against the taxation of race meetings in war time. That is the position.

Mr. Foley: The Premier said it was a Bill to diminish racing.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter) admits that we must have additional revenue, and the present leader of the Opposition when Premier and wanted additional revenue claimed that this was a legitimate form of taxation. The leader of the Opposition then said that it was a fair thing to tax people who indulged in sport.

Mr. Scaddan: I do not think any member will be found on this side of the House opposed to the proposal to increase by 2½ per cent. the totalisator taxation, standing by itself.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): What does the hon. member object to, then?

Mr. Scaddan: The fractions and the unclaimed dividends, and the abolition of the bookmaker.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I can understand the attitude of the leader of the Opposition provided he intends voting for the second reading.

Mr. Scaddan: Not unless the bookmakers are permitted on the racecourse.

The Minister for Works: You can do that in Committee.

Mr. Scaddan: I will not.

The Premier: He is twisting again.

Mr. Foley: That is a charitable remark.

The Premier: It is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Honorary Minister will proceed.

Mr. Scaddan: Is the Premier permitted to make such a remark?

Mr. SPEAKER: What was the remark?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The leader of the Opposition certainly is not consistent when he says that he will not support the Bill because one clause is not right.

Mr. Holman: It is a Bill of only one clause.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The Government proposes taking the fractions and the leader of the Opposition says that it is a legitimate way for the Government to raise revenue; still, he wants us

only to raise part. What harm will be done by passing the second reading? Let me say that the fractions amounted during last year to the sum of £12,000 at 261 race meetings including the trots, or an average of about £50 for each race meeting.

Mr. Allen: To whom do the fractions belong?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): They were commandeered by the Turf Club for years in Queensland until the Government stepped in. The member for Forrest appears to agree with the taking of the fractions but he does not agree with the proposed $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. additional taxation. It seems to me the whole thing should go into Committee, and then members could vote on their respective amendments.

Mr. Scaddan: You cannot impose a tax of £50,000 on the sport in Western Australia without killing it.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): If we raise this taxation to $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as proposed in the Bill, or even if we double it and make it 25 per cent., we would not kill the sport here. It might probably have the effect of reducing the number of race meetings. I believe that if the number of race meetings were only 161 instead of 261, the amount of money going through the totalisator would be the same. The same people are concerned and the same amount of money. The question has nothing whatever to do with the bookmaker; it is not a question of the life or death of the bookmaker. I wish to draw attention to the fact that the Bill has been side-tracked on this bookmaker question for the purpose of trying to save the bookmaker. I have just as good an opinion of the legitimate bookmaker as any which has been expressed here to-night. But there is certain element amongst the class for which I have not the same good opinion and I say that it is in the interests of that element that the Bill is being side-tracked by the Opposition.

Mr. HEITMANN (Geraldton) [10.20]: I have very few words to offer on this Bill. I have listened to the debate, but I have not been impressed greatly by the arguments put forward either by those who think racing is necessary or by those who would be inclined to lead this House to believe it means so much to the improvement of the

stock in the State. I think the day is past when the quality of stock in Western Australia will receive any great benefit from the thoroughbreds now being used in our racing. If it were that the quality of stock depended entirely on racing, then it becomes a matter of the cost to the State whether it would not be better for the State to own the thoroughbred stock and pass it on for the use of the people rather than adopt this roundabout method of improving the quality by maintaining racing. It has been argued that a thousand pounds per week is spent in chaff by the horse owners in Perth but to my mind that is no argument that we should retain racing as we have it at present. Nor am I impressed by the glowing recommendation which has been given to the bookmaker by several speakers. I did not know before that the bookmaker on the racecourse was of such value to the State. Neither am I impressed by the statement that if this legislation be passed the owners of racehorses would leave the State. The best owners in the State are people connected with squatting, and will anyone tell me that the Grant Bros. who are real good sports and own some of the best horses in the State, would leave this State if we close down on racing entirely, or that their stock on the station would deteriorate in value? It must be patent to those gentlemen who advanced the argument that the horse owner would leave the State, that it is rather desirable, if the horse owner depends on racing as a business, that he should leave the State. As regards the improvement of stock the member for Roebourne (Mr. Butcher) knows that for the high standard of blood stock on the North-West stations racing has not been responsible.

Mr. Foley: But racehorses have been solely responsible for it.

Mr. HEITMANN: No. Let us turn to other classes of stock for a moment. On the stations of the Messrs. Grant there is not a head of stock which is not of good blood—whether sheep, cattle, or any other kind of stock. Let us take the Clydesdale. It is well known that in this State we have Clydesdale stock equal to that to be found in any part of Australia. That is not the result of racing, or the result of competition for prizes; in fact, the leading blood stock

horses are not being used to any considerable extent for utility purposes. Most members must know that thoroughly well. It is not necessary to have racing in order to have a good standard of blood stock. While I am not impressed with the arguments relative to stock which have been used against the measure, I am going to oppose the Bill because I do not agree with either the Premier or the Honorary Minister in their contention that in war time we have a special right to tax any section of the community, irrespective of their ability to pay. The last speaker said, "Surely we are justified during war time in taxing that which is purely for pleasure." Let me point out to him that if he follows his argument to its logical conclusion—and that will not be going very far—he should tax the owner of a £600 motor car who uses it purely for pleasure.

Mr. Munsie: He is taxed now.

Mr. HEITMANN: But not to any appreciable extent. Let me ask the Honorary Minister, what right have we to say that we will tax one man earning £4 a week because he spends his money in a certain direction, and miss another man earning the same amount because he spends it in another direction?

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): If the man can afford to spend it in racing we should tax him.

Mr. HEITMANN: Another man might afford to spend it on a motor car or in beer. We have no right to tax the pleasure of any class of people until that pleasure interferes with the pleasure or liberty of other people. The Premier has clearly said that taxation under this Bill is going to be passed on to those who use the totalisator. There it is again—class taxation purely and simply. I should not consider myself justified in saying that because a man likes to visit the racecourse once a week, or once a fortnight, or once a year, and enjoy himself by placing 10s. on the totalisator, I will tax him and let go free the man who places his 10s. in the bank. The thriftiest man is the easiest to tax, and he is not always the most desirable man in the community. If the Government are not prepared to give evidence of some backbone by tackling the question of taxation in a proper manner, I am not going to assist them in sweeping the

by-ways for a penny here and a penny there. Is it not fair to say that we will allow a certain amount to provide a certain standard of living and after that tax the income? Let us take the stand of saying, "We will not interfere with the manner in which a man spends his money, but we will tax him on what we consider should be his surplus, no matter how he spends his income." The proposal of the Premier is unfair to a degree, and shows that he is not prepared to tax the class who are well able to afford something additional. There are men in this State making, during war time, more than they made prior to the war, men making money out of the war, men getting high salaries because of the war.

Mr. Smith: The Federal Government are going to tax those men.

Mr. HEITMANN: If the Federal Government's taxation proposals are not drawn on more scientific lines than this tax, I will oppose them too. I disagree with the Federal Government's tax on amusements, and I shall always oppose such an impost. I believe in taxing that part of a man's income which may be considered his surplus. That is the only fair method of taxation. Until the Premier is prepared to adopt that course I am not prepared to support him.

The Premier: I do not expect your support, you know. Support the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HEITMANN: I am not concerned about the leader of the Opposition or anyone else.

The Premier: Your leader has cracked the whip over you.

Mr. HEITMANN: I wish to put a question to the Premier. In what way is he going to reach the man who does not attend the racecourse or the threepenny picture show, although in receipt of a good salary or a large income? The Premier has not the pluck to tackle those men—men whom he suspects of supporting him. The Premier tackles the unfortunate few, a small section of the community whose votes will not make much difference either way. Let the Premier grapple with the broad question and say that every man shall pay a little during this time of war. Let him, if he likes, tax incomes from £2 a week upwards. For

my part, I would be prepared to vote for the complete wiping-out of racing.

The Premier: Not you.

Mr. HEITMANN: Let the Premier abolish bookmakers if he likes, but I will not assist him to impose class taxation of this description.

Mr. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [10.35]: The Honorary Minister, in concluding his remarks, stated that this Bill did not deal with the bookmaker. I interjected that the Government in introducing the Bill were thinking of the social reformer. In my mind there is no doubt that this matter had been thoroughly thrashed out by the Government some considerable time previously to the introduction of the measure. A leading article published by the *West Australian* in July last dealt with the liquor question and pointed out that the Premier would be wise to allow free discussion so far as liquor legislation was concerned. This had reference to the referendum, of course, the Bill for which was introduced by a private member, open discussion being allowed. The leading article proceeded—

If Mr. Wilson does not meet the social reformers altogether as they would like on the liquor question, he will secure their plaudits by announcing a Bill for the suppression of street betting; indeed, the Government is understood to intend the removal of the bookmaker entirely, abolishing the gentleman of the bag, the voice, and the sartorial finish which must often excite the envy of his customers.

The Premier: What was the date of that leading article?

Mr. ANGWIN: It was published on the day the Premier made his policy speech. There can be no doubt that the Press had a conference with the Premier, in the course of which the hon. gent outlined the policy he intended to place before Parliament. The Press discovered that he did not intend to deal with the liquor question in such a manner as would please the social reformers. The incoming Government wanted the plaudits of the social reformers in another direction, and they played for those plaudits. As a result, we find the leader of the social reformers in the city of Perth, Mr.

Prowse, saying that the Premier has gone off at a tangent for the abolition of the bookmaker, for which there has been no agitation. I sympathise with the Premier in his failure to gain the applause he anticipated from the introduction of this measure.

The Premier: I never look for applause.

Mr. ANGWIN: In my mind there is no doubt that the other Bill, now being discussed in another place, should have preceded this measure. Had that course been adopted, we would have been able to have a thorough discussion of the action of the Government, which is not possible on this Bill. The passage of another measure is anticipated by the Bill now under discussion. I certainly think the Premier has not realised the position. He has not thoroughly considered the amount of revenue he is likely to receive under this measure. His own words, in my opinion, clearly indicate that, if this Bill is passed, the Government will not receive the amount of money they are expecting from the totalisator. The Premier's own words show clearly that racing will be curtailed; and, if racing is curtailed, it will be impossible for him to get the revenue he anticipates under this Bill.

The Premier: Say I get 90 per cent. of it.

Mr. ANGWIN: I am very doubtful of that.

The Premier: Say I get 75 per cent.

Mr. ANGWIN: I doubt whether the Premier will get more than he is receiving at the present time. If the statements of those who profess to know racing, and the working of the totalisator, are correct—especially the statements of those who waited on the Premier by deputation—

The Premier: Do you believe their statements?

Mr. ANGWIN: A great part of those statements might be correct. There may be some little exaggeration. While allowing for a certain amount of exaggeration in those statements, I fail to see how it is possible to obtain the revenue the Premier anticipates from the totalisator.

The Premier: Suppose I get 50 per cent. of it.

The Minister for Works: The Premier is satisfied.

Mr. ANGWIN: I do not know whether the Premier is satisfied or not. I doubt that he is satisfied, because he played for the applause of the social reformers, and has not obtained it. Consequently, I think he is not satisfied.

The Minister for Works: He will be satisfied if he gets the money.

Mr. ANGWIN: I am doubtful whether he will get the money; and I do not think the Minister interjecting believes the Premier will get the money. It is not fair, just, or equitable to introduce a measure of this kind affecting one class of citizens. The Government should bring down a comprehensive measure for the purpose of dealing with all classes of citizens in the State. The Premier has repeatedly stated "We want this money to pay for your liabilities." He has had a fair sum from the trading concerns towards paying off some of this since he has been Treasurer.

The Premier: No fear.

Mr. ANGWIN: Far more than he would derive from this tax in three or four years.

The Premier: How much was it.

Mr. ANGWIN: You had £106,000 in the first month.

The Premier: Does it not take something to get that £106,000?

Mr. ANGWIN: We will have an opportunity of dealing with that particular question later on. I hope the Bill will be thrown out.

Mr. THOMAS (Bunbury) [10.40]: This Bill, on account of the lengthy debate, has assumed an importance which at first it did not seem to be worthy of. There was some little misunderstanding in my mind as to the purpose of the Bill when I listened to the Premier introducing it. I gathered in a casual sort of way that the object was to abolish the bookmaker. In looking through the Bill and after listening to the speeches made since then, it seems that everyone has repudiated any intention whatever to abolish the bookmaker, so far as this Bill is concerned. It appears to be a taxation measure for the purpose of raising revenue. I should say then that it presents itself in an entirely different light. There comes in the question of whether it is a just tax or otherwise. If racing is a menace to the wel-

fare of the community I should say, abolish it. If the bookmaker is undesirable, get rid of him. If racing, on the other hand, is not objectionable, if the laws of this country are going to permit it to continue and the bookmaker to raise his raucous voice, and it is for the welfare of this country that it should continue, why place a tax upon these people more than upon any other section of the community? If the thing is objectionable and wrong, and detrimental to the welfare of the country, however, get rid of it. If we are going to give it the protection of the law and say that horse-racing and the totalisator are quite fair, legitimate, and desirable, why place an impost upon one section of the community which is not going to be placed upon the other sections? I am not much concerned about the bookmaker. If a straight-out measure came before the House for the curtailment of racing in this country, and for the abolition of the bookmaker, I would be prepared to take a very definite stand on the matter, because I believe that whilst the fate of the Empire is swinging in the balance, whilst we are told that the great necessity of the time is that we should conserve our resources and save every penny we can, and whilst we realise that the best men of Australia are risking their lives for the protection of the Empire, I do not think it is a fair proposition to encourage horse-racing, or the totalisator, or the bookmaker in connection with racing, or football clubs or anything of that description. We have more serious matters to consider. If these things are not desirable, why not wipe them out? The member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) has said that £1,000 per week is being spent on horse-feed in order to maintain horse-racing in Perth. If that is so, it is very wrong. It is neither right, fair, nor just that such a thing should be permitted to continue. This Bill is not seeking to abolish that, but it seeks to divert revenue from the bookmaker into the totalisator. It is, however, not even seeking to do that. We are told that we must wait for a later occasion, when we may hear something in connection with that subject. It is to allow this sort of thing to go on, for this £1,000 a week to continue to be spent on chaff in order to keep going all the bookmakers, the touts and general hangers-on of the turf. The object

is to get a little more revenue from the totalisator, and in return for that compensation we must wink at the evils which are connected with the sport. As far as the breeding of horses and the improvement of the strain are concerned, and bringing horses into Western Australia to develop our stud stock, I do not value horse-racing from that point of view one iota. I have not seen any stock outside those racing on the courses which has shown any result of this improvement in breeding.

Mr. Scaddan: Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMAS: They are either bred almost exclusively for speed or have no breeding at all.

Mr. Scaddan: You are quite wrong. Hundreds of horses are bred in the State which never see a racecourse, but are bred from imported stock.

Mr. THOMAS: Amongst all the hacks that one sees about, one sees some of the poorest classes of animals that can be found in Western Australia.

Mr. Scaddan: You are quite wrong.

Mr. THOMAS: I do not agree with the hon. member. I will not pursue that argument any further. I have certain firm convictions about the matter. I have no love for or appreciation of the bookmaker, and do not think he serves any useful purpose in the community. I think he might be easily put to a better purpose. If he was made a primary producer or something of that sort, he would be more valuable to the State, and if he did a little honest toil in Western Australia and increased his productivity, he might be very usefully employed. I do not associate myself with bookmakers in any way. Racing in Western Australia during war time should be curtailed. If we are going to permit it to exist it must be placed on the same footing as several other amusements or businesses in Western Australia, and must stand or fall upon that position. To put an unreasonable amount of taxation upon people who follow racing, after permitting them to do so, I say is unfair and unjust. In any case such a proposal should be brought before the House, together with any other taxation proposals of the Government, in order that we

may know exactly the imposts that we are going to place upon everyone in Western Australia. However great the burdens may be, they should be divided according to the capacity of the people to bear them. I believe there is only one way of dealing fairly and squarely with a matter of this sort, namely, taxation, and it is one which the Premier would have adopted had it not been for the fact that he attacked the leader of the Opposition when he brought such a proposal before Parliament.

The Premier: What is the proposal?

Mr. THOMAS: The war tax proposal. That is the only fair and just form of taxation which could be put upon the people of Western Australia. Let us tax every man according to the benefits he receives from the country, and according to the amount he has with which to pay. I will not shirk my share of responsibility or escape any taxation that comes along. So much Western Australia needs for the carrying on of its government under proper conditions, and I am prepared to vote and to fight for such needs. But the proposals must be fair and just for every section of the community. I will not go so far as the member for Geraldton (Mr. Heitmann), who advocated that a man with £2 a week should pay a tax. I do not consider that would be a fair tax, because such a man is only on the starvation mark. When one passes the mark upon which a man can subsist in decency, then I would join with the Government in placing all the taxation upon people that is needed in order to carry on the government of the country, provided it is a fair and just measure of taxation. This measure I cannot vote for.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex—in reply) [10.50]: I commend the member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) for his brave utterances. I have been accustomed to listen to such utterances from the members of the Opposition on many occasions when they are prepared to do their duty by the country and the Government. It is the attitude the hon. member takes up. No matter what measure I brought forward I would expect to receive the opposition of hon. members who sit opposite to me, and I would not be disappointed. They talk all

round the subject. They approach it with the high and patriotic effort of men who are pledged to serve their country and do what is right, and they wind up with the declaration that they cannot support a measure which is unjust, and which touches the pockets of one section of the community without levying upon the whole of the people. With all my experience I am unable to formulate measures which will suit hon. members opposite. I very much regret to say that I do not propose to attempt the task.

Mr. Scaddan: You have my sympathy.

The PREMIER: I have, however, attempted to do my duty, according to my own judgment, and I am going to stand or fall by my actions in this respect. I had intended to pay some graceful compliment to the leader of the Opposition and to extend to him my heartfelt thanks for the gracious manner in which he received the proposal for this little increased taxation on the totalisator takings. If I can read English aright I certainly understand his words to say that he would not oppose the second reading of this measure. But I find that he is wobbling. Since several of his ardent supporters have taken upon themselves the duty of strongly opposing the measure because the Government have introduced it, he is wobbling in their direction. Let him wobble as he has done in the past. Let him continue to wobble as he likes. I would draw attention to what the hon. member said when he was introducing the Totalisator Regulation Bill in 1911, when he first took office. He and his supporters accuse me of bringing down a double-barrelled measure, something in the nature of taxation to raise revenue, which at the same time will minimise a great evil. The ex-Attorney General (Mr. Walker) was himself eloquent in his condemnation of a Government which would bring down a double-barrelled measure; as though he had never done such a thing himself or as though his leader had never done such a thing. When introducing the Totalisator Regulation Bill in December, 1911, the present leader of the Opposition said—

Personally I feel inclined to give some encouragement to trotting—

He was going to license the use of the totalisator on trotting courses. He continued—because trotting horses are a class of horses of more actual benefit to the community than galloping horses.

He went on to enlarge upon the utility of trotting meetings because of this very fact. Then he drops right down and says—

Viewed from another standpoint, to-day we are making use of the totalisator as a means for obtaining revenue.

A double-barrelled measure, not only to encourage trotting, but also to raise revenue! And his supporters condemn me because I introduce a measure which is going to increase my revenue, as the hon. member's did on that occasion, and which will also minimise the evil of the bookmaker.

Mr. Scaddan: The bookmaker is not in this Bill.

The PREMIER: "Would a gift some giftie gie us to see ourselves as ithers see us." The hon. member should look back into his own mind and explain all his actions and reconcile them with the condemnation he heaps on his successors. Let us go a little further in the introduction of this measure of 1911, and see whether he himself did not also contemplate the abolition of the bookmaker. On that occasion he said—

If we are going to allow betting at sports gatherings it is better to encourage people to bet through the totalisator, which cannot be up to the tricks of the bookmaker, and thus benefit the State. Then he quoted something from the Commissioner of Taxation in regard to the use of the totalisator, as follows:—

The law of the land has, since 1883, legalised the use of the totalisator by clubs or companies established for the purpose of promoting horse-racing—

Mr. Scaddan: You inferred that I did it.

The PREMIER: Nothing of the sort. The hon. member is wobbling again. He will fire his shots, but I am going to give him the 16-inch gun. He quoted the Commissioner of Taxation, as I have said, and the quotation continued—

and registered by the Western Australian Turf Club (Totalisator Act, 1883 and 1899, and Criminal Code, sec. 209), and since 23rd December, 1905, has imposed a

tax on totalisator takings. The Criminal Code, sec. 209, prohibits betting in any house, room, or place other than by means of a totalisator conducted on the race-course of a club, etc., registered by the Western Australian Turf Club. If business of this nature (betting) were confined to the totalisator, it is reasonable to predict that the returns from totalisator duty would be trebled.

The hon. member quoted that for the information of the House. If we restricted betting to the totalisator the returns would be trebled. I prophesy, on the advice of experts, that it may be doubled. The hon. member and his followers condemn such a statement and say I am going to kill the industry, as they call it. Now listen to what the hon. member said in comment on that quotation. These were his words—

It is worth consideration whether it is advisable to abolish the bookmaker and thus give an opportunity of extending the system of the totalisator and thereby adding to the revenue, while removing a lot of the evils that exist by the presence of the bookmaker. But I do not propose to do that on this occasion.

He was only going to license the totalisator. He continued—

Our object is to extend the operations of the totalisator machine to the West Australian Trotting Association and clubs registered under the Western Australian Turf Club. It may be found necessary later on to extend the Bill still further.

The hon. member is posing here as a moralist and he is speaking against the Bill now, although on the second reading he said it was not his intention to oppose it. The hon. member declared that it was worthy of consideration and he hoped later on to see the measure extended still further to deal with the bookmakers so that they too should contribute to the revenue.

Mr. Scaddan: That is absolutely incorrect.

The PREMIER: What are the arguments advanced in opposition to the measure? I cannot understand the opposition of hon. members on the other side of the House. Of course, I should not expect them to support me, because I have had so much experience

of them. An argument which has been advanced against the measure is that it will kill the industry; so says the member for Leonora (Mr. Foley). I do not know what his definition of "industry" is. It does not appeal to me that racing is an industry as we understand the meaning of the word. It seems to me that it ought to be classed as a luxury. Because the Bill is going to kill this industry or because the Treasurer will not get the revenue he anticipates receiving, the hon. member for Leonora is going to oppose it. Other hon. members followed in a similar strain. They are convinced that the Treasurer will not get the revenue he expects to receive, and consequently they are going to oppose the measure. We have heard that argument from time immemorial. It has always been advanced when taxation proposals have been submitted. I do not care whether such proposals have been in connection with liquor or customs tariff, or incomes or dividend duties, whatever the proposal, the same argument has been advanced in every Parliament of the British Empire. What does it matter if I get £10,000 or £20,000 less than I expect to receive, so long as I get the remainder? What does it matter if I do make an error in my estimate?

Mr. Holman: It would not be the first.

The PREMIER: I have made many errors and I have lived to rectify many and I have also been very correct very often in my judgment.

Mr. Munsie: You did not quite rectify the error you made in connection with the redistribution of seats.

The PREMIER: I made no error then. The error was an error of judgment on the part of the people who were misled by the clap-trap of hon. members opposite, hon. members who would make any statement on the hustings to advance their own ends. We will hear the same cry this time, but they will find that they will suffer defeat such as they never expected. I was pointing out that the same argument has always been advanced against any proposal to increase taxation.

Mr. Scaddan: You have used it too.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is trying to bluff me. He cannot support his statements by any quotations of my remarks.

Therefore, I do not propose to take any notice of his statements. They do not carry any weight even with hon. members if they be honest to themselves and to the House and the people whom they represent. Unfortunately, hon. members have become imbued with the one idea that their duty to the country is to destroy their political opponents, and if they can achieve that object they will do so notwithstanding what their electors may think, and notwithstanding what their ideals may be.

Mr. Munsie: Do not judge us by yourself.

The PREMIER: Let me touch on another argument which was advanced, that the Bill must be opposed because I cannot get the revenue which I estimate I shall receive. This argument has been advanced as though we were introducing some new proposal, as though we were attempting to ask the House to adopt some new principle of taxation which has never been in vogue in this State before. Hon. members have condemned this proposal because they have declared it to be an iniquitous form of taxation. Is it not already in existence and has it not been in existence since 1905? The leader of the Opposition had five years in office and he was supported by the members who are sitting with him, and I quoted from *Hansard* to show that their proposal was one not only to minimise the evil, but also for the purpose of raising revenue. I also quoted from his speech to show that he contemplated going even further and doing as we propose on this occasion to do, to abolish the bookmaker. What is the enormous sin we are guilty of? There is already on the statute book a law prescribing that those who bet on the totalisator shall suffer, in return for the privilege which they enjoy, a reduction of 10 per cent. That reduction is applied to the gross of the money placed in the totalisator. In addition, the racing clubs provide by their regulations that they also retain the fractions; and then, of course, there are the unclaimed dividends, which are retained by the clubs. The law further provides that the clubs shall be permitted to retain of the amounts invested in the totalisator 10 per cent. All that this Bill proposes is to extend this percentage to 12½. Where does the great and crying evil come in?

Mr. Bolton: What about the fractions?

Mr. Scaddan: You propose to do more than that.

The PREMIER: On the principle of taxation, we propose to increase the deduction from 10 per cent. to 12½. And yet hon. members rise in righteous indignation, saying "This is an unrighteous system of taxation, and we will oppose it."

Mr. Scaddan: If you will stick to that, I will support you.

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to repose any credence whatever in the hon. member's promise to support the measure at all.

Mr. Scaddan: You can please yourself as to that, of course.

The PREMIER: I do not care twopence about the hon. member's support.

Mr. Scaddan: It is not on sale.

The PREMIER: I would not give a penny for it. I ask, is it not absurd for men who claim to have common sense, men who are always prating about their fairness and justice, absolutely to condemn this proposal, when the system has been in being ever since 1905? They condemn it all round, and they allowed it to continue in existence all the time they occupied these Treasury benches; they even proposed to increase the taxation.

Mr. Bolton: The bookmaker was in competition with the totalisator then.

The PREMIER: The hon. member's leader proposed to abolish the bookmaker.

Mr. Scaddan: Nothing of the kind.

The PREMIER: I will quote the proposal; and I wonder what the outside public will think of the quotation.

Mr. Bolton: We know what they think of you.

The PREMIER: From the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) we had a most eloquent speech, in the course of which the hon. member was good enough to admit that there is far too much racing in this State.

Opposition Members: So there is.

The PREMIER: Hon. members opposite say there is; but have they ever taken any steps to decrease it? On the contrary, they increased it all the time they were in power. The member for Pilbara admits that there is too much racing, and then goes on to add that it is unfair to put up legislation of a piecemeal character. He argued that as we cannot by legislation prevent the practice of

betting and of other vices of the same description, forsooth—this is what I gathered from his remarks generally—we should take no action whatsoever. There is another Bill coming down? Certainly there is another Bill coming down which proposes certain amendments of the law controlling betting and other matters. But I protest that I cannot have all the Bills on the Table of this House at one and the same moment. I must propose one Bill before I propose another. Before the session ends, there will be several more Bills introduced, including, possibly, some as to which hon. members have, in very strong language, declared to-night that the Government are absolutely afraid to introduce them.

Mr. Scaddan: Hear, hear. Let us have them.

The PREMIER: Whilst I would be very willing and even glad to throw all my proposals on the Table of this House at one time, yet I do wish to enter my protest against the nature of the reply which I have received from the other side upon the introduction of this measure, the whole sum-total of the proceeds of which cannot go one-half the way towards paying interest and sinking fund on the deficit which my predecessors in office left me as a legacy to adopt.

Mr. Bolton: It will go towards meeting your own deficit.

The PREMIER: If hon. members opposite want to know what I intend to do with the money that will be coming to the Treasury under this Bill, and with the proceeds of the increase in stamp duty—the two taxation proposals now before the House—let me tell them that the proceeds will be devoted to payment of interest and sinking fund on the deficit they left behind them.

Mr. Bolton: What about your own?

The PREMIER: I shall deal with my own deficit when I come along with it. I shall not be backward in telling the House clearly what I propose to do with it, and how I propose to handle it, and how I propose to raise the funds needed for the purpose of successfully handling it.

Mr. Bolton: Tell us how you are going to stop your deficit from growing.

The PREMIER: To ask me to disclose the whole of the Budget, and the whole financial position of the State, on a two-

penny-halfpenny measure of this description, is to ask what I am satisfied the majority of the House will not tolerate. Hon. members opposite threaten to hang up the legislation of the Government because they cannot have a full and complete knowledge of all the Government propose to do in connection with the finances. The Government, as I have previously outlined, have to go to work cautiously. They have to get right down to the bottom of things, to formulate completely the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure for the current financial year. I do hope to have the Estimates so far advanced within a day or two as to be able to deliver the Budget in a week or so.

Mr. Scaddan: Adjourn the House and give yourself a chance.

The PREMIER: I will do nothing of the kind.

Mr. Scaddan: The country is entitled to know what you are going to do.

The PREMIER: I am going to conduct the business of the House as I think proper. If the leader of the Opposition thinks he can prevent me from doing so, I challenge him to take that course.

Mr. Bolton: We are taking the course now.

Mr. Scaddan: How many members does the Premier lead in this House?

The PREMIER: The two proposals which have been debated on this Bill are entirely separate, and yet it is argued that the two proposals should be submitted "in one comprehensive measure." Members who talk in that strain know very well that one cannot have taxation proposals and administration proposals in one Bill—that such proposals must be kept separate. It is no question of trickery or dodgery when a measure practically amending the Police Act is introduced in another place whilst a Bill relating to the means which we propose for raising increased revenue is introduced in this House. It is merely following precedent; and I object to this constant baggling, this continual harassing of the Government as to the methods they adopt for carrying out their business.

Mr. Scaddan: That from you, after your five years over here doing nothing else.

The PREMIER: I do not know that. I do know that for five years I did very good

duty in exposing the misdeeds of the hon. member interjecting and of his Government. I did very good duty in letting the people know exactly where the State was drifting, and how badly the affairs of the country were being administered. I did exceedingly good duty in letting the electors know that if they permitted the hon. member and his colleagues and his supporters to retain the helm, the country would very soon drift on the rocks of bankruptcy, and that it would need, not a few years, but a quarter of a century, to remedy the condition of affairs. I am happy to think that the majority of the people of Western Australia have to-day arrived at the conviction that what I was saying during the past five years was very true.

Mr. Scaddan: How many members have you in your party?

The PREMIER: The further arguments put forward by hon. members opposite were that betting cannot be suppressed, that this Bill will undermine the "industry," that the measure will close up racing and ruin it, that betting is as rife in South Australia and New Zealand as it is in Western Australia or in any of the Eastern States.

Mr. Munsie: One of your own colleagues proved that, you know.

The PREMIER: Then hon. members say we must confine betting to the racecourses. Others say that betting is going on under the lap in South Australia, that people can bet in the main streets of Adelaide. And yet it is argued that we can confine betting with bookmakers to the racecourse and that there will be no betting under the lap in the streets of Perth. If they are correct in their argument that in South Australia betting cannot be controlled, notwithstanding that the bookmaker is abolished there, then they are incorrect in their argument that we can confine betting to the racecourses in Western Australia. Why not tax the civil servant who goes to the races? Why not tax the civil servant who goes to the Eastern States and later on takes a trip to the Old Country, though I do not know many civil servants who could do that. Even the highest paid of our civil servants could hardly do that, and yet one hon. member had the audacity to get up in his place and instance this as a reason for imposing taxation upon

them, and taxing the civil servant who is going upon a holiday. One may well ask, why tax drink and not lollies? Why tax tobacco and not ice-creams? Why do we tax all sorts of luxuries instead of necessities? We tax luxuries because they are luxuries, and because those who can afford to participate in them presumably have the capacity, according to the member for Kanowna (Mr. Walker) to bear that taxation, and therefore it is a just and accepted principle that those who have the capacity shall pay. This is the argument of some hon. members all along when we talk about a graduated income tax, that those who have the capacity must pay. Even now we have the Federal Government introducing still further taxation. We have a graduated income tax here, and there is to be a war tax to take half the profits made during the war.

Mr. Munsie: Let us have a good stiff unimproved land tax.

The PREMIER: In several instances where taxation has been imposed the principle has been followed that those who had the capacity were able to pay the bill. I fail to see how a Government could get taxation from anyone else. After it is all boiled down, and all is said and done, from whom do we raise our taxation? We raise it from those who can afford to pay, and exempt, as hon. members know perfectly well, every individual whose income is below a certain mark. I want to acknowledge that if this Bill is to be effective the bookmaker must be abolished. Exception has been taken to the proposal of the Government to enforce the existing law as from 1st December. Certain reasons have been put forward by the clubs and bookmakers as to why this should not take effect so early. The question of extending the time until after the Christmas meeting is now under consideration, but no decision has yet been arrived at. We do not want to act in too arbitrary a manner. We want to be reasonable, but at the same time want to carry out our policy. We want to administer the laws of the State as we find them, and if we cannot administer them and they are not there for that purpose then our duty would be to come to the House and ask members to repeal them. I do want to make it very clear that if the House is not going to support me in

the financial proposals which I bring forward—I am always prepared to consider reasonable suggestions in Committee regarding my measures—and is not going to support me in my efforts to raise the necessary revenue to carry on the affairs of State during very trying circumstances, then the sooner someone else is obtained to lead the Government the better. But the House must take the responsibility. I say emphatically that if the racing community cannot stand an extra 2½ per cent. which I am putting on here—

Mr. Scaddan: Sixty thousand pounds.

The PREMIER: Let the people concerned close down, and there will be no harm done to the community at large. But these people could easily stand it. The very fact that the bookmakers have been to me and have offered as a body to surrender £15,000 as an increased taxation, and that they already pay £25,000 a year in license fees to the clubs, making a total of £40,000 a year, must prove conclusively that they are on an excellent wicket, and that they must reap enormous profits to stand such taxation. If that is so, then it is reasonable to suppose that not treble the amount, as the leader of the Opposition estimated in 1911—

Mr. Scaddan: I did not.

The PREMIER: Will come from the totalisator, but that the amount derived will be substantial, and I shall be able to reap every penny of increased revenue which the Bill provides for, and do no harm whatever to the legitimate section of the sport in Western Australia.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	18

Majority for .. 2

AYES.

Mr. Allen
Mr. Butcher
Mr. Connolly
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. George
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Harrison
Mr. E. B. Johnston
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Nairn

Mr. Plesse
Mr. Robinson
Mr. Smith
Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Thomson
Mr. Veryard
Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Carpenter
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Foley
Mr. Green
Mr. Heltmann
Mr. Holman
Mr. Hudson
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Mullany

Mr. Munzie
Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Underwood
Mr. Walker
Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Bolton
(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 11.32 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 15th November, 1916.

				Page
Bills: Prohibition of Treating, 1a.	879
Betting Suppression, 2a.	879
Special Lease (Lake Clifton), 2a.	904
Wheat Marketing, 2a.	910

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

BILL—PROHIBITION OF TREATING.

Introduced by Hon. J. J. Holmes and read a first time.

BILL—BETTING SUPPRESSION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON (North-East) [4.35]: In speaking on this measure for the suppression of betting I think it is recognised that certain sections of the public require protection from other sections, and that legislation with this object in view is necessary. It has long been the practice to regulate gambling by law. It is interesting